

CHAPTER 3

MACEDONIANS AND OTHER GREEKS

M. B. Hatzopoulos

A couple of years before the collapse of the Soviet system ignited nationalist passions in the dormant backwaters of South-Eastern Europe an English historian writing in German, observed that “the question of the actual nationality of the ancient Macedonians . . . is scientifically trivial and has acquired importance in modern times only because nationalists of all sorts in the Balkans and elsewhere have laid hold of it, and each according to the answer, has put it in the service of territorial or other claims.” Moreover, he continued, “All ancient accusations that the Macedonians were not Greeks originate from Athens, from the time of the conflict with Philip II . . . Only because of the political conflict with Macedonia was the question at all raised.” He also stressed that “today it must be considered as certain that the Macedonians and their kings actually spoke a Greek dialect and bore names of Greek type.”¹ Paradoxically, six years earlier his former thesis supervisor, a reputed scholar, hailing from a German-speaking country but writing in English, delivered at an international symposium staged by the National Gallery of Art at Washington a paper with practically the same title as the present chapter, challenging the Greek credentials of the ancient Macedonians.² His communication claimed to concentrate not on what the Macedonians actually were, but exclusively on the way in which they were perceived by their contemporaries, discarding as irrelevant the objective criteria on which national identities are usually evaluated (ancestry, language, religion, customs), only to reserve for the *finale* the argument that the most important objective criterion, to wit language, proved that the Macedonians were not Greeks. Indeed according to him “Greek was a difficult, indeed a foreign, tongue”

¹ R. M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens* (Munich, 1986), p. 13.

² E. Badian, “Greeks and Macedonians,” in Beryl Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 33–51.

to Macedonians, and a Greek, such as Eumenes, “could not directly communicate with Macedonian soldiers.”

How is it possible that such radically opposed opinions can be simultaneously aired by historians moving in the same scholarly circles and working on the same documents? Have the ensuing decades brought forth new evidence liable to decide the issue? Is it possible to keep clear of politics and polemics ancient and modern in order to reach a balanced conclusion? Such are some of the questions we shall address in the following pages.

To begin with we must admit that sometimes, perceptions can ignore “objective criteria” of national identity and that there are no such eternal essences as “Greeks” and “Macedonians.” Both terms cover in fact complex realities which never ceased to evolve, from the moment we begin to apprehend them down to our own days.³ Thus, even if we focus on the period between the Persian Wars, when Macedonia first comes to the fore, and the abolition of an even nominally independent Macedonian state in 148 BC, we realize that the concepts expressed by these terms did not remain stable. A further complication arises from the geographical discrepancy between these two ethnics and the corresponding toponyms: *Hellas*, variable in itself, is not necessarily co-terminal with the *Hellenes* and *Makedonia* is not necessarily co-terminal with the *Makedones*. Thus *Hellas* can mean in Demosthenes⁴ only continental Greece north of the Isthmus, or in Herodotus⁵ Greece from the Peloponnese to Epirus and Thessaly inclusively, or in Xenophon⁶ all lands inhabited by Greeks. As late as in the second century BC Philip V of Macedon could argue, “How do you define Greece? For most of the Aetolians themselves are not Greeks. No! The countries of the Agraiei, the Apodotae, and the Amphiloichians are not Greece,”⁷ in which he was consistent with Thucydides,⁸ who qualified the Aetolian tribe of the Eurytanes as “most unintelligible in tongue and eaters of raw flesh.” Conversely *Makedonia* could alternatively designate the Argead (and later the Antigonid) possessions irrespective of the origin

³ See in particular J. M. Hall, “Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity,” in I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass./London, 2001), pp. 159–186; id., *Hellenicity* (Chicago, 2002), pp. 154–156 and 165–166.

⁴ 19.303.

⁵ 8.44–47.

⁶ *Anab.* 6.5.23.

⁷ Polyb. 18.5.7–8.

⁸ 3.94.5.

of its inhabitants, or all the lands inhabited by the *Makedones*, irrespective of their being under the sway of the Argead kings or of other rulers.⁹

Although recent contributions have legitimately made us wary of the essentialist temptation, and have stressed the importance of discourse and perceptions, it would be nevertheless foolish to deny the existence of characteristics, such as language, cults, beliefs, and customs, which, though not immutable, evolve much slower than the perceptions related thereof and the discourse, both of which are amenable to a variety of exogenous influences.

Following the evolution of the fluctuating relations between realities, perceptions and discourse in the case of the Macedonians within the Greek world may prove a useful lead towards answering the questions that we need to address.

The Fifth Century BC

There is one illusion that ought to be first dispelled—that Mt Olympus and the Kambounian mountains constituted an impassable barrier between Thessaly and Macedonia. In fact recent archaeological discoveries have established that already in the second millennium BC the Mycenaean world extended well beyond Thessaly and included at least the southern part of Macedonia. Abundant Mycenaean pottery, both imported and locally produced, weapons, pins, brooches and syllabic script have been found in tombs of Orestis, Elimeia and Pieria.¹⁰

Bruno Helly¹¹ has recently argued that the kingdom of Philoctetes in the Homeric catalogue of ships extended in Pieria as far as the head of the Thermaic Gulf. The monumental pieces of all-round sculpture (*kouroi*, *korai*, funerary lions, *sphinges*, etc.),¹² the archaic ceramic heads from

⁹ Cf. Thuc. 2.99.2–6 and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 1 (MEΛETHMATA) 22 (Athens, 1996), pp. 204–209.

¹⁰ Georgia Karamitrou, *Boion-Notia Orestis* (Thessaloniki, 1999), 1, pp. 120–126; Effi Poulaki-Pandermali, “L’Olympe macédonien et ses premiers cimetières,” in Julia Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque* (Athens, 1993), pp. 122–127; B. Helly, “Le dialecte thessalien, un autre modèle de développement,” in I. Hajnal, ed., *Die altgriechischen Dialekte* (Innsbruck, 2007), p. 197.

¹¹ Helly, “Le dialecte thessalien,” pp. 198–200.

¹² Ch. Tsoungaris, “Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στο νεκροταφείο κλασσικών χρόνων του νέου ύδραγωγείου Πενταβρύσου Καστοριάς,” in *AErgMak* 18 (Thessaloniki, 2006), p. 687; Georgia Karamitrou-Mentesidi, “Aiane,” in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 29–32; ead., “Aianè, ville de Macédoine,” in Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque*, pp. 32–35.

Vergina,¹³ the massive production¹⁴ or import of metallic and ceramic¹⁵ drinking vessels,¹⁶ evident from the second quarter of the sixth century, discovered in inner Macedonia, from Aiane in Elimeia to Europos in the Axios valley,¹⁷ attest the vigorous exchanges between Macedonia and Greece south of the Olympus. It is not a coincidence that Apollo in the Homeric hymns haunts the pastures of Pieria¹⁸ or that the Hesiodic *Eoae*¹⁹ couples together the eponymous heroes of the Macedonians and the Magnetes as sons of Zeus and Thyia, the sister of Hellen, and locates them “around Pieria and Olympus.” Already by the end of the sixth century Macedonians from Pieria made offerings to Apollo at Delphi.²⁰ The archaeological and epigraphic finds are confirmed and illustrated in Herodotus’ narrative²¹ of the Persian advance in Thessaly, which makes abundantly clear that in the late Archaic period the local populations moved freely from Thessaly to Macedonia and vice versa, using, besides the Tempe valley, other passes, such as the one through Gonnoi, and, undoubtedly, also those of Petra and Volustana.

By the beginning of the classical period, the archaeological evidence leaves no doubt about the integration of Macedonia in the contemporary Hellenic world. The earliest signs are to be found in the maritime urban centres such as Pydna, where in male tombs strigils are found, with evidence of a new athletic habit, which tends to replace the deposition of weapons.²² It is true that many Macedonian men, preserving an archaic tradition, continued to be buried with their weapons, but this custom, which had been discontinued in the Peloponnese, south-eastern conti-

¹³ M. Andronikos, “Tombs at Vergina,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia* pp. 35–39.

¹⁴ Julia Vokotopoulou, “Αργυρά και χάλκινα έργα τέχνης,” in *Ελληνική τέχνη* (Athens, 1997), p. 29; Eudokia Skarlatidou, “Αρχαϊκή χάλκινη ύδρια από το νεκροταφείο της Θέρμης (Σέδες) Θεσσαλονίκης,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 499–509.

¹⁵ Anastasia and P. Chrysostomou, “Τάφοι πολεμιστών των αρχαϊκών χρόνων από τη δυτική νεκρόπολη του Αρχοντικού Πέλλας,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 113–132.

¹⁶ Beryl Barr-Sharrar, “Metalwork in Macedonia before and during the Reign of Philip II,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 485–498.

¹⁷ The best photograph of the monument before its mutilation is to be found in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981), p. 27.

¹⁸ *Hymn to Apollo* 216; *Hymn to Hermes* 191.

¹⁹ Fr 7, in R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Hesiodi fragmenta selecta* (Oxford, 1970).

²⁰ G. Rougemont, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes*, 1 (Paris, 1977), no. 1; cf. Pausanias 10.13.5.

²¹ 7.73.

