

CONNOTATIONS OF ‘MACEDONIA’ AND OF ‘MACEDONES’ UNTIL 323 B.C.

It was a characteristic of Macedonian custom that a name was used in a special and in a general sense. For example, ‘Foot-Companions’ was the name of a Bodyguard of Philip and also of the men of the Phalanx-Brigades from Lower Macedonia, and ‘Hypaspists’ was the name of Infantry-Guardsmen of Alexander and also of the men of three Hypaspist Phalanx-Brigades. Geographical names were repeated: there were at least two regions and two cities called ‘Emathia’, two or three regions called ‘Doberus’, four cities called Philippi or Philippopolis, and Alexandrias galore. To a modern mind this makes for confusion. That is certainly the case with the names ‘Macedonia’ and ‘Macedones’, which I shall treat separately in this article.¹

I. CONNOTATIONS OF ‘MACEDONIA’

That ‘Macedonia’ did have more than one connotation in ancient literature is obvious. What we may call the primary connotation has survived in the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides. In describing the encampment of Xerxes’ army on the coast from Therme to the mouth of the Haliacmon Herodotus remarked that the joint waters of the rivers Ludias and Haliacmon² formed the boundary between ‘the territory Bottiaeis’ and ‘the territory Macedonis’ (7.127.1 γῆν τὴν Βοττιαίδα τε καὶ Μακεδονίδα). Then within the area south of the Haliacmon, namely ‘Pieria’, where Xerxes lingered, Herodotus wrote of ‘the Macedonian mountain’ lying athwart Xerxes’ intended route into Perrhaebia (7.131). In these passages Herodotus was clearly writing of a Macedonian homeland, which extended from the lowest reach of the Haliacmon to the borders of Perrhaebia and Magnesia (7.131 and 7.173.1). Thucydides used the term ‘Macedonia’ in the same geographical sense, when he was writing of the events of 432 B.C. Then the Athenians who were laying siege to Pydna (in Pieria) decided to move elsewhere. ‘They depart from Macedonia, and on coming to Beroea...they proceeded towards Potidaea’ (1.61.3 ἀπανίστανται ἐκ τῆς Μακεδονίας, καὶ ἀφικόμενοι ἐς Βέροϊαν...ἐπορεύοντο).³ Thus the Athenian army left ‘Macedonia’ as it crossed the lowest reach of the Haliacmon and entered, *en route* to Beroea, the territory which Herodotus had called ‘Bottiaeis’ and which Thucydides called ‘Bottia’ (2.99.3) and ‘Bottiaea’ (2.100.4).

¹ The following abbreviations are used: *Anc. Mac.*: *Ancient Macedonia* 1–5 (Thessaloniki, 1970–93); Anson: E. M. Anson, ‘The Meaning of the Term Macedones’, *The Ancient World* 10 (1985) 67–8; Arr.: Arrian, *Anabasis Alexandrou*; Borza: E. N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus* (Princeton, 1990). Bosworth C: A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian’s History of Alexander I–III* (Oxford, 1967); Hammond Ep: N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* (Oxford, 1967); Hammond MS: idem, *The Macedonian State* (Oxford, 1989); Hammond Sources: idem, *Sources for Alexander: Plutarch’s Life and Arrian’s Anabasis* (Cambridge, 1993); Hammond THA: idem, *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge, 1983); HM: idem, *A History of Macedonia I* (Oxford, 1972), II with G. T. Griffith (1979), III with F. W. Walbank (1988). Tod: M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions I–II* (Oxford, 1933 and 1948).

² For these rivers see HM 1. 144f. and Map 15.

³ The opening part of this text is not affected by the emendation of ἐπιστρέψαντες which I discussed in HM 1. 183f. The significance of ‘Macedonia’ was not noted for instance by Gomme or Borza.

