

MACEDONIAN 'ROYAL STYLE' AND ITS HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

ANDRÉ AYMARD, in a pair of articles now more than twenty years old, directed his attention to a thorough collection and evaluation of not only Macedonian, but of all hellenistic royal titulature.¹ The conclusions of the impressive structure of fact and theory which he propounded in those articles have been widely accepted. But it seems likely that in the case of Macedonia he has been misled by pre-existing constitutional theory (despite his sensible rejection of its most outrageous aspects) into overvaluing the constitutional significance of the evidence from Macedonian royal style. This article is concerned with re-examining and re-interpreting the evidence for Macedonian titulature, and with testing the conclusions which Aymard drew from it.

There are two basic questions to be considered in this connection, the second dependent on the first: (i) is it correct, in any sense, to speak of 'official' titulature of the Macedonian kings (and therefore, *a fortiori*, of 'false' or 'correct' titles)? (ii) if so, what, if anything is the significance of variants, and what, if anything, can be learnt from them about the nature of the Macedonian monarchy? If we are to find an answer to (i), we must obviously look at the usage which the kings of Macedon themselves chose to use, particularly in their administrative and political public acts, and if any usage occurs with overwhelming frequency this should clearly be sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case that that usage is the normal one, though we might still retain doubts as to whether it could legitimately be called 'official.'

I. NORMAL USAGE

The evidence for Macedonian royal usage before the death of Alexander the Great is notoriously weak, but Aymard's demonstration that Philip II did not use the title *Βασιλεύς*, and that Alexander's usage of it may have been influenced by his ambivalent position in Persia, seems basically sound.² Certainly neither of them, so far as we know, called themselves in any formal connection *Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων*, though this did not prevent Demosthenes and Aristotle from so referring to kings of Macedon in general³ or Isocrates to Amyntas in particular.⁴ All these, however, are literary passages in which some geographical precision is required, where *Βασιλεύς* alone would be either confusing or meaningless; as far as 'official' nomenclature is concerned, we can reasonably conclude with Aymard that the available evidence suggests that in Macedonia up to the death of Alexander the Great the king of the Macedonians did not ever officially describe himself in this way.⁵

After Alexander the situation, as far as titulature is concerned, is in general much clearer. Simple *Βασιλεύς*, as a normal title, was universally used by the new dynasties of hellenistic kings after the transition period, the fashion being set by Antigonos and Demetrius after Demetrius' victory at Salamis in 306 (whether or not they consciously imitated Alexander).⁶ And we possess a large collection of letters written by hellenistic kings which

¹ Aymard (i) = A. Aymard, 'Le protocole royal grec et son évolution', *REA* 1, 1948, 232 f. (= *Études d'histoire ancienne* (Paris, 1967), 73 f. (cited in this edition); Aymard (ii) = 'Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων', *RIDA* iv, 1950, 61 f. (= *Études*, 100 f., from which I shall cite it).

² Aymard (i), 82 f.

³ Cf. Dem. II 15; Arist. *Pol.* 1310b, 39.

⁴ Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 126; *Archidamus* 46, cf. *Philippus* 14.

⁵ The case of Amyntas, son of Perdiccas in the inscription from Lebadeia (*IG* vii 3055) we shall examine in detail below, pp. 25-8.

⁶ Cf. Diod. xx 53.2-4; Plut. *Demetrius*, 18. A recently published inscription from Samothrake (J. R. McCredie, *Hesperia* xxxvii, 1968, p. 222) makes it clear that Philip III and Alexander IV also jointly used the title when dedicating the (unidentified) building from which the inscription comes. This must be dated before Philip's death, c. October 317

begin: *Βασιλεὺς δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνα χαίρειν*.⁷ The normally accepted conclusion from this usage, so far as the hellenistic monarchies other than Macedon are concerned, is that it indicates a 'personal monarchy', that in a juridical sense the king and the state are identical. These kings do not describe themselves as kings *of* anywhere or *of* any people—only *Βασιλεὺς + nomen*. Apart from various formulaic periphrases which include the name of the currently ruling king, there is no name for the states concerned. And this view seems to be broadly correct.⁸

It is when we come to the Macedonian monarchy that theory and fact seem to diverge; for several scholars insist that the Macedonian monarchy is fundamentally different from the other hellenistic kingdoms, that it is a 'national monarchy' as opposed to a 'personal monarchy'. If all this distinction meant was that the Macedonian kings ruled over a more or less united and unified people, we could let it pass—though it is not a difference which might in itself be regarded as fundamental to the effective nature of the kingship. But much more than this is claimed: the essential difference is said to lie in the alleged fact that in Macedon the king was not completely the state, but that the Macedonian people in some sense had juridical rights which they had machinery for asserting; and that in some public documents the Macedonian people had some kind of juridical position (what it was exactly is not defined, the vagueness being attributed to the feebleness of the sources), and that the king's full 'official' title was *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων*.⁹

This would be a major, indeed a fundamental difference from the other monarchies. And it has much wider implications (if it is real) than its chief recent advocate, Aymard, seems to have realised. If it is true that the Macedonian king was not only the ruler of the Macedonians but that he also in certain circumstances had to reckon with and take account of their constitutional rights, then all our literary sources are clearly very much at fault for giving an almost totally false impression of the nature of the kingship. One might argue, of course, that Demosthenes was hostile and biased, that the Alexander historians which we possess are all late and in any case are chiefly interested in Alexander personally, that the history of Macedon for most of the third century B.C. is largely lost. All this would be true. But Polybius is surely different. He was not only a contemporary of the last years of the Macedonian monarchy, but also an astute politician and political historian, therefore a man with a professional interest in how states worked both in theory and in practice, and with personal experience of the Macedonian monarchy. Yet Polybius gives exactly the same

(not 316, as McCredie, 223), and this provides a thread of continuity in usage between Alexander the Great and the hellenistic successors.

⁷ The standard collection of hellenistic letters outside Macedon remains that of C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven, 1934); for a list of the Macedonian letters (all of Philip V), see F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (Cambridge, 1940), 288 n. 1; to which add J. Crampa, *Labraunda III*, part 1 (Lund, 1969), nos. 5 and 7.

The only known exception to this practice is the letter of Ziaelas of Bithynia to Cos concerning the Coan *asylia* (Welles, no. 25), which begins: *Βασιλεὺς Βιθυνῶν Ζιαήλας*. This titular aberration is unique and remarkable, as indeed, in the context, are the other stipulations in the letter regarding the establishment of good relations generally between Bithynia and Cos; and we can only conclude that this formula had the specific purpose of emphasising the legitimacy of Ziaelas' rule in Bithynia. The chronology is unfortunately uncertain. The inscription is on the

same stone and is engraved under a letter of Ptolemy III; it is therefore after 246; but it is apparently before the establishment of the festival at Cos, the first celebration of which was in 241 (R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* (Berlin, 1952), 17). We do not know exactly when Ziaelas came to the Bithynian throne, but we do know that he was not left as heir to it by his father Nicomedes (Memnon of Heraclea (*FgrHist* no. 434), *fr.* 14), and that a period of civil war intervened (*ib.*). What this seems to mean, therefore, is that Ziaelas, once having established himself *de facto*, recognised his need to do everything possible to have his position recognised; and to describe himself on such a document as *Βασιλεὺς Βιθυνῶν* emphasised the fact that he was in control and able to make these concessions. See also Chr. Habicht, *RE* s.v. 'Ziaelas', esp. col. 391 f. Cf. also the discussion below p. 23 on Cassander's inscription from Cassandria.

⁸ Cf. e.g., Aymard (i), 73 f.

⁹ Aymard (i), 74 f; (ii), 100 f., esp. 122.

impression of total kingly supremacy in the state as do the other literary sources and gives no hint that this total control in any way offended the constitutional rights of the Macedonians. When the 'national monarchy' theory brings us to the point of effectively accusing Polybius of not understanding (or, at least, of not relating or even hinting at) how the most powerful Balkan state of his day really worked, it is time to re-examine such facts as are claimed to support the theory.

