

# Why Study Ancient Macedonia and What this *Companion* is About

---

*Edward M. Anson*

This *Companion to Ancient Macedonia* reflects a dramatic change in the focus of ancient Greek history over the last half century. The ancient kingdom of Macedonia was typically regarded until the latter part of the twentieth century as the land which produced Alexander the Great, who brought Hellenic civilization to the Near East, and in the view of G. Droysen paved the way for the success of Christianity, but noted for little else.<sup>1</sup> Alexander the Great not only grew beyond his homeland but also transformed the entire Greek world. Indeed, Alexander's creation of the Hellenistic world for most nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians was sufficient to forgive his participation in the eclipse of the Greek Classical Age and its concomitant reign of the city-states. Alexander's father Philip II then shouldered most of the blame for this end to 'Greek freedom'. For most nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars Alexander was Greek. It was only by the accident of birth that he came from Macedonia, the primitive and backward march of the Greek world. Of course, this view has a basis in antiquity. Alexander's dynasty, the Argead or Temenid, was generally acknowledged by contemporaries and vigorously endorsed by the members of the royal family themselves, to have arisen in the Peloponnesian city-state (*polis*) of Argos.<sup>2</sup>

A more critical view of the great conqueror has emerged in more recent times and is widely seen in this book. The conquests of Alexander and the inauguration of the

<sup>1</sup> G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* 1, *Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen* (Gotha 1877), p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> The kings, down to the death of Alexander's son and heir, Alexander IV, were by tradition descended from the Argive Temenus, thus Temenid: Hdt. 8.137–9, Thuc. 2.99.3. Argead apparently derives from a tribal name, 'Argeas, the son of Macedon' (Stephanus of Byzantium, s.v. Argeou), but was associated by the royal family with their claimed Argive origin. See the full discussion of Argead claimed genealogy in S.R. Asirvatham, 'Perspectives on the Macedonians from Greece, Rome, and Beyond' (chapter 6) and S. Sprawski, 'The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I' (chapter 7).

new Hellenistic Age left his homeland behind in many ways. While Alexander had apparently brought Macedonia to a world stage with his conquest of the Persian Empire, the greatest empire that the West had yet seen, Macedonia benefitted little. On the face of it, Macedonia in a century and a half had achieved a remarkable change of fortune. Beginning in the late sixth century and lasting until 479, Macedonia had been an appendage of this same Persian Empire and Macedonian troops had even fought alongside those of Persia during the Great Persian War of 480–479 (for this history and Alexander's subsequent conquest of the Persian Empire, see M.J. Olbrycht, 'Macedonia and Persia', chapter 17). While Alexander and the Macedonians had conquered Persia, Olbrycht demonstrates that Alexander, beginning in 330, began to 'Persianize' his court, his dress, and his army. Alexander had left his homeland behind more than just in miles; he was becoming the living god-ruler of a vast empire of which Macedonia was to be but a part. Moreover, D.L. Gilley and Ian Worthington, in chapter 10, 'Alexander the Great, Macedonia and Asia', while relating and discussing the life of this individual who so altered the course of history, emphasize that his effect on Macedonia was not all that positive. Alexander was only present in Macedonia during the first two years of his reign and this long absence, in addition to his tardiness in producing an heir, born after his father's death, who shared the rule with the conqueror's ill-suited half-brother, contributed substantially to the demise of his dynasty as rulers of his native land. P. Millett in 'The Political Economy of Macedonia' (chapter 23) also notes that Alexander's conquests were not made part of a Macedonian empire but rather these lands became independent, competitive, states. Very little of the tens of thousands of pounds of gold and silver liberated from the various Persian treasuries ever made its way to Macedonia. Much of this wealth was expended in the wars that broke out soon after Alexander's death among his successors. W.L. Adams in 'Alexander's Successors to 221 BC' (chapter 11) chronicles these battles and the resulting breakup of Alexander's great empire and the emergence of a new Macedonia, ruled by a new dynasty.

Alexander's failures even had an impact on the end of Macedonian independence before the onslaught of Rome two centuries later. While there were other contributing factors, including the power of the Romans, the expenditure of Macedonian manpower in the initial conquest of and subsequent migration to the greener pastures of Asia and Egypt, the resulting ongoing conflicts among Alexander's successor kingdoms, which sapped the strength of the Greek world, were all part of Alexander's legacy to his homeland. A.M. Eckstein in 'Macedonia and Rome, 221–146 BC' (chapter 12) chronicles the series of wars that led to the Roman conquest, emphasizing the political anarchy especially in the eastern Mediterranean world, which encouraged warfare as the way to settle international disputes. Rome and Macedonia were two aggressive states whose conflicts were not likely 'to result in mutual coexistence or cooperation'. In four wars, fought from the late third century to the middle of the second, Rome acquired control and then full possession of Alexander the Great's homeland. Macedonia would continue as a Roman province whose borders would expand or contract according to the organizational plans of their Roman overlords for the next thousand years. The first five centuries of this history, down to the reorganization of Roman provinces in the late third century AD, is covered in J. Vanderspoel's

*‘Provincia Macedonia’* (chapter 13); the account is then continued into the sixth century by C.S. Snively, in *‘Macedonia in Late Antiquity’* (chapter 26). The province to the late third century included the lands of the previous independent Macedonia kingdom and also those of neighboring peoples. During the reign of Emperor Diocletian the Roman province of Macedonia was divided into several smaller components and even the core of Macedonia was partially dismembered.

While the obsession with Alexander by so many earlier historians previously obscured Macedonia, what more recent historians have proclaimed is that Alexander did not appear out of a vacuum and that the culture and institutions of the Hellenistic Age did not begin with his death, nor were they mere continuations, albeit muted, of the previous Classical Age and its city-state culture. Increasingly the focus on Macedonia has shown that both Alexander and the Hellenistic era owed much to his homeland. C.G. Thomas in *‘The Physical Kingdom’* (chapter 4) reviews the land that was ancient Macedonia. Its often rugged terrain, continental climate, and its location, ‘the node of connections between both north/south and east/west’, made Macedonia a land that produced a ‘tough people’. Macedonia itself was seen in antiquity as divided between the coastal plain, commonly referred to as Lower Macedonia, and the western and northern highlands, referred to as Upper (or Inner) Macedonia.