What one may call the secondary connotation of the word 'Macedonia' appeared concurrently in the writings of Herodotus and of Thucydides. According to Herodotus, writing of some Persian envoys c. 510 B.C., one crossed Mt Dysoron and was 'in Macedonia' (5.17.2), that is to say in the canton called Amphaxitis. It was somewhere in that same region that 'Thracian Brygi' c. 492 B.C. attacked the army of Mardonius encamped 'in Macedonia' (6.45.1). Then, during the Persian preparation and invasion c. 482–480 B.C. 'Macedonia' included the coastal area from Therme at the head of the Thermaic Gulf to the mouth of the Haliacmon river (7.25.2 together with 7.127.1). When Herodotus was describing the origin of the Temenid dynasty, he wrote of 'the inland Macedonia' commencing at the border with the Illyrians and extending to within reach of the kingdom of the pre-Temenid king (8.137.1 *ἐκ δὲ Ἰλλυριῶν ὑπερβαλόντες ἐς τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίην*).⁴ Similarly he distinguished that pre-Temenid kingdom, which he evidently located within 'the territory Macedonis' of 7.127.1, from the land beyond the river which was 'another land of Macedonia' and from 'the rest of Macedonia', the latter including the region near 'the Gardens of Midas' below Mt. Bermium (8.138.2) and 3 *ἐς ἄλλην γῆν τῆς Μακεδονίης...καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην*). In the phrases 'another land of Macedonia' and 'the rest of Macedonia' Herodotus had in mind not the pre-Temenid kingdom but the Macedonia of his own day.⁵

At 2.95.1 Thucydides described Perdiccas as 'king of Macedonia' and at 2.99.1 his realm as 'the low Macedonia over which Perdiccas was ruling', i.e. in 429 B.C. (*τὴν κάτω Μακεδονίαν, ἣς ὁ Περδίκκας ἥρχεν*). Its limits were set by Thucydides at Arnisa in Eordaea (4.128.3 *Ἀρνισα πρῶτον τῆς Περδίκκου ἀρχῆς*) and at the Strymon river in the east (2.99.4 *μέχρι Στρυμόνος...νέμονται*). He also called the realm created by Alexander and his ancestors 'the present-day⁶ by-the-sea Macedonia', a rather vague phrase since Chalcidice and Bottice were both separate entities (2.101.5). He did refer to areas 'inland' (1.59.2 and 2.99.4 *ἄνωθεν*) and 'farther inland' (2.99.2 *ἐπάνωθεν*). But it is striking and no doubt deliberate on Thucydides' part that he did not use the phrase 'the inland Macedonia' as Herodotus had done. Instead, he called individual regions there by a toponym, e.g. 'Lyncus' (4.83.2) or by the name of a tribe, e.g. Elimiotae, Lyncestae and Orestae. At the end of his digression at 2.99.6 Thucydides,

⁴ The meaning 'inland' (L-S-J s.v. *ἄνω* II f) has to be borne in mind, as at Hdt. 7.128.1, where the contrast was between the coastal route from Lower Macedonia to Thessaly (7.173.1) and 'the inland route' via Petra Pass, for which see *HM* 1.123 with Map 12 and Borza 290f. The conventional translation 'Upper Macedonia' is less accurate; and the Petra Pass was not in what came to be known as 'Upper Macedonia'.

⁵ When the first capital, Aegeae, was placed by scholars at Edessa below Mt Bermium (e.g. by C. F. Edson in *Anc. Mac.* 1.21), the homeland of the Macedonians was placed there. That identification ran counter to all other evidence (see *HM* 1. 156f.) and was disproved by the excavations at Vergina, where Aegeae is to be placed. The old identification seems to have caused some confusion. For instance, Borza 82 wrote recently. 'We are further confounded by the geographical discrepancy between the Mt. Vermion association of Perdiccas [the first Temenid king] and the possibility that the Makedones settled first in coastal Pieria'. Borza then made his own 'suggestion...based on no ancient evidence' that 'the westward [?] a mistake for northward] movement of the Pierian Makedones eventually reached the piedmont of Mt. Vermion near Veria or Mieza'. The ancient evidence, which Borza mentioned on p. 63, is far preferable to his or anyone else's 'based-on-no-evidence' speculation. The evidence is that the Thracian Pieres held 'coastal Pieria', the early Makedones were 'around Pieria and Olympus', and the association of Perdiccas and his brothers with the land below Mt. Bermion was as fugitives and later as conquerors in their advance from Pieria into Bottiaea.

