

**BEFORE  
ALEXANDER:  
Constructing Early  
Macedonia**

---

Publications of the  
Association of  
Ancient Historians 6

---

**Eugene N. Borza**





**Before Alexander**

**Constructing Early Macedonia**

**Publications of the  
Association of Ancient Historians**

The purpose of the monograph series is to survey the state of the current scholarship in various areas of ancient history.

- #1 Past and Future in Ancient History  
*Chester G. Starr*
- #2 The Shifting Sands of History: Interpretations of  
Ptolemaic Egypt  
*Alan E. Samuel*
- #3 Roman Imperial Grand Strategy  
*Arther Ferrill*
- #4 Myth Becomes History: Pre-Classical Greece  
*Carol G. Thomas*
- #5 Ancient History: Recent Work and New Directions  
*Stanley M. Burstein, Ramsay MacMullen, Kurt A.  
Raaflaub, and Allen M. Ward*

**Other publications by the Association**

Makedonika: Essays by Eugene N. Borza  
*Edited by Carol G. Thomas*

The Coming of The Greeks  
*James T. Hooker*

Directory of Ancient Historians in the United States  
*Compiled by Konrad Kinzl*

# **Before Alexander Constructing Early Macedonia**

---

Publications of the  
Association of  
Ancient Historians 6

---

**Eugene N. Borza**



**Regina Books**  
Claremont, California

© 1999 by Eugene N. Borza

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, except for the inclusion of brief quotations in a review, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Borza, Eugene N.

Before Alexander : constructing early Macedonia / Eugene N. Borza.

p. cm. -- (Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians ; 6)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-941690-96-0 (alk. paper)

1. Macedonia--History--To 168 B.C.--Historiography. 2. Philip II, King of Macedonia, 382-336 B.C. I. Title. II. Series.

DF233 .B67 1999

938.1--dc21

99-057520

Co-published by arrangement with the  
Association of Ancient Historians

**Regina Books**

Post Office Box 280

Claremont, California 91711

Tel: (909) 624-8466 / Fax (909) 626-1345

Manufactured in the United States of America.

---

## CONTENTS

---

Foreword.....	1
I. Sources and Interpretations .....	5
II. Origins, Ethnicity, and Institutions .....	27
III. Philip II.....	51
IV. Afterword .....	75
V. Bibliography .....	85

•





---

## FOREWORD

---

What follows is a guide to the study of the ancient Macedonians through the reign of Philip II. It is intended to serve the interests of ancient historians who are not specialists in Macedonian history (although one hopes that even specialists might find something of value here), thereby fulfilling one of the goals of this monograph series. If the needs and interests of historians of other eras, of university students and their teachers, and of general educated readers are also served, the author will have been satisfied that the outreach and service goals of the Association have been met. An effort has been made to concentrate on the advances in scholarship of the past decade or so, as I attempted to provide a rather broad discussion of earlier scholarship in my book on early Macedon, published in 1990 with a revision in 1992. I hope to have avoided unnecessary repetition of what I wrote then. I have chosen to survey here only the formative period of Macedonian history, for two reasons. The first is that Ernst Badian is preparing a volume for the present series in which he will present a review of recent scholarship on Alexander the Great; any effort on my part to cover that material would be redundant. Second, a survey of Hellenistic Macedonia would be better left in the hands of someone more expert than I in the study of that era.

The organization of material in this volume is dictated by the uneven progress that has long characterized the study of the ancient Macedonians. Since I last surveyed the state of Macedonian studies, there has been a continuing lively interest in the origins of the Macedonians and in the career of Philip II, with rather little attention paid to the history of the fifth and early fourth centuries. Archaeology has proceeded at an almost furious pace for the prehistoric, late Classical and early Hellenistic periods. Thus it has seemed best to deal with recent developments in these latter periods within the context of the general discussion of sources and narrative history, and to treat the origins, ethnicity, and institutions of the Macedonians and the career of Philip II in separate chapters. I hope that the reader will forgive this somewhat unorthodox approach.

Each chapter discusses recent trends in scholarship for that particular period or topic, and provides a fundamental bibliography. No attempt has been made to make either the discussion or bibliography exhaustive; rather each chapter is a guide to the specialist literature which, in my view, has some interest or value for the student of the ancient Macedonians. To provide a detailed commentary on the many references I have cited would require space out of proportion to the format of this series. It will be sufficient here to indicate some bibliographical items as indicators of the direction of scholarship over the last decade or so, based on an examination of materials available to me through late 1998. I have been tempted to adopt the citation style long-used in the sciences, social sciences, and increasingly in some classical-studies journals, and that is to abolish footnotes in favor of simple references—author(s) and date of publication—in the text with a concordant bibliography at the end of the work. The new system, however, serves only to replace the clutter of

footnotes with clutter in the narrative text. For the sake of the reader's convenience I have retained the traditional system of citations, with a complete bibliography at the end. In order to make this essay as user-friendly as possible, I have attempted to avoid internal cross-citations as much as possible. And at the risk of repeating citations, the notes for each chapter form an independent unit. In order to avoid unnecessary page-turning I have cited titles in unabbreviated form.

If I have appeared to be opinionated about some matters, I hope that the reader will accept my views as a prerogative of age and an honest exercise of the historian's right to make judgments about the work and the methods of other scholars, with the expectation that my own work will likewise be subject to their criticism, as it has been in the past.

This monograph owes everything to numerous friends and colleagues—living and dead—whose own writings have influenced me, whose conversations have often been lively and stimulating (even through spirited disagreements), whose commentary on my own work has been helpful, and who have provided through the years a continuing source of support, encouragement, and pleasure in our society of Macedonian scholarship.

I mention a few: Lindsay Adams, Ernst Badian, Beryl Barr-Sharrar, William R. Biers, Brian Bosworth, Kostas Buraselis, Stanley M. Burstein, Elizabeth Carney, Jack Ellis, Malcolm Errington, Michael Flower, Peter Green, William Greenwalt, Charles Hamilton, Nicholas Hammond, Miltiades Hatzopoulos, Frank Holt, Richard Johnson, Eugene Ladopoulos, Stella Miller-Collett, John Morgan, Olga Palagia, and Nancy Wilkie. There are others who are no longer with us: Manolis Andronikos, Harry

Dell, Charles Edson, Sam Greenwood, Martin Price, Stewart Oost, and Eugene Vanderpool.

I wish to thank especially: Stanley M. Burstein, who originated the idea of the series of monographs, *Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians*, in which the present work appears; Carol G. Thomas, the Association president from May 1993 to May 1999, who contributed an admirable balance of patience and persistence for a manuscript long overdue; and James D. Muhly, Robert A. Bridges, Jr., and Nancy A. Winter, who provided unexcelled research facilities and creature comforts at my home away from home, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

There is additional pleasure in dedicating this monograph to my colleagues in the Association of Ancient Historians.

In the course of preparing this work it was inevitable that some important items would be overlooked. Fortunately, the publisher, Richard Burns, has permitted me the opportunity to add a few items at the last moment to the relevant chapters. I am grateful to him for his cooperation in this matter.

—*Fargo, North Dakota*  
*March 1999*



# I

---

## SOURCES AND INTERPRETATIONS

---

### ANCIENT WRITTEN EVIDENCE AND SOME MODERN COMMENTARIES

Like the Carthaginians and the Spartans, the Macedonians are among the silent peoples of the ancient Mediterranean basin. Almost everything we know about them derives from the written accounts of others, and—as in the case of the Carthaginians and the Spartans—those written accounts were either not well-informed or they were hostile, and occasionally both. While a handful of scattered fragments relate incidental and mostly mythological bits of information about Macedonian proto-history, the earliest attempt to deal with the proper history of the Macedonians is found in Herodotus. Herodotus visited the Macedonians, perhaps in the 450s B. C. While there he was told Macedonian versions of their own early history. These tales speak of an Argive—that is, Greek—origin of the Argead royal house, whereby refugees from Argos eventually settled in Macedonia and established their rule over local non-Greek people.<sup>1</sup> The traditions related by Herodotus reveal a strong prohellenic bent, are scattered throughout the narrative of Xerxes's invasion of Greece, and show King Alexander I (*ca.* 492-*ca.* 454 B. C.) as the

---

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 8.137-39.

secret ally of the Greeks, even after having medized. While much of Herodotus's description of Alexander I's behavior during the Persian invasion may be credible, the tales of the Greek origins of the royal family is likely Macedonian philhellenic propaganda designed to appeal to the contemporary mid-fifth-century Greek world.<sup>2</sup> Herodotus reveals himself on several occasions by commenting on such tales with "the Macedonians say...." There is no independent confirmation of this Macedonian tradition. It is noteworthy that Herodotus, with his famous inclination toward ethnography, appears to be not much interested in the Macedonians as a people, and refers to their kings only in the context of Alexander I's activity during the Persian Wars. Alexander emerges as the earliest king who must be regarded as a historical figure, and several studies have begun to build an account of his career along the lines indicated above.<sup>3</sup>

There have, however, been recent attempts to modify this picture. As Herodotus is virtually our only source for the activities of Alexander I, Scaife and Badian<sup>4</sup> have taken a somewhat different tack, and that is to examine Herodotus's portrayal of Alexander through a sophisticated

---

<sup>2</sup> Eugene N. Borza, "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House," *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*. Hesperia, suppl. 19 (1982) 7-13.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.; R. M. Errington, "Alexander the Philhellene and Persia," in Harry J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki 1981) 139-43; J. W. Cole, "Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles," *L'Antiquité Classique* 47 (1978) 37-49.

<sup>4</sup> Ross Scaife, "Alexander I in the Histories of Herodotus," *Hermes* 117 (1989) 129-37; E. Badian, "Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences," in Simon Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford 1994) 107-30.

literary and historiographical analysis of how Herodotus worked. Such an approach, of course, leads one inevitably to a reconsideration of Herodotus's subject, Alexander himself. The result is a revision of the portrait drawn by *inter alia* Errington, Cole, and myself. Scaife argues that it is uncertain whether Herodotus and Alexander had ever met and whether Herodotus was in fact a mouthpiece for Macedonian prohellenic propaganda. Like Badian, Scaife accepts the validity of a number of Herodotean accounts of Alexander's activities both before and during Xerxes's invasion, and concludes that Herodotus's account of Alexander's career was marked by a certain ambivalence: he was a Greek who had sold out to the Persians. Badian takes the analysis one step further, suggesting that Herodotus not only disapproved of Alexander's medism but also deliberately reinterpreted the events that linked Alexander, Athens, and the Persians prior to Xerxes's invasion so as to muddy the waters. Through silence and vagueness Herodotus concealed the truth about Alexander's activities, preserving only those traditions that appeared to cast the king in a prohellenic light.

Thucydides, who apparently accepted the Herodotean/Macedonian tradition, provides considerable information about the military and diplomatic activity of Macedonian kings during the Peloponnesian War. King Perdiccas II (*ca.* 454-*ca.* 413) ruled during much of the War. His reign was marked first by an internal conflict with members of his own family and then by his efforts to maintain the independence of his kingdom against the encroachments of the major protagonists of the Peloponnesian War, as Macedonia was rich in forest products. Greek city-states, starved for lumber and pitch for ships and for huge building timbers, attempted to gain access to Macedonian wood, and they fought to deny that access to their

adversaries. Both Athenians and Spartans sent armies north. Long-established Greek cities along the Macedonian and Thracian littoral as well as new settlements implanted during the period of Athenian expansion appeared to threaten Macedonian sovereignty. Perdiccas's response was to make and break alliances with both sides. Lacking sufficient military resources to be a major contender in the Peloponnesian War, the Macedonians could do little but offer assistance or resistance as conditions warranted. Perdiccas was able to maintain such a policy because no Greek city-state possessed the resources to sustain a military commitment sufficient to conquer the huge northern kingdom, especially when there were more pressing threats closer to home. Thus, the Macedonians sporadically emerge from and retire into Thucydides's narrative as a kind of third front in a conflict which has been generally regarded as bi-polar.

Using a method similar to that employed in his analysis of Herodotus's account of Alexander I, Badian examines Thucydides's description of the relations between Perdiccas and the Athenians and the Thracian king Sitalces.<sup>5</sup> It is a story of bad faith, with Perdiccas and the Athenians betraying one another, but also of the Athenians having botched the possibility of a potential profitable alliance with the Thracians. Badian argues that Thucydides deliberately disguised the Athenian betrayal of Sitalces, and substituted his own version of the motives and intentions of these parties. Thus recent scholarship has added a new dimension, an attempt to analyze the activities of Macedonian kings not only on the basis of general historical probability but also through the filter of ancient

---

<sup>5</sup> E. Badian, "Thucydides and the *Archē* of Philip," in *From Plataea to Potidaea. Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia* (Baltimore and London 1993) 171-85.



writers who had reason to modify their historical narratives in accord with their own points of view.

The first half of the fourth century B.C. presents a continuation of the fifth-century dilemma: there is no narrative source for Macedonia. Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus, Isocrates, Justin, Plutarch, and some Athenian orators provide bits of information, normally when there is some connection between the Macedonians and the Greek city-states. The original contemporary sources for the period—e.g., Theopompus, Ephorus, Callisthenes, and, somewhat later, Duris—are lost, and we are thereby deprived of knowing just how large the Macedonian kingdom loomed in the minds and policies of Greek cities during this period. Moreover, the Macedonian monarchy had fallen on hard times, beset by internal conflict and serious external pressure from the Thracians, Illyrians, and the Greek cities of Chalcidice. The period between the death of Archelaus in 399 and the accession of Philip II in 360 saw no fewer than eight Argeadae on the throne, and only one of these, Amyntas III (393-370/69), can be said to have provided the strong, stable leadership of his fifth-century predecessors and fourth-century successors.

Given the spotty nature of the evidence it is little wonder that so few scholars have attempted to work on an era that seems to promise little reward. Nevertheless there is some progress. Unlike the fixed literary evidence which can only be reinterpreted, the numismatic evidence is constantly being enlarged and analyzed.<sup>6</sup> Among his other interests in the Argead monarchy, William Greenwalt has occasionally examined Macedonian coinage. In a recent

---

<sup>6</sup> The American Numismatic Society publishes the semiannual *Numismatic Literature*, thereby providing a convenient way to keep current on numismatic-based scholarship.



essay<sup>7</sup> he suggested that Archelaus (ca. 413-399) adopted a new weight standard designed to facilitate trade with Athens at a time of an increased Athenian importation of Macedonian lumber, for which Archelaus was in 406 made *proxenos* and *euergetes* by that city. The disintegration of the monarchy following Archelaus's assassination in 399 is reflected in the poor quality of the Macedonian coinage; indeed—by Greenwalt's measure—the quality of the coinage mirrors the good or ill fortunes of the monarchy right up to the time of Philip II.<sup>8</sup>

In a closely-reasoned essay Duane March has re-examined the ancient and early medieval literary evidence on the early fourth-century Macedonian kings, and has thereby provided a revised chronology of the king lists.<sup>9</sup> Any such study is fraught with difficulties, not the least of which is the problem of how to figure Macedonian regnal years, and whether or not to accept that Amyntas III's

---

<sup>7</sup> William S. Greenwalt, "The Production of Coinage from Archelaus to Perdiccas III and the Evolution of Argead Macedonia," in Ian Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History* (Oxford 1994) 105-34.

<sup>8</sup> The great work on the coinage of Philip II, of course, is that of Georges Le Rider, *Le monnayage d'argent et d'or de Philippe II frappé en Macédoine de 359 à 294* (Paris 1977). In 1996 the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation provided a forum in which Le Rider reviewed his own classification of the gold coinage issued by the mints at Pella, Amphipolis, Pydna, and Aegae, and answered the challenges that had been raised by the late Martin Price.

The Le Rider-Price positions were reviewed also by Thomas R. Martin and M. B. Hatzopoulos, and the results published, with an excellent bibliography on Philip's coinage, in the Foundation's occasional monograph series, *Meletēmata*: Georges Le Rider, *Monnayage et finances de Philippe II. Un état de la question*. *Meletēmata*, no. 23 (Athens 1996).

<sup>9</sup> Duane March, "The Kings of Macedon: 399-369 B.C.," *Historia* 44 (1995) 257-82.

reign was split by the brief reign of one Argaeus. March has offered a plausible, if not completely persuasive, alternative to the chronology of kings set forth by *inter alia* J. R. Ellis and the present author. Paul Goukowsky has addressed the thorny issue of the collateral branches of the Argead royal family in the fourth century B.C.<sup>10</sup> In a careful study he attempted to connect the collateral branches with specific geographic regions of Macedonia (where known), and to examine the role that marriages played among the various branches of the family. Anyone who has even glanced at a genealogical chart of the Argeadae for this period cannot help but be impressed with its complexity, and one wonders just how—beyond the use of brute force—the royal succession was determined, whether on the basis of some unknown-to-us strict genealogical line or according to some base of power and wealth that resided in control of a region. Is it the old conflict between the “rights” of a narrow royal blood line on the one hand and, on the other, the entrenched power of a feudal nobility related to the blood line, such as characterized several European feudal monarchies?

Along these lines, Elizabeth Carney, who has over the years established herself as the leading investigator of the role of Macedonian royal women, sees the Argeadae as a clan, and women in the royal family as an integral part of that clan.<sup>11</sup> Female members of the clan were not excluded from “legitimate political power and action” because they did not normally hold a titled position, although the scope

---

<sup>10</sup> Paul Goukowsky, “Les maisons princières de Macédoine de Perdiccas II à Philippe II,” *Études d’Archeologie Classique* 7 (1991) 43-66.

