

The Legitimation of Conquest  
*Monarchical Representation  
and the Art of Government in the Empire  
of Alexander the Great*

---

Edited by  
Kai Trampedach and Alexander Meeus



## CONTENTS

Preface .....	7
Introduction: Understanding Alexander's Relations with His Subjects .....	9
<i>Kai Trampedach / Alexander Meeus</i>	
I SELF-PRESENTATION AND ROYAL PERSONA	
1 From Early On To Become A Hero ('Held'): Mythical Models of Alexander's Image and Biography .....	21
<i>Tonio Hölscher</i>	
2 Staging Charisma: Alexander and Divination .....	45
<i>Kai Trampedach</i>	
3 Alexander and Athletics or How (Not) To Use a Traditional Field of Monarchic Legitimation .....	61
<i>Christian Mann</i>	
4 Violence and Legitimation: The Social Logic of Alexander the Great's Acts of Violence between the Danube and the Indus – A Conceptual Outline and a Case Study .....	77
<i>Matthias Haake</i>	
II LOCAL PERSPECTIVES AND INTERACTIONS	
5 Alexander's Dedications to the Gods: Sacred Space, Pious Practice and Public Legitimation .....	99
<i>Ralf von den Hoff</i>	
6 Communication and Legitimation: Knowledge of Alexander's Asian Conquests in the Greek World .....	123
<i>Shane Wallace</i>	
7 Legitimation – Unwitting and Unrequested: Alexander of Macedon's Portrayal as Devine Tool in Zechariah 9 .....	145
<i>Wilhelm Köhler</i>	

8	Wooing the Victor with Words: Babylonian Priestly Literature as a Response to the Macedonian Conquest .....	165
	<i>Michael Jursa</i>	
9	Shaping the New World: Once More On the Cities of Alexander .....	179
	<i>Maurizio Giangiulio</i>	
III ADMINISTRATION AND INSTITUTIONS		
10	Alexander, the King of the Macedonians .....	197
	<i>Manuela Mari</i>	
11	On the Titulature of Alexander the Great: The Title <i>basileus</i> .....	219
	<i>Maxim M. Kholod</i>	
12	Alexander the Great and Asia Minor: Conquest and Strategies of Legitimation .....	243
	<i>Michele Faraguna</i>	
13	Alexander's Tributary Empire .....	263
	<i>Andrew Monson</i>	
IV EPILOGUES		
14	The Strategies of Legitimation of Alexander and the Diadochoi: Continuities and Discontinuities .....	291
	<i>Alexander Meeus</i>	
15	Concluding Remarks .....	319
	<i>Hans-Joachim Gehrke</i>	
	Abbreviations .....	325
	Bibliography .....	326
	Contributors .....	364

## ALEXANDER, THE KING OF THE MACEDONIANS

*Manuela Mari*

My paper focuses on Alexander as βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων: it examines the relationship between king and *Makedones* as it can be reconstructed from available sources, and then, more specifically, the aspects of this relationship that are central in the tradition on Alexander.<sup>1</sup> I am well aware of the many obstacles raised by the nature, chronology and complexity of this tradition. Authors who were very distant in time from the object of their narratives misunderstood (or consciously distorted) many details of Alexander's biography. His relation to Macedonian institutions obviously is no exception. Moreover, any attempt to schematically divide Alexander's life into 'phases' or 'roles' entails inevitably a degree of oversimplification, the more so when one distinguishes too sharply among those phases and roles. On the other hand, as everyone knows, schematic distinctions are often useful, and sometimes inevitable, for historians, and, while it is well beyond the scope of the present article (and probably impossible) to offer a final and comprehensive definition of the nature of Macedonian kingship – under Alexander as well as before and after him –,<sup>2</sup> we can at least attempt to identify some of its constitutive elements and to separate institutional realities from ideological representations. As for available sources, the difficulties they offer do not obscure their positive aspects. The literary tradition on Alexander, in spite of its problematic nature and chronological distance from the events, is of unparalleled richness and is therefore very much worth exploring – also in regard to the main topic of this article. Epigraphic evidence in turn offers precious hints and interesting points of comparison, and is sometimes useful to verify the ancient literature on Alexander, helping us ascertain which features of the role of king of the Macedonians and of the relationship between king and *Makedones*,

- 1 Here, as in the following pages, I am using the expression βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων as a simple ancient (and attested) equivalent of the modern 'king of the Macedonians'. I agree with ERRINGTON 1974 and his very flexible approach to Macedonian titulature ('[s]ince there was no single "official" style, it follows that none of the styles actually used by the kings should be regarded as in any sense incorrect', 37); paradoxically, precisely because I agree with his approach, I cannot agree with his denying any formal validity to the title and of limiting its usage to 'exceptional' circumstances (27–30, 37).
- 2 For references on the modern debate on the nature of Macedonian kingship ('constitutional' vs. 'autocratic' or 'personal') see below, n.22.

among those attested in the literary portraits of Alexander, are reliable and historically significant.

The main questions on which this paper will focus will therefore be the following:

- 1) Which were the basic elements that characterised the relationship between *basileus* and *Makedones*, and which is their impact on the literary tradition on Alexander?
- 2) In which ways did Macedonian tradition and customary rules influence Alexander's exercise of royal power?
- 3) Which were the most innovative contributions of Alexander (and of Philip II before him) in defining the role of a βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων?<sup>3</sup>

#### DESCRIPTIONS AND DEFINITIONS OF MACEDONIAN KINGSHIP IN DIFFERENT KINDS OF EVIDENCE

Kingship was the dominating factor in the political and social landscape of ancient Macedonia and, at the same time, the element that appeared most exotic and alien to southern Greeks. The widespread refusal of ancient Greek authors to include Macedonia within the *Hellenikon* was mainly the consequence of the Greek inclination to consider monarchic power either a temporary historical accident or a typical feature of barbarian civilisations.<sup>4</sup>

Yet, if examined more carefully, the attitude of the 'Greeks of the *poleis*' towards Macedonian kingship was ambivalent, and it included repulsion but also attraction. Two examples will suffice to make things clearer. Demosthenes, while criticising Philip II's aspiration to panhellenic leadership in the most hostile terms and insisting on Athenian love for freedom and democracy as a weapon against any foreign oppressor, here and there betrays a secret appreciation for the king's extraordinary effectiveness and rapidity in action, virtues he sees as a consequence of the concentration of different powers in the hands of one man. The ambivalent description of the effects of Philip's sole command in *Olynth.* 1.4–5 provides a good example. A similar ambivalence characterises Isokrates, who was (at least for a period of time) much more open than Demosthenes to Macedonian hegemony over the Greek world and at the same time was well aware of Greek hostility towards monarchic power: when describing to Philip II his own political programme, therefore, Isokrates care-

- 3 In the present as in other papers, my focus is on aspects of continuity linking Alexander to the Macedonian tradition, on the one hand, and to the Hellenistic developments, on the other. On the other hand, many of the 'revolutionary' aspects of Macedonian society and institutions which are usually attributed to Alexander and even some aspects of his way of being a βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων actually go back to his father's revolutionary way of interpreting the role (see LANE Fox 2011b).
- 4 On the weight of the Greek bias against monarchy in ancient definitions of Macedonian 'ethnicity' see MARI 2002, 11–12, 337–340; HATZOPOULOS 2007, esp. 59–60, 63–64.

fully explains that the Macedonian ruler was expected ‘to act towards the Greeks as a benefactor (εὐεργετῆν), to be the king (βασιλεύειν) of the Macedonians, and to rule (ἄρχειν) over most of the barbarians’ (*Phil.* 154). Significantly, the act of βασιλεύειν is referred to the Macedonians only, and the ideal of the ‘king-benefactor’ which will characterise Hellenistic kingship is already applied to the Greeks (and to them only).