⁶ Thucydides used *νῦν* at 2.100.2 in mentioning the forts built by Archelaus, and three times at 2.99.3 presumably with the same time reference. The present tense in 2.99.4 seems to be for variation only.

summing up the areas conquered by Alexander and his predecessors and 'still held today', wrote that 'the whole is called Macedonia', thus resuming his introductory phrase 'the low Macedonia' of 2.99.1.⁷

Xenophon followed the practice of Thucydides. Amyntas, 'king of Macedones', was expelled 'almost from all Macedonia' by the Olynthians who had captured Pella and other cities (*HG* 5.2.13) — which would not be true if Xenophon included Herodotus' 'inland Macedonia' in the realm of Amyntas. Moreover, the Spartan Teleutias in 381 B.C. advised Amyntas to buy the alliance of 'the neighbouring kings' (5.2.38 *τοῖς πλησίον βασιλεύσι*) if he wanted to regain his realm. Thus Xenophon regarded these kings not as part of Amyntas' realm but as independent rulers. So he described Derdas as 'ruler of Elimia' (5.2.38 *τὸν Ἐλιμίας ἄρχοντα*), and when Amyntas and Derdas joined Teleutias he wrote of 'the Macedonian army' and 'the army of Derdas' separately (5.2.43 *τὸ Μακεδονικὸν στράτευμα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Δέρδα*). In *The First Philippic* 4 Demosthenes looked back to this period as one in which many of the tribes had been 'self-governing and free' (*αὐτονομούμενα καλεύθερα τῶν ἐθνῶν*).

The situation changed when Philip absorbed the tribes of 'inland Macedonia' into his kingdom from 358 B.C. onwards. The western limit of the kingdom was later extended to include Tymphaea and Parauaea at the expense of the Molossians, and to the east shore of Lake Lychnitis (Ochrid) at the expense of Illyrians. Rather surprisingly 'inland Macedonia' retained that name; for in 335 B.C. 'the cavalrymen from the inland Macedonia' were serving in Alexander's forces (*Arr.* 1.2.5 *τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἁνωθεν Μακεδονίας ἱππέας*). In the south Crousis, Chalcidice and Bottice were added. The eastern frontier of the kingdom was reported by Strabo to have been at the Nestus river (7. frs. 33 and 35), and Philip in particular was said by Strabo to have shown a special interest in the region between the Strymon and the Nestus, so much so as to appropriate it to himself (323).⁸ In the north Paeonia was made subject. The western areas were added to 'the inland Macedonia'.⁹ The additional areas in the south and Paeonia in the north were not called 'Macedonia by the sea' and 'inland Macedonia' respectively but went only under their own names. Yet the kingdom as a whole was called 'Macedonia', and the individual areas were a part thereof. Thus Paeonia was said in Justin 7.1.4 to be 'now a part of Macedonia' (in regione Paeoniae, quae nunc portio est Macedoniae), the 'now' referring probably to the reign of Philip (*CQ* 41 [1991] 501).

To summarize, 'Macedonia' was the name of the homeland between the lowest reach of the Haliacmon and the southern foothills of Lower Olympus both before and after the pre-Temenid era. When conquests followed, 'Macedonia' became the name of the whole area ruled by the king. That area naturally varied from time to time. But within it some distinctions continued in use: 'Macedonia' as the homeland, and 'low Macedonia' or 'Macedonia by the sea', and 'inland Macedonia' (usually called 'Upper Macedonia' by modern historians), which were units of their own and did not include for instance Chalcidice and Paeonia.

⁷ In *HM* 1.437 I noted that Thucydides arranged his subject matter in the form ABCDDCBA, which helps us to see that the *Μακεδόνων αὐτῶν* were those of 2.99.2.

⁸ This was not a new policy. Amyntas II offered to give Anthemus to Hippias (*Hdt.* 5.94.1) and Perdiccas II gave a part 'of his own land of Mygdonia by Lake Bolbe' for evacuees to cultivate (*Thuc.* 1.58.2). The region between the Strymon and the Nestus was perhaps what Pausanias meant when he wrote that Lysimachus 'regained Thrace' and later 'ruled in addition over Nestioi and Macedones', whereas 'most of Macedonia' was held by Pyrrhus. In any case Pausanias indicated that the western frontier of 'Thrace' was related to the river Nestus.

⁹ See *HM* 2.654.

