

GREEK PERCEPTIONS OF ETHNICITY AND THE ETHNICITY OF THE MACEDONIANS*

Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, in *Identità e Prassi Storica nel Mediterraneo Greco* (Milan 2002) 173-203

The realization that Macedonian is a Greek dialect¹ has created serious problems for those scholars who are convinced that the Macedonians were not, and were not perceived to be, Greeks. Their conviction, I will argue, is based on conclusions concerning Greek perceptions of Macedonian ethnicity which resulted from the implicit and explicit deployment of flawed presuppositions about Greek perceptions of ethnicity in general.² Ethnic identity is not a timeless essence, but a fluid construction, involving sets of culturally determined perceptions, so the meaningful question about the ethnicity of the Macedonians is; 'How was this ethnicity perceived by the Macedonians themselves and by the non Macedonian Greeks?' It may be thought that many past enquiries investigated precisely this question, and concluded that the Macedonians wanted to be thought of as Greek, but the other Greeks believed that they were barbarians. However, I will try to show, such investigations often implicitly relied on modern 'logic' (which, for example, overprivileged notions such as 'political manipulations and propaganda') and on modern presuppositions about ethnic identity, and also about the meanings of myths pertaining to ancestry and about religion, and they also deployed by default modern assumptions in the reading of ancient statements. For unless the assumptions that had shaped the ancient formulations (and their readings by their contemporaries) are reconstructed, these formulations are inevitably made sense of through 'commonsense' and thus, inevitably, culturally determined, presuppositions – which leads to culturally determined conclusions. The danger of culturally determined distortions lurks even at the most basic level of reading. Since the word *barbaros* did not only mean 'non Greek', but also 'rude, uncivilized, brutal'³, in Greek eyes the word's meanings were different depending on whether they perceived the person or people so characterized to be Greek or not; if not, the

* I am very grateful to Professor Robert Parker for discussing some of these problems with me. Professor Ernst Badian will probably disagree with my conclusions, so I hope that he will not mind if I mention that what led me to pursue some of these issues further was a most inspiring and stimulating discussion with him at Harvard.

¹ See O. Masson, s.v. *Macedonian language*, in *OCD*³ (1996), 905-906; C. Brixhe, *Un "nouveau" champs de la dialectologie grecque: le Macédonien*, in A.C. Cassio (a cura di), *Kata Dialekton. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale de Dialettologia greca* (Napoli-Fiaiano d'Ischia 1996), Napoli 1999, 41-71; see also M.B.

Hatzopoulos, *Cultes et rites de passage in Macédoine*, Athènes-Paris 1994, 121.

² Sometimes with the help of extraneous preconceptions pertaining to the modern world – preconceptions of which oneself is, of course, free, but 'the other' (especially the modern Greek 'other') is guilty (see some striking examples of this attitude in E. N. Borza, *In the shadow of Olympus: the emergence of Macedon*, Princeton-Oxford, 1990, 90-91; E. N. Borza, *Before Alexander: constructing early Macedonia*, Claremont, Calif. 1999, 34-37, 39.

³ ARISTOPH. *Nub.* 492; DEM 21.150; 26.17.

word certainly denoted their non Greekness (with or without the connotations of cultural inferiority, depending on the context); if those so characterized were perceived to be Greek, then the word characterized them as culturally inferior, like barbarians, it was, in other words, a cultural insult – which may or may not have had the potentiality of being understood as casting aspersions on the Greekness of the people thus insulted. There is, then, a danger of circularity in ‘commonsense’ readings of Greek statements pertaining to ethnicity, the danger of reading into the evidence expectations derived from modern assumptions – or of simply adopting the *lectio facilior*. In order to avoid these dangers it is necessary to begin with the most crucial assumptions that shaped the relevant Greek filters, Greek perceptions of Greek ethnic identity, and then reconstruct the ways in which these perceptions related to perceived Macedonian realities. I have discussed elsewhere⁴ archaic and classical Greek perceptions of Greek ethnic identity, and argued that it is an extremely complex and fluid construction, and that the people who shared in the Greek ethnic identity were the people who perceived themselves to be Greeks, and whose self-perception was validated by those who had the dominant role in ‘controlling’ the boundaries of Greekness, such as, in the fifth century, the Hellenodikai who controlled participation in the Olympic Games. That is, Greeks were those who perceived themselves, and were perceived, to be members of a group which defined itself as Greek through a cluster of cultural traits which pertained, above all, to perceived ancestry, language and religious practices. Material culture is not a strongly defining trait; it was also adopted by non Greeks in various circumstances, and there were strong regional diversities in the material cultures of the Greek world, which involved – among other things – varying degrees of input from different non Greek cultures, and included colonial hybridities in cities that were unequivocally perceived to be Greek.⁵

⁴ *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and others. Myth, ritual, ethnicity* (forthcoming), chapter I.2 (in which I also set out a critique of J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 1997); see also my forthcoming paper entitled *Herodotus (and others) on Pelasgians: some perceptions of ethnicity*, to be published in a volume edited by Prof. R. Parker and Dr. P. Derow and dedicated to the memory of W.G. Forrest.

⁵ In colonial situations the dominant culture of the colonists and the native cultures of the people of the area being colonized mix in complex ways resulting in new cultural artifacts, - not simple combinations of two cultures, but complex interactions generating complex phenomena that may be subsumed in the post colonial concept of hybridity. (On hybridity see H.K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, London 1994, 102-122, cf. esp. 111-116; 127; cf. also 85-92; P. Van Dommelen, *Colonial constructs: Colonialism and archaeology in the Mediterranean*, in C. Gosden (ed.), *Culture Contact and Colonialism*, in “World Archaeology”, 28, 1997, 305-323, esp. 309-310, 314-320. Borza’s flawed perceptions of the relationship between material culture and Greek ethnicity (for example, the simple fact that there is no essence ‘Greek material culture’ to which we can compare ‘Macedonian material culture’) can be illustrated by the fact that he appears to believe that the notion that Macedonian craftsmen developed a “regional style, heavily indebted to Greece, but with abundant Balkan and Asian influences in shape and decoration” is an argument against the Greekness of the Macedonians (Borza *Before Alexander*, cit., 33).

Nevertheless, material culture does have a place – albeit a peripheral one – in the cluster of traits defining Greekness, above all in so far as it reflected, and was perceived to be reflecting, a ‘common way of life’, which contributed to the construction of Greek identity.⁶

Ancestry was the most effective argument for convincing those who had the dominant role in controlling the boundaries of Greekness, but implicit in such arguments concerning ancestry was the fact that the ‘petitioners’ shared in the language, religion and other cultural traits that were considered Greek. For the role of ancestry, and the discourse of Greek ethnicity in general, was, I have argued elsewhere, much more complex, and less monolithic, than is often assumed.⁷ Though the Greeks appeared to privilege ancestry, this was perceived by them as one element in a complex system of interacting traits that made up perceived Greekness, in which one or another element could be privileged or underprivileged, depending on the circumstances. For example, despite the importance of ancestry, people could have barbarian ancestors and still perceived to be Greek, as is illustrated by myths about barbarian kings such as Pelops, and barbarian peoples who had lived in Greece, such as the Pelasgians and the Leleges, who became absorbed in the Greek mainstream.⁸ Because blood ancestry was not the only criterion for Greek ethnicity, barbarians could become Greeks.

What, then, of the Macedonians? With regard to the first crucial criterion of Greek ethnic identity, language, it is now unambiguously clear that Macedonian is a Greek dialect related to Northwest Greek.⁹ As for the second criterion, religion, space prevents me from discussing Macedonian religion in other than the most superficial terms. The minimum that can be asserted with certainty is that as soon as the religion of the Macedonians becomes visible to us, it is part of Greek religion, involving Greek cults, deities and rites.¹⁰ Like the religious systems of all Greek poleis and ethne, it is a local religious system, the system of a particular *ethnos*, with its own characteristics and emphases – for Greek religion consists of interacting local systems, each with their particular characteristics, and also of a Panhellenic dimension which interacted significantly with the local religious systems.¹¹

⁶ See the notion of ἥθεα ὁμότροπα in Hdt. 8,144,23. This similar way of life was reflected, in complex ways, in the material culture.

⁷ See *supra* n. 4.

⁸ I have discussed the complex issue of the ethnicity of the Pelasgians elsewhere (Sourvinou-Inwood, *Herodotos, cit.*). On the Leleges see *infra*.

⁹ See *supra* n. 1.

¹⁰ That Macedonian religion was Greek is also stated by M. Oppermann, s.v. *Macedonia, cults*, in *OCD*³ (1996), 905: “they also shared in the common religious and cultural features of the Greek world.” but “regional characteristics have to be noted.”

¹¹ I have discussed these issues in “*Persephone and Aphrodite at Locri: a model for personality definitions in Greek religion*,” in *JHS*, 98, 1978, 101-121 (=C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading Greek culture: texts and images, rituals and myths*, Oxford 1991, 147-188): see also C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *What is polis religion?*, in O. Murray-S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford

Methodologically, it is not more rigorous to think that Macedonian religion had been a non Greek religion before it becomes visible to us than it is to think that it had been Greek in the early archaic period. On the contrary, since there is no evidence whatsoever to support the notion that Macedonian religion had ever been non Greek, it is far less rigorous to believe that it was. The only reason why such a position may misleadingly appear to be rigorous is because 'we cannot be sure that Macedonian religion was a Greek religion from the beginning' takes the superficial form of skepticism, which appears rigorous because 'we cannot be sure that' sounds like scholarly caution; but in reality it relies on an implicit fallacy, since the fact that we cannot assume that A is right does not entail that it is more rigorous to presume that, unless the opposite can be demonstrated conclusively (in an area where very little can) A is wrong, though all the evidence indicates that it is right. All the evidence does indicate that Macedonian religion was a Greek religious system, and there is no evidence that it had been non Greek at any time. In fact, the more information becomes available, the further back Macedonian religion can be shown to have been part of Greek religion. At Dion, for example, recent excavations have shown that the sanctuary of Demeter was in use at least as early as the late sixth / early fifth century.¹² Moreover, the cultic institutions that are the rights of transition to adulthood which are associated with divine cults have been shown to be closely comparable to those in the rest of Greece, with similarities to, and differences from, those of other Greek religious systems, comparable to the similarities and differences that govern the relationships between such rites in the different Greek religious systems.¹³ All this indicates that there is no reason to think that the Macedonians had ever had any religious system that had not been Greek, and that, on the contrary, all the available evidence suggests that Macedonian religion had been a Greek local religious system.

