THE ROYAL MACEDONIAN TOMBS AND THE PARAPHERNALIA OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

E. N. Borza

The following paper raises two related points about the identification of the remains in the royal Macedonian tombs in the great tumulus at Vergina (ancient Aegae). One is that the evidence now seems to point toward a date for Tomb II later than the death of Philip II. The other is that some of the materials found within that tomb may have belonged to Alexander the Great.[1]

Following the chronology suggested by the excavator—that all three tombs belong to about the last third of the fourth century B.C.—only a few royal personages were eligible by birth, status, or marriage for burial at Aegae in that era.[2] If the identification of the human remains in Tomb III as a teenaged male is correct, the structure is probably the final resting place of Alexander IV, son of the Conqueror and the Bactrian princess, Roxane (see Endnote A). He was the last Argead, and his murder by Cassander ca 310 marks the end of the dynasty.

The male-female burial in Tomb II is the only main chamber-antechamber double burial thus far recovered from a Macedonian tomb. There are only two sets of candidates for this unusual interment: Philip II and his wife, Cleopatra, and Philip III Arrhidaeus and his wife, Eurydice. Immediately following Philip II's assassination in 336, Alexander was declared king, and went off to put down frontier rebellions. In his absence, Olympias, Alexan-

[1]What follows has been excerpted from a study of material culture that forms part of my forthcoming monograph on Argead Macedonia, *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, N.J.). In recent years the archaeological discoveries from Macedonia have acquired a deservedly large bibliography, which I have attempted here to keep to an minimum. The most recent descriptions of the Vergina discoveries by the excavator are Manolis Andronikos, *Vergina. The Royal Tombs and the Ancient City* (Athens 1984), hereinafter cited as *Vergina*, and "Βεργίνα. Ἀρχαιολογία καὶ Ἱστορία," *Philia epi eis Georgion E. Mylonan* 1 (Athens 1986) 19–37.

[2]See P. Green, "The Royal Tombs of Vergina: A Historical Analysis," in W. L. Adams and E. N. Borza, eds., *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Washington 1982) 129–151, with a summary table at 140–141.

Of course, as Prof. A. B. Bosworth points out to me, there is no certainty beyond doubt that the great tumulus at Vergina contains tombs that are necessarily either Argead or royal. As the *de facto* rulers of Macedon from the time of Alexander the Great's Asian expedition were not Argeadae, but members of the house of Antipater, one might extend the range of possibilities to include the burials of a number of other persons, both Antipatridae and private individuals. Bosworth's suggestion has merit, and one must hold in reserve the possibility he suggests; for present purposes, however, I am inclined to accept, on the basis of the available evidence, that these are royal burials, and will proceed to argue on that basis.

Phoenix, Vol. 41 (1987) 2.

der's mother and Philip's estranged former wife, arrived at Aegae and murdered Philip's young widow, Cleopatra, and her child. Alexander returned and was outraged at Olympias' act. Presumably the young queen was buried at Aegae.[3] In 317 Alexander the Great's successor, Arrhidaeus, and Eurydice were imprisoned and murdered on the orders of Olympias. By 316, however, the general Cassander, contending for the throne, had overcome Olympias, and interred the royal couple with honors at Aegae.[4]

The excavator of Vergina holds that Tomb II, the great unlooted chamber tomb, is the burial place of Philip of Macedon. His arguments have been presented energetically (above, note 1) and there is no need to repeat them here. I may say only that I do not regard the analysis of the bones recovered from the main chamber as proof of the identity of the occupant. There is not only disagreement among the specialists who have examined the human remains, but their examinations have concentrated mainly on the skull for signs of Philip II's injury and insufficiently on the leg bones, where the king was also wounded.[5]

Virtually since the discovery of the royal tombs, objections have been raised to an identification of Tomb II with Philip II. Many of these have not stood the test of criticism, and I present here only those which may yet be valid.

1—The tomb contained ceramic objects which have been identified as Athenian, dated by an archaeologist working in the Athenian Agora to at least the generation after the death of Philip II. Contextual numismatic

[3]Evidence for these events is gathered in E. N. Borza, "The Macedonian Royal Tombs at Vergina: Some Cautionary Notes," *Archaeological News* 10 (1981) 73–87, at 76–77.

[4]The evidence is set out by W. L. Adams, "The Royal Macedonian Tomb at Vergina: An Historical Interpretation," *Ancient World* 3 (1980) 67–72.

[5]J. Musgrave, R. A. H. Neave, and A. J. N. W. Prag, "The Skull from Tomb II at Vergina: King Philip II of Macedon," *JHS* 104 (1984) 60–78. See my criticism of the *JHS* report (especially of Prag's work) in "A Macedonian Skull," *Newsletter* of the Association of Ancient Historians 36 (April 1985), in which I pointed out some flaws in the authors' methods, including the alteration of the facial features of the reconstructed head of the deceased to conform to some predispositions about Argead physical appearance. The initial anthropologists' report found no evidence of either injury or healing; see N. I. Xirotiris and F. Langenscheidt, "The Cremation from the Royal Macedonian Tombs at Vergina," *ArchEph* (1981) 142–160.

The excavator has maintained (most recently in *Vergina* 186, 189, and 231) that a pair of mismatched gilded greaves found in Tomb II must be taken seriously as a "pointer" toward identifying the deceased warrior as Philip II, who suffered severe leg and thigh wounds. The *left* greave is considerably shorter and smaller in diameter. But Green (above, n. 2, 135–136) showed on the basis of the ancient accounts that Philip's wounds were in the *right* leg. The only published report on the condition of the leg bones indicates that there was no sign of injury; see Xirotiris and Langenscheidt, 146 and 158. The deceased had a smaller lower left leg. He may have been hampered by it, or even been somewhat lame. Whether this condition was congenital, or caused by disease or injury, is unknown, and cannot, in any case, be used to identify the dead man.

evidence has made the chronology of these late fourth-century materials secure within about a decade.[6] The existence of materials associated with late fourth-century Athens would make it virtually impossible that the tomb belonged to Philip and Cleopatra, who were buried in 336 B.C., and enhances the possibility that this is the tomb of Arrhidaeus and Eurydice, who were interred in 316.

2—Macedonian tombs of the period normally have relatively small antechambers designed as repositories for grave goods rather than for burials. The unusually large antechamber of Tomb II—nearly as large as the main chamber—points more to the interment of Eurydice as part of a planned royal double burial than to the burial of Cleopatra, whose own interment was unanticipated (see Endnote B).

