Winthrop Lindsay Adams

Historical Perceptions of Greco-Macedonian Ethnicity in the Hellenistic Age

The scope of this topic chronologically (the entire Hellenistic Age), and the nature of the sources dictate that there be certain parameters for our consideration in the course of an article: this is a foray into the subject in the historical sources, which ultimately should be broadened beyond them to include other philosophical and cultural material. The first point is that, aside from the initial wars of the Diadochoi, it will concentrate primarily on the perceptions of ethnicity in the Aegean Basin rather than survey the entire Hellenistic East. The reason for this being that the social and cultural considerations in terms of Greeks and Macedonians are inevitably caught up in the host of other ethnic differentiations in the ancient Near East (Egyptian, Syrian, Indian, Jewish, Phrygian etc.) and constitute a separate consideration. The Greco-Macedonian experience in those regions will have an effect on the Aegean Basin, but it is the latter from which most of our sources come and where one would expect the clearest view of self-definition.

Second, also as regards parameters, the sources with which this article will deal are historical narratives, biography and geographic works, and primarily from Greek authors themselves. There are a number of reasons for this: it is the perceptions of the contemporary Greeks which are the key to the question of ethnicity and by definition represent the primary material both in terms of the period on which they were writing and in which they were composing those works; they provide a concentration of documents for which such perceptions were essential, rather than a mere sidelight; and as a *corpus* they are manageable enough to be comprehended in the scope of an article[1].

1. Latin sources will be discussed in the notes, where appropriate. It is clear that Roman authors differentiated between the Macedonians and Greeks politically, not culturally or

The sources for the Hellenistic Age are notorious for being chronologically spotty and of varying reliability. That will mean that the subject is best viewed where the depth of those sources permit: particularly in the period of the Diadochoi and to an extent the Epigonoi (the first two generations after Alexander); the period of Philip V of Macedon and the advent of Rome; and the realities after the Roman hegemony. Though problematic, these "snapshot" views actually provide some advantages in that one can better see any changes over time. Also, we are moving from a clear starting point in the Fourth Century (B.C.) in which some modern scholars have argued that Greeks and Macedonians perceived themselves as separate entities not only politically and geographically, but still to a degree ethnically. Just as important there is an equally clear goal towards which we are moving, embodied in the comments of the First Century historian and geographer, Strabo (7.9), that: "Macedonia, indeed, is part of Greece" (ἔστι μὲν οὖν Ἑλλὰς καὶ ἡ Μακεδονία) but that he was discussing it according to the topographical scheme of the area (τῇ φύσει τῶν τόπων ἀκολουθοῦντες καὶ τῷ σχήματι χωρίς) and therefore decided to examine it separately from the "rest of Greece" (ἔγνωμεν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος τάξαι).

Any topic involving ethnicity has a large number of pitfalls, which should be self evident, but frequently get glossed over. Modern scholars often pick precise criteria and expect clear delineations on these subjects in Antiquity, usually relying on a single item or a set of litmus tests such as language, social organization, race, or religion. Yet we readily accept the complexity of modern concepts of ethnicity, both external and internal, embodied in our own societies. It would be foolish to presume that such perceptions were any less complex in Antiquity, and indeed this work is predicated on that assumption. So ultimately we are concerned with "perceived" differences, which can be elastically

exaggerated or diminished depending on circumstances, usually political.

So what was Macedonian ethnicity? Virtually all criteria such as language, religion and culture applied to Greeks and Macedonians fail to be helpful in proving or disproving differentiation for a variety of reasons. First, and for most philologically oriented scholars the most important, is language. The problem is that we don't have enough examples of Macedonian language, which hasn't stopped anyone from speculating[2]. One group, chief among whom is N. G. L. Hammond, maintains that it was a dialect (φωνή) of Greek, rather than a separate language (γλῶσσα)[3]. Others equally assert that it was a distinct, separate, but closely related language[4]. The fact is that we do not have enough examples to tell definitively. Further, as Attic Greek was undeniably the court and administrative language of Macedonia from the reign of Archelaus onward[5] (and there is archaeological and epigraphical

2. On lack of evidence, see P. Green, *Alexander to Actium: the Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley, 1990), 3-5. See also E. N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus: the Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, 1990, revised ed., 1992) 92. N. G. L. Hammond in a lengthy discussion also notes the sparsity of examples, while arguing that it is Greek, *History of Macedonia*, vol. II (with G. T. Griffith) (Oxford, 1979) 46-54 [this multi-volume work will herafter be abbreviated *HM*].

3. Hammond N. G. L. and Griffith G. T., *HM*, vol. II, 47-49, again, where he states it is a dialect of Aeolic Greek; and a more moderate stance, but still a form (*patois*) of Greek in *HM*, vol. III (with F. W. Walbank) (Oxford, 1989) 189-190. Here Hammond cites as examples of the two meanings: Thucydides (6.5.1 and 7.57.2) for φωνή and Arr. *Anab.* 3.6.6 for γλῶσσα, as in δίγλωσσος. Hammond is followed in this by E. M. Errington, *History of Macedonia* (Berkeley, 1990) 3 where he simply states that it is a dialect of Greek without arguing the point. See, also, G. L. Cawkwell, *Philip II of Macedon* (London, 1978) 22. The fullest discussion is in J. N. Kalleris, *Les anciens Macédoniens: Études linguistique et historique*, vol. II, 488-531. For an excellent general discussion of the entire problem, see E. N. Borza, *In the Shadow*, 90-97.