P. Millett, *‘The Political Economy of Macedonia’* (chapter 23), emphasizes that Macedonia was a land of many natural resources, including rich farmland, abundant pastoral wealth, large deposits of base and precious metals, and especially abundant supplies of timber and its by-products which were in short supply in southern Greece. From Macedonia’s earliest history these resources made the land a target for its neighbors. Macedonia was surrounded by numbers of often hostile populations, whose frequent incursions were certainly part of the chemistry that made the Macedonians a ‘tough people’. To the northwest were the Illyrians and to the west the Epirotes. W.S. Greenwalt in *‘Macedonia, Illyria, and Epirus’* (chapter 14) records the long history of interaction and conflict between the Macedonians and the Illyrians and the more peaceful relationship between the former and the Epirote tribes. The frequent hostility between the collective group of tribesmen, called Illyrians by the Greeks, and the Macedonians was not the result of any long-standing enmity but rather the consequence of proximity, Macedonian weakness, and the importance of raiding and pillaging to the Illyrian economy. By the mid-fourth century with the growth in power of Macedonia, the Illyrians turned their efforts to easier targets. Little is known of Macedonia’s relations with its western neighbors, the Epirote tribes, until the fourth century when it became the policy of the Macedonian kings to ally with these western neighbors in part to forge a common resistance to Illyrian raids. To the east of Macedonia were the Thracians whose resources and lifestyle paralleled those of the Macedonians in many ways (see Z. Archibald, *‘Macedonia and Thrace’*, chapter 16), and to the south were the Thessalians, whose history and long-term contacts with their northern neighbors are chronicled by D. Graninger in *‘Macedonia and Thessaly’* (chapter 15). Thessalian elite society maintained close connections both to the Macedonian kings and to individual Macedonian aristocrats. Of all the areas of the southern Greek world Thessaly shared not only a common border with its northern

neighbor but also much else. This was especially true with respect to religion. With regard to the northern neighbors Macedonia had long served as a little-appreciated bulwark for the Greeks to the south, a buffer that repulsed or absorbed attacks from these northern peoples, a condition that remained also through the early years of her existence as a Roman province. It was only with the extension of the Roman frontier to the Danube, and even beyond that great river, that Macedonia relinquished this role to others.

The new scholarly emphasis on Macedonia has developed in part out of the many archaeological finds being revealed almost on a daily basis. Much of our new appreciation of Macedonian culture and society comes from the numerous surviving and excavated tombs of prominent Macedonians dating from the period of the Argead and the following Antigonid dynasties, the latter who ruled until supplanted by Roman suzerainty (see A.M. Eckstein, 'Macedonia and Rome, 221–146 BC', chapter 12). These tombs from the monarchical period contain frescoes and other magnificent objects of artistic manufacture which demonstrate that amongst the upper classes Macedonian society existed at a very high level of sophistication. These remains then give insights into the lifestyle of the upper class, as set forth by N. Sawada in 'Social Customs and Institutions: Aspects of Macedonian Elite Society' (chapter 19). Much of this lifestyle revolved around lavish entertainments and hunting, and such scenes predominate on the walls of the noble tombs.

Macedonia still awaits the intensive field surveys, those meticulous examinations of land surfaces, which should provide more information regarding the ancient Macedonian countryside.<sup>3</sup> Such studies as those conducted in the Argolid,<sup>4</sup> Boeotia,<sup>5</sup> and Messenia,<sup>6</sup> would give historians a better understanding of the life of the Macedonian rural population, the majority of the ancient Macedonian people. Apart from these archaeological discoveries of predominantly upper-class material culture, however, there is little other evidence available for the study of Macedonia. Much of the evidence for the history of Macedonia is reviewed by P.J. Rhodes in

<sup>3</sup> Intensive field surveys differ from the more traditional 'extensive field survey' in that they do not concentrate on a few sites but rather develop a comprehensive examination of an entire area: J. Bintliff, 'The History of the Greek Countryside: As the Wave Breaks, Prospects for Future Research', in P.N. Doukellis and L. Mendoni (eds.), *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques* (Paris 1994), pp. 7–15 and G. Shipley, 'Hidden Landscapes: Greek Field Survey Data and Hellenistic History', in D. Ogden (ed.), *The Hellenistic World: New Perspectives* (London 2002), pp. 177–98.

<sup>4</sup> T.H. van Andel and C.N. Runnels, *Beyond the Acropolis: A Rural Greek Past* (Palo Alto 1987).

<sup>5</sup> J.L. Bintliff, 'Appearance and Reality: Understanding the Buried Landscape through New Techniques in Field Survey', in M. Bernardi (ed.), *Archeologia del Paesaggio* (Florence 1992), pp. 89–137. Most recently the first volume cataloging the findings of the Boeotian Project has been published: J. Bintliff, P. Howard and A. Snodgrass, *Testing the Hinterland: The Work of the Boeotia Survey (1989–1991) in the Southern Approaches to the City of Thespiiai* (Cambridge 2007).

<sup>6</sup> W.A. McDonald and G.R. Rapp (eds.), *Minnesota Messenia Expedition: Reconstructing a Bronze Age Regional Environment* (Minneapolis 1972).

‘The Literary and Epigraphic Evidence to the Roman Conquest’ (chapter 2).<sup>7</sup> Most of our literary information comes from late sources and is especially concentrated on the campaigns of Alexander the Great. Rhodes points out that of the lost Greek historians listed by F. Jacoby in *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, only 13 possible writers of histories of Macedonia are listed, and of these perhaps five date from the time of the Roman Empire. For Macedonian history prior to the reign of Philip II, the creator of the united ancient state of Macedonia and Alexander the Great’s father and predecessor as king, modern-day historians have to rely on the occasional inscription or other material remains, fragments from these now lost historians, the occasional references to Macedonia and Macedonian affairs in the fifth-century historians Herodotus and Thucydides, and ‘universal histories’, dating from the Roman era. S.R. Asirvatham, in ‘Perspectives on the Macedonians from Greece, Rome, and Beyond’ (chapter 6), points out that despite the oft-quoted aphorism that the victors write the history, in the case of Macedonia that is certainly not the situation. Macedonia’s entire history is provided to us almost exclusively by non-Macedonian sources. Even with regard to Philip, while there is considerable contemporary evidence, it is largely Athenian and most often hostile. With respect to the great fifth-century historians Herodotus and Thucydides, not to mention many of the inscriptions, the content typically concerns the relations of various Greek city-states with Macedonia, with the focus most often clearly centered on these other entities rather than on Macedonia and her interests. As Rhodes notes, ‘there are very few inscriptions, of any kind, from Macedonia or cities and other units within it, of the Classical period; some are of the Hellenistic period but most are later than AD 100’. P. Millett in ‘The Political Economy of Macedonia’ (chapter 23) comments, ‘there is also absent from earlier Macedonia the “epigraphic habit” that was a feature of mainstream *poleis*’. These few inscriptions, however, many of which for the Classical and Hellenistic periods can now be conveniently found in the second volume of M.B. Hatzopoulos’s *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, provide, among other insights, some understanding of the functioning at the municipal level of the Macedonian kingdom.<sup>8</sup> Part of the explanation for the reluctance of earlier scholars to pursue Macedonian history was the lack of any contemporary, relatively detailed, narrative histories until that of Polybius in the second century, and even here much of the focus is otherwise directed and large portions of the original are lost.

Other forms of evidence are examined by K. Dahmen in ‘The Numismatic Evidence’ (chapter 3), C.I. Hardiman in ‘Classical Art to 221 BC’ (chapter 24), and R. Kousser in ‘Hellenistic and Roman Art, 221 BC–AD 337’ (chapter 25). According to Dahmen, coinage began in Macedonia in the sixth century showing wide-ranging influences, including Greek, Persian, and Thracian, and representing different tribes and cities.

<sup>7</sup> The sources for the Roman period are discussed in J. Vanderspoel, ‘*Provincia Macedonia*’ (chapter 13) and C.S. Snively, ‘Macedonia in Late Antiquity’ (chapter 26).