Material culture, we saw, has a place – albeit a peripheral one – in the cluster of traits that defines Greekness, especially in so far as it reflects a 'common way of life.' However, defining what constitutes Greek material culture in the archaic and classical period (let alone which aspects of it reflect a common way of life) is an extremely complex issue, involving the consideration of regional diversities, and above all of colonial hybridities in cities unequivocally perceived to be Greek.¹⁴ It should also involve defining more specifically the material cultures of the elites, the Panhellenic aristocracy, the most 'international' segment of all archaic Greek societies, and also of the non elite cultures in each society, and determining the extent to which the latter as well as the former were similar to, and different from, each other in the different Greek cities, ethne and regions, and how that situation related to the situation in Macedonia. Thus, an investigation of Macedonian material

1990, 295-322 [also published in: R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, Oxford 2000, 13-37].

¹² LS. Pingiatoglou, *To hiero tis Dimitras sto Dion. Anaskaphi 1990*, in "Archaeologiko Ergo ste Macedonia kai Thrake," 4, 1990 [1993], 205-215; "AR", 1997-1998, 82; M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian institutions under the kings*, Athens-Paris, 1996, 129-130.

¹³ Hatzopoulos, *Cutles*, *cit. passim*, see esp. 122.

¹⁴ See *supra* n. 5.

culture in the archaic and classical period,¹⁵ and the ways in which, if any, it may have reflected (and to what extent) a 'common way of life' with the other Greeks, for example in burial customs, would require at the very least one whole book. All I can do here is set out my own view on this extremely complex issue simply as a personal assessment, for I would need a great amount of space to present even a rudimentary form of an argument. I believe that it is becoming increasingly clear that the Macedonians, to a certain extent at least, shared the material culture of the other Greeks (at least the Macedonian elite of the other Greek elites) in the archaic period; the objects imported by the Macedonians from southern Greece do not appear to have been deployed as exotic or in other ways in which alien elites deploy material objects appropriated from other cultures; on the contrary, I suggest, they are deployed, for example as grave offerings, in ways comparable to those in which they had been used in their original Greek contexts of production, with the imports slotting into preexisting functions, being luxury replacements of local products – which, in my view, would suggest a common way of life between Macedonians and other Greeks.

I will now consider the ancestry of the Macedonians, the discussion of which will also involve an attempt to reconstruct the assumptions that will allow us to read the various discourses of Macedonian ancestry as much as possible through Greek eyes; this discussion will eventually become intertwined with the consideration of Greek statements about the ethnicity of the Macedonians. The earliest formulation pertaining to the Macedonian's ancestry comes from a fragment of the *Catalogue of Women* or *Ehoiai*,¹⁶ which is probably of early sixth century date¹⁷ and had circulated orally in the seventh century.¹⁸

¹⁵ The investigation of Macedonian material culture before the fifth century needs to be directed to the area west of the Axios, and focused on Vergina, the Haliakmon and its surrounding area and down to Olympos. (Restrictions of space prevent me from attempting to discuss Macedonian geography and the history and expansion of the kingdom of Macedon, so I will simply say that the area suggested above is not coterminous with the kingdom of Macedon from an early period, but it involves the areas known to have been inhabited by people perceived to be Macedonians from an early period; the perception that shaped *Catalogue of Women* fr. 7 M-W. suggests that they included (in one way or another, and whoever the Pieres may have been – if they had any historical existence and were not a later construct) Pieria]. The Greek colonies in the Chalcidice and the lands of the non Macedonian tribes in part of the central and in the eastern part of present day Macedonia are not directly relevant – though a systematic study should use them as a set of comparanda, since they can provide sets of similarities with, and differences from, the land of the Macedonians, in the different periods, which would help place more precisely the Macedonian forms of use of Greek material culture by determining the extent to which on the one hand Greek colonies interacted with local non Greek material culture and created certain hybridities, and on the other non Greeks took over Greek material culture.

¹⁶ On the *Catalogue of Women* see now R.L. Fowler, *Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue, and the creation of the Hellenes*, in "PCPhS" 44, 1998, 1-19 with bibliography.

¹⁷ It is certainly not later than the last quarter of the sixth century at the very latest (see Fowler, *art.cit.*, 1 n. 4).

According to this poem, Thyia, the daughter of Deukalions and sister of Hellen, had two sons from Zeus, Magnes and Makedon, who lived around Pieria and Olympos.¹⁹ Another sister of Hellen and Thyia, Pandora, was the mother of Graikos, also from Zeus.²⁰

In order to attempt to reconstruct the perceptions concerning the Macedonians' ethnic identity that had shaped this genealogy, and the ways in which the archaic and classical Greeks had made sense of it, we need to reconstruct the assumptions that had shaped their filters. Starting with the set of assumptions that is most concretely available to us, the Magnetes, whose eponymous hero was Magnes, were perceived to be Greek. Most specifically, they were perceived to be Greek in the particular geographical and cultic milieu in which the *Catalogue of Women* had been constructed and circulated, since they had two votes in the council of the Delphic Amphictyony.²¹ Since in this genealogy Magnes, the eponymous hero of the Magnetes, was the brother of Makedon, the eponymous hero of the Macedonians, it is unambiguously clear that in the assumptions concerning ethnic identity that had shaped the genealogy, and in the eyes of the Greeks making sense of this representation, the Macedonians were perceived to have had the same ethnic identity as the Magnetes, and therefore to be Greek. This genealogy, then presents the Macedonians as Greek, and would have been understood to be doing so by the archaic and classical Greeks.

This conclusion is supported by other arguments. Before I consider them, I should say something about the modern belief that only the people who are descended from Hellen were perceived to be Greek in the assumptions articulating this poem, and that therefore this poem presents the Macedonians as non Greek.²² That this belief is mistaken²³ is illustrated, for example, by the fact that the Arcadians, who were unequivocally perceived to be Greek, were not descended from Hellen; Arkas was, on his mother's side, in one way or another, of autochthonous descent²⁴ and this is correlative with the myths that

¹⁸ See Fowler, *art.cit.*, 1.

¹⁹ *Catalogue of Women* fr. 7 M-W.

²⁰ Fr. 5 M-W.

²¹ On the connection between the *Catalogue of Women* and the Delphic Amphictyony see Fowler, *art.cit.*, 11-15

²² See, for example, most recently, Fowler's opinion (Fowler, *art.cit.* 14-15): "unhellenic, like the Macedonians and the Graikoi, who descended not from Hellen, but from daughters of Deukalion, sisters of Hellen. Their descent directly from Deukalion acknowledges their affinity to the Hellenes It would be unthinkable for Makedon or Graikos to be brothers of Hellen." This formulation leaves out Magnetes, for he would have invalidated the argument, since the Magnetes are Greek; its latter part shows that it is based on, or at least facilitated by, the assumption that the Macedonians cannot be Greeks.

²³ I have set out a longer argument against the view that only the people who are descended from Hellen were perceived to be Greek elsewhere (Sourvinou-Inwood, *Hylas, cit.*, chapter I.2).

²⁴ Cf. e.g. Hesiod, frs. 160-161 M-W; See Jacoby, *Komm ad FGrHist* 3F156, 1a, 427.

make the Arcadians autochthonous.²⁵ Since this was more significant than descent from Hellen, he was not made to be descended from Hellen, precisely because in Greek eyes descent from Hellen was not a necessary part of Greek ethnic identity. The expectation that because Hellen became the eponymous hero of the Greeks, and the *Catalogue* presents so many eponyms and royal houses as his descendants, all those perceived to be Greeks would have been made into his descendants is a reflection of modern preconceptions concerning Greek ideas of blood ancestry. But ancient perceptions were not so tidy, and this particular expectation about descent from Hellen is invalidated by the poem. Besides the Arcadians, the Locrians also ought to have been perceived to be non Greeks if descent from Hellen was a necessary precondition of Greekness. For in the *Catalogue*²⁶ Lokros was the leader of the Leleges, who had been created from the stones thrown by Deukalion and Pyrrha. The poem, then, presents the Locrians as being descended from a barbarian people created from stones. Thus, if those not descended from Hellen had been perceived to be barbarians, the Locrians would have been perceived the most barbarian barbarians, since they were descended from barbarians who were descended from stones; they certainly would have been much more barbarian than the allegedly barbarian Macedonians, and the same would be true for the Arcadians, since, unlike the Arcadians and the Locrians, the Macedonians were descended from Hellen's sister. In reality, of course, the Locrians were perceived to be Greeks, indeed were members of the Delphic Amphictyony; their allegedly barbarian ancestry does not make them any less Greek, nor does the fact that they may have been perceived to be, or accused of being, culturally backward.²⁷ Such commonsense readings, then, can be seen to be mistaken when they can be tested; the Greeks started with certain presuppositions when constructing, and also when making sense of, these genealogies, and we should try to reconstruct at least some of these to read the poem in ways as near as possible to those of the Greeks.

