Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos
Ancient Macedonia

Trends in Classics – Key Perspectives on Classical Research

Volume 1

Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos

Ancient Macedonia

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-071864-5
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-071868-3
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-071876-8
ISSN 2626-1030

Library of Congress Control Number: 2020946505

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Cover image: Domenico Spinosa, Fondo Marino, courtesy of Nicola Spinosa
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Preface

Two years ago the editors of the new De Gruyter series *Key Perspectives on Classical Research* kindly invited me to contribute to it by writing a volume which would provide a critical reappraisal of research on the kingdom of Macedon conducted in recent decades and even further back. After a number of epistolary exchanges with Patrick Finglass, Simon Malloch and Christos Tsagalis, the tutelary 'triad' of the series, it was decided that my brief would consist in "an in-depth critical presentation of a selected number of topics especially prominent" in the field of Macedonian studies. I proposed *exempli gratia* (and rather pell mell) "the language or dialect, the political institutions, the assassination of Philip II, the causes of the Third Macedonian War etc.", all subjects which had interested me recently.

On second thoughts, it seemed to me that the selected subjects should be topical enough, so as to interest a public beyond the narrow circle of experts, and at the same time methodically presented, so as to ease the wandering of the reader through the labyrinth of Macedonian scholarship. Consequently, the volume was structured on three main axes (parts II, III and IV) devoted respectively to the land, the people and to a couple of prominent Macedonian personalities who have changed the course of world history. These are preceded by an introduction explaining the significance of the ancient Macedonian kingdom and are followed by an 'envoi' intended both as a warning against the unreliability of even one of our best ancient sources and as an assessment of the way travelled through in the volume.

From the previous paragraph it follows that the present book does not include an array of subjects. It is not an annotated bibliography, such as an entry from *Oxford Bibliographies Online*.[1] Nor is it a history of Macedonia. Anyone who wishes to discover the events that raised a small principality on the northern marches of Greece to world power has a number of choices, from the short but convenient *A History of Macedonia* by R. Malcolm Errington (1990) to the three-volume monumental *History of Macedonia* by N. G. L. Hammond in collaboration with G. T. Griffith and F. W. Walbank (1972–1988). It is even less a "Companion" volume, such as the excellent *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650B.C–300 AD* edited by Robin Lane Fox (2011), or the Blackwell *Companion to Ancient Macedonia* edited by Joseph

1 For a bibliographical guide see Andrianou/Hatzopoulos 2011. For an overview, see Hatzopoulos 1981; Hatzopoulos 1990; Hatzopoulos 2011c. Cf. Molina Marin 2015.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110718683-202

Roisman and Ian Worthington (2010), since it does not aim at covering all aspects of Macedonian history, archaeology and culture in antiquity. Readers particularly interested in Macedonian archaeology can also consult with great profit the sumptuous publication of the Louvre Museum *Au royaume d'Alexandre le Grand. La Macédoine antique* (Paris 2011).

Nevertheless, the present volume does have a historical frame, since its timespan extends from the seventh century to the end of Macedonian independence in 168, and it concerns equally the archaic, the classical and the Hellenistic periods, each of which is represented in proportion to the available sources. Some chapters in parts II and III inevitably follow a chronological order and may seem to favour the earlier stages of the formation of the kingdom and of its institutions, because the refoundation of the state took place in the reign of Philip II. However, the source material used in these parts for defining, for instance, the 'national' territory, the royal land and the allied cities of Macedonia or for describing the tongue and the the political and social institutions of the Macedonians comes at least as much from the Hellenistic period, while the first chapter of part IV concerns this same period exclusively.

Conversely, the Roman period has not been included in this volume, for after 168 the erstwhile sovereign kingdom of the Macedonians was no more. It had been reduced first to a protectorate and then to a mere province of the globalised Roman Empire. By losing its autonomy, it also lost its originality. Its main institutions – King, Companions, Assembly – were suppressed. There were still shepherds, shopkeepers, even a new class of landowners, but the old aristocracy had been exterminated on the battlefield and by mass deportation. As a subject of research, Roman Macedonia is no less interesting than any other Roman province, but it appeals to a different, Roman-oriented, public.