Maxim Kholod’s paper in the present volume deals in detail with the evolution of Macedonian royal titulature, thus allowing me to limit myself to a few summary remarks on this subject:<sup>5</sup>

1) Inscriptions – from within or outside Macedonia – that mention Argead kings before Alexander are rare, and the activity of the royal chancery, which possibly existed already before Philip II, is well documented in stone only for the Hellenistic period.<sup>6</sup> Due to the state of our sources, it is extremely difficult to ascertain whether the use of the royal title was a radical innovation by Alexander. There is no doubt, however, that the title βασιλεύς was employed by Alexander’s chancery, and that official local documents from his lifetime equally refer to him as βασιλεύς, evidently as a direct consequence of the chancery’s habits.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, just because of the scarcity of epigraphic documents mentioning Macedonian kings before the reigns of Philip and Alexander, we are not entitled to conclude that for a long period the use of the royal title was deliberately avoided by Macedonian rulers in order to respect Greek sensitivity.<sup>8</sup>

2) Unlike Kholod and other scholars, I am willing to admit that a few documents earlier than Alexander’s age did use the title βασιλεύς with a fully official value. Despite its non-Macedonian provenance, this evidence is historically meaningful. It is also worth noting that, down to and including Alexander’s age, the use of the royal title in official documents is inconsistent, within and outside Macedonia.<sup>9</sup> In Alexander’s age, the royal settlement concerning Philipoi may

- 5 KHOLOD, this volume. My necessarily more superficial overview of these aspects of royal ideology is inspired by a partly different view of the meaning of the relevant sources and of their evolution over time. I am sure that any reader who is interested in Macedonian institutions and kingship will profit from the comparison of two partly diverging interpretations of the same subject.
- 6 For the epigraphic documents which mention Argead kings (with or without the royal title) see KHOLOD, this volume. For the creation or reorganisation of the royal chancery under Philip II and the extreme scarcity of preserved pre-Hellenistic documents issued by it see MARI 2006, 2018a, 125–129, 2018d, 283–285.
- 7 See, e.g., the list of priests of Asklepios from Kalindoia (HATZOPOULOS 1996b II, no. 62) and the dedication and the settlement from the temple of Athena Polias at Priene (RO 86). A full list of available evidence can be found in KHOLOD, this volume.
- 8 Pace KHOLOD, this volume, developing an implicit suggestion by BADIAN 1996, 12.
- 9 In the Athenian treaty with Perdikkas II, also involving some other minor rulers, KHOLOD interprets the sentence [Περδίκκα]ν καὶ τὸς βασιλέας [μ]ετὰ Περδ[ίκκο] (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 89, l. 35), as distinguishing the status of Perdikkas (who is never defined *basileus* in the preserved parts of the text) from that of the other dynasts who took part in the alliance; but the phrasing could (or even

have employed the title *basileus* for Alexander on one occasion (the word is totally restored), while in the remaining lines of the document both Alexander and Philip are called only by their names;<sup>10</sup> in documents from outside Macedonia, like the royal letter or *diagramma* for Chios<sup>11</sup> and the Eresos dossier,<sup>12</sup> the same inconsistency emerges.

3) Kholod also reminds us that the available evidence never applies the expression βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων, appearing in both earlier and later epigraphic documents, to Alexander. I am not sure that this fact by itself – considering the general scarcity of attestations of the phrase – can be viewed as reflecting a radical change in the way Alexander conceived his own *basileia*, but the circumstance deserves mention.<sup>13</sup> In any case, the regular occurrence of the royal title for the Macedonian kings after Alexander clearly indicates that at some point during the king's life, the use of the title – first of all by the royal chancery itself – became more consistent (probably in the simple formula βασιλεὺς, without Μακεδόνων).<sup>14</sup> Coins confirm

should) be interpreted rather as extending the royal title (the only one through which a legitimate monarch could be described) to Perdikkas too. The unusual form [Μα]κεδόνων βασιλεὺς[ς] describes Amyntas IV (son of Perdikkas III and cousin of Alexander) in a decree of Lebedeia, in Boiotia, including a list of offerings, perhaps to be dated to the period when Philip II was Amyntas' tutor (*IG VII 3055*, ll. 8–9): for Kholod, like Errington 1974, 25–28, the formula, lacking any official value, is an insertion by the Lebedeians in order to include a 'famous name' among the donors, an interpretation which cannot be verified. Some scholars identify the 'king Philip' of an inscription from Oleveni preserving some words of a royal letter (Hatzopoulos 1996b II, no. 5, ll. 14–15) with Philip II, but many others prefer Philip V (see Arena 2003); equally uncertain is the identification of Philip II as the authority issuing a boundary settlement from Mygdonia (Hatzopoulos 1996b II, no. 4; cf. ll. 1–2, [Ἐπὶ τῆς Φιλίππου] βασιλῆας τοῦ Ἀμ[ύοντος]). During Philip's reign the Macedonian *hieromnemes* at Delphi are always styled παρὰ Φιλίππου, as are the *tamiai* (e.g. *CID II 36* col. I, l. 23 and 74 I, l. 43), while Alexander's *hieromnemes* are either παρ' Ἀλεξάνδρου or παρὰ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου (e.g. *CID II 32*, l. 42, and no. 69, l. 19: all references in Kholod, this volume). Finally, again unlike Kholod, I deem the sentence [οὐδὲ τ]ῆν βασιλείαν [τ]ῆν Φ[ιλίππου καὶ τῶν ἐκγόν]ων καταλύσω, in the Athenian copy of the oath of the members of the League of Corinth, meaningful (*IG II/III*<sup>3</sup>[1.2] 318, ll. 11–12, on which see also Aymard 1948, 255 n. 1): it should be considered as the description of the (legitimate) monarchic power of Philip and of his descendants in an official document of his own time (the use of the verb καταλύειν is significant).

- 10 Hatzopoulos 1996b II, no. 6: see more particularly I, ll. 3 (complete restoration of [βασιλέα] with reference to Alexander), 9, 11–12, II, ll. 5, 10–12.
- 11 Heisserer 1980, 79–95 = Bencivenni 2003, 15–38: ll. 1, 7, 18. Admittedly, this letter, or *diagramma*, issued by the royal chancery and later modified when published at the local level, contains other formal inconsistencies: see Bencivenni 2003, who also wisely avoids drawing any firm chronological conclusion from the presence of the royal title in l. 1 and 18 of it (26–28).
- 12 Heisserer 1980, 27–78 = Bencivenni 2003, 55–77: see in part. B, l. 18, Γα, ll. 6, 12, 34–35, 39, Γβ, l. 24, Γγ, ll. 2, 10, 18, 25.
- 13 Kholod, this volume: Amyntas IV is styled [Μα]κεδόνων βασιλεὺς[ς] in the document from Lebedeia cited in n. 9, and Kassandros appears as βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων in two official documents of the royal chancery (Hatzopoulos 1996b II, no. 20 and 23).
- 14 Kholod, this volume (with bibliography on the likely date of this innovation; see also Arena 2013).

such a general evolution, because the royal title was apparently first introduced on some of them in Alexander's reign (or immediately after his death) and became general practice thereafter.<sup>15</sup> Notoriously, a key-moment of the war over Alexander's succession was the adoption of the royal title by the Diadochoi, a few years after the murder of Alexander's son Alexander IV instigated by Kassandros. From this period at the latest the title was perceived as an inescapable element of the royal authority.<sup>16</sup>

4) It is essential to clearly distinguish the information provided by epigraphic evidence (on which my points 1 to 3 are mainly based) from that offered by literary sources. The latter can sometimes mirror the official usages of contemporary chanceries, but this is not always the case.<sup>17</sup> It is safer to consider the occurrences of the title βασιλεύς, or βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων, or, more rarely, βασιλεὺς Μακεδονίας in literary sources as reliable evidence for the way in which the Greeks perceived and described, according to their own political categories, the form of government of Macedonia. Unsurprisingly, at least from the fifth century onwards, the Macedonian ruler was usually labelled 'king' by contemporary Greek observers.<sup>18</sup> Greek authors, accustomed as they were to living in 'republican' states, could not but apply the political language of the Greek *poleis* to the Macedonian rulers and thus had no alternative for the term βασιλεύς (regardless of their personal opinion about Macedonia, its historical role, and its relation to the *Hellenikon*). Until the murder of Alexander IV, monarchic power in Macedonia was transferred over the centuries within the same royal clan (the Argeads); in spite of the trouble that often affected succession, kingship itself was perceived by the subjects as perfectly legitimate, and was characterised by delineated (although very ample) prerogatives and powers: the Macedonian ruler was therefore, in Greek terms, definitely a βασιλεύς. Even Demosthenes (almost always) resisted the temptation of using

15 KHOLOD, this volume, accepts a dating during Alexander's reign (see his article for references to different interpretations). I thank Katerina Panagopoulou for her suggestions and remarks on this specific aspect.

16 On the adoption, first by Antigonos and Demetrios in 306 and later by the other *Diadochoi*, of the royal title see Diod. 20.53.2–4 and Plut. *Demetr.* 18.1–2 (the latter attaches much weight to the use of the title in written documents like *epistolai*, recording the exception represented by Kassandros; cf. Diod. 18.56.1–2: a few years earlier, in 319/8, with both Philip III Arrhidaios and Alexander IV still alive, Polyperchon's *diagramma* on the 'liberation' of the Greeks was issued in the name of the *basileis*). See also MEEUS, this volume.

17 Polybios, whose language is reputed in many instances to reflect that of the Hellenistic chanceries, is only a partial exception to this general rule (MARI 2018d, 286–288).

