



INTERNATIONAL
HELLENIC
UNIVERSITY

ALEXANDER I IN THE HISTORIES OF HERODOTUS

ELEFThERIA TSOLAKI

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES

A thesis submitted for the degree of

***Master of Arts (MA) in Classic Archaeology & Ancient History of
Macedonia***

February 2018
Thessaloniki – Greece

Student Name: Eleftheria Tsolaki
SID: 2204160008
Supervisor: Dr. Ioannis Xydopoulos

I hereby declare that the work submitted is mine and that where I have made use of another's work, I have attributed the source(s) according to the Regulations set in the Student's Handbook.

February 2018
Thessaloniki – Greece
2

Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Preface.....	5
Acknowledgements	6
1. The image of Alexander in Herodotus.....	6
1.1 The image of Alexander in Herodotus.....	6
1.2 The Persians in Macedonia, Amyntas I and the young Alexander	9
2. Herodotus and Macedonia.....	13
3. MACEDONIA AND THE ACHAEMENID EMPIRE.....	21
4. Alexander I as “Proxenos” and “Euergetes” of Athens.	35
4.1 Proxeny in the Greek world.....	35
4.2 Alexander I as proxenos and euergetes of Athens.....	37
5. Macedonia after the Persian retreat.....	42
6. The conquest of Bisaltia and the Macedonian eastern boundaries.....	49
Conclusions.....	57
Bibliography.....	62

Abstract

This dissertation was written as part of the MSc in Classic Archaeology & Ancient History of Macedonia at the International Hellenic University. The aim of the proposed thesis is to examine the history of ancient Macedonia and the early Temenid Kings. The main focus of this paper will be on the Macedonian King Alexander I in the Histories of Herodotus. As it is common knowledge Herodotus is one of the most important historians and there is no doubt why Cicero called him the father of History. Herodotus' work "Histories" which is a record of his "inquiry" describes many issues concerning the Greco- Persian wars, including a wealth of geographical and ethnographical information. It is crucial to underline the fact that he was the first historian who tried to treat historical subjects as a method of investigation. Moreover, the Histories of Herodotus are thought to be the most significant and contemporary source that informs us about Alexander I and about the early history of Macedonia.

In the following chapters I will try to shed light on various aspects concerning the relations of the early Macedonian Kingdom with the Persians and with the northern Greeks as well, the personality and the role of Alexander as King of Macedonia, Alexander I's activities during the Persian wars, the status quo of Macedonia during the Persian occupation and the role of Macedonia during the period after the Persian withdrawal.

In order to present these aspects, all available sources will be taken into consideration. The sources that will be studied are ancient literary sources, such as Herodotus who is the main and basic source concerning the history of early Macedonia and modern bibliography is examined too. Furthermore archaeological and coinage evidence will be also taken into consideration as a really helpful tool.

Eleftheria Tsolaki

22/02/2018

Preface

The early history of Macedonia is a very interesting period, and the study of Ancient Macedonia contains many interesting and important topics for research. Despite the fact that many scholars have tried to shed light on the early history of the so called Temenid Kings of Macedonia many aspects of the early Macedonian history still remain ambiguous and controversial. In the beginning of my dissertation I would like to make a brief introduction about Alexander I as a King and his importance as a personality of his time. What is more, Alexander I is known in history books as Alexander Philhellene. It is most probable that he was given the nickname many years after he died. It is possible that the choice of the nickname was influenced by the image of Alexander I as the benefactor of Greece .

As far as Alexander I is concerned I would like to refer that he was the King of Macedonia since 495 B.C until 454 B.C and he was the son of Amyntas I . At his young age Alexander expressed his anger during a sumposium ,that his father Amyntas prepared, in order to honour the Persian ambassadors of the King of Persia Megabastus and Herodotus claimed that Alexander he himself and his fellows were dressed up as women and assassinated them. However, this story is considered to be fictitious by many scholars.

In the following part of my dissertation I would like to analyze the way in which Alexander I is portrayed in the Histories of Herodotus and for what reason Herodotus seems to be friendly to the Macedonians. It is clear that Herodotus in his work presents Alexander I exclusively in the context of their relations with the Persians and his efforts to construct his image in the eyes of the Southern Greeks. In the following part of my dissertation I am going to present that Alexander was claimed as “proxenos” and benefactor “euergetes” by the Athenians . Furthermore, Alexander was submissive to the Persians as well as an ally of them . Due to this fact he was claimed as “ proxenos “ by the Athenians he was a good candidate. Thus, Alexander was a faithful ally of the Persians as to Mardonius since the latter decided to send him on a mission to the Athenians and he was considered to be a good

candidate. I will continue my dissertation by referring to the situation in Macedonia after the retreat of the Persian army from Macedonia and I will also refer to the expansion of the Macedonian Kingdom up to Bisaltia.