²² M. Besios, “Νεκροταφεία του 5^{ου} αϊ. π.Χ. στη Β. Πιερία,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), p. 647.

mental Greece, and the islands, had been maintained in Thessaly and in Epirus.²³ The ever increasing number of fifth-century figured funerary stelae from Orestis,²⁴ Dion,²⁵ Pydna,²⁶ and Aigai,²⁷ all indigenous Macedonian cities,²⁸ but also from more cosmopolitan Pella,²⁹ are works of sculpture which, though they show an unmistakable connection with Thessaly,³⁰ might have been found anywhere in the Greek world. This is equally true of the inscribed tombstones from the same localities. The fifth century funerary inscriptions from Upper Macedonia and from “the cradle of the Macedonian kingdom” commemorate men and women bearing exclusively Greek names such as Kleiona, Attya (Aiane),³¹ Leon, Mariskos, Theoteles, Pannaios, Sosias (Pydna),³² Xanthos, and Amadika (Pella).³³

If we now turn to what the fifth-century authors have to say about the Macedonians, we note that their statements correspond to the picture emerging from the archaeological and epigraphic evidence. Herodotus presents Alexander I claiming both a Macedonian and a Greek identity as perfectly compatible. He states that he is of Greek ancestry and could not suffer to see Greece enslaved instead of free, and concludes declaring

²³ A. and P. Chrysostomou, “Τάφοι,” p. 118, with references.

²⁴ Ch. Tsoungaris, “Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στον νομό Καστοριάς κατά τὸ 1999,” in *AErgMak* 13 (Thessaloniki, 2001), p. 618 and p. 622, fig. 12.

²⁵ Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, p. 26, fig. 11 (see above, note 17).

²⁶ M. Besios and Maria Pappa, *Πύδνα* (Thessaloniki, 1995), pp. 43, 45 and 73.

²⁷ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Τὰ ἐπιτάφια μνημεία ἀπὸ τῆ μεγάλης Τούμπα τῆς Βεργίνας* (Thessaloniki, 1984), pp. 19–27, no. 1.

²⁸ For the Macedonian character of Pydna, see Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, p. 106, note 3, and M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Cités en Macédoine,” in M. Reddé et al., eds., *La naissance de la ville dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 2003) pp. 130 and 139, n. 45; cf. M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Bulletin Epigraphique* 2005, no. 315.

²⁹ Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, p. 115, fig. 65; I. M. Akamatis, “Ξάνθος Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀμαδίνας υἱός,” in *ΑΜΗΤΟΣ:Τιμητικός τόμος γιὰ τὸν καθηγητὴ Μανόλη Ἀνδρόνικο* (Thessaloniki, 1987), pp. 13–29; Maria Lilimbaki-Akamati, “Recent Discoveries at Pella,” in Maria Stamatopoulou and Marina Yeroulanou, eds., *Excavating Classical Culture* (Oxford, 2002) p. 88 and pl. 20B.

³⁰ Myrina Kalaitzi, *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth–First Century B.C.*, 1, (Oxford, forthcoming), pp. 216 and 218.

³¹ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Bulletin Epigraphique* (1994), no 385.

³² Vasiliki Misailidou-Despotidou, *Έπιγραφές ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki, 1997), pp. 66–68, nos. 56, 57, 62; I. Xydopoulos, “Νέες έπιγραφές ἀπὸ τὴν Πύδνα τῆς Πιερίας,” *Hellenika* 50 (2000), 35–43; cf. M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Bulletin Epigraphique* (2001), no. 277. The name Pan(n)aios is attested in Athens in the fourth century BC and the personal name Mariskos, from *mariskos*, the Greek name of the *gladium mariscus*, became popular among gladiators and is twice attested in Beroia in the Roman period.

³³ See above, note 26.

"I am Alexander the Macedonian."³⁴ Previously³⁵ he had seen no contradiction in proclaiming simultaneously his Greek and Macedonian connection: "a Greek, second in command over the Macedonians."³⁶ This is possible because Herodotus believed, rightly or wrongly, both in the Heraclid ancestry of the ruling house of Macedonia (in my opinion wrongly) and in the Dorian origin of the Macedonians (rightly, if we understand thereby that the founders and the elite of the Macedonian kingdom spoke a north-western dialect, for which, see below). He relates in some detail how the first was established by Alexander I on the occasion of his participation in the Olympic games: "I so happen to know for sure myself and I shall prove in my subsequent writings that [the descendants of Perdikkas] are Greek."³⁷ Herodotus, true to his word, provided the relative details three books later.³⁸ Similarly, the historian from Halicarnassus finds no difficulty in suggesting, albeit indirectly, that in fact the Macedonians were more Greek than the Athenians,³⁹ because they belonged to the Dorian kin. Before descending into the Peloponnese these Dorians had roamed from Phthia to the region around Mt Olympus and Mt Ossa, and thence to the Pindus, whereas the Athenians were of Pelasgian ancestry. Thus, in Herodotus' view, the relation of the Macedonians to their Argead rulers was similar to that of the Lacedaemonians to their Agiad and Eurypontid kings,⁴⁰ and in no way implied that the former were not Greek. In both cases a branch of the Dorian kin was ruled by Heraclid, that is to say putatively "Achaean," sovereigns.

Thucydides concurred with Herodotus. For him, too, "Alexander, the father of Perdikkas and his ancestors [were] originally Temenids from Argos."⁴¹ Judging from his writings, nothing in his extended experience in northern Greece seems to have contradicted this belief. On the contrary, in his description of Sitalces' invasion in Macedonia he contrasts the Thracian hordes, carrying knives and swarming the country in view of plunder, to the Macedonian cavalry, equipped with corselets in the Greek manner, and fighting bravely until they were engulfed by the Thracian multitudes.⁴²

³⁴ 9.45.2-3.

³⁵ 5.20.4.

³⁶ Hdt. 5.20.4.

³⁷ Hdt. 5.22.1-4.

³⁸ 8.137-39.

³⁹ Hdt. 1.56-58.

⁴⁰ Cf. Hdt. 5.72.3.

⁴¹ Thuc. 2.99.3.

⁴² Thuc. 2.98.3-4 and 105.

One could hardly find a more emblematic opposition between Greek and barbarian.

Thucydides' description of the allied Macedonian and Spartan forces that invaded Lynceus in 424 tells the same story. The Athenian historian contrasts the Macedonian and Chalcidian cavalry and the hoplite infantry of Perdiccas and Brasidas recruited from the Peloponnese, the Chalcidian League, Acanthus and the "Greeks" dwelling in Macedonia,⁴³ to the throngs of their barbarian allies.⁴⁴ The same distinction between the Macedonians and "the throng of the barbarians" is repeated in the beginning of the next chapter.⁴⁵

It has been argued that Thucydides is merely following Herodotus, who in his turn had swallowed Alexander I's propaganda.⁴⁶ However, it is very doubtful that the Athenian historian, who had a first hand experience of northern Greece, would let himself be "indoctrinated," least of all by Herodotus. Moreover, the fact that the essential Greekness of the Macedonians is also upheld by yet another fifth-century historian shows that such a view was not limited to a literary coterie, but was the *communis opinio* in that period. In effect, Hellanicus⁴⁷ makes of Macedon, the eponymous hero of the Macedonians, a son of Aiolus and thus grand-son of Hellen, the eponymous hero of all Greeks. N. G. L. Hammond⁴⁸ has convincingly argued that the reason for this "Aiolic" paternity of Macedon is that Hellanicus, who spoke himself the Aiolic dialect of Lesbos, recognized its common traits with the Macedonian dialect (for which, see below).

Legendary lists of kings, genealogies and myths were not literary distractions but reflected or influenced political practice. Alexander I was able to overcome the objections of his rivals who strove to exclude him from the Olympic contests by invoking an Argive genealogy. By the second half of the fifth century the Argive connection had been well established not only in literary works such as Thucydides' *Histories*, but also in the practice of Greek city-states and local or Panhellenic sanctuaries. Thus

⁴³ These were probably provided by the "allied" or rather subject cities of the Argead kings (cf. *IG* I³ 89, l. 40; Xen., *Hell.* 5.2.13).

⁴⁴ Thuc. 4.124.1.

⁴⁵ Thuc. 4.125.1.

⁴⁶ Cf. E. N. Borza, "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House," in Carol G. Thomas, ed., *Makedonika* (Claremont, 1995), pp. 113–123, originally published in *Hesperia Supplement* 19 (1982), 7–13; id., *In the Shadow of Olympus* (Princeton, 1990), pp. 98–113.

⁴⁷ F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, no. 4, F 74.

⁴⁸ N. G. L. Hammond, in N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, 2 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 47–48.