18 See KHOLOD, this volume, for occurrences in literary sources. BADIAN's statement that 'not once, either in Herodotus or in the *Corpus Demosthenicum*, is the king of Macedon referred to with "King" before his name' (1996, 12) is wrong: cf. e.g. Hdt. 9.44.1 and Dem. 2.15.



the terms τύραννος or τυραννίς when talking about Philip II and his monarchical power, and this is definitely significant.<sup>19</sup>

## MACEDONIA AND MACEDONIANS

No less significant is that in Demosthenes' eyes the *basileus* was the sole στρατηγός καὶ δεσπότης καὶ ταμίης of the Macedonian state.<sup>20</sup> Such a description, although partly justified by the several occasions in which abroad the king appeared to be the only official representative of the entire community of the Macedonians (and, therefore, the sole authority visible from the outside),<sup>21</sup> is of course an ideologically-oriented oversimplification. More neutral descriptions of the Macedonian state in other sources rather suggest that it actually consisted of two component parts (βασιλεὺς ὁ δεῖνα καὶ Μακεδόνες), mutually depending on one another; when taken by itself, the definition βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων implies that the *Makedones* were perceived as a political community.<sup>22</sup> More precisely, the Macedonian state was identified with the territory that had become the property 'of the Macedonians' over time, as we can clearly see in Pella's decree granting *asylia* to Cos (243 BC), which uses the expression χώρα Μακεδόνων ('the land, or territory, of the Macedonians') as an equivalent of οἱ Μακεδόνες.<sup>23</sup> The modern definition of Macedonia as a 'territorial state' thus finds a perfect equivalent in the ancient evidence, and such a conception was already pre-Hellenistic: it clearly emerges already in Thucydides' well known description of Macedonian expansion up to the time of the Peloponnesian war. The territories annexed to the kingdom and distributed 'among the Macedonians' can be described (and were perceived) as *doriktetos chora*: the ultimate owner of the land was the king himself, who from time to time decided whether to assign large estates to his 'Companions' (the Macedonian court elite) or

19 Macedonian kingship is indirectly depicted as a τυραννίς, when compared to the Chalkidian cities, by Dem. 1.5, but in 'neutral' contexts the orator usually refers to the Macedonian ruler as βασιλεύς (cf. for example 2.15; for other references see KHOLOD, this volume).

20 I am here referring again to Dem. 1.4.

21 On this see below.

22 Cf. AYMARD 1948, 236–239, 1950, 63, 96–97; MOSSÉ 2001, 63. A city-state was typically defined by the community of its citizens (ἡ πόλις ['the city'] or ὁ δῆμος ['the people'], e.g., τῶν Ἀθηναίων ['of the Athenians']). The identification of a political community (an *ethnos*?) in the Μακεδόνες of the formula βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων and the attribution of an official (or even 'constitutional') value to the phrase (attested in both literary and epigraphic sources) βασιλεὺς ὁ δεῖνα καὶ Μακεδόνες are therefore crucial to the debate on the nature of the Macedonian state, on which a recent synthesis is KING 2010; see also, among recent publications, HATZOPOULOS 2015a and PANAGOPOULOU 2019. My synthetic formulation in the text evidently follows the line going back to HOLLEAUX 1907, 97–98, later developed by AYMARD 1950, 77–84, 96–97; PAPA-ZOGLU 1983; HAMMOND 1988, 1989, 49–52, 58–70; HATZOPOULOS 1996b I, 261–263, 487–496; a different interpretation has been defended by ERRINGTON among others (1974, 1986, 196–205).

23 HATZOPOULOS 1996b II, no. 58, with MARI 2019a, 222.

to open the conquered areas to the settlement of small Macedonian landowners. We can clearly reconstruct the phenomenon in the cases of Amphipolis, Methone, the Chalkidian territories in Philip II's age, but the general idea of an ever-expanding *Makedonia* was already familiar to Thucydides.<sup>24</sup>

It was Philip, therefore, who turned a well-established element of Macedonian history into the fuel of a radical military and social reform and of an unprecedented territorial expansion: in this respect the age of Alexander did not bring any radical innovation.<sup>25</sup> I think that Alexander's assigning land 'to the Macedonians' in Kalindoia<sup>26</sup> and Philip's distribution of Methone's territory 'among the Macedonians'<sup>27</sup> were largely similar. Although the procedural details escape us, in both cases the procedure's final outcome was that a certain amount of conquered territory was distributed *viritim* to Macedonian settlers on the king's initiative. Kalindoia and the neighbouring villages, on the one hand, and Pydna (which annexed the former territory of Methone to its own), on the other, thus became πόλεις Μακεδόνων. The epigraphic documents show the effects of such a transformation in status: huge numbers of colonists from the 'Old Kingdom' moved to the new territories, where typically Macedonian anthroponyms now appeared, along with the Macedonian calendar and other institutions.<sup>28</sup>

## THE KING AND THE MACEDONIANS

The relationship between the king and the Macedonians was of a hierarchical nature, and Macedonian society as a whole was characterised by strong internal inequalities, even after the transformations and the increase of social mobility determined by Philip's and Alexander's policy of enrolment and distribution of conquered

- 24 Thuc. 2.99. See MARI 2019a, with references and bibliography (214–216 on Thucydides' passage).
- 25 See, along with MARI 2019a, LANE FOX 2011b and HATZOPOULOS 2015b. The latter (*ibid.*, 118, 120) also persuasively reconsiders the *vexata quaestio* of the reforms Anaximenes (*FGrHist* 72) F4 attributed to an 'Alexander', who is said to have called the horsemen *hetairoi* ('Companions') and the infantry soldiers *pezetairoi* ('foot Companions') (cf. already HAMMOND / GRIF-FITH 1979, 705–713); if, as it seems most probable, we are dealing here with Alexander the Great, the denomination of the infantrymen symbolically acknowledges the social rise of so many *Makedones* prompted by Philip's and Alexander's military policies.
- 26 HATZOPOULOS 1996b II, no. 62: it is a list of the eponymous priests of Apollon and Asklepios from Kalindoia, which was engraved 'since King Alexander assigned to the Macedonians ([ἀφ' οἷ] βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔδωκε Μακεδόσι) Kalindoia and the nearby districts of Thamiskia, Kamakaia, Tripoatis'.
- 27 As described by Diod. 16.34.5. HAMMOND 1988 tried to establish a distinction, considering only that of Methone a case of *viritim* distribution of land to Macedonian colonists; thus recently also FARAGUNA 2018, 200; *contra*, ERRINGTON 1998, 79–82; MARI 2019a, 220–222.
- 28 On these status markers of a πόλις Μακεδόνων see HATZOPOULOS 1991, 28 and n.1, 77, 80–86; ID. 1996b I, 163–165, 181–184, 188–189, 201–205, 382, 387–392; MARI 2018b.

lands. Royal ideology and political discourse, however, managed to soften – if not to conceal – such a factual reality by emphasising the egalitarian aspects of the relationship between the king and the *Makedones*. The king was expected to share the lifestyle of his Macedonian subjects, on and outside the battlefield,<sup>29</sup> and both constituent parts of the state took part in religious rites and public ceremonies which defined and periodically reaffirmed Macedonian ‘national’ (or, in Greek terms, ‘ethnic’) identity.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, freedom of speech when addressing the king was granted not only to the royal Companions (*hetairoi*) but to the whole of the *Makedones*. This right of meeting the king and speaking frankly to him is frequently recalled in the literary sources and is not simply a literary *topos*.<sup>31</sup> According to epigraphic evidence, Macedonian kings settled controversies at the public or private level when petitioned by private citizens or groups. In some cases the evidence clearly suggests that the petitioners personally met the king, thus enjoying the right of ἔντευξις (‘petition’).<sup>32</sup>

More generally, at the central level Macedonia was a monarchical state where accession to the throne was regulated by custom rather than by well-defined norms