<sup>8</sup> M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 2 vols. (Athens 1996). The second volume of this work contains the most complete collection currently available in one volume of these Macedonian inscriptions; the first, an insightful review of this evidence combined with that available from other sources as well.

Beginning with Alexander I (498–454), Macedonian coinage came to be the province of the monarch. Hardiman and Kousser examine the artistic and material culture of Macedonia from earliest times well into its history as part of the Roman Empire. While Hardiman emphasizes that Macedonia's art in the 'Classical' period was derived from strong Hellenic influence, Kousser stresses that subsequently its art maintained a distinctive quality, and in the later Roman and Byzantine Empires Macedonia became a Christian religious and artistic center with Thessaloniki, the modern port and capital of the Greek Periphery (region) of Central Macedonia, becoming a second city to Constantinople in the east (much of this long history is reviewed in C.S. Snively's 'Macedonia in Late Antiquity', chapter 26).

Historians seeking to reconstruct Macedonian history and institutions for the period before and after the reign of Alexander III ('the Great'), down to the regency and monarchy of Antigonos Doson (229–221) and the history of Polybius, must rely primarily on two problematic historians of the Roman era: Diodorus of Sicily, writing a 'universal history' in the last half century of the Roman Republic, and Justin's *Epitome* of the now lost *Philippic History* of Pompeius Trogus, another world history but with its primary focus on the rise of Macedonia and the following Hellenistic Age. Trogus' original was written during the reign of Augustus; the *Epitome* dates probably from the third or fourth century of the Roman imperial period.<sup>9</sup>

Despite the difficulty of the task of reconstructing Macedonia's past prior to the reigns of her two greatest monarchs, Philip II and his son Alexander III, what can be known is well presented in the chapters by S. Sprawski ('The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I', chapter 7) and J. Roisman ('Classical Macedonia to Perdiccas III', chapter 8). Sprawski relates the mythical origins of the Macedonian ruling house. It is not until the late sixth century that the first truly historical monarch, Amyntas I, appears, but it is this monarch's son, Alexander I, who truly inaugurates Macedonian history. In the period after this early Alexander, Roisman describes a Macedonia often disrupted by internal conflict, power struggles between various members of the royal Argead clan, and by external forces ranging from the southern *poleis* of the Athenians and Spartans to Macedonia's tribal neighbors. Yet in this Classical period Roisman emphasizes that 'the country had an infrastructure of roads and fortresses, administrative and religious centers in Pella, Aegae, and Diium, and a brisk trade in timber and pitch'.

Perhaps the most significant change in Macedonian studies over the last 30 years has been the emphasis on the role played by Alexander the Great's father.<sup>10</sup> This

<sup>9</sup> J.M. Alonso-Núñez, 'An Augustan World History: The *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus', *G&R* 34 (1987), pp. 56–72.

<sup>10</sup> For example, J.R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976); G.L. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon* (London 1978); G. Wirth, *Philipp II. Geschichte Makedoniens* 1 (Stuttgart 1985); N.G.L. Hammond, *Philip of Macedon* (London 1994); Ian Worthington, *Philip II of Macedonia* (New Haven 2008). Worthington in particular emphasizes Philip's achievements and closes his biography as follows: 'does Alexander even deserve to be called Great? His greatness, if such it is, is surely further proof of the success, sensibility and indeed greatness of Philip II' (p. 208).

monarch's reign is examined by S. Müller in 'Philip II' (chapter 9). It was he who, in her words, 'managed to turn the peripheral, disunited, economically and militarily ruined Macedonia into the dominating political power of the Mediterranean world'. As demonstrated in the chapters of Sprawski and Roisman, Macedonia (or at least the part termed Lower Macedonia) prior to the reign of Philip was a country ostensibly unified under the rule of its Argead kings and was hardly more than a footnote in the history of the eastern Mediterranean. The great urban centers on the coast were all Greek colonies founded by the city-states in the south. It was Philip who turned this northern area of the Greek peninsula from a fragmented land of powerful aristocratic land owners and poverty-stricken serfs into a unified state, a nation, with cities and a large free population.<sup>11</sup> He created the institutions of the Macedonian royal court, perhaps in emulation of those of the Persian Empire (see M.J. Olbrycht, 'Macedonia and Persia', chapter 17), and it was he who transformed the Macedonian army from a force far inferior to the armies of the southern Greek city-states into the best fighting force in the western world. On the development of the army from the earliest kings through the last independent dynasty of Macedonia, the Antigonid, see N.V. Sekunda in 'The Macedonian Army' (chapter 22). Finally it was Philip who used this new Macedonia to make himself the master of most of the Greek peninsula. His legacy to Alexander was a unified and much expanded kingdom, the army and the nucleus of the officer *corps* with which Alexander conquered the East, and a federation of Greek states answering to first Philip's and subsequently Alexander's leadership.<sup>12</sup> The invasion of Persia had also been planned and its preliminaries carried out by Philip. Philip's assassination in 336 gave Alexander the opportunity to become the greatest conqueror down to his time.<sup>13</sup>

The Hellenistic kingdoms that arose out of Alexander's conquests are now increasingly seen as deriving from Macedonian traditions more than from those of the East, and in their organization certainly more than simply those of the more southern inhabitants of the Greek peninsula. With respect to the original kingdom of Macedonia, a debate rages over many aspects of the traditional Macedonian monarchy. These arguments are clearly set forth in C.J. King's 'Kingship and other Political Institutions' (chapter 18). While the debate continues, one element stands clear: the monarch was

<sup>11</sup> E.M. Anson, 'Philip II and the Transformation of Macedonia: A Reappraisal', in T. Howe and J. Reames (eds.), *Macedonian Legacies: Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza* (Claremont 2008), pp. 17–30.

<sup>12</sup> See W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London 1992), p. 3; E.M. Anson, 'Philip II – the Creation of the Pezhetairoi', in P. Wheatley and R. Hannah (eds.), *Alexander and His Successors* (Claremont 2009), pp. 88–98 with his 'The Hypaspists: Macedonia's Professional Citizen-Soldiers', *Historia* 34 (1985), pp. 246–8 and *Eumenes of Cardia: A Greek among Macedonians* (Leiden 2004), pp. 225–31.