Alexander I was deemed worthy to be honoured with the title of *proxenos* and *eueregetes* by the Athenians⁴⁹ and could erect a golden statue at Delphi (and perhaps also in Olympia) from the rich booty won from the Persians,⁵⁰ while Perdiccas II most likely participated in the contests of the Argive Heraion and won an inscribed bronze tripod, which was unexpectedly discovered among the funerary deposits of Tomb II at Aegae/Vergina.⁵¹ The tradition was pursued and extended by later Macedonian kings, as we shall see below. But the kings were not the only Macedonians active in the Panhellenic sanctuaries. Contrary to the opinion generally held, this was not a royal privilege explained by their alleged Heraclid ancestry, but, as we have already seen, the continuation of a practice by Macedonian commoners which is epigraphically attested in Delphi from the end of the sixth century.⁵²

With the reign of king Archelaus (413–399) the insertion of Macedon into the Greek *oikoumene* sees a notable acceleration and expansion. Thucydides⁵³ credits him with the building of roads and fortifications and with the distribution of weapons, perhaps especially to hoplite infantry, the lack of which had so severely handicapped his father Perdiccas II. The newly built walls and the emergence of a “middle class,” which was a prerequisite for the formation of a hoplite infantry,⁵⁴ gave the urban centres of the kingdom a new sense of identity and corporate loyalty, to the point that they might seek to secure their independence, as Pydna effectively did.⁵⁵ Indeed in the wake of Archelaus’ reign we first encounter Macedonians identified by their city ethnic (Alorites, Pydnaïos).⁵⁶

Writers and artists had for nearly a century been frequent visitors of the Macedonian court. Pindar had composed probably there⁵⁷ an *enkomion*⁵⁸ for king Alexander I. Perdiccas II entertained in his capital the dithyrambic poet Melanippides and the father of scientific medicine Hippocrates of Cos. But it is under Archelaus that a qualitative leap took place and

⁴⁹ Hdt. 8.136.1 and 143.3.

⁵⁰ Hdt. 8.121.2; [Dem.] 12.21; Solinus 9.13.

⁵¹ M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs* (Athens, 1993), pp. 164–166.

⁵² See above, note 18.

⁵³ 2.100.2.

⁵⁴ W. S. Greenwalt, “The Development of a Middle Class in Macedonia,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 87–96.

⁵⁵ Diod. 13.49.1.

⁵⁶ Hatzopoulos, “Cités,” pp. 130–131 and 139, note 50. (see above, note 28).

⁵⁷ Solinus 9.14.

⁵⁸ C. M. Bowra, *Pindari carmina* (Oxford, 1935), fr. 106.

Macedonia became an active centre of Hellenic culture.⁵⁹ The famous painter Zeuxis decorated his palace;⁶⁰ the celebrated architect Callimachus probably worked and died at Aegae too;⁶¹ both the prominent epic poet Choerilus and the great poet and musician Timotheus chose to live at the court of Archelaus and to die in Macedonia (the latter decades later). Agathon, one of the most significant Attic tragic poets, left Athens in ca. 408 and moved to Macedonia, where he produced several tragedies, of which only fragments survive. But the most famous and the most honoured of Archelaus' guests was Euripides, who spent his final years at the king's court writing his masterpieces *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, *Bacchae* and the lost play *Archelaos*, the homonymous hero of which he made, instead of Perdicas, the founder of the dynasty, obviously in honour of his host. These latter two plays were perhaps performed also at the athletic and musical festival that Archelaus founded at Dion in honour of Zeus Olympius and the Pierian Muses.⁶²

Archelaus was a panhellenic celebrity. Honoured in Athens as *proxenos* and *euergetes*,⁶³ but slandered by Plato⁶⁴ and allegedly despised by Socrates,⁶⁵ crowned for his victories in chariot races at Olympia and Delphi,⁶⁶ he was justly celebrated by Thucydides⁶⁷ as the king who had accomplished more for Macedonia than his eight predecessors taken together. Yet the man who, according to a tradition,⁶⁸ was such a lover of literature that he allegedly appointed Euripides as his chief adviser and mourned his death by shaving his hair,⁶⁹ is the first Macedonian to be called a barbarian by one of his contemporaries. Indeed the sophist

⁵⁹ N. G. L. Hammond, "Intellectual Life," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia* (Athens, 1983), p. 88.

⁶⁰ Ailianos, *VH* 14.17.

⁶¹ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, "Ναῶν Εὐστῆλων, a Fragmentary Inscription of the Classical Period from Vergina," in *Inscriptions of Macedonia* (Thessaloniki, 1996), pp. 100–122.

⁶² Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, p. 149. S. Scullion, "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the *Frogs*," *CQ* 53 (2003), 389–398, has recently denied the historicity of Euripides' presence at the court of Archelaus. Whatever one may think of the various imaginative legends attached to that presence, I still believe that Aristotle, *Politics* 1311b30–34, is a more trustworthy witness than the silence of the *Frogs*.

⁶³ *IG* I³ 117.

⁶⁴ *Gorgias*, 471.

⁶⁵ Aelian, *VH* 8.9; 12.43.

⁶⁶ Solinus 9.16.

⁶⁷ 2.100.2.

⁶⁸ Solinus 9.16.

⁶⁹ Solinus 9.16.

Thrasymachus of Chalcedon in one of his speeches in defence of the Larissaeans, of which only one sentence survives, exclaims "Shall we be slaves to Archelaus, we, being Greeks, to a barbarian?"⁷⁰ How is this paradox to be explained?

To begin with, the formula is an adaptation of a verse from Euripides' tragedy *Telephos*, which was destined to become a stock expression, as we see later in Pseudo-Callisthenes,⁷¹ where Alexander exhorts the Macedonians to take up arms "in order that we campaign against the barbarians and deliver ourselves from Persian bondage, so that we, being Greeks, be not slaves to barbarians!" Given its clearly conventional character, it can hardly be taken literally as ethnological or linguistic evidence.⁷² It is particularly telling that Thrasymachus' sally belongs to a speech in favour of Thessalians, about whom Stratonicus according to Hegesandros⁷³ was to wonder whether they are "more or less barbarian than the Boeotians."

In fact, the explanation of the paradox is probably to be sought in the position achieved by Macedon in the reign of Archelaus. After the loss of Amphipolis and the Sicilian disaster, Athens was no more in a position to threaten Macedonia, the Chalcidian League was quiescent and Thessaly was divided between opposing cities and factions.⁷⁴ Archelaus could make the most of his neutrality in the Peloponnesian war, recover the easternmost provinces of his kingdom, deal effectively with the Upper Macedonian "kings" and, finally, responding to the appeal of the Larissaean Aleuadae, to intervene in Thessaly against the tyrants of Pherae.⁷⁵ It was the very successes of the Macedonian king that made him the target of abuse by the defeated partisans of the tyrants. "Barbarian" was an insult as good as any other for a king on the northern marches of the Greek *oikoumene*.

The Fourth Century BC

E. Badian asserted that Greek culture in Macedonia regressed during the first half of the fourth century.⁷⁶ Archaeology, but also the literary sources,

⁷⁰ F 2 (Diels), E. Badian's translation.

⁷¹ 1.25.

⁷² See. E. Kapetanopoulos, "Xennias μακεδονίζων τῆι φωνῆι," *Ephemeris* 60 (1993), pp. 23–24.

⁷³ In Athenaios 8.850a.

⁷⁴ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 137–138.

⁷⁵ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 139–141.

⁷⁶ Badian, "Greeks", p. 37 (see above, note 2).

tell a different story. Finds from all over Macedonia (of which the cemetery of Phoinikas, near Thessaloniki, provides a well-dated specimen)⁷⁷ show the diffusion of panhellenic social habits (*e.g.* the *symposion* as an element of both private and public festivities, athletic training and formal education),⁷⁸ the multiplication of top-quality monumental sculpture from the sanctuary of Eucleia at Aegae/Vergina,⁷⁹ the ever-increasing number of figured tombstones (from Pydna, Aegae, Beroia and Pella, such as those of Callicrates,⁸⁰ Antigonos⁸¹ or Amyntas)⁸² created locally and most probably by Macedonian artists, and a plethora of inscribed funerary stelae bearing scores of names, of which only one is foreign (Thracian),⁸³ and several original epigrams in impeccable Greek metres.⁸⁴ A certain preference for martial self-representation is the only possible indicator of their Macedonian origin, as opposed to corresponding monuments found in the south-Greek colonies of the north Aegean shores. None of these developments implies a regression of Greek culture.

It so happens that from this first half of the fourth century dates the most extensive document in the local Macedonian dialect. Its importance is such that it requires a more detailed discussion. It is a curse tablet written by or on behalf of an abandoned woman and aiming at impeding the marriage of Dionysophon, her faithless lover, with another woman named Thetima. The dialect, as it might have been expected given the geographical position and the history of Macedonia, is basically north-western Greek—especially in morphology—with ‘Thessalian’ phonetic traits in the pronunciation of some vowels (neutralisation of the opposition between /e/

⁷⁷ Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, “Από ένα νεκροταφείο προγενέστερο τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης,” *Ancient Macedonia* 7 (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 675–696.

⁷⁸ Cf. the stelae of the two Antigonoi from Vergina: Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, pp. 44–54 and 108–111, nos. 3 and 9 (see above, note 27), and the inscribed bronze *stlengis* (strigil) from the necropolis of Aiane: Georgía Karamitrou-Mentesidi, *Aiani* (Athens, 1996), p. 42, no. 26.

⁷⁹ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, “Βεργίνα 1990. “Ανασκαφή στὸ ἱερὸ τῆς Εὐκλείας,” in *AErgMak* 4 (Thessaloniki, 1993), pp. 21–34.

⁸⁰ Besios-Pappa, *Πύδνα*, p. 73.

⁸¹ Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, pp. 45–54, no. 3.

⁸² Loukretia Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Ἐπιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας. Τεύχος Α' Ἐπιγραφές Βεροίας* (Athens, 1988), no. 498.