3—One of the most intriguing ideas to grow out of the recent interest in Macedonian chamber tombs is the recognition that the architectural design and decoration are illusory.[7] The architectural façade is often that of a small Doric or Ionic building, sometimes with a pediment. This façade is not structural (as in Greek architecture), but ornamental. It is designed to imitate Greek architecture, but hides completely what lies behind: normally a simple barrel vault with one or two chambers. The architectural principle is to create an illusion. Once that principle is accepted, there is no need to conform to the canons of architectural or decorative integrity, especially since the façade is not an essential structural component of the building.

The origin of this idea, as well as the chronological development of Macedonian tombs, has not been clear. There is evidence that very simple cist tombs, such as those at Derveni, contained rich grave goods as early as the 340s or 330s B.C. But we do not know when the Macedonians began to build chamber tombs. Some have suggested that the barrel-vaulted chamber tomb

[6]S. I. Rotroff, "Spool Saltcellars in the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 53 (1984) 343–354, and J. H. Kroll, "Nailing Down the Archaeological Chronology of Early Hellenistic Athens," *AJA* 87 (1983) 241–242 [abstract]. The saltcellars are listed in K. Ninou, ed., *Treasures of Ancient Macedonia* (Athens 1980) nos. 134–137 (no illustrations). To the best of my knowledge they remain otherwise unpublished.

It is possible that the saltcellars from Tomb II may be Macedonian antecedents for the late fourth-century Athenian objects dated by Rotroff. But this possibility must remain hypothetical until (or unless) someone can produce evidence and argumentation proving that the spool saltcellars from the Athenian Agora are a later imitation of a style of vessel initially produced in Macedonia, of which the Tomb II examples are representative. Prudence requires acceptance of Rotroff's suggestion that the late fourth-century Agora finds might be used to help date Tomb II at Vergina.

[7]The pioneering study was by Stella G. Miller, *Hellenistic Macedonian Architecture. Its Style and Painted Decoration* (diss., Bryn Mawr 1972). For the thesis of illusory design see Miller, "Macedonian Tombs: Their Architecture and Architectural Decoration," in B. Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington 1982, Studies in the History of Art 10) 152–169.

was introduced only with Alexander's Asian expedition, as there is no earlier evidence of the evolution of the barrel vault in Greek architecture. The device appears to arrive quite suddenly in Greece and Macedonia, after the Macedonians' exposure to the concept in Asia.[8] If it could be shown that Tomb II at Vergina contained the remains of Philip II, we would have a secure date (336 B.C.) for the existence of such a built tomb, but the verification of that tomb as Philip's is uncertain.

The arguments concerning a late (that is, post-Philip) date for the introduction of the built tomb have concentrated on the barrel vault[9] and have largely neglected the development or introduction of decorated illusory façades. Asia Minor was replete with small tombs with architectural façades.[10] The use of rock-cut chamber tombs had been widespread in Asia for centuries, but in southern Anatolia they took an altered form with the addition of Greek—usually Ionic—architectural façades. The façades were often stuccoed and the architectural details painted. The dates of these tombs are much debated, for many of them were built or reused for later burials down into the period of the Roman Empire. The façades of Greek monuments were most likely combined with the customary rock-cut tombs when Greek culture was introduced into the region in the second quarter of the fourth century.

There are many such tombs in Caria and Lycia, both of which areas saw Alexander's passage. And we know that Alexander visited Parsargadae, near Persepolis, where he saw Cyrus' tomb, which, though not as complex as the

[8]Detailed arguments and bibliography in Borza (above, n. 3) 75–77.

While the present article was undergoing final preparation for publication, an announcement from Greece heralded the discovery in late summer 1987 of another chambered tomb at Vergina. The new tomb, which is reported to be richly decorated with interior painting, is somewhat larger than Tomb II. On the basis of "vessels" found within, Prof. Andronikos, the excavator, dates the tomb to 340–330 B.C. No details about these "vessels" have been published, but the dates offered by the excavator permit the possibility that the new tomb can belong to the age either of Philip II or that of Alexander the Great. See E. Cadelo, "The New Vergina," *Athena Magazine* 19 (1987) 272; the photograph accompanying the article does not illustrate the new discovery, but rather the tomb excavated by K. A. Romaios in 1938.

[9]E.g., R. A. Tomlinson, "Vaulting Techniques of Macedonian Tombs," *Archaia Makedonia* 2 (1977) 473–479, and T. Boyd, "The Arch and Vault in Greek Architecture," *AJA* 82 (1978) 83–100. The work of both Tomlinson and Boyd was in press before the announcement of Andronikos' discoveries at Vergina, and is thus unconnected with the ensuing controversy over the identification of the deceased in Tomb II.

[10]For an overview of the evolution of Anatolian rock-cut tombs, see D. C. Kurtz and J. Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (London 1971) 283–297, with illustrations. For details see Paavo Roos, *The Rock-Cut Tombs of Caunus* 1. *The Architecture* (Göteborg 1972, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 34, 1), and *Survey of Rock-Cut Chamber Tombs in Caria* (Göteborg 1985, Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 72, 1). The six groups of tombs at Caunus alone number 166 individual monuments. Some of these Caunus tombs are also illustrated in *Historia tou Hellinikou Ethnous* 4 (Athens 1980) 71.

Anatolian structures, was nevertheless an isolated built chamber tomb.[11] It is thus possible that the transition in Macedonian burial practices from simple cist graves to built tombs with architectural façades might have resulted from ideas imported by those who accompanied Alexander.[12] The suggestion that this development was an imported idea is supported by the absence of archaeological evidence in Macedonia and mainland Greece for the evolution of both the barrel vault (although see note 8, above) and the architectural façade.[13] Both appear rather suddenly in the later fourth century, full blown. The rich grave goods that had long been a feature of Macedonian burials were now enhanced by a monument that imitated elements of both Greek and Asian architecture, and which was adapted, as was the Macedonian manner in some of the minor arts, for local taste and use. If this hypothesis has merit, it provides yet another example of the Macedonians borrowing and adapting from foreign cultures to suit their own needs. It also sheds some light on the possibility of dating the royal tombs at Vergina.