<sup>13</sup> E.A. Fredricksmeyer, 'On the Final Aims of Philip II', in W.L. Adams and E.N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great, and the Macedonian Heritage* (Lanham 1982), pp. 85–98, believes that Philip planned to replace the Great King of the Persian Empire, deify himself, and establish an absolute monarchy over the lands of his conquest.

for all practical purposes an autocrat.<sup>14</sup> Even those who postulate limitations on the king's authority do not envision a true constitutional monarchy but rather see an elective kingship and the right of the army or people to judge cases of treason. The monarch's clearly unfettered authority included taxation, foreign policy, including making war and peace,<sup>15</sup> command of the armies,<sup>16</sup> control of most natural resources,<sup>17</sup> the ability to transfer populations within his kingdom without the consent of those inhabitants,<sup>18</sup> and the authority to create new cities.<sup>19</sup> Unlike in the Greek city-states, where religious officials were chosen from the population, in Macedonia, among a variety of distinctive features of this basically Greek religion, described by P. Christesen and S.C. Murray in 'Macedonian Religion' (chapter 21), the king served as the chief religious official. The kingdom itself in large part was regarded by the king as 'spear-won land' and as such subject to the desires of the conqueror or that individual's descendants.<sup>20</sup> Most importantly, all modern commentators are agreed that the Argead monarchy possessed a personal, as opposed to a bureaucratic, quality.<sup>21</sup> Prior to the Hellenistic Age the nobility as a class provided the king with his military commanders and administrators. Their relationship with the king was as his 'companions', the *hetairoi*, who regularly ate and drank with him in *symposia*, those aristocratic banquets so reminiscent of those found in Homer, and participated with him in royal hunts. As noted by Sawada, these were the venues in which regular interaction between the king and his companions would occur. For much of its history Macedonia was a land dominated by these aristocratic elites. One important result of this is examined by

<sup>14</sup> See Griffith in Hammond and Griffith, *History of Macedonia 2*, pp. 383–5; R.M. Errington, 'The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy', *Chiron* 8 (1978), pp. 77–133; E.M. Anson, 'Macedonia's Alleged Constitutionalism', *CJ* 80 (1985), pp. 303–16 and 'Macedonian Judicial Assemblies', *CP* 103 (2008), pp. 135–49; Borza, *Shadow of Olympus*, pp. 238–9.

<sup>15</sup> See Anson, 'Macedonia's Alleged Constitutionalism', p. 304.

<sup>16</sup> Borza, *Shadow of Olympus*, p. 238.

<sup>17</sup> See Borza, *Shadow of Olympus*, pp. 56–7, 238. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions 1*, pp. 431–5, argues that the king was only the trustee of the people's money. Even if this were technically true, there is no evidence of any regulatory body or a postulated 'assembly' overseeing or disciplining the king.

<sup>18</sup> J.R. Ellis, 'Population-transplants under Philip II', *Makedonika* 9 (1969), pp. 9–12.

<sup>19</sup> See Hammond, *History of Macedonia 1*, pp. 143, 173, 199–200, 204; Hammond and Griffith, *History of Macedonia 2*, pp. 652–7; A.B. West, *The History of the Chalcidic League* (repr. Chicago, 1973), pp. 131 n. 37, 134. Alexander the Great founded 70 cities according to Plutarch, *Moralia* 328e.

<sup>20</sup> See N.G.L. Hammond, 'The Continuity of Macedonian Institutions and the Macedonian Kingdoms of the Hellenistic Era', *Historia* 49 (2000), p. 158, and especially Anson, 'Philip II and the Transformation of Macedonia', pp. 17–30.

<sup>21</sup> W.L. Adams, 'Macedonian Kingship and the Right of Petition', *Ancient Macedonia 4* (Thessaloniki 1986), pp. 43–52; Borza, *Shadow of Olympus*, pp. 281–2. It is claimed by D. Kienast, *Phillip II. von Makedonien und das Reich der Achaimeniden* (Marburg 1973) and Fredricksmeier, 'Final Aims of Philip II', *passim*, that Philip II was moving Macedonia towards an autocracy modeled on that of the Persian Empire.

E. Carney in ‘Macedonian Women’ (chapter 20). For her, the importance of royal and elite society throughout the Argead period created a culture where ‘the role of both royal and elite women was more like that of royal women in Homeric epic and aristocratic women in the Archaic period’. During the later and more bureaucratic Antigonid dynasty, continues Carney, women were ‘far less prominent and politically active’.<sup>22</sup>

In the Hellenistic period the kingdoms in general were more bureaucratic, relying less on a noble class. While less bureaucratic than its counterparts in Asia and Egypt, the later Antigonid dynasty in Macedonia proper was still more so than its Argead predecessor. Even so it still maintained much of the personal nature of the Argead dynasty. In these more bureaucratic Hellenistic states in general, especially in Ptolemaic Egypt, there was more social mobility into this privileged class than what had been traditional in Argead Macedonia. The old aristocratic class had been thinned considerably by Alexander’s campaigns and those of his immediate successors. The new world created from Alexander’s conquests was too vast and complex to be administered by whatever remained of the old Macedonian nobility, and this was true even in the homeland. In Antigonid Macedonia much of the change was a direct result of the urbanization and growth of a middle class begun during the reign of Philip II. In Asia and Egypt, while initially there was an ethnic distinction made between the previous inhabitants of the Achaemenid Persian Empire and the new Greek and Macedonian settlers, over time and as a result of intermarriage, the distinction became one of language and culture (see S.R. Asirvatham, ‘Perspectives on the Macedonians from Greece, Rome, and Beyond’, chapter 6).

The evidence also shows that in their organization the cities of the Hellenistic Age owed much to the nature of Macedonian cities, especially those created or captured and transformed by Philip II, rather than to the classical Greek *polis* or those pre-existing communities of the Near East.<sup>23</sup> Certainly the new communities created by Alexander and his successors were not ‘free’ in the classical Greek sense of being autonomous and at least theoretically in charge of their own destinies. While classical Greek cities often became subject to the authority of some outside power, as in the heyday of the fifth-century Athenian Empire, they tended to remain fiercely independent. Most classical Greek cities guarded their citizenship vigorously.<sup>24</sup> Even though certain Greek states were forcibly absorbed by other *poleis*,<sup>25</sup> and a number of federations were created in which there was a local citizenship as well as a federal one,<sup>26</sup> city-states would seldom willingly

<sup>22</sup> See E.D. Carney, *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman 2000), pp. 199–201.

<sup>23</sup> R.M. Errington, ‘Recent Research on Ancient Macedonia’, *Analele Univ. Galați, s. Istorie* 1 (2002), pp. 9–21, available at [www.istorie.ugal.ro/ISTORIE/CERCETARE/ABALE/%20Errington\\_Macedonia.pdf](http://www.istorie.ugal.ro/ISTORIE/CERCETARE/ABALE/%20Errington_Macedonia.pdf), last accessed March 2010.

<sup>24</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, ‘The Macedonian Imprint on the Hellenistic World’, in P. Green (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1993), p. 23.

<sup>25</sup> For example, the Argives increased their population by eliminating the communities of Tiryns, Hysiae, Orneae, Mycenae, Mideia, along with other towns in Argolis and removing the people to Argos in 462 (Paus. 8.27.1).