There remains the pleasant duty of thanking all those who contributed to the preparation of the present book. First to Patrick Finglass, Simon Malloch and particularly Christos Tsagalis, who offered me the opportunity to write and to publish it in the new De Gruyter series. Then, to my Academy colleague Antonios Rengakos, who encouraged me to accept this offer; to my friend and colleague at KERA Paschalis Paschidis, with whom I have engaged for years in an unending dialogue on all matters Macedonian; to my epigraphist colleagues Klaus Hallof and Demetrios Bosnakis, who kindly communicated to me the new and unpublished Macedonian decrees from Kos; to my German colleague Sabine Müller, who generously sent me her recent book on Perdikkas II; to my Italian colleague Monica D'Agostini, who did the same with the her equally recent monograph on the early years of Philip V; to our librarian and dear colleague at KERA Sophia Saroglidou, who never failed to provide me with information on the publications

I was after; to my boyhood friend Thanos Veremis, who improved this preface, to my archaeologist colleagues Chrysoula Paliadeli, Angeliki Kottaridou, I. Graekos and Elizabeth Tsigarida, to whose generosity I owe the illustrations of this edition; and last but not least to Véronique Hautefeuille, without whose understanding and unconditional support the present book would not have been written.

Contents

Note on transliterations

Unfortunately, there are no generally accepted rules for rendering Greek proper names (ancient and modern) into English. The rules of transliteration followed in the present volume are the following:

1. Names of ancient authors retain their traditional latinised form (Thucydides, not Thoukydides).
2. All other ancient proper names, with the exception of a few which have become part of English vocabulary (e.g. Athens, Corinth, Delphi, Alexander the Great, Philip II) are transliterated into Latin script with each letter retaining its conventional Greek phonetic value (Kassandros, not Cassander; Philippoi, not Philippi; Kalindoia, not Calindoea).
3. Modern Greek place names inherited from antiquity or coined from elements of the ancient vocabulary retain their ancient form, even if the pronounciation has changed (Beroia, not Veria; Thessalonike, not Thessaloniki; Kleidi, not Klidi).
4. Other modern names are rendered phonetically. This category also includes ancient names given to modern settlements, although these do not correspond geographically to the homonymous ancient ones. In such cases they figure between inverted commas. Thus 'Thermi' (previously Sedes, not to be confused with ancient Therme), 'Sindos' (previously Tekeli, not to be confused with ancient Sindos), etc.
5. In citations the original spelling of the publication is maintained.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110718683-204

List of Figures

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110718683-205

1 Introduction: Why does ancient Macedonia matter?

The name of Macedonia inescapably evokes that of Alexander. But the empire he founded disintegrated centuries ago, and the sands of Egypt have effaced even the traces of his last abode. Adepts of political correctness can freely question his achievements and line him up along with Genghis Khan and Timur Lenk as one the major scourges of humanity. It is perhaps another passing fashion, no less than the uncritical admiration Alexander enjoyed in the colonialist era. But does Alexander exhaust by himself the contribution of Macedon to world history? In fact, Alexander was but the brilliant propagator of a Macedonian heritage which dated from before his birth and survived long after his death.

The mountain chains of Pindos and of its southern ramifications, from Lake Ochrid and the twin Prespa lakes down to the Corinthian Gulf, cut the Greek peninsula in two: in the east, along the Aegean coast, a Greece of *polis*-states, in the west a Greece of *ethnos*-states. For Thucydides (1.5.3–1.6.2) genuine Greece did not extend beyond Delphi. Westwards and northwards the Ozolian Lokroi, Aitolians, Akarnanians and even more so the Epirotes and the other peoples (in Greek *ethne*) of Upper Macedonia (Lynkestai, Orestai, Elimiotai), even if they were not authentic barbarians, "lived like barbarians" (Thuc. 1.6.1). Thucydides meant that they did not live in walled urban centres which dominated the surrounding countryside and concentrated the main economic and social activities, and practically all the functions of the state, but in unfortified villages of equal status disseminated over extensive territories and having as a single point of reference a common sanctuary, such as Thermos in Aitolia, Dodona in Epirus or Itonos in Thessaly. The survival of kingship in some of these *ethnos*-states constituted for the Athenians of the classical period an aggravating factor, which (if politically expedient) could be used as a criterion for excluding them from the Hellenic community, although they shared with the other Greeks the same language and the same religion.

The Macedonian kingdom under the Temenid dynasty formed a particular case. The central Macedonian plain faced the Aegean sea. In the fifth century Pella, Beroia, Aigeai and Europos were already urban centres. Nevertheless, even for a pro-Macedonian such as Isocrates, who made a clear distinction between Macedonians and barbarians, these elements did not suffice to make him accept the Macedonians as authentic Greeks, because of their monarchical regime.