4—A lion forms part of the hunting scene portrayed on the frieze of Tomb II (*Vergina* 101–119). The lion hunt as a theme was absent from Greek art from the end of the orientalizing period of the seventh century B.C. until its reintroduction and sudden popularity due to Alexander's expedition.[14] The lion hunt was depicted as the royal sport of Asian kings,

[11]Curt. 5.6.10; Strabo 15.3.7; Arr. 3.18.10; 6.29.4–11. Cyrus' tomb is illustrated in R. Ghirshman, *Persia from the Origins to Alexander the Great*, tr. S. Gilbert and J. Emmons (London 1964) pl. 185, and J.-L. Huot, *Persia* 1. *From its origins to the Achaemenids*, tr. H. S. B. Harrison (London 1967) pl. 68.

[12]This was first hinted at by Kurtz and Boardman (above, n. 10, 288), who tentatively suggested that the Greek architectural facades of Anatolian rock-cut tombs may have "played some role in determining this feature in Macedonia." It is also true that Philip II had been involved in negotiations with the Carian dynast, Pixodarus, concerning a marriage-alliance between Pixodarus' daughter and Philip's son, Arrhidaeus (Plut. *Alex.* 10.1–5). But nothing suggests an intensive Macedonian involvement in Caria itself before Alexander's expedition. Macedonian representatives in Caria (if there were any) may have seen rock-cut tombs, as Greek travellers in Asia had presumably seen vaults, which had been in use for centuries, but which were not transferred to Europe as an architectural device until the later fourth century.

[13]Rock-cut tombs also exist in Macedonia, notably at Veria and Siderokastro, but the former are securely dated to the middle Hellenistic era, and the latter probably should be dated likewise. See S. Drougou and I. Touratsoglou, *Hellinistiki Laksefti taphi Verias* (Athens 1980) 187–190. The Siderokastro tombs can easily be seen by the interested traveler. Unfortunately, they have been ill-published beyond the notice in *Archaeological Reports* 15 (1968–69) 25, pl. 26.

[14]Craterus is said (Plut. *Alex.* 40.4) to have set up a sculptural group at Delphi showing Alexander at a lion hunt, celebrating in Asian fashion not only the king's bravery, but perhaps also reminding the Greek audience that the king of the Macedonians was now also the Great King. See M. Robertson, "Early Greek Mosaic," in Barr-Sharrar and Borza (above, n. 7) 240–249, at 246, and J. J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass. 1986) 38 and 40 (part of a longer discussion [38–45] of royal hunts and battle scenes as a feature of early

whether they actually hunted lions or not, and the lion hunt on the Tomb II frieze is the central feature of the composition.

Thus on both archaeological and stylistic grounds there is reason to suggest that Tomb II belongs to a period commencing with Alexander's Asian expedition (see also Endnote B). That Tomb II may be the resting place of Arrhidaeus and Eurydice has, of course, its own historical/archaeological interest, but this should not be emphasized to the detriment of the main point, and that is that the tomb probably post-dates the era of Philip II.

But there is more. It may be possible to identify the provenance of some of the burial goods in light of evidence that some of Alexander's personal equipment survived into the wars of his successors. According to Quintus Curtius, during the turmoil immediately following Alexander's death at Babylon in June 323, Perdiccas displayed the king's throne, draped with Alexander's diadem, robe, and arms.[15] Not long after, Arrhidaeus was nominated for the succession, and put on the robe of his deceased half-brother, the very garment that had been placed on the throne.[16] Whether Arrhidaeus also took the diadem and arms, however likely that appears, is not mentioned in our sources. The only further reference in Curtius to Alexander's personal accessories occurs in the account of the preparation of his body for burial, where we are told, somewhat enigmatically, that the emblems of his rank (*fortunae eius insignia*) were placed on his head.[17] If these details are to be trusted, Arrhidaeus alleviated his own initial insecurity as successor by taking at least the king's robe, which may have been his right as the sole surviving Argead and son of Philip II.

Eumenes of Cardia was Alexander's secretary and one of the few Greeks on the king's staff. Following Alexander's death Eumenes emerged as one of the contending Successors, but not for the sake of the throne; our sources make clear, that, as an ethnic Greek, he had no claim to power in a struggle among Macedonians.[18] Eumenes, who had served both Philip and Alexan-

---

Hellenistic art). A lion hunt is the subject of one of the large mosaics at Pella, dated to the late fourth or early third century.

[15]Curt. 10.6.4: *in qua diadema vestisque Alexandri cum armis erant.* But see T. R. Martin, "Quintus Curtius' Presentation of Philip Arrhidaeus and Josephus' Accounts of the Accession of Claudius," *AJAH* 8 (1983) 161–190, who argues that Curtius cast these Macedonian events in the form of the emperor Claudius' succession. Martin's warning is salutary, but many of Curtius' details, when supported by similar references in other sources on the events of 323, can be taken as a genuine part of the traditions about the aftermath of Alexander's death.

[16]Curt. 10.7.13: . . . *vestem fratris, eam ipsam quae in sella posita fuerat induitur.*

[17]Curt. 10.10.13, a passage that must be used with caution, as it also narrates that the king's unprepared corpse lay for seven days without signs of putrefaction in the mid-June Babylonian heat.

[18]The ethnic prejudice against Eumenes is manifest; e.g., Plut. *Eum.* 3.1; 8.1; 18.1; Diod. 18.60.1–3, 62.7 and 19.13.1–2.

der, remained an Argead loyalist, and, during the confusion of Alexander's succession, pledged his services to the surviving members of the royal family.[19] In an attempt to retain Argead continuity in the face of the naked use of force by the competing commanders of Alexander's army, Eumenes adopted the following stratagem: proclaiming that Alexander had appeared to him in a dream presiding over a council of officers, Eumenes took materials from the royal treasury, rich in gold, and set up a fine tent. Inside was erected a throne, upon which were placed Alexander's own diadem (διάδημα), sceptre (σκῆπτρον), and armor (ὅπλα). With these materials at hand, Eumenes joined the other commanders in earnest discussions, as if in the presence of the king.[20]

We thus have literary evidence that some of Alexander's personal effects did not accompany the king's funeral train (hijacked to Egypt by Ptolemy), and that these items were in the hands of the Argead loyalist, Eumenes. Moreover, except for the throne, examples of all the items mentioned by Diodorus as being used by Eumenes are found in Tomb II at Vergina along with other objects that might have been associated with Alexander. These objects require some discussion:

1—The restored iron and gold cuirass from the main chamber is similar to that worn by Alexander in the famous second-century B.C. mosaic found in Pompeii. The mosaic probably copied a work of Philoxenus of Eretria, who was said (Pliny *HN* 35.110) to have painted for Cassander a picture of Alexander and Darius at battle.[21] Alexander's use of weapons and armor

[19]E.g., Plut. *Eum.* 13.1; Diod. 18.58.4.