<sup>26</sup> In general, see J.A.O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History* (Oxford 1968).

give up their independence totally.<sup>27</sup> The ancient Spartans once a year purged their population of 'foreigners' and the far more cosmopolitan Athenians instituted a citizenship law requiring that both parents be Athenian citizens for a child to be considered as such. However, 'the Macedonian *polis* [...] was a mixture of Macedonians and other peoples'.<sup>28</sup> Nor were the newly created cities of Asia and northeastern Africa the clones of those indigenous communities whose antiquity preceded Alexander. These were seen as tributary communities totally subject to the rulers or their representatives. Yet even here the king's relationship was often shaped by negotiation between the monarch and the local population.<sup>29</sup> This was a process that is in evidence in the epigraphical material from the reigns of Philip II, Alexander the Great, and their Hellenistic successors. As with the Macedonian cities prior to Alexander the Great,<sup>30</sup> the new Hellenistic foundations exhibited limited local autonomy under the ultimate authority of the monarch.<sup>31</sup>

Ancient Macedonia has significant political and cultural importance to this day. J. Agnew in a recent article, remarks on 'Macedonia's centrality to the making of Greece over the past century'.<sup>32</sup> As discussed by L. Danforth in 'Ancient Macedonia, Alexander the Great, and the Star or Sun of Vergina: National Symbols and the Conflict between Greece and the Republic of Macedonia' (chapter 27), the land historically called Macedonia became a contentious issue in the wake of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and this has been amplified in the last two decades of the twentieth century with the break-up of Yugoslavia in the 1990s. Out of this dissolution there emerged among a number of new political entities a new state, located across the border from the current Greek Region of Macedonia, and claiming at least a share of the legacy of ancient Macedonia, including the name 'Macedonia', the person of Alexander the Great, and the 'Star of Vergina', emblematic of Alexander's dynasty, as a national symbol. The new nation occupies part of the territory of what was in antiquity Upper Macedonia but

<sup>27</sup> Such an exception was the creation of Megalopolis. Here forty-one cities were abandoned and their populations incorporated into the new foundation (Paus. 8.27.2–4). Pausanias 8.27.2 states that this was possible because of the Arcadians' fear of the Spartans. Even here, however, three repented and were removed to Megalopolis by force; many of the residents of Trapezus left the Peloponnese entirely and settled in the area of the Black Sea in order to avoid incorporation; many other dissidents were massacred by other Arcadians (Paus. 8.7.5–6).

<sup>28</sup> Hammond, 'Macedonian Imprint on the Hellenistic World', p. 37.

<sup>29</sup> See J. Ma, *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford 2002), pp. 179–234; 'Kings', in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 2003), pp. 182–3; Errington, 'Recent Research on Ancient Macedonia', pp. 12–20.

<sup>30</sup> Errington, 'Recent Research on Ancient Macedonia', pp. 16–19, believes this relationship between city and monarch developed from the urbanization activities inaugurated by Philip II.

<sup>31</sup> R.A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1997), p. 197; Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions* 1, pp. 66–7, 69; Anson, *Eumenes of Cardia*, pp. 221–3; Ma, 'Kings', p. 192. Hatzopoulos and Ma assume that these negotiations reflect the constitutionality of the Macedonian state, but it in actuality reflects the earlier tradition of the non-bureaucratic nature of this monarchy.

<sup>32</sup> 'No Borders, No Nations: Making Greece in Macedonia', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97 (2007), p. 398.

mostly that of the ancient kingdom of Paeonia, which was conquered by Philip II but retained a separate status under Macedonian rule until fully annexed during the Antigonid dynasty and later became the separate Roman province of Dardania.<sup>33</sup> This new state called itself the Republic of Macedonia and was so recognized by many nations including the United States, but officially proclaimed in 1993 by the United Nations as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM). Of all the topics covered in this book, this is both the most controversial and certainly the most impassioned.

As Danforth relates, this new state has stirred the passions of its neighbor to the south, the Hellenic Republic, with the Greeks proclaiming their exclusive hold on the ancient Macedonian legacy: ‘Both Greek and Macedonian nationalisms are based on a discourse of racial and cultural continuity in which national identities existing in the present are legitimated by being projected far back in time to the glorious age of Alexander the Great and the ancient Macedonians’. These modern issues put the entire history of ancient Macedonia into a political arena not often encountered by historians of antiquity. However, this modern context in conjunction with its ancient one is very important for a general examination of the creation of national identities. It is commonly accepted today amongst anthropologists and historians that the ultimate basis of ethnicity is popular perception,<sup>34</sup> which typically owes much to historical circumstance.<sup>35</sup> Any examination of national identity demonstrates just how significant history is in this entire process. As one researcher has remarked, ‘the Nation can rarely (if at all) be conceived without ruins’.<sup>36</sup> Yet much of this history, as with the sense of belonging to an ethnicity or a nation itself, may indeed be imagined, built on popular perception but often with little real basis. It has even been stated by B. Anderson that all communities beyond the mere village are imagined.<sup>37</sup> Kinship, real or imagined, in the present is then seen as continuing from a past, which may likewise be actual or not, and, consequently, becomes a perceived national heritage.<sup>38</sup> Nationhood in that case is

<sup>33</sup> I.L. Merker, ‘The Ancient Kingdom of Paeonia’, *Balkan Studies* 6 (1965), pp. 43–4. For the location of Paeonia, see Strabo 7.5.1, 12 (‘it is situated north of Macedonia’), 9.5.1, Livy 45.9.7, 29.12.

<sup>34</sup> F. Barth, ‘Introduction’, in F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Boston 1969), pp. 10–15; R. Just, ‘Triumph of the Ethnos’, in E. Tonkin, M. McDonald and M. Chapman (eds.), *History and Ethnicity* (London 1989), pp. 74–5; T.H. Eriksen, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives* (Boulder 1993), pp. 20–2, 38; A.C. Renfrew, ‘From Here to Ethnicity, Review of J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*’, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 8 (1998), pp. 275–7.

<sup>35</sup> A.D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford 1986); J. Toland, ‘Dialogue of Self and Other: Ethnicity and the State Building Process’, in J. Toland (ed.), *Ethnicity and the State* (New Brunswick 1993), pp. 1–20; M. Banks, *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions* (London 1996).

<sup>36</sup> Y. Hamilakis, *The Nation and Its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece* (Oxford 2007), p. 301.

<sup>37</sup> *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London 2006), pp. 6–7.

<sup>38</sup> B. Williams, ‘Classification Systems Revisited: Kinship, Caste, Race, and Nationality as the Flow of Blood and the Spread of Rights’, in S. Yanagisako and C. Delaney (eds.), *Naturalizing*

embodied and materialized in this past, yet, it is never left in this past. In the Balkans, as noted by Danforth, modern nationalistic claims emphasize long-standing cultural heritages and specific cultural characteristics. For modern Greeks this has typically meant membership in the Greek Orthodox Church, fluency in the Greek language, and descent from the Greeks of antiquity. Similarly, for the Macedonian or FYROM community the definition is membership in the Macedonian Orthodox Church, competency in the Macedonian language,<sup>39</sup> and claimed descent from the ancient Macedonians.<sup>40</sup> Both groups, therefore, base their respective nationalisms on a racial and cultural continuity from the past to the present. Consequently, much of this modern conflict has developed over the nature of these ancient Macedonians. Were they part of ancient Greek civilization or a separate people with a distinct heritage? In many ways the current conversation involving the identity of the ancient Macedonians evokes Herodotus' definition of ethnicity as based on genetics, language, religious institutions and practices, and lifestyles (8.144.2; cf. 7.9b.2). While anthropologists and historians generally accept Fredrik Barth's thesis that ethnicity arises from and is maintained through an interplay between external ascription and individual self-identification,<sup>41</sup> much of the non-academic world views it from a Herodotean perspective of specific genetic and cultural markers. These are regarded by Barth as 'boundaries'<sup>42</sup> or 'trade-marks' according to Danforth and serve as the proclaimed attributes of the group.