II. CONNOTATIONS OF 'MACEDONES'

The earliest 'Macedon' in the surviving literature figures in Hesiod, *Eoëae* fr. 7, as the eponymous ancestor of the Macedones. Two brothers, 'Magnes and Macedon who fights from a chariot had their dwelling around Pieria and Olympus.' Of the two Magnes' name was given to Magnesia, the area in northeast Thessaly to which his descendants, the Magnesians, moved (Hesiod, *The Great Eoëae* fr. 256, lines 6–7), and Macedon's name was given to Macedonia (*Eoëae* fr. 7). Thus Macedon's descendants, the Macedones, stayed on 'around Pieria and Olympus', where we find them in later literature. What value do we attach to the statements of Hesiod and the Hesiodic School? They wrote during the colonising period, and they had every reason to learn from their near neighbours, Chalcis and Eretria, the geographical setting of their colonies. Thus they would have learnt from Eretria as foundress of Methone on the coast of Pieria c. 730 B.C. what peoples lived in the hinterland: namely Thracians associated with Orpheus (Plut. *Greek Questions* 11) and Macedonians around Pieria and Olympus. Once this is realised,¹⁰ one will estimate Hesiod's statements not as 'early folk traditions' but as well-based information dating from the colonising period. Nor should the fact that the information is conveyed in the poetic form of a genealogy mislead us into supposing that the information was 'the product of ancestor-creation'.¹¹ For that was the form in which much historical knowledge was conveyed from the epic cycle to the history of Herodotus.

The expansion of the Macedones into areas beyond the vicinity of Pieria and Olympus was associated with the coming to power of a new dynasty, that of the Temenidae, who had come from Argos in the Peloponnese. Both the name and the origin of this dynasty were stated by Herodotus (8.137.1 and 138.2) and by Thucydides (2.99.3 and 5.80.2), and the claim of Alexander I to be descended from the Temenidae of Argos was upheld by the Judges at the Olympic Games around 500 B.C. (Hdt. 5.221–2); thereafter in ancient times the name and the origin were accepted without any prevarication.¹² The Macedones over whom the first Temenid king, Perdiccas, ruled, when they were living 'around Pieria and Olympus', were mountaineers who, like their counterparts today, were engaged in transhumant pastoralism and rented some of their winter pastures from the Thracian 'Pieres' who occupied the Pierian coastland (Thuc. 2.99.3). Such transhumant pastoralists lived in small tribal groups.¹³ The name of one tribe has survived as 'Argeadae Macedones'

¹⁰ There was a time when the eighth and seventh centuries were regarded as prehistoric and the Lycurgean reform was dated c. 600 B.C. by H. T. Wade-Gery. Excavation has proved that there were reliable historical records of the foundations of colonies and other events for those centuries. Thus the traditional literary dating of Mende, across the Thermaic Gulf from Methone and founded like Methone by Eretria, to 730 B.C. has been confirmed by current excavations; see the report of houses and sherds of Eretrian pottery of the second half of the eighth century by J. Vokotopoulou in *Arkhaiologikon Ergon in Macedonia and Thrace 4* (Thessaloniki, 1990) p. 400.

¹¹ The quotations are from Borza 63 and 70.

¹² Herodotus states that he had information from the royal family (5.22.1 *κατάπερ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι*) and from the Macedonians (7.73 *οἱ Μακεδόνες λέγουσι*). Thucydides presumably drew on the same sources. It is a mistake to suppose that Thucydides simply repeated what Herodotus had said (as suggested by Borza 82); for if any historian was an independent thinker, it was Thucydides and he had a poor opinion of Herodotus. The number of generations back to the founder of the dynasty as given independently by Herodotus and by Thucydides brings us into the first half of the seventh century, well within historical time for an enquiry at Argos by the Judges. I am unconvinced by the arguments of Borza that 'the Temenidae (in Macedonia) must disappear from history' (82, based on his article in *Hesperia*, Suppl. 19 [1982] 7–13).

¹³ For this way of life see my book *Migrations and Invasions in Greece and adjacent areas* (New Jersey, 1976), 37ff.

(App. Syr. 63; cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. *Argeou*), because it was the royal tribe into which the Temenid dynasty was adopted (Paus. 7.8.9 and App. Mac. 2) and because it led the way in the conquest of Bottiaea (Strabo 7 fr. 11 and fr. 20 fin.).