4. E. Badian, "Greeks and Macedonians", in B. Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington, D. C. 1982) 33-51, in which Badian is trying to look, as here, at Macedonian and Greek perceptions of one another, but only in the Fourth Century context. See also, Borza, 92-93 especially and soon his "Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: the Source Tradition" in *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146*, R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (Univ. of Oklahoma Press, forthcoming) [for convenience, references to this article will be cited by section title, subject and line. I would also like to thank both Professor Borza and the editors for permission to use this work]; A. B. Bosworth, "Eumenes, Neoptolemus and *PSI* XII.1284", *GRBS* 19 (1978) 227-237, especially 236.

5. Borza, 92, where he points out that it may go back further than Archelaus and is part of a "process of hellenization". As relates to Attic Greek, it was a two way street as Athe-

confirmation of this[6]) there is clearly "a process of hellenization" at work here which includes the Macedonians absorbing non-Greek peoples as well as the Macedonians adapting to Attic Greek. Add to this the emergence of κοινή Greek as the lingua franca of the entire eastern Mediterranean, and any argument that there is a differentiation based on language has even less validity as the Hellenistic Age wears on. It simply cannot be used in that way.

The same might be said, and for the same reasons, of using religion or culture as a determinant. Greek culture influenced Macedonia early on, and Archelaus in particular imported Greek architects and literati, as well as establishing Greek religious festivals[7]. Macedonia itself incorporated divers ethnic elements from the beginning: Thracian, Illyrian, Paeonian, and "southern" Greek as well as whatever one defines as ethnically "Makednic"[8]. This is reflected and complicated by the fact the Macedonians internally did not define citizenship on an ethnic basis, but on a political one: holding land from the king in exchange for military service[9]. Culturally within Macedonia, these different ethnic elements will be absorbed into a recognizable Greek norm so that (for example) whether a religious cult had a Thracian origin or not, it became indistinguishable in terms of Greek religious practice. This indeed matched what was going on in general terms in the Hellenistic Age even with the older Near Eastern cults[10]. The point is that this process of

naeus points out that many Macedonian idioms (μακεδονίζοντας) were used by Attic authors (3.122A).

6. See particularly, M. Andronikos, *Vergina: the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City* (Athens, 1984) 83-85 where he discusses the forty-odd grave stelae from the Great Tumulus, which are not only in Greek with Greek names, but Greek patronymics denoting the earlier generations "hellenic" roots.

7. Hammond and Griffith, *HM*, vol. II, 148-149; Borza, 171-177.

8. See, for example, C. F. Edson, "Early Macedonia", *Archaia Makedonia*, vol. I (Thessalonika, 1970) 17-44, especially 21-24 and 27-28 on acculturation and religion; J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London, 1976) 36; Hammond and Griffith, *HM*, vol. II, 52, and especially n. 2. Pliny the Elder notes 150 different ethnic groups in Macedonia (*NH* 4.10.33). For instance, in Alexander's reign, Nearchus (though born on Crete) became a citizen of Amphipolis and a Macedonian (Arr. *Ind.*, 18.4). See also W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander the Great* (London & New York, 1992) 228.

9. Edson, 30-31.

10. See in general, Green, 334 & 408. Add to the "fusion" (as Green puts it) of Greek and Oriental traditions, the Greek tendency to view other religions generally in relation to their own, such as Herodotus 5.7 (where he asserts that the Thracians worshipped Greek gods

hellenization, which is going on throughout the period, is clearly recognizable even in the Fourth Century, so that if one takes Isocrates' criterion for being Greek, that it is a matter of sharing a culture rather than a physical basis (καὶ μᾶλλον Ἕλληνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδεύσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας – *Paneg.* 51), then the usual tools for objectively establishing ethnic differentiation in this case simply don't work. At the same time, in Isocrates' sense of the term, one has to acknowledge that the Macedonians were Greek or becoming so. Isocrates, however, was not the only voice in the Fourth Century: Demosthenes, arguably for political reasons, is notable for a different view of the Macedonians[11]. So, to pursue the matter, one has to rely on the perceptions of the principals involved have of one another as the only effective benchmark, as Badian noted over a decade ago in a study of this problem in the Fourth Century, and here is our starting point at last[12].

Badian asserts that regardless of whatever criteria one employs, the Greeks and Macedonians thought of themselves in the Fourth Century as different peoples, and that the Greeks by their own admission saw all too much of the Macedonians. A good deal of this evaluation is defined in terms of political rivalry. The question is whether it goes beyond this. That such perceptions seem to exist among some of the principals immediately after Alexander's death is evident by revolts against Macedonian authority which broke out at the disparate ends of the Empire (Greece and Bactria) from clearly ethnic Greeks. The revolt in Bactria and Sogdiana (what Diodorus calls the ἄνω σατραπεῖαι – 18.7) is worth looking at because both the origins and manner in which it was put down were ethnically based.