⁸³ Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, pp. 165–169, no. 22 (Amadokos). For the importance of personal names in recapturing the demographic and cultural history of Macedonia, see Argyro B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society* (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ) 8 (Athens 1988) pp. 407–513; M. B. Hatzopoulos, “L’histoire par les noms’ in Macedonia,” in S. Hornblower and Elaine Matthews, eds., *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 99–117.

⁸⁴ Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, p. 53, no. 3; p. 79, no. 6, ead., “Fragmentary Inscription,” 100–122, *SEG* 24 (1969) 541; *SEG* 27 (1977) 298 and 1291.

and /i/ and between /o/ and /u/), and with the typically Macedonian substitution of voiced instead of unvoiced stops.⁸⁵ Thus, this document amply confirms the testimonies of Strabo⁸⁶ and Plutarch⁸⁷ on the affinity between the dialects spoken in Macedonia and in Epirus and also the existence of a distinctive Macedonian 'accent'.⁸⁸ What this text, and two or three other shorter texts, clearly belie is E. Badian's and A. B. Bosworth's assertions that Macedonian was a "difficult," "foreign," "separate," "alien," and incomprehensible tongue to "Greeks."⁸⁹ A speaker of Attic Greek would not have any greater difficulty in understanding a speaker of that dialect than, for instance, a Lacedaemonian or an Elaeian.

The literary texts tell the same story. Queen Eurydice, Amyntas III's wife, dedicated a monument to the Muses explaining in a metrical epigram how she had taught herself reading and writing,⁹⁰ and her son, Perdiccas III, invited Plato's pupil Euphraeus of Oreos in Macedonia, who gained a decisive influence on the life of the royal court, to the point that conversations at meals were allegedly restricted to geometry and philosophy.⁹¹ In spite of G. T. Griffith's⁹² disbelief, Platonic influence at the Macedonian court did not necessarily disappear with the accession of Philip, as the eminently Platonic constitution that this king gave to the city of Philippi, his model foundation, can be argued to imply.⁹³ At the same time the ambitious policy of Alexander II in Thessaly was matched by the growth of the army, and especially the infantry, as can be inferred from the very extent of Macedonian losses in Perdiccas III's war against the Illyrians. They show the continuing development of a 'middle class' in the cities of Macedonia.⁹⁴

⁸⁵ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *La Macédoine: géographie historique, langue, cultes et croyances, institutions* (Paris, 2006), pp. 47–48.

⁸⁶ 7.7.8.

⁸⁷ *Pyrrhos* 11.4; cf. 2.5–6.

⁸⁸ Pausanias 4.29.3.

⁸⁹ Badian, "Greeks" 41; A. B. Bosworth, "Eumenes, Neoptolemus, and *PSI* XII 1284," *GRBS* 19 (1978), p. 236.

⁹⁰ For a recent discussion of that epigram, see Sylvie Le Bohec-Bouhet, "Réflexions sur la place de la femme dans la Macédoine antique," in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos, and Yvette Morizot, eds., *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine*, (MEΛETHMATA) 45 (Athens, 2006), p. 191.

⁹¹ Athenaeus, 11.508e.

⁹² Griffith in Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, p. 206, followed by Badian, "Greeks," pp. 37–38.

⁹³ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, pp. 158–160 (see above, note 9).

⁹⁴ Greenwalt, "Middle Class," pp. 92–94 (see above, note 54).

What is even more important than stories about Macedonian kings in literary works, as far as perceptions are concerned, is the actual practice of Greek states towards Macedonians. Fortunately, in this field we possess two very significant pieces of evidence. The first is a passage of Aeschines,⁹⁵ from which we learn that Amyntas III had participated via a delegate in the Panhellenic congress held in Sparta in 371. E. Badian's desperate efforts⁹⁶ to minimize its significance as evidence of the acceptance of the Greek character of the Macedonian state are ineffective, for it is confirmed by the second piece of evidence, which shows that the Macedonian state was treated by Panhellenic sanctuaries as any other Greek state. The 360 BC catalogue of the *thearodokoi*, that is to say the official hosts of the sacred envoys, of Asclepius from Epidaurus includes an entry "Macedonia: Perdicas," which is the exact correspondent of "Molossoi: Tharyps."⁹⁷ In both cases the duties of *thearodokos* are assumed by the head of the state, who customarily extended his hospitality and protection to foreign envoys. In a similar manner, a few decades later, Cleopatra, acting as regent for her absent husband Alexander of Molossia, was the *theorodokos* of the sacred envoys from Argos.⁹⁸ In any of these instances it would be vain to pretend—a misconception that as yet, has not altogether disappeared—that this evidence concerns only the person of the head of the state and not the whole community. The mission of the *theoroi* was precisely to announce the holy truce and to invite to the relevant festival delegations from the population at large of the state to which they were despatched.

A similar misunderstanding has obfuscated the significance of the transfer of the two Phocian votes in the Amphictyonic Council in 346. At the conclusion of the Third Sacred War these votes were given, according to Diodorus,⁹⁹ to Philip II and his descendants, but according to Pausanias,¹⁰⁰ and to Demosthenes,¹⁰¹ to the Macedonians. As François Lefèvre has recently shown,¹⁰² there is no contradiction between these testimonies, because Philip and the subsequent kings of Macedon are mentioned

⁹⁵ 2.32. The importance of this event has been recently vindicated by M. Zahrt, "Amyntas III. und die griechischen Mächte," *Ancient Macedonia* 7 (Thessaloniki, 2007), p. 245.

⁹⁶ Badian, "Greeks," p. 47, n. 33.

⁹⁷ *IG V* 1, 94.

⁹⁸ P. Charneux, "Liste argienne de théarodoques," *BCH* 90 (1966), p. 157, col. I, L. 11.

⁹⁹ 16.60.1.

¹⁰⁰ 10.3.3 and 10.8.2.

¹⁰¹ 19.327.

¹⁰² F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions* (Athens/Paris, 1998), pp. 94–101.

specifically in their capacity as heads of state and official representatives of the Macedonian *ethnos*, which is congruent with the very principle of the exclusively “ethnic” composition of the Amphictyony.

With the accession of Philip II in 360 we reach a new watershed for both the effective integration of Macedonia in the Hellenic community and of the opposition with which such integration was met, at least from some prominent Greek quarters.

The meteoric growth of Macedonia's power and wealth under Philip II, Alexander III, and their immediate successors was known from literary sources,¹⁰³ but it is only very recently that we have begun to visualize it thanks to the abundant new archaeological evidence. It is enough to mention the palaces of Pella and Vergina,¹⁰⁴ “Macedonian” tombs of “Eurydice”¹⁰⁵ and tombs I and II of the Great Tumulus of Vergina,¹⁰⁶ but also dozens of other early vaulted and cist tombs, decorated or not, from all over Macedonia, from Eordaea to Amphipolis, and beyond. The paintings of some of them, such as the Rape of Persephone,¹⁰⁷ the Hunt¹⁰⁸ (Aegae/Vergina) or the twin guards¹⁰⁹ (Heracleia/Agios Athanasios) outclass anything that we have previously known from Greece in antiquity.¹¹⁰ The mosaic floors from Pella and Aegae remain unsurpassed anywhere in the fourth century.¹¹¹ From the historical point of view, the scores of sculptured or painted stelae are no less significant,¹¹² because they show that the appreciation of fine arts was not restricted to a courtly elite but was diffused to a much wider section of the population. In some fields, such as metalwork

¹⁰³ Cf. the *prooimion* of the 16th book of Diodorus 1.1–6.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. R. Ginouvès, “The Palaces,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonia*, pp. 84–90.

¹⁰⁵ Angeliki Kottaridou, “Couleur et sens : l'emploi de la couleur dans la tombe de la reine Eurydice,” in Guimier-Sorbets, Hatzopoulos, Morizot, *Rois, cités, nécropoles*, pp. 155–166.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Andronikos, *Vergina* pp. 86–197 (see above, note 51).

¹⁰⁷ M. Andronikos, *Βεργίνα II. 'Ο τάφος τῆς Περσεφόνης'* (Athens, 1994).

¹⁰⁸ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα. 'Ο τάφος τοῦ Φιλίππου. Ἡ τοιχογραφία μετὰ τὸ κνήγι* (Athens, 2004).

¹⁰⁹ Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, *Μακεδονικοὶ τάφοι στὸν Φοῖνικα καὶ στὸν Ἅγιο Ἀθανάσιο Θεσσαλονίκης* (Athens, 2005).

¹¹⁰ See now the admirable work of Hariclia Brecoulaki, *La peinture funéraire de Macédoine: Emplois et fonctions de la couleur, IV^e–II^e s. av. J.C.*, (MEΛETHMATA) 48 (Athens, 2006) and the collective volume Sophie Descamps-Lequime, ed., *Peinture et couleur dans le monde grec antique* (Paris – Milan, 2007), with contributions on Macedonia by Katerina Rhimiopoulou, Angeliki Kottaridi, Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, Agnès Rouvret, Hariclia Brecoulaki, Penelope Malama, and Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets.

¹¹¹ Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, “Mosaic,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonia*; pp. 117–136.