The issue of ethnicity is then complicated by the various definitions applied by a broad range of interpreters from anthropologists to politicians. Both S.R. Asirvatham in 'Perspectives on the Macedonians from Greece, Rome, and Beyond' (chapter 6) and J. Engels in 'Greeks and Macedonians' (chapter 5) look at the issue of ancient Macedonian ethnicity but from slightly different perspectives. The former examines exclusively the literary evidence from a number of different sources, including Persian and Egyptian, and is concerned with the perception that the various groups have of one another. The latter looks at the full range of evidence, including archaeological and literary, seeking some sense of the true nature of Macedonian nationality as it relates to 'Greek' ethnicity, but concludes that 'Hellenic and Macedonian ethnic identity or ethnicity should be regarded as extremely complex and fluid social constructions which surely deserve further studies'. As noted earlier with regard to Asirvatham's chapter, and reinforced in that of Engels, the evidence is seldom 'Macedonian' in origin but mostly Athenian and Roman. Moreover, as set forth by Asirvatham, 'authors fit and refit the Macedonians into a pre-existing but flexible framework for Panhellenic

---

*Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis* (London 1995), p. 206; D.E. Sutton, 'Local Names, Foreign Claims: Family Inheritances and National Heritage on a Greek Island', *American Ethnologist* 24 (1997), pp. 415–16, 428–9.

<sup>39</sup> Modern 'Macedonian' is defined by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as a 'South Slavic language that is most closely related to Bulgarian and is written in the Cyrillic alphabet'.

<sup>40</sup> V. Roudometof, 'Nationalism and Identity Politics in the Balkans: Greece and the Macedonian Question', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 14 (1996), p. 254.

<sup>41</sup> 'Introduction', pp. 9–38.

<sup>42</sup> 'Introduction', p. 15.

identity, which was in turn (to different degrees with different authors) based on Hellenic genealogy and, more importantly, political/cultural ideals of Greekness’.

In antiquity Greeks, or Hellenes, as they called themselves, were most often seen as the descendants of those who had sent ships on the great Trojan expedition and been recorded in Homer’s catalogue of ships in the *Iliad* (2.494–759)<sup>43</sup> and/or as those descended from Hellen, a mythical ancestor.<sup>44</sup> In general, Greeks divided the world between themselves and the barbarians (that is, non Greeks).<sup>45</sup> Even the advanced peoples of western Asia were seen as barbarians. The ancient definition of Greek ethnicity, however, was not this simple.<sup>46</sup> Perhaps, the most ‘Greek’ of all the Greeks, the ancient Athenians, are reported by Herodotus as being originally Pelasgians, the supposed autochthonic inhabitants of the peninsula, who through the adoption of the Greek language and culture became ‘Hellenes’ (1.57.3, 58.1; cf. 7.161.3).<sup>47</sup> Clearly, while Herodotus 8.144.2 lists ‘kinship of all Greeks in blood’ as a part of ethnicity, he obviously accepted cultural aspects as more important.

Moreover, in antiquity, while in certain contexts the concept of a common Greek ethnicity was accepted, as with the acknowledged right for only ‘Greeks’ to participate in the Olympic Games, Greeks politically were organized in city-states or tribal affiliations, to which was owed primary allegiance. This narrower definition of ethnicity tied to city-states (*poleis*) or tribal bonds was much responsible for the interminable strife waged amongst the various Greek states and peoples against one another. The issue of ethnicity is still further complicated by the acknowledgment of ethnicities which were wider than the *polis* or tribal group but were less than Panhellenic. In this category were those designations of Aeolian, Ionian or Dorian, reflecting linguistic and perceived ancestral differences;<sup>48</sup> Euboean, Boeotian, Achaean, Arcadian and so on, indicating regional distinctions, but which likewise were seen as having genetic origins.

<sup>43</sup> Thucydides 1.3.4, 12.2 (cf. Hdt. 1.3.2) regards the Trojan War as the first ‘Hellenic enterprise’.

<sup>44</sup> Genealogical lists became common in the Archaic Age (800–479). These survive today in the so-called Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, dating from either the seventh or sixth century, and in *Library* of Pseudo-Apollodorus, a work of unknown authorship and a significantly later date (perhaps first or second century AD) chronicling Greek mythology: see M.L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure and Origins* (Oxford 1985), p. 45.

<sup>45</sup> See M.J. Olbrycht, ‘Macedonia and Persia’ (chapter 17). J. Engels in ‘Macedonians and Greeks’ (chapter 5) points out that the Persians referred to Macedonians and their southern neighbours as Ionians.

<sup>46</sup> It is even claimed that the Spartans made no distinction between Hellenic or ‘barbarian’ foreigners. All were regarded as aliens: see P. Cartledge, ‘Greeks and “Barbarians”’, in A.F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge 2007), p. 308.

<sup>47</sup> The Arcadians, whose Greek ethnicity is never questioned, are omitted from mythical descent from Hellen and are also seen as originally being Pelasgians: see T.H. Nielsen and J. Roy (eds.), *Defining Ancient Arkadia* (Copenhagen 1999), pp. 31–3.

<sup>48</sup> These dialectic designations were tied in the Greek view to different eponymous ancestors and histories: [Apollodorus] 1.7.3, Hdt. 1.143–53, 7.176.4, Thuc. 3.2.3, Paus. 3.1.6,

It is in this environment of complex ethnic distinctions that any attempt to define ancient 'Macedonian' ethnicity must be placed. Asirvatham describes the changing perception of Macedonians over the course of antiquity. While Aristotle (*Politics* 7.1324b) apparently listed the Macedonians among the barbarians, it is very clear from the earliest Hellenic sources that many 'Greeks' perceived the Macedonians as being some sort of hybrid, related to the Hellenes, but distinct. This is seen in the ancestral myth presented in *The Catalogue of Women* attributed in antiquity to Hesiod: 'The district Macedonia took its name from Macedon, the son of Zeus and Thyia, Deucalion's daughter, and she conceived and bore to Zeus who delights in the thunderbolt two sons, Magnes and Macedon, rejoicing in horses, who dwell round about Pieria and Olympus'.<sup>49</sup> The ancestor of the Macedonians is then the nephew of Hellen, the forebear of the Hellenes. By the end of the fifth century Hellanicus, the Greek logographer, makes Macedon the son of Aeolus, a son of Hellen and ancestor of the Aeolians, and hence in the family of Hellenes (*FGrH* 4 F 74). Hellanicus was apparently attempting to systematize all of the various genealogical myths. He must then have believed that the Macedonians were true Greeks.<sup>50</sup>

The evolving view of the ancient Macedonians as seen by the southern 'Greeks' is, therefore, instructive in any discussion of the development of ethnicities whether ancient or modern. Macedonians were not commonly seen as true Greeks before or during the reigns of Philip and Alexander. Throughout the Classical Age most 'Greeks' acknowledged a distinction between themselves and the Macedonians. When the Macedonian king Alexander I attempted to participate in the Olympic Games, the Greeks who were to run against him said that the contest was for Greeks and not for foreigners. Alexander convinced the *Hellenodikai*, the officials in charge, that he was descended from an Argive, and so was judged to be a Greek and competed in the foot race (Hdt. 5.22). Apparently as a Macedonian he would have been barred. As noted earlier, the Argive origin of the Macedonian royal house was generally recognized in the Classical period.<sup>51</sup>

However, this perceived distinction was not the dichotomy between Greeks and 'barbarians'. While Macedonians were not commonly viewed as Hellenes in the fifth and much of the fourth centuries, a distinction was also seen by most Greeks at that time between Macedonians and the so-called 'barbarians' including those 'barbaric' groups living within the Greek peninsula. Illyrians throughout antiquity were regarded

---

4.21.5, 30.1, 5.1.26, 4.9, 3.5-7, 7.1.4, 5-9, 2.1-4, 3.9, 8.5.1, 6, 10.8.4. Herodotus 1.56.2 refers to the Dorians and Ionians as *genoî*, or kinship groups.