<sup>11</sup> Elizabeth D. Carney, “Women and *Basileia*: Legitimacy and Female Political Action in Macedonia,” *Classical Journal* 90 (1995) 367-91.

of their activity varied with circumstance. Indeed, argues Carney, the “kingship” itself was not a titled office (like modern European monarchs) until quite late. By raising what might at first appear to be an issue peripheral to the main thrust of her article, Carney has touched on a matter of importance to our understanding of Macedonian royal authority before the age of Alexander the Great. It is problematic whether any Macedonian leader before Philip II bore the formal title of *basileus*; every possible contemporary attribution of that title to a king’s name is in dispute.<sup>12</sup> The treaty that defined the structure of the so-called League of Corinth refers to the *basileian tēn Philippou*,<sup>13</sup> which here means nothing more than the “rule” or “authority” of Philip over his land. The treaties between Macedonian “kings” and the Greeks in the fifth

---

<sup>12</sup> Stephen W. Tracy, “*De Antipatro et Archedico Lamptrensi. IG II<sup>2</sup> 402 and Agora I 4990*,” *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 249-251, suggests that the *basileus* referred to in the fragment of an Athenian decree may be Philip II, although this is denied by E. Badian, “A Reply to Professor Hammond’s Article,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 100 (1994) 388-90. In another case, a Boeotian inscription from Lebadeia recording the prescriptions for consulting the oracle of Trophonius, including a list of names of visitors, was copied by Pococke in the early eighteenth century and again by Leake about one hundred years later. Although the stone had deteriorated considerably between Pococke and Leake’s eras, there are some points of agreement in the two copies, including the possibility of a reference to *Amyntas*. . . *basileus*. It is of no concern here whether Amyntas III, father of Philip II is meant, or Amyntas IV, whom some believe acted as regent before Philip II’s actual elevation to the throne; if the restoration as *basileus* is correct, it predates Philip II. Unfortunately the stone itself is long lost, the text in the copies highly problematic, and it is a document, like the Athenian example, whose provenance is external to Macedon. The inscription is discussed in detail by J. R. Ellis, “Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great. A Study in Conspiracy,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91 (1971) 15-24.

<sup>13</sup> Tod, *GHI* 2.177, l; see n. 24 below.

and early fourth centuries refer to the Macedonian leader by name only. Thus, the documentary evidence.

Contemporary writers, including Herodotus, Thucydides, and the Athenian orators down through the age of Demosthenes occasionally refer to the Macedonian monarch as "king."<sup>14</sup> But the use of the term *basileus* by these writers implies nothing more than the application of a term for "ruler" or "chief" of a group possessing some political and/or ethnic unity. How would a Greek of any period address the ruler of a foreign (or Greek) people? Homer is not consistent in his use of *basileus* or *wanax* (or neither) in describing Agamemnon, Alcinoos, Menelaus, Nestor, Odysseus, and Paris,<sup>15</sup> and students of the Heroic Age have long known that there are greater and lesser *basileis* in Homer and Hesiod, some of whom are hereditary rulers of the community, while others are family chiefs who serve as a kind of council. And, while Herodotus may have called Alexander I of Macedon a *basileus*, he used the same term to describe the kings of Egypt. Herodotus, who had visited both Macedonia and

---

<sup>14</sup> E.g., Hdt. 9.44 (Alexander I); Thuc. 1.57.2 (Perdiccas II); Isoc. *Paneg.* 126 and *Archid.* 46 (Amyntas III), *Philip* 106-7 (Philip II, using *basileia* and *monarchia* interchangeably), *Ep. ad Phil.* I (Philip II, frequent use of *basileus* and *basileia*); Demos. *Olynth.* 1.9 and 2.15 (Philip II). I wish to express my appreciation to Professor John D. Morgan for extensive discussions on pre-Philip II uses of *basileus* in both literary texts and inscriptions. Professor Morgan contributed his extensive knowledge of the inscriptions and his skill in computer scans of the data. To the best of my knowledge all applications of *basileus* to the Macedonian king in the earlier period derive from non-Macedonian sources for whom it may have seemed perfectly natural to use the term without any technical significance. I also recognize that the discovery of *Macedonian* versions of Greek inscriptions might alter my views.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., Richard J. Cunliffe, *Homeric Proper and Place Names* (London and Glasgow 1931) *passim*.



Egypt, certainly knew the difference between the “kings” of Macedon and the *kings* of Egypt! It would seem that there is little consistency in the use of *basileus* by Greek writers well into the fourth century, and no significance can be attached to the use of the term beyond its role as a synonym for “ruler.”

As far as we know, the earliest *Macedonian* uses of the title with a proper name—*Basileus Alexandros*—belong to the early part of the reign of Alexander, who would transform a traditional leadership into a formal “kingship,”<sup>16</sup> and the new form of address on the documents would become increasingly common.<sup>17</sup> The earliest attested contemporary use of a full title with a name is a statue base of Cassander, now residing in the museum at Dion: *Basileus Makedon[ôn] Kassandros Antip[atrou] Dii Olympiôî*.<sup>18</sup> Thus arguing from the best available documentary evidence (the inscriptions), we would appear to have something like a military chieftainship exercised over a people—the Macedonians—and their land, and it would appear that this system became transformed into a “proper” kingship only under Alexander the Great in a manner more reminiscent of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Of two royal inscriptions found in Macedonia that date to a period just before Alexander’s expedition into Asia, one refers to Alexander by name alone (*SEG* 34.664), the other by the title *Basileus Alexandros* (*SEG* 36.626). For up-to-date bibliography on both see, M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings*, II, *Epigraphic Index*, Meletêmata, no 22 (Athens 1996), nos. 6 and 62.

<sup>17</sup> For which see A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence* (Norman 1980) passim.

<sup>18</sup> *SEG* 34.620. Illustrated in Hatzopoulos (above n. 16), Pl. XXVIa, and in the guidebook to Dion, the site of the find: Demetrios Pandermalis, *Dion. The Archaeological Site and the Museum* (Athens 1997) 72.



East than of any Greek antecedents. The model for kingship established by Alexander would, of course, have profound implications for succeeding generations and centuries, as many scholars have pointed out. This transformation of a traditional family leadership into a despotism caused unrest among many of Alexander's Macedonians, and it is no surprise that, following the king's death in Babylon, they reverted to a more traditional monarchy under Alexander's half-brother and (later) son.

Carney argues that the leadership of the clan (the Argeadae) was critical, and that women were part of that *basileia*. Women remained inobtrusive during stable times, emerging in periods of crisis, as in the case of Eurydice, the redoubtable widow of Amyntas III and mother of Philip II, another Eurydice—wife of Philip III Arrhidaeus—and, of course, the mighty Olympias. Whether this set the pattern for the strong royal women of the Hellenistic era I leave to others to describe.<sup>19</sup> There was little peace in the extended house of the Argeadae: about half of the Argead monarchs for whom we have information were murdered. Yet the leadership remained within the family, moving to collateral branches whenever necessary, thereby supporting Carney's view that this was a broadly based clan. It was only with the deaths of Alexander III, Philip III Arrhidaeus, and Alexander IV—along with their royal women—within the space of about a dozen years (323-311/10 B.C.) that the Argead well ran dry, and Cassander attempted to replace the old clan with a new one.

---

<sup>19</sup> Carney herself treats the matter of Macedonian royal women fully in her monograph, *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman and London, 2000 [forthcoming]).

## INSCRIPTIONS

Perhaps no category of evidence (except for the results of archaeological excavation) has played such an important role in extending our knowledge of ancient Macedonia in recent years as the collection of inscriptions. Several of the most important Athenian-Macedonian treaties from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. had been edited with commentaries and bibliographies in Tod's *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (1946-48). Some describe military pacts, others define economic agreements between the Athenians and the Macedonian king, and therefore provide important evidence for the powerful economic and political role of the royal family. These inscriptions have been known and studied for some time, but their provenance is in Greek cities external to the Macedonian kingdom itself.

The great desideratum was the epigraphical material from Macedonia itself, which gap has recently begun to be filled by the publication of Macedonian inscriptions. In 1972 there appeared the long awaited Macedonian volume of *Inscriptiones Graecae*, edited by the dean of American Macedoniasts, the late Charles Edson.<sup>20</sup> The earliest inscriptions in Edson's volume, however, date only from the mid-third century B.C., and nearly all of the material is from Thessaloniki. The situation was remedied somewhat with a collection of inscriptions from parts of western Macedonia, covering the cantons of Elimeia, Eordaea, Orestis, and southern Lyncestis.<sup>21</sup> This valuable volume extended both the geographical and chronological range of

---

<sup>20</sup> Charles F. Edson (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. 10, *Epiri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae*. Pars 2, *Inscriptiones Macedoniae*, fasc. I, *Inscriptiones Thessalonicae et viciniae* (Berlin 1972).

<sup>21</sup> Athanasios Rizakis and Yiannis Touratsoglou, *Epigraphes anō Makedonias*. Vol. 1, *Katalogos Epigraphôn* (Athens 1985).

the Macedonian corpus, providing considerable information about the region of Upper Macedonia, although most of the material is from the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Unfortunately, the Rizakis-Touratsoglou collection of texts has not yet yielded its promised companion volume of commentary, and its geographical coverage ends at the modern Greek national border. Those parts of the ancient Macedonian kingdom that lie within present-day Albania and the Republic of Macedonia are excluded, having fallen victim to the absence of international scholarly cooperation in the modern Balkans.<sup>22</sup>

It became clear that some more systematic way of collecting and recording the epigraphical material was needed, especially in the face of a burgeoning excavation program at many Macedonian sites in Greece. It was decided to establish an archive of Macedonian inscriptions under the aegis of the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity in the National Hellenic Research Foundation, located in Athens. The Centre produces a monograph series, *Meletêmata*, in which scholars associated with the Centre publish the results of their work on the material. As of this writing nearly thirty volumes of *Meletêmata* have appeared, with a heavy concentration on Macedonian topography and local institutions, mainly based on the Hellenistic and Roman inscriptions lying within the boundaries of the modern Greek state.

---

<sup>22</sup> It should go without saying that the annual issues of *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, under the expert direction of Professor Ronald S. Stroud *et al*, provide a superb record of continuing scholarship on epigraphical matters. Unconstrained by modern Balkan politics, *SEG*'s sections on ancient Macedonia transcend modern national borders. A review of the past dozen volumes or so reveals a marked increase in the number of inscriptions and graffiti on stone and ceramics that date from the period earlier than Alexander the Great.

Suggestive of the Centre's work are the volumes by Tataki on the prosopography of Beroea and Edessa.<sup>23</sup> These latter volumes represent the first attempt to provide an onomasticon of ancient Macedonian cities on the basis of a thorough prosopographical survey. The various cross-linked indices assist the scholar in tracking the names of individuals, and also provide a chronology of name usage over several centuries. In the end all the onomastic lexica lead one back to the evidence—the collection and publication of the inscriptions. It should be noted that there is very little evidence for the period before the Roman organization of Macedonia. A few inscriptions from the Hellenistic period appear, but the epigraphical evidence from the earlier era of the Argead dynasty is slim indeed. And it is not just a matter of the circumstances of survival; on the basis of present evidence it would appear that, whatever the degree of organization of the kingdom in the pre-Hellenistic period, the Macedonians did not possess the habit of writing on stone to the extent of their Greek contemporaries or their successors in Hellenistic and Roman times. It is also important to note that the earliest inscriptions concerning the Macedonians derive from foreign—that is, non-Macedonian—sites.<sup>24</sup> Even the most

---

<sup>23</sup> Agyro B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea. Prosopography and Society*. Meletēmata, no. 8 (Athens 1988), and *Macedonian Edessa. Prosopography and Onomasticon*. Meletēmata, no. 18 (Athens 1994). The Introduction to the volume on Edessa provides a useful description of the Centre's program to develop a prosopography of ancient Macedonia.

<sup>24</sup> E.g., those published in M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. 2 vols. (Oxford 1946-48). Is it too much to suggest—given the Greek provenance of the pre-Alexander the Great inscriptions—that the surviving copies are the result of a Greek insistence to record formal relations with the Macedonians, and that the Macedonians, with their more primitive institutions, may not have felt the same necessity?



complete study of Macedonian institutions refers to only a handful of inscriptions in the age before Alexander the Great.<sup>25</sup> That simple fact raises the clear problem of attempting to read back from the later into the earlier periods—that is, from a more complex organization to a simpler age—with its consequent danger of anachronism. It is possible that continuing archaeological investigation will increase the quantity of epigraphical material from the earlier periods, and thereby enhance the quality of our understanding of how Macedonian society was organized. But it is unlikely that we will ever possess anything approaching full documentary evidence for Macedonia under the Argead kings, because, in part, that documentary evidence never existed.

As an extension of the fundamental epigraphically-based studies of the *Meletēmata* series, Tataki has produced a fuller prosopography that includes the names of persons attested by both epigraphical and literary evidence.<sup>26</sup> Despite the title *Macedonians Abroad* this volume includes virtually all Macedonians known to have had some public role, and, as such, it is an important extension of the standard prosopographical works on the age of Philip II and Alexander the Great.<sup>27</sup> Most names in Tataki's onomasticon are from the period before the Roman occupation of Macedonia—when the ethnic

---

<sup>25</sup> M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings*. 2 vols. Meletēmata, no. 22 (Athens 1996). For a review of Hatzopoulos's collection see Chapter II below.

<sup>26</sup> Argyro B. Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad. A Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia*. Meletēmata, no. 26 (Athens 1998).

<sup>27</sup> H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. 2 vols. (Munich 1926; reprint: Salem, New Hampshire 1988); Waldemar Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London and New York 1992).

*Makedon* begins to lose significance—and the earliest names go back to the fifth century B.C. The material is well organized with several indices (including a reverse index in Greek, which should prove very useful to epigraphers), and includes nearly 3000 names. Thus, major advances in the establishment of a Macedonian prosopography have been made by our colleagues in Athens.

## ARCHAEOLOGY

The Macedonian region of Europe was part of the Ottoman Empire until the Balkan Wars of 1912-13, after which the area of the ancient Macedonian kingdom was divided among three national states: Serbia (later Yugoslavia, then the Republic of Macedonia), Bulgaria, and Greece, the lion's portion—about 65%—attached to northern Greece. The 1920s and 1930s saw some important archaeological survey work in Greek Macedonia by British, French, and Greek scholars, but there was rather little excavation, partly because of the relative remoteness of the region, and partly because the interests of Greek and foreign archaeologists were mainly directed toward the famous centers of Bronze Age and Classical civilization in central and southern Greece and on the renowned island cultures of antiquity. Excavation by foreign archaeologists commenced at some important sites (Thasos and Philippi by the French, and Olynthus by the Americans, for example), revealing important Greek and/or Roman remains, but little related to the early Macedonians, as these important cities were outside the Macedonian *archê* until the time of Philip II. A few looted chamber tombs were excavated in the period before World War II, and some scattered finds were deposited in museums. A small number of buildings, mainly from the Hellenistic era, were



published, but the remains of the age of Philip II and earlier had to await the post-war period. Thus, there was virtually no material evidence to enrich our understanding of the history of the Argead ruling dynasty.

The 1960s and 1970s saw rapid advances in excavation, especially by archaeologists from Greek universities and the Greek Archaeological Service. Famous old Macedonian centers, heretofore known only from literature, were gradually revealed: among others Pella, Edessa, Dion, and Aegae, the latter yielding the Macedonian royal tombs of Philip II, Philip III Arrhidaeus, Alexander IV, and members of their families. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s dozens of tombs (some unlooted) were excavated, yielding a considerable amount of material that helped shed light on Macedonian burial customs, attitudes toward death and the afterlife, aesthetic tastes, and material values. It was a society which, at least in its upper strata, valued material wealth and the decorative arts. The remains reflect a borrowing of influences and tastes of the Greeks who lived in the south and east, of Balkan (especially Thracian) peoples, and of non-Greek Asians. The excavations have revealed a people who were eclectic in their tastes, and who built and decorated according to what they thought was practical, possible, and attractive without reference to any strict canon. In her book on Macedonian tombs, Stella Miller-Collett describes the several variations in tomb types alone.<sup>28</sup> One of the difficulties faced by many art historians is the frustration of attempting to make Macedonian decorative and practical arts fit into some Greek mold. The solution of the problem is simple: there was no Macedonian canon. Every object or

---

<sup>28</sup> Stella G. Miller, *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles: A Painted Macedonian Tomb* (Mainz 1993).

building found on a Macedonian site should be examined with an open mind.

There are three major sources of information about recent archaeological investigation. About every five years, a large international congress featuring recent scholarship in the history, epigraphy, linguistics, art history, and archaeology of Macedonia is staged in and about Thessaloniki. Most of the papers presented at this congress are eventually published in *Archaia Makedonia*. It is indicative of the growth of research in Macedonian studies that the publication of the first congress held in 1968 was a single volume of about 436 pages presenting 33 papers. The most recent publication (as of the present writing) of a congress is three volumes in length and includes 102 papers.<sup>29</sup> The congress has become so large that concurrent sessions are staged, with the unfortunate result that one often must choose between allied papers in, say, history and those in archaeology.

Partly to remedy the unwieldy character of recent congresses, the Greek archaeologists have begun to meet regularly on an annual basis to present reports on excavations in Macedonia and Thrace. The publication of these reports in *To Archaiologiko Ergo stê Makedonia kai Thrakê* provides the surest way to keep abreast of recent archaeological investigations. While most of the reports are published in Greek, there are convenient (mainly) English-language summaries. Finally, each year *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* issues a supplement, *Archaeological Reports*, compiled by the staff of the British School at Athens from various sources, including the Greek archaeological journals and monographs, the popular press, and reports of excavators and the foreign schools of

---

<sup>29</sup> *Archaia Makedonia* 5 (1993); reports of the 1989 congress.

archaeology in Greece. This useful compendium summarizes the previous year's publications, and is conveniently organized by geographical region in Greece; within each region sites are listed alphabetically. It is the perhaps the most efficient means to survey current excavations. But it must be emphasized that, while both the Acta of the congresses and the annual archaeological reports offer a convenient means of keeping current, they are no substitute for serious scientific publication of the sites and materials, whose final publication is often delayed for years, if not decades.