¹¹² See Myrina Kalaitzi, *Figured Tombstones* (forthcoming).

and miniature sculpture, readily admired by any visitor of the Museum of Vergina or Thessaloniki, Macedonia appears not only to have assimilated the artistic lessons of the greater city-states, but to have become herself a leading centre of Greek art.¹¹³

The picture of Macedonia in the second half of the fourth century would be incomplete without even a passing mention of its intellectual life. Philip himself, in spite of what Demosthenes claims,¹¹⁴ was a man with a taste for literature and philosophy,¹¹⁵ Alexander the Great was an amateur of painting and sculpture, a passionate reader of epic and tragic poetry, and had an insatiable and encyclopaedic curiosity in the human physical sciences.¹¹⁶ Cassander was an appreciated patron both of philosophers and of artists.¹¹⁷ It would be tedious to enumerate all the intellectuals and artists active in Macedonia during these years. It should be enough to mention some celebrities, such as the philosophers Speusippus, Aristotle and Theophrastus, the historians Theopompus and Callisthenes, the painters Nicomachus and Philoxenos, the sculptor Lysippus, and a host of lesser poets, actors and all sorts of scholars and artists, such as the ones who followed Alexander's expedition to the East. What is even more interesting is that the Macedonians are no longer only "consumers" but also producers of Greek culture. Antipater wrote a history of the Illyrian wars of Perdiccas III.¹¹⁸ Marsyas of Pella, half-brother of Antigonus Monophthalmus, composed a history of his country,¹¹⁹ and half a dozen of Alexander's companions from Upper Macedonia, the "Old Kingdom," and Philip's enlarged

¹¹³ See the seminal article by Beryl Bar-Sharrar, "Macedonian Metal Vases in Perspective: Some Observations on Context and Tradition," in Beryl Bar-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 123–139; ead., "Metalwork in Macedonia before and during the Reign of Philip II," in *Ancient Macedonia* 7 (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 485–498. See also in D. Pandermalis, ed., *Alexander the Great* (Athens, 2004) the lavishly illustrated contributions of Angeliki Kottaridi, "The Symposium," pp. 65–87 and Eleni Trakosopoulou, "Jewelry in Macedonia," pp. 115–137.

¹¹⁴ Demosthenes, 19.308, Aeschines called him "most Greek among men."

¹¹⁵ For artistic and intellectual life at Philip's court, see J. R. Ellis, "Macedonia under Philip," in Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, pp. 146–165.

¹¹⁶ H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosographischer Grundlage*, 1 (Munich, 1926), pp. 65–80. For a recent bibliography of Alexander's scientific endeavours, see H. U. Wiemer, *Alexander der Grosse* (Munich, 2005), p. 323.

¹¹⁷ For a recent evaluation, see Franca Landucci Gattinoni, *L'arte del potere. Vita e opere di Cassandro di Macedonia*, (Historia Einzelschriften) 171 (Stuttgart, 2003), pp. 137–144.

¹¹⁸ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 114.

¹¹⁹ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 135.

Macedonia—the most eminent of whom was Ptolemy—wrote their versions of the great Asiatic adventure.¹²⁰

As far as political praxis is concerned, Philip, already from 356, long before he dominated peninsular Greece, took part in the Olympic contests and was crowned twice as an Olympic victor (356 and 352).¹²¹ In 352 he became the elected head of state of the Thessalian League.¹²² Six years later not only did Macedonia become a member of the Amphictyonic Council, but Philip himself presided at the Panhellenic Pythian festival of that year.¹²³ Ten years later Philip died as the *hegemon* of the Hellenic League and commander in chief of the Hellenic war of revenge against the Persian empire.¹²⁴

This was also the time when the cities of Macedonia acquired not only their physically “Greek” aspect, with the building of columnated temples (Aegae/Vergina),¹²⁵ theatres (Dion¹²⁶ Aegae/Vergina¹²⁷), and gymnasia (Amphipolis),¹²⁸ but also their political autonomy and the relevant civic institutions. They deal directly with the Panhellenic sanctuaries, as the Nemean list of *theorodokoi*,¹²⁹ and the presence of their citizens increasingly identified by their city ethnic,¹³⁰ reveal. They formed their own civic laws (Dion)¹³¹ and were administered by their own magistrates, councils and assemblies.¹³² The central government itself acquired a more professional character with the creation of a “Secretariat,” which used, instead

¹²⁰ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, nos. 122 (Amyntas); 124 (Kallisthenes); 133 (Nearchos); 135 (Marsyas); 138 (Ptolemy); 139 (Aristobulus).

¹²¹ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 664–665; M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis*, (MEΛETHMATA) 14 (Athens, 1991), pp. 82–83.

¹²² Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 285–295.

¹²³ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 450–456, with Lefèvre, *Amphictionie*, p. 94.

¹²⁴ M. B. Sakellariou, “Panhellenism: From Concept to Policy,” in Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, pp. 142–145.

¹²⁵ Stella Drougou and Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα: ό τόπος και ή ιστορία του* (Athens, 2006), pp. 134–138.

¹²⁶ D. Pandermalis, *Δίον* (Athens, 1999), pp. 75–79.

¹²⁷ Drougou and Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα*, pp. 126–133.

¹²⁸ Kalliopi D. Lazaridi, “Τό γυμνάσιο τής Αμφίπολης,” in *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη* (Thessaloniki, 1990), pp. 241–273.

¹²⁹ S. G. Miller, “The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games,” *Hesperia* 57 (1988), 147–163.

¹³⁰ Manuela Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo*, (MEΛETHMATA) 34 (Athens, 2002), pp. 289–332; I. K. Xydopoulos, *Κοινωνικές και πολιτιστικές σχέσεις τών Μακεδόνων και τών άλλων Ελλήνων*, 2nd ed. (Thessaloniki, 2006), pp. 98–114.

¹³¹ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 2, p. 73, no. 56. Cf. a partial photograph of the stone in D. Pandermalis, *Δίον. Αρχαιολογικός χώρος και Μουσείο* (Athens, 1997), p. 9.

¹³² Hatzopoulos, “Cités,” pp. 133–137.

of the local dialect, the Attic *koine*, which was then becoming the *lingua franca* of the whole Aegean basin.¹³³

Paradoxically, however, this is also the time when the identification of the Macedonians as barbarians and their rejection from the Greek community becomes most virulent.

Demosthenes does not miss an occasion to call Philip¹³⁴ as well as the Macedonians¹³⁵ barbarians, and to heap on them every sort of abuse. But, as E. Badian¹³⁶ has rightly stressed, the very virulence of his attacks disqualifies them as historical evidence. Much more intriguing are the distinctions made between Macedonians and Greeks and between the kings and the Macedonian commoners by Isocrates in three passages of his essay on Philip. In the first¹³⁷ he writes that the founder of the Macedonian monarchy "left altogether the land of Greece and desired to acquire a kingdom in Macedonia." In the second¹³⁸ it is asserted (inaccurately) that "he was the only Greek who thought fit to rule over a people of a different stock, and was thus also the only one who was able to escape the perils inherent to monarchies." In the third one¹³⁹ Isocrates advises Philip that he "ought to become the benefactor of the Greeks, to reign over the Macedonians and to rule over as many barbarians as possible." "If you act in this way," pursues Isocrates, "all will be grateful to you, the Greeks for your benefactions, the Macedonians because you govern them in a royal but not tyrannical manner, and the other nations, if they get rid of a barbaric and despotic rule and benefit from a Greek superintendence." These passages have been extensively discussed, because Isocrates, contrary to Demosthenes and to other Athenian orators of that period (Deinarchus, Lycurgus, Hyperides), was most favourably disposed to Philip and had no possible reason to slight the Macedonians. The partisans of the non Hellenic character of the Macedonians have found in them the irrefutable confirmation of their thesis.¹⁴⁰ The champions of Macedonian

¹³³ M. B. Hatzopoulos, "The Language: The Origins of the *Koine*," in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonia*, pp. 79–80; cf. Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou, "L'atticisation de la Macédoine: l'une des sources de la koiné," *Verbum* 11 (1988), pp. 245–260.

¹³⁴ 3.17; 3.24; 19.305; 19.308; 9.31; cf. 18.185.

¹³⁵ Dem., 19.327.

¹³⁶ Badian, "Greeks," p. 42.

¹³⁷ Isocrates, *Philip*, 107.

¹³⁸ Isocrates, *Philip*, 108.

¹³⁹ Isocrates, *Philip*, 154.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Badian, "Greeks," pp. 42 and 50, n. 69.

Hellenism have cavilled over the significance of individual terms used by the orator.¹⁴¹

It is indeed true that, as we have seen, Greece (Hellas), like Europe today, has a rather elastic meaning, which varies both according to historical periods and within the same period according to the authors who use it. Macedonians might be Greeks, even if they lived outside the lands traditionally called Hellas. It is also true that ‘people of a different stock’ (*ouch homophylou genous*), just like similar expressions (*allophylos*), might also be used for Greeks of a different origin. But—especially in view of the third passage—it is undeniable that, taken as a whole, Isocrates’ essay clearly distinguishes between Greeks and Macedonians. The pertinent question is why the Athenian orator insisted on that distinction at a moment when in political praxis the Macedonians were perceived and treated like Greeks by other Greek states and by Panhellenic sanctuaries and organisations.