Herodotus mentioned the expulsion of the Bottiaeans by 'Macedones' (8.127) almost as an aside. He was probably familiar with a fuller account of the conquests such as that which Thucydides later gave at 2.99. Because the Macedonians expelled or killed the previous inhabitants, they themselves occupied the whole area from Pieria to the Axios. Some Macedones continued to be mountaineers, for instance in Pieria (Hdt. 7.128.1 *Μακεδόνων τῶν κατύπερθε οἰκημένων*) and in Eordaea where the community was tribal and men had a tribal citizenship (Arr. 6.28.4), but the great majority adopted a settled life and each pastoral group made its own 'city' (*polis*). Thus the original tribal affiliation which we see in the 'Argeadae Macedones' was replaced in most areas by a 'city' citizenship, for instance in the list of trierarchs in Arr. Ind. 18.3–6, so that a man was a 'Macedon Pellaïos' or a 'Macedon from Pydna'. It was these 'Macedones' of the homeland and of the conquered areas over whom Perdiccas II ruled in Thucydides' account (2.99.1–6).

Thucydides distinguished 'these Macedones' (2.99.6 and 2.100.1 *οἱ Μακεδόνες οὗτοι*) from those who also bore the name 'Macedones'. He described the latter thus. 'There are of the Macedones also Lyncestae and Elimiotae and other tribes further inland who are indeed allied and obedient to them but have their own monarchies' (2.99.2). The Greek words *ξύμμαχα... ὑπήκοα* are usually translated 'allied and subject to them', but alliance can only be between independent states. I therefore take the meaning to be that when they were in alliance the Lyncestae etc. obeyed 'these Macedones' by accepting their military command. At 4.83.1 Thucydides described the Lyncestae as *Λυγκηστῶν Μακεδόνων*, which confirms the meaning of 2.99.2. What did these words imply? A fragment of Hecataeus supplies an answer: '*Ορέσται Μολοσσικὸν ἔθνος* (FGrH 1 F 107). Thus in the sixth century, of which Hecataeus was writing, the Orestae living between the Lyncestae and the Elimiotae had been affiliated to the Molossian group of tribes. But at some time between that century and the reign of Perdiccas II the Orestae became affiliated to the Macedonian group of tribes, as did the Lyncestae.

I have argued elsewhere¹⁴ that this was achieved by force with Persian help in the late 480s, and it was then that 'these Macedones' of 'the low Macedonia' acquired 'much land from Macedones themselves', i.e. from those of the inland areas (2.99.6). Later these tribes broke away from the Macedonian kingdom.¹⁵ During the reign of Perdiccas II the name 'Macedones' remained, but the kings of the tribes were independent and only if they made alliance with Perdiccas did they accept the hegemony of Perdiccas. In practice they were more likely to be at war with Perdiccas (as in 1.57.3, 1.59.2 and 4.79.2), and in the fourth century in the reign of Amyntas Xenophon distinguished the army of Derdas from the Macedonian army. So too outside powers treated the kings of the inland areas as independent kings (IG I³ 89; X, HG. 5.2.38; D. 4.4).

¹⁴ See Justin 7.4.1 'Xerxes gave to Alexander rule over all the region between Mt. Olympus and Mt. Haemus' and my comments in *HM* 2.63f. and in *CQ* 41 (1991) 501, where I maintained that the ultimate source of Justin was Marsyas Macedon, a contemporary of Alexander the Great. Borza 115 n. 38 held that Justin's comment should be 'dismissed', an opinion not based on any consideration of Justin's sources.

¹⁵ The wealth of the Elimiotae royal house as revealed by the exciting excavations at Aiani (see G. Karamitrou-Mentessidi, *Aiani of Kozani* [Thessaloniki, 1989]) certainly rivalled that of the Temenid dynasty.

In 358 B.C. Philip combined both groups of Macedones under his rule on equal terms. Some distinctions survived. The Macedones of Lower Macedonia continued to use their traditional Macedonian dialect, and those of Upper Macedonia their traditional West-Greek dialect; brigades of the former in the phalanx were 'Foot-Companions' and of the latter 'Town-Companions'; and the King's personal Infantry Bodyguard was that of 'the Macedones', and his palace Infantry Guard that of the 'Hypaspists' (Arr. 1.8.4).¹⁶ In the years after 358 B.C., when the kingdom of Philip was being increased in size, the name 'Macedones' was not granted to the conquered peoples – Illyrians, Paeonians, Chalcidians etc. It was restricted to the two groups of 358 B.C.