Recent excavation has shown the Macedonians to have produced exquisite metalware in gold, silver, and bronze, superb wall painting, and delicate miniature ivory sculpture. To what extent these accomplishments are reflections of non-Macedonian culture or may even have been articulated by non-Macedonian artists and artisans is a question the answers to which will require future study. The soil of Macedonia is a rich lode of artifacts, and there appears to be no limit to what it may yield. If this brief survey has concentrated mainly on archaeology in Greece, it is because the other Balkan areas that knew ancient Macedonian settlement and influences are presently struggling to reorganize themselves following recent dramatic political changes. In these nations archaeological activity is subordinate to more pressing needs.

### MODERN NARRATIVE HISTORY

Stanley Casson's experience in Macedonia had included active service with the British Salonika Force during World War I and excavation experience in the Axios River valley in the early 1920s. Shortly thereafter he released what might be described as the first modern attempt to produce a narrative history of the region,

including also adjacent parts of Illyria and Thrace.<sup>30</sup> It remained the standard history of ancient Macedonia for more than half a century, even though there were as yet virtually no archaeological and epigraphical underpinnings and rather little discussion of the ancient literary sources.

It remained for one of the founders of regional history to alter the picture. Nicholas Hammond had considerable field experience in Epirus, Macedonia, and Thessaly as a student, scholar, and British liaison officer with the Greek Resistance during World War II. Hammond's regional history technique was to combine topography, historical geography, and archaeology with the traditional analysis of the surviving literary and epigraphical texts. Despite the subsequent criticism of many of his conclusions, Hammond's success in pioneering a wide-ranging approach to the study of the past should put every contemporary and future historian in his debt. Hammond's monumental *A History of Macedonia* is, however, despite its wealth of material, not an easily accessible narrative history.<sup>31</sup> Errington's apt criticism of Griffith's account of Philip II in Volume 2 can be applied to the work as a whole: it is difficult to detach the authors' views from a dense and ponderous text which is "uncommonly difficult to read."<sup>32</sup> The work is a handbook—a compendium of valuable analyses of the sources—not to be read at length, but to be consulted on details. There is little sense of the flow of Macedonian affairs and rather few attempts to put

---

<sup>30</sup> Stanley Casson, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria* (Oxford 1926).

<sup>31</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 1, *Historical Geography and Prehistory* (Oxford 1972); Vol. 2 (with G. T. Griffith), *550-336 B.C.* (Oxford 1979); Vol. 3 (with F. W. Walbank), *336-167 B.C.* (Oxford 1988).

<sup>32</sup> R. M. Errington, "Review-Discussion: Four Interpretations of Philip II," *American Journal of Ancient History* 6 (1981) 86-87.



the history of the Macedonians into any wider historical context. The forest is obscured by the trees. In sum, the work is essential for specialists, but of doubtful value to others, and much of the material on early Macedonia is now outdated because of the inevitable advances in archaeology.

Hammond attempted to remedy the situation with the publication of a more cogently organized summary of many of his views,<sup>33</sup> and even produced for the general public a narrative history.<sup>34</sup> The former is a useful compendium of the author's ideas on Macedonian institutions originally stated in *A History of Macedonia*, but made more accessible by the format of a single volume. The latter is too detailed for the general audience for whom it presumably is intended, and, lacking references to the most recent scholarship, is without value to specialists. Neither of Hammond's most recent works reflects any new advances or a reconsideration of his early views on the history of the Macedonians, but consists rather of a re-packaging of older material for different audiences.

For a more useful introduction to the history of ancient Macedonia one is well advised to turn to Errington's *A History of Macedonia*.<sup>35</sup> It is well-organized and cogently written, with an emphasis on the evolution of political institutions, representing the sound judgments of a competent scholar based on a reasonable analysis of the

---

<sup>33</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State: Origins, Institutions, and History* (Oxford 1989).

<sup>34</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, *The Miracle That Was Macedonia* (London 1991).

<sup>35</sup> R.M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens* (Munich 1986); reissued in an unrevised English translation by Catherine Errington as *A History of Macedonia* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1990).



ancient literary and epigraphical sources. What is lacking is a coordination with the important recent advances in our understanding of Macedonian material culture resulting from extensive excavation. It was the intent of the present author to provide that coordination for a narrative history of Macedonia down to the death of Philip II.<sup>36</sup> I argued that the Macedonians emerged as a people recognized as distinct from their Greek and Balkan neighbors, and, to borrow Charles Edson's phrase, they were a people who unwittingly acted as a "shield" that protected the Greek city-states from the occasional and sometimes devastating incursions of northern invaders. A useful analytic essay comparing these several recent attempts at narrative history has been offered by Elizabeth Carney.<sup>37</sup> With the general outlines of the history of the ancient Macedonians now set out by several authors, one can anticipate that the major contributions over the next decade or so will lie in the journals and excavation reports. And, armed with several years' fresh scholarship it will become necessary for some future historian to construct anew the general history of the Macedonians. Discussions of particular issues that might point the way to future scholarship will be found in the chapters that follow.

---

<sup>36</sup> Eugene N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton 1990; rev. paperback edition 1992).

<sup>37</sup> Elizabeth D. Carney, "Review Essay on Macedonian History," *Ancient History Bulletin* 5 (1991) 179-89.

## II

---

### ORIGINS, ETHNICITY, AND INSTITUTIONS

---

#### ORIGINS AND ETHNICITY

Some years ago I wrote “Who were the Macedonians? As an ethnic question it is best avoided, since the mainly modern political overtones tend to obscure the fact that it really is not a very important issue. That they may or may not have been Greek in whole or in part—while an interesting anthropological sidelight—is not really crucial to our understanding of their history. They made their mark not as a tribe of Greeks or other Balkan peoples, but as *Macedonians*.”<sup>1</sup>

Two years later, in the revised edition of that book, I reflected on my comment: “In the original edition I had hoped to put to rest the tangled question of the ethnicity of the ancient Macedonians by (1) establishing some reasonable standards by which one could address the nationality of an ancient people, and (2) attempting to disconnect the issue from modern politics. While I maintain the principles of my first point, I admit failure on the second.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Eugene N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton 1990), p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* (1992), p. 305.

Two connected events account for that failure. The first is the emergence in 1991-92 of an independent Republic of Macedonia from the breakup of the former Yugoslav confederation. The second is the heightened response of many Greeks to the establishment of the new state on their northern border, characterized by the public and private expression of passionate feelings that the Macedonian republic had expropriated the name and symbols of an ancient people believed by modern Greeks to have been of Greek ethnicity in antiquity. Thus one cannot escape the fact that the history of the ancient Macedonians has fallen into the service of modern Balkan politics.<sup>3</sup> The ancient historian unconstrained by and divorced from intense Balkan rivalries should attempt to set the historical record straight: What does the ancient evidence say about the origins and ethnicity of the ancient Macedonians, and what is its relevance to the history of the Balkans in recent times?

The most remote prehistory of Macedonia is best left to the archaeologists. It seems prudent to limit the present discussion to the Late Bronze Age and to a consideration

---

<sup>3</sup> Readers interested in pursuing the controversy between the modern Hellenic and Macedonian republics have an increasingly rich literature to choose from. Setting aside as worthless propaganda the chauvinist responses of both sides (replete with factual errors and curious interpretations of antiquity), there remains much of value: Loring M. Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic Nationalism in a Transnational World* (Princeton 1995); Human Rights Watch, *Denying Ethnic Identity. The Macedonians of Greece* (New York, Washington, Los Angeles, and London 1994); Anastasia N. Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990* (Chicago and London 1997), and Eugene N. Borza, "Macedonia Redux," in Frances Titchener and Richard F. Moorton, Jr. (eds.), *The Eye Expanded. Life and the Arts in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1999) 249-66.

of whether or not Macedonia was part of the Mycenaean (i. e., Greek) world. If it could be shown that Macedonia was Mycenaean, it might follow that, having shared the same prehistory as the southern Greeks, the Macedonians emerged in the historical period as a Greek people. Nine decades have passed since A. B. Wace commenced his archaeological investigations of the Macedonian countryside. And nearly sixty years have elapsed since the publication of W. A. Heurtley's pioneering systematic analysis of this early period.<sup>4</sup> It was to be expected that excavation of Bronze Age Macedonia would continue apace, but, while the amount of material recovered has considerably enlarged the data base for the period, Heurtley's basic conclusions have remained little changed. In the words of two of the most recent comprehensive surveys of Bronze Age Macedonia: "Neither Macedonia nor Epirus to the west were ever part of Mycenaean Greece...." "...Macedonia was never part of the Mycenaean *koine*. Indeed, one has to admit that, despite evidence of contact and exchange with neighboring areas to the north and south, Macedonia in the Bronze Age has a character and identity of its own."<sup>5</sup>

There is no question about Mycenaean influence in the north. More than fifty sites in Macedonia, Epirus, and Albania have yielded Mycenaean artifacts, with the earliest imported Mycenaean pottery dated to the sixteenth century

---

<sup>4</sup> W.A. Heurtley, *Prehistoric Macedonia. An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Greek Macedonia (West of the Struma) in the Neolithic, Bronze and Early Iron Ages*. (Cambridge 1939).

<sup>5</sup> K.A. Wardle, "Mycenaean Trade and Influence in Northern Greece," in C. Zerner, P. Zerner, and J. Winder (eds.), *Wace and Blegen. Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age: 1939-1989* (Amsterdam 1993), p. 117, and A. Cambitoglou and J.K. Papadopoulos, "The Earliest Mycenaean in Macedonia," *ibid.*, p. 289.



B.C. But what Heurtley believed, and has been confirmed in the most recent studies,<sup>6</sup> is that the inhabitants of Macedonia turned quickly to local imitations of Mycenaean pottery and weapons, although some highly prized swords and spear points continued to be imported from the south from the fourteenth century B.C. down to the end of the Bronze Age. Local imitation of Mycenaean pottery was produced separately as a kind of a luxury product, co-existing with cruder indigenous local ware. That is, the inhabitants of Macedonia absorbed into their own material culture a number of Mycenaean influences. But influence is not the same as settlement. While it is often difficult to distinguish between imported Mycenaean artifacts, local imitations of Mycenaean ware, and Mycenaean materials representing genuine Mycenaean settlements, a number of archaeologists have failed to recognize the significance of such distinctions. There are claims for the existence of true Mycenaean settlements in the Macedonian regions adjacent to Mt. Olympus, but unless or until these claims can be substantiated by comprehensive scientific publication of the evidence,<sup>7</sup> we

---

<sup>6</sup> For which see Stelios Andreou, Michael Fotiadis, and Kostas Kotsakis, "Review of Aegean Prehistory V: The Neolithic and Bronze Age of Northern Greece," *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996) 537-97, esp. 560-91 on Macedonia.

<sup>7</sup> Thus E. Poulaki-Pandermali, who has reported at several conferences her discovery of a "Mycenaean" cemetery at the head of the Petra Pass which crosses the northern Olympus range from Thessaly into the Macedonian Pierian coastal plain. She is also said to have surveyed the Pierian coastal plain itself, but thus far has not provided evidence of Mycenaean *settlement* on the plain, nor has she, in any of the brief archaeological reports I have heard, distinguished between imported Mycenaean and local imitation ware. In the complex site at Aiani in southwestern Macedonia (see note 15 below) another excavator has attempted to move the Mycenaean frontier



must accept the conclusions expressed in the summary quotations cited above. What Feuer suggested several years ago still holds true: the northern frontier of the Mycenaean world was Thessaly.<sup>8</sup>

These conclusions place an additional burden on those who would make Macedonia part of the Greek world at a later time. If the roots of the Greek world lie in the Mycenaean period, but Macedonia is not part of the Mycenaean world, where are the Greek roots of Macedonia? That is, if Macedonia was not "Greek" in the Late Bronze Age, when and under what circumstances did it become Greek? For example, does the origin of Macedonian Hellenism lie in the Age of Greek Colonization? While it is true that the Greeks established cities along the coast of the Thermaic Gulf and in Chalcidice during the Archaic Period, these cities remained steadfastly independent from the development of the Macedonian kingdom until the age of Philip II, at which time they were incorporated into the kingdom through conquest. Thus we would be hard pressed to explain the genesis of Macedonian Hellenism either in the late prehistoric or early historical period. In our present state of knowledge the only possible conclusion is that the origins of Macedonian culture lay elsewhere, perhaps in an Iron Age famous throughout the Balkans for its intense borrowing from other cultures.

---

north from Thessaly into Macedonia, but has not provided evidence of Mycenaean *settlement* as opposed to trade and contact.

<sup>8</sup> Bryan Feuer, *The Northern Mycenaean Border in Thessaly*. BAR International Series, no. 176 (Oxford 1983). In her survey of the Grevena region of southwestern Macedonia, Nancy C. Wilkie reported that sites with Mycenaean sherds were not numerous and that where Mycenaean ware was discovered it was imported; "The Grevena Project," *Archaiia Makedonia* 5.3 (Thessaloniki 1993) 1747-53.

In his study of European and Anatolian Iron Age cultures, Jan Bouzek has provided an exhaustive review of recent research on the materials excavated from this era.<sup>9</sup> Although Bouzek pays only scant attention to the issue of continuity between the Late Bronze and Iron Ages in Macedonia proper, he provides ample evidence of the highly eclectic nature of Iron Age culture among a number of Balkan and other peoples who became the historical Greeks, Scythians, Thracians, Illyrians, Macedonians, etc. They all seem to have borrowed heavily from their Bronze Age precursors as well as from their contemporaries. As for the Macedonians, we cannot trace an evolution from the Bronze Age into the historical period, but we can note that Iron Age Macedonia seems as diverse as did its Late Bronze Age antecedent, at least as far as material culture is concerned. The Iron Age saw several Balkan cultures emerge that were—as Bouzek wrote—cultural “collaborators” in their borrowing from a number of diverse West Asian and other European sources. Perhaps we should look to this Iron Age period as the origin of the culture we associate with the historical Macedonians.

What is the nature of that Macedonian culture? What are its indigenous characteristics and what are derivative? In the formative period of the early Archaic Era one looks in vain for the emergence of a material culture that appears to be uniquely “Macedonian.” Instead, the artifacts reveal the influences from the Greek south, the Greek east, the central and northern Balkans, and western Asia. In the period in which we might expect the Macedonians to have evolved a characteristic culture of their own, we find that they are like “a sponge, absorbing a variety of surrounding

---

<sup>9</sup> Jan Bouzek, *Greece, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interrelations During the Early Iron Age*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, no. 122 (Jonsered 1997).

cultures,” in the words of University of Athens art historian Olga Palagia.<sup>10</sup>

This characteristic of eclectic borrowing continues well into Classical times. Barr-Sharrar<sup>11</sup> has shown that Macedonian craftsmen, encouraged perhaps by royal patronage, expressed themselves freely in a variety of ways, in some cases imitating foreign objects in pure form, in other cases developing an independent repertoire, but in all cases demonstrating superior technique in the working of metals. The result was what might be described as a “regional” style, heavily indebted to Greece, but with abundant Balkan and Asian influences in shape and decoration. All of which is confirmed by Miller-Collett’s superb analysis of the architecture and decoration of chambered Macedonian tombs.<sup>12</sup> There is a remarkable lack of consistency in the orientation, form, decoration, and grave-goods assemblages of these tombs of the fourth and third centuries B.C. The Macedonians were not slaves to any canon; their cultural expressions are marked by variety, freshness, and pragmatism.

A recognition of the diversity of Macedonian material culture would be significant in describing Macedonian origins and ethnicity. One of reasons (modern politics aside) why some scholars believe that the Macedonians

---

<sup>10</sup> Personal communication.

<sup>11</sup> Beryl Barr-Sharrar, “Macedonian Metal Vases in Perspective: Some Observations on Context and Tradition,” in Beryl Barr-Sharrar and Eugene N. Borza (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*. Studies in the History of Art 10 (1982) 122-39, and “Eastern Influences on the Toreutic Art of Macedonia Before the Conquest of Alexander the Great,” *Archaeological News* 13 (1984) 1-12, revised version in *Archaiia Makedonia* 2 (1986) 71-82.