Isocrates’ essay was written soon after the Peace of Philocrates between Athens and Macedon and their respective allies, which put an end to the Third Sacred War in 346. Its nominal addressee was Philip, but in fact it was equally aimed at Greek—and more particularly Athenian—public opinion. Isocrates was pursuing with Philip his old project of uniting the Greeks, in order to crush the Persian might, thereby putting an end to Achaemenid meddling in Greek affairs, and securing territories which could be used for the settlement of landless and homeless Greeks. Philip was the last in a long list of prospective champions, which included Dionysius tyrant of Syracuse, Agesilaus and Archidamus kings of Sparta, and Jason and his son Alexander, tyrants of Pherai.¹⁴² The problem was that many Greeks and most of all the Athenians were extremely wary of monarchs, be they kings or tyrants.¹⁴³ By 346 Isocrates had understood that his exhortations could not have a wide appeal unless he could mitigate the mistrust that was roused by the name “king” or “tyrant.” With Philip, he thought that he had found a champion with a characteristic which he could exploit for this purpose and decided to make the most of it. Although the kings of Macedon were Greeks, when they decided to conquer and rule a kingdom, alone among the Greeks they sought one which lay outside Greece, because they were—and still were—too respectful of

¹⁴¹ Cf. A. B. Daskalakis, *Ὁ Ἑλληνισμὸς τῆς ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Athens, 1960), pp. 413–425.

¹⁴² Sakellariou, “Panhellenism,” pp. 128–134 (see above, note 124).

¹⁴³ For what follows, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Perception of the Self and the Other: The Case of Macedonia,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 63–65.

Greek democratic liberties to try to impose a monarchical regime on their compatriots. Thus, Isocrates implies, the Greeks could trust Philip and not fear that they may be subjected to his autocratic rule.

Some Macedonians might not have appreciated being relegated to this category of neither Greek nor barbarian, but that was not the Athenian orator's first concern. On the other hand Philip, to whom he appealed, would be only too happy to see his Heraclid pedigree confirmed. Just like the kings of Sparta or of Molossia, he was set apart by it from his subjects, who were thus indirectly cautioned not to aspire to Greek democratic liberties. As I have written elsewhere,¹⁴⁴ it is not impossible that Philip shared Isocrates' concern to keep his kingdom separate from the other states of the projected alliance. Certainly, as if heeding Isocrates' advice, he preferred not to include it in the Hellenic League which was finally constituted in 337.

The decision to exclude the Macedonians from the Hellenic League proved a mistake with long-term consequences, for it enabled the anti-Macedonian politicians of the later fourth and the third century to construct a "Hellenic" identity from which the Macedonians were excluded. Thus Hypereides¹⁴⁵ could pretend that the Lamian War was fought for the freedom of all the Greeks and was comparable to Panhellenic ventures such as the Trojan or the Persian wars,¹⁴⁶ and the Attic decree in honour of Euphron of Sicyon of 318/7¹⁴⁷ speaks of "the Hellenic war that the people of Athens started on behalf of the Greeks." This theme finds one of its last echoes as late as 268/7 in the decree of Chremonides,¹⁴⁸ in which Athenians and Peloponnesians are represented as united and ready to fight for the liberty of Greece, as they had done during the Persian wars, implicitly equating thereby Antigonos Gonatas to Xerxes. The fact that the alliance of the *Macedonian* king Ptolemy II, the Athenians, the Spartans, and a dozen other cities of the Peloponnese bore no resemblance by any stretch of imagination to the Hellenic alliance of 480¹⁴⁹ did not trouble the enthusiastic author of the decree. In that he was no more inconsistent than a politician such as Hypereides,¹⁵⁰ who in one and the same paragraph

¹⁴⁴ Hatzopoulos, "Perception," p. 65.

¹⁴⁵ *Epitaph.* 12; 24; 34–35–38.

¹⁴⁶ Xydopoulos, *Σχέσεις*, pp. 83–84.

¹⁴⁷ *IG II²* 448, L. 43–45.

¹⁴⁸ *IG II²* 687.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Chr. Habicht, *Athènes hellénistique* (Paris, 2000), p. 162.

¹⁵⁰ *Epitaph.* 11.

could equate Athens and her allies in the Lamian war with those who had fought in the Persian wars for the freedom of all the Greeks, and name as their enemies "the Boeotians, the Macedonians and the Euboeans."

At the root of such contradictions was the ambiguous meaning of the term "Hellenes," which these orators were using (and abusing). Besides its common meaning of persons speaking a Greek dialect, practicing Greek cults, and living according to Greek customs, this term acquired in 337 the technical meaning of "members of the Hellenic League," the so called League of Corinth, of which the Macedonian state (viz. the king) was the leader (*hegemon*), though he was not himself a part of it. This ambiguity has bedevilled writers from Arrian, who vainly tried to accommodate it in his speeches,¹⁵¹ to E. N. Borza, who failed to recognize it.¹⁵²

E. Badian¹⁵³ rightly points out that nearly all references to antagonism or even difference between Greeks and Macedonians are in speeches composed by Arrian himself. In these he has taken great pains to convey the content of such distinction. It is obvious in the alleged speech of Callisthenes¹⁵⁴ in which "Greeks" and "Macedonians," after being distinguished from each other, are lumped together as destined to honour Alexander in "a human and Greek style," in contrast to Persians and other "barbarians."

More interesting than Arrian's freely rhetorical compositions are descriptions of events which show actual political, administrative, or religious practice. One such circumstance, which has escaped the attention of both E. Badian and P. A. Brunt (who is E. Badian's source in this matter), is the ceremony at Opis. There Arrian¹⁵⁵ describes how Alexander made sacrifices and gave a feast sitting in the midst of "Macedonians," while next to them sat the Persians and other nations. The ceremony was initiated by "Greek seers" and "Magians." There is a striking disequilibrium in this arrangement, for if the "Magians," the Persians' clergy, naturally officiated on behalf of the Persians and other Iranians, one may wonder why on the Macedonian side the religious specialists are described not as "Macedonian" but as "Greek." The reason is obviously not that mantic art was practiced exclusively south of Mt Olympus, but that in the field of religion the distinction between "Macedonian" and "Greek" made no

¹⁵¹ Cf. Badian, "Greeks," p. 51, n. 72.

¹⁵² See below.

¹⁵³ Badian, "Greeks," p. 51, n. 72.

¹⁵⁴ Arr., *Anab.*, 2.4.8.

¹⁵⁵ Arr., *Anab.*, 7.11.8.

sense. There was no distinct Macedonian mantic art any more than there was a distinct Macedonian language. What did exist was the *political* distinction between the Macedonian kingdom and the Hellenic League, as another passage from Arrian makes abundantly clear.

E. N. Borza¹⁵⁶ thought that he had struck pure gold when he noticed that in Arrian's *Indica*,¹⁵⁷ almost certainly reproducing a list from Nearchus'—a Companion of Alexander's—work on the Indian Ocean, Alexander's trierarchs "are named according to their ethnicity." He further specified that he used the latter term "to describe a cultural identity that is near the meaning of nationality, but without the necessity of membership in a political organism" and he added that the relevant criteria of ethnicity are "language, contemporary perceptions, historical perceptions, and cultural institutions." The "ethnicities" of Alexander's trierarchs according to him were "Macedonian," "Greek," and "Persian."

A more attentive reading of the text in question, however, reveals that Arrian distinguishes not three but four categories of trierarchs: Macedonians, Greeks, Cypriots and one Persian, which requires a reconsideration of Borza's interpretation of the passage.

As I have repeatedly stressed,¹⁵⁸ the understanding of the Macedonian paradox, that is to say of a human group speaking a Greek dialect, celebrating Greek cults, and governed by Greek, albeit monarchic, institutions, and nevertheless occasionally distinguished from, and indeed opposed to the Greeks, cannot be understood in isolation. Its case must be studied in connection with that of other peripheral Greek-speaking peoples, such as the Epirotes and the Cypriotes. The former spoke a north-western Greek dialect, celebrated Greek cults taking part in the same Panhellenic events as other Greeks, and had Greek institutions, albeit of the *ethnos* and not of the *polis* variety. Yet from the time of Thucydides to that of Strabo the Epirotes were excluded from the geographical definition of Hellas and occasionally identified as barbarians. It was the absence down to the Hellenistic period of urban centres deserving the name and status of *polis* and the survival of ancestral kingship which explains the occasional and

¹⁵⁶ E. N. Borza, "Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: The Source Traditions," in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris, eds., *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman/London, 1996), p. 125.

¹⁵⁷ 18.3–10.

¹⁵⁸ M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Prefazione," in Manuela Mari, *Olimpo*, pp. 9–10; id., "Perception," p. 60.

paradoxical denial of their Hellenism, especially when there was some political axe to grind.¹⁵⁹

The city-kingdoms of Cyprus, with the exception of Phoenician Kition and “autochthonous” Amathous, spoke a Greek dialect of Mycenaean origin and related to Arcadian, albeit written in an archaic syllabic script until well into the fourth century. Their cults were Greek, although Aphrodite, the principal goddess of the island, was of oriental origin.¹⁶⁰ But, after all, had she not been adopted by all the Greeks? The Cypriote kingships, like those of Macedonia and Epirus, were an anomaly for the majority of the polis-state minded Greeks of the classical period. But monarchies had survived elsewhere on the periphery of the Greek world, as in Cyrenaica, or had reappeared, as in Sicily. Thus no single criterion can satisfactorily explain the exclusion of the Cypriotes from the Greek community in the list of Alexander the Great’s trierarchs.