The Macedonian state was founded by the Argeads, one of the numerous *ethne* or "clans" hailing from the western mountain chains, who conquered

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110718683-001

"coastal Macedonia" and settled on the land. In spite of the urban centres they found there, annexed and further developed, they retained from their past the institution of kingship and the primary centrality not only of the royal residences of Aigeai and later Pella, but also of a common sanctuary: that of Zeus at Dion. There, every October, representatives of local communities and ordinary citizens gathered to offer sacrifices, celebrate contests, and take counsel together about the common weal.

The originality of the Macedonian kingdom consists in this combination of archaism and modernity, in the appetite of the Macedonian élites for the latest intellectual quests and cultural creations, and also in the parallel conservation of the values of an epic past. No wonder that this heady mixture exerts an irresistible attraction to those who study it.

The Macedonian sovereigns imported poets, historians, philosophers, architects and painters from Athens and other city-states renowned as centres of letters and arts, though not to copy them passively. They favoured the appearance of new artistic and intellectual schools and of particular genres which corresponded to local conditions and mentalities. The combination of architectural orders, the emancipation of decoration from structure in monumental buildings, the use of stucco as a complement to masonry and illusionist painting – all these were first developed in Macedonia before being disseminated across the Hellenistic world and later copied by Rome. The same is true of vaulted tombs with monumental façades, which we call "Macedonian", of the large and sumptuous honorary *tholoi* (rotundas) and, of course, of the royal palaces. Even the *koine*, the Greek "common tongue", which spread across the ancient world as an international language and which is the direct ancestor of Modern Greek, had its cradle in Macedonia, where Philip II (or perhaps Archelaos) adopted Attic Greek, instead of the Macedonian dialect, for the purposes of administration. The vehicle of Buddhism at the gates of India, it later became the language through which Christian religion was propagated in the Mediterranean. It survives today as the liturgical language of the Greek Orthodox Church.

These facts have been known for some time and today tend to be generally acknowledged. What has not been yet fully realised is that the kingdom of Macedonia was the harbinger of modern European monarchies, whose direct heirs are modern democracies, be they formally kingdoms or republics, in which an elected prime minister or president wields more power than any king of the past. The combination of a strong executive authority embodied in the king assisted by his Companions/Friends, who formed his Privy Council and General Staff, with extensive local autonomy for the numerous cities of the realm assured an equilibrium between centre and periphery. In effect, each city had its own citizenship,

its own legislation, its own assembly and council, its own magistrates. The cities interacted with the central authorities through the *epistatai*, the chief magistrates of each city, but also thanks to the continuous renewal of court aristocracy by local magistrates and army officers of the local levy who distinguished themselves.

The foremost cohesive element of the Macedonian people was the army, which fell under the direct authority of the king. It comprised both professional units and numerous and well-trained reserves thanks to the institutions of the gymnasium and the *ephebeia*, a two-year training for youths aged between eighteen and twenty years. This unique political system, which was no less inventive than that of the Athenian democracy, was abolished by the Romans, who, however, ended up adopting many elements of Hellenistic kingship. These elements, were reintroduced into Western European states by jurists of the later Middle-Ages, and greatly influenced the evolution of modern monarchies, whose heirs are our contemporary democracies, that combine extensive territories peopled by citizens possessing a vigorous national identity, a strong central government and more or less wide local autonomy, though that autonomy is generally less extensive than in ancient Macedonia. Thus, it would not be out of place to submit that the ancient Greeks not only invented democracy, symbolised by the Parthenon, but also the modern national state embodied in the 'democratic' royal palace of Aigeai, with its porticoes wide open to the public.