It could be argued that if the Macedonians were indeed perceived to be Greeks, we would expect that at some point a genealogy would have been constructed that made them descendants of Hellen. Such a genealogy had indeed been constructed. Hellanikos²⁸ is quoted as saying that Makedon, the eponym of the Macedonians, was the son of Aiolos – who was the son of Hellen in the *Catalogue of Women*.²⁹ The particular quotation referred to comes from the first book of *The Priestesses of Hera at Argos*, but since Hellanikos had written a *Deukalioneia* it is likely that he had created (or adopted) this genealogy in the context of that work.

Another argument that shows that the *Catalogue* presents the Macedonians as Greek, and would have been understood to be doing so by the archaic and classical Greeks, concerns the mother of Magnes and Makedon. The poem articulates three elements of her persona. First, her name, which in Greek eyes evoked connotations that we need to reconstruct if we are to try to make

²⁵ Cf. e.g. Hdt. 8.73; Hell. *FGrHist* 4F161.

²⁶ Fr. 234 M-W.

²⁷ See Thuc. 1.5 on the Ozolian Locrians; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume I: Books 1-III*, Oxford 1991, 24 *ad loc.*

²⁸ Hell. *FGrHist* 4F74

²⁹ Fr. 9 M-W.

sense of Makedon's genealogy as much as possible through Greek eyes. Second, her familial associations: she is the daughter of Deukalion and sister of Hellen. Finally, her story is structured through the schema 'woman has sex with a god, a hero is born,' in a variant which involves two heroes, and in which the god is Zeus – not only the most powerful Greek god, and the father of many heroes, but also a god especially connected with Olympos and the Pieria region, and therefore an especially appropriate father for Magnes and Makedon. What of Thyia? The name Thyia is closely connected with Dionysos. Thyiai or Thyiades is a term for women associated with the worship of Dionysos.³⁰ Thyia is the name of an Elean festival of Dionysos.³¹ Thyia is also a name associated with Delphi.³² In one version of his myth, Delphos, the city's eponym, was the son of Apollo and Thyia, the daughter of the autochthon Kastalios.³³ Thyia was the first priestess of Dionysos, and the first to celebrate *orgia* for the god; and people call the women who *μαίνονται* for the god Thyiades, after her. There is a very close connection, etymological and ritual, between Thyiades and *μανία*: the Thyiades are the women who *μαίνονται*.³⁴ The mythological female companions of Dionysos were also called Thyiades at Delphi, and in some other contexts, and they were associated with *μανία*.³⁵ The other main association of the name Thyia is with central Greece; besides the connection with Delphi, Thyios is the name of a month in Thessaly, Boeotia and Naupaktos, presumably name after a festival of Dionysos.³⁶

I submit that the fact that the mother of Magnes and Makedon has a name that is intimately connected with Greek religion, specifically the cult of Dionysos,³⁷ and also with central Greece, adds support to the reading that in

³⁰ On the Thyiades see e.g. Paus. 10.4.3; 10.32.7; Plut. *Aetia Graeca* 293F; M.-Ch. Villanueva Puig, *A propos des thyiades de Delphes*, in *L'association dionysiaque dans les sociétés anciennes. Actes de la table rond organisée par l'École française de Rome* (Rome 1984), Paris-Rome 1986, 31-51. A. Henrichs, *Der rasende Gott: Zur Psychologie des Dionysos und des Dionysischen in Mythos und Literatur*, in "A&A," 40, 1994, 31-58. Cf. also H.s. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman religion 1. Ter Unus. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three studies in Henotheism*, Leiden 1990, 137-138.

³¹ See Paus. 6.26.1-2; Plut. *Aetia gr.* 299A; Theop. *FGrHist* 115F277. See also M.P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit MAusschluss der attischen*, Leipzig 1906, 291-293; V. Mitsopoulos-Leon, *Zur Verehrung des Dionysos in Elis. Nochmals: AXIE Taure und de sechzehn heiligen Frauen*, in "MDAI(A)" 99, 1984, 275-290; Versnel, *op.cit.* 138-139 and bibl. in n. 168.

³² Cf. Hdt. 7.178.2 (a place called Thyia in which there is a *temenos* to Thyia the daughter of Kephisos).

³³ Paus. 10.6.4

³⁴ Henrichs, *art.cit.* 53-54.

³⁵ See Henrichs, *loc.cit.* On the West pediment of the temple of Apollo Delphi see Paus. 10.19.4; Villanueva Puig, *art.cit.*, 38-39; cf. bibl.: Henrichs, *art.cit.* 56 n. 97. See also Soph, *Ant.* 1149-1152, where the Thyiades *μαίνόμεναι πάννυχοι χορεύουσι*.

³⁶ See e.g. C. Trümper, s.v. *Monatsnamen. Griechenland*, in *NP*, VIII (2000), 357.

³⁷ There are also connections between other Thy- names and Dionysos: Thyone was another name for Semele (see e.g. Apollod. 3.5.3); or Thyone was a nurse of Dionysos (Panyassis fg. 5 Davies); or Thyene was the name of one

the perceptions shaping the selections that led to the construction of this genealogy the Macedonians were perceived to be Greeks, and would have been so understood by the archaic and classical Greek 'readers'³⁸ of this genealogy.

The central Greek associations of the name Thyia strengthens the notion that the genealogy of Makedon in the *Catalogue* was a central Greek construct. It is possible to go further, and suggest that the basic genealogical schema that had structured the early versions of the *Catalogue* was tripartite, and had involved descendants of Deukalion who were eponyms of places in central Greece:³⁹ first, the group whose eponym is Deukalion's son Hellen, the Hellenes inhabiting Hellas, to be understood as Thessaly,⁴⁰ and then the other groups, whose eponyms are the sons of Deukalion's daughters from Zeus, through the deployment of the schema 'woman has sex with a god, a hero is born.; This is as we would expect, since the *Catalogue* stands at the end of a process that took place in the seventh century, and of which the first stage 'involved north-central Greece';⁴¹ it was focused on that region and articulated relationship between its different peoples: Hellen is the eponymous hero of the region Hellas, and his sister's sons are the eponymous heroes of other peoples in the regions, of whom Makedon and Magnes are associated with Pieria and Olympos,⁴² who were perceived to be related to the people of Hellas – not to the Hellenes = Greeks, but to the Hellenes = the inhabitants of Hellas. Once Hellen came to be seen as the eponymous hero of the Greeks, genealogies were constructed (through the deployment and reshaping of other genealogical constructs) to show that specific heroes were descended from Hellen. In the tripartite schema involved the offspring of Deukalion the groups whose eponyms are Deukalion's daughters' sons are in one way less privileged, because they are descended from daughters, but in another way more privileged, because their eponyms have a divine father. When the figure of Hellen came to be privileged because he became the eponym of the Greeks (thought not the ancestor of all of them) he was given divine paternity, the schema 'woman has sex with a god, a hero is born' came to structure his myth, so that in one version he was only said to be the son of Deukalion, while in reality he was the son of Zeus.⁴³

A discourse about barbarians in Greece ascribed to Hekataios by Strabo⁴⁴ includes a statement pertaining to the ethnicity of the Macedonians. "Hekataios of Miletos says of the Peloponnese that before the Greeks it was inhabited by barbarians. Nearly the whole of Greece was the abode of

of the Dodonidai Nymphs who was a nurse of Dionysos (Pherrec. fr. 90 d; see the text in R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* I, Oxford 2000, 323).

³⁸ I use this term conventionally, to include the notion 'audiences.'

³⁹ The *Catalogue* (fr. 6 M-W) says that those descended from Deukalion reigned in Thessaly, as does Hekataios (*FGrHist* 1 F 14). Hellanikos (*FGrHist* 4 F 6; cf. F 117) says that Deukalion reigned in Thessaly.

⁴⁰ Cf. also Fowler, *art.cit.* 11 for the association between Hellen and Thessaly.

⁴¹ See Fowler, *art.cit.*, 15.

⁴² On Graikos and Graikoi see F. Gschnitzer, s.v. *Grai, Graikoi*, in *DNP*, IV (1998), 1195.

⁴³ See Acou. fr. 34 Fowler.

⁴⁴ Hecat. *FGrHist* 1 F 119 (= Strabo 7.7.1, C 321).

barbarians in the past, if one draws inferences from the traditions themselves.” Then Strabo, probably reporting Hekataios, mentions Pelops bringing over peoples from Phrygia and Danaos from Egypt, and he also mentions the Dryopes, Kaukones, Pelasgians and Leleges, before going on to claim that Attica was once held by Eumolpos’ Thracians, Daulis in Phokis by (the clear implication is the Thracian) Tereus, and Thebes by the Phoenicians who came with Kadmos; then he states that (among others) Kodros and Kekrops are shown to have been barbarians by their names, and goes on to say that “even now” the Thracians, Illyrians, and Epirotes live on the flanks of the Greeks, and that “barbarians hold many parts of the land which is at the present time indisputably Greece, Macedonia is held by the Thracians, as are parts of Thessaly, and the parts above Akarnania and Aitolia are held by Thesprotians, the Kassopaeans, the Amphilochians, the Molossians, and the Athamanes who are Epirot ethnē.” It is not certain that this last segment reflects Hekataios. If it does not, then it is not relevant to my investigation. But in order to conduct this investigation as rigorously as possible I will examine the position that is most inimical to the conclusions that I have reached so far; that is, I will assume as a working hypothesis that the last segment is based on a formulation by Hekataios.