<sup>12</sup> Stella G. Miller, *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles: A Painted Macedonian Tomb* (Mainz 1993), with valuable bibliography.

were a Greek people is that Macedonian culture owed much to Greek influences. But in fact Macedonian material culture is *less* Greek in the earlier period, and becomes more so as time goes on until it eventually merges with the Greek civilization of the *koinê*. This appears to be the gradual Hellenization of a people not Greek in their origins. One can only urge that scholars will accept the notion of the Macedonians acting like “a sponge,” and thereby free themselves from the constraints of attempting to evaluate early Macedon through a Greek filter. In the end, Macedonia and Greece would merge so as to become virtually indistinguishable beyond the regional variations that are common throughout the Greek world: the Hellenization of Macedon was completed. Late Roman and medieval Macedonia can be said to be part of the Greek world, with all that that implies for the history of Byzantine politics and religion down to the age of the Slavic incursions and even beyond. All I would argue is that the process of Hellenization—one of Europe’s most powerful and successful cultural forces in ancient, medieval, and modern times—began slowly in the eclecticism of the Macedonian Iron Age, but did not become the pre-eminent feature of Macedonian life until late in the Hellenistic era. During the Classical period it is a process in a state of becoming.<sup>13</sup>

One needs read only a representative sampling of modern Greek archaeological literature about Macedonia to see that some claims of Hellenic origin are dangerously close to what has been described as “nationalistic” archaeology, which can be defined as an archaeology that promotes national unity in a modern state by emphasizing

---

<sup>13</sup> And the Hellenic quality of northern Greece today results from a process of *reHellenization* in modern times, as Karakasidou’s field work (above, note 3) makes perfectly clear.



its famous past. Whatever the value of nationalistic archaeology as good, sufficient, and necessary politics, or as an honest expression of a deeply-felt and proud cultural ideology, it is not science. There is a growing literature on what has been described as the “political anthropology” of nationalistic archaeology (and “imperialist” and “colonial” archaeology, as well),<sup>14</sup> and one notes that some Greek archaeologists dealing with the quality of Macedonian life in both the Bronze Age and the historical periods down to the Hellenistic era occasionally seem as much interested in proving the Hellenism of the ancient Macedonians as in providing an unbiased analysis of material culture.<sup>15</sup> Lest

---

<sup>14</sup> E.g., Philip Kohl and Clare Fawcett (eds.), *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology* (Cambridge 1995), and Marguerita Diaz-Andreu and T. Champion, *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe* (London 1996), both reviewed by Yannis Hamilakis, “Through the looking glass: nationalism, archaeology and the politics of identity,” *Antiquity* 70 (1996) 975-78. The importance of a national interpretation of ancient Greece is discussed by Yannis Hamilakis and Eleana Yalouri, “Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society,” *Antiquity* 70 (1996) 117-129.

<sup>15</sup> In the descriptions of her important excavation at Aiani in southwestern Macedonia, G. Karamitrou-Mentessidi *begins* with the problematic assumption that the inhabitants of the site were Greek from an early period (citing mainly the opinions of Nicholas Hammond), and then proceeds to identify the finds in terms of the evolution of a Greek settlement from Mycenaean times through the Dorian invasions (see note 19 below) into the historical period. Methodologically this line of reasoning is very tenuous, if not actually backwards: if the historical premise is incorrect, the analysis of the pottery fails; *Aianê Kozanês/Aiani of Kozani* (Thessaloniki 1989), and “*Aianê 1983-1997*,” *To Archaïologiko Ergo stê Makedonia kai Thrakê* 10 (1996) 23-40. The pottery thus far published is an eclectic mix of local and imported ware, and it is unconvincing to have the materials forced into a purely Hellenic mold when it appears that other forces are at work. The main conclusion to be drawn from the excavator’s achievement at Aiani is not a dubious argument that Macedonian Greeks had inhabited the site over several centuries, but



the reader feel that I have unfairly singled out Greek archaeologists, he/she should review the whole matter of nationalist archaeology. Other examples abound, including the attempts to redefine "English ethnicity" against the possibility of a Celtic prehistory<sup>16</sup> or the exposition of a British "imperialist" archaeology which, in an attempt to combat Greek Cypriot nationalism during the colonial administration, virtually invented the Iron Age "Eteocypriots" as survivors of an indigenous non-Hellenic culture on Cyprus.<sup>17</sup> Thus Eteocypriot theory claimed that

---

rather than a far-more-than-expected sophisticated Macedonian site--characterized by the eclecticism seen elsewhere--existed in the mountains of Upper Macedonia. In a regional study of the antiquities around Kozani, the excavator replicates her method and uses terms like "common descent and common national identity," in describing the "Macedonian Greeks" of the area; see G. Karamitrou-Mentesidi, *Kozanê, Polê Elimiôtidos. Archaiologikos Odêgos/Kozani, City of Elimiotis. Archaeological Guide* (Thessaloniki 1993). It is unfortunate that in her admirable attempt to halt the destruction of ancient sites and call attention to the rich archaeological heritage of the region, the excavator has resorted to nationalist archaeology.

<sup>16</sup> J.V.S. and M.R. Megaw, "Ancient Celts and modern ethnicity," *Antiquity* 70 (1996) 175-81.

<sup>17</sup> Michael Given, "Inventing the Eteocypriots: Imperialist Archaeology and the Manipulation of Ethnic Identity," *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 11 (1998) 3-29. Anyone interested in understanding the breadth of nationalist archaeology in places as diverse as Cyprus, former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Lebanon, Iraq, Israel, the Gulf states, and Egypt should consult the essays written by specialists in the study of these regions in a volume edited by Lynn Meskell: *Archaeology Under Fire. Nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East* (London 1998). Of special note are the contributions of Kostas Kotsakis on the Macedonian region of modern Greece and K.S. Brown on the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. And the press has reported widely that recent excavations in northern Japan suggest that the origins of the Japanese may lie in the Jomon culture, a prehistoric indigenous people. The idea is attractive to most Japanese, as it would appear to overturn a commonly-held notion that Japanese culture was the

the *real* Cypriots were not descended from ancient Hellenes, or, at best, were of mixed ancestry. This attempt to manipulate the ethnic identity of an ancient people in order to bolster a modern political program failed: no one was persuaded of the validity of the Eteocypriots except the colonial administrators and the archaeologists themselves. And Colin Wells has, in a famous and as-yet unpublished paper, revealed the dramatic differences between French and German attitudes toward their respective Roman frontiers.<sup>18</sup>

And there remains the fundamental problem: what is it in an archaeological record that defines the ethnicity of a people? Absent a written record, what language do the sherds speak, to paraphrase the late John Chadwick? There is no doubt that an overwhelming preponderance of similarities in, for example, pottery, jewelry, metal vases, weapons, grave goods and burial customs, decorative arts, and architecture which show an evolutionary record can help define an ancient culture and an ethnicity. But are these the sole determinants of ethnicity (see below), especially when the mix of material remains is eclectic? And the problem is exacerbated in the non-Hellenic parts of the Balkans, where there is an abundant diversity of materials both Greek and non-Hellenic on many sites. We

---

product of Chinese and Korean migrations. The abundant skeletal evidence, however, shows that the Jonon people may not have looked like modern Japanese, and that, strictly from an anthropological point of view, many Japanese share physical structures more akin to the Chinese and Koreans than to the Jonan people. The social implications of these discrepancies for a reconstruction of the roots of Japanese culture is self-evident.

<sup>18</sup> The first version of the paper was given at an annual meeting of the Association of Ancient Historians several years ago, and revised versions have been delivered since. I am grateful to Professor Wells for granting permission to mention his paper in the present essay.

have seen in recent years the evolution of skepticism regarding the plotting of ethnic-group migrations during the Late Bronze Age and following centuries, based on the record of pottery and certain types of grave goods. It now appears that, whatever the ethnicity (if that is the appropriate word) of those early peoples who have left us an archaeological record, many of them were characterized by highly variable behaviors, tastes, and acquisition of material goods. Thus the existence of, for example, a certain type of fibula or spear point, or the practice of either inhumation or cremation burials, do not alone identify a unique culture. Much the same may be true of the inhabitants of Macedonia in the early historical period. The collapse of the theory of the "Dorian invasions" in recent years due to a virtual absence of any pure "Dorian" archaeological record<sup>19</sup> is sufficient to confirm Jonathan Hall's suggestion that any attempt to define the ethnicity of an ancient people when the *only* evidence is archaeological has little chance of success.<sup>20</sup> Thus one must be extremely cautious in the use of archaeological materials as an ethnographical record, especially when there is little or no supporting written evidence.

It must now be clear that I believe that attempts to define a people's ethnicity on the basis of a scant archaeological and literary record are fraught with danger. Moreover, I am not even certain that the kinds of questions

---

<sup>19</sup> The abandonment of the Dorian invasion theory (with bibliography) is nicely summarized by Carol G. Thomas, *Myth Becomes History: Pre-Classical Greece*. Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians 4 (Claremont, Calif. 1993) 69-73. Also, Borza (note 1 above) 65-69.

<sup>20</sup> Jonathan M. Hall, *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity* (Cambridge 1997) 142; every archaeologist and ancient historian interested in the relationship between archaeological and ethnographical methods would profit from reading this book, especially Chapter 5.

asked by modern scholars—even those as sophisticated as Hall *et al*—would have been understood by the ancients themselves. In fact, I do not know *who* the ancient Macedonians were or what language they spoke,<sup>21</sup> and I am not even confident that these are appropriate questions and issues except for those who need to bolster modern political and ethnic claims by reference to antiquity. I have attempted to show that those who claim that the Macedonians were Greek have offered arguments in support of their views that were unconvincing, both because those arguments rest upon flimsy evidence and reasoning and because they oversimplify very complex matters of determining the ethnicity of an ancient people. Many of the principles developed in modern cultural anthropology<sup>22</sup> to define ethnicity have recently been taken up by a group of mainly younger scholars of antiquity. In 1998 the American Philological Association concluded a three-year colloquium on ancient and modern ethnicities, which dealt with methods relating to the ethnography of a number of ancient peoples as diverse as the Greeks, Celts, Romans, Macedonians, Libyans, and Huns, among others. Some things are clear: ethnic identity is both a matter of self-ascription and external perception. It is also not a fixed matter, and the parameters of definition may be altered over time in accord with the changing needs of a people. This is made clear by Hall in his recent monograph<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> It must be clear that I am strongly opposed to recent attempts to define the Macedonians in terms of some other people. They were Macedonians, a unique people in antiquity who gradually became Hellenized, and who are unrelated to any modern people.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., see Danforth and Karakasidou, above note 3.

<sup>23</sup> Note 20 above. One must also note the work of Irad Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1998) who analyzes the effect of Archaic Era exploration on the evolution of Greek ethnicity. His arguments about



where he argued that, among the dynamic changes undergone by ancient Greek ethnography, common ancestry was not as important to the Greeks in defining themselves in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. as it had been in the age of Homer and Hesiod. That is, the assumption that the ancients never changed their minds about these matters must be abandoned.

This has particular meaning when it comes to defining a Macedonian ethnicity based on common ancestry with Greeks<sup>24</sup> an argument used often by Nicholas Hammond and those who follow him. Indeed, Hall shows (p. 64) that the very evidence cited by Hammond refutes his own claim: "Although the mention of Makedonia in the Herodotean account of the Dorians' wanderings has often been invoked as support for the idea of an historical invasion from the northern Balkans...it has every appearance of being a more recent invention. In the *Catalogue of women*, the eponymous founder of Makedonia, Makedon, was the son of Zeus and Deukalion's daughter Thuia [Hesiod frag. 7 Merkelbach/West]. This line of descent *excludes* him from the Hellenic genealogy—and hence, by implication, the Makedonians from the ranks of Hellenism," which latter point Hall goes

---

the role of myth may prove disturbing to those who use stories about common progenitors as a kind of proof of common ethnicity.

<sup>24</sup> It must be clear that throughout this chapter I am dealing with the origins of the Macedonians *as a people*, not with the purported Argive origins of the Argead royal family, which suggests that, whatever their origins, the Macedonians were ruled by a Greek family. The story of how the Argeadae came to rule Macedon is in Hdt. 8.137-39; see my commentary on the myth of Argive origins as a piece of fifth-century B.C. royal Macedonian propaganda, "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House," *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*. *Hesperia*, suppl. 19 (1982) 7-13.



on to argue in detail. Thus Hall undercuts the methodological foundations of Hammond's use of the ancient sources to define the Hellenic ancestry of the Macedonians by showing that the earliest Greek texts embedded a process of myth-making, and that those very texts were part of a continuing process of self-definition that experienced changes as time went on.

On the matter of the Macedonian spoken language ("standard" Greek, a "Macedonian" dialect of Greek, or a non-Greek language/dialect?) there has not been much movement in recent years. If anything, previously held positions have hardened in proportion to an elevation of political tensions in the Balkans, especially during the decade of the 1990s, when the impact of a newly independent, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia intensified feelings in Greece that the ancient Macedonians were Greek. The ongoing discovery of Greek-language inscriptions on stone and ceramics in Macedonia has seemed to confirm the position of many modern Greek scholars that the ancient Macedonian language was a form of Greek, even though Greek inscriptions continue to be found on objects that are associated with the Thracians, a non-Greek people who never developed a writing system of their own.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, the northern Aegean was a

---

<sup>25</sup> E.g., the 1995 excavation of a rich Thracian grave near Kazanluk yielded a late fifth/early fourth-century B.C. silver phiale with the inscription *Dynto Zêmyios* ("Dyntos [son of] Zemys") written in a local Greek script, thereby adding one more example of Thracian tribes borrowing scripts from Greek coastal settlements; see Nikola Theodossiev, "A New Thracian Inscription from Bulgaria," *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 144.

A famous hoard of Greek-inscribed Thracian silver vessels has been well-described in several publications, among which are Alexander Fol (ed.) *et al*, *The New Thracian Treasure from Rogozen, Bulgaria*,

region of active commerce throughout the Archaic and Classical periods, and has preserved a rich informal epigraphical record on many of the items that found their way there.<sup>26</sup> In brief, there is no change from what I wrote more than a decade ago: while standard Greek was certainly the language of religion, administration, and contacts between Macedonians and foreigners (as Latin and French were used in parts of Europe over the centuries as a means of communication between locals and foreigners), and while several dialects of Greek are to be found throughout Classical Macedonia, there is scant evidence of a *Macedonian* dialect of Greek.<sup>27</sup> Moreover,

---

British Museum Publications (London 1986), and *ibid.*, *The Rogozen Treasure* (Sofia 1989).

<sup>26</sup> Thus an eighth-century Attic amphora bearing a Cypriot graffito, and a later fifth century B.C. Attic skyphos with a graffito in the Carian alphabet; see Ioulia Vokotopoulou and Anastasios-Phoebus Christidis, "A Cypriot Graffito on an SOS Amphora from Mende, Chalcidice," *Kadmos* 34 (1995) 5-12, and Katerina Tzanavari and Anastasios-Phoebus Christidis, "A Carian Graffito from the Lebet Table, Thessaloniki," *ibid.*, 13-17.

<sup>27</sup> There is an insufficient amount of "Macedonian"—by that I mean a non-Hellenic language—surviving to know what language it was. Recent scholarship on an early-to-mid-fourth-century B.C. curse tablet discovered at Pella in 1986 suggests the possibility that the Greek dialect of the tablet was non-Ionian, and perhaps "Macedonian." See Larent Dubois, "Une tablette de malédiction de Pella: s'agit-il du premier texte Macédonien?," *Revue des Études Grecques* 108 (1995) 190-97. In the end we may have succeeded only in revealing an unsettled writing system on the tablet; in any case, unless it is a true bi-lingual inscription, *one* is an insufficient statistical sample. Variations due to unsettled orthography and regional dialects complicate the matter, and are discussed by Anna Panayotou, "Dialectical Inscriptions from Chalcidice, Macedonia and Amphipolis," *Epigraphes tês Makedonias*. Third International Symposium on Macedonia, 8-12 December 1993 (Thessaloniki 1996) 124-63. It would appear that Amphipolis possessed no extensive substratum of Greek speakers, that the main Greek dialect of Chalcidice

Macedonian and Greek were sufficiently different as late as the time of Alexander the Great as to require interpreters and cause ancient writers to note the differences. This is a matter that I dealt with in a recent essay in which I attempted to show that—whatever *we* wish to believe about the ethnicity of the ancient Macedonians—the *ancient writers* who concerned themselves with the age of Alexander and shortly afterward believed that the Greeks and Macedonians were two different peoples.<sup>28</sup> That may be the most persuasive argument of all, as it removes the issue from what *we* think, and helps define ethnicity in terms that were used by the peoples of antiquity.

---

was Ionic, but that Ionic was not strong in Macedonia proper. As for the uncertainty of things, Panayotou concludes that the “Macedonian” dialect was rarely written down, but was related to north-western Greek dialects until the adoption of the Attic *koinê* in the early fourth century as the official written language used to serve diplomatic contacts with the Greeks. (One may reasonably wonder by what means it can be determined that the Macedonian language/dialect was related to northwest Greek if it was rarely written down.) Thus it would seem that no progress has been made on the issue of the native language of the Macedonians.

<sup>28</sup> Eugene N. Borza, “Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander. The Source Traditions,” in Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman and London 1996) 122-39. There is a piece of evidence I overlooked in that essay: in *Ant.* 27.5, Plutarch contraposes Cleopatra VII’s many foreign-language skills against her Ptolemaic predecessors who were ignorant of the native Egyptian language, adding that some of them had even abandoned “speaking Macedonian” (*to Makedonidzein eklipontôn*). Presumably the language of the Ptolemies had become Greek. See the commentary of C.B.R. Pelling, *Plutarch. Life of Antony* (Cambridge 1988), ad loc. 27.5.

## INSTITUTIONS

We know a great deal more about the structure and institutions of the Macedonian kingdom today than we did a decade ago, thanks largely to the efforts of Dr. M. B. Hatzopoulos and his colleagues at the National Hellenic Research Foundation in Athens. Under Hatzopoulos's direction the Foundation's Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity has been deeply involved in the collection and publication of the epigraphic evidence from ancient Macedonia (see Chapter 1 above). A culminating effort resulted in the production of Hatzopoulos's *Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings*, the first volume of which is a detailed reconstruction of Macedonian internal structure, based largely on the epigraphical evidence published in the second volume.<sup>29</sup> If nothing else were to be accomplished by this work, the collection and organization of inscriptions with extensive bibliography and epigraphical indexes would mark Hatzopoulos's study as an important contribution to Macedonian studies. But there is more.