2 The Land: Where was Macedonia?

"Macedonia was an historical-geographical term based upon confused historical memories and devoid of geographical significance … Disappearing at the time of the Turkish conquest (the Turks spoke only of Rumeli) the term was resurrected during the classical revival only to be variously used and later to be deliberately misappropriated", wrote a British modern historian half a century ago.[1] Until very recently if somebody entered the word "Macedonia" into an internet search engine, the first item that would appear would be the Wikipedia article "Republic of Macedonia", with the following commentary: "The Republic of Macedonia geographically roughly corresponds to the ancient kingdom of Paeonia, which was located immediately north of the ancient Kingdom of Macedonia. Paeonia was inhabited by the Paeonians, a Thracian people, whilst the northwest was inhabited by the Dardani and the southwest by tribes known historically as the Enchelae, Pelagones and Lyncestae; the latter two are generally regarded as Molossian tribes of the northwestern Greek group". The second item was another Wikipedia article: "Macedonia-Wikipedia", itself subdivided into nine articles: 1) Republic of Macedonia, a country in southeastern Europe; 2) Macedonia (Greece), a traditional geographic region, spanning three administrative divisions of northern Greece; 3) Macedonia (region), a region covering all of the above, as well as parts of Bulgaria, Albania, Kosovo and Serbia; 4) Macedonia (ancient kingdom), also known as Macedon, the kingdom that became Alexander the Great's empire; 5) Macedonia (Roman province), a province of the early Roman Empire; 6) Diocese of Macedonia, a late Roman administrative unit; 7) Macedonia (theme), a province of the Byzantine Empire; 8) Independent State of Macedonia, a proposed puppet state of the Axis powers (1944); 9) Socialist Republic of Macedonia, a part of the former Yugoslavia (1944–1991), predecessor of the Republic of Macedonia. In these articles the reader could follow the protean significance of the geographical term from a small kingdom on the shores of the Thermaic Gulf in the sixth century to Greater Macedonia under Philip II and his successors until 167, to the Roman province established in 146, which constantly changed boundaries during the Republic and the Early Empire, to its division between *Macedonia Prima* (or Macedonia tout court corresponding roughly to the Greek province of Macedonia) and *Macedonia Secunda* or *Salutaris* (territorially corresponding roughly to present-day North-Macedonia) in the late fourth century, to the creation of the Diocese of Macedonia under Constantine the Great, regrouping several

1 Dakin 1966?, 3, n. 4.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110718683-002

Balkan provinces of the Roman Empire, to the Byzantine theme of Macedonia situated outside Macedonia in Western Thrace, to the modern Greek province of Macedonia, to the short-lived puppet state created by the Germans in 1944, to the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, which succeeded it in the same year and finally became the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In 1991 this federated state seceded from Yugoslavia and declared its independence dropping the "Yugoslav" part of its name. Situated almost completely outside the borders of the ancient kingdom of that name, it was admitted to the United Nations under the provisional name of Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or FYROM. North-Macedonia, the new official name of this entity, is now added to the list of Macedonian metamorphoses.

How did such a paradoxical result come about? The answer is to be sought in the third of the above-mentioned articles, Macedonia as a geographical region including, in addition to the Greek province of Macedonia and to North-Macedonia, parts of Bulgaria, Albania, Serbia and even Kosovo.

By the end of the eighth century, when the theme of Macedonia was created in Thrace, the term had lost all connexion with the ancient kingdom, due to successive Roman administrative reforms, though memories of it continued to linger.[2] The Ottoman conquest emptied it of all practical relevance. When early modern geographers rediscovered the works of Strabo and Claudius Ptolemy, and started introducing ancient geographical terms into their maps, they did so with the loosest approximation. See, for instance, the maps of Ortelius (1570), Mercator (1598), Mariette (1645), Blaeu (1650), De Wit (1680), Nolin (1699) and Homann (1740).[3]

A new era began with the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, which opened the Ottoman Empire to European political and scientific scrutiny. The ensuing progress of cartography coincided with parallel territorial losses by Turkey. Thus, after the Treaty of Berlin (1878), Ottoman possessions in the Balkans had shrunk to six "vilayets" (provinces): Adrinople, Shkodra, Iannina, Skopje, Monastir and Salonica. The latter three had been lately included in the enlarged state of Bulgaria by the stillborn Treaty of San Stefano (1878), and remained a hotbed of Bulgarian irredentism. For practical reasons European diplomacy arbitrarily regrouped them under the name "Macedonia" reserving (on sounder historical

2 A twelfth century byzantine text (*Timarion*) uses the term "Old Macedonia" (παλαιὰ Μακεδονία) to differentiate the area of the ancient kingdom from the homonymous theme. See Τιμαρίων ἢ περὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν παθημάτων, in Ellisen 1860, 3.

3 Colocotronis 1919, pl. VIII–XIII.

grounds) the name "Thrace" for the vilayet of Adrinople. Although this nomenclature (especially concerning the three 'Macedonian' vilayets) did not correspond to any administrative, historical or natural entity, it was readily adopted by diplomats and geographers alike, and thus the territorial settlement of the Balkan Wars (1912–13) was presented as a partition of an unimpaired Macedonia, which in fact had never existed within such frontiers, into several parts, but mainly three: Aegean Macedonia, Vardar Macedonia and Pirin Macedonia, annexed respectively by Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria.