[20]The most detailed description of this practice is in Diod. 18.60.3–61.3, based on Hieronymus of Cardia, Eumenes' friend, who was probably an eyewitness. There are less detailed versions in Diod. 19.15.3–4; Plut. *Eum.* 13.3–4; Nepos *Eum.* 7.2–3; and Polyaenus 4.8.2, and an echo in Curt. 10.6.15 (Ptolemy's proposal that a *junta* of commanders rule) although all accounts save, perhaps, Curtius' seem to go back to the same source used by Diodorus. The "Alexander-Tent" has drawn considerable attention; for a recent discussion and bibliography see L. Mooren, "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy," in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium. Leuven, 24–26 May 1982* (Louvain 1983) 238 and n. 146. R. M. Errington's view that Eumenes was imitating Ptolemy's attempt to establish a *junta* may have merit, but I find his suggestion that, while Ptolemy's relics of Alexander were real, Eumenes' were "purely imaginary" unsupported by what is reported in Diodorus; see his "Alexander in the Hellenistic World," *Alexandre le Grand. Image et realité* (Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1976, Entretiens Hardt 22) 137–179, at 140–141. Moreover, Eumenes' attempt to compete with Ptolemy would likely have had more credibility if he, too, were using actual Alexander-relics.

[21]The cuirass is illustrated by Andronikos (*Vergina* 138–139) who writes (137) that the shape of the cuirass is "absolutely identical" to that worn by Alexander in the mosaic. Discussion of the mosaic copy of Philoxenus' painting in Pollitt (above, n. 14) 45–46, and (with illustrations) in B. T. Maiuri, *Museo Nazionale Napoli* (Novara 1971) 70–74, and J. Charbonneaux, R. Martin, and F. Villard, *Hellenistic Art (330–50 B.C.)*, tr. P. Green (New York 1973) 114–118. There is also a striking similarity between the barren tree found in the mosaic and two such trees in the Tomb II frieze, perhaps a stylistic convention.

varied depending upon the situation.[22] Curtius (4.13.25) relates that Alexander rarely used a breastplate, and then more from the urging of his comrades than from fear. Whatever the value of Curtius' comment, Alexander is shown with breastplate in the Issus mosaic, and he wore one at the siege of the Mallian town. In the latter case, he was severely wounded by an arrow to the chest. His body armor probably saved his life against the huge Indian arrows shot from powerful bows.[23] After the battle of Issus, Alexander captured Darius' baggage train, and among the items taken was a two-ply linen corselet (θώραξ).[24] Darius' linen *thorax* appears again in the fullest description of Alexander's battle dress, before the battle at Gaugamela (Plut. *Alex.* 32.5–6). Whether this garment was worn over a normal breastplate as a piece of decoration or in lieu of it as a daring affront to Darius cannot be determined from the sources; in either case the psychological value of Alexander confronting Darius while wearing the Persian's own *thorax* cannot failed to have missed the mark. Alexander is otherwise fully armored, as the linen *thorax* cannot be considered as a serious and effective protective device.[25]

2—An iron helmet found in the main chamber accords with Plutarch's description (*Alex.* 32.5) of the helmet worn by Alexander at the battle of Gaugamela, a helmet that "gleamed like polished silver."[26] The helmet from Tomb II is unusual in two respects: it is the only such helmet thus far discovered in a Macedonian tomb of this period, and it is made of iron. Its tall crest has a peak that curls forward, identifying it as a "Thracian" or, more commonly, "Phrygian" type, known from late fourth- and early third-century art to have been worn by some Macedonians.[27] It is a type not

[22]The evidence is gathered by M. M. Markle III, "Macedonian Arms and Tactics under Alexander the Great," Barr-Sharrar and Borza (above, n. 7) 87–111.

[23]Arr. 6.10.1–2, 11.7–8; 8.16.6; Plut. *Alex.* 63.3–6; Curt. 8.9.28, 14.19; 9.5.9–10. There are, as to be expected, some minor discrepancies in the accounts of Alexander's wound, but the best tradition seems to be that the king was shot by an arrow that pierced his breastplate to enter the chest. It does not seem likely that an unprotected body would have survived the force of an Indian arrow shot.

[24]Plut. *Alex.* 32.5; Arr. 2.11.10; Curt. 3.13.2–17; Diod. 17.35.1 ff.

[25]The cuirass from Tomb II was fashioned from very thin sheets of iron, and was covered with leather and cloth (Andronikos in M. B. Hatzopoulos and L. D. Loukopoulos, eds., *Philip of Macedon* [Athens 1980] 220). Suetonius' comment (*Cal.* 52) that Caligula sometimes wore the breastplate of Alexander, which had been taken from his sarcophagus, must be tempered by Dio Cassius 59.3, who also refers to Caligula's wearing of the breastplate of Alexander, "or so he claimed."

[26]Illustrated in Andronikos, *Vergina* 140–141, with discussion at 144, where the excavator acknowledges the similarity between the helmet of Tomb II and the helmet described by Plutarch.

[27]E.g., on the wall painting in "Kinch's" tomb at Lefkadia. The painting is now gone, but appeared in the original publication of the monument. See K. F. Kinch, "Le tombeau de Niausta, tombeau macédonien," *Danske Vidensk. Selskab.* 7R., *Hist.-Filos. Skrifter* 4.2

normally found on Greek sites, and may be derived from a leather or cloth cap common in Thrace and Asia.[28] I have found no other example of an iron helmet from this period, and it must have been regarded as a rarity in the fourth century. Plutarch (*Alex.* 32.5) mentions Theophilus as Alexander's helmet-maker; the object from Tomb II reveals a very sophisticated technique of manufacture (*Vergina* 144).