If it is assumed that this segment is based on a formulation by Hekataios, the first problem that arises is, in whose present were these lands ‘indisputably Greece’? If it was in Hekataios’ present, if, that is, the formulation was part of Hekataios’ text, what would have made Hekataios think of Macedonia as ‘indisputably Greek’, if he believed that it had been inhabited by Thracians? There are two possibilities. First, the formulation has been Hekataios’, in which case it would follow that Macedonia had been considered indisputably Greek in the Greek collective representations of his time – which would entail that the Greeks as a whole had not believed that its inhabitants were Thracians; or, second, and most likely, this segment was shaped by Strabo, through Strabo’s filters, which were different from Hekataios’. I do not think that we can know Hekataios’ perception of Macedonia,⁴⁵ but he clearly considered the country east of the Axios river to be Thrace,⁴⁶ while for Strabo Macedonia extended from the Adriatic on the West to the river Hebros in the East.⁴⁷ There certainly were Thracians in territories that were conquered and absorbed by the Macedonians in the wake of the Persian Wars, such as Mygdonia and Bisaltia – and also other non Greeks, such as the Paiones.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, cit. 465 agrees with the view that Strabo 7 fr. 11 reflects Hekataios. I am far from convinced.

⁴⁶ Cf. N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia I*, Oxford 1972, 146-147. An illustration of the difference between Hekataios’ and Strabo’s conception of Macedonia can be seen, for example, in *FGrHist* 1 F 146, a quotation from Stephanos Byzantios, who says that according to Hekataios Chalastra was a Thracian town, while according to Strabo it was a town of Macedonia. Chalastra was a town in Mygdonia conquered by the Macedonians in the wake of the Persian Wars. On Chalastra see Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, cit., 107-108.

⁴⁷ Strab. 7 fr.10. On Strabo on Macedonia see also Borza, *Shadow*, cit., 292-293.

⁴⁸ On the history of the Macedonian kingdom and its expansion see e.g. Thuc. 2.99; Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, cit., 105-123; 167-179; 463-486 with bibl. On

Thus, if the segment of the text under consideration had been shaped through Strabo's filters, it is impossible to reconstruct even the general lines of what Hekataios had said; he may have said that Macedonia was held by Thracians, or he may simply have named specific areas, for example Mygdonia and Bisaltia, as being Thracian, and perhaps also others as being non Greek, and Strabo gave it that particular spin, summarized it as Thracians holding the 'now indisputably Greek' land of Macedonia.

In these circumstances, it is unsafe to conclude that Hekataios had said that Macedonia, in the sense of the land west of the Axios, and especially the kingdom of Macedon, was held by Thracians. But even if Hekataios had made such a statement, would it have been taken by fifth century Greeks to mean that the Macedonians had been Thracians? Though we cannot reconstruct what Hekataios had said, let alone the nuances of his text, it is possible to set in place some of the parameters that would have shaped 'the main lines of the ways in which fifth century Greeks would have made sense of the main lines of the discourse in Strabo that may be reflecting Hekataios, and so to chart a rough sketch of how it would have been perceived to have related to common Greek perceptions.

First, this discourse privileges a strong version of the notion of barbarians as ancestors of the Greeks – and so implies a strong version of the Greek perception that barbarians can become Greek; it is based on the manipulation of complex myths, through rationalization and a radical expansion of the barbarian element, not least through the claim that Pelops, Danaos and Kadmos brought with them peoples from Prygia, Egypt and Phoenicia respectively, so that what were myths about the arrival of heroes became stories about population movements. Second, some of these statements would have run counter to the common Greek representations and would have been considered invalid by the specific Greeks involved. For example, the statement that the names of Kodros and Kekrops show that the people who bore them were barbarians would have been considered wrong by the Athenians. The same would probably have been true of the claim that a barbarian Thracian Tereus held Phokis (on which is clearly based Thucydides' statement that Daulis in Phokis was inhabited by Thracians when the story of Prokne and Tereus had taken place),⁴⁹ which can be seen to be based on a rationalizing interpretation, through the filter of strongly privileging the notion of 'barbarians in Greece in the heroic age,' of the fact that there were two versions of the myth of Tereus, in one of which he was from Daulis in Phokis, while in the other that he was a Thracian. In reality, each of these versions is mythologically significant, constructs different meanings pertaining to Tereus' role as husband and father, perpetrator and victim, which is beyond my scope to discuss here. Finally, the claim that Thracians held parts of Thessaly in the present (if it had been made by Hekataios) does not, to my knowledge, correspond to a Greek perception that at c. 500 parts of Thessaly were inhabited by people whom the Greeks perceived to be non Greek. Thus, there is a disjunction between common Greek perceptions of the

the process of Macedonization see e.g. on Lete in Mygdonia: Hatzopoulos, *Cultes*, cit. 42-53 *passim*.

⁴⁹ Thuc. 2.29.3; see Hornblower, *op.cit.*, 287-288 *ad loc.*

ethnic identity of the inhabitants of Thessaly and the statement attributed to Hekataios.

Consequently, fifth century Greeks would almost certainly not have believed all these statements to be correct (even if they had been made by Hekataios), and so would probably not have believed that the Macedonians were Thracians. If (which, we saw, is far from certain) Hekataios had written that the kingdom of Macedon was held by Thracians, which would imply that the Macedonians were Thracians, fifth century Greeks would have perceived this as an exaggeration to fit the ideological bias of his discourse, thus leaving open the ethnicity of the Macedonians, since even readers who knew nothing about that ethnicity would have registered Hekataios' discourse concerning what they did know about as distortions, and would have adjusted their filters accordingly.⁵⁰

To sum up. So far we have seen that Macedonians are presented as Greek in the earliest extant text relevant to the issue, the *Catalogue of Women*; this is especially interesting, since the first stage of development of this poem involved north-central Greece,⁵¹ and so was shaped in an area, and by people, who had knowledge of the Macedonians, and would thus have been aware of the fact that they shared in the system of interacting cultural traits that defined Greekness, above all language and religion. Strabo's version of Hekataios' discourse cannot be used to support the belief that in the Greek perceptions the Macedonians were considered to be non Greeks – though if the relevant segment is indeed reflecting Hekataios, and reflecting him correctly, it may indicate their vulnerability to being subsumed together with the barbarian neighbours when looked at from a distance, if the text's ideological thrust makes this desirable. If Hekataios had said that Macedonia was held by barbarians, which is far from certain, he would have blurred distinctions to class all the inhabitants of the wider geographical region together, in a context in which he stressed the presence of barbarians in Greece and lessened the distance between Greeks and barbarians. Herodotos, the next earliest source on the ethnicity of the Macedonians, presented the Macedonians as Greeks. He articulated two sets of relevant perceptions, one pertaining to the Macedonian *ethnos* as a whole, the second pertaining to king Alexander and the Macedonian royal family.⁵²

Herodotos connects the Macedonians with the Dorians twice. First, in the highly problematic passage 1.56,⁵³ the Dorian γένος, which was an *Hellenikon ethnos*, had been driven from Histaiotis and gone to live in the Pindos area, where it was called Makednon – from there it migrated to Dryopia, and eventually to the Peloponnese, where it came to be called Dorian. Herodotos,

⁵⁰ Very much later Greek readers is another matter, which does not concern me here.

⁵¹ See Fowler, *art.cit.*, 15.

⁵² On Alexander I in Herodotos see also E. Badian *Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences*, in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, 107-130.

⁵³ I discuss this passage elsewhere, together with some aspects of Herodotos' perceptions of ethnicity and the problems concerning the Greekness of the Ionians and the Pelasgians (Sourvinou-Inwood, *Herodotos, cit.*).

then, identifies the early Dorians with the Macedonians – though, obviously, the Macedonian Dorians who, in his articulation, went to the Peloponnese would not have been perceived to have been the same as the Macedonians who now live in Macedonia, but those who are now Dorians are those who left Macedonia. But there can be no doubt that the fact that Herodotos presents the Dorians as Macedonians entails that he perceived the Dorians to be closely connected with the Macedonians of Macedonia; and that therefore he perceived the Macedonians to have been among those who were already Greek when the early Ionians were Pelasgian, and who had spoken Greek from the beginning. This, of course, also entails that in Herodotos' assumptions the fifth century Macedonians were speaking Greek – which is historically correct. A comparable assumption is articulated in book 8, where he calls various Peloponnesians (the Lacedaemonians and others) “a Dorian and Macedonian (Μακεδόνων) ethnos.”⁵⁴

Alexander, Herodotos reports, referred to his father Amyntas as a Greek man in a message he sent to the Persian king (ἀνὴρ Ἑλλην Μακεδόνων ὑπαρχος).⁵⁵ A bit later on Herodotos asserts the Greek ethnicity of the Macedonian kings in his own voice:⁵⁶ “That these descendants of Perdikkas are Greeks, as they themselves say, I myself happen to know and will prove it in the later part of my writing.” Then he says that the Hellenodikai at Olympia established that the Macedonian kings are indeed Greeks, for when Alexander went to compete at the Olympic Games, some of those who were to compete against him tried to stop him by saying that the competition is for Greeks only and not for barbarians, but Alexander proved himself to be an Argive, and was judged to be a Greek. Herodotos eventually⁵⁷ fulfills his promise to prove the Greek ethnic identity of the Macedonian kings by telling the story of their Herakleid ancestry. According to this myth the Macedonian royal house was descended from Herakles via Perdikkas, a descendant of Temenos (who was a descendant of Heracles), who had fled Argos with his two brothers and become king of Macedonia. Euripides' *Archelaos* tells a different variant of the myth: the Macedonian royal house was descended from a different exiled Temenid Argive, a son of Temenos called Archelaos. Finally, according to Herodotos,⁵⁸ Alexander, speaking in secret to the Athenian generals before the battle of Plataea, says that he cares for συναπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος; the selections that shaped this formulation may suggest that Herodotos is presenting Alexander as thinking of his own country, Macedonia, as part of Greece, since they may suggest an underlying meaning ‘I care for the whole of Greece, not just my own country.’ Then he explains that he himself is Greek by ancient descent, at this rhetorically appropriate point, when the Athenian generals were still ignorant of this identity, which he reveals at the very end, “I am Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδών.”