- 29 Literary sources frequently depict Philip II and Alexander as risking their lives in battle, and this seems a relevant element of Macedonian royal ideology (HAMMOND / GRIFFITH 1979, 473–474). The idea that the king shared his soldiers’ labours, efforts, and lifestyle (while the conquered territories and booty actually belonged to them, and not to him) is a key-feature of Alexander’s speech to the Macedonians in revolt at Opis (Arr. *Anab.* 7.9.8–10.3): the speech, while obviously fictional, nevertheless insists on recurrent and reliable elements of the self-representation of the Macedonian kings. Sharing food (not only with the ‘Companions’, but with the *Makedones* as a whole) is another fundamental element of the relationship between the king and the Macedonians in royal self-presentation (MARI 2018c, 305–309).
- 30 See below, on the king as representative of the entire *ethnos*.
- 31 The tradition on Alexander records many episodes centered on the *isegoria* of the members of his circle and the accessibility of the king, and the progressive reduction of this right is significantly linked to the supposed evolution of Alexander’s conception of power and his assimilation of Oriental patterns: see TRAMPEDACH, this volume, on the significant cases of Kallisthenes and Aristandros of Telmessos. The fact that the freedom of speech was perceived as an essential feature of the relationship between the Macedonians and the king is admitted, for the Antigonid period, even by Polybios, whose representation of Philip V and of Perseus is in most cases hostile (5.27.6, and cf. HATZOPOULOS 1996b I, 224 n. 1 and 2001a, 194, 197 n. 5). Significantly, Plutarch considers Demetrios Poliorketes’ growing ‘inaccessibility’ as a part of a failed attempt at introducing an autocratic conception of kingship which the Macedonians strongly disliked (*Demetr.* 42).
- 32 For example, the letters of Demetrios II (still regent at the time) to Beroia about the sanctuary of Herakles *Kynagidas* mention his meeting with the envoys of the sanctuary, to whom he gave the letters addressed to the civic officer Harpalos (HATZOPOULOS 1996b II, no. 8, l. 1–3); while king, some years later, Demetrios received a letter from the Perrhaibian cavalry officer Philoxenos, who claimed the grant of a small estate which the king had promised to him during an encounter (TZIAFALIAS / HELLY 2010, no. 1, ll. 11–15). This aspect should not make us forget, however, that in the Hellenistic courts (including the Antigonid one) the more direct access and (at least virtual) closeness to the king marked the influence and power of the *philoï* when compared with the other members of the court and the common people: a significant example is offered by the fate of Apelles at the court of Philip V (see Polyb. 5.26, with MA 2011, 522–523).

of law and could become (especially in pre-Hellenistic times) the object of a furious struggle among the different branches of the royal clan.<sup>33</sup> A candidate therefore needed the official recognition of the *Makedones* in order to be appointed *basileus*. This custom is suggested by sources in cases when regents (*epitropoi*) turned into kings (like Philip II), but it can be hypothesised that it applied to other cases too, including the accession of Alexander.<sup>34</sup>

Up to a certain point, therefore, we are entitled to describe the relationship between the king and the Macedonians as one of mutual dependence. In the literary tradition on Alexander, the extremely delicate balance between the king's (legitimate) authority, his attempts at violating/innovating customary rules, and the Macedonians' capacity to exercise their own rights and therefore to put pressure on (or openly contrast) the king's will emerges in the clearest way in the narratives of the protest of the soldiers against Alexander's decision to extend the Macedonian military training to tens of thousands of Asian boys, the so-called *Epigonoï*. The planned reform became a crucial issue in the last part of Alexander's life, also because it implied a different conception of the empire and of royal power itself.<sup>35</sup> According to Arrian, Alexander's decision raised suspicion that he 'was contriving every means of reducing his dependence on Macedonians in future',<sup>36</sup> while Diodoros describes the new recruits as 'an opposing force', or 'a counter-balance' (*ἀντίταγμα*), to the Macedonian phalanx.<sup>37</sup> Our sources stress the fact that the *Epigonoï* received Macedonian weapons and dress,<sup>38</sup> and indirectly

33 See MARI forthcoming (b), with bibliography.

34 On Philip II's accession (after his original appointment as *epitropos* of the legitimate heir Amyntas, son of Philip's brother and previous king Perdikkas III) see Just. *Epit.* 7.5.9–10; on Demetrios Poliorketes see Plut. *Demetr.* 37.2–3. On the general matter see HATZOPOULOS 1996b I, 276–279, 290–291, and, for Alexander's accession, MOSSÉ 2001, 63–65. For cases in which the king's will was read at his death and submitted for approval to the assembly of the *Makedones*, see MARI forthcoming (b), with references.

35 On the development of the military reform and on the increasing employment of Iranian soldiers in Alexander's army in the last years of his life see OLBRYCHT 2015. The name *Epigonoï*, according to Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.1, was chosen by Alexander himself. Just. *Epit.* 12.4.2–11 employs it to describe the children of Asian women by Macedonian soldiers: according to Arr. *Anab.* 7.12.2 those children too were included in Alexander's project and supposed to be raised 'in the Macedonian fashion' (Μακεδονικῶς; cf. HAMMOND 1990b, 277–278).

36 Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.2: ὡς πάντα δὴ μηχανωμένου Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηκέτι ὡσαύτως δεῖσθαι Μακεδόνων.

37 Diod. 17.108.3. The name *Epigonoï*, 'descendants', alludes to a 'replacement' of the existing soldiers with the newly recruited ones (OLBRYCHT 2015, 197). On their ethnic origins see HAMMOND 1990b, 275–280; OLBRYCHT 2015, 203–204, 207, 2016, 66–67, 69.

38 Most clearly Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.1 and 7.6.5 and Diod. 17.108.1–2 (cf. HAMMOND 1998, 245–246). It is important to stress, as an essential feature of Philip's reforms, that the State provided the infantry soldiers with a part of their equipment and made it less expensive in general terms (HAMMOND / GRIFFITH 1979, 352–362, 705–713; HATZOPOULOS 1996b I, 268–271 and 2015b). The Antigonid military code shows that the army in the Hellenistic period was enlisted on a strict census system, and this was the case already under Philip and Alexander, although the details are unknown. According to this system, the Macedonians of modest means were enrolled as infantrymen on a

allude to the inclusion of the young Asians into the same system of age classes which a few years earlier Philip II had rearranged.<sup>39</sup>

With their protest the Macedonians claimed the exclusive right to participate in the educational and military system which had turned their homeland into a world power. Philip's reforms (based, as we have seen, on extensive distributions of land) granted participation in military service and, therefore, full Macedonian citizenship to tens of thousands of people previously excluded by their low socio-economic level.<sup>40</sup> Alexander's enormous and rapidly achieved expansion of the empire raised a completely new set of issues (military control of the conquered territories, maintenance of a large army, peopling of newly-founded settlements) and thus undoubtedly marked the beginning of an era, in which, among other things, the prestigious ethnic *Μακεδών* was extended to non-Macedonians who 'received their allotments of land in return for their own and their descendants' military service in units armed and trained as Macedonian-style phalangites'.<sup>41</sup>

Such a legal (rather than ethnic) definition of who the *Makedones* were, also helps to clarify the sense in which the Alexander sources distinguish the 'Macedonian' from the 'Greek' participants of the campaign, and separate, among the areas under his control, 'Greece' from 'Macedonia'.<sup>42</sup> What is at stake in most cases in which those distinctions occur<sup>43</sup> is the different legal status of Macedonian citizen-soldiers and of Greek allies or mercenaries in relation to the king, or, to put it

non-permanent basis (see HATZOPOULOS 2001b, 89, 103–107 and the copies of the *diagramma* on military service from Drama and Kassandreia, *ibid.*, epigraphic appendix, nrs. 2 I and 2 II).

39 See Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.1; Diod. 17.108.3; Souda s.v. βασιλῆιοι παῖδες ἐξακισχίλιοι (who refers the reform to Egypt only). On the age classes in Macedonian military training, the *basilikoi paides*, and Philip's initiatives in these fields see HAMMOND 1990b (in part. 278 for the inclusion of the *Epigonoi* in the same system); GAUTHIER / HATZOPOULOS 1993, 65–78, 157–158; SAVALLI-LESTRADE 1998, 293–300; HATZOPOULOS 2001b, 133–140. On the adoption of the same system in Hellenistic armies see MARI 2019b, 519–520; on age classes at the Antigonid court see MA 2011, 525–526, 534–535.

40 On these aspects and on the quantitative dimensions see BILLOWS 1995, 9–23; ANSON 2008.

41 BILLOWS 1995, 208 (cf. also 155–157). Many scholars scale down both the numbers of Macedonians *stricto sensu* who moved from their own land into new territories after the conquests of Alexander, and the duration of the phenomenon, with excellent arguments: e.g. BILLOWS 1995, 6–7, 148–160, 183–212; SCHARRER 2006.

42 Abundant evidence from the Alexander historians is provided by BORZA 1996, with whose interpretation that all these passages show an ethnic distinction between Greeks and Macedonians I basically disagree.