Other factors contributed to and simultaneously aggravated the confusion regarding the configuration of Macedonia.[4] First, no ancient work comparable to Pausanias' *Description of Greece* that includes Macedonia within its scope (instead of stopping at Ozolian Lokris as Pausanias does) had survived from antiquity. Due to additional ill-luck the seventh book of Strabo's *Geography*, with the description of Macedonia, has come down to us in a fragmentary state. Modern geographers working with literary sources had to make do only with lists of place names, mostly names of cities, found in the works of Pliny, Claudius Ptolemy, Hierocles, in Roman itineraries and in late lexica. Secondly, Macedonia occupied the northernmost part of the (ancient and modern) Greek world, and due to its location was most exposed to all sorts of invasions and demographic upheavals, which resulted in frequent change of place names. Thus, to mention a couple of instances, besides Mount Olympos and the city of Beroia, which clung to their antique names, or Thessalonike (Θεσσαλονίκη), which during the Middle-Ages merely lost its first syllable (Σαλονίκη) in the popular idiom,[5] Pella became Hagioi Apostoloi, and Edessa took the Slavic name of Vodena (Βοδενά) in the Middle Ages, retaining its ancient name only in ecclesiastic terminology. Unfortunately, the cases in which the ancient place names were retained or in which their memory persisted were the exception. When Renaissance and early modern scholars became interested in putting on the map place names that they read in ancient authors or in identifying ancient remains that they encountered on their

4 For what follows, see Hatzopoulos 2006a, 19–33. The two fundamental works on the historical geography of Macedonia are Hammond 1972 and Papazoglou 1988b. For Chalkidike in particular, Zahrnt 1971 remains indispensable.

5 The city was founded by Kassandros, who named it Θεσσαλονίκεια in honour of his wife Θεσσαλονίκη. However, the simplified form Θεσσαλονίκη soon prevailed. During the Middle-Ages the name of the city was further reduced to Σαλονίκη in popular parlance, various adaptations of which were adopted by Western European and Slavic languages (and in Turkish). Nevertheless, the ancient name continued to be used by educated people, and Θεσσαλονίκη has become again the current name of the city.

journeys, they could only propose unverifiable hypotheses, unless their texts provided clear topographical indications. A case in point is the controversy over the two royal capitals of Macedonia.

Hellenistic Pella was destroyed by an earthquake in the first years of the first century B.C.[6] A Roman colony was founded by Brutus or Caesar and then by Augustus under the name of *Colonia Iulia Augusta Pella*. At the time of Dio Chrysostom (first-second century A.D.), Pella (presumably the Hellenistic city) lay in ruins. After further damage sustained during the Gothic raids of the late third century A.D. the city was restored by Diocletian and for a brief period was renamed Diocletianopolis after him. It is last mentioned in a historical narrative in connexion with the presence of Theodoric's Ostrogoths in Macedonia in A.D. 482, and as a contemporary city of *Macedonia Prima* in the sixth-century work *Synekdemos* attributed to Hierocles. A place called Βασιλικὰ Ἀμύντου by Procopius may correspond to the site of Hellenistic Pella, where the remains of a small Early Christian settlement have been discovered. The city was finally destroyed and its site abandoned during the Slav invasions. Its name reappears six centuries later in the title of the bishops Σ(θ)λανίτζης ἤτοι Πέλλης, whose See was probably situated in the town that would be given the name Yenidjé Vardar (Yannitsa in Greek) after the Ottoman conquest. In modern times the first attempt at identifying the site of ancient Pella was made by the eighteenth-century Greek scholar Meletios, who hesitated between Yannitsa and a place "called today *ta Palatia*" ("The Palaces"). Less than a century later, Pouqueville identified this site, which he calls Palatitzia, with the village Allah Kilissa. In these same years three other travellers, Beaujour, Cousinéry and Leake, confirmed the identification with the same village (variously spelled), the Greek name of which was Hagioi Apostoloi, adding the information that two kilometres to the west a source retained the name of Pella (Πέλλα in Greek, Pel in 'Bulgarian'). So where was ancient Pella, at Yannitsa, at Hagioi Apostoloi or at a site by the source of that name? Although the distances transmitted by the Roman Itineraries favoured the location of Pella on the site by the source, nineteenth-century travellers unanimously chose the one by Hagioi Apostoloi, because they were impressed by its resemblance to the description of Pella in Livy (44.46.4–11, after Polybius). However, they could offer no valid explanation for the transfer of the place name to the source or to Yannitsa nor could they justify the variety of names under which the site was known. It took the systematic excavations of G. Oikonomos in 1914–15, resumed by Ch. Makaronas and Ph. Petsas in the 1950s, to solve the puzzle. The archaeological