The differentiation was shown clearly and decisively in the description of the army which Alexander took to Asia. 'Macedones' were listed first: *πεζοὶ Μακεδόνες μὲν* and *ἵππεις δ' ὑπὸ ἄρχον Μακεδόνες μὲν* being 'infantrymen 12,000 Macedones' and 'cavalrymen 1800 Macedones' (Diod. 17.17.3–4).¹⁷ The former constituted 'the phalanx of Macedones' (17.64.6; 108.3; Arr. 3.11.9, including both hypaspists and brigades, as also in 5.12.2; 2.5.6, 3.23.8; Nepos, *Eum.* 7.1). Here too there was a survival. For in Arr. 1.6.6, when Alexander 'ordered the Hypaspists to cross the river and after them the brigades of the Macedones', it is clear that 'the brigades of the Macedones' were units of the original phalanx, when it was recruited only from Macedones of the kingdom as it was before 358 B.C., and that the Hypaspists, being recruited from the subsequent enlarged kingdom, were a separate formation.¹⁸ The '1800 cavalrymen Macedones' were the Companion Cavalrymen. There were no other 'Macedones' in the list. The squadrons of light-armed cavalrymen which were recruited from within the kingdom were listed as 'Thracians, Scouts and Paeonians 900' (Diod. 17.17.4); of them the Scouts numbered 600, and were recruited evidently from more than one ethnic group. There were also light-armed infantrymen who were recruited within the kingdom,¹⁹ but they were not included in Diodorus' list.

The relationship between the king and these Macedones was clear. He was 'king of Macedones'. The Companion Cavalry squadrons were 'the King's own Squadrons' (Arr. 3.11.8 fin.). The men of the phalanx brigades were 'Foot-Companions' and

¹⁶ For 'Town-Companions' see my comments in *CQ* 28 (1978) 129 and in *Historia* 40 (1991) 403ff., citing rival interpretations.

¹⁷ The ultimate source was probably Ptolemy, drawing on the *King's Journal* (Hammond *THA* 36f.).

¹⁸ 'The Guard of the Macedones' (Arr. 1.8.4) and 'the Brigades of the Macedones' (1.6.6) are similar, the genitive being substantial in the context and not partitive. Arrian drew probably on Ptolemy (Hammond *Sources* 198ff. and 205f.).

¹⁹ An ethnic name was never attached expressly to the 600 Scouts (*prodromoi*) by Arrian. However at 2.8.9 they and others were probably meant. As Alexander was approaching the battlefield of Issus, he deployed on his right 'cavalrymen the so-called Companions, the Thessalians and the Macedones' and on his left the Peloponnesian cavalry and the other allied cavalry. Who were these 'Macedones'? The only cavalry units in his army which were not mentioned here were the Scouts, the Paeonians and the Thracians; and two of these — the Scouts and the Paeonians — appeared in Arrian's account of the battle (2.9.2). Arrian presumably used the word 'Macedones' here in contrast to Thessalians and Peloponnesians to mean simply that the Scouts, 600 strong, and the Paeonians (and ? the Thracians), each 150 strong, came from Macedonia. I disagree here with P. A. Brunt's deletion of 'the Macedones', and Bosworth's view that the text is 'impossible' (*C* 209). Something similar occurred with some light-armed infantry. On the Balkan campaign Alexander had archers and slingers (Arr. 1.2.5), of whom the latter were certainly recruited from within the kingdom. At Issus he had on the left wing 'Cretan archers' and on the right wing 'archers', next to Agrianians (Arr. 2.9.2–3), and at Gaugamela 'the archers the Macedones' were next to Agrianians on the right wing (Arr. 3.12.2). The two groups were clearly the same, i.e. Macedones as contrasted with Cretans. Bosworth *C* 302 did not mention the analogy in 2.9.2–3.