It is obvious that the “ethnic” criterion cannot adequately explain the arrangement of the list of Alexander’s trierarchs, especially since at the very same period, in the late twenties or the early tens of the fourth century, the contemporary catalogue of the *theorodokoi* from Nemea attests that both the Macedonians and the Cypriotes participated fully along with the other Greeks in Panhellenic sacrifices and contests.¹⁶¹ In fact, another anomaly ought to have made us suspicious of the alleged ethnicity distinction. The list of the Macedonian trierarchs comprises two persons of impeccable Greek ethnicity: Nearchus son of Androtimus from Lato in Crete, and Laomedon son of Larichus from Mytilene in Lesbos. In fact, just as the “forgotten” Cypriote category contradicts the allegedly binary opposition between “Greeks” on the one hand and ‘Macedonians’ on the other, an anomaly like the above belies the “ethnic” character of the list and can only be explained if the distinction reflects “nationality,” that is to say “Staatsangehörigkeit,” rather than ethnicity. In fact both Nearchus and Laomedon, when they moved to Macedonia, did not simply settle in the country, as did for instance Eumenes, who paid a heavy price for that mistake. They became citizens of Amphipolis and *ipso facto* also of the Macedonian Commonwealth. Ernst Badian¹⁶² ridicules the suggestion that the Macedonian state may have been “provided with a Department

¹⁵⁹ On the problem of the Epirotes, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, “The Boundaries of Hellenism in Epirus during Antiquity,” in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Epirus* (Athens, 1997), pp. 140–145.

¹⁶⁰ On the question of the Cypriote Greeks, see Hatzopoulos, “Perception,” pp. 60–63.

¹⁶¹ See above, note 125.

¹⁶² Badian, “Greeks,” p. 49, n. 50.

of Immigration and Naturalization,” or its citizens with “identity cards,” but, *pace* Badian, recent epigraphic finds have revealed that its cities were indeed provided with lists of their citizens.¹⁶³ It is therefore clear that the classification of the trierarchs is not based on ethnicity but on political criteria. All citizens of Macedonian civic units are classified as “Macedonians,” whatever their origin. Those who are classified as “Greeks” in Arrian’s list hail from Larissa in Thessaly, Cardia, Cos, Magnesia and Teos, all members of the Hellenic League, the first two since 337 and the remaining three since 332.¹⁶⁴ The kingdoms of Cyprus, on the other hand, which joined Alexander at the siege of Tyros, never joined the League whose members were officially styled “the Hellenes.”

In conclusion, as M. B. Sakellariou¹⁶⁵ has judiciously stressed, the contrast and occasionally the antagonism between Greeks and Macedonians was political and had to a certain extent social causes. The Macedonians satisfied indeed the “objective” criteria of Greekness enumerated by Herodotus.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, the eagerness with which they adopted the artistic and intellectual lessons of “the school of Hellas” should leave no doubt that, as Myrina Kalaitzi so aptly writes, they projected themselves as “the chief representatives of what was defined as Greek culture both at home and in their conquering campaigns to the East.”¹⁶⁷ Nevertheless, it is equally true that their Hellenic quality was repeatedly disputed, especially when political animosities created a suitable political environment. In the political field there was a double opposition between a majority of *polis* states and an *ethnos* state, as well as between regimes which ideally were democratic and a reputedly tyrannical monarchy. Thus, even for pro-Macedonians, such as Isocrates, wanting to dispel fears that the Macedonian kings might extend their monarchical regime to the Greek cities, it was important to dissociate as much as possible the Macedonian kingdom from the Greek *polis* states.

It should not come as a surprise that the subtleties of the Macedonian paradox were best understood by German scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, who could rely on the particular position of

¹⁶³ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides*, (MEAETHMATA) 30 (Athens, 2001), pp. 96–98.

¹⁶⁴ E. Badian, “Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia,” in E. Badian, ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 37–69.

¹⁶⁵ M. B. Sakellariou, “The Inhabitants,” in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia* (Athens, 1983), p. 52.

¹⁶⁶ 8.144.2.

¹⁶⁷ See above, note 27.

Prussia vis-à-vis the rest of Germany.¹⁶⁸ Initially outside the borders of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, even after the abolition of the latter, it remained an entity the citizens of which had to be reckoned separately from the other Germans. The German unification of 1870 formally put an end to this paradox, but the antagonism between militarist and mainly Protestant Prussia and the Catholic Länder along the Rhine and in the Alpine region could resuscitate it any time, given the appropriate political circumstances, as it did after the Second World War. As late as in 1990 one could write a book under the title *Preussen und Deutschland gegenüber dem Novemberaufstand 1830–1831*. In a similar way, as late as the twenties of the third century Phylarchos could still try, though unsuccessfully, to make capital out of an opposition between “Macedonian barbarity” and “Greek nobility.”¹⁶⁹ In any case, the refoundation in 222 of the Hellenic League by Antigonos Doson did not repeat Philip II’s mistake, but integrated his Macedonians as full members of the Hellenes and thereby formally put an end to the Macedonian paradox. That did not stop efforts by Macedonia’s retrospective enemies to revive it, echoes of which we still read in the works of Atticist writers of the Roman period.

If one were to sum up the whole argument in one sentence, one might say that the distinction—indeed the opposition—between “Macedonians” and “Greeks,” went unheeded as long as the identity of the former was only a matter of ethnological interest, but surfaced as soon as the Macedonians aspired to become major players in Greek politics. It finally lost all pertinence, except as a literary topos, when the Romans put an end to any independent Greek political life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. M. Akamatis, “Ξάνθος Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀμαδίεας υἱός,” in *AMHTOΣ: Τιμητικός τόμος γιὰ τὸν καθηγητὴ Μανόλη Ἀνδρόνικο* (Thessaloniki, 1987), pp. 13–32.
 M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs* (Athens, 1993).
 —, “Tombs at Vergina,” in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 35–39.
 —, *Βεργίνα II. Ὁ ἄφορος τῆς Περσεφόνης*, (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας) 138 (Athens, 1994).
 E. Badian, “Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia,” in E. Badian, ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 37–69.

¹⁶⁸ F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich – Berlin, 1930), p. 32.

¹⁶⁹ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 81, F 52.

- , "Greeks and Macedonians," in Beryl Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, (Studies in the History of Art) 10 (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 33–51.
- Beryl Bar-Sharrar, "Macedonian Metal Vases in Perspective: Some Observations on Context and Tradition," in Beryl Bar-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, (Studies in the History of Art) 10 (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 123–140.
- , "Metalwork in Macedonia before and during the Reign of Philip II," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 485–498.
- H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopografischer Grundlage I–II* (Munich, 1926).
- M. Besios, "Νεκροταφεία του 5^{ου} αι. π.Χ. στη Β. Πιερία," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 645–650.
- M. Besios and Maria Pappa, *Πύδνα* (Thessaloniki, 1995).
- E. N. Borza, "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House," in Carol G. Thomas, ed., *Makedonika: Essays by Eugene Borza* (Claremont, 1995), pp. 113–123, originally published in *Hesperia Supplement* 19 (1982), pp. 7–13.
- , *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, 1990).
- , "Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: The Source Traditions," in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris, eds., *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman-London, 1996), pp. 122–139.
- A. B. Bosworth, "Eumenes, Neoptolemus, and PSI XII 1284," *GRBS* 19 (1978), 227–237.
- Hariclia Brecoulaki, *La peinture funéraire de Macédoine: Emplois et fonctions de la couleur, IV^e–II^e s. av. J.C.*, (MEATHMATA) 48 (Athens 2006).
- Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou, "L'atticisation de la Macédoine: l'une des sources de la koiné," *Verbum* 11 (1988), 245–260.
- P. Charneux, "Liste argienne de théarodoques," *BCH* 90 (1966), 156–239.
- Anastasia and P. Chrysostomou, "Τάφοι πολεμιστών των αρχαϊκών χρόνων από τη δυτική νεκρόπολη του Αρχοντικού Πέλλας," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 113–132.
- A. B. Daskalakis, *Ο Έλληνισμός της αρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Athens, 1960).
- Sophie Descamps-Lequime, ed., *Peinture et couleur dans le monde grec antique. Actes de Colloque, Musée du Louvre, 2004* (Paris-Milan, 2007).
- Stella Drougou and Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα: ό τόπος και ή ιστορία του* (Athens, 2006).
- J. R. Ellis, "Macedonia under Philip," in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981), pp. 146–165.
- R. M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens: von den Anfängen bis zum Untergang des Königreiches* (Munich, 1986).
- F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich-Berlin, 1930).
- R. Ginouvès, "The Palaces," in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 84–90.
- W. S. Greenwalt, "The Development of a Middle Class in Macedonia," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 87–96.
- Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, "Mosaic," in R. Ginouvès and M.B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 117–136.
- Chr. Habicht, *Athènes hellénistique: histoire de la cité d'Alexandre le Grand à Marc Antoine* (Paris, 2000).
- J. M. Hall, "Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity," in I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2001), pp. 159–186.
- , *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago, 2002).
- N. G. L. Hammond, "Intellectual Life," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1983), pp. 88–91.
- N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II* (Oxford, 1979).