The aim of my dissertation is to examine carefully each source of the Histories of Herodotus concerning Alexander I and I will analyze all the topics I mentioned above. Also, my main target is through my research to draw conclusions that will be accurate and that will prove the importance of my historical research.

Acknowledgements

At this point, I shall warmly thank my supervisor, Ioannis Xydopoulos, firstly because he was the person who inspired my interest in order to make the choice of my topic and secondly for all the assistance and guidance that he provided during the writing of the current paper. Moreover, I cordially thank the great team of Professors in the International Hellenic University in Thessaloniki for all their hard and enthusiastic work, while I would especially like to thank Dr. Nikolaos Akamatis for his great guidance throughout my MA studies. Last but not least, I would like to thank my fellow students and great friends for making this MA course even more interesting and for all their amazing encouragement.

1. The image of Alexander in Herodotus

1.1 The image of Alexander in Herodotus

Herodotus was born in Halicarnassus circa 484 B.C.¹ According to the *Lexicon of Suda*,² he was the son of Lyxes and Dryo or Rhaeo and his brother was Theodorus. Also, it is stated that he was related to Panyassis, who was an epic poet of the time. Moreover, he was called “The Father of History” by the Roman writer and orator

¹Lexicon of Suda, 482.

²Lexicon of Suda, 482.

Cicero.³ Despite the fact that Herodotus is well known for his work (“The Histories”) little do we know about his personal life that is why we should examine in brief the sources given about his life.

As far as ‘Herodotus’ sources are concerned, firstly we take information by himself because he travelled extensively thus and he tends to use the term “autopsy of a location” in many cases. Herodotus claims that he travelled to numerous places such as the coastal area of Asia Minor up to the Black sea as well as Babylonia, Mesopotamia and Egypt,⁴ and he used many witnesses from whom he extracted his information with great attention, that is why some scholars consider him a great journalist. In addition, Herodotus might have visited Macedonia. Also, Herodotus was the first who made extensive use of geographical, archaeological and historical information in his writing. The main topic was the Persian Wars and his work is thought to be accurate and is preferred for its enchanting and simplistic character.

It is of utmost importance to stress the fact that it has been a matter of contention amongst scholars to what extent Herodotus supported and expressed the dynastic tradition at the court of Alexander I.⁵ First of all, we have to set it clear that Herodotus did not refer to a great extent to Macedonian history in his work, albeit he was interested more in the Athenian and the Persian.⁶ Moreover, according to Badian,⁷ it seems that Herodotus in his work refers to Alexander I as he was the only Macedonian that was related to the events of the war that he described in his books. To begin with, Alexander I is presented initially as a Macedonian who participated in the Olympic Games and this is an important proof of the Greekness of the King of Macedonia⁸. According to Herodotus the other athletes of the race denied the right of Alexander to participate in the Games because he was barbarian. So Alexander

³ Mark 2009.

⁴ Fehling 1994, 1-15; Rood 2006, 291.

⁵ Sprawski 2010, 129.

⁶ Badian 1994, 107.

⁷ Badian 1994, 107.

⁸ Xydopoulos 1998, 50.

proved his Greekness claiming that his descent comes from Argos⁹ and he was accepted by the judges of the Olympic Committee. Alexander's participation in the Games is ambiguous but the majority of the scholars accept it as a real incident¹⁰ as the fragments of an ode of Pindarus for Alexander's victory in the Games indicate.¹¹ It is crucial to underline that the most probable date of his participation in the Olympics is about 496 B.C.¹² when Alexander was young enough to cope with the needs of the race. Another possible date is about 476 when Greeks celebrated their freedom after the Persian wars. It was the perfect occasion for Alexander to present himself as a member of the victorious side and to increase his influence among the Greek world.¹³

Obviously, Herodotus tries to present both Alexander I and his father Amyntas I in matters of their relationship with the Persians. The historian refers to Alexander's endeavor to create a better impression on the Southern Greeks.¹⁴ In addition, as for the general image of Alexander in the Histories of Alexander, it is obvious that in his book,¹⁵ Alexander I managed to prove that he originated from Argos. Moreover, as far as the events between 480-479 B.C are concerned Herodotus, underlines the help that Alexander provided to the Southern Greeks during the Persians wars as well as the expression of his Greek consciousness.¹⁶ It is also said recently that Herodotus adopted the *intepretatio Macedonica*, which most possibly would have heard from Alexander I, in his attempt to bridge the gap with the Greek world.¹⁷ Therefore, we must note that if Herodotus had tried to enhance the image of Alexander I, this would have been rejected by the majority of the

⁹Herodotus V.22.