⁵⁴ Hdt. 8.43: “These, except the Hermioneans, are Dorians and Macedonians who had last come from Erineos and Pindos and Dryopia.”

⁵⁵ Hdt. 5.20. This is discussed in Badian, *Herodotus on Alexander, cit.*, 114-115.

⁵⁶ Hdt. 5.22. See also R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context. Ethnography, Science and the Art of Persuasion*, Cambridge 2000, 223.

⁵⁷ Hdt. 8.137-139.

⁵⁸ Hdt. 9.45; see also Badian, *Herodotus on Alexander, cit.*, 118-119.

The story that some of those who were to compete against Alexander at the Olympic Games had tried to stop him by claiming that he was a barbarian may be a narrative dramatization, an articulation through an agonistic schema, of the notion 'Alexander had to prove that he was Greek,' or it may be reflecting a real event, perhaps an attempt to eliminate a strong competitor (which we know Alexander was, since ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρώτῳ), or it may be a narrative marking of Alexander's Greekness. In the story Alexander by-passes the question of whether the Macedonians were Greeks, by demonstrating that he himself is an Argive.⁵⁹

The implications of this story in the eyes of fifth century Greeks have not, in my view, been fully realized, and this, together with certain fourth century statements I will be discussing below, has helped to generate the modern view according to which the Macedonian royal family was considered to be Greek, but the other Macedonians were considered barbarians. This, of course, was the irreducible minimum Greekness that modern discourses based on the ancient statements about the Macedonians' ethnicity have to accept, that from the early fifth century the Macedonian royal family was perceived by the other Greeks to be Greek. But this interpretation, (besides being in conflict with statements which will be discussed below, which should alert us to the fact that the situation is more complex than may appear)⁶⁰ would also, I will now argue, not have been consistent with the implications of Herodotos' story in Greek eyes, or indeed with Herodotos' own presentation of the Dorians.

Herodotos, we saw, presents the Macedonians as Dorian, and their kings as Achaeans, descendants of Herakles. This is also how represents the Spartans, Dorians whose kings were Herakleids, descended from Eurysthenes and Procles, the twin sons of Aristodemos son of Aristomachos, son of Kleodaios, son of Hyllos,⁶¹ and so of Achaean origin. Herodotos, then, has constructed identifications and isomorphisms between on the one hand the Macedonians, and on the other the Dorians of the Peloponnese in general, but most specifically and closely, the Spartans. All four elements of this construct, the Spartan Dorians and their Achaean kings, the Macedonians (whom he identified with Dorians) and their Achaean kings, are Greek; but in both

⁵⁹ E. Badian, *Greeks and Macedonians*, in B. Barr-Sharrar – E.N. Borza (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in late classical and early Hellenistic times*, Washington 1982, 35 noted that Alexander I was described as Philhellene in the lexicographers who go back to fourth century sources, and suggested that such an adjective would not have been used for a Greek. The last point is indeed valid, but, in my view the fact that the attestation is late, and is more likely than not to have been a construct by later readers, who were steeped in and conditioned by, fourth century cultural insults suggests that it is not a valid argument against the view that Alexander was perceived to be Greek in the fifth (and indeed fourth) century.

Editor's note: both Badian and the author are mistaken. See FAQ #1.

⁶⁰ See esp. Dem. 3.24; 9.31; cf. also 30.32

⁶¹ Hdt. 6.52; cf. Ephor. *FGrHist* 70 F 117. See C. Calame, *Spartan Genealogies: The Mythological Representation of a Spartan Organization*, in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London 1987, 175-177.

cases the peoples are more purely Greek than their kings; first, because Herodotos claims that the Dorians are the most purely Greek among Greeks,⁶² and second, because he says of the Spartan Herakleid kings – and this in his eyes would have been also valid of the Macedonian Herakleid kings – that though their ancestors were reckoned to be Greeks by Perseus' times, if one goes further back than that, then the leaders of the Dorians had Egyptian ancestors.⁶³ Once again, we see the Greek perception that people can become Greek, here coupled with the paradox that the leaders of the Dorians who were the most purely Greek are descended from Egyptians. This paradox would have been activated at 8.137-9, where Alexander's Argive descent, which he demonstrated when challenged to prove his Greekness at 5.22, proves to be a Herakleid descent (as had not been stated at 5.220, which gives him a glorious ancestry, by which also in Herodotos' schema, makes him somewhat less purely Greek than his subjects, the Macedonian people.⁶⁴

The stated Greekness of Herodotos' Macedonians and their place in the construct involving the Spartans is one of the arguments that invalidate the notion that the story of Alexander at the Olympic Games shows that the Macedonian royal family was considered to be Greek, but the other Macedonians were perceived to be barbarians. Herodotos' readers had been told that the Macedonians are Greeks, and later on they will be directed to seeing them through the filters of the Spartans with their Herakleid kings. So they would be assuming that the Hellenodikai acknowledged the Greekness of a Macedonian king of Argive descent who ruled over Macedonians who were Dorian Greeks, especially since – and this is a second, related, but also

⁶² Hdt. 1.56, 58.

⁶³ Hdt, 6.53

⁶⁴ The myths of the Herakleid ancestry, and indeed of the Macedonian/Dorian movements in central and northern Greece, should be considered only as myths; what is pertinent is these myths' meanings and functions in Herodotos' text and in the Greek collective representations in general, and what perceptions they articulated (for ex. that Herodotos perceived them, or at the very least chose to present them, as correlative with the Spartans). Attempts to reconstruct history on the basis of myths (as in Borza, *Shadow, cit.*, 78-79, 81-84) are doomed to create culturally determined constructs, reflecting the operator's own presuppositions, and flawed with circularity. This is illustrated for ex., in Borza, *Shadow, cit.*, 78: "this account of early Macedonian history is based on the most skeptical analysis of literary traditions." - a statement that reveals an absence of awareness of the dangers of cultural determination and circularity and of the complex modalities of mythopoea. This simplistic perception of mythopoea also underlies Borza's (*Shadow, cit.*, 84) confident assertion: "The fact that their fifth-century B.C. kings found it desirable to impose a southern Greek overlay through the adoption of Argive lineage in no way alters the picture, beyond suggesting that fifth-century Macedonians were less certain about their Hellenic origins than are some modern writers." The only rigorous way of correlating myth with history is to study each (on the one hand the historical data, including archaeological evidence, and on the other the myths and their sets of complex meanings) totally separately, on the basis of their own appropriate methodologies, and then compare the two – bearing in mind that historical material I radically changed as it is deployed to serve mythological purposes.

independent and most important argument in my case – in Greek perceptions of ethnicity ancestry alone, we saw, was not enough to define someone as Greek; it was the most effective argument, but implicit in discourses that deployed it was the fact that those claiming to be Greek shared in the language, religion and other cultural traits that were perceived to be defining Greekness. Consequently, it would have been a necessary presupposition for Alexander’s argument about his ancestry to have been accepted by the Hellanodikai that should have lived in a place in which Greek was spoken and Greek religion was practiced – and which, at least to some extent, shared in the main lines of what could be called the Greek way of life. Herodotos’ readers certainly would have brought to bear the knowledge derived from Herodotos’ text that the Macedonians were Dorian Greeks. It is now clear that the decision of the Hellanodikai was right; the Macedonians did indeed speak Greek and practise Greek religion. The sanctuary of Demeter at Dion is one Macedonian sanctuary, a Greek sanctuary to a Greek deity, that predated the Persian Wars.⁶⁵

The notion that in terms of these other cultural traits – as opposed to ancestry – Alexander could have been judged separately from the rest of the Macedonians, and the related notion that Alexander’s admission to the Olympic Games had only involved the acknowledgment of Greekness for himself and the royal family, and not for the Macedonians as a whole, also conflicts, I will not argue, with the religious mentality articulated the Panhellenic Games. In Greece membership of a group was expressed and reinforced through cult. The Greeks saw themselves as a religious group; their common sanctuaries and sacrifices was one of the things that made them all Greek, and this identity was expressed in , and reinforced through, ritual activities in which the worshipping group was “all the Greeks,” all those who were members of a Greek polis or *ethnos*, the most important of which was the Olympic Games. Participation in the Olympic Games defined Greeks as a worshipping group, helped define Greekness, because the Panhellenic Games were the ritual shared by all Greeks.⁶⁶ At the same time, and correlatively with this, an individual’s participation in Panhellenic religion was mediated by the polis or *ethnos*; one participated in Panhellenic religion in virtue of being a member of a polis or *ethnos*.⁶⁷ To think that it would have been different for Alexander because he was the king is to impose logical schemata on a conceptual framework governed by a different mentality; for in terms of Greek mythological (and so also ethnicity shaping) mentality, kings define kingdoms – to a greater or lesser extent, in different contexts: at one end of the spectrum, Erichthonios’ autochthony and descent from Hephaistos, for example, gave all Athenians a share in autochthony and a claim to being the sons of Hephaistos;⁶⁸ at the other end, we saw, the Dorian Spartans had Herakleid Achaean kings, as did the Macedonians; but even here (in the case of the Spartan kings for which we have the evidence), the disjunction is within circumscribed parameters: kings and Dorian Spartans shared a

⁶⁵ See *supra* n. 12.

⁶⁶ Conceptually; only a small proportion were actually there, but all, or almost all, were present symbolically, since individual cities sent official embassies to the Panhellenic Games.