The largest body of epigraphical material we have which issued from the kings themselves is the collection of royal letters. We shall see immediately that in none of the letters of Philip V (the only letters of an Antigonid king to survive, once the dynasty was firmly established in Macedonia) can we trace any variation from the normal autocratic hellenistic royal letter style, *Βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος τῷ δεῖνα χαίρειν*. A *prima facie* case is thus immediately established for thinking that Polybius and other writers knew what they were talking about when they talked of the Macedonian monarchy in the same personal terms as the other hellenistic kingdoms.

Modern theorists have therefore tended to play down these similarities, either by arguing that in the early years of Philip V, when the preserved letters were written, the Macedonian monarchy was more authoritarian than at other times¹⁰—a theory which has since been shown to be groundless¹¹—or that since the letters of all the hellenistic kings (with the one exception of Ziaelas' letter to Cos discussed above, n. 7) show the same formal pattern, they represent merely normal epistolary style to which the Antigonid kings of Macedon conformed.¹² This latter is not a cogent argument. For, however normal the formula became as a royal epistolary style, it was an epistolary style which was suitable only for kings who were personally masters of their own states. It was a letter style which (if we can trust Diodorus) originated with Alexander the Great's letter about the Greek exiles, read at Olympia in 324, though the title had been used in other contexts for, if not certainly by, Alexander before this.¹³ In any case, it was first employed, to our knowledge, by a king who remained king in the Macedonian homeland (whatever his other achievements); and it is next attested for Antigonus Monophthalmus, the founder of the power of the Antigonid dynasty and great-great-grandfather of Philip V (though, of course, he never himself actually ruled in Macedon).¹⁴

It is therefore very difficult to argue convincingly that the hellenistic epistolary convention was *imitated* by the Antigonid kings once they were established in Macedonia from the usage of the other hellenistic autocrats, when the usage seems to have been initiated by the greatest of all the kings of Macedon and perhaps first imitated by the founder of the Antigonid dynasty. Thus *if* the letter form is a sign of personal monarchy, it is not only a sign of personal monarchy in the Antigonid house *also*, but in the Antigonid house *especially*.

It is, however, to the claimed positive titular evidence for Macedon's having had a 'national monarchy' (in the juridical sense described above) that we must now turn. Aymard has asserted and argued at length that the 'juridically correct', 'official', title of the king who ruled in Macedon was *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων*,¹⁵ yet the paucity of the evidence compels him to admit that it was used only on quite rare occasions; and we may add that (so far as we know) it was never used on that most official of all official publications, the

¹⁰ The theory is that of Holleaux, *BCH* xxxi, 1907, 94 f. (= *Études*, iii, 55 f.).

¹¹ S. Dow and C. Edson, *HSPH*, 1937, 127 f.; Aymard (ii), 110 f.

¹² Aymard (ii), 101–2.

¹³ Diod. xviii 8.4. See also *Syll.*³ 283 (Chios); 277 (Priene); *OGIS* 1 (Priene); Lindos Chronicle (Blinkenberg, *Lindos* ii (Berlin–Copenhagen, 1941) p. 179), C xxxviii. Some of Alexander's coins are also the first Macedonian coins to bear *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ*: see

B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*², 226; A. R. Bellinger, *Essays on the coinage of Alexander the Great* (New York, 1963), 1.

¹⁴ Diod. xx 53.2–4; cf. Welles, nos. 2 and 4.

¹⁵ He begins his essay thus, begging a major question: 'Toutes les analogies révèlent que l'appellation officielle de celui que l'usage courant nomme aujourd'hui "roi de Macédoine" était "roi des Macédoniens": *Μακεδόνων Βασιλεύς* ou *Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων*' (ii), 100).

coins of the Macedonian kings, where the Antigonids, like the other hellenistic kings, were content with the simple conventional title *Βασιλεύς*.¹⁶

What, we may then reasonably ask, is the reason for choosing to regard this as an official title, if it is never (so far as we know) used on official state letters or on the royal coinage? Aymard is finally compelled to admit that his 'official' title was used only on special occasions¹⁷—not surprisingly, since he can find only five genuine instances (which we shall look at). I find it difficult therefore to understand why he and others have chosen this rare formulation as their 'official' nomenclature, and deny the technical legitimacy of others more frequently used. More likely, as we shall see, is that there was no 'official' title, therefore no 'false' title; for such juridical rigidity seems entirely foreign to the Macedonian court style which, even in the hellenistic period seems not to have developed in the same formally rigid way as other hellenistic kingdoms.

We shall see that a number of varying formulations are used from time to time to describe the king ruling in Macedon. And the one thing they have in common is that they all clearly indicate who is meant by the particular expression concerned in the context in which it is used. What the evidence of the 'titles' therefore seems to suggest is merely that the king (or those describing him) chose such verbal usages as were felt to suit the particular occasion, as far as was compatible with the meaning being clear to those who might read the formula.

The royal letters provide no exception to this principle. For the customary simple royal epistolary style, while occasionally causing problems of identification for those who read only the engraved stones, could not possibly have caused any confusion to the original recipients of the letters (which is what mattered) since the letters would either be delivered by a royal messenger or received direct from the royal chancellery, and would in any case be sealed by the king's seal.

Let us now examine the evidence for Aymard's claimed 'correct' official titular usage of the Macedonian monarchy, *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων*. It is immediately surprising to discover that only one of Aymard's five documentary instances of the usage comes from Macedonia itself, and only it can claim to be an official state document. Beyond these five instances Aymard has rightly accepted that the other occurrences of the usage are either apocryphal (as the so-called letters of Philip II preserved in our manuscripts of Demosthenes' *De Corona*)¹⁸ or misinterpreted (as the famous cuneiform cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa).¹⁹ The most important of the authentic usages is clearly that attested within Macedonia. This is the inscription from Cassandreia in which Cassander, calling himself *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων Κάσσανδρος*, confirms some land transactions for Perdicas son of Coenus.²⁰

The text concerns four pieces of land, which Cassander 'gives' (*δίδωσι*) to Perdicas. Two of them had been in Perdicas' family since Perdicas' grandfather Polemocrates had them as cleruch, one since his father Coenus had it as cleruch, from Philip II; and now all three are 'given' by Cassander to Perdicas *καθάπερ καὶ Φίλιππος ἔδωκεν ἐμ πατρικοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγγόνοις κυρίοις οὔσι κεκτήσθαι καὶ ἀλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι* (lines 10 f.). The fourth piece of land had been bought by Perdicas at some time from one Ptolemy son of Ptolemy, who had received it from Alexander (line 25) on similar terms as Coenus and Polemocrates from Philip. Now if land pieces 1–3 were given to Perdicas' grandfather and father explicitly *ἐμ πατρικοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγγόνοις*, what is Cassander doing 'giving' them to Perdicas? If land piece 4 was given to Ptolemy and his descendants *κυρίοις οὔσι . . . ἀλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι*, again we must ask, why is Cassander here 'giving'

¹⁶ See Head, *Historia Numorum*², 218 f.

¹⁷ (ii), 122.

¹⁸ Refs. in (ii), 102 n. 2.

¹⁹ (ii), 103–4, supporting the original translation

of F. H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden* (Leipzig, 1911), 132–3.

²⁰ Ditt. *Syll.*³ 332.

the land to Perdiccas? And why does he call himself *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* while doing so?

The traditional answer, which was formulated by Rostovtzeff, is that Cassander was here exercising his right and duty as king and owner of all royal lands, of giving what was his to give, since such lands (it was claimed) were never completely alienated by the kings but remained in some sense royal property.²¹ This theory however places precious little weight on the form of words which was used to describe the original gift. If Rostovtzeff's explanation is correct, why had Philip and Alexander bothered to stipulate explicitly the very detailed rights of the recipients over the lands, if it was normal and accepted practice that the exercise of these rights was subject to ratification by every new king? And why is Cassander here bothering to repeat them *in extenso* since, on Rostovtzeff's theory, they are utterly without value, indeed positively misleading and fraudulent? Moreover, it is clear that neither Alexander nor Philip Arrhidaeus nor Alexander IV had gone through the legalistic motions which Rostovtzeff's theory requires, of 'giving' these lands to Perdiccas.²² If they had, this most recent 'gift' would obviously have constituted Perdiccas' legal right to the lands, and must have been cited here instead of or in addition to the earlier 'gifts'; and it is clear that Alexander the Great (at least) would have had time to do this, if it were necessary, since he had had time to grant a new piece of land to Ptolemy on exactly the same terms as Philip's grant to Perdiccas' father and grandfather. Rostovtzeff's theory therefore cannot be right: it implies that the kings did not mean what they said when they made the initial detailed stipulations about the rights of the recipients of the lands; and Philip's successors did not exercise what, it is claimed, was their legal duty.