¹⁰ Cole 1978, 39; Sprawski 2010, 142.

¹¹Sprawski 2010, 140.

¹²Hammond- Griffith1979,60; Borza1990, 111.

¹³ Sprawski 2010, 142; Kertész 2005, 115-126.

¹⁴Sprawski 2010, 131.

¹⁵Herodotus V.22.

¹⁶Xydopoulos1998, 52.

¹⁷Xydopoulos 1998, 52.

people and we may say that it would have been considered unbelievable.¹⁸ In particular, it has been expressed that Herodotus was the mouthpiece for Alexander's propaganda which is considered to be totally inaccurate according to Scaife's opinion¹⁹. Furthermore, it is obvious that Herodotus was convinced that Alexander was of Greek origin. Thus, Herodotus could more easily support and present the king not only as Macedonian but, also as a Greek as well. By all means he is presented as a king who betrayed the Persians and consequently a thwart to real Greek heroism²⁰. It is clear that Alexander's propaganda was based on Alexander's Greek roots and as a consequence of this his crucial role as a "secret friend" and protector of the Greeks during Xerxes' campaign.²¹

1.2 The Persians in Macedonia, Amyntas I and the young Alexander

Initially, it is of great importance to underline that Herodotus, refers that Amyntas I was the ruler of the Macedonian kingdom at the period of time around 512 B.C , while the Persians managed to conquer the Paeonians²². As a result, the strength of the Paeonians who were mixed with the Thracians was reduced to a great extent and the population of the Paeonians moved to Asia. Then Megabazus agreed to make peace with the Thracians and reported that he would send as soon as possible an embassy to Amyntas, who was the king of Macedonians at that period of time²³. However, Herodotus is mostly attracted by Alexander I who has ruled from 495 (or 498) to 454 B.C.²⁴ , also we are informed that Alexander I had under his

¹⁸Xydopoulos 1998, 52-53.

¹⁹Scaife 1989, 129.

²⁰Scaife 1989, 134.

²¹Vasilev 2015, 41.

²²Sprawski 2010, 131.

²³Borza 1990, 100.

²⁴Sprawski 2010, 131.

control an area where silver was minted on Mount Dysoron , and its location was next to lake Prasias in the Strymon valley²⁵.

It was possibly around 513 BC when Darius and his Persian forces penetrated into Europe crossing Hellespont.²⁶ Their mission was to defeat Scythians and to conquer Thrace. Having completed successfully his will the Persian King returned to Asia while Megabazus remain in Europe as leader of the Persian troops.²⁷ About 511 or 512 BC the Persian army occupied the territories into the Strymon basin defeating Paeonians who had created in that area an important and influential state. The population of Paeonians has been sent to settle in Asia while the area between Axios and Strymonas rivers was inhabited by Thracian tribes.²⁸ At the same time Macedonians took advantage of the Paeonian defeat occupying the areas of Amphaxitis and of Anthemus valley.²⁹

About 510 BC Megabazus sent an embassy to Macedonian king Amyntas, consisting of seven Persian nobles, asking for “earth and water” for king Darius.³⁰ Despite the fact that Herodotus does not mention exactly where the meeting of the Persian embassy with Amyntas took place it is sensible to assume that the Macedonian capital Aegae was the most appropriate place for the negotiations.³¹ According to Herodotus Amyntas succumbed to the Persians’ will and invited their envoys to have a feast so as to welcome them. During the feast the Persian envoys were drunk and asked for female company. Despite the fact that Macedonians didn’t have a similar custom, Amyntas in order to please them asked women to enter the room where the celebration was taking place. However, Alexander, Amyntas’ son felt

²⁵Herodotus V.17.

²⁶Borza1990, 101·Sprawski 2010, 134· Olbrycht 2010, 343.

²⁷ Sprawski 2010, 134.

²⁸ Errington 1986, 139· Borza1990, 87-88, 101· Sprawski 2010, 134-135.