6 On the identification, history, topography and archaeological research of Pella, see now *EKM II* p. 601–636.

discoveries made clear that the capital of the Macedonian kings from Amyntas III to Perseus was at the village of Hagioi Apostoloi (consequently renamed "Palaia Pella"), while the Roman colony was at the site near the homonymous source and the modern village of Nea Pella[7]. Thanks to subsequent excavations epigraphic evidence is now amply available, vindicating the choice of the nineteenth- century travellers and the resumption of the glorious name of the royal capital by the deme of Hagioi Apostoloi.

The question of the location of Aigeai, the first capital and according to Diodorus (22.12.1) the "hearth" (ἑστία) of the Macedonian kingdom, is both more complicated and fraught with political implications[8]. Until the 1960s all specialists, with the exception of the nineteenth-century German scholar Th. L. Fr. Tafel, agreed that before its conquest by Karanos (founder of the Temenid dynasty), Aigeai was called Edessa, which they identified with ancient Edessa, the mediaeval Vodena. This conviction was based on evidence from the works of Euphorion of Chalkis, a poet from the third century, and of Justin, a Roman historian who wrote an *Epitome* of the *Historiae Philippicae* by Pompeius Trogus, a first-century Latin historian of Gallic extraction. Against this established opinion that Aigeai and Edessa were one and the same city or two parts of the same city Tafel made the following objections: 1) Several ancient authors, namely Pliny the Elder (*HN* 4.33 and 6.34), Plutarch (*Pyrrhus* 10.2; 12.6; 26.6) and Claudius Ptolemy (3.13.39) made a clear distinction between Aigeai and Edessa; 2) the meteorological phenomenon observed by Theophrastus (*De ventis* 27) at Aigeai and attributed by him to the proximity of Mount Olympos could not concern Edessa situated some 90 kilometres to the north, but a distinct city closer to that mountain; 3) no royal tombs had been reported at Edessa, whereas according to ancient authors the royal cemetery was situated at Aigeai.[9]

It is not easy to explain why such strong arguments were not taken seriously. Perhaps the reasons were more sentimental than rational. The magnificent natural setting of Edessa with its panoramic Upper City, cataracts and luxurious vegetation deserved to be chosen as the capital of a glorious dynasty more than any other city in Macedonia. Such at least was the feeling of all its visitors who have left us lyrical descriptions of its beauties. As a result, L. Heuzey did not realise that he might have discovered a royal capital, although he was fully aware of the

7 On the date of the transfer of the usual royal residence from Aigeai to Pella, see Hatzopoulos 1987a, 41–44.

8 On the identification, history topography and archaeological research of Aigeai, see also *EKM II*, p. 60–62.

9 Tafel 1842, 48–50.

paramount significance of the palace he had unearthed at Palatitsia; fully aware, too, that the Great Tumulus, according to him "the most beautiful tumulus of Macedonia", concealed a funerary monument of the greatest importance; although he did not fail to remark that the ruins of Palatitsia could possibly be identified with Ptolemy's Aigaia, a city of Emathia.[10] Thus, with all due reservations, he inclined towards identifying Palatitsia with the obscure city of Balla. It took nearly a century before two scholars, the Yugoslav Fanoula Papazoglou and the Englishman N.G.L. Hammond successfully challenged the *communis opinio*. The former in her doctoral thesis of 1957 alleged literary and epigraphic evidence, which mentioned the names of both cities and attested the use of two distinct ethnics, *Edessaios* and *Aigaios*, proving that we are dealing with two different cities. She also drew attention to the absence of royal tombs in Edessa, adding that sumptuous tombs were indeed discovered, but south of Edessa, in the neighbourhood of the modern town of Naoussa[11]. Eleven years later, at the first international conference on ancient Macedonia held in Thessalonike in 1968, Hammond added two more arguments to those put forward by Tafel and Papazoglou, namely a) that Diodorus' narration of the unsuccessful march of the pretender Argaios from Methone to Aigeai and back in 360 is incompatible with the 90 km distance from the former of these two cities to Edessa, and b) that an inscription from Argos dating from the late fourth century and enumerating cities of Macedonia in a geographical south to north order mentioned Aigeai, then another city whose name is now lost, probably Beroia, and after that Edessa. Hammond, however, went beyond the mere rejection of the identification of the two cities. He argued that the ancient site which satisfied all requirements was that of Palatitsia-Vergina. It was close enough to Mount Olympos and its Pierian ramification to satisfy the conditions of the phenomenon observed by Theophrastus; it displayed a "built Macedonian tomb" containing a throne, which might be that of Philip II; being at a mere distance of 25 kilometres from Methone, it was compatible with Diodorus' narration of the march of Argaios; finally, it lay to the south