The real answer to the problem clearly does not lie in this untenable legal theory. It must rather be connected with the confused legal conditions which had prevailed in the Balkans since the original lands were granted. The position of Perdiccas may not have seemed to him very secure after the extinction of the Argeads. He possessed four valuable properties which had originally been granted by members of a dynasty which was not only extinct but finally extinguished by the current ruler, who himself had no traditional claim to the throne at all. His actual legal titles, therefore, dating from Philip and Alexander, might have seemed very slight protection indeed for his property. It was therefore obviously in Perdiccas' own interest to obtain from Cassander himself a formal statement that Cassander would respect (and, perhaps more important, cause others to respect) Perdiccas' title to the estates. And since the stone was found at Potidaea/Cassandreia, the transaction was probably connected in some way with the early stages of the foundation of Cassandreia.

It is otherwise difficult to see why Cassander should have bothered with the matter at all. The uncertain legal situation, and the inevitable re-settlements connected with the new foundation, therefore, seem much more likely than Rostovtzeff's legalism to account for the odd formulation whereby Cassander 'gives' what Perdiccas already possesses—presumably because this was the traditional formula for a king's bestowing recognition of ownership and because (I suggest) there was *no* Macedonian precedent for a king confirming grants of lands in perpetuity which had already been given in perpetuity by a previous king.

If this reconstruction of the circumstances is correct, we can more easily understand why Cassander describes himself as *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* in this document: because it was important that he should assert his legitimate kingship on which rested his right to confirm Perdiccas' holdings, and that the document should therefore sound as solemn and formal as possible. Paradoxically, the fact that Cassander uses such an assertive title within Macedonia seems to suggest not that his position was so secure that he chose to use the traditional 'official' title of the Macedonian kings (to our knowledge, not actually ever used

²¹ M. Rostowzew [sic], *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1910), 251-2; cf. W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford, 1913), 190 f.,

esp. 191 n. 78.

²² I owe this argument to a discussion with Dr A. Giovannini.

in Macedonia by a ruling Macedonian king before or after him), but that it was so insecure that he considered it necessary to assert his authority in a legal document of this sort, the aim of which seems to me to have been to stabilise the situation within Macedonia by using as unusually self-assertive a title as he could think up. Obviously, because the pieces of land were Macedonian land, and because he ruled in Macedonia he called himself 'king of the Macedonians'—but only as an assertion of the title whereby he 'gave' the land.²³

Cassander's use of the title *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* was therefore, I suggest, adopted purely for internal political reasons and was clearly intended for purely internal consumption. It was not, in itself, based on a reaction to the development outside Macedon whereby after 306 the other *diadochoi* called themselves (and each other) *Βασιλεῖς*. We may still continue to believe that Plutarch is right—his statement is probably based on Hieronymus of Cardia—when he states that Cassander, while the other kings used their new *Βασιλεὺς* titles, 'wrote letters as before', i.e. not using the royal title himself and (presumably) not using it for the other dynasts either.²⁴ Plutarch refers only to letters, that is, in effect, to Cassander's conduct of foreign policy and his relations with the other dynasts.²⁵ Inside Macedon, as our inscription shows, things were different. Interestingly, Cassander's coinage also seems to show the same distinction. The bronze, doubtless intended chiefly for local internal consumption, bore *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ* (but *not* *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΩΝ*), whereas his silver, with which he will have traded and paid his soldiers, seem to have consisted of Alexander tetradrachms.²⁶ The use of the title *Βασιλεὺς* within Macedonia seems a clear confirmation that Cassander was trying to assert his legitimacy within the country; but even in this context the unique use of *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* in the Cassandreia land grant seems to be extraordinary, and must have been chosen deliberately, I suggest, because of its more than usually assertive form; and it therefore reflects (as does the whole document, whatever Cassander had called himself) an extraordinary and insecure state of affairs. We cannot regard it, by itself, as normal or 'official' usage.

Aymard's second piece of evidence (though first in time) is of such doubtful meaning that little can be built upon it. It is the inscription from Lebadeia in which one [*Ἀμύντα*][*ς*] *Π[ερ]δίκ[κ]α [Μα]κεδόνων Βασιλεύ[ς]* (note the word order, title—even this in the opposite order to Cassander's inscription—*after* name) is named at the head of a list of visitors and dedicators (none of the rest of whom can be identified) at the oracle of Trophonius. The list is preceded by a decree of Lebadeia which seems to stipulate rules about the recording of donations by visitors to the oracle.²⁷ The only Amyntas known to have been a son of Perdiccas who could have been so described is Amyntas, son of Perdiccas III, for whom Philip II (on the normal interpretation of the evidence) was initially guardian. Since Amyntas is here called [*Μα*][*κεδόνων Βασιλεύ[ς]*], it has been claimed that the inscription supports Justin's view of a regency by Philip, and that this inscription must fall within the period of that regency.²⁸

The situation, however, is much more complex than it seems at first sight, and a firm

²³ See also Aymard (ii), 120, briefly to this effect, though he, of course, regards the 'title' as 'official'.

²⁴ Plut. *Demetrius* xviii 4.

²⁵ Jacoby, *RE* x 2 s.v. 'Kassandros', 2307, rejects Plutarch's statement because he believes it conflicts with our inscription and Cassander's coinage (see below). It does not.

²⁶ See Head, *Historia Numorum*², 228.

²⁷ *IG* vii, 3055. The stone was copied by Pococke and Leake and has since disappeared. The most recent discussions of the text are by J. R. Ellis, *JHS* xci, 1971, p. 17; Cl. Vatin in F. Salviat and Cl. Vatin, *Inscriptions de Grèce centrale* (Paris, 1971), 81–94; cf.

also H. Collitz, *SGDI* i, 156–9). It is perhaps conceivable (though entirely speculative) that Leake, whose copy alone reads *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥ[* (Pococke read the uninterpretable B—ITA) might have misread a final omega of the line as upsilon, and that *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩ[ς]* might have originally stood on the stone. If so, all interpretations based on the phrase as hitherto reconstructed would have to be given up and would make most of my following argument otiose.

²⁸ E.g. Dittenberger, *ad IG* vii, 3055, citing U. Köhler, *Hermes* xxiv, 1889, 636 f., esp. 640 f.

and final interpretation seems to be impossible to achieve. Köhler wants to place the inscription *c.* 350, since he thinks that Amyntas must have been more than a child when he visited Trophonius. But, as Aymard points out, as late as 350 Philip must clearly have been king in his own right; and he emphasises that despite the apparent support of Justin, we really have no idea at all within the limits of Amyntas' lifetime (he died at Alexander's hands *c.* 335) when his visit to Trophonius might have taken place. He further suggests that the titulary usage might even be an indication of Amyntas' opposition to Philip or Alexander;²⁹ and this idea has also been developed independently by J. R. Ellis.³⁰

Before we consider this possibility in more detail, two other aspects are worth pointing out, which, unfortunately, only add to the uncertainty of the interpretation. First, the inscription is not from Macedonia itself, and the description attached to Amyntas, judging from its unique word order,³¹ seems most likely to have been the work of the Lebadeians or their secretary. Secondly, it is possible (though we have no way of assessing how probable), that our Amyntas could be identical with the Amyntas (whose patronymic we do not know)³² sometimes called Amyntas II, who was king in at least part of Macedonia³³ for a year sometime soon after the death of Archelaus.³⁴

If, however, we are dealing with the son of Perdiccas III, as previous writers, perhaps rightly, have assumed, what are we to make of the Lebadeian titlature? If we assume an early date (while Philip was still regent), we must envisage the child, who was not capable of governing Macedon, undertaking a pilgrimage to Trophonius' oracle.³⁵ Such a visit is, of course, not impossible. But the traditional date has recently been challenged on other grounds (which also challenge the validity of the evidence for Philip's ever having been regent for Amyntas). Thus, it is argued that this inscription, together with some other Boeotian stones, all from Oropus,³⁶ is evidence for opposition to Alexander's succession in the months after Philip's death; centred on this Amyntas, it ended when he himself was slaughtered, Amyntas son of Antiochus and Aristomedes of Pherae (both also mentioned in Boeotian inscriptions of the period) went into exile, and Alexander of Lyncestis was arrested.³⁷

The theory has its attractions. Every historian loves a newly discovered conspiracy. But the very meagre evidence is capable of bearing more than one explanation. It is slightly misleading (though true) to emphasise that all the evidence comes from Boeotia. In fact, with the exception of the Lebadeia inscription, all the other evidence comes from Oropus. Now Oropus, we know, was explicitly singled out by Philip after Chaeronea for special treatment: it was given back to Athens, apparently without a special Athenian

²⁹ (ii), 102 f.; 120 f.