43 Although not in all cases: the different condition of *Makedones* and *Hellenes* (in Alexander's army as in other contexts) could be (and often was) perceived and represented as an ethnic distinction: at least two passages discussed by BORZA 1996 fit in with his ethnic interpretation (Arr. *Anab.* 2.10.6; Diod. 17.99.5–6); the effectiveness of Demosthenes' statements on the barbarian character of the Macedonians, including their kings, speaks for itself (MARI 2015), and such propaganda was still employed against Macedonia in the late Hellenistic period (THORNTON 2010, 2014, 16–19). But all of BORZA's other cases simply concern the coexistence of different 'rules of engagement' in Alexander's army and, therefore, of different kinds of relations between the soldiers and the commander in chief. In the text I will briefly discuss only the

in modern terms, the different ‘rules of engagement’ of the different components of Alexander’s army.<sup>44</sup> The clearest example is a list of officers in Arrian’s *Indika*, in which some who were definitely born outside Macedonia proper are listed among the ‘Macedonians’ and not among the ‘Greeks’. The illuminating case of Nearchos (who is also the source of Arrian’s passage) suggests that these men had moved to Macedonia proper, presumably after receiving allotments of land from the king, and had therefore become full Macedonians.<sup>45</sup> The boundary line between Greeks and Macedonians in this passage, as in many others, is therefore represented by ‘Macedonian citizenship’ vs. the citizenship in member states of the ‘League of Korinth’.<sup>46</sup> Alexander was the *basileus* of the Macedonians, but was never described as such in relation to his Greek allies.<sup>47</sup>

### THE KING AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ENTIRE *ETHNOS*

As a constituent element of Macedonian society the concurrent hierarchical nature and egalitarian representation of the relationship between king and *Makedones*

most significant case in which BORZA’s interpretation appears wrong (Arr. *Ind.* 18.3–10, on which see already HATZOPOULOS 2007, 59–63); on Eumenes of Kardia cf. *infra* n. 77.

44 See BETTALI 2013, 377–383, who also highlights the fact that it is not always easy to distinguish between allies and mercenaries when the Greeks of Alexander’s army are concerned.

45 *Ind.* 18.3–10; on Nearchos see § 10 (= *FGrHist* 133 T 7): ναύαρχος δὲ αὐτοῖσιν ἐπεστάθη Νέαρχος ὁ Ἀνδροτίμου, τὸ γένος μὲν Κρής ὁ Νέαρχος, ὤκει δὲ ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει τῇ ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι. Among the other ‘Macedonians’ of the list, Laomedon (from Mytilene) and Androsthene (from Thasos) are also classified as ‘Amphipolitans’ (§ 3–4: ἐκ δὲ Ἀμφιπόλεως), as they too probably were permanent residents in that city. For biographical details see BERVE 1926 II, no. 80, 464, 544; HECKEL 1985, 1992, 190–195, 210–215, 2006, 29, 119, 146, 171–173; BUCCIANINI 2015, 9–28. On the general problems raised by Arrian’s list of *Makedones* see also HAMMOND / GRIFFITH 1979, 353. Other prominent Greeks received allotments of land from Macedonian kings without *ipso facto* becoming ‘Macedonians’ (Dem. 19.145–146): the key-element clearly was permanent residence in Macedonia. Other possible cases are considered by HAMMOND / GRIFFITH 1979, 648.

46 HATZOPOULOS 2007, 59–63, calls attention to the presence of the separate group of Cypriot officers at the end of the list (Arr. *Ind.* 18.8); the condition of the kingdoms of Cyprus was closer to that of Macedonia than to that of the home cities of the other trierarchs, as Cyprus ‘never adhered to the League officially styled as “the Hellenes”’. While the phrasing also allows interpreting Arrian’s passage as including the Cypriots among the Greeks, other passages cited by BORZA 1996 suggest that the distinction between Macedonia/Macedonians and Greece/Greeks in the literary tradition refers to the different kind of authority of the Macedonian kings over the two areas: cf. Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.3, on Alexander and Antipatros; Plut. *Alex.* 74.4, on Kassandros.

47 See MOSSÉ 2001 (on the ‘king of the Macedonians’ vs. the ‘hegemon of the Greeks’). The *Makedones* were definitely not members of the League of Korinth (HATZOPOULOS 2007, 62), while, on the contrary, they did take part in the later ‘Hellenic league’ of Antigonos Doson and Philip V (see Polyb. 4.9.4). For ERRINGTON (1974, 33–37) the occurrences of the *Makedones* beside their king in official acts like the Delian dedication for the victory at Sellasia (HATZOPOULOS 1996b II, no. 24) and the alliance between Philip V and Hannibal (Polyb. 7.9) simply imply their being the most powerful members of the ‘Hellenic league’, but this interpretation must be rejected (PAPAZOGLU 1983, 197–202; HATZOPOULOS 1996b I, 312–317).

is only apparently puzzling. This fundamental aspect both explains and nuances the fact that kingship was the only Macedonian institution clearly visible to an outside observer: the king was the only representative of his country in all official acts; he concluded alliances and issued coins in his own name; Macedonian political and religious interstate envoys were usually described as the king's representatives.

A few well-known examples will suffice to elucidate the point. Athenian diplomatic relationships with Macedonia during the fifth and the first half of the fourth century make exclusive reference to the king (Perdikkas II, Archelaos, or Amyntas III respectively).<sup>48</sup> The Macedonian *synedros* to a panhellenic peace conference (probably that of 371) is described by Aischines as an envoy of the same Amyntas.<sup>49</sup> Still at the eve of Philip's accession to the throne (360 BC), his father Perdikkas III is the only *theorodokos* of the Macedonian state in a list from Epidauros,<sup>50</sup> while, from Philip II's reign onwards, Macedonia was represented in Delphi by *hieromnemones* invariably depicted in the epigraphic documents as envoys of the king.<sup>51</sup> Circumstances like the ones I have just cited could easily suggest to Greek observers that all powers and functions were concentrated in the hands of the king and thus justify an interpretation of the latter's power as autocratic.<sup>52</sup>

This symbolic role of the king as representative of the entire *ethnos* extended to the religious field, and this specific aspect has prompted several modern scholars to describe him as the 'High priest' of the state. Part of the evidence usually cited in

48 One of the Athenian treaties of alliance with Perdikkas II is preserved on stone (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 89), while Thucydides frequently alludes to the king's tendency to change sides (1.57.2, 1.61.3, 1.62.2, 2.29.6, 4.79.2, 4.128.5, 5.83.4, 6.7.3–4, 7.9). In 410 the Athenians offered their military help to Archelaos (Diod. 13.49.1–2), and in turn they honoured him for his cooperation, probably in 407/6 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 117). The Athenian alliance with Amyntas III is to be dated to (or soon after) 375 (*IG* II<sup>3</sup> 102); in the 390s, the alliance with the Chalkidian *koinon* was also concluded in the name of 'Amyntas son of Errhidaios' (HATZOPOULOS 1996b II, no. 1, A, ll. 2–3). On the almost exclusive visibility of the king in treaties and alliances involving Macedonia see ERRINGTON 1974, 32–36, with a very different interpretation.

49 Aeschin. 2.32.

50 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup>(1) 94b, line 9, on which see MARI 2002, 67–71.

51 Some references in n.9; for Perseus' representatives see *CID* IV, 108, ll. 5–7. The same qualification of envoys 'of the king' is applied, at Delphi, to the Macedonian *tamiai*: on both *hieromnemones* and *tamiai*, and more generally on the description of Macedonian officers in Delphic inscriptions see MARI 2002, 110–116, 153, 226–227, 277–282. Interestingly, the amphiktionic lists confirm Diodoros' statement that in 346, at the end of the third sacred war, the two amphiktionic votes previously belonging to the Phokians were transferred 'to Philip' (16.60.1). The visible presence of Macedonian cities (and individuals) in panhellenic sanctuaries clearly grows in our evidence from the early Hellenistic period, possibly starting from the age of Alexander (MARI 2002, 319–329, 2007).