⁶⁷ Sourvinou-Inwood, *Polis, cit.*, 297-298

⁶⁸ Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 13.

common history since the conquest of the Peloponnese, and they certainly shared a language, religion and way of life. Since Herodotos invites us to see the Macedonian kings and the Macedonian people through the filter of the Spartan kings and the Spartan people, there can be no doubt that he perceived and presented the two relationships as isomorphic, and so that his presentation of the story about the Olympic Games did not involve assumptions in which the kings were to be perceived as radically different from the Macedonian people.

The acknowledgement of the Greekness of the Macedonians by the Hellenodikai was of fundamental importance, precisely because participation in the Olympic Games defined Greekness.⁶⁹ This acceptance, then, would have sealed the Greek ethnicity of the Macedonians in Greek perceptions, so that even those Greeks who were not familiar with them would have perceived them to be Greek. But if this is right, how can we make sense of Greek statements that appear to contradict this? Before I attempt to answer this question I will sum up the discussion on ancestry, since from now on the focus will be on statements pertaining to ethnicity.

Editor's note: the author might have noted, in this context, the fragment of an ode by Pindar in honor of Alexander I (fr 120-121). Although usually considered an enkomion rather than a victory ode, it certainly places Alexander in the mainstream of contemporary literary efforts, and just might have referred to his Olympic victory.

The earliest myth about the Macedonians' ancestry, which was generated and circulated from at least as early as the early sixth century, probably since the seventh century, in north-central Greece, the area with which the Macedonians interacted most closely, presents them (when read through archaic Greek assumptions) as Greeks, descended from an eponym who was the son of Zeus and Hellen's sister Thyia. Herodotos, the only other extant early source on the ancestry of the Macedonians, presents the Macedonian

⁶⁹ Badian, who expressed no opinion as to whether the Macedonians were Greek (see Badian, *Herodotus on Alexander*, cit., 119n.13) had pointed out (Badian, *Greeks*, cit., 36) that Macedonians do not appear in the surviving Olympic victor lists before the reign of Alexander the Great, and that Archelaos instituted "counter-Olympics" at Dion. He connects this (see Badian, *Herodotus on Alexander*, cit. 119n.13) with the Macedonian kings' desire to avoid having Macedonian noblemen compete in the Olympic Games because it would not have suited them to have their subjects recognized as equals in Hellenic descent, which would have opened up the possibility of such noblemen winning an Olympic victory. I am arguing that it had not been possible for the Macedonian royal family to have been admitted to the Olympic Games without such participation becoming open to all Macedonians. But I am sure that Badian is right that the Macedonian kings would not have been keen on, and would have discouraged, participation by their people, because of the prestige involved in an Olympic victory, as well as the networking with aristocrats from other cities and ethnē.

*Editor's note: Both Badian and the author ignore the participation, and victories, in the Olympics by Philip, and perhaps even by Archelaos, before the reign of Alexander the Great. See Moretti, *Olympionikai*, nos. 434, 439 and 445 for Philip and no. 349 for Archelaos.*

people as Dorians and the Macedonian kings as Achaean Herakleids, in an isomorphic relationship with the Spartan kings and the Spartan people; both the Macedonian and the Spartan kings were less purely Greek than their subjects. This representation of the Macedonians as Greek that has been reconstructed here is, I submit, consistent with the conceptual geography that shaped the representations articulated in, and articulating, Greek tragedies, in which Thrace represents the marginal other – especially the version in the in the fourth stasimon of Sophocles' *Antigone*, in which there are degrees in the otherness and marginality of Thrace, with the land of the Edonoi and Lykourgos, around Strymon and Mount Pangaion, being less remote and less marginal, and Salmysessos at the other end the most other and most savage.⁷⁰

Like Herodotos, Thucydides also stated that the Macedonian royal family were descended from a Herakleid: in his discussion of the history and expansion of the Macedonian kingdom⁷¹ he says that the Macedonian kings were descended from the Argive Temenos.⁷² I will not consider Thucydides' statements pertaining to the ethnicity of the Macedonians, and try to reconstruct the perceptions articulated in them. A cluster of references to the Macedonians in book 4, at 124-126, contains formulations that have given rise to the belief that Thucydides had not, or may have not, considered the Macedonians to be Greeks. There are two such formulations at 4.124.1. First, Thucydides says that Perdikkas led the Macedonian forces, ὧν ἐκράτει Μακεδόνων τὴν δύναμιν and a hoplite force of Greeks who lived in the country, τῶν ἐνοικούντων Ἑλλήνων ὀπλίτας. It has generally been thought that Thucydides sets out an opposition here between Macedonians and Greeks, with the implication that in his view the Macedonians were not Greeks.⁷³ But I submit that the contrast at 2.124.1 is not between Macedonians and Greeks, but between Macedonians on the one hand, ὧν ἐκράτει Perdikkas, and on the other non Macedonian Greeks living in Macedonia.

In the second formulation at 4.124.1 Thucydides first refers to the entire hoplite forces of the Greeks, who came to about three thousand, ξύμπαν δὲ τὸ ὀπλιτικὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων τρισχίλιοι μάλιστα, then to “the Macedonian cavalry with the Chalkidians, nearly one thousand strong,” ἱππῆς δ' οἱ πάντες ἠκολούθουν Μακεδόνων ξὺν Χαλκιδεῦσιν ὀλίγου ἐς χιλίους, “and also a great crowd of barbarians” καὶ ἄλλος ὄμιλος τῶν βαρβάρων πολὺς. It has been suggested that while just before Thucydides had made a binary distinction

⁷⁰ See C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *The fourth stasimon of Sophocles' Antigone*, in “BICS,” 36, 1989, 154, 162.

⁷¹ Thuc. 2.99-100.2; see Hornblower, *op.cit.*, 374-376 *ad loc.*

⁷² Thuc. 2.99.3.

⁷³ See the nuanced discussion in S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume II: Books IV-V.24*, Oxford 1996, 390-392 *ad loc.*, which summarized that position; Hornblower's own much more sophisticated opinion concerning all these passages in 4.124-126, is that Thucydides' view was not rigid or consistent; that if he had to choose between saying whether the Macedonians were Greeks or barbarians he would say barbarians, hence 124.1, and also 126.3; but he thought there were degrees of barbarian-ness, and in the second passage from 124.1, he meant to suggest that the Macedonians were intermediate between Greeks and utter barbarians. I will be offering a different view.

between Macedonians and Greeks, here it looks as though he is sorting into three categories, Greek, Macedonians and barbarians, with the Macedonians intermediate between Greeks and barbarians.⁷⁴ However, I would suggest that the tripartite division here is not structured by perceptions pertaining to three different types of ethnicity, but by three categories of combat forces, a categorization which partly also involved ethnicity: first, the hoplites who were Greeks from different places, who came to about three thousand; second the cavalry, which consisted of Macedonians and Chalkidians (from the Chalkidian League), who came to nearly a thousand; and finally a great crowd of barbarians, presumably lightly armed, and with or without the connotation of absence of proper military discipline, certainly to be distinguished from both hoplites and cavalry.

In the third passage, at 4.125.1, Thucydides speaks of οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν βαρβάρων. Here there is an opposition between Macedonians on the one hand and barbarians on the other, which fits perfectly the readings proposed for the two passages at 4.124.1.⁷⁵

The final passage is not in Thucydides' own voice. At 4.126.5 he sets out a speech by Brasidas to his troops, in which Brasidas refers to the Macedonians as barbarians: he speaks of the "barbarians, whom you now fear because you have no experience of them," and then says "from the contests you have had before with the Macedonians among them, τοῖς Μακεδόσιν αὐτῶν." As Hornblower noted, in such a speech by a Spartan general "a slighting reference to a recently defeated sub-group of Macedonians, . . . the Lynkestians, as barbarians is rhetorically appropriate and says nothing about Th.'s own categorization."⁷⁶ It is not the main, Perdikkas', Macedonians to whom Brasidas refers as barbarians, but the Lynkestian Macedonians.⁷⁷ Indirectly, the insult may or may not have been perceived as affecting Perdikkas' Macedonians; if it did, it would be hardly surprising that this would not have worried Brasidas or his audience, since the reason they were in a difficult position just then is because the Macedonians had ran away, together with the barbarians.

Let us consider more closely the rhetorical manipulation involved in this passage. Thucydides' Brasidas begins his speech by addressing the army as 'Peloponnesians,' while most were not Peloponnesians; he is rhetorically treating the army as a cohesive unit.⁷⁸ So the rhetorical manipulation of ethnicity begins at the very beginning in an overt way, and this sets the filters for the rest of the speech; what Brasidas is presented as doing with the Lynkestian Macedonians is the mirror image of the address: he refers to the

⁷⁴ Hornblower, *Thucydides II, cit.*, 391-392 *ad loc.*

⁷⁵ Hornblower, *Thucydides II, cit.*, 394 *ad* 4.125.1 rightly rejects a suggested emendation for this passage, which had aimed at making Thucydides' Macedonians fit into the category 'barbarians.'

⁷⁶ Hornblower, *Thucydides II, cit.*, 392 *ad* 126.3.

⁷⁷ On the Lynkestians see Hammond, *op.cit.*, 102-105; map: 58 map 8.

Editor's note: It might have been appropriate for the author to have cited Thucydides' (2.99.2) identification of the Lykneestians as one of the Macedonian tribes of the upper country.