The revolt (ἀπόστασις) broke out among the Greek mercenary settlers in the upper satrapies because they longed for Greek customs and manner of life (ποθοῦντες μὲν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ δίαιταν

---

only). See, also, J. K. Davies, "Cultural, Social and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World", [ch. 8] *CAH* VII.1 (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1984) 315-316. R. A. Billows in *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism* (Leiden, 1995) notes one manifestation of a "Macedonian" god, Tauropolos, as a popular affectation among soldiers and colonists.

11. The citations here are exhausting, e.g. the three *Olynthiacs*, the four *Philippics*, *De Corona*, *De Falsa Legatione*, etc., but all in the full flight of political rhetoric.

12. See n. 4 (supra).

– Diod. 18.7.1). When Perdiccas, serving as regent for the Kings since the settlement at Babylon[13], heard of the revolt he chose by lot 3,000 infantry and 800 cavalry from among the Macedonians (ἐκ τῶν Μακε-δόνων – Diod. 18.7.3). Peithon (satrap of Media and a Macedonian) was named to command this force as well as a levy from the regional satrapal armies amounting to another 10,000 infantry and 8,000 horse. Peithon's plans, which included furthering his own ambitions, were to win the Greeks over with kindness (φιλανθρωπία) leaving them intact for his own future military operations. Perdiccas, however, gave specific orders to kill all the rebels (τοὺς ἀφεστηκότας ἅπαντας ἀποκτεῖναι – Diod. 18.7.5). Peithon defeated the mercenaries, by treachery, expecting to integrate them into his own forces as planned (Diod. 18.7.8); but the Macedonian soldiery (largely to get the booty involved) broke faith with the Greeks and followed Perdiccas orders killing the whole force[14].

The point of this lurid tale is that the lines appear to be drawn ethnically between the two forces (though there may have been Greeks in Peithon's force as well, the key element was clearly meant to be ethnic Macedonians[15]), and the outcome was influenced as well by politics and greed. But it is also worth noting that Peithon had hoped to incorporate them (which is what Perdiccas feared) precisely because in the midst of Asia they were too useful as allies to waste. Ethnic differentiation played a major part, but it is clear those ethnic lines were flexible, at least as far as Peithon was concerned, in the harsh realities of their geographic location.

At the other end of the empire, the Lamian War does not show as clear a delineation in ethnic terms because it is even more caught up in politics and geography. The very nature of Alexander's empire saw Greece and Macedonia lumped together as an entity. Antipater had been

13. For an analysis of events, see R. M. Errington, "From Babylon to Triparadeisos: 323-320", *JHS* 90 (1970) 49f.

14. Diod. 18.7.9. It is doubtful that the massacre was extensive, and there are simply too many Greeks left in the region (proven by the resilience of the communities in the region) to credit this. Also, see Curt. 9.7.1-11. For an excellent discussion, see F. L. Holt, *Alexander the Great and Bactria* (Leiden, 1989) 88-91, as well as W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London, 1993) 277.

15. See A. B. Bosworth, "Alexander the Great and the Decline of Macedon", *JHS* 106 (1986) 3.

the general for Europe[16] since the beginning of Alexander's Persian campaigns. That grouping of Macedonia with Greece administratively continued with the settlement at Babylon[17]. Justin, reflecting his or Pompeius Trogus' Roman perspective, refers to it as the "Macedonian province" (*Macedonia provincia* – 13.1.15) and states that Antipater was made "governor of Macedonia and Greece" (*Macedoniae et Graeciae Antipater praeponitur* – 13.4.5), but that merely reflects a tendency in the Greek sources to do the same thing[18].

Most of the references in terms of the Lamian War are inconclusive, and couched in political or military terms rather than ethnic ones. So Diodorus states that Athens began the War "to assert their liberty and claim the leadership of the Greeks" in the wake of Alexander's death (καὶ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν ῾Ελλήνων ἡγεμονίας – 18.9.1), and their agent Leosthenes calls on the Greeks to rid themselves of Macedonian despotism (τῆς τῶν Μακεδόνων δεσποτείας – 18.9.5), which may or may not imply an ethnic separation but clearly is no different from the rhetoric used against Sparta in the same Century. The differences are there, but the reasons are not necessarily ethnic. Diodorus, however, comes closer to an ethnic differentiation when he follows this up by paraphrasing an Athenian decree which initially uses the same terminology (τῆς κοινῆς τῶν ῾Ελλήνων ἐλευθερίας) as before, but then provides for mobilization and sending ambassadors to the Greek cities (τὰς ῾Ελληνίδας πόλεις) to tell them that they are convinced that "all Greece was the common fatherland of the Greeks" (τὴν ῾Ελλάδα πᾶσαν

16. Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.3; Diod. 17.17.5; Curt. 3.19.1; see also Curt. 4.1.10 where he again puts Greece and Macedonia together as a single political entity.

17. Diod. 17.118.2; 18.3.2; Justin, 13.2. Two accounts assign the task jointly to Antipater and Craterus, but the geographic description is the same: Arr. *Τὰ μετὰ ᾽Αλέξ.* 1.9 (Jacoby, *FGrH* IIB no. 156, F1.3) and Curt. 10.7.9 and 10.10.19 where Antipater siezes control of both Macedonia and Greece. Cf. Borza, "Source Tradition", section on "the ancient narrative tradition" on Curtius, *In.* 54-55, for an alternate interpretation and earlier examples. See, also, Errington, "From Babylon", 59-64.