³⁰ *Ancient Macedonia*, ed. B. Laourdas and Ch. Makaronas (Thessaloniki, 1970), 68 f.; *JHS* xci, 1971, 15 f.

³¹ On the inscriptions of Philip V, which repeat exactly the word order of Cassander's document ('title' before name), see below, p. 28.

³² A. Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* iv (Leipzig, 1883), 35 f. identifies him with Amyntas, son of Archelaus (*Arist. Pol.* v, 1311b, 13 f.) who received his half-sister as wife. This is possible though entirely speculative; since a few lines above (1311b, 3-4) Aristotle mentions Amyntas *ὁ μικρός*, clearly from the context a king of some sort, who was murdered by one Derdas *διὰ τὸ καυχῆσθαι εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ*; and since he is not explicitly identified with the son of Archelaus a few lines further on, who is independently identified as *τῷ νιῷ* (i.e. of Archelaus), these separate and different identification phrases actually suggest that Aristotle regarded the two Amyntases as different.

In which case the murdered king Amyntas *ὁ μικρός* (patronymic unknown) is a more likely candidate for identification with the Amyntas II of the chronographers' king lists. He could even have been a late-born son of Perdiccas II (hence, perhaps, *ὁ μικρός*) and need not have been much more than about 20 in the mid-390s when he is mentioned in the king lists.

³³ Beloch, *GG*² iii 2, 56, suggests that he must have been a challenger to Aeropus or Orestes, arguing from a confusion in the king lists and Amyntas' omission by Diodorus. If so, he would fit very neatly into our inscription (as long as he was a son of a Perdiccas).

³⁴ For refs. and discussion, see Beloch, *GG*² iii 2, 51; 56.

³⁵ This consideration made Köhler (*op. cit.*) place the inscription *c.* 350.

³⁶ Ditt. *Syll.* 258 = *IG* vii 4251+4250; *Arch. Dell.* xxi, 1966, A', 45 f.

³⁷ Ellis, *op. cit.*; cf. also Aymard (ii), 121.

embassy about it being necessary.³⁸ Now whatever the people of Oropus thought about this business, they would obviously in the end be bound officially to honour the Macedonians who brought them the news. Moreover, we also know that after Chaeronea Philip made use of a more important member of his family for a similar (though more important) task: Alexander accompanied Antipater to Athens.³⁹ It would not therefore be particularly surprising if Amyntas had accompanied his namesake Amyntas son of Antiochus on a similar diplomatic mission to Oropus, where they both received the honorary decrees which have been preserved.

Aristomedes of Pherae may with reasonable certainty be excluded from Ellis's conspiracy on other grounds, which suggest that his visit to Oropus can only with great difficulty be placed as late as 335. Didymus, commenting on our Aristomedes, cites the 48th book of Theopompus' *Philippica* and Philip's *Letter to Athens* for the information that Aristomedes had collaborated with the king's generals in a war with Philip;⁴⁰ and we know from other sources that Aristomedes fought for Darius at Issus, after which he was in Cyprus and Egypt.⁴¹ Theopompus' 48th book seems to have been one of a group of books which dealt with the war in Thrace, therefore with the years 342–339.⁴² Philip's *Letter*, in the form in which it is preserved in the Demosthenic corpus,⁴³ does not mention Aristomedes, an omission which may either be explained by the view that the letter as preserved is a rhetorical revision of an originally authentic letter, perhaps by Anaximenes of Lampsacus,⁴⁴ or that the preserved letter is not the letter to which Didymus refers. In this case, Didymus' letter will perhaps be a slightly later letter, the final ultimatum of autumn 340.⁴⁵ But whichever view of Didymus' letter is correct, the date of the mention of Aristomedes' being in Persian service cannot be other than summer or autumn 340, a date which fits very satisfactorily with the citation of the same event by Theopompus in his book 48.

The conclusion from this evidence about the position of Aristomedes in 340 is now clear. If he was already in Persian service in 340 and continued to support the Persian cause until at least 333, it is very difficult to see how he can have been at Oropus at the time of the alleged conspiracy in 336 or 335, making a dedication which would thoroughly advertise his presence there.

Nor do we need the implication of Amyntas son of Antiochus in a conspiracy to explain his flight to Persia after Alexander's accession (and it is only after his flight that he was directly associated with Aristomedes of Pherae,⁴⁶ who, we have seen, was already established in Persian service by *c.* 340); for whatever really happened at Alexander's accession, his murder of Amyntas son of Perdiccas would undoubtedly make the position of Amyntas' earlier associate Amyntas son of Antiochus *seem* dangerous.⁴⁷

The whole new reconstruction is therefore uncertain and, in parts, very unlikely. This brings us back to the Lebadeian inscription, which Ellis regards as a cornerstone of his theory and which he makes contemporary with the 'conspiracy' after Philip's death. Here too however there is room for serious doubt. The Lebadeian inscription, it seems, is not an honorary inscription. It contains rules, presumably new, about the engraving of donations over ten drachmae by visitors to Trophonius, and a duly engraved list of such visitors, none of whom, except (possibly) our Amyntas, son of Perdiccas, who heads the list, is otherwise

³⁸ Paus. i 34.1; [Demades], *On the Twelve Years*, 9.

³⁹ Justin, ix 4.5.

⁴⁰ Didymus, in *Dem.* 9.43 (= *FgrHist* 115 F 222). This passage was kindly drawn to my attention by Professor Chr. Habicht.

⁴¹ Cf. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* (München, 1926) ii, no. 128.

⁴² Jacoby, *FgrHist* comm. ad 115, p. 359, suggests books 45–50; Beloch, *GG²* iii 2, 24, suggests that books 48–51 dealt with events from 340 to Philip's

march into Greece. The date of book 48 of *c.* 340 is thus agreed in both schemes for the 'economy' of the *Philippica*.

⁴³ [Dem.] xii.

⁴⁴ So P. Wendland, *Anaximenes von Lampsakos* (Berlin, 1905), 13 f.

⁴⁵ So M. Pohlenz, *Hermes* lxiv, 1929, 41 f.

⁴⁶ Arr. *Anab.* ii 13.2–3.

⁴⁷ So already Dittenberger, ad *Syll.*³ 258 n. 3.

known. The question which arises from the conspiracy theory therefore is not just why the Lebadeians called Amyntas *Μακεδόνων Βασιλεύς*. It is much wider. We must also ask why they should have chosen the brief period when the alleged revolt of Amyntas was in operation, sometime after summer 336, to start their new rules about the engraving of visitors' donations to Trophonius; and, more important, why they should choose a rebel, who had not established himself (and did not do so), and who presumably was in no position to pressure them to give him the name to which he allegedly aspired, to inaugurate their new rules; and why, having chosen the rebel, they should swallow his propagandist claim and publicise their support for him in terms of his own propaganda. All this seems to require a very large degree of coincidence or naivety on the part of the Lebadeians: and one of these things it must be (if the conspiracy theory is to survive) for the inscription cannot have been engraved *after* the alleged conspiracy was suppressed, for we can hardly believe that then, and particularly after the destruction of Thebes, Lebadeia would continue to propound what had become not only useless but also dangerous propaganda of Alexander's dead opponent.