'Town-Companions' of the king. The Hypaspists were 'Royal Hypaspists' (4.24.10) and 'Companions' of the king (1.14.2). Probably 1000 Companion Cavalrymen and 12,000 Foot-Companions and Town-Companions of the phalanx were left with Antipater in Macedonia. All other units of 'Macedones' were in Asia with Parmenion or accompanied Alexander when he crossed to Asia. Throughout the campaigns Alexander fought at the head of a unit of 'Macedones', and he convened 'Macedones' in assemblies for deliberation and for treason-trials.

When we turn to civilian life we find the same distinction. While adult males of Lower and Upper Macedonia were 'Macedones', 'Lyncestae Macedones' etc., the other residents in the kingdom were called by their ethnic names alone: Illyrians in the extreme northwest (Diod. 16.8.1), Paeonians, Greeks (Thuc. 4.124.1, being for instance Mycenaean and Histiaeans),²⁰ Bottiaei, Chalcidians, Crousaeans, Bisaltae, Thracians, Pieres, Eordi, Sarnousii. Within their territories Philip and Alexander planted 'cities of Macedones': for instance, 'Oesyme, a colony of Thasos, but thereafter of Macedones' (Scymn. 656f.), and Calindoea, a Bottiaean city, transferred to 'Macedones' (*Anc. Mac.* 4.87–114). In the latter instance, as the inscription records, 'King Alexander gave to Macedones Calindoea and the places around Calindoea, (being) Thamiscia, Camacaea, and Tripoatis.' The inhabitants of Calindoea were moved elsewhere; but the inhabitants of Thamiscus, Camacae and Tripoae stayed to work the land which they were now to rent from the Macedones of Calindoea.²¹ In another inscription Thracians near Philippi had to pay rents on land which Philip and Alexander gave them to 'harvest for themselves' (*καρπιζέσθαι*). It is apparent from these instances that the king owned the spear-won lands, i.e. those outside Lower and Upper Macedonia, and he alone dealt directly with the conquered inhabitants and decided the conditions under which they might work his land.²²

Politically, 'the king of Macedones' (without a definite article) was elected or deposed by 'Macedones'.²³ He and they formed the Macedonian state. In a trial for treason he prosecuted and 'Macedones' gave the verdict. In a treaty of c. 391 B.C. the king made the agreement and payments were to be made to 'Macedones' (Tod 111). In 359 B.C. Philip 'convened the Macedones in frequent assemblies' and in 358 B.C. 'convened an assembly and addressed the soldiers'. Philip as king compelled other peoples to 'obey the Macedones' or 'pay a tithe to Macedones'.²⁴ In 346 B.C. membership and votes on the Council of the Delphic Amphictyony were transferred from 'Phocians' to 'Macedones' (Paus. 10.8.2; 10.3.3), funds were contributed by 'Macedones', and the king sent his delegates to exercise the two votes of the state on the Council. In 335 B.C., when Thebes was razed, 'the guest-friends of Philip or Alexander and the official representatives of Macedones' were not enslaved.²⁵ It was probably in winter 335–4 B.C. that Alexander gave Calindoea to 'Macedones', and that 'Macedones' in assembly decided which group of Macedones was to be transplanted to Calindoea.

²⁰ In this passage there is a contrast between 'the Macedones over whom he (Perdiccas) ruled' and 'the Greeks dwelling in (the kingdom)', which shows that dwellers in the kingdom did not thereby become 'Macedones' and suggests that Perdiccas had a different relationship with these Greeks. The Mycenaean had been in Macedonia since c. 468 B.C.

²¹ See my comments in *CQ* 38 (1988) 383ff.

²² Ibid. 382ff. For a similar view see M. B. Hatzopoulos in *BCH* 117 (1993) 321.

²³ The earliest example is that of Amyntas III (Porphyr. fr.1 in *FHG* 3.691 ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων ἐξεβλήθη), in the late 390s.

²⁴ Diod. 16.3.1, 4.2–3, 71.2. Ephorus was probably the source of Diodorus in these passages, except the last one.

²⁵ *Mélanges G. Daux* 22 and 24; Arr. 1.9.9 and Plut. *Alex.* 11.12.

From these and other examples it is clear that the 'Macedones' were not drawn from the kingdom as a whole but from the 'Macedones' of Lower and Upper Macedonia and of the 'cities of Macedones' elsewhere in the kingdom. The only question is whether membership of the assembly was open to all adult male 'Macedones' or was restricted to 'the citizen soldiers' (Diod. 17.109.1 and 18.12.2), i.e. the Companions of the king, and to such retired soldiers. To answer that question would be to go beyond the scope of this article.