18. Polybius regularly refers to affairs in "Greece and Macedonia" (καὶ τὴν περὶ τοὺς ῞Ελληνας καὶ Μακεδόνας), for example 2.71.8. Also see references to Diodorus (supra. n. 16). Arrian (again, supra n. 16) and Plutarch do the same, but are after Trogus chronologically (though before Justin himself). See, for example, Plut., *Pyrrh.* 14.6 where Cineas talks of "recovering Macedonia and ruling Greece" as part and parcel of the same thing. Cf., Borza, "Source Tradition", section on "the ancient narrative sources" on Justin, *In.* 16-17, for a different interpretation of the passage.

κοινὴν εἶναι πατρίδα κρίνων τῶν Ἑλλήνων). The passage finishes with the Athenians making reference to Xerxes' invasion, when they had "also fought by sea those barbarians who sought to enslave them" (τοὺς ἐπὶ δουλείᾳ στρατευσαμένους βαρβάρους ἠμύνατο) and now thought it necessary to do so again (18.10.2-3). By allusion, the decree sets up a parallel between the Macedonians and Persians as barbarians, but does not actually directly refer to Macedonians as barbarians (something Demosthenes earlier makes clear by their actions[19]).

The majority of the references, however, in the Lamian War are simply to Greeks and Macedonians as enemies or allies (depending on the situation), but in political not ethnic terms[20]. Some of the categories in Diodorus, indeed, become confusing. When listing potential Greek allies, he includes the Molossi and Dolopians (not usually considered so) while discussing other ethnic groups (Thracians and Illyrians) elsewhere in the passage[21]. Diodorus is capable of identifying an ethnic Macedonian: for instance, he refers to the commandant of the garrison at Tyre (Archelaus) as being Μακεδόνων τὸ γένος (18.37.4). The sense of separation is still there, but the rhetoric which had preceded Alexander's reign is not.

In the struggle for the regency that followed the Lamian War, in reality a Macedonian civil war which opened the wars of the Diadochoi, that same trace of a light ethnic strain is there, but growing lighter. When discussing the forces used by all sides from 321 to 319, the only one delineated is Macedonian[22]. While most of the forces are identified by their commanders, it is the Macedonians under them that are noted ethnically. So, when Neoptolemus deserts to Antipater and Craterus, it is "because he is jealous of Eumenes and had a considerable Macedonian force" (φθονήσας τῷ Εὐμενεῖ καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχων Μακεδονικὴν δύναμιν – Diod. 18.29.4). Conversely, when Eumenes not only defeats Neo-

19. See, for example, the *Second Olynthiac* (in general), and especially for Philip and his court, 9 & 18-20 as illustrations.

20. So Justin, 13.5.7; Diod. 18.17 (battle of Crannon) or 18.18 where Antipater destroys the Greek alliance (τὸ σύστημα τῶν Ἑλλήνων).

21. Diod. 18.11.

22. Only on Alexander's funeral cart, which depicts a bodyguard composed of one group of Macedonians and another of Persians, is there a symbolic differentiation, which either omits the Greeks (as some argue) or possibly assumes them under the term "Macedonians": Diod. 18.27.1.

ptolemos but acquires his troops, it increases his power not only by the victory but because he now has a "large number of good Macedonian men" (ἀλλὰ καὶ προσλαβόμενος Μακεδόνων ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν πλῆθος – Diod. 18.29.5). Describing Eumenes confrontation with Craterus, Diodorus states that he could not equal the Macedonian phalanx [of Craterus] with his footsoldiers, and that Craterus had 20,000 infantry "chiefly Macedonians famed for their courage" (ὧν ἦσαν οἱ πλείους Μακεδόνες διαβεβοημένοι ταῖς ἀνδραγαθίαις – 18.30.4). Eumenes had the same sized phalanx as Craterus, but made up of men of all races (παντοδαποὺς τοῖς γένεσιν – 18.30.5). Other than a single reference to an Indian mahout (Diod. 18.34.2) all references to the fighting between Ptolemy and Perdiccas are to Macedonians (18.33-37), including the surrender of Tyre by its Macedonian commandant, Archelaus (mentioned above).

The one area where one would expect such ethnic differentiation to be important is the struggle between the Diadochoi and Eumenes of Cardia. Eumenes was a Greek, and a point of that was indeed made by himself and his opponents, but a quick review shows how little power that differentiation held. Diodorus, in the previous passage makes no mention of Eumenes ethnicity as a cause for Neoptolemos' desertion, merely his jealousy. As E. M. Anson has pointed out, it is Eumenes (Plut. *Eum.* 3,1) himself who brings up his Greekness in dealing with the conference at Babylon[23] and later Eumenes still considers himself a foreigner (ὁρῶν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν μὲν ξένον ὄντα – Diod. 18.60.1). The only oblique reference to his ethnicity by his own men is calling him a "pest from the Chersonese" (Plut. *Eum.* 9.2). But a point of it is made by his opponents, such as Seleucus and Peithon who try to persuade Eumenes' men to remove him as an ἄνδρα ξένον who had killed many Macedonians (Diod. 19.13.1-2). Eumenes' men were not persuaded, however, and Anson makes a case that this was important as a prejudice only to the envious Macedonian nobility[24]. Eumenes did seem to acknowledge an ethnic difference on another occasion by specifically choosing a Macedonian officer, Xennias, to speak to troops in the Macedonian

23. E. M. Anson, "Discrimination and Eumenes of Cardia", *AncW* 3 (1980) 57.

24. *Ibid.* On one occasion, his troops even saluted him in Μακεδονιστὶ τῇ φωνῇ (Plut. *Eum.* 14.5); Hammond argues specifically that it was to honor Eumenes, *HM*, vol. II, 46.

tongue (Μακεδονιστί)[25], presumably because he would be more persuasive.