I am not therefore convinced by the new approach to this inscription, and prefer to envisage the Lebadeians so describing Amyntas simply because they wanted a famous name to head their list. In this case, the very obscurity of this Amyntas (and this consideration applies equally well whether the inscription concerns the earlier part-king Amyntas (II) or the child Amyntas son of Perdiccas III) would make it desirable for the Lebadeians to inscribe *after the name* this title, merely as a descriptive definition, to make it clear to later visitors—who might easily never have heard of this Amyntas—who he actually was.

The one clear thing that emerges from examining this inscription, whatever its interpretation and whatever its real date, is that the usage *Μακεδόνων Βασιλεύς* (though here not, as we have noticed, occurring in the same form or position as its other occurrences) is again attested in extraordinary circumstances in which the specific point of the title is to assert what might otherwise be disputed or unknown. Certainly the Lebadeian stone gives us no reason for believing that *Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων* is the correct 'official' or normal title of the ruling king of Macedon. Once more, as with Cassander's inscription, it seems most likely to have been used because it sounded impressive, because an assertive usage was required by the circumstances; and the fact that at Lebadeia the reversed formula was added after the name, rather than as with Cassander and with Philip V later, prefixed, suggests that it was supplied by the Lebadeians (or their secretary) themselves.

Aymard's last three examples of the usage of *Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων* all concern Philip V, and all retain the order of words which Cassander used. However, none of them is a public document in the sense that Cassander's stone is, since they are all dedications. Moreover, none of them is from Macedonia—two come from Delos,⁴⁸ the third from Lindos⁴⁹—and all are obviously drafted specifically to create an impressive effect. Two are explicitly boastful dedications after victories—at Delos ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ γῆν ἀγώνων,⁵⁰ at Lindos νικάσας Ἀα[ρ]δ[αυί]ου[s];⁵¹ and Aymard, developing a point made by Vallois,⁵² has argued at

⁴⁸ Ditt. *Syll.*³ 573 and 574.

⁴⁹ Lindos Temple Chronicle, C xlii, in C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos* II, Inscriptions 1, no. 2.

⁵⁰ Ditt. *Syll.*³ 573.

⁵¹ A. Wilhelm, 'Zu griechischen Inschriften und Papyri III', *AAWW* 1922, 70 f., restored after Ἀα[ρ]δ[αυί]ου[s] (which is doubtless correct), [καὶ Μαίδους . . .] and connected the inscription with Livy xxvi 25.3 f., which mentions Philip's expedition against Dardanians and Maedi in 211. This Blinkenberg (*Lindos*, *ib.*) prints, and comments:

'130 Il faut regarder comme certaine la restitution'. It is, of course, entirely possible; but we should not forget that the Dardanians were a constant menace to Macedon, and Philip doubtless led many more expeditions against them than our literary sources happen to tell us about.

⁵² R. Vallois, *Exploration archéologique de Délos* vii 1 (Paris, 1923), 155 f.; cf. W. A. Laidlaw, *A History of Delos* (Oxford, 1933), 118; Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon*, 269.

length and with some plausibility that the third, the dedication of Philip's *stoa* at Delos, which completely overshadowed the so-called 'south *stoa*' (which may have been built by Attalus I), was a deliberate political act and therefore that the verbal formula used here was also intended for boastful show.⁵³ Aymard argued further that Philip used what he regards as his 'official' title for the *stoa* dedication simply to aggravate Attalus who, obviously, as king in Pergamum, cannot have called himself king of the Macedonians. But this argument involves two uncertain assumptions: that the title was 'official' (which other considerations, as we have seen, suggest is unlikely), and that Attalus would be needled by Philip's using such a title (which is dubious). Moreover, Aymard's hypothesis is in any case unnecessary to explain Philip's action. Philip can easily have chosen this formula simply because of its unusually assertive and dramatic nature, whether or not he deliberately wanted to insult Attalus with it. Its use therefore does not make it seem any more an 'official' or 'juridically correct' formula.

Moreover, despite Aymard's powerful rhetoric, we have really no precise idea of when or in what circumstances any of these dedicatory inscriptions was erected. Aymard has argued for a date around 201 for both the Delian inscriptions, the *stoa* and the dedication ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ γῆν ἀγῶνων.⁵⁴ But his grounds are far from cogent. Even if Philip's *stoa* was built as a direct challenge to Attalus, it need not be so late as Philip's Aegean activities after 205, the main period of his active hostility towards Pergamum. Vallois had already suggested that some time after 211, when Pergamum entered the First Macedonian War, was perhaps the most suitable time for the *stoa*.⁵⁵ But wartime was perhaps not the best time for massive expenditure on the decoration of shrines, however political the motive and international the shrine; and an even earlier date is in no way excluded. Dason had had interests in Caria which, we now know, Philip continued even in his earliest years.⁵⁶ This connection alone implies Aegean interests which might easily have given Philip the idea of competitiveness towards Pergamum, and certainly interest in Delos, virtually as soon as he received the kingship—after all (so far as we know), competitive *stoa*-building does not in itself require a war situation to explain it.

Nor is Aymard's connection of the κατὰ γῆν ἀγῶνες with this period wholly cogent. Following the views of De Sanctis about the stone, he argues that the dedication implies the existence of another dedication from the κατὰ θάλατταν ἀγῶνες.⁵⁷ It certainly rings rather oddly to find κατὰ γῆν so explicitly and baldly stated; it is however, not impossible that it stood alone. But in any case, even if we allow a κατὰ θάλατταν implication, the widest extent of the implication is that κατὰ θάλατταν ἀγῶνες had taken place. We obviously cannot make any inference about whether they were successful for Philip, whether there was any spoil to dedicate, whether (if so) it was dedicated at Delos and whether the dedication (if any) used the same verbal formula to describe the king. The dedication therefore cannot with any certainty be placed at the time of Philip's naval battles at Chios and Lade in 201; in fact, it could stand at any time during or after the Social War.⁵⁸ Similarly, the Lindos dedication for his victory over the Dardanians could be from virtually any time during Philip's kingship (presumably, apart from the time of his war with Rhodes), though Aymard advances a fanciful hypothesis which would place it around 204.⁵⁹

How far, then do these items take us? We have three examples of a usage which, prior to Philip, seems to have been used only in extraordinary circumstances, in Cassander's case

⁵³ (ii), 115 f.

⁵⁴ Cf. also De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* iv 1 (Turin 1923), 9 n. 26.

⁵⁵ Vallois, *op. cit.*, 150 f.; cf. Laidlaw, *op. cit.*, 118.

⁵⁶ See particularly, Crampa, *Labraunda* iii 1, esp. nos. 5 and 7, and pp. 123 f.

⁵⁷ (ii), 104 f.; cf. De Sanctis, *Storia*, iv 1, 9 n. 26;

Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon*, 67 n. 6.

⁵⁸ From at least 218 onwards, when we know that Philip deliberately employed a naval policy: Pol. v 2.1 f. Admitted as possible even by Aymard, (ii), 105; cf. Vallois, *op. cit.*, 158.

⁵⁹ (ii), 118 f.

(the only one where we know the king used the title himself within Macedon) apparently as a specific assertion of his legally rather dubious right to distribute land. Was Philip V also affected by extraordinary conditions? The difference between his inscriptions and Cassander's is that his are all non-Macedonian and non-legal documents. We have seen that the *stoa* may have been built as (in some sense) a challenge to Attalus; and the use of the assertive title seems to mark out a claim to recognition. The two victory dedications are obviously proud and boastful—as such things tend to be—and as such it would not be surprising, particularly if the dedications belong to Philip's early years when he was young and obviously self-assertive and proud of his power, if he used an unusually assertive and impressive description of himself.

But whatever the real date of the dedications, the use of *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* in itself gives us no reason for believing that it was either official or even normal usage: all circumstances point to its once again being distinctly abnormal (as Aymard himself, oddly, recognised);⁶⁰ and, on the sole evidence of these five inscriptions it is clearly absurd to talk of this formula's being the only juridically 'correct' title of the king who ruled over the Macedonians, that other usages are basically 'incorrect', and that this little-used so-called official usage is an indication that the king was not a personal monarch but a 'national' monarch, in the sense I have outlined above. The evidence that we have so far examined for Aymard's assertion that the Macedonian kings exercised a less personal rule than the other hellenistic kings is wholly unconvincing.