52 It is hard to distinguish between simple misunderstanding and wilful distortion in these literary descriptions (see again Dem. 1.4). Interestingly, several modern scholars adopt a similar perspective: see e.g. ERRINGTON 1974, 33 ('Nowhere is there any suggestion or even hint that the king might be acting juridically as the representative of the Macedonian People and not wholly in his own right').

support of such an interpretation should in reality be dismissed as irrelevant.<sup>53</sup> But the literary tradition on Alexander does offer some extremely interesting indications, not only showing him actually in a ‘religious’ role and performing rites in the name of the entire *ethnos* (a function for which the parallel of the Spartan kings can be usefully cited),<sup>54</sup> but also insisting on the traditional character of such actions, which included the offering of sacrifices, the employment of (and cooperation with) specialists in divination, and the consultation of oracles.<sup>55</sup>

Well known is also the king’s personal attendance to ‘national’ festivals in which the entire community of the *Makedones* was supposed to take part.<sup>56</sup> This was definitely the case of the *Olympia*, celebrated in autumn in the ‘pan-Macedonian’ sanctuary of Dion, and of the *Xandika*, which marked the beginning of the military season in early spring, each time in the place where the army first gathered. The most relevant evidence for the *Xandika* concerns Hellenistic episodes, but the festival undoubtedly had an ancient and traditional character, as suggested by the month named *Xandikos* in the Macedonian calendar. As for the *Olympia*, literary sources insist that the festival was introduced by king Archelaos, at the end of the fifth century; the participation of Philip and of Alexander in the festival is described by

- 53 Inscriptions, at least from the Hellenistic period, attest royal interventions aimed at regulating the relationships between cities and sanctuaries, defining the fiscal status of the latter, or even correcting details of cult practice: in my view all of this tells us less of the cultic or religious prerogatives of the king than of the large extension of his legislative authority (MARI forthcoming [a], with references).
- 54 On the Spartan kings’ ‘religious’ functions, see esp. Xen. *Lac.* 15.2, on Lykourgos ordaining ‘that the king shall offer all the public sacrifices on behalf of the state, in virtue of his divine descent’, and cf. CARLIER 1984, 250–276, 292–301; R. PARKER 1989, 154–160; RICHER 2012, 244–252, 258–260. At Sparta no ‘national’ *hierous* or ‘High priest’ (other than the king) is attested, while the existence of such a figure can at least be hypothesised in Macedonia under the last two Antigonids (MARI forthcoming [a]).
- 55 Most episodes (especially those describing the king as personally performing a sacrifice) were related to critical moments, such as battles, sieges, crossing of rivers, foundations of cities, or a mutiny, and the sources frequently stress the fact that the sacrifices were offered ‘in accordance with ancestral custom’ (τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ, ὡς νόμος, κατὰ νόμον) or ‘to the traditional (πάτριον) gods’ (Arr. *Anab.* 2.26.4, 3.16.9, 3.25.1, 3.28.4, 4.4.1, 5.3.6, 5.8.2–3, 5.20.1, 5.29.1–2, 6.3.1–2, 7.11.8, 7.14.1, 7.24.4, *Ind.* 18.11–12; Plut. *Alex.* 76; Curt. 3.8.22, and cf. FREDRICKSMEYER 1966; EDMUNDS 1971). The king’s consultation of oracles may also be a part of his duties as representative of the *ethnos* towards the gods: many such episodes are attested in the tradition on Alexander and are in most cases to be accepted as historical. Moreover, the concession of the Delphic *promanteia* to Philip (Dem. 9.32) fits in perfectly with such an interpretation of the ‘religious’ role of the Macedonian king (MARI 2002, 138). TRAMPEDACH, this volume, also stresses the regular presence of ‘divinatory specialists’ in ancient Greek armies and their direct relationship with the generals. On the contrary, the late references to religious rites (ιερά, *sacra*) which were specific and exclusive prerogatives of the Argead clan are not very reliable, due to the nature of the sources: see Ath. 14.659 F - 660 A, who quotes a letter by Olympias to Alexander, or Curtius’ reference (10.7.2) to Philip Arrhidaios being ‘sacrorum caerimoniarumque consors’ with Alexander.
- 56 See already above.



the same sources.<sup>57</sup> The traveling lifestyle of the army and therefore of the political community of the *Makedones* during Alexander's Asian campaign<sup>58</sup> possibly affected some aspects of Macedonian festivals and influenced later developments of the Hellenistic *panegyreis* (mainly, their being celebrated each time in a different location and their strongly military character), but, once again, significant continuity may be observed.<sup>59</sup>

## RULER CULT

Another aspect of the religious relationship between the king and the Macedonians – the possibility of offering a cult to the ruler himself – did see significant changes over time, as far as our evidence allows us to conclude: and yet, once again, Alexander does not appear to have played the greatest role in that process. Some anticipation of the Hellenistic ruler cult in Greek cities can be observed in Macedonia (as in other areas of the Greek world), from the age of Philip II or even earlier,<sup>60</sup> and Philip himself may have explored new forms of 'State cult' of the living king.<sup>61</sup> If historical, the attempt was apparently unsuccessful, and the whole process, at least in Macedonia *stricto sensu*, does not seem to have been very advanced by the time of Alexander. Both Alexander and his father became the object of some form of cult by the Macedonians, either on the private level or as the result of exceptional circumstances, only after their death, while evidence of cult during their lifetime is practically non-existent.<sup>62</sup>

57 See esp. Diod. 16.55.1–2, on the *Olympia* of 348, celebrated by Philip (also mentioned by Dem. 19.192–193); Diod. 17.16.3–4 and Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.1, on those of 335, celebrated by Alexander (in Aigai according to Arrian). For all the remaining evidence on both *Olympia* and *Xandika* and the relationships between Macedonian traditional festivals and some Hellenistic *panegyreis* see MARI 2017b, 2018c, 2019b.

58 This aspect is briefly, but brilliantly, highlighted by LANE FOX 2011b, 387.

59 See MARI 2019b, with remarks on the different elements of the Macedonian traditional *panegyreis* which possibly influenced later developments. See also MANN, this volume.

60 See the appendix of sources at the end of MARI 2008, with all references: nos. 1 (sacrifices to Philip II, in his lifetime, at Amphipolis), 10 (*temene* of Philip [II] at Philippoi), 11 (a tribe named after Philip II at Philippopolis), 12 (a temple possibly dedicated already to Philip's father, Amyntas III, at Pydna).

61 See MARI 2008, 232–236, with a discussion of two possible 'experiments' by Philip: the allusion to some kind of 'dynastic cult' in the *Philippeion* at Olympia (Paus. 5.20.9–10), on which see VON DEN HOFF, this volume; and the procession of images of the Twelve Gods, to which a statue of Philip himself was added (Diod. 16.92.5, 16.95.1; Stob. 4.34.70.846 W.).

62 For local cults see above, n. 60; for Alexander, to date no cult at the local level is attested in Macedonia, and the kingdom *stricto sensu* was apparently not involved in Alexander's so-called 'claim to divine honours' in 324 BC (literary sources are quoted by MARI 2008, 244 n. 59; probably the Thasian *Alexandreia* were introduced during Alexander's lifetime, but the island was not part of the kingdom at the time: *ibid.* 245–247, 268, no. 15). An exceptional instance of posthumous cult is known from literary sources: according to Diod. 19.22 in 317 BC the Macedonian

Things changed only in the Hellenistic period, when the cult of the living king, in Macedonia as in the remaining parts of the Greek world, became a key-element of the relationship between individual cities and central power. We can define the main aspects of the ‘Macedonian way’ of ruler cult as follows:

1) No positive evidence attests that the ceremonies following the death of members of the royal family ever gave rise to a regular cult practice, with sacrifices, offerings, funeral games and a specific cult area dedicated to each one of them, as an established part of a ‘national’ *nomos* in Macedonia, even in the Hellenistic period, when such a process took place in Ptolemaic Egypt.

2) In Macedonia (either before or after Alexander) no cult epithet permanently included in the titulature of any king is known so far, either from literary or epigraphic evidence (again in contrast to Ptolemaic Egypt).

3) On the contrary, in the Antigonid era, some epigraphic indications clearly suggest cults of Macedonian kings at the local level, even in their lifetime. This typically Hellenistic interaction between kings and cities remained apparently alien to the Macedonian ‘Old Kingdom’: to date the available evidence comes exclusively from the ‘New Lands’ annexed to the kingdom by Philip II or later, which, in this respect, behaved exactly like the cities of other areas of the Greek world.<sup>63</sup>

We may wonder about Alexander’s specific contribution to (or influence on) these later developments. The debated evidence on the reactions of Macedonian officers and soldiers and of Greek members of Alexander’s inner circle to the attempt at introducing *proskynesis* in the court ceremonial in 328/7 can be of some use. Kallisthenes’ position, as it is described by Arrian,<sup>64</sup> is particularly interesting, as he was a Greek intellectual born in a Greek city (Olynthos) with a glorious history as a free *polis* (after having been the capital-city of the Chalkidian *koinon*, it had been conquered and destroyed by Philip II in 348). In other words, towards the Macedonian central power Olynthos had found itself in a position quite similar to those of Pydna, or of Amphipolis (which apparently did offer a cult to Philip).<sup>65</sup> Kallisthenes, therefore, was an influential member of the court who was well aware of both the Macedonian *nomos* and the Greek political tradition. In Arrian’s narrative, Kallisthenes interprets the *proskynesis* as a visible sign of divine cult (an interpretation probably shared by most contemporary Greeks, including the Macedonians) and connects such a ceremony exclusively to a barbarian conception of royal power. He probably agreed with Isokrates in dividing the world into three parts, as far as the

satrap of Persia, Peukestas, offered ‘a magnificent sacrifice to the gods, and to Alexander and Philip as well’, and then a feast to which the whole army was invited; the participants occupied a large space, at the center of which ‘altars for the gods and for Alexander and Philip’ were located (see MARI 2008, 228–229). For examples of popular devotion towards the two great dead kings see Just. *Epit.* 24.5.9–11 and the late imperial graffiti from Pella published by CHRYSOSTOMOU 1994.