Eumenes was sensitive to the loyalty of his Macedonians. In the confrontation with Craterus in Asia Minor, Eumenes was careful not to set a single Macedonian against him, for fear they would desert once they recognized Craterus. Instead, two hipparchies of "foreign" cavalry (ἱππαρχίας ξενικὰς) under Pharnabazus and Phoenix were detailed to the task (Plut. *Eum.* 7.1). Eumenes primary concern was with a popular Macedonian officer, but it was arguably displayed on ethnic lines nonetheless.

One other bit of confusion emerges in the period of the wars of the Diadochoi, "Macedonian" comes to mean how a force is equipped with distinctive Macedonian weapons (such as shield, σάρισσα, etc.) and trained in Macedonian tactics rather than as a reference to ethnic origins. In Peithon's command at Gabiene, Diodorus notes "more than 9,000 mercenaries (οἱ ξένοι) ...8,000 multiethnic troops armed in the Macedonian fashion" (παντοδαποὶ δ' εἰς τὰ Μακεδονικὰ καθωπλισμένοι), and finally 8,000 Macedonians (ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ Μακεδόνες – Diod. 19.29.2-3). References to Eumenes troops earlier had virtually identical wording (Diod. 19.27.6) and a later accounting is even fuller and includes "mercenaries" as well as other infantry armed in the Macedonian fashion (ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοὺς ξένους καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς εἰς τὰ Μακεδονικὰ καθωπλισμένους – Diod. 19.40.3). It is equally clear that this was a widespread practice. Peucestas (satrap of Persia) is noted by Diodorus for having a force of "3,000 men of every origin equipped in the Macedonian fashion" (τοὺς δὲ εἰς τὴν Μακεδονικὴν τάξιν καθωπλισμένους παντοδαποὺς τρισχιλίους – Diod. 19.14.5). What exactly the "Macedonian" way means is not evident, but probably refers to body armor and training rather than the famed σάρισσα[26]. Polybius, in discus-

---

25. Bosworth, "Eumenes, Neoptolemus...", 236; Borza, *In the Shadow*, 92 and esp. n. 31. Other scholars use this to claim that Greek would have been unintelligible to these Macedonians or conversely that a Greek could not have been persuasive in Μακεδονιστί: Badian, 41-42; again, Borza, *In the Shadow*, 92, n. 30 & 31. However, Greek had been the acknowledged official language for over three generations in Macedonia (Borza, *In the Shadow*, 92) so the former seems unlikely. Equally, there were political reasons why Eumenes might send a fellow Macedonian to persuade these troops to join him in the "Kings" cause.

26. Earlier, Plutarch makes a point that Alexander ordered 30,000 boys (presumably "cardaces") to be trained in Greek language and Macedonian arms (ἐκέλευσε γράμματά τε

sing the Battle of Sellasia at the end of the 3rd Century, still refers to the use of the σάρισσα as an "idiomatic" Macedonian weapon as well as the use of a "double" phalanx by Antigonus Doson (2.66), so there were equipment and tactics that were peculiarly Macedonian even a century after Alexander's death.

Nevertheless, the obvious deduction is that whatever the ethnic distinctions which may have existed previously became more blurred as the wars of the Diadochoi went on. The importance of hoplites (Greek or Macedonian), especially when surrounded by "barbarians", in order to hold on to what one had both against the natives and among the Diadochoi themselves is obvious. Also, the massive settlements and city foundation in the East, amidst overwhelming numbers of native populations, tended to make the differences between Macedonian and Greek simply seem negligible in Asia. The main differentiation was between non-Greek and Greek (including Macedonians) and Walbank has noted that "Racial prejudice was a characteristic of the Greco-Macedonian cast within the kingdoms" which emerged in the East[27]. Still, symbolically even within this there was an assertion of Macedonian heritage as being important in these colonies, particularly using the Macedonian shield as an emblem and in preserving Macedonian placenames and terminology[28]. But the distinctions drawn here are not between Macedonians and Greeks, but between Greeks and "Barbarians", and the Asian kingdoms will cease to be useful in examining the

μανθάνειν Ἑλληνικὰ καὶ Μακεδονικοῖς ὅπλοις ἐντρέφεσθαι – 47.3). It is interesting to note that the language was not Μακεδονιστί, but Greek.