Moreover, there is another usage which is as widespread as *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* and (so far as I can see) is used in similar circumstances for similar purposes. This is the formula *Βασιλεὺς δεῖνα Μακεδών*. Essentially this seems to be the normal hellenistic royal usage with the addition of the definitive ethnic, which alone without *Βασιλεὺς* had been widely used in the fourth century to describe Philip II, and which also continued to find employ in the hellenistic period, not only by the kings ruling in Macedon but also by at least Ptolemy III and his family⁶¹ and by Antiochus the Great.⁶² It was used at Delos by (or for) Antigonus Gonatas in the temple inventories;⁶³ it was used by the king Antigonus, son of king Demetrius (probably Gonatas but, as Aymard has pointed out, possibly Doso) who built the *progonoi* monument at Delos, and apparently for the king who dedicated the 'North-East' *stoa*;⁶⁴ the Epidaurians used it when they did honour to Doso, and apparently repeated it when they similarly honoured Philip V.⁶⁵

What then (if anything) is the particular significance of this usage, so widespread as it is and not restricted solely to kings ruling in Macedonia? First, we may notice that the dedications in which the usage occurs are all from outside the areas directly controlled by the persons described. And the title is in any case not particularly remarkable. What it seems actually to amount to is the normal Greek dedicator's (or dedicatee's) description with his ethnic, in the normal suffix position, with the prefixure of *Βασιλεύς*, the normal hellenistic royal usage. The thing therefore that these *Βασιλεὺς δεῖνα Μακεδών* inscriptions have in common is that they obey the normal Greek practice of adding an ethnic to descriptions of non-citizens of the community where the person is named, the purpose presumably being quite simply that people reading the inscription should know where the man is from. Obviously, this was strictly speaking unnecessary with a king; but the pretensions of many hellenistic kings to normality in the Greek world were such that they chose to adopt the normal formula and to add *Μακεδών*. When, however, a Macedonian king made a dedication within Macedon (or in areas controlled or heavily influenced by Macedon) it was

⁶⁰ (ii), 122. His explanation of why the 'official' title was hardly ever used is, perhaps not surprisingly, one of the most curious passages of Aymard's work.

⁶¹ *IG*² ix 1, 56.

⁶² *OGIS* 239.

⁶³ C. Durrbach, *Inscr. de Délos*, 298 A, lines 85; 86–7; 372 B line 21.

⁶⁴ *IG*² xi 4, 1096 and 1095.

⁶⁵ *IG*² iv, 589 and 590 A.

obviously unnecessary to add the ethnic *Μακεδών*: several inscriptions from the time of Philip V prove the point by reading simply *Βασιλεύς Φίλιππος Βασιλέως Δημητρίου*.⁶⁶

We have thus isolated two types of titulature which, for use in different circumstances, we may regard as normal. The simple *Βασιλεύς δεῖνα*, sometimes called the epistolary usage (though in practice not limited solely to letters),⁶⁷ was the normal hellenistic usage (and the kings of Macedon were no exceptions) for letters and for use in the areas ruled at any given time by the monarchs, where there could be no real confusion with other like-named persons. Its use seems indeed to have been limited to these two broad areas but not, I suggest, for reasons of style or title, but solely for reasons of clarity. Outside the areas of their immediate control, like any Greek private person acting outside his home territory, the kings seem to have followed the normal Greek practice, and added the normal ethnic in the normal suffix position after name and patronymic (if used). This style was not exclusively used—as the Lindos temple chronicle shows—⁶⁸ since it was, strictly speaking, unnecessary for the kings thus to act the part of the normal man. But at Delos and at Epidaurus, at least, it seems to have been normal practice. It must be emphasised, however, that in neither usage can there have been anything fixed or 'official'. They were usages based on convention with clarity as their chief aim, and are to be regarded as normal, but not invariable practice.

Set into this context of normal usage, therefore, the variant which Philip used at least three times in international shrines is immediately marked out as unusual and abnormal usage. If Philip chose on these occasions to call himself *Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων*, as Cassander did before him in extraordinary circumstances, it must have been because he wanted to create a particular effect, by choosing deliberately an unusual formulation, not, obviously, because it was official or 'correct', but *because it was different* and its impact would therefore be that much greater. The fact that we cannot date the inscriptions precisely, and do not know exactly why Philip chose the unusual formula, does nothing to shake the firmness of the main conclusion. And since *Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων* was not the 'official' title of the Macedonian king, its occasional occurrence obviously tells us nothing at all about his juridical position *vis-à-vis* the Macedonian people.

II. TREATY LANGUAGE

One final verbal formula has in the past been discussed in connexion with the 'official style' of the Macedonian king; but since it also raises the larger question of the participation of the Macedonian people in some sense in treaties negotiated on behalf of the kingdom, it will be easier to deal with the whole question in a separate section.

The problem was first raised by Maurice Holleaux in his discussion of the inscription from Delos commemorating the victory of Antigonus Doson against Cleomenes III at Sellasia. It reads as follows:

*Βασιλεύς Ἀντίγο[νος βασιλέως]
Δημητρίου κα[ὶ Μακεδόνες]
καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι [ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ]
Σελλασίαν μά[χης Ἀπόλλωνι]*⁶⁹

⁶⁶ C. Edson, 'Macedonica', *HSPH* li, 1940, 125–6 (Pella); *BCH* xcii, 1968, p. 886 (Beroea); *SEG* xv, 421 (Lysimacheia); *BCH* xciv, 1970, p. 1084 (Samothrace).

⁶⁷ See the collection of non-epistolary instances in S. Dow and C. Edson, *HSPH* xlviii, 1937, 129 f., to which add the inscription recording the *diagramma* δ ἔθηκεν βασιλεύς Φίλιππος published by S. Pelekides,

⁶⁸ *Ἀπὸ τὴν πολιτεία καὶ τὴν κοινωμία τῆς ἀρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης* (Thessalonike, 1934), 5–23 = Welles, *AJA* xlii, 1938, 249; Fraser, *Op. Ath.*, iii, 1960, 53 no. 10.

⁶⁹ Blinkenberg, *Lindos* ii, no. 2, C xxxviii–xlii.

⁶⁹ Ditt. *Syll.* 518. M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* iii (Paris, 1942), 55 f.

Holleaux extracted from this dedication the phrase *Βασιλεὺς . . . καὶ Μακεδόνες* and interpreted it thus: 'Elle nous montre, nettement distingués, les deux éléments constitutifs de l'état, le roi d'une part, et de l'autre la nation macédonienne. . . . La nation n'est pas identifiée avec le roi: elle subsiste à côté de lui; le roi n'agit point au lieu et place de la nation, mais de concert avec elle.'⁷⁰

This seems an enormous step to take from the wording of a single broken inscription; and Holleaux's further discussion of Macedonian titulature, whereby he argued that Philip V's subsequent usage of the title *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων* indicates a move towards expansion of the power of the king at the expense of the nation, has met little favour. We need not discuss it further here.⁷¹ But the implications of the titulature of the Sellasia monument for the type of autocracy which the Antigonids operated has not received much subsequent discussion; and since the same phrase occurs in Philip's treaty with Hannibal, cited by Polybius,⁷² and seems also to be present in two treaties agreed by Antigonus with the Cretan cities Eleutherna and Hieropytna,⁷³ Holleaux's view of the implications of the phrase has been accepted as more or less standard, and is used as an argument for the Macedonian monarchy's having been a 'national' rather than a 'personal' monarchy. Aymard, for instance, cites these treaties along with the absence of royal cult and the specifically attested superficially less autocratic character of Macedon as evidence for Macedonia's being a 'national' monarchy.⁷⁴

We must therefore look carefully at these alleged instances of the Macedonians' being mentioned in treaties alongside their king. But first it will be worthwhile, in order to set the new instances into context, to look at the normal Macedonian practice in concluding treaties. For this purpose I shall not use treaties whose only evidence comes from citations in literary sources, though it is worth pointing out nevertheless that our literary sources (apart from Philip V's treaty with Hannibal, which we shall look at below), offer virtually no evidence for the Macedonian People's having had any mention, still less real participation in treaties.⁷⁵

It will be best to begin with the slight documentary evidence for the third century; for although it is not large in quantity, it is fairly conclusive for normal usage. When Lysimacheia fell into Philip's hands in 202, a treaty was arranged which sometime subsequently required extension or renewal. We possess pieces which seem to be fragments of this second transaction.⁷⁶ Unfortunately the stone is very badly damaged; but enough is nevertheless preserved to make it almost certainly clear that in this document there was no

⁷⁰ *Ib.* p. 58 *cf.* also Aymard (ii), 109 f. (cautiously).