But there is more than a literary description of Alexander's helmet; it appears on a rare silver decadrachm known as the "Porus" medallion.[29] The obverse shows a Macedonian cavalryman lancing at a retreating war elephant bearing an Indian warrior. The reverse portrays Alexander in battle dress holding (perhaps) a sceptre in one hand and a thunderbolt in the other and being crowned by a flying Nike. The interpretation of the battle scene is much debated, whether it is a portrayal of "two historical personages engaged in an historical act" (Davis and Kraay) or is rather only symbolic of the New Order imposed by Alexander on the eastern marches of the old Persian Empire (Price). Two matters, however, are beyond much dispute. One is that the figure being crowned by the Nike is in fact Alexander. The other is that this is a life issue, struck perhaps not long after Alexander's defeat of the Indian king Porus. We thus have a first-hand contemporary portrait of Alexander as king and conqueror.

The helmet worn by Alexander on the medallion is of the same type as found in Tomb II. The helmet is crested and tall plumes protrude upward. Plutarch (*Alex.* 16.7) describes Alexander as wearing such plumes in his crested helmet at the battle of the Granicus.[30] While none of this amounts to

---

(Copenhagen 1920), reproduced in *Historia tou Hellinikou Ethnous* 4 (Athens 1980) 186 (in color), and in Markle (above, n. 22) 90, fig. 5.

[28]For a more elaborate version of this type of helmet found at a Thracian site see R. F. Hoddinott, *The Thracians* (London 1981) 106–107, with pl. 101.

[29]Perhaps only seven examples are extant. There is a full recent discussion by M. J. Price, "The 'Porus' Coinage of Alexander the Great: a Symbol of Concord and Community," in S. Scheers, ed., *Studia Paulo Naster* 1: *Numismatica Antiqua* (Louvain 1982) 75–85. Useful illustrations and additional descriptions can be found in *The Search for Alexander. An Exhibition* (Boston 1980) no. 21, N. Davis and C. M. Kraay, *The Hellenistic Kingdoms. Portrait Coins and History* (London 1973) 29 and nos. 10–12, and in *Wealth of the Ancient World. The Nelson Bunker Hunt and William Herbert Hunt Collections,* Kimbell Art Museum (Fort Worth, Texas 1983) no. 101. I acknowledge the assistance of Professor F. L. Holt for invaluable advice, not only on numismatic matters about which he is an expert, but also in several fruitful discussions on the problems raised by this study.

[30]The feathered plume fit into a holder near the temple of the helmet. Such a holder may be seen on a fourth-century bronze Phrygian-type helmet found in Epirus; *The Search for Alexander,* no. 103 and color plate 16, and K. Ninou, ed., *Alexander the Great. History and Legend in Art* (Thessaloniki 1980) 54.

The Vergina helmet has undergone some restoration since its discovery. Photographs of the object *in situ*, Andronikos, *Vergina*, figs. 31 and 34, and Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulos (above, n. 28), fig. 103, show a gaping hole on the top left rear of the helmet. Prof. Holt recalls

proof that the helmet of Alexander the Great lay within Tomb II at Vergina, it is compelling that this unique iron helmet accords with Plutarch's descriptions of Alexander's helmet and is of the type worn by Alexander on the Poros medallion.[31]

3—Plutarch also tells that Alexander's battle dress included an iron collar set with precious stones.[32] Such an iron collar was found in conjunction with the cuirass in Tomb II, although it is impossible to tell at sight whether it could have been adorned with stones, due to its badly corroded condition.[33] We thus have three components of unique iron armor—helmet, collar, and cuirass—two of which are of a type mentioned as belonging to Alexander, and the third of a design similar to one portrayed as being worn by the

---

for me that, at the battle of the Granicus, the blow of the Persian commander Spithridates' battle-axe that nearly ended Alexander's life did considerable damage to the king's helmet (Plut. *Alex.* 16.7). It would be useful to have a technical reexamination of the helmet to determine whether it underwent any repairs in antiquity and if there is any evidence of plume holders.

[31]Prof. Bosworth reminds me that it became the custom of some of Alexander's Successors to imitate the conqueror's dress and habits, as in the case of Leonnatus (Arr. *Succ.* F 12, Roos ed.). True enough, as far as the literary evidence goes. But we are dealing here with actual (and unique) objects and—assuming that this is a royal cemetery—we may have the tomb of Arrhidaeus, who is known to have possessed at one point some of the Alexander's own paraphernalia. Whatever the value of the Arrian fragment about those who later imitated Alexander, the possibility that this may be the tomb of *Arrhidaeus* makes a more direct connection with Alexander himself than is possible with some of the imitators, for whom there is no archaeological evidence, anyway. In sum, I cannot *prove* that some of the objects in Tomb II actually belonged to Alexander the Great, but they are clearly of the type known to have be used by Alexander, and they are unique; that is, there are no other examples associated with burials of Alexander's Successors that can be used as a control for items made in imitation of the king's dress.

[32]Plut. *Alex.* 32.5: περιτραχήλιον . . . λιθοκόλλητον.

[33]The collar is unpublished, but is on display in the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki. Its catalog description and circumstances of discovery can be found in Ninou (above, n. 6) no. 97, *Vergina* 189, and M. Andronikos, "Vergina: the Royal Graves in the Great Tumulus," *AAA* 10 (1977) 1–72, at 58.

A gilded silver collar of the same shape and size (30 cm. diameter) was recovered from the antechamber of Tomb II. It is adorned with several bands of decoration, among which is a prominent group of four identical horsemen, flanked by two heads, which, in the judgment of the excavator, are to be identified as Heracles. I do not know whether this ornamental collar was used as a ceremonial cover for the iron collar found in the main chamber, or was worn separately. Its placement in the antechamber is not significant; many items which probably should be associated with the panoply of the main chamber were placed in the antechamber, probably as an afterthought (Borza [above, n. 3] 79, although at that time I still believed that the tomb was Philip II's). On the gilded collar see Andronikos, *Vergina* 188–189, and *AAA* 10 (1977) 62 and pl. 62; also Ninou (above, n. 6) no. 91. A nearly identical collar of silver-plated iron was found at a Thracian site at Mezek; see Hoddinott (above, n. 28) 106–107 and pl. 100, and *Bulgaria in Antiquity* (London 1975) pl. 43.

conqueror. Whoever the owner, his burnished helmet and, perhaps, body armor, must have been a dazzling sight.[34]

4—The main chamber yielded another unique item, a gilded silver diadem, fashioned either to be worn on the head directly or to adorn the traditional Macedonian hat (καυσία), in the manner of Alexander as described by Athenaeus (12.537e–f).[35]