27. F. W. Walbank, "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas" [ch. 3], *CAH* VII.1, 70; see also, Green, 319-320; Billows, 29-30. Though not in the scope of this current effort, an examination of this conception of Greek ethnicity for Egypt in particular, with its significant papyrological sources would be valuable particularly since such definitions survived to be incorporated into legal status in the Roman period. See, for example, A. E. Samuel, *The Shifting Sands of History: Interpretations of Ptolemaic Egypt* (Lanham & London, 1989) 52 and 58-65 or N. Lewis, *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford, 1983) 25-31, 156-184 (especially 169 & 177), and 185-195 on questions of status regarding class, taxation and administration of justice.

28. For the use of the shield, see Billows, 171; for the placenames, see Davies, 304-5. Davies points out this sometimes went as far as using "Macedonian civic phraseology" such as "peligones" for town council, but that overall the cities used "uniform Greek physical and governmental components".

question[29].

Plutarch's characterization of what happens in the wake of the conquests in the East is revealing, at least of later Greek attitudes towards what happens there culturally. In a famous passage in which he is comparing Alexander to Plato and Socrates (Alexander as a "doer of deeds" rather than a theorizer), Plutarch states that the various peoples of Asia were civilized by Alexander by the introduction of Greek customs, cities, laws and the worship of Greek gods (*De Fort. Alex.* 328c-f). He goes further in the same work, in Alexander's exchanges with Diogenes, by having Alexander state that he intends to establish "Greek justice and peace over all" (καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα σπεῖραι καὶ κατα- χέασθαι γένους παντὸς εὐδικίαν καὶ εἰρήνην) while at the same time stating that he will extend the frontiers of Macedonia to the farthest Sea (καὶ θαλάττης ὠκεανῷ προσερεῖσαι Μακεδονίαν – 332a). At least here, in retrospect, there is no differentiation between Greek and Macedonian[30].

What of the Aegean? A similar blurring of dividing lines culturally can be seen there as well. So, Lysimachus being forcibly entertained by the Thracian dynast Dromichaetes, draws the difference between the "Macedonian" style of banqueting (that is, "civilized") as opposed to the Thracian style (clearly an allusion to "barbaric" custom)[31]. Such a passage immediately strikes anyone familiar with the Greek view of the Macedonian symposium in the Fourth Century as odd or at least ironic, but in the sense of the passage Lysimachus (i.e. Diodorus) could just as easily have substituted "Greek" for "Macedonian"[32].

Possible ethnic references to the differences between Greeks and Macedonians all but disappear, instead to be expressed in terms of

29. The Seleucid and Ptolemaic Kingdoms obviously employed recognizably Macedonian court rituals, terminology, and practices, but whether or not these were Macedonian versus Greek ceased to make a difference. The main adjustments Greeks had to make was to kingship itself. See, Billows, 56-70; Walbank, 62-64; Edson, "Imperium Macedonicum", *CPh* 53 (1958) 153-170 (where he makes a greater case for emphasizing the "Macedonian" element among the Seleucids).

30. See Borza, "Source Tradition", section on "the ancient narrative sources", Plutarch In. 45-51.

31. Diod. 21.12.4-5.

32. On the Symposium, see E. N. Borza, "The Symposium at Alexander's Court", *Archaia Makedonia* 3 (1983) 45-55.

politics and geography. In the former, the Antigonids in particular, make numerous references to "the freedom of the Greeks", but clearly as political capital against Cassander and only on political grounds —not ethnic[33]. This is hardly surprising when all of the major players after the Lamian War in the struggles of the Diadochoi are Macedonian and so would not be likely make an appeal to the Greeks on an ethnic basis, which would be irrelevant since they were all the same in Greek eyes. So Olympias, besieged by Cassander at Pydna over the winter of 317/16 expects that "large numbers of Greeks and Macedonians will come to her rescue by sea" (κατὰ θάλασσαν Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Μακεδόνων πολλούς – Diod. 19.35.6). Both Polyperchon and Cassander make appeals to the Greek cities, but again politically rather than ethnically[34]. When Antigonus calls an assembly of his followers (significantly both Macedonians and "foreigners" – καὶ τῶν τε στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῶν παρεπιδημούντων κοινήν) to condemn Cassander, while Cassander is vilified for his treatment of Roxane and Alexander IV and his ambition, it is NOT on an ethnic basis[35]. And the same sort of political maneuvering characterizes the rest of the wars of the Diadochoi and becomes the form for the remainder of the Third Century[36].

The point is not so much that there weren't differences as that whatever the differences they were ceasing to matter much. To emphasize that there were still recognizably Macedonian distinctions, there are two illustrations. The first has already been mentioned: Eumenes dispatching Xennias to address a body of Macedonian troops in Μακεδονιστί[37]. The second comes from the early Third Century. Plutarch

33. On the propagandistic use of "freedom of the Greeks", see C. B. Welles, "Greek Liberty", *JJP* 15 (1965) 29-47. For ancient references, e.g., see Diod. 19.61.3-4, 62.1, 74.1-2, 105.1; for Antigonus maneuvers from 315 to 311; Diod. 20, 19.3-4, 37.1-2 for some by Ptolemy including an attempt to revive the League of Corinth. For later attempts by the Antigonids, see Diod. 20.45.1-2, 46.1; Plut. *Demetr.* 8.1-4; 25.2-3. See, also, R. H. Simpson, "Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Greeks", *Historia* 8 (1958) 385-409; W. S. Ferguson, "Demetrius Poliorcetes and the Hellenic League", *Hesperia* 17 (1948) 112-136; and now R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley, 1990) 189-236 (passim).