⁷¹ On this see Dow and Edson, *HSPH* 1937, 127 f.; Aymard (ii), 110 f.

⁷² Pol. vii 9 = *Staatsverträge* iii, 528.

⁷³ *Inscriptiones Creticae* ii, xii, 20 = *Staatsverträge* iii, 501 (Eleutherna); *Inscr. Cret.* iii, III, 1 A = *Staatsverträge* iii, 502 (Hierapytna). On non-Macedonian occurrences of the usage, see below p. 36.

⁷⁴ Aymard (iii) (= *Études*, 143 f., from *REA* lii, 1950, 115 f.), 150. The absence of ruler cult is a red herring so far as information goes concerning the basic character of the Macedonian monarchy. Ruler cult was deliberately fostered as a unifying principle in those kingdoms which ruled diverse peoples. Macedon was a nation state (if not, in the legalists' sense, a 'national monarchy'), therefore by definition, did not require a promoted royal cult as a unifying factor. Thereby, of course, Macedon also avoided some of the more superficial developments of autocracy which the royal cult tended to encourage,

and thus made possible a freer communication between subject and king. But neither the absence of cult nor this freer communication tell us anything about the real basis of power in the state. The differences are juridically quite superficial (though they might, of course, have made Macedon a pleasanter place to live in).

⁷⁵ The Macedonian treaties mentioned only by literary sources to 200 B.C. are the following. Numbers refer to volume and number in *Staatsverträge*: ii, 165; 195; 249; 275; 298; 300; 301; 314; 315; 318; 319; 327; 329 (peace of Philocrates, for which Demosthenes quotes freely from the treaty); 330; 333; 336; iii, 402; 405 (Alexander and Aspendos, in which, according to Arrian (i 27.3), the Aspendians must *φόρους ἀποφέρειν . . . Μακεδόσι*. But Arrian is only summarising, not quoting from the document, and cannot be relied on for exact terminology); 458; 477; 490; 506; 520; 543; 547.

⁷⁶ Most accessible edition in *Staatsverträge* iii, 549.

mention of the Macedonians alongside the king, and nobody has ever proposed any restoration which would introduce them. Lines (a) 5 (*Βασιλέα Φιλίππου τ. . .*), (a) 9 (*[μήτε βασιλ]εὺς Φιλίππου συμμαχίαν ποιείσθω*), and (b) 3 (*[ὑπὸ] βασιλέως Φιλίππου. βασιλε. . .*) seem conclusive.

The second conclusive treaty is that of Demetrius II with Gortyn, dated to 237/6.⁷⁷ Here lines 14–15 decide the issue without any doubt: there shall be perpetual friendship and alliance *Δημητρί[ωι] τ[ῶι] βα[σι]λεῖ καὶ [Γορτυ]νίοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμμαχοῖς* (*cf.* also lines 4–5); and the restoration seems quite certain in comparison with lines 4–5 and 11–12. There is thus no room here either for the Macedonians.

These two third-century examples are obviously more important for our present question than earlier, fourth-century evidence, since between them they (probably) span the period in which all the *Βασιλεὺς καὶ Μακεδόνες* usages occur. Nevertheless, no epigraphical evidence from the fourth century (or earlier) would give us any reason to believe that the Macedonians were normally (or even abnormally) mentioned in Macedonian treaties, which the Macedonian king himself in his own right negotiated. The first preserved documentary instance is the fifth-century treaty between Athens and Perdiccas II and Arrabaeos of Lyncestis.⁷⁸ Many details are obscure, including the precise date, but what does seem to emerge clearly (and most importantly for our point of view) is that the treaties were arranged with the dynasts alone; and that they were sworn to by a group of people who in one place seem to be described by the Athenians as *τὸς βασιλέας τὸς μετὰ Περ[δίκκο]*⁷⁹ and in another as *[ἀρχο]ντες(?) Μακεδ[όνο]ν*.⁸⁰ The Macedonian political situation recorded by this stone was certainly much more complex than it was in the third century; but for our purpose it seems clear that there is no place, even in this early document, for the Macedonian People as such.

The inscriptions from the fourth century show the same thing clearly. The Chalcidians' fifty-year alliance with Macedon *c.* 393 is simply *πρὸς Ἀμύνταν τὸν Ἐρριδαῖο*;⁸¹ the critical passage is lost from the stone which recorded the Athenians' alliance with Amyntas III in 373 or 375, but the oath was taken merely by Amyntas and his son Alexander⁸² (the reason for the latter is not clear: perhaps the treaty was with Amyntas and his descendants, and Alexander was the most prominent of the descendants); the Chalcidians' alliance with Philip II in 357/6, while again the stone is badly broken, includes the phrase *ᾧτι ἂν δοκῆι Φιλίππῳ καὶ [Χαλ]κιδεῦσι*.⁸³ We may perhaps add to this brief catalogue the oath of the foundation of the Corinthian League, part of which (as restored) reads: *οὐδε τῆν βασιλείαν [τ]ῆν Φ[ιλίππου καὶ τῶν ἐκγόν]ων καταλύσω . . .*⁸⁴

It is now clear that the normal practice for treaties with the Macedonian monarchy was that they were made with and by the king, and were sworn either by him alone, or by him and as many of his family or nobles as the current political situation made desirable. 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. Let us now turn to the alleged exceptions, which are now clearly seen to be such. We may deal first with the Sellasia monument, since Holleaux himself began from it. What Holleaux did not point out in the critical place, and his followers have also ignored, is that this monument was not erected by king Antigonos and the Macedonians alone: it was erected by king

⁷⁷ *Inscr. Cret.* iv, 167 = *Staatsverträge* iii, 498.

⁷⁸ *Staatsverträge* ii, 186. The exact date is not certain (and for our purpose unimportant), but see Bengtson, *ad loc.*, arguing for 423/2.

⁷⁹ *Frg.* f, line 27. The precise restoration is uncertain, but the alternative, *Περ[δίκκαν]*, provides an odd-looking phrase for 'Perdiccas' successors'. Moreover, the document finally seems to list

ἀρχο]ντες? Μακεδ[όνο]ν (*frg.* c, line 52), among whom are at least two people who receive the title *Βασιλεὺς* (line 61).

⁸⁰ Line 61.

⁸¹ *Staatsverträge* ii, 231.

⁸² *Staatsverträge* ii, 264, lines 2 and 20–1.

⁸³ *Staatsverträge* ii, 308, line 11.

⁸⁴ *Staatsverträge* iii, 403, lines 11–12.

believe Eusebius when he says that Doson had children by Chryseis, but killed them off after birth to preserve the throne for Philip,⁹⁴ at the time when these treaties were concluded their maker was obviously very much alive, and if it was Doson, nobody can have relied on his continuing to fail to rear the children which he and Chryseis were clearly capable of producing. Moreover, the purely formal aspect of such regular phrases should not be underestimated,⁹⁵ since it was clearly regarded as a token of goodwill on the part of the contracting parties to bind themselves to agreement also with the successors of the treaty-maker.

On the other hand, the argument in favour of Doson, as it has been usually presented, is also very feeble, for it relies on our critical phrase, 'king Antigonos and the Macedonians', and argues that this formula was peculiar to Doson (evidence from the Sellasia monument), and therefore must refer to him here.⁹⁶ The phrase in the form in which it appears on the Sellasia monument is not, as we have seen, peculiar to Doson, since it was used by Philip V also; but in each of these cases it occurs with the vitally important addition of 'the allies', which can only mean that the king, in those instances, chose to represent himself as the *hegemon* of the League.