Of the 93 inscriptions, the vast bulk are royal and civic documents of the Hellenistic era, with only a handful of private and royal documents from the period before Cassander. We thus have an unusually rich collection of material relating to Antigonid Macedonia which will certainly assist the next generation of scholars who will rewrite the history of that period, especially the reign of Philip V. But the old problem remains: to what extent can we use the material from this later period to read back into the history of the Argead monarchy? Throughout his work Nicholas Hammond has argued for a rather formal

---

<sup>29</sup> Vol. I, *A Historical and Epigraphic Study*; Vol. II, *Epigraphic Appendix*, Meletēmata, no. 22 (Athens 1996).



structure for the Argead period: king, council, and army assembly operating in conjunction with a basic law or code regulating their relationship with one another.<sup>30</sup> I and others are more sceptical, suggesting that 1) the evidence from the Argead period before Alexander does not permit reconstructing such a formal arrangement; 2) the evidence from the Hellenistic period does not permit such a reading back into Argead history; and 3) the extensive use of the limited evidence from Alexander the Great's campaigns should not be used to read back, as that event was an aberration in Macedonian history: "government" by a king leading an army on the move, with all parties far from their normal home-based sources of financial and political support.

In his recent work Hatzopoulos has presented a view allied with Hammond's, though based upon far more documentary evidence. His 500-page discussion of how the Macedonians organized themselves is much too complex to describe in detail here, but it is a necessary and successful antidote to the "kings-'n'-things" approach which traditionally has dominated the writing of Macedonian history. Hatzopoulos issues a salutary corrective to our preoccupation with famous kings and their exploits which have made it appear (mainly because of the interests of our narrative evidence) that royal behavior dominated Macedonian life, whereas, in reality, most people under Macedonian rule probably knew little of

---

<sup>30</sup> For a review of the history of scholarship on Macedonian royal institutions, see my discussion in *In the Shadow of Olympus* (note 1 above), Chapter 10. Hammond's views are an outgrowth of the work of earlier scholars, and can be followed most conveniently in his *The Macedonian State. Origins, Institutions, and History* (Oxford 1989), Chapters II, IV, VII, and VIII.



politics beyond the local village or city level.<sup>31</sup> And it is the description of the organization of the kingdom on the village and city level that marks Hatzopoulos's major contribution, a description based largely on the dozens of civic documents that he and his associates have collected. Beginning with the Roman settlement of 167 B.C., Hatzopoulos works through the evidence backwards in time, a method which has value for the study of the Hellenistic era (although see below). He places Macedonian institutions very much in the mainstream of Greek political structures, and emphasizes the difference between Greek federal states (which integrated existing local communities into ethnic states with appropriate representation on the federal level) and the northern "monarchical" states where more primitive local urban institutions were not integrated into the large ethnic state. He describes the several nuances that distinguished differences among regional political organizations, but sees all of them as part of a Hellenic *koinê*.

Hatzopoulos provides a sophisticated argument, but I have some reservations about his attempt to make of the Macedonians just another group of Greeks (albeit somewhat retarded in their political institutions) analogous to the Thessalians, Boeotians, Aetolians, and other confederations of Greek cities and villages. For the ancient world remembered the Thessalians and others as groups of Greeks, but the Macedonians as a people—or ethnic state—different and special. This is not because of the exploits of their most famous fourth-century kings, as it seems to have been true before the age of Philip II and

---

<sup>31</sup> A point that Hatzopoulos has expanded elsewhere; e.g., "Épigraphie et villages en Grèce du Nord: *Ethnos, Polis et Kome* en Macédoine," in A. Calbi, A. Donati and G. Poma (eds.), *L'epigraphia del villaggio* (Faenza 1993) 151-171.

continued to be true during the Hellenistic period. The appearance of differences between Macedonians and Greeks is explicit in the ancient authors, as I have argued elsewhere.<sup>32</sup> As Hellenized as the Macedonians became in their culture and civic institutions, they were perceived as a people distinct from their Greek neighbors until quite well on in the Hellenistic era. It would be too simplistic to say this was so because they were not Greeks, not only because that raises a red flag in the hotbed of the modern Balkans, but also because it does not take sufficient account of the fluid and flexible definitions of ethnicity that we have recently come to recognize. Later twentieth-century ethnographers have taught us to describe the processes and realities of self-ascription, and there is quite simply too little information about the Macedonians—even in the Hellenistic period—to do that, whereas contemporary external perceptions of the Macedonians from the early Hellenistic and late Classical eras seem to indicate that they were not considered to be Greek.

One other misgiving is that Hatzopoulos's method of arguing back, whatever its value for illuminating Hellenistic royal and civic institutions, runs into the same wall as has blocked other scholars: the documentary evidence quickly runs out during the reign of Philip II. Hatzopoulos attributes on the basis of rather little evidence (although not without validity) that Philip II was responsible for an organizational reform of administration that presaged the more elaborate schemes of the Hellenistic era;<sup>33</sup> he does not, however, entirely avoid Hammond's

---

<sup>32</sup> Note 28 above.

<sup>33</sup> In an even more recent publication, Hatzopoulos succinctly and strongly reaffirms his argument that Philip was the architect of the institutional reform whereby the Macedonian territory was organized in terms of its urban centers which served as mainly autonomous

anachronistic error of reading too much back into the earlier period of the Argeadae where the evidence about internal customs and institutions is virtually non-existent. Despite these few reservations, one must recognize that Hatzopoulos's achievement will have elevated future discussions of Macedonian institutions to a more refined level.

*Addendum:*

The most detailed and comprehensive survey of the settlements and toponyms of ancient Macedonia is Fanoula Papazoglou, *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Suppl. 16 (Athens and Paris, 1988). In a major scholarly achievement Papazoglou gives a full account of the textual sources and archaeological reports related to hundreds of sites scattered across the Macedonian landscape.

The dearth of accurate and detailed maps of Macedonia will soon be corrected, thanks to the Classical Atlas Project initiated by the American Philological Association, and sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities and several other public and private agencies in this country and abroad. Under the general direction and

---

entities recognized by and operating under the umbrella of royal authority; see "L'état Macédonien antique: un nouveau visage, par M. Miltiade Hatzopoulos," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes Rendus* (1997) 7-25. The epigraphical evidence offered by Hatzopoulos suggesting that Philip authored this administrative reform is slight. If Hatzopoulos is correct it is odd that no ancient writer—even including Diodorus who at his distance may be said to have been the least prejudiced of the sources on Philip's career—mentions a reorganization that borders on the revolutionary, although it may be said that this is an argument from silence about an ancient author who wrote very little about Philip II during the very period when the king was presumably engaged in his reforms.

editorship of Richard J.A. Talbert, this folio-size volume will cover the Classical World from the Atlantic to India. Sheets 50 and 51 provide detailed information (with bibliography) on the ancient sites in Macedonia and Aegean Thrace at a scale of 1:500,000. Entitled the *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, the work is scheduled for publication by Princeton University Press in Fall 2000.





### III

---

#### PHILIP II

---

The surge of interest in the reign of Philip II is not the result only of the extraordinary recent archaeological discoveries made at the Macedonian royal cemetery at Vergina (ancient Aegae). In fact, the Vergina excavations had roughly coincided with the publication of several works long in preparation, two of which are noteworthy: J. R. Ellis's *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* and G. T. Griffith's section on Philip in the second volume of N.G.L. Hammond's *A History of Macedonia*. Ellis provided the first new, bold interpretation of Philip's career in forty years,<sup>1</sup> giving us a picture of Macedonian foreign policy from the Macedonian perspective, and insisting that Philip's moves among the Greeks were deliberate, cautious, and conciliatory. When diplomacy failed, however, Philip resorted vigorously to force of arms. Griffith provided a full account of Philip's political, military, and diplomatic activities based on the author's unexcelled and penetrating knowledge of the ancient evidence.<sup>2</sup> It is a foundation for all modern studies of the king.

---

<sup>1</sup> J.R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976). Ellis has also provided a useful account of Philip's career in volume VI of *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> (1994), chapters 14-15.

<sup>2</sup> N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2, 550-336 B.C. (Oxford 1979) 203-646. Hammond produced his own

As a result of modern scholarship, Philip has emerged from behind the screen of an Atheno-centric vision of events. No longer blinded by the power of Demosthenes's ringing accusations, most modern scholars now see Philip as an independent monarch who not only expressed his personal ambitions but also maintained Macedonian sovereignty against his Greek and other Balkan neighbors. While the general outlines of Philip's career are clearer than ever, major problems remain in scholars' efforts to understand many of the details of his activities. Among these problems are several relating to chronology.

The date of Philip's accession to the throne remains in dispute. In his interpretation of the so-called Olevni inscription Hatzopoulos<sup>3</sup> proposed a revision of the commonly-accepted date of 359 B.C. to sometime between June and October of 360 B.C. The inscription is controversial, with many scholars believing that it refers instead to the reign of Philip V. Much of the controversy is discussed in Goukowsky,<sup>4</sup> with an outline of the problems inherent in coordinating the calendars of the Athenians and the Macedonians. I am inclined to accept Hatzopoulos's chronology and to follow Ellis and Griffith's view that Philip never acted as regent for his nephew, Amyntas, but assumed the kingship from the start. It was a kingship

---

volume on Philip (*Philip of Macedon* [London 1994]), but there is little new or different in it from his views expressed elsewhere, and the archaeological arguments which provided part of the justification for the book are now outdated.

<sup>3</sup> M.B. Hatzopoulos, "The Olevni Inscription and the Dates of Philip II's Reign," in W. Lindsay Adams and Eugene N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Lanham, New York, and London 1982) 21-42, and "La lettre royale d'Olevni," *Chiron* 25 (1995) 163-85.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Goukowsky, "Encore l'Inscription d'Oloveni [*sic*]," *Études d'Archeologie Classique* 9 (1997) 91-102.

immediately threatened by the attempt of Argaeus, who may have held the throne briefly on an earlier occasion, to seize the throne for himself, with Athenian support.<sup>5</sup> Philip engaged in a reform of the Macedonian army, and in less than two years from his accession defeated the Macedonian's perennial Illyrian enemy, under their king Bardylis, whose career is nicely surveyed by Kate Mortensen<sup>6</sup>. Thus Philip established himself as a Balkan power to be reckoned with. On Philip's military organization one cannot do better than Griffith's account<sup>7</sup> now supplemented in a brief summary by Hammond himself, and by the appropriate parts of an article written by P. T. Keyser.<sup>8</sup>

An even larger—and perhaps insurmountable—problem (given the nature of the evidence) is the chronology of Philip's relations with the Greek city-states. Book 16 of Diodorus is our main detailed narrative source,

---

<sup>5</sup> See Duane March, "The Kings of Macedon: 399-369 B.C.," *Historia* 44 (1995) 257-82, and Julia Heskell, "Philip II and Argaios. A Pretender's Story," in Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman and London 1996) 37-56. Heskell argues that the threat of Argaeus was serious, and that Philip was not only forced to defeat him, but also to placate the Athenians who had supported the pretender. It would be years before Philip recovered from his concessions to Athens, and could emerge to thwart Athenian ambitions in the north.

<sup>6</sup> Kate Mortensen, "The Career of Bardylis," *The Ancient World* 12.1 (1991) 49-59.

<sup>7</sup> In Hammond-Griffith, sec. xii (above, note 2).

<sup>8</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State: Origins, Institutions and History* (Oxford 1989); Paul T. Keyser, "The Use of Artillery by Philip II and Alexander the Great," *Ancient World* 15.1 (1994) 27-49. For the possibility that Philip also engaged in a wide-ranging reform of the balance between civic institutions and royal authority, see Chapter II above, pp. 44-48.

and the chronology of his account must be coordinated with the evidence from Books 7-9 of Justin and from the Athenian orators. Justin is a notoriously problematic source, and the evidence from Athenian politicians is suspect on several levels (see below). It is a great tragedy that two of the most powerful historians of the fourth century are lost. Ephorus of Cyme and Theopompus of Chios provided contemporary accounts of the rise of Macedonian power. The latter's *Philippica* consisted of 58 books (not all on Philip) covering the entire period of Philip's reign, of which there survive a large number of fragments imbedded in the works of later authors. Theopompus's history may have been based in part on the author's own experience at the Macedonian court, and it provided a detailed, if somewhat jaundiced, view of Philip's exercise of power over the Greek cities. There has been a strong interest in Theopompus in recent years, and this critical contemporary observer of Philip has found a modern scholar suitable for his importance: Michael Flower's cautious and sensible study of Theopompus<sup>9</sup> concludes that the historian explained Philip's successes as a result of the decline in private and public morality among the Greeks. Not only did Theopompus not echo Isocrates's panhellenic fervor, but he actually saw Philip as an unpleasant creature who had barbarized the Greek world. Markle<sup>10</sup> has recently argued that Theopompus was one of Diodorus's sources for the Sacred War, who, along with Diyllus of Athens, Duris of Samos, and Demophilus, son of Ephorus, provided Diodorus with information about Philip's career. This challenges Hammond's classic study

---

<sup>9</sup> Michael A. Flower, *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1994; rev. ed. 1997).

<sup>10</sup> M.M. Markle, "Diodorus' Sources for the Sacred War," in Ian Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History* (Oxford 1994) 43-69.



of Diodorus's sources, published more than sixty years ago, in which he suggested that Diodorus depended on Ephorus, Diyllus, and Demophilus.<sup>11</sup>

To return to the matter of chronology, there is a problem of determining from difficult sources the connection between concurrent events in Thrace and the northern Aegean and the activities of the city-states in central Greece and Attica. There was a resurgence of Athenian interest in north Aegean lands in the fourth century, perhaps a deliberate attempt by Athenians to re-establish some form of their fifth-century empire. In any case, the Athenian momentum came to a halt with the advent of Philip II. Philip's ambitions in central Greece aside, it was perhaps inevitable that Philip would clash with Athens on the northern matter. In her important dissertation, Julia Heskell recognized that a better understanding of these complex issues would require a refinement of the chronology of Philip's activities.<sup>12</sup> She also realized that any discussion of Philip's foreign policy rested on a knowledge of the general situation in the northern Aegean prior to Philip's accession to the throne, a subject which she addressed thoroughly in a recent monograph that was an outgrowth of her dissertation.<sup>13</sup> Heskell describes in precise detail the renewed Athenian interest in the north and the conflict with Olynthus over control of Amphipolis. Among the most valuable contributions of this monograph is a more-than-twenty-page comparative chronological table, showing season-by-

---

<sup>11</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, "The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI," *Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937) 79-91; 32 (1938) 137-51.

<sup>12</sup> Julia Heskell, *The Foreign Policy of Philip II Down to the Peace of Philocrates* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University 1987).

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., *The North Aegean Wars, 371-60 B.C.* Historia Einzelschriften, no. 102 (Stuttgart 1997).



season concurrent events in a number of places, including Macedon, Athens, Chalcidice, the Peloponnese, Thebes, Thessaly, and others. Likewise, in his study of the Sacred War, John Buckler<sup>14</sup> addressed in an appendix a series of chronological problems relating to Greek and Macedonian events in central Greece in the period from about 356 to 346 B.C. The work of Heskell and Buckler has contributed to a finer understanding of these particular regions in which Philip eventually became deeply involved.

The study of Philip's foreign policy continues to provoke scholars, and we may examine several areas of recent interest. First, the matter of the evidence. Ryder<sup>15</sup> has restated the proposition that Demosthenes may have revised or edited his speeches to take into account later events, although Trevett<sup>16</sup> vigorously denies that the orator ever revised or published (that is, circulated) his deliberative speeches. The obvious problem, simply put: to what extent does the text of any Athenian orator reflect what he actually said on a given day in response to a contemporary situation?<sup>17</sup> And, even if the published text is deemed an accurate record of what was said, to what extent is the speech an accurate record of Philip's actual diplomatic overtures, as opposed to what the speaker

---

<sup>14</sup> John Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War* (Leiden 1989).

<sup>15</sup> T.T.B. Ryder, "The diplomatic skills of Philip II," in Ian Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History* (Oxford 1994) 228-57.

<sup>16</sup> Jeremy Trevett, "Did Demosthenes Publish His Deliberative Speeches?" *Hermes* 124 (1996) 424-41, who argues that what has survived of Demosthenes's deliberative speeches are drafts written as preparation for his speeches, which drafts were collected after his death. The "confused state" of the Demosthenic corpus thus reflects the disorderly condition of the orator's papers.

<sup>17</sup> This is an issue explored by Ian Worthington, "Greek Oratory, Revision of Speeches, and the Problem of Historical Reliability," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991) 55-74.

wanted his Athenian audience to believe was Philip's policy? What we know of Philip's overtures to the Athenians passed through the filter of Athenian oratory designed to persuade the *dêmos* to accept or reject certain policies. Tuplin has enlarged this theme by suggesting that Demosthenes did in fact aim at publication but that his goal was not "the creation of an historical record."<sup>18</sup> In his close analysis of the order of the *Olynthiacs* Tuplin argues that the traditional relative order of the speeches is not obvious. Two things are going on: (1) what Philip wanted and was doing at any given moment, and (2) what Demosthenes said was going and what the orator believed. (2) is self-evident, while (1) is difficult to recover. Thus historians should be cautious about using Demosthenes as a historical narrative.