<sup>49</sup> West, *Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, pp. 127-30, 169-71.

<sup>50</sup> See the comments of Hammond in Hammond and Griffith, *History of Macedonia* 2, p. 47.

<sup>51</sup> Herodotus 5.22, 8.137-9, Thucydides 2.99.3, 5.80.2, and Isocrates 5.32, 107, accept the Argive origin of the Macedonian royal house, probably reflecting general Greek acceptance as well. Demosthenes, however, is one possible negative voice (14.3). E.N. Borza, 'Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House', in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography. Presented to Eugene Vanderpool* (Princeton 1982), pp. 7-13, believes the Argive connection was a myth put forward by the Argead royal house. Yet, as noted earlier, the officials at Olympia accepted not only the Greekness of the Argead dynasty but also Alexander personally as a valid Greek, permitting his participation in the Olympic Games.

as barbarians,<sup>52</sup> as were the Paeonians<sup>53</sup> and most Thracians.<sup>54</sup> Thucydides on occasion (4.125.1, 127.2) appears to list the Macedonians separately from barbarians and Diodorus, perhaps following the fourth-century historian Ephorus, also distinguishes between Macedonians and barbarians (16.4.2, 5, 71–2). Demosthenes is clear, however, that, for him, Macedonians were barbarians (3.24, 9.31–32). Isocrates, another Athenian orator of the Classical Age, in his *To Philip* states: ‘I assert that it is incumbent upon you to work for the good of the Hellenes to reign as king over the Macedonians and to extend your power over the greatest possible number of the barbarians’ (5.154). Nor was this distinction between Greeks and Macedonians altered during the reigns of Philip and Alexander or through the period of the *Diadochoi*.<sup>55</sup> However, what is clear from the evidence is that this ambiguous ethnic relationship between the Macedonians and their southern neighbors was evolving over time.<sup>56</sup> Already by the fifth century Macedonia and the southern Greeks shared most of the same gods; the Greek alphabet and language were employed in Macedonia at least for written communication,<sup>57</sup> and likely for oral as well,<sup>58</sup> Macedonian cities possessed

<sup>52</sup> Thuc. 4.125.1, Diod. 12.30.3, 15.13.3, 14.1–2, 16.4.5; and see W.S. Greenwalt, ‘Macedonia, Illyria and Epirus’ (chapter 14).

<sup>53</sup> Hdt. 5.13.2, Homer, *Iliad* 5.342, Diod. 16.4.2. Pausanias 5.1.5, who wrote *A Description of Greece*, in the second century AD, however, claims that Paeon was the brother of Epeius and Aetolus, the respective founders of the Eleans and Aetolians, both Hellenic peoples. This notice from Pausanias may suggest that at least by the second century AD the Paeonians were seen as part of the Greek community. Merker, ‘Ancient Kingdom of Paeonia’, pp. 36–93, accepts the Paeonians as Hellenes.

<sup>54</sup> Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 168, *Birds* 199, Diod. 15.36.4, 16.71.2, and see W.S. Greenwalt, ‘Macedonia, Illyria and Epirus’ (chapter 14).

<sup>55</sup> 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 1996), pp. 122–31.

<sup>56</sup> A point emphasized by W.L. Adams, ‘Historical Perceptions of Greco-Macedonian Ethnicity in the Hellenistic Age’, *Balkan Studies* 37 (1996), pp. 205–22 and by J. Hall, ‘Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity’, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge 2001), pp. 159–86. Hall indeed, states ‘to ask whether the Macedonians “really were” Greek or not in antiquity is ultimately a redundant question given the shifting semantics of Greekness between the sixth and fourth centuries B.C. What cannot be denied, however, is that the cultural commodification of Hellenic identity that emerged in the fourth century might have remained a provincial artifact, confined to the Balkan peninsula, had it not been for the Macedonians’ (p. 172).

<sup>57</sup> Of the roughly 6,300 inscriptions recovered within the confines of ancient Macedonia, approximately 99 per cent were written in Greek: A. Panayotou, ‘The Position of the Macedonian Dialect’, in A.-F. Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge 2007), p. 436. As K. Dahmen in ‘The Numismatic Evidence’ (chapter 3) notes, the legends on all currently discovered Macedonian coins are in Greek.

<sup>58</sup> The evidence suggests that the language spoken by most Macedonians was a dialect of Greek and had been for centuries: E. Voutiras, ‘Revue des études grecques: À propos d’une tablette de malédiction de Pella’, *REG* 109 (1996), pp. 678–82; O. Masson, ‘Macedonian Language’,

theaters and other architectural and cultural attributes of their southern neighbors and Macedonian art, in the words of C.I. Hardiman in ‘Classical Art to 221 BC’ (chapter 24) ‘was part of the general artistic *koinai* of the age’. Indeed, Hardiman states that ‘the beginnings of Macedonia as a locus of Hellenic art and as a disseminator of this art may be the most “Macedonian” element of its “classical” period’. Macedonians had also established their own national ‘games’ clearly modeled after those of Olympia.<sup>59</sup> Macedonian coinage from its beginnings depicted gods common to the southern Greeks.<sup>60</sup> D. Graninger, in ‘Macedonia and Thessaly’ (chapter 15), points out that ‘there were religious traditions common to both greater Thessaly and Macedonia’. However, P. Christesen and S.C. Murray in ‘Macedonian Religion’ (chapter 21), while emphasizing the general Greek context of Macedonian religion, also point to aspects that set it apart. Among these were the existence of certain deities peculiar to Macedonia, the expenditure of resources by the elite on the construction of tombs rather than on temples, and the position of the king in Macedonian religious life. Yet despite sharing a common host of deities all of the city-states and tribal groups also exhibited their own local variations.<sup>61</sup>

By the second century the literary evidence suggests that the Macedonians and their southern neighbors saw themselves and each other as Greeks.<sup>62</sup> Polybius in particular regularly associates Macedonians and Greeks as the same ethnicity.<sup>63</sup> This is also the evidence of the Olympic Games. Following Alexander I, the only Macedonian participants down to the reign of Alexander the Great were royal.<sup>64</sup> Philip II is the

---

*Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>3</sup> (Oxford 1996), pp. 905–6. The names of the Macedonian months and the majority of Macedonian towns are Greek in form and even the origin of the word ‘Macedonian’ probably derives from the Greek word for highlander: see J. Engels, ‘Macedonians and Greeks’ (chapter 5) with E.M. Anson, ‘The Meaning of the Term Macedones’, *Anc. World* 10 (1984), pp. 67–8.