⁷⁸ See Hornblower, *Thucydides II, cit.*, 397 *ad* 4.126.1.

opposing enemies as also one unit, barbarians, through a *pars pro toto* trope that allows him implicitly to construct the claim that the Illyrians, the barbarians whom, we are told at 125.1, everyone feared, were no different from the Lynkestian Macedonians, whom his forces had defeated before. In these circumstances, the filters through which Thucydides' readers would have made sense of his slighting reference to the Lynkestian Macedonians would have left open the question of their actual ethnicity. Given the readers' assumptions, the formulation (τοῖς Μακεδόσιν αὐτῶν) may well not have been anchored to the meaning 'from among the barbarians' for Thucydides' readers, though that meaning would have registered as a rhetorical construct; the reading may have implicitly slid to 'among the enemy.' Be that as it may, it is, in any case, clear that this passage tells us nothing about Thucydides' – or indeed Brasidas' – perceptions of the ethnicity of the Macedonians.

To sum up. On my reading, there is nothing in these passages to suggest that Thucydides thought that the Macedonians were not Greek. On the contrary, I suggest, the problem of apparent inconsistencies between the different passages disappears in the readings that construct meanings articulated by the perception that the Macedonians were Greeks. However, we have also seen an instance of the use of the term 'barbarian' being allowed to be constructed as a cultural insult against the Macedonians. After the Macedonians conquered the territories of neighboring Thracian tribes, they had absorbed many of those non Greeks, and they Hellenized people and places.⁷⁹ So the notion 'Macedonians' would have come to include a spectrum of people, from the Greek Macedonians of the kingdom which had its capital at Aigai to the not yet Hellenized Thracians of the latest conquest. However, given Greek perceptions of ethnicity, according to which people can become Greek, and did, hence the Greek identity of Greek colonies with mixed populations,⁸⁰ this did not mean that the Greek ethnic identity of the Macedonians became unstable. But this state of affairs may well have facilitated the deployment of the term 'barbarian' as a cultural insult against the Macedonians in certain polemical contexts – with the 'cultural inferiority' meaning of 'barbarian' both facilitating this and also entailing that the accusation was never clearly unambiguously about ethnicity. However, the notion that the Macedonian royal family was considered to be Greek, but the other Macedonians were barbarians (which, I argued, is a modern construct), appears at first glance to be supported by a statement of Isocrates. In *Philippus* (5) 106-108 Isocrates tells Philip that the Argive founder of the Macedonian kingdom⁸¹ had wanted a king's power, but did not pursue it in the same way as other Greeks did, by fomenting στάσεις and bringing about bloodshed in their own cities; he left the Hellenic territory and became king in Macedonia because he knew that Greeks were not accustomed to submit to monarchy, while the others cannot order their lives without some such control. And so (108) "because he along among the Greeks did not feel worthy of ruling over a people of kindred race, he alone managed to escape the dangers involved in monarchies." Thus, while those Greeks who had

⁷⁹ On the history of the Macedonian kingdom and its expansion see *supra* n. 48.

⁸⁰ I discuss some of these questions in Sourvinou-Inwood, *Hylas*, *cit.* chapter I.2.

⁸¹ See also 5.76 (Philip a Herakleid).

acquired one-man power over Greeks were destroyed, as was their γένος, he lived happily and bequeathed the kingdom to his descendants.

I will now set in place some of the parameters for the reconstruction of the main lines of the ways in which Isocrates' contemporaries would have made sense of this discourse. To begin with, Isocrates' statement is not only in conflict with Herodotos' presentation of the Macedonians, and my readings of the *Catalogue* and of Thucydides, and of the religious significance of Alexander's participation in the Olympic Games, it is also in conflict with some statements of Demosthenes, which are of interest because they articulate a rejection of the Greekness of the Macedonian royal family, which even on modern culturally determined readings is guaranteed by Alexander's participation in the Olympic Games. In one of his speeches against Philip⁸² Demosthenes claims that Philip is not only not Greek, nor related to the Greeks, he is not even a barbarian from a place that can be named with honour, but a pestilent (ὄλεθρος) Macedonian, from a place from which one couldn't even buy a good slave. This characterization, it should be noted, was presented at a time when Macedonian culture was Greek to an extent that even skeptical commentators cannot deny. Demosthenes' claim is in conflict with reality, that is, with Greek perceptions of the Macedonian royal family – even on the modern minimalist reading of Alexander's participation in the Olympic Games. Obviously, this distortion is correlative with the orator's hostility towards, and his forensic construction of contempt for, Philip. Demosthenes' remarks on Philip's ethnicity are a cultural insult, which radically distorts the generally perceived reality – partly through a reliance on an implicit blurring of the notion 'barbarian as a non Greek' and 'barbarian in the sense of uncivilized.' At 3.24 Demosthenes' rhetorical manipulation of the Macedonian kings' ethnicity is explicitly correlative with his rhetorical manipulation, and distortion, of past history.⁸³ For he claims that Perdikkas II had been a subject of the Athenians, as it was appropriate, ὡςπερ ἐστὶ προσῆκον for a barbarian to be the subject of Greeks. In fact, Perdikkas II had not been the subject of the Athenians, or anything like it.

Demosthenes' claim that Philip and the Macedonians were barbarians is correlative with his ideological desire to eliminate from the Athenians' conceptual universe any possibility that a positive paradigm of Panhellenic unity under Philip's leadership may challenge Demosthenes' presentation of reality.⁸⁴ Denying that they were Greeks was a radical strategy for achieving such elimination. Demosthenes' statements illustrate the fact that descriptions of the Macedonians as non Greeks in rhetorically charged contexts can radically distort what we would consider to be historical reality; therefore they must not be assumed to be necessarily reflecting historical

⁸² The third Philippic (Dem. 9.31; cf. also 30, 32). See also 4.10.

⁸³ On how far orators could go in manipulating history see C. Pelling, *Literary Texts and the Greek Historians*, London 2000, 61-67.

⁸⁴ I am not interested in Demosthenes' motivation, or 'real' beliefs, only in his rhetorical constructs, agenda and consequent ideological desiderata. On Demosthenes as a politician and orator see now I. Worthington (ed.), *Demosthenes: Statesmen and Orator*, London 2000.

Greek perceptions in every case in which they cannot be shown to be wrong – as they can in the case of Demosthenes’ statements.⁸⁵

Like Demosthenes, Thrasymachos also appears to have characterized a Macedonian king as a barbarian. He is said to have deployed a modified form of a formulation from Euripides’ *Telephos* in his ὑπὲρ Λαρισσάϊων “Will we, who are Greek, be slaves to the barbarian Archelaos?”⁸⁶ Since we do not know the context of the Euripidean formulation, or the context of the deployment of the modified Euripidean expression by Thrasymachos, we cannot reconstruct the ways in which the readers would have made sense of this expression. But since we know that we lack some of the assumptions they had deployed in making sense of it, we are not entitled simply (and implicitly) to assume that the meaning was straightforward, that the formulation referred to a generally accepted barbarian ethnicity for Archelaos, let alone for the Macedonian royal family as a whole, especially since such a notion is in conflict with the acknowledgment of the Greekness of (at the very least) the Macedonian royal family by the Hellenodikai. Archelaos was hardly a colourless ‘Macedonian king’ figure. He was an ally of the Athenians, who bestowed public approval on him, but he also aroused strong feelings of hostility in Platonic circles and Plato traduced him in *Gorgias* as a paradigm of an evil man.⁸⁷ His mother is said to have been a slave, though he was certainly legitimized.⁸⁸ Thrasymachos’ expression, then, would have activated knowledge of Archelaos’ mother’s (probably) barbarian origin; the raising of the issue of ethnicity (if it is right that the Greek ethnic identity of the Argeads had been firmly established) would have made his mother’s ethnicity an issue and evoked her (at least alleged) slave status. This is an insult, constructed through rhetorical manipulation of perceived reality in a hostile context, which activated the issue of one individual’s idiosyncratic parentage; it should therefore not form the basis of modern assessments of Greek perceptions of the ethnicity of the Macedonians.

I now return to Isocrates. In order to set the parameters for reconstructing the filters that will allow us to make sense of the passage in *Philippus* 106-108 as much as possible in ways similar to those of Isocrates’ contemporary Greeks we should first look at another passage from the same oration, *Philippus* 117, which involved matter for which we have better access to evidence that will allow us to chart the relationship between Isocrates’ rhetoric and the generally perceived reality. In this passage Isocrates is making a distinction between on the one hand benevolent gods who bring blessings, and who, he says, are called Olympian, and on the other those who bring punishments and disasters, who, he says, have less pleasant names; he claims that to the

⁸⁵ In reality, the reading of the evidence through filters implicitly constructed through the deployment of such statements have shaped modern perceptions of Macedonian ethnicity, in the same way as, as Hatzopoulos (*Institutions, cit.*, 49) pointed out, the rhetorically charged passage in Arr., *Anab.* 7.9.2, from a speech ascribed to Alexander, has shaped modern views of Macedonian civic institutions more than archaeological discoveries.

⁸⁶ Thrasym. D-K 85 fr. 2.

⁸⁷ *Gorgias* 470c9-471d2. See E. R. Dodds (ed.), *Plato, Gorgias*, Oxford 1959, 241-243 ad 470c9-471d2.