The last connotation which we have to mention is when a contrast was made between the forces under Alexander's command and those of other nations. For example, when Diodorus or Arrian gave the losses of 'the Macedonians' and 'the Persians', or when Arrian reported the prayer of Alexander for reconciliation between 'Macedones and Persae' (7.11.9), they meant all the forces led by Alexander and by Darius, and the reconciliation was to be between Alexander's European leaders and those of the 'Persians and of the other races' (7.11.8) in his Kingdom of Asia. Similarly, 'the baggage of the Macedones' which Indian and Persian cavalry attempted to seize at Gaugamela was that of the whole army,²⁶ not that of the 'Macedones' units only (3.14.5). The Attic orators of the period spoke mainly of Philip and Alexander. When they mentioned the Macedonians, it was sometimes in the restricted sense of the 'Macedones': for instance, in Aeschines 2.27 (during the struggle between Amyntas and Pausanias for power) 'Macedones not being of one mind', and Hypereides 3.32.24 (Teubner edn.) 'he (Euxenippus) was a flatterer of her (Olympias) and Macedones'.²⁷ But in some cases they no doubt talked of 'Macedones' or 'the Macedones' as the inhabitants of the Macedonian kingdom, for instance when Demosthenes ordered Athenians 'to spit on the Macedones' (Aeschin. 3.73).

III. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The connotations of 'Macedonia' and of 'Macedones' advanced more or less *pari passu*. The earliest connotation was of a homeland, 'Macedonia' and 'the Macedonian territory' around Pieria and Olympus, and there the descendants of 'Macedon', the 'Macedones', lived. Next came that of a large area which Thucydides defined, the area ruled by the Temenid kings with whom he was concerned, Perdiccas II and Archelaus. The inhabitants in many regions of that area were 'Macedones' only; for they expelled or killed the earlier inhabitants of coastal Pieria, Bottiaea, Eordaea and Almopia. In the other areas there were Macedones who lived alongside the earlier inhabitants – in southernmost Paeonia and Mygdonia, and perhaps in Anthemus, Crestonia and Bisaltia. The next change came after Philip's defeat of Bardylis in 358 B.C. The connotation of 'Macedonia' must have changed in time with the conquests of Philip and the extension of his kingdom. The connotation of 'Macedones' changed only to include the tribesmen of Upper Macedonia, who had once been subject but had for long acted independently. Under Alexander 'Macedones' occupied Upper Macedonia (including Parauaea and Tymphaea),

²⁶ This passage was cited by Anson 67: 'he (Arrian) calls the camp-guards Macedones, when they, in fact, were Thracians (Arr. *Anab.* 3.14.5, cf. 3.12.5).' Such inaccuracy is extraordinary. Arrian described some Indian and Persian cavalymen breaking their way through towards 'the baggage-train of the Macedones' (3.14.5), correctly because it was the baggage-train of the Macedonian army as a whole. He described 'the infantry from Thrace' as being posted to protect the baggage (3.12.5); no doubt they became engaged in the action around the baggage-train but were not mentioned by name (3.14.5–6).

²⁷ During the absence of Alexander Olympias acted in religious matters as head of state at Pella; see *CQ* 30 (1980) 474f.

Eordaea, Pieria, Almopia and Bottiaea. Elsewhere in the kingdom they lived alongside the native peoples, mainly in 'Cities of Macedones' or on estates granted by the king. It was these 'Macedones' who became Cavalry Companions, Foot-Companions, Town-Companions and Hypaspist-Companions of Alexander. Troops raised from other peoples of the kingdom were not called 'Macedones'. Politically the king dealt with 'Macedones' in assembly for deliberation and treason-trials. The 'Macedones' in assembly elected or deposed a king, appointed a guardian for a minor king, made decisions in financial matters, appointed diplomatic representatives and chose a city to be transplanted, e.g. to Calindoea. On the other hand, foreigners who were not concerned with internal distinctions referred sometimes to all inhabitants of the kingdom as 'Macedones'.

*University of Washington
Clare College, Cambridge*

N. G. L. HAMMOND