10 Heuzey 1876, 183: "Il est vrai que Ptolémée fait d'Αἰγαία une ville émathienne ; mais il n'est pas même bien prouvé que le canton de Palatitza appartînt à l'ancienne Piérie. Aujourd'hui ces villages au-delà du fleuve, loin de se rattacher à l'évêché piérien de Kitros, sont dans la dépendance du métropolitain d Verria. Or on sait à quelle haute autorité remontent parfois les conscriptions ecclésiastiques, calquées sur les anciennes délimitations politiques du pays. Il est de fait que la chaîne épaisse des monts Piériens forme en cet endroit une limite plus effective que le cours guéable de l'Haliacmon, et que cette partie de la rive droite du fleuve paraît se relier naturellement à la grande plaine d'Emathie".

11 Papazoglou 1957, 111.

of both Edessa and Beroia.[12] M. Andronicos, present at the conference, was convinced, while Ph. Petsas disagreed and commented on Hammond's theory ironically.

From being merely academic, the subject became personal and political after the sensational discovery of the royal tombs during Andronicos' excavation at the Great Tumulus of Vergina. It was not unexpected that Petsas, who had directed excavations both at Levkadia-Kopanos in the neighbourhood of Naoussa and at Edessa, and had brought to light the imposing Tomb of the Judgement in the former site and the circuit wall of the lower city in the latter, and, in addition, had a long history of personal rivalry with Andronicos from their student years, would contest his colleague's findings passionately. It was no surprise, either, that public opinion in Edessa, whose inhabitants took pride in being citizens of the first capital of Macedonia, and which displayed the inscription "Ancient site of Aigeai" at the entrance of the archaeological site, would react negatively to the loss of status. Harder to foresee was the reaction of some of Greece's northern neighbours. Particularly revealing is an article by Hristo Andonovski entitled "Rich Archaeological Discoveries in Vergina" in the first issue of the new English-language periodical *Macedonian Review* published in 1979. The author challenged Hammond's theory since "so far neither an ancient city nor an ancient theatre has been found in Vergina", and interpreted the ready acceptance of the identification of Vergina with ancient Aigeai as politically motivated. "The old illness was, and is, that a portion of the learned Greeks and of the official government seek to wipe out anything that could evidence the fact that on the geographical space of Aegean Macedonia lived, and live today, people who are not of Greek descent … Voden, up until 1912 and beyond, had pure Slav characteristics. It was not until the colonization of this area by fugitive inhabitants of Asia Minor that Slav characteristics were diluted. Voden falls within the ethnographic borders of the Macedonian people, while Ber and Vergina lie further south, just outside the ethnographic borders of the Macedonian people. If the hypothesis proved to be true, if the capital of the ancient Macedonian kingdom were to be found in Vergina and not in Voden, we ourselves would put forth an argument for the continuity of Greek culture within the Macedonian space, supporting the notion that ancient Macedonia had Greek ethnic origins. To date, however the supporters of such a theory have a very weak argument".[13]

12 Hammond 1970, 53–67. By coincidence, in September 1970, during a visit at Vergina, the young R. Lane Fox observed the phenomenon described by Theophrastus: Lane Fox 1973, 504.
13 Andonovski 1979, 112.