Philip's gradual intrusions into central Greek affairs combined diplomacy, guile, force, and the threat of force, resulting in the uneasy Peace of 346, by which he had established himself as a power in the region with a seat on the Amphictyony protecting Delphi. Buckler suggested that Philip "came not as an invader," but as the champion of the sanctuary's god.<sup>19</sup> This is, of course, less a comment about the Macedonian king's personal religious fervor than it is a description of Philip's public posture before the Greek world, and there was little that the Greeks could do but swallow the pretense. For the internecine Third Sacred War had been highly destructive, as Buckler shows, and the exhausted Greeks fell prey to Philip's overtures. In his discussion of Philip's diplomatic talents Ryder<sup>20</sup> argues

---

<sup>18</sup> Christopher Tuplin, "Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs* and the Character of the Demegoric Corpus," *Historia* 47 (1998) 276-320.

<sup>19</sup> Note 14 above.

<sup>20</sup> Note 15 above.

that the number of Greek states “whose submission or cooperation was directly due to his use of force was comparatively small,” thereby echoing Diodorus’s encomium (16.95.3-4) to Philip’s mastery of diplomacy. Philip’s complex and multi-faceted diplomacy was bolstered by his wealth. The charge that he bribed some states is not rare in the history of Greek diplomacy.<sup>21</sup> But, in the end, Ryder argues, Philip’s diplomacy produced only temporary peace and alliances, failing to provide anything long term. This was confirmed with the outbreak of the Fourth Sacred War, which pitted Amphissa against Delphi and the Amphictyony. In his study of the event, Londey<sup>22</sup> suggested that the new conflict grew out of local rivalries, not as a plot of Philip to involve himself further in central Greek affairs, at least not at the moment, as he had other problems in Thrace. But what began as a local matter eventually drew in the major powers, and Philip took advantage of the situation by bringing the Macedonian army into the fray, once again as a protector of the Delphic deity. As Athens and Thebes became involved, the situation led ultimately to Chaeroneia, and it was Chaeroneia that insured a final solution to Philip’s problems in dealing with the Greeks.

Or was Chaeroneia the final solution, from the Athenian point of view? In a stimulating overview of fourth-century Athenian foreign policy Harding challenges the common notion that Athenian policy was disorderly

---

<sup>21</sup> It was, of course, Demosthenes who elevated bribery charges against his enemies to a high art form; e. g., *de Cor.* 18.294ff. See Cawkwell (below note 33) 100-104.

<sup>22</sup> Peter Londey, “The Outbreak of the 4th Sacred War,” *Chiron* 20 (1990) 239-60.

and incapable of dealing with an autocrat like Philip.<sup>23</sup> Over a seventy-year period, suggests Harding, the Athenians demonstrated a consistent principle that *eleutheria* and *autonomia* were the underlying goals of Athenian statesmen, and that defense of the state, preservation of its borders, insurance of a food supply, and economic prosperity would be maintained through control of traditional spheres of influence (no narrow Fortress Attica mentality here!). This argument, incidentally, bolsters Heskell's notion that Athens attempted in the fourth century to revive its fifth-century interests in the northern Aegean, thereby colliding with Macedonian expansion in that region. Harding proposes that throughout the period the Athenians thought and acted strategically, rather than as a continuing exercise in crisis management, and that Athens had been generally successful in thwarting Philip's ambitions. Thus Philip was forced to invade Greece. The defeat of the Athenians at Chaeroneia was not as severe for them as it would have been for Philip had he lost the battle. Moreover, Chaeroneia was not the end—from the Athenians' perspective—as they strengthened their walls and navy, and continued training their young men for battle. It was not Philip but Alexander who changed everything. The conclusion of the Athenian-Macedonian conflict was not Chaeroneia or the so-called League of Corinth, but the Lamian War.

One more point: Philip's career has been studied mainly in terms of the literary evidence and, more recently, the archaeological record of the third quarter of the fourth century. But Stephen Tracy reminds us that occasionally the rich epigraphical record of the Athenians can play a

---

<sup>23</sup> Phillip Harding, "Athenian Foreign Policy in the Fourth Century," *Klio* 77 (1995) 105-25.



role.<sup>24</sup> His join of two stones suggests that there were those in Athens in the immediate aftermath of Chaeroneia who were able to promote and pass legislation honoring Philip's friends in the city. Perhaps this is evidence of some good will that had resulted from Philip having dispatched Antipater to deal personally with the Athenians. If true, it suggests yet another nuance to Philip's diplomacy.

Is it possible to know Philip's long-term intentions?<sup>25</sup> In his *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* Ellis argued that Philip's efforts in Greece were designed primarily to provide a stable base for the Macedonian invasion of Asia.<sup>26</sup> To the extent that he had a goal, the wealth of Asia was the lure for the king. There has been no disagreement among modern scholars concerning the necessity for Philip to settle Greek affairs as a precondition for crossing the Hellespont: it was essential to achieve coalition, security, and the possibility of Greek military assistance. The debate has instead concerned itself with *when* Philip first conceived of an attack on the Persian empire as a major objective. It seems hardly likely that the plan for an Asian expedition can be dated much before 346 B.C., the date at which Diodorus (16.60.4-5) first mentions it, although possibly with the advantage of hindsight. And there is no

---

<sup>24</sup> Stephen V. Tracy, "De Antipatro et Archedico Lamptrensi. IG II<sup>2</sup> 402 + Agora I 4990," *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 249-51. See also, Tod *GHI* 2.181. For further treatment of the arrangements made by Philip with the Athenians after Chaeroneia see Tracy, *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340-290 B.C.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1995) 7-9.

<sup>25</sup> The question is not new, having been considered by German scholars a century ago; see E. Badian, "Eduard Meyer's American Paralipomena," in W. M. Calder III and Alexander Demandt (eds.), *Eduard Meyer. Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers*. Mnemosyne, suppl. 112 (1990) 1-38, esp. 18-20.

<sup>26</sup> Note 1 above.



way of knowing the effect on Philip of Isocrates's panhellenic harangues or even if Isocrates was aware of Philip's plans. There is no hint of a Persian plan in Demosthenes *Third Philippic* and *On the Chersonnesus*. Stephen Ruzicka has described the increasingly chaotic and weakened Persian position in Anatolia, marked by intrigue at the court and open satrapal rebellion.<sup>27</sup> The situation had worsened through the 350s and had become quite disorderly in the 340s and 330s. Certainly the astute Macedonian king must have been aware of the vulnerability of the region, but there was little to be done about it so long as Philip was occupied with matters closer to home.

In an essay challenging Ellis's proposal that Philip had long planned a Persian war, Errington suggested that the king's plan came late because Philip's policy in Greece had *failed* to bring stability: perhaps the incentive of a Hellenic Crusade against the ancient enemy would neutralize the leading states of central Greece in a way that Philip's carrot-and-stick diplomacy backed by the formidable Macedonian army had not.<sup>28</sup> Errington argued that there is no evidence of a plan before 341, and he is correct in suggesting that nothing could be done in any event until Philip had neutralized eastern Thrace. He concluded that the war against Athens and Thebes which Philip had failed to avoid is what motivated the Persian plan: an allied expedition into Asia would provide a "dramatic gesture" to reconcile the Greek states. Thus, the Persian plan does not reveal itself fully until shortly before

---

<sup>27</sup> Stephen Ruzicka, "A Note on Philip's Persian War," *American Journal of Ancient History* 10 (1985 [1993]) 84-91.

<sup>28</sup> R. M. Errington, "Review-Discussion: Four Interpretations of Philip II," *American Journal of Ancient History* 6 (1981) 69-88.

Chaeroneia. In a more recent study Buckler concurs,<sup>29</sup> adding that there was no hostility between the Macedonians and the Persians until the King attempted to thwart Philip's campaign against Perinthus in 340; even at that there is nothing to suggest that Philip ever planned anything beyond the Ionian coast, thus pursuing a traditional policy in the Greek Aegean.

Ruzicka reminds us that, while it is impossible to know Philip's final plan (would the Macedonians go it alone, or with Balkan and Greek allies? how far did he intend to push into Asia?), his dispatch of Attalus and Parmenio into Asia Minor shortly before his death, and his interest in diplomatic settlements by proposing an alliance with the satrap Pixodarus suggested that Philip had met no opposition in Asia Minor. The situation changed drastically, however, with the deaths of Artaxerxes and Bagoas and the accession of Darius III, who took a strong hand and virtually pushed the Macedonian advance force out of Asia. Thus Alexander later would be forced to fight in western Asia Minor, something that Philip perhaps had not originally planned to do.

One final thought. It is impossible for us to know what lay in the back of Philip's mind, to what extent his activities in Thrace or central Greece were related to some ill-formed ultimate scheme, and when the plan to invade Asia Minor became an operative component of his foreign policy. And it is probably true that none of our ancient sources was privy to this information either, at least not until the late 340s or early 330s. There are only two possible reasons for Philip's military engagements against his Balkan and Greek neighbors. The first would be the

---

<sup>29</sup> John Buckler, "Philip II, the Greeks, and the King, 346-36 B.C.," *Illinois Classical Studies* 19 (1994) 99-122.

necessity to protect the frontiers of Macedon, whose integrity had experienced a long history of being challenged by the incursions of Greeks, Illyrians, Thracians, and others. A strong military force was required to defend the frontier against both his Balkan neighbors and against the threat of renewed southern Greek ambitions in the north. The Macedonian army became the vehicle by which Philip articulated his foreign policy, and the means by which a successful king and his soldiers achieved their status as Macedonians. The second reason for an intrusion into distant places—especially into central Greece—was to prepare the base for the ultimate goal of attacking the Persian Empire. One cannot accept conquest for conquest's sake as a third possible reason, as, given the standards of the day, there is no evidence that Philip was interested in the "conquest" of Greece. He drew no wealth from Greece.<sup>30</sup> His Greek policy was piecemeal, a mixture of diplomacy, bribery, and military intervention. He attacked no major southern Greek city.<sup>31</sup> (It was *Alexander* who destroyed Thebes.) In the end, when all else had failed, he met and defeated a major Greek coalition at Chaeroneia. Then, having the Greeks at his mercy in the aftermath of military disaster, he gave them a settlement similar to the

---

<sup>30</sup> Philip was wealthy enough in his own right; see N.G.L. Hammond, "Philip's Innovations in Macedonian Economy," *Symbolae Osloenses* 70 (1995) 22-29.

<sup>31</sup> In a recent essay whose general conclusions I am in agreement with, John Buckler argues that there is no evidence of a long-term plan in Philip's mind for dealing with the southern Greeks. The king combined aggression with opportunism. Athens was the stumbling block for Philip, and when war between him and the Athenians became inevitable, Philip began to realize that the mastery of all Greece was not only desirable, but possible; see Buckler, "Philip II's Designs on Greece," in Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris, (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C. in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman and London, 1996) 77-97.

one he had offered through diplomacy and the threat of force eight years earlier. *Conquest* was not the point. Peace and alliance were (see below). It is true that Philip was the master of the Greeks, but, aside from four strategically placed Macedonian garrisons (Philip knew his Greeks), he withdrew to celebrate his victories and to begin preparations for the move into Asia. Whatever one wishes to make of Philip's ultimate objectives, it must be remembered that his foreign policies and military campaigns in Europe seem primarily designed to insure security and stability in the regions bordering the Macedonian frontier. He was drawn into the morass of central Greek affairs when it became apparent that the major powers there appeared to threaten the stability he sought elsewhere. Just when he began to view that stability as a precondition for an Asian expedition probably cannot be known.

Buckler sees the peace settlement of 338/37 (commonly and erroneously called the "League of Corinth") as a *koinê eirênê*—whether or not that exact term was used contemporaneously to describe it<sup>32</sup> For the first time in a long while, a major settlement had occurred in Greece without the involvement of the Persian King. It was an alliance of which the King was not a member, indeed, one from which the King had been tacitly excluded. It is a matter of speculation as to whether Philip saw it in these terms, but it is clear that he intended to use the alliance against the Persians who had proven themselves lately vulnerable in western Asia Minor. It is also speculation about whether this was Philip's long-term goal in settling Greek affairs, to replace the titular Persian hegemony over

---

<sup>32</sup> Note 29 above. Buckler provides a long list of Diodorus's anachronistic uses of *koinê eirênê*.



the Greeks with his own practical leadership. Whatever the gestation of Philip's policy it ended as a magnificent achievement, echoing Diodorus's sentiment (16.95-2-4): "...the growth of his position was not due so much to his prowess in arms as to his adroitness and cordiality in diplomacy. Philip himself is said to have been prouder of his grasp of strategy and his diplomatic successes than of his valour in actual battle [trans. C. B. Welles]."<sup>33</sup>

Philip's assassination in the theater at Aegae in (perhaps) October 336 continues to draw the interest of scholars, although the elaborate conspiracy theories that once dominated the literature on this famous murder now (happily) seem to be on the wane. A very useful survey of modern scholarship was accomplished by Carney, who concluded that the troubled relationship of Philip, Olympias, and Alexander during the last years of Philip's reign was not the cause of the king's assassination.<sup>34</sup> The charges—ancient and modern—that a vindictive Olympias was behind the plot to kill the king stem from a cultural

---

<sup>33</sup> Diodorus's comment has met with the general approval of modern historians. E. g., see George Cawkwell, "The End of Greek Liberty," in Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman and London 1996) 98-121. Cawkwell balances Philip's diplomatic achievements with an appreciation of the king's superior military skills, arguing that overwhelming Macedonian force was the main cause of the end of Greek "liberty." One wonders, however,—given the long history of the Greek cities' experiencing a variety of external oppressions—if Philip's victory represented only one exchange of masters for another. If, by loss of "liberty," Cawkwell implies (he does not make this explicit) the subversion of freedom to a *foreign* power, it supports the view that the Macedonians were not just another Greek threat to other Greeks.

<sup>34</sup> Elizabeth Carney, "The Politics of Polygamy: Olympias, Alexander and the Murder of Philip," *Historia* 41 (1992) 169-89.



misunderstanding of the Macedonian royal practice of polygamy, according to Carney. Both ancient Greek and modern prejudices against polygamy have drawn unwarranted attention to the person of Olympias, and there is no doubt that she was *capable* of horrid deeds: her later career would be proof enough of that. But the suspicion—and it is no more than that—that Olympias was the author of a conspiracy of regicide is not well founded in the evidence. Hammond enriches the discussion of the assassination itself, described in most detail by Diodorus (16.91.1-94.4), probably based on an eyewitness account.<sup>35</sup> Hammond recalls and summarizes his earlier discussion of *P. Oxy* 15.1798, which supplements Diodorus's version, and also discusses the exact placement of the *sômatophylakes* (of whom the assassin Pausanias was one) as Philip walked into the theater at Aegae.<sup>36</sup> In the end one is inclined still to accept the word of the best contemporary authority on the matter. Aristotle (*Pol.* 1311b.2-4) tells us that the murder was the result of the assassin's private grievance against the king: no modern attempt to weaken the credibility of that evidence has been successful.

The murder of Philip, obviously, was not the intent of the organizers of the great festival at Aegae that autumn day in 336 B.C. The festival was not only the occasion of the marriage of Alexander, king of Epirus, to Philip's daughter, Cleopatra, but it was in fact a culminating celebration of Philip's new-found leadership over the

---

<sup>35</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, "The Various Guards of Philip II and Alexander III," *Historia* 40 (1991) 396-417.

<sup>36</sup> Hammond (above, note 35) is correct in placing the assassination in one of the orchestra's entry passages, but, unlike Hammond, I find it impossible on both archaeological/topographical and literary grounds to determine by which *parados*—right or left—Philip entered the theatre.

Greek and Macedonian world. He may have even intended it as a symbol of peace and unity in preparation for the forthcoming expedition to Asia. Envoys from many Greek cities were in attendance, and there was a show of games, sacrifices, musical contests, and symposia—a major exercise in public relations. As the royal entourage moved into the theatre (Diod. 16.92.5), Philip was preceded by a procession of elaborately wrought statues of the twelve gods plus a thirteenth statue of the king himself, suitable to be enthroned among the gods. The description of this procession has given rise to a major debate among scholars concerning Philip's pretensions to divine honors, if not divinity itself. The question is an important one, for it not only deals with Philip's elevation to a unique status, but also portends possible similar interests later on Alexander's part, with implications for the subsequent rise of divine monarchy during the Hellenistic era.

Diodorus's description of the scene at Aegae is not made up. It was a public event, with many eyewitnesses forming the basic version(s) upon which Diodorus based his account. There have been few doubts about the validity of Diodorus as a source for this event, and scholarly opinion has focused on the implications of the thirteenth statue in an attempt to establish fine distinctions between the various degrees of elevation between mortal monarchy and godhood. In two earlier essays Fredericksmeyer laid out in detail a proposition that, no later than Chaeroneia, Philip was attempting to establish a theocratic basis for an absolute monarchy,<sup>37</sup> and at least one cult—in

---

<sup>37</sup> E.A. Fredericksmeyer, "Divine Honors for Philip II," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979) 39-61, and "On the Background of the Ruler Cult," in Harry Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson* (Thessaloniki 1981) 145-56.

Athens—had come into existence during his lifetime. While agreeing in part with Fredericksmeier that “Philip had pretensions to be regarded as more than mortal,” Badian argued in the same volume honoring Charles Edson that it is unlikely that Philip actually received a cult anywhere at any time.<sup>38</sup> A very useful statement of the problem was written by Baynham, and should be consulted by those who wish an introduction to the issues.<sup>39</sup>

The subject of Philip’s final days cannot be abandoned without consideration of some recent developments along the archaeological front. In a remarkable series of excavations in 1977-78, the late Professor Manolis Andronikos recovered from a great tumulus at Vergina four tombs of the later fourth and early third centuries B.C. Two of these tombs, both large dual-chambered barrel vaults with architectural facades, were unlooted. The largest of these, Tomb II, was proclaimed to house the remains of Philip II and his young wife, Cleopatra, the latter murdered by Olympias in the aftermath of Philip’s assassination. Major international exhibitions of the rich contents of these unlooted tombs were staged in Europe, North America, and Australia, and Andronikos’s interpretations were widely accepted, despite some initial reservations expressed by a handful of scholars. A decade after the discovery, and following a major change of heart, I published an article in which I argued that, on several grounds, Tomb II should be dated to the generation following Philip II, and that some of the objects might

---

<sup>38</sup> E. Badian, “The Deification of Alexander the Great,” *ibid.*, 27-71.