5—The elaborate ceremonial shield from the main chamber, exquisitely wrought of ivory, glass, gold, and wood, reminds us that Alexander had an unusual shield, cared for by Peucestas, one of the king's high-ranking officers. Alexander had taken the shield—described as "sacred"—from the temple of Athena at Ilium, kept it close by and had it carried before him in battle. As Alexander lay wounded inside the walls of the city of the Malli, Peucestas protected him with the shield.[36] The elaborate Tomb II shield —itself a great work of art—has no parallels enabling us to judge whether it might have been carried into battle. Not only is the shield unique for its type, it is the only shield found inside the tomb, which lacks an ordinary battle shield among the arms deposited therein. I leave it to those skilled in iconography to offer suggestions about both the splendid, though deteriorated, ivory figures of a reclining, submissive female and a dominant male that form the central composition on the face of the ceremonial shield and the two pairs of opposing lions that decorate the gilded trapezoids flanking the grip on the rear of the shield.[37]

6—There were at least five early reports (including three by the excavator) of the discovery of a gold-sheathed sceptre. The sceptre, however, seems to

[34]Of offensive weapons found in the main chamber there is an iron sword and several spear and sarissa points and butts; see Andronikos, *AAA* 10 (1977) 58, and *Vergina* 144–145. The points have been studied by Markle (above, n. 22) 86–111, esp. 98.

[35]Illustrated and discussed in Andronikos, *Vergina* 171 and 174–175. For the use of the *kausia* and diadem jointly, and for other details of the royal costume, see E. A. Fredricksmeyer, "Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Kausia," *TAPA* 116 (1986) 215–227.

[36]Evidence: Arr. 6.9.3, 10.2; Curt. 9.5.14–18; Plut. *Alex.* 63.4. There are some small discrepancies in the sources concerning the king's battle experiences at the Mallian city, but they do not affect the evidence that affirms the existence of a ceremonial shield managed by Peucestas. The fullest description of the shield from Tomb II is Andronikos, *Vergina* 136–140, with figs. 91–94.

[37]Identical parallels for the lions can be found, for example, in the bronze shield-grip decorations of late seventh- and early sixth-century shields at Olympia. Several are on display in the museum at that site. See E. Kunze, *Olympische Forschungen* 2. *Archaische Schildbänder* (Berlin 1950) 241–244, *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* 6 (Berlin 1958) 87, and 7 (Berlin 1961) Taf. 56–57. These materials derive from a period in which orientalizing influences were still evident in Greece. The decorative lions on the Tomb II shield-grip might not be unusual for a shield that had Asian influences or origins, such as a shield taken from Ilium.

have disappeared from the recent literature without explanation.[38] The rod-like object was described by the excavator as possessing a wooden core wrapped in gold, and measuring about two metres in length. Clearly the item would have been difficult to identify as a sceptre without parallels: what should a Macedonian sceptre look like? It may now be possible to confirm the excavator's initial identification by reference to the Porus medallion. The pole-like object held in Alexander's left hand rests one end on the ground and rises to a height slightly higher than the top of the king's plume—a length of about two meters.[39] As the Macedonian cavalry sarissa measured between 4.5 meters and 5.5 meters (Markle, above, note 22, 87), the object shown on the medallions cannot be that weapon. Moreover, given the significance of the coin issue, the use of the sceptre as a symbol of royal authority may be more relevant than an illustration of a sarissa, which, in any case, is too long to fit into the design of the medallion. That is, we may have illustrated on a contemporary medallion the type of object found in Tomb II, an object which can be identified as a Macedonian sceptre.

One would be hard pressed to explain a sceptre in the tomb of Philip II, as this symbol of royal authority was normally passed down from king to king, and it seems unlikely that Philip's sceptre would not have been inherited by Alexander. It is also likely that the sceptre of Alexander was passed on to those who intended to succeed, both the surviving Argeadae, Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV, and those who might have wished to replace them in the rule. The possibility that a sceptre lay among the goods in Tomb II provides a partial basis for suggesting that when Cassander interred Arrhidaeus he buried not only the elder son of Philip II, but also the personal paraphernalia of Alexander, including the sceptre of the Argeadae. It was a sign that the Old Order was finished. Within a few years the son and wife of Alexander would be dispatched, and the Argeadae were no more.

It is difficult to explain how this material might have found its way to Macedon in the two or three years between Eumenes' ceremonies with Alexander's paraphernalia and the interments of Tomb II. The problem is made worse by the shifting alliances and rapid rise and fall in the fortunes

[38]The sceptre was mentioned in accounts of the excavation of Tomb II by N. G. L. Hammond, "'Philip's Tomb' in Historical Context," *GRBS* 19 (1978) 335 (based on the original *New York Times* report of N. and H. Gage), and M. Andronikos in "Vergina: the Royal Graves in the Great Tumulus," *AAA* 10 (1977) 59 ("the only possible explanation is . . . that it is a sceptre"), "Regal Treasures from a Macedonian Tomb," *National Geographic* 154 (1978) 72, and "The Royal Tomb of Philip II," *Archaeology* 31.4 (Sept.-Oct. 1978) 38 (". . . it seems almost unavoidable to interpret it as a scepter"). No reference to it has appeared in the half dozen or so reports of the Vergina finds that have been written by the excavator since.

[39]This can be seen quite clearly in Price, pl. XI, no. 4, and Davis and Kraay, no. 12 (above, n. 29). On those examples of the medallion struck off-center, it is impossible to tell where the top of the object was intended.

of those who competed for power in the aftermath of Alexander's death. For example, we are told (Plut. *Eum.* 13.4, following the description of "Alexander's tent") that when Eumenes marched into the interior to campaign against Antigonus, he met Peucestas, Alexander's old shield-bearer. As Peucestas is described as friendly to Eumenes, can one speculate that the ceremonial shield passed from its caretaker to the Argead loyalist? The shield itself is not mentioned by Plutarch, and one is left with nothing more than a suggestive shred of circumstance. Which royal items remained in the hands of Eumenes and Arrhidaeus before their deaths, for how long, and whether and under what circumstances they came into Cassander's possession, to be laid to rest along with other materials associated with both Arrhidaeus and Alexander, are matters that remain to be studied.[40] Nevertheless, we face the *possibility* (but no more) that some of the magnificent armor and royal emblems in Tomb II—which on other grounds might be suited to a date later than Philip II—are in fact those of Alexander the Great.