34. See W. L. Adams, "Cassander and the Greek City-States: 319-317 B.C.", *Balkan Studies* 34 (1993) 197-211.

35. Diod. 19.61.

36. See n. 33 (supra).

37. See n. 25 (supra). Regardless of whether Μακεδονιστί is a dialect (*patois*) of Greek

states that Pyrrhus sent spies into Demetrius Poliorcetes' camp "pretending to be Macedonians" (προσποιουμένους εἶναι Μακεδόνας – Plut. *Pyrrh.* 11.4-5), which implies more than their just stating that they were Macedonians. But they are the only two examples in the period of the later Diadochoi, and both are minor. The majority of the narratives emphasize the political differences, particularly between kings and cities rather than ethnic or cultural ones, between the Greeks and Macedonians[38].

An examination of Polybius and the sources for the late Third Century bear this out. Again, the passages in Plutarch, Polybius and Diodorus are without "ethnic" references in regard to customs or religion. That does not mean that the "separateness" of Macedon is not apparent geographically, in political organization or military equipment and tactics. The last point has already been made (Polyb. 2.66). The geographical distinctions are embodied in statements such as Justin's dealing with the Gallic invasion of 279 or on Pyrrhus[39]; and in Plutarch's *Lives* (*Cleomenes* 16.3) or in Polybius throughout his work[40]. But none of these references preclude the idea that the Greeks and Macedonians shared a common culture. The differentiations are directional not ethnic.

This is borne out in the concept of political separateness, which falls out along whether or not the states are polis or kingdom, not Greek or Macedonian. So Justin states that Ptolemy, Antiochus and Antigonus "were at war with each other, and almost all the city-states of Greece (24.1.2)". Polybius makes almost all his comments along this line, so that the dissolution of the Achaean League was done by "the kings of Macedonia" (ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκ Μακεδονίας βασιλέων ἀρχή – 2.40.5)[41].

---

or a different language, it (like the style of Macedonian arms) was something recognizably distinct. For other references to Μακεδονιστί, see Plut. *Alex.* 51.4 and *Eum.* 14.5; and Curt. 6.9.35. In addition to Borza, *In the Shadow*, 92 and n. 30, see Ap. Daskalakis, *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians* (Thessaloniki, 1965) 66-76.

38. See n. 27 supra.

39. On the Gallic invasion, see Justin 24.4.6 and 25.1.2 & 4; on Pyrrhus, see Justin 25.4.1 and 26.1.1; for earlier references to Macedonia as simply a different place, see Justin 9.1.1, 11.2.5, 12.10; 13.4.5; 14.5.1 & 5.8.

40. E.g. Polyb. 4.29.6; 5.30.1, 101.6, 108.1, 110.11; 22.6; 27.9; 29.1.

41. See also Polyb. 2.41.9, 50.9 (εἰς τὴν Μακεδόνων οἰκίαν), 62.1; 3.1.9, 8.16.4; 4.1.5; 7.11.4; 22.18.1.

Plutarch makes reference to the "kings" forces (meaning Macedonian) at Acrocorinthos (*Aratus* 16.17, 22.4) and to Cassander as king of Macedonia and ruler of the Greeks (*Alex.* 74.6), where the differention is political (one acknowledges his title, the other describes his role). Most references are to the individual kings simply by name as symbolic of the kingdoms at large.

But the treatment does not exclude a cultural unity between the two and often presumes such a link. In the *Life of Cleomenes*, Plutarch states that "...the Spartans alone of Greek or Macedonian armies (ἐπεὶ ἄλλως γε τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν καὶ βασιλικῶν στρατευμάτων) had no players in attendance, no jugglers, no dancing girls, no harpists" (33.4). At the Battle of Sellasia, the Achaean general Philipoemen was stationed among the cavalry, which includes the Macedonian, "with his own fellow citizens", Plutarch making no distinction between Greek and Macedonian cavalry (*Philipoemen* 6.1). Justin, in discussing Philip V's policy, states that it was "to maintain the tranquility of Greece" as a whole (29.2.8), and that all that held Carthage and Rome back from attacking "Greece and Asia" was the duel for supremacy in the West (28.2.9). Macedonia, here, is clearly being subsumed under "Greece".

Polybius goes even farther. A large number of references treat Macedonia (or her kings) in exactly the same fashion as "other" Greek states. So the Achaean League was hampered historically by either Lacedaemonian power or Macedonians (2.39.13); or an example of equal treatment of the Macedonians and Tegeans (2.54). Action against Sparta was taken by Macedonia and Achaea jointly (dealt with on an equal footing) —καὶ συνελθόντων τῶν Μακεδόνων καὶ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν— 2.65.1). Rome, after the mastering of Italy and disputing Carthage at sea, next dealt with the state of Greece and Macedonia (καὶ τὴν περὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ Μακεδόνας – 2.71.8). In naming the allies for the "Cleomenic" War in Greece, Polybius list "Achaeans, Epirotes, Phocians, Macedonians, Boeotians, Acarnanians, Thessalians..." (4.9.5), putting Macedonia in among the "other" Greeks[42]. Finally, in talking about "the calamities" which fell on all of Greece, "common misfortune befell the Peloponnesians, Boeotians, the Phocians, the Euboeans, the

---

42. Other references along exactly the same lines, equating Macedonians and Greeks, include: 4.35.6; 5.35.1.

Locrians, some of the cities of the Ionic Gulf and finally the Mace-
donians" (38.3.8).