<sup>39</sup> Elizabeth Baynham, “The Question of Macedonian Divine Honors for Philip II,” *Mediterranean Archaeology* 7 (1994) 35-43.

have been Alexander the Great's personal royal possessions.<sup>40</sup>

Recently, my views have been corroborated by the investigations of a number of scholars in Greece. While I do not accept the proposition of Faklaris that the location of Aegae must be other than the village of Vergina,<sup>41</sup> the views of Palagia and Themelis and Touratsoglou are persuasive. Professor Palagia, who may be Greece's foremost art historian, has determined that the complex painted frieze on the entablature of Tomb II is from the age of Cassander, her argument resting on both stylistic grounds and on the iconography of the hunting scene that is the subject of the frieze.<sup>42</sup> In their formal publication of

---

<sup>40</sup> Eugene N. Borza, "The Royal Macedonian Tombs and the Paraphernalia of Alexander the Great," *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 105-21. In rejecting the excavator's view that Tomb II was the resting place of Philip II, I was anticipated by Prof. Phyllis W. Lehmann, whose instincts were correct from the start, although there was insufficient archaeological information available at that time to permit her to develop the matter fully; see "The So-Called Tomb of Philip II: a Different Interpretation," *American Journal of Archaeology* 84 (1980) 527-31, and "The So-Called Tomb of Philip II: An Addendum," *ibid.*, 86 (1982) 437-42. About the same time, W. L. Adams, arguing almost entirely on the basis of literary evidence, presented the possibility that Tomb II at Vergina contained the remains of Arrhidaeus rather than those of Philip II; see "The Royal Macedonian Tomb at Vergina: An Historical Interpretation," *The Ancient World* 3 (1980) 67-72.

<sup>41</sup> P.B. Faklaris, "Aegae: Determining the Site of the First Capital of the Macedonians," *American Journal of Archaeology* 98 (1994) 609-16. Faklaris's views have been adequately refuted by *inter alia* M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Aigéai: la localisation de la première capitale Macédonienne," *Revue des Études Grecques* 109 (1996) 264-69, and N.G.L. Hammond, "The location of Aegeae," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117 (1997) 177-79.

<sup>42</sup> Olga Palagia, "Hephaistion's Pyre and the Royal Hunt of Alexander," in A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham (eds.), *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford 2000 [forthcoming]). Palagia's essay is definitive in its presentation of how the royal lion-hunt theme



seven tombs discovered at Derveni, a few miles north of Thessaloniki, Themelis and Touratsoglou described a wide selection of pottery that dates the active period of the Derveni burials to the last quarter of the fourth century B.C.<sup>43</sup> There are several parallels between the pottery from the Derveni burials and late fourth-century dated contexts in Athens and elsewhere, some of which pottery is also associated with Tomb II at Vergina, thereby confirming Rotroff's dating of the spool salt cellars found inside Tomb II to the later fourth century.<sup>44</sup> The quality of this archaeological evidence, when combined with Palagia's study of the lion-hunt frieze on Tomb II, confirms the earlier arguments laid out in my 1987 article and in my book on Macedonia, thereby strengthening the revisionist interpretation of the finds from the Macedonian royal tombs: Tomb II at Vergina is later than the death of Philip II in 336 B.C.

Where, then, are the remains of Philip II? The tombs should be taken in their natural order. Tomb I is a cist tomb that was looted in antiquity, but which contains the scattered remains of three persons, according to the bone

---

was borrowed from the East to help Alexander's Successors establish their legitimacy by association with the deceased king, who himself had not only hunted in Persian style, but who ordered that Hephaestion's funerary pyre be decorated with lion-hunt scenes. I am grateful to Professor Palagia for sharing her essay with me in advance of publication.

<sup>43</sup> Petros G. Themelis and Yiannis P. Touratsoglou, *Oi Taphoi tou Derveniou* (Athens 1997). The chronology of the tombs is discussed on pp. 183-85, with an English-language version and excellent discussion of the context of these tombs on pp. 220-24.

<sup>44</sup> Susan I. Rotroff, "Royal Saltcellars in the Athenian Agora," *American Journal of Archaeology* 86 (1982) 283 [abstract], and "Spool Salt Cellars from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 53 (1984) 343-54.

specialists' reports: a mature male, a much younger female, and a neonate.<sup>45</sup> These would correspond to Philip II, his wife Cleopatra, and their infant, the latter two murdered by Olympias, according to our literary sources. Although the robbers had cleared the tomb of grave goods, there has been preserved a monumental wall painting depicting the rape of Persephone; moreover, the cist-type of tomb was in use before the development of large chambered tombs. Tomb II was the burial place of Philip III Arrhidaeus and his wife Eurydice, both murdered by Olympias in 317, and, following Olympias's death, interred together (Diod. 19.52.5) by Cassander at Aegae.<sup>46</sup> The archaeological evidence is not inconsistent with the literary evidence.

---

<sup>45</sup> The formal publication of Tomb I was set out by the excavator as part of the program of publication of the Vergina tombs. Professor Andronikos had himself prepared a draft of a volume on Tomb I before his death in 1992, which was published posthumously: Manolis Andronikos, *Vergina II. The 'Tomb of Persephone'*. Library of the Archaeological Society at Athens, no. 142 (Athens 1994). Unfortunately, the volume deals only with the paintings in the tomb, along with a brief account of the excavation of the exterior of the tomb, and must be regarded as incomplete. There is nothing about the human bones found within, although there is a photograph (p. 46) clearly showing the scattered long bones of an inhumation. Andronikos believed that the artist responsible for the magnificent painting of the Rape of Persephone on the tomb's north wall was none other than the famed Nichomachus, and that the date of the painting is the third quarter of the fourth century B.C. (pp. 129-30). This date of course, accords perfectly with the assassination of Philip II. For a full discussion of the bones (with relevant bibliography) see Elizabeth Carney, "Tomb I at Vergina and the Meaning of the Great Tumulus as an Historical Monument," *Archaeological News* 17 (1992) 1-11.

<sup>46</sup> Diodorus reports that Eurydice's mother Cynna (or Cynnane: several ancient sources are in disagreement about her name) was buried at Aegae at the same time; see a fragment of Diyllus (*FGrH* 73.F1=Athen. 4.155a), who provides the same information about the burials, and may be Diodorus's source. Cynna/Cynnane's burial place remains unknown.

Tomb III was unlooted, and contained a wonderful assortment of grave goods, including an array of fine silver vessels. The burial urn in the main chamber contained the remains of a teenage male. If the tomb complex at Vergina is a royal cemetery, these remains can be no other than those of Alexander IV, son of the conqueror and the Bactrian princess Roxane. Alexander, the last of the Argeadae, was murdered by Cassander in 311-10 B.C. The fourth tomb was nearly obliterated and defies identification with any particular individual(s), although, on the basis of the pottery evidence it may belong to the age of Antigonos Gonatas.<sup>47</sup>

In the more than two decades since the excavations of these tombs no new argument has been advanced to support Andronikos's original claim that the monumental Tomb II is the resting place of Philip II, while a number of propositions based on the re-evaluation of the evidence have pointed to the revision offered above. Moreover, no basic excavation report has appeared, so that one is as yet unable to judge the evidence provided by the stratigraphic relationship of tombs and the dates of the incidental pottery that normally accompany the construction of monuments in antiquity. One hopes that these *desiderata* will be corrected in the near future. As these words are being written there is a public debate going in Greece, in which scholars and others have used the press and television to present the revisionist view about the burials at Vergina.

---

<sup>47</sup> The tombs of Vergina are described in the most recent version of the guidebook to the site: Stella Drougou *et al*, *Vergina. The Great Tumulus* (2nd ed., Thessaloniki 1996), although the reader should exercise caution in accepting an "official" interpretation of matters still very much in the heat of scholarly debate. In the end, the most that the revisionists can accomplish is to move Philip II's burial from one tomb at Vergina to another.

Their arguments have been opposed by many of those still associated with the excavations at Vergina. Some who still favor Professor Andronikos's interpretation of the site apparently believe that any revision of his views would reflect ill on the excavator's accomplishments. But scholarship is not a fixed matter. Interpretations change in light of new evidence or as the result of a re-evaluation of existing evidence, and it would be unfortunate if the interpretation of the finds from Vergina were frozen in time from the moment of Andronikos's death in 1992. A deviation from his views does not diminish the importance of his achievement: we still have several wonderful tombs, a rich variety of grave goods, fine paintings, and an impetus for Macedonian studies and archaeology in northern Greece that has had a profound effect on advancing our knowledge about the ancient Macedonians.

Few archaeological discoveries in Greece in this century have commanded as much attention as the excavation of the royal tombs at Vergina, and there may be those whose interests are rooted in other regions and periods who have wondered at the publicity. There are, however, sound reasons why the Vergina finds have been so widely heralded. It is rare in the study of Greek and Roman antiquity to have discovered such historically important tombs—to have at hand the physical evidence of the burials of famous persons. Such a discovery provides an unusual opportunity to study the relationship between historical (that is, literary) evidence and physical (archaeologically derived) remains.<sup>48</sup> The co-existence of

---

<sup>48</sup> Not the least of the benefits to be derived from an archaeological/historical correspondence is the possibility of establishing a precise archaeological date—a rare occurrence. If, for example, the date of Tomb II at Vergina is 316 B.C. it follows that every object in that tomb dates from 316 or earlier, providing a



literary and physical evidence concerning the deaths and burials of the last of the Argeadae—except, of course, for Alexander—enables us to understand the advantages and pitfalls of archaeological evidence illuminating historical evidence, and vice-versa. This is not to suggest that any general methodological theory about the connections between the literary and physical evidence can arise from a single excavation, but rather that the lessons learned from this case can provide a guide for any such future fortuitous discoveries.

*Addendum:*

The first chapter of Richard A. Billows, *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism* (Leiden, New York and Köln, 1995) is a sensitive and effective summary of the rise of Macedonian imperialism through the reign of Philip II. In this excellent monograph Billows otherwise explores the scope of Macedonian imperialism influences in the era following Alexander the Great and their reciprocal effects on the Macedonian homeland itself.

---

precise reference for determining the chronology of materials from the later fourth century B.C.

## IV

---

### AFTERWORD

---

In 1980 I wrote: "...one may predict that an age of fulfillment in Macedonian studies is about to begin." That presumptuous prediction concluded a paper presented at the euphoric opening of "The Search for Alexander" exhibition at the National Gallery of Art in Washington.<sup>1</sup> It was an exciting time, as a magnificent collection of ancient Macedonian antiquities—many freshly excavated—commenced their two-year tour of North American and Australian museums. As one looks back to that moment across nearly two decades, it is clear that few of us associated with the discovery and interpretation of the objects recovered in those years could anticipate what direction Macedonian studies would take. Few of us could have predicted the intense and often hostile debate that would develop concerning the ethnicity of the ancient Macedonians, nor could we have anticipated the extraordinarily eclectic nature of the materials to be excavated from Macedonian burials. We have literally lost count of the cist and chamber tombs that have been discovered, and there have developed fundamental disagreements among scholars regarding the institutional

---

<sup>1</sup> The papers presented at that symposium were published as *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, Beryl Barr-Sharrar and Eugene N. Borza (eds.), *Studies in the History of Art* 10 (Washington 1982).

apparatus of the Macedonian monarchy. The use of the word "fulfillment" in 1980 was perhaps naive, yet the energy of discovery and controversy that have followed directly from that moment has engaged an increasing number of scholars as well as some segments of the public at large.

The literature of antiquity is rich with information about Macedonian kings and armies, but they have been historical actors playing their roles on a stage without scenery. Unlike, for example, the Minoans, for whom we have a splendid physical and archaeological setting but almost no information about the people, the Macedonians, more renowned in antiquity than any of their Bronze-Age antecedents, have until recently lacked a setting within which to describe their activities. What our Greek archaeological colleagues have accomplished in recent decades has changed all that. We have dozens of tombs (many unlooted), town sites, a burgeoning lot of grave goods, superb painting, and many important inscriptions. We are now able to construct the stage and furnish props for Macedonian life, at least on its upper levels. And there is every reason to believe that as long as peace prevails in the southern Balkans the excavation of those parts of the ancient Macedonian kingdom situated within the borders of the Greek state will continue apace, for both scholarly and political reasons. This successful program of excavation has enriched our understanding of the written sources, as the sources themselves have helped us to appreciate some features of the archaeological record. If our knowledge of ancient Macedonian life is still imperfect, it is only because the field is yet so new, and the simple passage of time should improve our comprehension.

I have attempted from time to time in this essay to warn of the danger of anachronism in discussing Macedonian

institutions. It is tempting for historians to regard monarchies as a form of government marked by static customs—a not unreasonable hypothesis. But, as we have seen, the Macedonians appear not to have been characterized by an unyielding conservatism in their material culture, and one wonders if they were free also from a fixed canon in their political and social institutions. Certainly Philip II and Alexander III were innovators in several aspects of their rule, which may account in part for their success in their respective endeavors. In the absence of evidence one should be prudent in reading the institutions of one period of Macedonian history back into earlier eras. The simple fact is that we know almost nothing about Macedonian internal institutions before the age of Philip II. Much of our information comes from the period of Alexander, but his rule may be an aberration. The king's relationship with his fellows may have been altered by the reality that they were an army on the march in an alien and often hostile world, far from the lands and retainers upon which his comrades normally derived their support. It was military government on the road, which may have been different from the way Macedonians lived at home, both during Alexander's reign and at other times as well. Moreover, one should be cautious about postulating a straight line development from the Argead into the Antigonid period. Hellenistic Macedon existed in a world different from the Argead era, in which the practice of Macedonian institutions was in part a response to the Macedonians' Greek and Balkan neighbors. It is difficult to know to what extent traditional institutions were altered, or what new institutions came into being as the result of the Antigonid response to the political pressures and cultures of Greek leagues, the Successor kingdoms great and small, and the advent of Rome. This is not to say that



the historian's instinctive practice to search for long-term patterns and order should be abandoned. It is only to remind ourselves how little yet we really know.

The future of Macedonian studies is problematic. Archaeological investigation is inherently slow and expensive in both excavation and publication. Greek scholars are pressed financially, overworked by heavy teaching obligations at their universities, frustrated by short excavation and study seasons, and burdened by the expense of publication. Excavators who have no university affiliations, but work for the Archaeological Service, have more opportunity to excavate and publish than do their academic counterparts, but they are sometimes subject to the vagaries of the national budget and to the competition among dozens of sites for limited financial resources. I myself was present one morning at Pella in 1985 when the director of the excavation there received a phone call from Athens announcing that her funds for continuing excavation had suddenly been axed. She excused herself from our conversation to dismiss the workmen and others who were not on continuing staff salaries.

The last quarter century has seen dramatic advances in our knowledge of the ancient Macedonians, a people known heretofore mainly through the exploits of their most famous kings. Archaeology and epigraphy have begun to flesh out the skeleton of literary evidence, and the result is the appearance of several proper narrative histories of these people, as well as continuing royal biographies now put in the context of a national history. It is difficult to know what direction Macedonian studies will take next, although it may come in the form of institutional history based on fresh information deriving from excavations and the discovery and interpretations of inscriptions. There are a handful of serious chronological problems in the study of

the fourth century before the reign of Alexander the Great, and one awaits creative new interpretations based upon existing literary sources, while hoping for additional epigraphical evidence. We anticipate that the continuing activities of our Greek colleagues will enrich the fund of evidence. And we await a more stable political environment in the southern Balkans that will enable scholars who live in nations across the modern Greek frontiers to join the effort to reconstruct the history of the ancient Macedonians.



# V

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Adams, W. Lindsay. "The Royal Macedonian Tomb at Vergina: An Historical Interpretation," *The Ancient World* 3 (1980) 67-72.
- and Eugene N. Borza (eds.). *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*. Lanham and New York, 1982.
- Andreou, Stelios, Michael Fotiadis, and Kostas Kotsakis. "Review of Aegean Prehistory V: The Neolithic and Bronze Age of Northern Greece," *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996) 537-97.
- Andronikos, Manolis. *Vergina II. The 'Tomb of Persephone'*. Library of the Archaeological Society at Athens, no. 142. Athens 1994.
- Archaeological Reports*, annual supplement of *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.
- Archaia Makedonia*. Vols. 1-5 (congresses of 1968-89). Thessaloniki, 1970-73.
- To Archaialogiko Ergo stê Makedonia kai Thrakê*. Vols. 1-10 (reports of 1987-96). Thessaloniki, 1988-97.
- Badian, E. "A Reply to Professor Hammond's Article," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 100 (1994) 388-90.
- . "Eduard Meyer's American Paralipomena." In W. M. Calder III and Alexander Demandt (eds.), *Eduard Meyer. Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers*. Mnemosyne, suppl. 112 (1990) 1-38.
- . "Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences." In Simon Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, pp. 107-30. Oxford, 1994.
- . "The Deification of Alexander the Great." In Harry J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, pp. 27-71. Thessaloniki, 1981.
- . "Thucydides and the *Archê* of Philip." In *From Plataea to Potidaea Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia*, pp. 171-85. Baltimore and London, 1993.