- M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amhipolis*, (MEΛETHMATA) 14 (Athens, 1991).
- , "The Language: The Origins of the *koine*," in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 79–80.
- , *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*. 1. *A Historical and Epigraphic Study* 2. *Epigraphic Appendix*, (MEΛETHMATA) 22 (Athens, 1996).
- , "The Boundaries of Hellenism in Epirus during Antiquity," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Epirus. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1997), pp. 140–145.
- , "L'histoire par les noms' in Macedonia," in S. Hornblower and Elaine Matthews, eds., *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 99–117.
- , *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux*, (MEΛETHMATA) 30 (Athens, 2001).
- , "Cités en Macédoine," in M. Reddé et al., eds., *La naissance de la ville dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 2003), pp. 127–140.
- , *La Macédoine: géographie historique, langue, cultes et croyances, institutions* (Paris, 2006).
- , "Perception of the Self and the Other: The Case of Macedonia," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 51–66.
- M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981).
- B. Helly, "Le dialecte thessalien, un autre modèle de développement," in I. Hajnal, ed., *Die altgriechischen Dialekte: Wesen und Werden, Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19.–22. September 2001*, (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft) 126 (Innsbruck, 2007), pp. 177–222.
- Myrina Kalaitzi, *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth-First Century B.C.*, 1–2 (Oxford, forthcoming).
- E. Kapetanopoulos, "Xennias μακεδονίζων τῆι φωνῆι," *Ephemeris* (1993), pp. 13–30.
- Georgia Karamitrou, *Boion-Notia Orestis*, 1–2 (Thessaloniki, 1999).
- Georgia Karamitrou-Mentesidi, "Aiane," in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 29–32.
- , "Aianè, ville de Macédoine," in Julia Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque* (Athens, 1993), pp. 32–35.
- , *Aiani* (Athens, 1996).
- Angeliki Kottaridi, "The Symposium," in D. Pandermalis, ed., *Alexander the Great: Treasures from an Epic Era of Hellenism* (Athens, 2004), pp. 65–87.
- Angeliki Kottaridou, "Couleur et sens : l'emploi de la couleur dans la tombe de la reine Eurydice," in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos and Yvette Morizot, eds., *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine*, (MEΛETHMATA) 45 (Athens, 2006), pp. 155–166.
- Franca Landucci Gattinoni, *L'arte del potere. Vita e opere di Cassandro di Macedonia*, (Historia Einzelschriften) 171 (Stuttgart, 2003)
- Kalliopi D. Lazaridi, "Τὸ γυμνάσιο τῆς Ἀμφίπολης," in *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη. Πόλις καὶ χώρα στὴν ἀρχαία Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη: Πρακτικά Ἀρχαιολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου, Καβάλα 9–11 Μαΐου 1986*, ('Ἑλληνογαλλικὲς Ἐρευνες) 1 (Thessaloniki, 1990), pp. 241–273.
- Sylvie Le Bohec-Bouhet, "Réflexions sur la place de la femme dans la Macédoine antique," in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos and Yvette Morizot, eds., *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine* (MEΛETHMATA) 45 (Athens, 2006), pp. 187–198.
- F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions* (Athens – Paris, 1998).
- Maria Lilimbaki-Akamati, "Recent discoveries in Pella," in Maria Stamatopoulou and Marina Yeroulanou, eds., *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 83–90.
- Manuela Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo. Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo Ellenismo*, (MEΛETHMATA) 34 (Athens, 2002).
- S. G. Miller, "The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games," *Hesperia* 57 (1988), 147–163.
- Vasiliki Misailidou-Despotidou, *Ἐπιγραφές ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki, 1997).

- D. Pandermalis, *Δίον. Αρχαιολογικός χώρος και Μουσείο* (Athens, 1997).
- , *Δίον: η ανακάλυψη* (Athens, 1999).
- Effi Poulaki-Pandermali, "L'Olympe macédonien et ses premiers cimetières," in Julia Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque* (Athens, 1993), pp. 122–127.
- G. Rougemont, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes I* (Paris, 1977).
- Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Τὰ ἐπιτάφια μνημεία ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης Τούμπα τῆς Βεργίνας* (Thessaloniki, 1984).
- , "Βεργίνα 1990. "Ανασκαφὴ στὸ ἱερό τῆς Εὐκλείας," *AERGmak* 4 (Thessaloniki, 1993), 21–34.
- , "Ναῶν Εὐστήλων, a Fragmentary Inscription of the Classical Period from Vergina," in *Inscriptions of Macedonia. Third International Symposium on Macedonia. Thessaloniki, 8–12 December 1993* (Thessaloniki, 1996), pp. 100–122.
- , *Βεργίνα. Ὁ τάφος τοῦ Φιλίππου. Ἡ τοιχογραφία μὲ τὸ κυνῆγι*, (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας) 231 (Athens, 2004).
- M. B. Sakellariou, "Panhellenism: From Concept to Policy," in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981), pp. 128–145.
- , "The Inhabitants," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1983), pp. 44–63.
- S. Scullion, "Euripides and Macedonia, or the Silence of the *Frogs*," *CQ* 53 (2003), 389–400.
- Eudokia Skarlatidou, "Αρχαῖκη χάλκινη ὕδρια ἀπὸ τὸ νεκροταφεῖο τῆς Θέρμης (Σέδες) Θεσσαλονίκης," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 499–513.
- Eleni Trakosopoulou, "Jewelry in Macedonia," in D. Pandermalis, ed., *Alexander the Great: Treasures from an Epic Era of Hellenism* (Athens, 2004), pp. 115–137.
- Argyro B. Tatakī, *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society* (MEΛETHMATA) 8 (Athens 1998).
- Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, *Μακεδονικοὶ τάφοι στὸν Φοῖνικα καὶ στὸν Ἅγιον Ἀθανάσιο Θεσσαλονίκης: Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη τῆς εἰκονογραφίας τῶν ταφικῶν μνημείων τῆς Μακεδονίας*, (Δημοσιεύματα τοῦ Ἀρχαιολογικοῦ Δελτίου) 91 (Athens, 2005).
- , "Ἀπὸ ἓνα νεκροταφεῖο προγενέστερο τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 675–696.
- Ch. Tsoungaris, "Ἀνασκαφικὲς ἔρευνες στὸν νομὸ Καστοριάς κατὰ τὸ 1999," *AERGmak* 13 (Thessaloniki, 2001), 611–622.
- , "Ἀνασκαφικὲς ἔρευνες στὸ νεκροταφεῖο κλασσικῶν χρόνων τοῦ νέου ὕδραγωγείου Πενταβρύσου Καστοριάς," *AERGmak* 8 (Thessaloniki, 2006), 687–694.
- Julia Vokotopoulou, *Ἑλληνικὴ τέχνη. Ἀργυρὰ καὶ χάλκινα ἔργα τέχνης στὴν Ἀρχαιότητα* (Athens, 1997).
- H. U. Wiemer, *Alexander der Grosse* (Munich, 2005).
- I. Xydopoulos, "Νέες ἐπιγραφές ἀπὸ τὴν Πύδνα τῆς Πιερίας," *Hellenika* 50 (2000), 35–43.
- I. K. Xydopoulos, *Κοινωνικὲς καὶ πολιτιστικὲς σχέσεις τῶν Μακεδόνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων: Συμβολὴ στὴν ἔρευνα τῆς γραμματειακῆς καὶ ἐπιγραφικῆς παραδόσεως γιὰ τὴν ἀρχαία Μακεδονία*, 2nd ed. (Thessaloniki, 2006).
- M. Zahmt, "Amyntas III. und die griechischen Mächte," *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 239–251.

Further Reading

The whole literary corpus about Macedonia had been examined from every aspect for decades, if not for centuries, with disappointing—indeed inaccurate—results. It is the archaeological and particularly the epigraphical finds of the last thirty years which have revolutionized our knowledge of the material and non-material culture of ancient Macedonia and rendered to a large extent obsolete most of the earlier scholarship. Who had dreamt of archaic sculpture in the cantons of Upper Macedonia, of supreme quality painting not only in the capitals Aegae and Pella, but also in the third-rate city of Heracleia

in Mygdonia utterly unknown until 1985, of self-governing Macedonian cities voting laws and decrees which instruct us more about the Greek institution of *ephebeia* than Aristotle himself? Thus, if one wishes to follow the ongoing discovery of this new Macedonia, he should consult the publications in which source material and provisional syntheses are most likely to appear:

Τὸ ἀρχαιολογικὸ ἔργο στὴ Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη. The conference is jointly organized by the University of Thessaloniki and the Archaeological Service and takes place in Thessaloniki every year (20 volumes of proceedings (1987–2006) have already been published).

Ancient Macedonia. The proceedings of seven international symposia (1968–2002) of that name organized in Thessaloniki by the Institute of Balkan Studies have been printed.

ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ: monographs of the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Research Foundation. 21 out of the 45 nos published hereto (1985–2006) are devoted to Macedonia. The same Centre publishes the *Epigraphes Makedonias*, the systematic regional corpus of ancient Macedonia.

ΤΕΚΜΗΡΙΑ: a scientific journal initially edited at Thessaloniki and now by the above-mentioned research centre in Athens. 9 volumes (1995–2009), dealing mostly with epigraphy, numismatics and topography of Macedonia, have been published.