Since 1979, both the theatre and the ancient city have come to light in Vergina. It is not known whether the author of the above article has been convinced that the first Macedonian capital lay there, and that, following his reasoning, ancient Macedonia had Greek ethnic origins, but there are still Greek scholars who despite the royal palace, the royal tombs and the theatre deny the identification of Vergina with ancient Aigeai, and prefer to locate it either at Naoussa-Kopanos, where there is a theatre but neither palace nor royal tombs, or at Edessa, where none of these three elements is to be found.[14]

There are several other examples of (until recently) contested identifications of Macedonian cities, such as Kalindoia, Morrylos, Arrolos, Berge, Strepsa, Herakleia Sintike etc., which have been settled in the last half-century thanks to the progress of archaeology, epigraphy and numismatics, without triggering similar controversies. Leaving aside the issue of the use – and abuse – of ancient Macedonian history in modern diplomatic and political debates, we must now examine the main relevant question in the context of ancient history: where exactly was Macedonia situated and where precisely its borders were.

As I wrote some three decades ago, "there are peoples who owe their identity to a country, and countries that owe their identity to a people. If the French are the product of France, Macedonia, by contrast, is nothing more than the country conquered and populated by the *Makedones*. Hence the difficulty in defining it precisely in geographical terms. Throughout history, the boundaries of the country have followed the expansion of the Macedonian people, from the Pindos range in the west to the plain of Philippoi in the east, and from Mount Olympos in the south to the Axios gorge between Mounts Barnous (Nidje and Paikon) and Orbelos (Beles) in the north. We shall use here the term "Macedonia" to denote the country in the form it had achieved at the end of the Hellenistic period, before the Roman domination, as a result of conquest, colonisation of conquered lands, and expulsion or/and assimilation of 'indigenous' peoples".[15]

2.1 The archaic period

The question of the borders of Macedonia in the archaic period is indissolubly linked with that of the origins and the early stages of expansion of the Macedonian kingdom. As long as scholars situated Aigeai, "the hearth" of the kingdom,

14 Faklaris 1994, 609–616; Touloumakos 2006, and my rebuttal Hatzopoulos 1996d, 264–269 (= *Recueil* 171–176); cf. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1996, 225–235; Hammond 1997a, 177–179.

15 Hatzopoulos 1993a, 19.

at or near Edessa, they had to face the difficult challenge of combining the two earliest, most detailed, but apparently contradictory pieces of evidence from the historical works of Herodotus and Thucydides respectively. Thucydides' narrative is firmly dated, and refers to the kingdom of Macedonia as it stood in 429 or rather in the reign of Archelaos (414–399), after the end of the Peloponnesian War, when Thucydides was composing his historical work[16]. The only indication helping to put Herodotus' legend into a chronological frame is that Alexander I was the sixth descendant of Perdikkas, the founder of the kingdom. Given that Alexander came to power in *c.* 495, the foundation of the kingdom should be situated in the seventies of the seventh century or in the middle of that century, depending on our reckoning on a basis of 30 or of 25 years per generation respectively. Such a date seems to find confirmation in the archaeological evidence[17].

Herodotus (8.137–138) stated that the founder of the kingdom was Perdikkas, the youngest of the three Temenid brothers hailing from Argos who from Illyria crossed over to Upper Macedonia and sought employment at Lebaie, the seat of a local king. Following an omen which announced that Perdikkas would inherit the kingdom, the three brothers had to flee to save their lives. In their flight from the king and his horsemen who were pursuing them, they were protected by a river which they alone were able to cross and to which they later made sacrifices of thanksgiving. They settled in the gardens of Midas under Mount Bermion, "in which roses grow of their own accord", and issuing forth from it they started conquering the rest of Macedonia.

At first sight, there was no contradiction between this tale and the supposed location of Aigeai at or near Edessa. After all, Edessa is located on the pass formed by the junction of the foothills of Mount Bermion and Mount Barnous (Nidje), its gardens and orchards are full of flowers and trees, making it a place that corresponds perfectly to Herodotus' description of the gardens of Midas. This legend was hardly compatible with Thucydides' (2.99) more sober narrative, however:

"So Sitalces' army was being mustered at Doberus and preparing to pass over the mountain crest and descend upon lower Macedonia, of which Perdiccas was ruler. For the Macedonian race includes also the Lyncestians, Elimiotes, and other tribes of the upper country, which, though in alliance with the nearer Macedonians and subject to them, have kings of their own; but the country by the sea which is now called Macedonia, was first acquired and made their kingdom by Alexander, the father of Perdiccas, and his forefathers, who were originally Temenidae from Argos. They defeated and expelled from Pieria the Pierians, who

16 Cf. Hornblower 1991, 375–376.

17 Saripanidi 2017, 86.