Moreover, the famous artist Philoxenus, known to have been commissioned by Cassander to paint Alexander in battle, might also have portrayed the Macedonians (including Alexander?) at hunt in the Asian style. The frieze decorating Tomb II not only has some of the same impressionistic qualities as the mosaic from Pompeii, but also complements its grove of trees with a tall pillar, which suggests strongly a hunt staged in a game park (παράδεισος), well known in Persian usage.[41] Indeed, the painter may have substituted an oriental game park for a sacred grove, another indicator pointing to a later fourth-century date. Alexander's accomplishments were to be celebrated in an Asian setting and then laid to rest, along with some of the personal accessories of his kingship.

One wonders how many other items found in Tomb II might reveal themselves more clearly if analyzed under the hypothesis that they might have been associated with Alexander. One thinks, for example, of the small rectangular sheet of gilded silver with a relief depiction of a club of Heracles that was attached to the inside of the ceremonial shield, and the delicate beardless Heracles heads that decorate the handles of a silver alabastron from

[40]One does not, however, need to posit that some of the items in Tomb II belong to Alexander the Great to put to rest the argument that such a richly endowed tomb could not possibly belong to a minor figure like Arrhidaeus (as Andronikos, *Vergina* 230–231). Tomb III, quite likely the resting place of the boy-king Alexander IV, was also richly endowed, though not quite on the scale of Tomb II. And one might recall another relatively unimportant boy-king, Tutankhamon of Egypt, whose treasure-filled tomb should have taught us not to measure the importance of a king by the quality of his grave goods.

[41]Discussion in M. Carroll-Spillecke, *Landscape Depictions in Greek Relief Sculpture: Development and Conventionalization* (Frankfurt, etc. 1985) 154–155. And Plutarch (*Alex.* 40.3) narrates that Alexander hunted lions in Asia, although the story is used to make a moral point—the contrast between Alexander's adventuresome life of exertion and the sloth into which his friends had fallen.

the main chamber.[42] While Heracles is the mythological progenitor of the Argeadae, Alexander maintained a closer identity with his heroic ancestor than did Philip, a connection that would eventually blossom into a ruler cult in the Hellenistic period.[43] And one awaits detailed analysis of the decorations on the splendid iron sword and the iconography on the gilded quiver (γωρυτός).[44]

We thus offer a hypothesis that the burial goods of Tomb II may include some of the royal accessories of Alexander the Great. There is little or no direct evidence that identifies the tomb as that of Arrhidaeus and Eurydice, but indirectly we have specific literary evidence that they were interred at Aegae together, and the tomb itself and some of its contents appear to be from the age of Alexander and a little later. The process of elimination points to Arrhidaeus and Eurydice, and there is little in the way of human remains and burial goods to make such an identification improbable.

If we hold that Tomb III contains the remains of Alexander IV, and Tomb II those of Arrhidaeus and Eurydice, where is Philip II buried? No anthropologist's analysis of the human remains (mature male, younger female and infant) found in Tomb I has been published, and the tomb was otherwise robbed. Stylistically, this cist tomb is similar to those discovered at Derveni, north of Salonica. Tomb B at Derveni, which contained a magnificent decorated bronze krater, has been dated to the 330s on the basis of a coin of Philip II found within the vessel.[45] We thus have in the Argead royal cemetery a tomb dating from the era of Philip II and containing the remains of a mature male, younger female, and infant. We are reminded of the relative ages of Philip and Cleopatra and the fact that Olympias killed Cleopatra only after forcing the young queen to watch the murder of her child.[46]

The cist tomb may present no barrier to the unanticipated double burial; all that was necessary was to remove a roof slab or two for the second interment, although I would not like to press this point prior to the publica-

[42]Illustrated in Andronikos, *Vergina* 136 and 155, and *The Search for Alexander. An Exhibition* (Boston 1980) no. 165.

[43]Athenaeus (12.537f) reports that Alexander occasionally dressed as Heracles, complete with lion's skin and club. For a review of the evolution of Alexander-as-Heracles, see O. Palagia, "Imitation of Heracles in Ruler Portraiture. A Survey, from Alexander to Maximinus Daza," *Boreas* 9 (1986) 137–151.

[44]Sword: Andronikos, *Vergina* 142–145, and Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulos (above, n. 25) pl. 126. *Gorytos*: *Vergina* 180–186 and pls. 146–149, and Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulos, pls. 122–123. The *gorytos* has Scythian parallels, and it should be mentioned that Alexander, as well as Philip, had Scythian connections from having campaigned in regions inhabited by Scythians.

[45]Ninou (above, n. 6) no. 184, and *The Search for Alexander. An Exhibition* (Boston 1980) no. 127. The date is supported by the existence in Tomb I of a few sherds of mid-fourth-century pottery (Andronikos, *Vergina* 86). The original publication of the Derveni krater was by E. Youri, *O krateras tou Derveniou* (Athens 1978, Vivliothiki tis en Athinais Archaiologikis Hetairias 89).

[46]Paus. 8.7.7; Justin 9.7.12–14.

tion of the final excavation report. Unfortunately, the tomb has been looted of all its grave goods. But its fine interior wall paintings, including a magnificent Rape of Persephone, is testimony to the care given the burial. The excavator has connected the decoration with the school of Nicomachus, who is said (Pliny *HN* 35.108–109) to have painted such a scene on another occasion, and whose purported technique is similar to that of the painter of Tomb I. One need not even connect the painting with the atelier of Nicomachus; the great painter himself may have accepted the commission to adorn the tomb of the most famous man of his day. If so, we no longer need wonder why such a superb work exists in a such an apparently unimportant grave.

I would thus offer the possibility that these three tombs be taken in the following order: Tomb I belongs to Philip II, his queen, Cleopatra, and their infant; Tomb II to Philip III Arrhidaeus and his queen, Eurydice, and contains as well some of the accoutrements of Alexander the Great; and Tomb III to Alexander IV, the last of the Argeadae.