⁸⁸ On Archelaos see E.N. Badian, s.v. *Archelaos*, in *DNP*, I (1996), 984-985.

first group are offered temples and altars, while the second is not honoured in prayers and sacrifices but only apotropaic rites are performed, rites intending to push them away. The descriptions, especially of the second group, are somewhat vague and ambiguous. This is not an accident; it is the result of the fact that, we shall see, this statement presents a version of Greek religious realities that is polarized to the point of distortion. The vagueness of the description prevents complete identification with the relevant cultic categories, and this partly protects Isocrates' statement from total invalidation. For it was not only chthonic gods who received chthonic cult; celestial gods also received chthonic cults and chthonic deities had non chthonic cults. The real situation in Greece, that deities in each category, Olympian or chthonic, had sides and cults belonging to the other, does not correspond to Isocrates' claim. Another dissonance is that Isocrates has grouped under the second category all those deities who bring disasters and punishments, whom he contrasts to, and differentiates from, the Olympians. But in fact the gods who bring calamities and punishments are a much broader category than simply the Chthonian gods, and include at least some of the Olympians. Even the most Olympian, full of light, gods could have a dark side; Apollo, for example, was also a death bringer. We can make sense of this disparity between Isocrates' statement and Greek religious beliefs and practices when we consider the context of this statement: Isocrates is urging Philip to be benevolent towards the Greeks, arguing that benevolence makes people more well disposed toward the superior who is benevolent, while harshness is bad for those who exercise it as well as for those who suffer it. Clearly, in this context it suited his purposes to manipulate reality to make things appear much more polarized than they in fact were, to stress the binary opposition in a form exaggerated to the point of distortion of the actual beliefs and practices. This is deliberate rhetorical manipulation, a restructuring of reality that allows Isocrates to articulate implicitly the compliment that the best way of thinking of the relationship between Philip and the Greeks was on the model of that between the gods and humanity. Isocrates is doing something comparable in 106-108, where his rhetorical manipulation of reality allows him to distance the Macedonian royal family from the bad connotations of kingship and tyranny (which he subsumes under 'monarchy') in the Athenian collective representations, indeed to contrast the two to the benefit of the Macedonian monarchy. In order to construct this contrast he has deployed the scheme 'Macedonians as barbarians,' a cultural insult reversing an anti-Macedonian schema into a pro-Macedonian royal family one. But even in this exaggerated rhetoric, he does not use the word 'barbarian' to refer to the Macedonians – though he does contrast them to the Greeks: at 107 τούς μὲν Ἑλληνας . . . τοὺς δ' ἄλλους includes the Macedonians, and also Macedonia is contrasted to ὁ τόπος ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς, and at 108 the Macedonian king rules over an οὐχ ὁμόφυλον γένος. At 5.154, Isocrates says that Philip should εὐεργετεῖν the Greeks, βασιλεύειν over the Macedonians and ἄρχειν over as many barbarians as possible. The assumptions underlying the distinction between Greeks and Macedonians is obvious here: Philip is king of the Macedonians, Isocrates obviously does not want him to be king of all the other Greeks.

In these circumstances, I conclude that in the archaic and classical period the Macedonians perceived themselves to be Greeks and were also perceived to be Greeks by the other Greeks. When they first became involved in affairs

that concerned the Southern Greeks, and then major players in Southern Greek politics, their ethnicity became open to rhetorical manipulation, or rather, they became vulnerable to the cultural insult 'barbarian,' with the help of the deployment of the 'cultural inferiority' meaning of 'barbarian', so that the accusation was not unambiguously about ethnicity. It is not that perceptions of the Greekness of the Macedonians became unstable; it was the acknowledgement of their Greekness that became unstable at the level of rhetoric, it was manipulated as a weapon. But in Greek eyes the Greek identity of the Macedonians was indelibly sealed through their admittance as participants in the Panhellenic Games, which in the Greek collective representations defined Greekness, and defined not simply the individual, but also, I hope to have made clear, his *polis* or *ethnos*, as Greek.

Appendix: Deconstructing a construct

Borza pays lip service to the dangers of attempting to define ethnicity on the basis of archaeological evidence,⁸⁹ but he uses archaeological evidence to support his thesis that the Macedonians were not Greek in his argument concerning the Late Bronze Age.⁹⁰ For he claims that there are no "genuine Mycenaean settlements" in Macedonia, just imports and local imitations of Mycenaean pottery, and that this places "an additional burden" on those who think that the Macedonians were Greek later; for "If the roots of the Greek world lie in the Mycenaean period, but Macedonia is not part of the Mycenaean world, where are the Greek roots of Macedonia? That is, if Macedonia was not 'Greek' in the Late Bronze Age, when and under what circumstances did it become Greek?" This argument, and his underlying assumption, that unless we identify through the material culture whether the Macedonians were, or 'became' Greek, in the Late Bronze, or the Early Iron, Age it is difficult to believe that they were Greek in the historical period, are, I will now try to show, deeply flawed.

First, B. Speaks of Macedonia 'being' Greek rather than the Macedonians perceiving themselves and/or being perceived by other Greeks as Greek – or not Greek, as the case may be – which we saw, is the only meaningful issue. Then, through the deployment of the hazy notion "the roots of the Greek world lie in the Mycenaean period" B. implicitly, through suggestion, makes the presence of Mycenaean material culture into a diagnostic index of Greek ethnicity in the historical period. But a series of arguments invalidate this construct. To begin with, the ways in which "the roots of the Greek world" can be said to "lie in the Mycenaean period" are extremely complex, and pertain above all to Greek perceptions of the heroic age; what matters is not the historical realities concerning the ethnicity of a particular region in the Mycenaean period, but the perceptions (in that region, and among the other Greeks) in the historical period pertaining to that ethnicity. Of course historical realities contributed to the creation of such perceptions, but the relationships between the two are complex and shifting, and they most certainly do not involve a simple equation. Furthermore, a consideration of, first, the distribution of known Mycenaean settlements, and second, of the

⁸⁹ Borza, *Before Alexander*, cit., 38.

⁹⁰ Borza, *Before Alexander*, cit., 30-31.

complex upheavals in the transition between the Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age and in the Early Iron Age,⁹¹ both suggest that the notion that the presence of Mycenaean settlements in the Late Bronze Age is a diagnostic index of Greek ethnicity in the historical period is very unlikely to be correct.

B.'s belief that he can determine whether or not Macedonia 'was' Greek in the Mycenaean period on the basis of whether or not there had been Mycenaean settlements might have had some validity if Mycenaean material culture had been brought from outside by a newly arrived group of incomers that could be identified as 'the Greeks,' since in that case its absence would have shown that those incomers had not settled in a particular region. However, Mycenaean material culture developed out of Middle Helladic culture with the help of Minoan influences, with localized features eventually becoming combined to create a kind of koine. This complex culture, I need hardly mention, was only one possible development out of Middle Helladic culture. The handmade matt-painted pottery that characterizes the area that concerns us, Macedonia west of the Axios river, had also developed out of the Middle Helladic tradition.⁹² I must stress that the area that concerns us is Macedonia west of the Axios, for B.'s contention about Mycenaean culture and later ethnicity in Macedonia should implicate only the area inhabited by the Macedonians in the early period;⁹³ It is this area that, given his argument, he needs to show was non-Greek in the Late Bronze Age. It is not without interest that the Axios is the cultural boundary⁹⁴ for the distribution of the matt-painted handmade pottery that developed out of Middle Helladic pottery, a development alternative to that which (under Minoan influence) had created Mycenaean pottery – which was then both imported and imitated in Macedonia.

The central problem implicated in B.'s argument, is one which he has not even considered: 'what does it mean to be Greek in the Mycenaean period'? We do not know that there was a Mycenaean notion of Greekness at all; but if there was, judging both from historical Greek perceptions of ethnicity and from cross-cultural parallels, Greekness would not have been equated with sharing an identical material culture – which is a marginal defining trait that pertained above all to its reflection of a common way of life, which is difficult enough to determine even in the historical period. Macedonian language in the Mycenaean period is inaccessible to us, and religion virtually so – though further finds, and a systematic study of all the relevant material may give

⁹¹ These, in my opinion, had included various small population movements from the periphery of the Mycenaean world into southern Greece, which eventually became mythologized into the construct 'unified Dorian invasion' in the construction of a discourse of Dorian ethnicity (see briefly on this, and on the construction of Dorian ethnicity in Herodotos (which, we saw, involved also the Macedonians) Sourvinou-Inwood, *Herodotos, cit.* and n. 109).

⁹² L. Stefani – N. Meroussis, *Incised and Matt-painted Pottery from Late Bronze Age Settlements in Western Macedonia: Technique, Shapes and Decoration*, in R. Laffineur – P. P. Betancourt (eds.), *TEXNH: Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age*, Liège 1997, 357.

⁹³ See *supra* n. 15.

⁹⁴ Stefani – Meroussis, *art.cit.*, 357.

some answers. Limitations of space prevent me from setting out what I think may be deduced on the basis of the present, extremely limited, evidence with regard to religion and way of life in Late Bronze Age Macedonia west of the Axios – or indeed of attempting to define the modalities of penetration and deployment of Mycenaean material culture in the different parts of Late Bronze Age Macedonia.⁹⁵ But if the inhabitants of the area that concerns us had spoken Greek and had a Greek religious system – with local variations, like the other religious systems of Mycenaean Greece – they would have perceived themselves, and the other Greeks would have perceived them, to be Greek.

In these circumstances, it is clear that the available evidence cannot tell us anything about the ethnicity of the inhabitants of Macedonia west of the Axios in the Late Bronze Age, and it most certainly does not allow the conclusion that the Macedonians were not Greek in the Mycenaean period – let alone offer any support for the notion that they were not Greek in the historical period.

Editor's note: The author might have pointed out that Borza's unhappy theory – that the absence of Mycenaean settlements in the prehistoric period in Macedonia indicates the absence of Greeks in the historic period – if applied elsewhere would mean that there were never Greeks in Magna Graecia, very few in Ionia, etc.

⁹⁵ Though I should perhaps mention that Mycenaean pottery is more widely distributed than would have been the case with prestige goods for the elites [cf. E. Kiriati – S. Andreou – S. Dimitriadis – K. Kotsakis, *Co-existing Traditions: Handmade and Wheelmade Pottery in Late Bronze Age Central Macedonia*, in Laffineur – Betancourt (eds.), *op.cit.* 366, for Central Macedonia].