This last really opens a new category in which Macedonia is treated
as part and parcel of Greece, which heralds a new *mentality*. The cata-
lyst for this clearly is the advent of Rome into Greek affairs. The clearest
example of this is in the passage dealing with the treaty between Philip
V and Hannibal, which probably reflects the Macedonian copy which
fell into Roman hands[43]. In the opening lines the formula for the Greek
side of the alliance reads "King Philip and the Macedonians and the allies
of the other Greeks" (ἔσται δὲ καὶ Φίλιππος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ Μακεδό-
νες καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων οἱ σύμμαχοι – 7.9.7). Polybius goes on to
discuss respect for Philip born out in all of Greece (ἐγένετο τῶν Ἑλλή-
νων – 7.11.3) and that all his hereditary dominions (including Thessaly)
were more attached to him than any king before him (7.11.4). This
embodies the ready admission of part of Greece proper as also part of
Philip's hereditary domain, and implies a cultural unity which Polybius
makes even clearer in the next book.

In a famous passage, in which he is criticizing Theopompus, Polybius
makes the point that just as he was approaching the most brilliant period
of Greek history, Theopompus abandoned Greece and her efforts to
write the history of Philip. "Certainly", Polybius says, "it would have
been much more dignified and fairer to include Philip's achievements in
the history of Greece than to include the history of Greece in that of
Philip" (καίτοι γε πολλῷ σεμνότερον ἦν καὶ δικαιότερον ἐν τῇ περὶ
τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὑποθέσει τὰ πεπραγμένα Φιλίππῳ συμπεριλαβεῖν ἥπερ
εἰ ἐν τῇ Φιλίππου τὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος – 8.11.4). Finally, in a speech by
Lykiskos (the Acarnanian Envoy) to the Spartans to persuade them to
make common cause against the Aetolians (in the First Macedonian
War), he completes the synthesis in a long speech detailing the benefices
of "Philip V [and other Macedonian kings] and the Macedonians" on
Greece by identifying "Achaeans and Macedonians" as peoples of the
same tribe (πρὸς Ἀχαιοὺς καὶ Μακεδόνας ὁμοφύλους – 9.37.7).
Indeed, the speech as a whole largely takes linking Macedon and Greece
as its main theme. Thus, the two strands have become interchangeable.

43. See E. J. Bickermann, "Hannibal's Covenant", *AJP* 73 (1952) 1-23 and F. W.
Walbank, *Historical Commentary on Polybius* II 43.

Here we have the beginning of what will lead Strabo to make his statement that "Macedonia was, indeed, part of Greece".

It is not that the old rivalries are forgotten. Pausanias, who will write an historical guide two and a half centuries after Polybius, is filled with references to Macedonian and Greek antagonism such as Antipater and Cassander crushing the Greeks (1.4.1); Pyrrhus dedicating at Dodona the Macedonian shields which had enslaved Greece (1.13.3); and all of Greece fearing the Macedonians (2.8.4). But these only reflect the old political rivalries and Pausanias was writing an historical guidebook. Even in the speech of Lykiskos just quoted, it is in the context of old rivalries with Sparta.

On the other hand, Pausanias equally shows the cultural sense of unity between Macedon and Greece. Listing a series of Greek dedications to the gods, a bronze statue of Apollo from the Macedonians appears in the middle of the list (10.13.5). In explaining why the Macedonians do not set up victory trophies over Greeks or Barbarians (ὁπόσας μάχας ἄλλας Βαρβάρους ἢ καὶ ῞Ελληνας ἐνίκησαν – 9.40.7), Pausanias recounts the tale of the founder of the Argead dynasty, Caranus defeating one Cissaius and setting up a trophy in the Argive fashion (κατὰ νόμους τοὺς 'Αργείων ἔστησεν ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ – 9.40.8), but it was overturned in the night by a lion from Mount Olympus. Caranus realized that it was a mistake to incur the hatred of barbarians who surrounded them in such a fashion (οὐκ εὖ βουλεύσασθαι βαρβάροις τοῖς περιοικοῦσιν – 9.40.9). The clear implication of the passage is that Macedonia (even at its beginnings) was Greek rather than barbarian to Pausanias, presumably because he could not conceive of them being anything but Greek.

The change in cultural perception is now complete. We have moved from the Fourth Century (B.C.) when cultural perceptions, real or imagined, were still in force; through to the Second Century (B.C.) when the cultural unity of Macedonia and Greece can be asserted even by a Greek; down the Second Century (A.D.) when that ethnic identity is presumed by everyone, both Greeks and others. The ethnic distinctions, in the light of Alexander's conquests and the realities of the Near Eastern non-Greek populations already softened, then blurred, recognized as essentially meaningless. That same pictured altered with the coming of Rome so that the lines all but disappeared altogether. How-

ever one perceives them as they began their journey, the Greeks and Macedonians, both to themselves and others, ended it together as one people.

University of Utah