63 For a complete collection of the evidence and a detailed discussion see MARI 2008.

64 Arr. *Anab.* 4.11–12.

65 See above, n. 60.

conception of kingship and the ways of exercising it were concerned (ἐδεργεταιῖν / βασιλεύειν / ἄρχειν),<sup>66</sup> and he apparently attributed the inclination of paying divine honours to living men only to barbarians (Isokrates' third group).<sup>67</sup>

Be that as it may, in the literary tradition on the introduction of a cult of Alexander in the Greek cities, in 324 BC no Macedonian city is ever mentioned, and such a cult is so far unattested in Macedonia by contemporary epigraphic evidence.<sup>68</sup> If ruler cult was basically a way of 'coming to terms with royal power, or making sense of it',<sup>69</sup> it is understandable why Macedonian cities – even those only recently annexed to the kingdom – never needed to address Alexander in such a way. A few years later, even Demetrios Poliorketes, who in many respects tried to innovate the conception of royal power and broke with the Macedonian tradition, was much more cautious in Macedonia than in the rest of the Greek world with religious traditions and any connections between religion and power: but other prominent figures of the age of the Diadochoi and, more clearly, later Antigonid kings (particularly Philip V) acted in a markedly different way. Over time, therefore, the difference between Macedonia and the other Hellenistic kingdoms with respect to cults paid to living kings or members of the royal family decreased or disappeared. Several cities of the Macedonian 'New Lands' shaped their relationship with the kings also by employing the ruler cult as a flexible and effective tool.<sup>70</sup> In short, the revolutionary changes sparked by Alexander's conquests affected his own homeland at a slower rate.

66 Isoc. 5.154 (cf. *supra*). On Kallisthenes' role first at Philip's and then at Alexander's court see PRANDI 1985.

67 See esp. Arr. *Anab.* 4.11.8, where Kallisthenes wonders about the practical consequences of an imposition of the *proskynesis* custom: 'Consider this also: on your way back (to Europe) will it be the Greeks, the most free of all men, whom you will compel to bow down before you, or will you perhaps exempt the Greeks, and shackle the Macedonians with this shame? Or will you draw a line thus in the matter of honours for all the world, so that by Greeks and Macedonians you shall be honoured as a man, according to the Greek custom, and by foreigners only in this foreign fashion?'. This passage, which BORZA 1996, 124 quoted as an example of an 'ethnic' opposition between Greeks and Macedonians (omitting any reference to the 'barbarians'), actually is a contrast of both of them and the barbarians (on the recurrent distinction Greeks/Macedonians, or Greece/Macedonia, in the Alexander sources, see above). The literary tradition also records anecdotes on leading figures at court who resisted *proskynesis* or mocked the Persians for performing it: these are probably fictional, but all the same meaningful (see MARI 2008, 244 n. 58, for references).

68 Above, n. 62, also for the apparent exception of Thasos.

69 MA 1999, 219.

70 On Demetrios' 'religious policy' see MARI 2016 (168–169 on Macedonia). On the cult paid by individual Macedonian cities of the 'New Lands' to Kassandros, Lysimachos, Eurydike (mother of Ptolemy Ceraunus, king of Macedonia between 281 and 279 BC), 'Antigonos' (Gonatas or Doson) and 'Philip' (to be identified in most cases with Philip V), in their lifetime, see MARI 2008, appendix (267–268).

## THE ‘MACEDONICITY’ OF THE KING

A final element needs to be considered, namely what we could label the ‘Macedonicity’ of the βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων himself. The epigraphic evidence of the Hellenistic period shows that the Macedonian king was sometimes described not as βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων, but as βασιλεὺς Μακεδών.<sup>71</sup> Such an ‘ethnic’ description was not limited to the Antigonids, but occasionally applied to the members of other Hellenistic dynasties: in this case, Errington’s explanation that a ruler was described as a βασιλεὺς Μακεδών exclusively for practical reasons and only in territories external to those under his direct control, seems to me unsatisfactory.<sup>72</sup> It rather seems that these claims to ‘Macedonicity’ had an ideological significance and were part of a large and systematic effort to legitimise royal power (and the existence itself of the Hellenistic kingdoms) through some kind of connection with Alexander and his homeland.<sup>73</sup>

In earlier Macedonian history, the king’s belonging to the *ethnos* of the Macedonians was no less important, although for other reasons: as frequently stressed by modern scholars, in most of literary references Philip II is described simply as ‘the Macedonian’, often with polemical overtones,<sup>74</sup> but the fact that the king of the Macedonians was himself a Μακεδών emerges also in the neutral context of an interstate alliance and is therefore particularly relevant. In one of the treaties he concluded with the Athenians – the only one which is preserved on stone –, Perdik-

71 See AYMARD 1950, 67–68, 72–75, with references. See also ERRINGTON 1974, who concludes that a fixed and stable royal titlature never existed in Macedonia.

72 ERRINGTON 1974, 30–31, who quotes examples of the use of such a title as referred to Ptolemy III or Antiochos III.

73 On references to the Seleucids as ‘Macedonians’ and its meaning see MUSTI 1966, 104–105, 111–121. Among other things, MUSTI stresses that in the cuneiform text of the Borsippa cylinder Antiochos I carries several royal titles (‘the Great king, the legitimate king, the king of the world, king of Babylon, king of all countries’), while the ‘ethnic’ definition ‘Macedonian’ is limited to his father Seleukos, in order to stress the dynasty’s Macedonian origins (cf. AYMARD 1950, 67–68). On Ptolemies as ‘Macedonians’, particularly in dedications in the Panhellenic sanctuaries (Paus. 6.3.1 and 10.7.8), see BEARZOT 1992a, 265–268, 1992b. No doubt that legitimacy claims to ‘Macedonicity’ or even to a direct blood relationship with the Argeads were more frequent in the first generation of the *Diadochoi*: see their attempts at establishing such a relationship through marriages (Diod. 18.23.3, 18.25.3, 19.52.1, 19.61.2), or Ptolemy’s ‘theft’ of Alexander’s corpse, who was buried at Alexandria and became the centre of an elaborate cult (Diod. 18.26–28 and Paus. 1.6.3, among others). But among the Antigonids Philip V apparently still showed a constant will to be associated – even in terms of ‘kinship’ – to Philip II and Alexander (Polyb. 5.10.9–11). In his case, of course, ‘Macedonicity’ was not questioned, but his being a member of the *ethnos* is in some way highlighted in *I. Magnesia* 47, ll. 1–5 (on which see MUSTI 1963, 230). Cf. also MEEUS, this volume.

74 On Philip II as ‘the Macedonian’ (without the title *basileus*) in literary sources see ERRINGTON 1974, 30–31, and, with reference to Dem. 9.30–31, MARI 2015.

kas II is alluded to as a member of the *ethnos* over which he rules (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 89, l. 26: [Περδικ]κο καὶ τῶν ἄλλον Μακεδόνων).<sup>75</sup>

The literary tradition on Alexander, in its turn, also shows – at least indirectly – this key-aspect of the royal ideology and self-representation, for instance in Alexander’s speech to the ‘mutineers’ at Opis in Arrian’s *Anabasis* (which insists on the common lifestyle shared by the king and the Macedonians, once again a literary *topos* more revealing than is usually assumed), or in Diodoros’ famous description of Alexander’s landing in Asia (‘he flung his spear from the ship and he fixed it in the ground, and then he went ashore the first of the Macedonians’).<sup>76</sup>

Even more meaningful are the passages in literary sources which attribute a specific meaning to the use of the Macedonian dialect (or the refusal to use it) in Alexander’s circle. In Curtius’ narrative of the trial of Philotas, refusing to speak or even to learn the ‘language of the forefathers’ (*patrius sermo*) is taken as proof of Philotas’ general contempt of Macedonian customs and identity by Alexander, while in Plutarch’s *Eumenes* speaking Μακεδονιστί is a sign of cohesion among the phalangites when they hail Eumenes – a non-Macedonian by birth – as their commander-in-chief.<sup>77</sup> Unlike other scholars, I do not think that such passages can be used in any way to demonstrate that ancient Greek authors considered Macedonian a non-Greek language.<sup>78</sup> The Greek character of the language spoken in Macedonia can no longer be questioned.<sup>79</sup> Thus, a different view of passages like those mentioned above can be taken. If speaking Greek (ἐλληνίζειν) was the key-feature of being (or becoming) *Hellenes*,<sup>80</sup> specific dialects too could be seen as mark-

75 Due to Perdikkas’ regularly switching sides and the fragmentary character of the text, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 89 cannot be dated with certainty (above, notes 9 and 48).