- Barr-Sharrar, Beryl and Eugene N. Borza (eds.). *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*. Studies in the History of Art 10. Washington, 1982.
- Barr-Sharrar, Beryl. "Eastern Influence on the Toreutic Art of Macedonia before the Conquest of Alexander the Great." *Archaeological News* 13 (1984) 1-12; revised version in *Archaia Makedonia* 2 (1986) 71-82.
- . "Macedonian Metal Vases in Perspective: Some Observations on Context and Tradition." In Beryl Barr-Sharrar and Eugene N. Borza (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*. Studies in the History of Art 10, pp. 122-39. Washington, 1982.
- Baynham, Elizabeth. "The Question of Macedonian Divine Honours for Philip II," *Mediterranean Archaeology* 7 (1994) 35-43.
- Berve, Helmut. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*. 2 vols. Munich, 1926. Reprinted Salem, New Hampshire, 1988.
- Billows, Richard A. *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*. Leiden, New York and Köln, 1995.
- Borza, Eugene N. *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon*. Princeton 1990; revised paperback edition, 1992.
- . "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House," *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*. Hesperia, suppl. 19 (1982) 7-13.
- . "Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander. The Source Traditions." In Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian*, pp. 122-39. Norman and London, 1996.
- . "Macedonia Redux." In Frances Titchener and Richard F. Moorton, Jr. (eds.), *The Eye Expanded. Life and the Arts in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, pp. 249-66. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1999.
- . "The Royal Macedonian Tombs and the Paraphernalia of Alexander the Great," *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 105-21.
- Bosworth, A. B. and E. J. Baynham (eds.). *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Oxford, 2000 [forthcoming].
- Bosworth, A. B. "Philip III Arrhidaeus and the Chronology of the Successors," *Chiron* 22 (1992) 55-81.
- Bouzek, Jan. *Greece, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural Interrelations During the Early Iron Age*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, no. 122. Jonsered, 1997.
- Buckler, John. *Philip II and the Sacred War*. Leiden, 1989.
- . "Philip II, the Greeks, and the King 346-36 B.C.," *Illinois Classical Studies* 19 (1994) 99-122.

- . "Philip II's Designs on Greece." In Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian*, pp. 77-97. Norman and London, 1996.
- Calbi, A., A. Donati and G. Poma (eds.). *L'epigraphia del villaggio*. Faenza, 1993.
- Calder, W. M. III and Alexander Demandt (eds.). *Eduard Meyer. Leben und Leistung eines Universalhistorikers*. Mnemosyne, suppl. 112 (1990) 1-38.
- Cambitoglou, A. and J. K. Papadopoulos. "The Earliest Mycenaean in Macedonia." In C. Zerner, P. Zerner, and J. Winder (eds.), *Wace and Blegen. Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age: 1939-1989*. Amsterdam, 1993.
- Carney, Elizabeth D. *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman and London, 2000 [forthcoming].
- . "Review Essay on Macedonian History," *Ancient History Bulletin* 5 (1991) 179-89.
- . "The Career of Adea Eurydice," *Historia* 36 (1987) 496-502.
- . "The Politics of Polygamy: Olympias, Alexander and the Murder of Philip," *Historia* 41 (1992) 169-89.
- . "Review Essay on Macedonian History," *Ancient History Bulletin* 5 (1991) 179-89.
- . "Tomb I at Vergina and the Meaning of the Great Tumulus as an Historical Monument," *Archaeological News* 17 (1992) 1-16.
- . "Women and *Basileia*: Legitimacy and Female Political Action in Macedonia," *Classical Journal* 90 (1995) 367-91.
- Casson, Stanley. *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria*. Oxford, 1926.
- Cawkwell, George. "The End of Greek Liberty." In Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian*, pp. 98-121. Norman and London, 1996.
- Cole, J.W. "Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles," *L'Antiquité Classique* 47 (1978) 37-49.
- Cunliffe, Richard J. *Homeric Proper and Place Names*. London and Glasgow, 1931.
- Danforth, Loring M. *The Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic Nationalism in a Transnational World*. Princeton 1995.
- Dell, Harry J. (ed.). *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki, 1981.
- Diaz-Andreu, Marguerita, and T. Champion. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London, 1996.

- Drougou, Stella *et al.* *Vergina. The Great Tumulus. Archaeological Guide*. 2nd edition. Thessaloniki, 1996.
- Dubois, Larent. "Une tablette de malédiction de Pella: s'agit-il du premier texte Macédonien?," *Revue des Études Grecques* 108 (1995) 190-97.
- Edson, Charles F. (ed.). *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. 10, *Epiri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae*. Pars 2, *Inscriptiones Macedoniae*, fasc. 1, *Inscriptiones Thessalonicae et viciniae*. Berlin, 1972.
- Ellis, J. R. *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*. London, 1976.
- . "Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great. A Study in Conspiracy," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91 (1971) 15-24.
- . "Macedon and north-west Greece," (chapter 14) and "Macedonian hegemony created," (chapter 15), *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> vol. VI, *The Fourth Century B. C.* (Cambridge 1994).
- Errington, R. M. *Geschichte Makedoniens*. Munich, 1986.
- . *A History of Macedonia*. Translated by Catherine Errington. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1990.
- . "Alexander the Philhellene and Persia." In Harry J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, pp. 139-43. Thessaloniki, 1981.
- . "Review-Discussion: Four Interpretations of Philip II," *American Journal of Ancient History* 6 (1981) 69-88.
- Faklaris, P. B. "Aegae: Determining the Site of the First Capital of the Macedonians," *American Journal of Archaeology* 98 (1994) 609-16.
- Feuer, Bryan. *The Northern Mycenaean Border in Thessaly*. BAR International Series, no. 176. Oxford 1983.
- Flower, Michael A. *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC*. Oxford, 1994; revised paperback edition, 1997.
- Fol, Alexander (ed.) *et al.* *The New Thracian Treasure from Rogozen, Bulgaria*. British Museum Publications. London, 1986.
- (ed.) *et al.* *The Rogozen Treasure*. Sofia, 1989.
- Fredericksmeyer, Ernst. "Divine Honors for Philip II," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979) 39-61.
- . "On the Background of the Ruler Cult" In Harry J. Dell (ed.), *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, pp. 145-56. Thessaloniki, 1981.
- Given, Michael. "Inventing the Eteocypriots: Imperialist Archaeology and the Manipulation of Ethnic Identity," *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 11 (1998) 3-29.
- Goukowsky, Paul. "Encore l'Inscription d'Oloveni [sic]," *Études d'Archeologie Classique* 9 (1997) 91-102.

- . "Les maisons princières de Macédoine de Perdiccas II à Philippe II," *Études d'Archeologie Classique* 7 (1991) 43-66.
- Greenwalt, William S. "The Production of Coinage from Archelaus to Perdiccas III and the Evolution of Argead Macedonia." In Ian Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*, pp. 105-34. Oxford, 1994.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Hamilakis, Yannis. "Through the looking glass: nationalism, archaeology and the politics of identity," *Antiquity* 70 (1996) 975-78.
- and Eleana Yalouri. "Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society," *Antiquity* 70 (1996) 117-29.
- Hammond, N.G.L. *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 1, *Historical Geography and Prehistory*. Oxford, 1972.
- . *Philip of Macedon*. London, 1994.
- . *The Macedonian State: Origins, Institutions, and History*. Oxford, 1989.
- . *The Miracle That Was Macedonia*. London, 1991.
- . "Philip's Innovations in Macedonian Economy," *Symbolae Osloenses* 70 (1995) 22-29.
- . "The location of Aegeae," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117 (1997) 177-79.
- . "The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI," *Classical Quarterly* 31 (1937) 79-91; 32 (1938) 137-51.
- . "The Various Guards of Philip II and Alexander III," *Historia* 40 (1991) 396-417.
- and G. T. Griffith. *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 2, 550-336 B.C. Oxford, 1979.
- and F. W. Walbank. *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. 3, 336-167 B.C. Oxford, 1988.
- Harding, Phillip. "Athenian Foreign Policy in the Fourth Century," *Klio* 77 (1995) 105-25.
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. *Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings*. 2 vols. Meletēmata, no. 22. Athens, 1996.
- . "Aigéai: la localisation de la première capitale Macédonienne," *Revue des Études Grecques* 109 (1996) 264-69.
- . "Épigraphie et villages en Grèce du Nord: *Ethnos*, *Polis* et *Kome* en Macédoine." In A. Calbi, A. Donati and G. Poma (eds.), *L'epigraphia del villaggio*, pp. 151-71. Faenza, 1993.
- . "La lettre royale d'Oleveni," *Chiron* 25 (1995) 163-85.



- . "L'état Macédonien antique: un nouveau visage, par M. Miltiade Hatzopoulos," *Comptes Rendus. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1997) 7-25.
- . "The Oleveni Inscription and the Dates of Philip II's Reign." In W. Lindsay Adams and Eugene N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*, pp. 21-42. Lanham, New York, and London, 1982.
- Heckel, Waldemar. *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*. London and New York, 1992.
- Heisserer, A. J. *Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence*. Norman, 1980.
- Heskel, Julia. *The Foreign Policy of Philip II Down to the Peace of Philocrates*. Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1987.
- . *The North Aegean Wars, 371-60 BC*. *Historia Einzelschriften*, no. 102. Stuttgart, 1997.
- . "Philip and Argaios. A Pretender's Story." In Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian*, pp. 37-56. Norman and London, 1996.
- Heurtley, W. A. *Prehistoric Macedonia. An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Greek Macedonia (West of the Struma) in the Neolithic, Bronze and Early Iron Ages*. Cambridge, 1939.
- Human Rights Watch. *Denying Ethnic Identity. The Macedonians of Greece*. New York, Washington, Los Angeles, and London, 1994.
- Karakasidou, Anastasia N. *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*. Chicago and London, 1997.
- Karamitrou-Mentesidi, G. *Aianê Kozanês/Aiani of Kozani*. Thessaloniki, 1989.
- . *Kozanê, Polê Elimiôtidos. Archaïologiko Odêgos/ Kozani, City of Elimiotis. Archaeological Guide*. Thessaloniki, 1993.
- . "Aianê 1983-1997." *To Archaïologiko Ergo stê Makedonia kai Thrakê* 10 (1996) 23-40.
- Keyser, Paul T. "The Use of Artillery by Philip II and Alexander the Great," *The Ancient World* 15.1 (1994) 27-49.
- Kohl, Philip and Clare Fawcett (eds.). *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge, 1995.
- Lehmann, Phyllis W. "The So-Called Tomb of Philip II: a Different Interpretation," *American Journal of Archaeology* 84 (1980) 527-31.
- . "The So-Called Tomb of Philip II: An Addendum," *American Journal of Archaeology* 86 (1982) 437-42.

- Le Rider, Georges. *Le monnayage d'argent et d'or de Philippe II frappé en Macédoine de 359 à 294*. Paris, 1977.
- . *Monnayage et finances de Philippe II. Un état de la question*. Meletēmata, no. 23. Athens, 1996.
- Lewis, D. M., John Boardman, Simon Hornblower, and Martin Ostwald (eds.). *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup>. Vol. VI, *The Fourth Century B. C.* Cambridge, 1994.
- Londey, Peter. "The Outbreak of the 4th Sacred War," *Chiron* 20 (1990) 239-60.
- Malkin, Irad. *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1998.
- March, Duane. "The Kings of Macedon: 399-369 B.C.," *Historia* 44 (1995) 257-82.
- Markle, M. M. "Diodorus' Sources for the Sacred War." In Ian Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*, pp. 43-69. Oxford, 1994.
- Megaw, J.V.S. and M. R. "Ancient Celts and modern ethnicity," *Antiquity* 70 (1996) 175-81.
- Meskell, Lynn (ed.). *Archaeology Under Fire. Nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London, 1998.
- Miller, Stella G. *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles: A Painted Macedonian Tomb*. Mainz, 1993.
- Mortensen, Kate. "The Career of Bardylis," *The Ancient World* 12.1 (1991) 49-59.
- Numismatic Literature*. (Semianual publication of the American Numismatic Society, surveying numismatic literature.)
- Palagia, Olga. "Hephaistion's Pyre and the Royal Hunt of Alexander." In A. B. Bosworth and E. J. Baynham (eds.) *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Oxford, 2000 [forthcoming].
- Panayotou, Anna. "Dialectical Inscriptions from Chalcidice, Macedonia and Amphipolis," *Epigraphes tēs Makedonias*. Third International Symposium on Macedonia. 8-12 December 1993, pp. 124-63. Thessaloniki, 1996.
- Pandermalis, Demetrios. *Dion. The Archaeological Site and the Museum*. Athens, 1997.
- Papazoglou, Fanoula. *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Suppl. 16. Athens and Paris, 1988.
- Pelling, C.B.R. *Plutarch. Life of Antony*. Cambridge, 1988.
- Rizakis, Athanasios and John Touratsoglou. *Epigraphes anō Makedonias*. Vol. 1, *Katalogos Epigraphôn*. Athens, 1985.

- Rotroff, Susan I. "Royal Saltcellars in the Athenian Agora," *American Journal of Archaeology* 86 (1982) 283 [abstract].
- . "Spool Salt Cellars from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 53 (1984) 343-54.
- Ruzicka, Stephen. "A Note on Philip's Persian War," *American Journal of Ancient History* 10 (1985 [1993]) 84-91.
- Ryder, T.T.B. "The diplomatic skills of Philip II." In Ian Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*, pp. 228-57. Oxford, 1994.
- Scaife, Ross. "Alexander I in the Histories of Herodotus," *Hermes* 117 (1989) 129-37.
- Sealey, R. *Demosthenes and his Time: A Study in Defeat*. Oxford, 1993.
- Talbert, Richard J.A. (ed). *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton, 2000 [forthcoming].
- Tataki, Argyro B. *Ancient Beroea. Prosopography and Society*. Meletēmata, no. 8. Athens, 1988.
- Tataki, Argyro B. *Macedonian Edessa. Prosopography and Onomasticon*. Meletēmata, no.18. Athens, 1994.
- . *Macedonians Abroad. A Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia*. Meletēmata, no. 26. Athens, 1998.
- Themelis, Petros G. and Yiannis P. Touratsoglou. *Oi Taphoi tou Derveniou*. Athens, 1997.
- Theodossiev, Nikola. "A New Thracian Inscription from Bulgaria," *Kadmos* 36 (1997) 144.
- Thomas, Carol G. *Myth Becomes History: Pre-Classical Greece*. Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians # 4. Claremont, Calif., 1993.
- Titchener, Frances and Richard F. Moorton, Jr. (eds.). *The Eye Expanded. Life and the Arts in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1999.
- Tod, M. N. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1946-48.
- Tracy, Stephen V. *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic Letter-Cutters of 340-290 B.C.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1995.
- . "De Antipatro et Archedico Lamptrensi. IG II<sup>2</sup> 402 + Agora I 4990," *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 249-51.
- Trevett, Jeremy. "Did Demosthenes Publish His Deliberative Speeches?" *Hermes* 124 (1996) 424-41.
- Tuplin, Christopher. "Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs* and the Character of the Demegoric Corpus," *Historia* 47 (1998) 276-320.

- Tzanavari, Katerina and Anastasios-Phoebus Christidis. "A Carian Graffito from the Lebet Table, Thessaloniki," *Kadmos* 34 (1995) 13-17.
- Vokotopoulou, Julia. "Archaic Cities and Sanctuaries in Chalkidike," *Annual of the British School at Athens* 91 (1996) 319-28.
- and Anastasios-Phoebus Christidis. "A Cypriot Graffito on an SOS Amphora from Mende, Chalcidice," *Kadmos* 34 (1995) 5-12.
- Wallace, Robert W. and Edward M. Harris (eds.). *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman history, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian.* Norman and London, 1996.
- Wardle, K. A. "Change or continuity: Assiros Toumba at the transition from Bronze Age to Iron Age," *To Archaialogiko Ergo stê Makedonia kai Thrakê* 10 (1996) 443-60.
- . "Mycenaean Trade and Influence in Northern Greece." In C. Zerner, P. Zerner, and J. Winder (eds.), *Wace and Blegen. Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age: 1939-1989.* Amsterdam, 1993.
- Wilkie, Nancy C. "The Grevena Project," *Archaia Makedonia* 5.3 (Thessaloniki 1993) 1747-53.
- Worthington, Ian (ed.). *Ventures into Greek History.* Oxford, 1994.
- . "Greek oratory, Revision of Speeches, and the Problem of Historical Reliability," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991) 55-74.
- Zerner, C., P. Zerner and J. Winder (eds.). *Wace and Blegen. Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age: 1939-1989.* Amsterdam, 1993.



---

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

---

Eugene N. Borza retired in 1995 as Professor Emeritus of Ancient History from the Pennsylvania State University. He has served as Solomon Katz Visiting Professor in the Humanities at the University of Washington, Mitchell Visiting Distinguished Professor of Classical Studies at Trinity University, Benedict Distinguished Visiting Professor of Classics at Carleton College, and Visiting Professor/Special Research Fellow at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, where he has long been active as a member of the School's Managing Committee. He has also lectured widely on ancient Macedonia, often as a national lecturer of the Archaeological Institute of America. He served as the historical consultant for "The Search for Alexander" exhibition of Macedonian antiquities which toured North America in 1980-82. From 1984 to 1990 he was President of the Association of Ancient Historians.

Among his publications are numerous articles about the history and archaeology of Macedonia, and the history and historiography of Alexander the Great. He is the author of *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, 1990; rev. ed. 1992) and editor of several volumes of papers dealing with ancient Macedonia. A selection of his essays were collected and published in 1995 by the Association of Ancient Historians as *Makedonika. Essays by Eugene N. Borza*, Carol G. Thomas (ed.).