This hypothesis, presented as an alternative to the excavator's views, is not conclusive, and is limited by problematic evidence. Inconsistencies and unanswered questions remain. Some may be resolved with the full publication of the final excavation reports. Others will probably never be solved because of the incomplete documentary record of Macedonian royal burial practices. To that extent, every attempt to explain the circumstances accounting for Macedonian grave goods will remain at least partly conjectural. We await more information about the incidental pottery finds and stratigraphic relationship among the tombs, and we follow the continuing attempts to establish the place of the paintings in the evolution of later fourth-century Greek art. But it is also interesting to note that the past few years have produced no new evidence or analysis (beyond the dubious report about the skull bones) to support the advocates of a Philip II-burial in Tomb II.[47] One would suppose that, were there a stronger case for Philip II to be made, it would have appeared by now.[48]

We have from Vergina a full range of materials: architecture, painting, human remains, weapons and armor, jewelry, metal and ceramic vessels, and other practical and ceremonial items. The materials are rich enough and important enough to provide a possible scene for a historical drama we know just barely through literary sources. We are tantalized by the proximity of material remains and documentary evidence, and we risk the tempta-

[47]One wonders, for example, if any of the collection of 74 arrowheads found in the antechamber of Tomb II (Andronikos, *Vergina* fig. 38) bore Philip II's name, like the arrowhead found in the ruins of Olynthus (*The Search for Alexander* [above, n. 42] no. 104 and color pl. 16).

[48]My own first tentative conclusion was that Tomb II contained the remains of Philip of Macedon (above, n. 3, 84), but I have seen the case weaken over the years.

tion to associate this extraordinary array of goods with events in the lives (and deaths) of some of the most important people of the era.

I have attempted to extend the range of possibilities by offering this alternative, with the hope that specialists in many fields will be encouraged to re-evaluate the grave goods from Vergina in light of the issues raised above. No single point I have raised is conclusive, but the cumulative weight of evidence points to a burial in Tomb II later than that of Philip II—a burial which is probably that of Arrhidaeus, and which may include some of the paraphernalia of Alexander the Great. If so, we can for the first time recognize the personal property of one of the most famous men of all time.[49]

Department of History
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

ENDNOTE A: THE OCCUPANT OF TOMB III

We would appear to have a serious discrepancy (assuming that this is a royal cemetery) between a) what appear to be the bones of the only known adolescent member of the royal family who died during this period (Alexander IV), and b) literary evidence (Diod. 19.105.3 and Justin 15.2.5—probably based ultimately on Hieronymus of Cardia) relating that Cassander had Alexander murdered (by poisoning, according to Paus. 9.7.2) and buried in secret. It is possible that the sources have not got it quite right (else how would the information about the murder be known?), and that the normally reliable Hieronymus (if his is the ultimate source) transmitted anti-Cassander propaganda spread by Argead loyalists. The same Cassander had been charged (falsely, in my view) with an active role in the poisoning of Alexander the Great. (Evidence and arguments are laid out in A. B. Bosworth, "The Death of Alexander the Great: Rumor and Propaganda," *CQ* NS 21 [1971] 112–136, and D. Engels, "A Note on Alexander's Death," *CP* 73 [1978] 224–228.)

It is also possible that the interment of Alexander near his uncle and grandfather in a tomb that was eventually covered with earth could be considered secret, especially if it were done without ceremony. Yet Tomb III has a decorated façade, a splendid painted chariot-race frieze in its antechamber, and a magnificent array of grave goods (Andronikos, *Vergina* 198–217); that is, archaeologically it speaks of an honorable burial.

Like Arrhidaeus, Alexander IV had not been hostile to Cassander and was both a member of the royal family and the son of the great Alexander. If Cassander were to make a clean sweep in his massacre of the Argead dynas-

[49]I am deeply indebted to the referees and the editor of this journal for numerous suggestions which, I hope, have improved the presentation of what is bound to be a controversial hypothesis.

ty, perhaps better to do so consistent with his disposition of the other members of the house of Philip II and the tradition of burying kings at Aegae. Clearly, the conflict between the archaeological suggestion that Tomb III is Alexander IV's and the literary evidence pointing to a secret burial is an open matter that requires further archaeological/historical investigation into questions only some of which I have attempted to raise here.

ENDNOTE B: THE DESIGN OF TOMB II

Two features deserve some comment. First, the antechamber of Tomb II measures 14.65 m.^{2}, the main chamber 19.89 m.^{2}, giving an antechamber/main chamber ratio of 1:1.28; to put it another way, the antechamber is nearly three-quarters as large as the main chamber. For purposes of comparison, there follow the interior dimensions and ratios of the two chambers of some nearby tombs of the later fourth and early third centuries:

Tomb	*Antechamber*	*Main chamber*	*Ratio*
Lefkadia (Petsas)	13.78 m.^{2}	22.66 m.^{2}	1:1.64
Vergina III	7.05 m.^{2}	12.09 m.^{2}	1:1.71
Vergina (Romaios)	11.40 m.^{2}	20.79 m.^{2}	1:1.82
Palatitsia	3.71 m.^{2}	9.30 m.^{2}	1:2.51
Lefkadia (Romiopoulou)	8.20 m.^{2}	20.66 m.^{2}	1:2.52
Lefkadia (Kinch)	5.33 m.^{2}	14.72 m.^{2}	1:2.76

(These dimensions derive from a variety of sources, including preliminary and final excavation reports and local archaeological guidebooks. Much of the raw data about Macedonian tombs, with bibliography, is conveniently gathered in B. Gossel, *Makedonische Kammergräber* [Berlin 1980].)

Secondly, we may note the two-stage construction of the tomb by which the main chamber was built, roughly finished inside and sealed, while the antechamber and façade were added somewhat later and decorated more finely. These architectural details accord well with the circumstances surrounding the burials of Philip II and Cleopatra, as I have argued elsewhere (see above, note 4), and still seem to me to be the strongest argument favoring a burial of 336 B.C. As we lack details from literary sources about the Arrhidaeus/Eurydice burials, these architectural features cannot be explained in terms of their interment in 316 B.C. In the end the reader must weigh the odd two-stage construction of the tomb as evidence of a Philip/Cleopatra burial against the unusually large antechamber which suggests a planned double burial, keeping in mind that both arguments depend upon weak circumstantial evidence.

This article was already in proof when M. Andronikas, "Some Reflections on the Macedonian Tombs," and R. A. Tomlinson, "The Architectural Context of the Macedonian Vaulted Tombs," appeared in BSA *82 (1987) 1–16 and 305–312, and it has not been possible to take them into account.*