76 Cf. Arr. *Anab.* 7.9.8–10.3; Diod. 17.17.1–2 (πρῶτος τῶν Μακεδόνων).

77 Curt. 6.9.34–36; Plut. *Eum.* 14.5. Eumenes of Kardia is an interesting case of a leading figure at Alexander’s court whose Greek (that is, non-Macedonian: see above) origin is frequently stressed by our sources: see the different interpretations by BORZA 1996, 133–136, and ANSON 2015c, 252–261. Sometimes more psychological than ideological interpretations of the use of the native dialect are evoked by our sources, as in Plutarch’s description of Kleitos’ murder (*Alex.* 51.4).

78 According to BORZA 1996, 132, Curtius’ passage would show that ‘Macedonian and Greek were mutually unintelligible languages in Alexander’s day’, but nothing of that kind emerges from Curtius’ words (cf. HATZOPOULOS 2018, 320); J. HALL 2001, 161–163, interprets Plut. *Ant.* 27.3–4 as if the Macedonian was here included among barbarian languages, but this is definitely not the case. A very useful discussion and further bibliography can be found in HATZOPOULOS 2007, 54–55 and n. 16.

79 For recent discussions of the evidence and scholarship on the position of the Macedonian among the Greek dialects see BRIXHE 2018; HATZOPOULOS 2018.

80 The *locus classicus* is Hdt. 8.144.2 (part of the Athenian reply to the Spartan envoys in 480/79 on Xerxes’ request to surrender), according to which the ‘Greekness’ (*to Hellenikon*) is, among other things, ‘kinship in blood and speech (ῥαμαὸν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον), and the shrines of gods and the sacrifices that we have in common, and the likeness of our way of life’. On ancient and modern conceptions of the meaning of the words ἐλληνίζειν, ἑλληνισμός, ἑλληνιστής, used mainly – though not exclusively – in reference to non-Greeks, see CANFORA 1987, 83, 85–89, 91–109; MUSTI 1990, 683–685.

ers of identity, for example when they helped in defining the exact origin and ethnic composition of a Greek colony.<sup>81</sup> In Alexander's army and at court, Macedonian normally coexisted with other Greek dialects, and the same situation had already developed in Macedonia after the great expansion under Philip II.<sup>82</sup> But the episodes I have recalled, regardless of the historical accuracy of the details, clearly show that the use of dialect could be seen as symbolically or ideologically meaningful.<sup>83</sup>

On the other hand, the ideological interpretation of the act of 'speaking Macedonian' which our sources suggest as a historical reality did not affect the official written habits of the kingdom and of the royal chancery. Philip II (if not already his predecessors) adopted Attic as the official language of the chancery, paving the way to a generalised use of the *koine* in official documents by Alexander, his successors and, within Macedonia, the cities themselves.<sup>84</sup> In a way, public documents were a 'literary genre' requiring a specific dialect; in more practical terms, Philip's adoption of Attic settled the problem of choosing one dialect among those spoken (and written) in the now enlarged kingdom (Macedonian, Ionic, Thessalian).<sup>85</sup> If this usefulness of the *koine* is self-evident in the case of written usage, the same can be said of its adoption as the common language of Alexander's army, which emerges from the literary tradition.<sup>86</sup>

- 81 See e.g. Thucydides' remarks on Himera in Sicily, whose foundation by Chalkidians from Zankle and Syracusans was confirmed by the city's dialect, 'a mixture of Chalkidian and Doric'; and on the mixed population of the Akte peninsula, in Chalkidike, where the Greek element was represented by 'a small number of Chalkidians' (6.5.1 and 4.109.3–4 respectively). Herodotos, in his turn, classifies the Ionians of Asia in four groups according to their dialects (1.142).
- 82 In the Chalkidian cities or in Amphipolis, for example, the Ionian dialect was still prevailing at the time of the Macedonian conquest and was slowly replaced by the *koine* (MARI 2018b, 182 and n.12).
- 83 It should be stressed that, while our sources' distance in time from the events is usually a problem and can lead to misunderstandings or conscious distortions (for example when they apply rhetorical *topoi* or patterns taken from later historical periods to Alexander's conception of kingship or to his approach to barbarian cultures), these references to the use of the Macedonian dialect are most probably genuine and already present in Plutarch's and Curtius' sources. References to the peculiarity of the dialect and to speaking Μακεδονιστί are never attested in Hellenistic sources: in Polybios μακεδονίζειν means 'to side with the Macedonians' (20.5.5), while epigraphic documents in Hellenistic Macedonia are invariably written in *koine*.
- 84 No document issued by the royal chancery earlier than the reign of Philip II is available so far (see HATZOPOULOS 1996b II and the updated list in MARI 2018a, notes 14, 15, 21, 27, 31, 32). Of course nothing can be said about the language of the royal letters, *diagrammata* or other official acts earlier than Philip II (on their possible existence see MARI 2006, 213–214).
- 85 For references and bibliography see MARI 2018b, 182 and n.12; on the *koine* spoken in Macedonia see HATZOPOULOS 2018, 300, 305–307.
- 86 See e.g. Curtius' chapters on Philotas' trial (6.9.35, 10.23). On *koine* (or 'standard Greek') as language for oral communication within Alexander's army see the different views by HAMMOND 1994b, 137 and J. HALL 2001, 162–163. BRIXHE's view that the use of the dialect was precociously abandoned by the Macedonians, starting from the members of the elite, seems impossible to prove and possibly refuted by the passages already quoted, and his conclusion that '(e)n Macé-

## SOME (VERY LIMITED) CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, I hope to have shown that the simple use of different royal titulatures, if taken in isolation, does not prove the existence of completely different conceptions of royal power (in Macedonia or anywhere else). Every general interpretation of the nature of the Macedonian monarchy (before and after Alexander) as either ‘national’ or ‘autocratic’ should be based on larger and firmer grounds. The existence itself of the formula βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων and the explicit mention of the *Makedones* in official documents, however, are at least clear hints of the growing ‘visibility’ of the *ethnos*, in Hellenistic Macedonia, as one of the two constituent parts of the state. On the other hand, the use of the royal title itself (βασιλεὺς, with or without Μακεδόνων) as an official description of Macedonian rulers remained unsystematic even in Alexander’s reign.

The relationship linking the Macedonian kings – who were, first of all, military leaders – to the *Makedones* – whose condition was determined by census and military service – undoubtedly had a strongly charismatic character. At the same time, such a relationship determined some kind of mutual dependence between the two constituent elements of the state. As a consequence, a condition of permanent (or semi-permanent) war was needed, in order to legitimise the king’s power and ability to redistribute wealth, to fuel the Companions’ lifestyle,<sup>87</sup> and to allow men of lower classes to reach the minimum census level necessary to be (in legal terms) *Makedones*. The conquests of new territories, which since the age of Philip II vastly expanded the recruitment pool of Macedonian infantry soldiers, were also the basic *raison d’être* of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

Some important innovations can be attributed to Alexander, who certainly attempted to modify and expand the ethnic composition of his army and explored radically new ways of conceiving and representing kingship. But we should also admit that Philip II had already adopted a revolutionary approach to the exercise of royal power (his experiments in ruler cult being among the most impressive signs of such a new conception) and, on the other hand, that other innovations were fully completed only after Alexander: to the regular adoption of the royal title and the explicit mention of the *Makedones* in official documents we should add the diffusion of the civic cult paid to living kings in some areas of the kingdom. Apparently those changes did not entirely alter – even after Alexander – the ideological representation of the relationship between king and Macedonians as a fundamentally egalitarian one. In spite of the charismatic base of his power and of his position at the top of a deeply hierarchical society, the king (even Alexander at the height of his success) needed to present himself as a *primus inter pares* with regard to his Companions, or,

doine, le dialect n’a (...) jamais été utilisé comme étendard identitaire’ (2018, 24), is in my view to be rejected.

87 On this aspect of the relationship between the king and the Macedonian elite see MONSON and MEEUS, this volume.

with regard with the ‘common’ Macedonians, as a Macedonian himself, in lifestyle as in language.

Nicholas Hammond rightly remarked that treating the reign of Alexander as a watershed in the historical development of Macedonian institutions and limiting ourselves to the study of only ‘one side or other of the watershed’ is a mistake that must be avoided.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, the different topics dealt with in the previous pages show that the reigns of Philip, Alexander and the Diadochoi can be taken together as a long period of change. The great expansion of Macedonian territories under Philip, Alexander’s long absence from the homeland and relations with foreign peoples, and the constant struggles among the Successors definitely affected the relationship between the king and the Macedonians, even though some remarkable elements of it remained stable and unchanged.

88 HAMMOND 2000, 141.