What, then, of our Cretan inscriptions? As they are commonly regarded, they are the only Greek documents which preserve the phrase 'king Antigonos and the Macedonians' without the addition of 'the allies'. If this view is correct, they can, as before, belong either to the reign of Gonatas or of Doson, since the naked phrase is not otherwise attested. But are these in fact the only instances without 'the allies'? In both texts after the mention of 'the Macedonians' there is a large lacuna, for neither of which has any editor suggested a restoration. Comparison with the other usages of the style 'king *x* and the Macedonians', particularly with the directly comparable treaty with Hannibal, suggests that for the lacunae in these Cretan treaties we should supply some phrase which will indicate the allies. I therefore suggest (*exempli gratia*) the following restorations. For the Eleutherna treaty, lines 3-4:

πρ]ὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Μακεδό
[νας καὶ πρὸς? τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς] Ἐλευθερναίους· κατὰ

For the Hierapytna treaty, lines 12-13:

μηδ]ὲ τὸς ἐγγόνος μηδὲ Μα
[κεδόνας μηδὲ πρὸς τὸς συμμάχους] μηδὲ ξενολογία παρε⁹⁷

If the argument supporting the sense of these restorations is acceptable (and it is only the sense that I should insist on) we are in a position to date reasonably firmly both the treaties after 224, the founding date of Doson's League against Cleomenes.⁹⁸

But the real purpose of our examination of these documents must not be lost sight of. We began by examining all available relevant documents for the purpose of testing Holleaux's interpretation of the phrase 'King Antigonos and the Macedonians' on the Sellasia monument. We have now seen that the phrase probably has no attestation as a formally used phrase outside the League created by Doson in 224 and continued by

⁹⁴ Eusebius, *Chron.* i, 238 (ed. Schoene).

⁹⁵ Cf. Van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe* (Paris, 1948), 219 f.

⁹⁶ Schmitt, *Staatsverträge* iii, p. 197, is rightly more cautious when he says that the phrase is not known before Doson.

⁹⁷ This restoration is a letter or two short of what an average letter count would require; but see the description of the stone, which was badly pitted

when it was engraved, and the lines are very irregular.

⁹⁸ Schmitt, *ad Staatsverträge* iii, 501 and 502, gives the dates, 'Etwa 227-224(?)', and attaches them to the preparations for the war with Cleomenes. Even without my argument about the allies, I do not see why the limit should be placed at 224 (even with a question mark), since Cretan mercenaries are known in this war only from the battle of Sellasia in 222; therefore 222 should be the *terminus ante quem*.

Philip V; and that even there it (probably) never occurs without the addition of 'the allies'. What it therefore seems to represent is not, as Holleaux thought, the relationship between king and people in Macedonia, but rather the relationship between the Macedonian and allied elements in Doso's League.

The only other usages of the phrase are a single restored Pergamene dedication of spoils, and several Roman usages, all in war or post-war situations, which therefore do not necessarily represent the real constitutional arrangement in Macedonia, but merely whom the users of the phrase thought they were dealing with. So, after (probably) the battle of Chios, Attalus dedicated spoils at Pergamum [ἀ]πὸ τ[ῆς] πρὸς Φίλιππον|καὶ Μακεδ[όνας] παρὰ Χίου| ναυμ[αχίας].⁹⁹ At the beginning of the Second Macedonian War in 200, the Romans declared war *Philippo regi Macedonibusque qui sub regno eius essent*,¹⁰⁰ a definition which shows the Romans carefully ruling out any Macedonians who might not be subject to Philip, and thus emphasising that the war was only against Philip, his supporters and his power base. The phrasing was therefore conditioned not by Macedonian constitutional formulae, but by Roman political aims. It was the king that mattered. And when Flaminius in his Isthmian proclamation described himself and the Senate as *καταπολεμήσαντες βασιλέα Φίλιππον καὶ Μακέδονας*,¹⁰¹ he was merely picking up the phrase in which the Roman Senate had formulated the *rogatio* in 200.

We may compare the strictly comparable situation on the outbreak of the war with Antiochus when, in Livy's words, *populus Romanus eo tempore duellum iussisset esse cum rege Antiocho quique sub imperio eius essent*,¹⁰² and in the final peace treaty in which, though it was formally between Antiochus and the Romans, not only Antiochus himself but also οἱ ὑποταγμένοι are given certain responsibilities.¹⁰³

Similarly, although Livy's description of the *rogatio* for the Third Macedonian War does not mention the Macedonians as such,¹⁰⁴ we may nevertheless readily assume that in that case also (in view of Roman intentions towards the 'Macedonian question' at the time), the Macedonians were considered to be included in the declaration.¹⁰⁵ This will therefore be echoed by the Delphic monument of Aemilius Paullus (*L. Aemilius L.f. imperator de rege Perse Macedonibusque cepet*);¹⁰⁶ the *acta triumphalia* may also preserve the formula (*L. Aemilius L.f.M.n. Paullus II, procos . . . ex Macedon. et rege Perse; Cn. Octavius Cn.f.Cn.n. propr. . . . ex Macedon. et rege Perse*), though Degrassi, on what seem to be good grounds, expands in each case *ex Macedon(ia)*. If he is right, the *acta triumphalia* are removed as evidence from the debate.¹⁰⁷

Roman usage, therefore, as has been previously pointed out, offers no support to Holleaux's thesis, the whole of which has now been shown to be deprived of its evidence. We can now say in all probability that, apart from the Greek League of Doso and Philip V, no Macedonian king used the phrase 'king *x* and the Macedonians' in an official context; and that during the period when it was used it was probably accompanied in every case by a mention of the allies of the League; moreover, it reflects therefore not the normal constitutional arrangement in the Macedonian state between the king and the People, but only the relationship within the League between the Macedonians and the non-Macedonians. It should therefore disappear from discussions of Macedonian titulature.

III. CONCLUSION

It is now possible to answer the questions which were posed at the beginning of this

⁹⁹ *OGIS* 283.

¹⁰⁰ Livy xxxi 6.1.

¹⁰¹ Pol. xviii 46.5, cf. Walbank, *Comm.* ii, ad loc.

¹⁰² Livy xxxvi 2.2.

¹⁰³ Pol. xxi 42.

¹⁰⁴ Livy xlii 30.10-11.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Livy xlii 31.1: *cui Macedonia obvenisset, ut is regem Persea quique eius sectam secuti essent . . . bello persequeretur.* Cf. also Plut. *Mor.* 197F.

¹⁰⁶ *ILS* iii 2, 8884.

¹⁰⁷ *Fasti Triumph. Capit.* in *Inscr. Italiae* xiii 1, ad ann. 167.

article concerning the Macedonian royal titulature and its significance as evidence for the nature of the Macedonian monarchy. We have examined all the evidence which has been called into the debate concerning Macedonian 'official' titulature without the preconception that there *must* have been some kind of official style. And the results which have emerged are different from views commonly held.

We may now say, with reasonable certainty, that there was no such thing as a single 'correct', 'official', Macedonian royal titulature. Where ambiguity was not a serious danger, the Macedonian king, like his hellenistic royal contemporaries, was content to call himself simply *Βασιλεύς* as the royal letters and several dedications from areas controlled or substantially influenced by the Macedonian kingdom show clearly. Outside these areas other styles occur, the more frequent being the suffix *Μακεδών* to the usual *Βασιλεύς*, with or without the king's patronymic. This usage however was not confined to members of the Antigonid house. Only on rare occasions, in contexts where a king wished, for some personal or political reason, particularly to assert himself, do we find the variant *Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων*.

Since 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. Moreover, the second of our initial questions can also now be answered: since there was no single 'official' style, there was strictly speaking, no such thing as a variant from it. The different titles, as we have seen, seem to be chosen chiefly on principles of economy and clarity. We cannot therefore hope to find hidden traces of a Macedonian constitution in them. What does emerge is a picture of the total supremacy of the king in all recorded aspects of public life, a picture which our surviving literary sources wholly support. This is, perhaps, the most important single conclusion to emerge from this study.¹⁰⁸

R. M. ERRINGTON

Marburg/Lahn

¹⁰⁸ I am grateful to The Queen's University of Belfast for leave of absence and to the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung for a Forschungsstipendium, during the tenure of which in Heidelberg the sub-

stance of this article was written. Professor Chr. Habicht very kindly read an earlier version and suggested several improvements: he does not necessarily agree with all or any of my conclusions.