<sup>59</sup> On this last aspect, see W.L. Adams, ‘Sport and Ethnicity in Ancient Macedonia’, in T. Howe and J. Reames (eds.), *Macedonian Legacies: Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza* (Claremont 2008), pp. 57–78.

<sup>60</sup> These include Heracles, Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Poseidon, and Zeus: see K. Dahmen, ‘The Numismatic Evidence’ (chapter 3) and M.J. Price, *Coins of the Macedonians* (London 1974).

<sup>61</sup> See J.D. Mikalson, *Ancient Greek Religion* (Oxford 2005), pp. 160–4.

<sup>62</sup> See Adams, ‘Sport and Ethnicity’, pp. 220–2; F.W. Walbank, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: Essays and Reflections* (Cambridge 2002), p. 98.

<sup>63</sup> Polyb. 5.104.1, 7.9.3, 5, 7, 9.37.7, 38.3.8; cf. Livy 31.29.15, Strabo 10.2.23. Asians were still regarded as barbarians (Polyb. 10.30.2, 31.2, 48.8), as were Gauls (Polyb. 9.30.3, 35.1, 2) and Romans (Polyb. 11.5.7, 18.22.8; cf. Livy 31.29.15).

<sup>64</sup> Solinus 9.16 records that Archelaus competed at Olympia and also at Delphi. He is listed as the winner of the tethrippon in 408: see L. Moretti, *Olympionikai, i vincitori negli antichi agoni Olimpici, Memorie* (Rome 1957), pp. 110–11, no. 349, however his participation is rejected by E. Badian, ‘Greeks and Macedonians’, in B. Barr-Sharrar and E.N. Borza (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington, 1982), pp. 35, 46 n. 16 and Borza, *Shadow of Olympus*, p. 174, but accepted by Hammond and Griffith, *History of Macedonia* 2, p. 150.

recorded winner of three Olympic competitions, the horse race in 356, the four-horse chariot race in 352, and the two-horse chariot race in 348. But in 328 Kliton, the winner of the foot race, is listed as from Macedonia, as is Lampos, the winner of the four-horse chariot race in 304, and five other non-royal Macedonians are recorded as victors in the third century.<sup>65</sup> Later, Greeks living in the Roman Empire, like Plutarch, accepted the Greekness of the Macedonians.<sup>66</sup>

Were the ancient Macedonians, then, basically Greek, but because of their pastoral and monarchical traditions were rejected during the Classical Age as such by most inhabitants of the city-states?<sup>67</sup> If this is the case, then the process by which the non-royal population of Macedonia was assimilated into the Greek family of peoples becomes easier to understand. The Macedonians, after all, when they emerge onto the world stage share so much with the southern Greek world. Moreover, beginning with Philip II, urban growth, which had been minimal before his reign, expanded and this expansion continued during the subsequent Antigonid dynasty.<sup>68</sup> Noted distinctions between ancient Greeks and Macedonians in the Classical Age do tend to emphasize the latter's political organization but there is far more variety politically among the 'Greeks', so much more than just *poleis*. The Phocians were a federation of small and medium communities<sup>69</sup> as were the Aetolians.<sup>70</sup> Even though Macedonia was a land of much diversity, with its population including a mixture of peoples ranging from southern Greek immigrants to those from the neighboring regions of Thrace and Illyria, among others, the evidence suggests that this region was certainly part of the Greek cultural milieu in the fifth century and, by the end of the fourth century, was recognized as such by the inhabitants of the southern regions of the peninsula.

While, as Danforth explains, 'regardless of whether the ancient Macedonians "were Greek" or not, collective identities change over time, and names used for cultural groups two thousand years ago do not constitute a legitimate basis for resolving contemporary ethnic and national disputes', certain conclusions can be reached with respect to the ancient Macedonians. What appears clear from the currently available

<sup>65</sup> See Moretti, *Olympionikai*, pp. 127 no. 463, 132 no. 498, 134 no. 527, 135 no. 533, 136 nos. 543 and 549, 137 no. 552.

<sup>66</sup> Of course Plutarch still accepted the dichotomy between Greeks and 'barbarians' as seen in his *Parallel Lives* and in his criticism of Herodotus for being 'too fond of barbarians' (*Moralia* 857a). The first-century AD geographer Strabo at 10.2.23 associates the Macedonians with the 'Greeks'.

<sup>67</sup> See Anson, *Eumenes of Cardia*, pp. 202–14.

<sup>68</sup> See the inventory in M.B. Hatzopoulos and P. Paschidis, 'Makedonika', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford 2005), pp. 794–806.

<sup>69</sup> J. McInerney, *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis* (Austin 1999), pp. 186–7.

<sup>70</sup> The Aetolians have been described as 'the best example known of a Greek tribal state' by Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, p. 78. While Pausanias 5.1.3 relates a tradition that puts the Aetolians outside of the Hellenic line, he further relates that 'others with greater probability' traced their lineage directly to Hellen (5.1.4). The Aetolians are recorded in Homer's *Iliad* as having sent forty ships to Troy (2.638–44).

evidence is that (1) Macedonia was clearly part of a broader Greek cultural world at least by the fifth century, (2) whatever may be meant by the stray allusions to spoken ‘Macedonian’<sup>71</sup> all surviving epigraphical evidence from grave markers to public inscriptions is in Greek, and (3) while the literary evidence into the fourth century suggests that the Greeks did not accept the Macedonians as brothers and there is virtually no evidence to garner the views of non-royal Macedonians, the Argead royal family, including both Philip II and Alexander III, believed themselves to be Greek and were accepted as such by most of the Greek world. But the discussion of the ‘Macedonian Question’, both ancient and modern, provides insights into the very nature of ethnicity and, perhaps more importantly, its functioning on a practical level among politicians and the populations they represent.

<sup>71</sup> References to ‘Macedonian speech’: Curt. 6.9.36, *PSI* 12.1284. Plut., *Alexander* 51.11, *Eumenes* 14.5, *Antony* 27.4. While Herodotus routinely refers to ‘Greek speech’ he is nonetheless cognizant of the many variations in the Greek language during the fifth century, and while Plato has Socrates speak of ‘Greek speech’ (*Crates* 409e, 410a) he also acknowledges that Greeks differed in their speech (*Crates* 385e). Our sources routinely refer to ‘Boeotian speech’ (Xen., *Anabasis* 3.1.26, Arr. 6.13.5, Paus. 9.34.2.), ‘Laconian speech’ (Plut., *Pyrrhus* 26.11), ‘Aeolian speech’ (Paus. 9.22.3), ‘Chalcidian speech’ (Thuc. 6.5.1), ‘Phocian speech’ (Aeschylus, *Supplices* 563–4), ‘Arcadian speech’ (Paus. 8.23), and ‘Attic speech’ (Hdt. 6.138.2, Xen., *Memorabilia* 3.14.7), etc.