²⁹Hammond- Griffith1979, 58· Borza1990, 88, 100.

³⁰ Herodotus V.17. Hammond- Griffith1979, 58-59· Scaife 1989, 132- 133· Borza1990, 88, 100-101· Sprawski 2010, 135-136· Olbrycht 2010, 343·

Vasilev 2015, 109-110.

³¹Borza1990, 88, 101.

really insulted and he took over the whole thing; he decided to disguise his male friends as women, so that the Persians would be punished for their arrogance towards the king of Macedonia. The young Alexander preserved the young men, all dressed up as females, saying that these Macedonian women are a special gift for the Persian nobles from the Greek man who rules Macedonians (*ὡς ἀνήρ Ἕλληνα, Μακεδόνων ὑπαρχος*³²). After that the disguised young men slaughtered the Persian envoys and their servants. Their bodies were thrown, their equipment completely destroyed and everything related to Persian envoys and their traces had vanished.³³ According to Herodotus very soon after the failure of the embassy a Persian mission came to search for the vanished envoys Alexander managed to save his life and his country. It is referred that he gave a sum to the Persians and moreover that he gave his sister Gygaea as wife of the leader of the Persian mission Bubares.³⁴ The marriage between Gygaea and Bubares is also referred by Justin in a more “romantic” view. It is said that Bubares fell in love with Gygaea.³⁵

The above mentioned story about the murder of the seven Persian envoys has been characterized as unhistorical and as a tale and has been rejected by the vast majority of scholars.³⁶ A crucial point that has raised doubts about the accuracy of Herodotus story, is the fact that he doesn't refer to the place where the meeting took place, where the Persian envoys demanded “earth and water” for their King Darius. It is thought that the exact place of the meeting was most probably Aegae, the capital of the Macedonian Kingdom at that period of time.³⁷ Moreover Herodotus does not refer to the names of the Persian nobles as he normally does on other occasions.³⁸ Also, it has been argued that under no circumstances could

³²Herodotus V.20.

³³ Herodotus V.19-21.

³⁴ Herodotus V.21.

³⁵ Justin 7.3.9-4.1.

³⁶Hammond- Griffith1979, 59· Errington 1986, 142· Scaife 1989, 133·Borza1990, 102· Badian 1994, 108· Sprawski 2010, 136. Vasilev 2015, 109.

³⁷Borza,1990, 101.

³⁸ Badian 1994, 108.

Alexander not have respected his father's opinion as there is no possibility that a prince would have acted in such a way without taking his father's permission.³⁹ Amyntas is completely absent in the text of Herodotus. We know that he offered Anthemous at about 510 BC to Hippias who has been exiled from Athens. As a result the absence of Amyntas and the underestimation of his role during so crucial moments for Macedonia is at least suspicious.⁴⁰ Furthermore the reaction of the Persian king would be much stronger if the Macedonians had killed seven of his most important officers.

Consequently, most probably this story was a tale that was invented in order to enhance the character of Alexander,⁴¹ thus Herodotus and his history was the best way that could manage and display the character of Alexander. For this reason the story is considered to be part of Alexander's "propaganda"⁴² and has been doubted for many years by many scholars as it doesn't seem credible enough. What is more, it is crucial to add that Herodotus' source might have been Alexander himself of course if we accept that Herodotus really visited Macedonia.

On the other hand, there are a number of scholars who believe that Herodotus merely wrote down what he was told,⁴³ as he gave much attention to the eye - witness testimony. While, some others support that the story has a sperm of truth⁴⁴ as the marriage of Gygaea, the daughter of King Amyntas and sister of Alexander with the King Bubares seems really acceptable and thus trustworthy.⁴⁵ But was Alexander competent to marry his sister as the herodotean text refers to since Amyntas was still king of Macedonia?

³⁹Borza,1990, 102.

⁴⁰ Sprawski 2010, 136.

⁴¹Borza,1990,102.

⁴²Scaife 1989, 133· Borza,1990,102.

⁴³Sprawski,2010 ,136

⁴⁴ Herodotus V-21.

⁴⁵ Errington 1986, 141·Borza1990, 103· Badian 1994, 109· Olbrycht 2010, 343·

Sprawski 2010, 136· Vasilev 2015, 112.

Moreover, it is common knowledge that Macedonians had as a custom to exploit marriages with foreigners in order to succeed in their ultimate goals concerning either political issues or diplomatic ones.⁴⁶ As a result, this marriage might have given Amyntas crucial territorial benefits, which were considered to be of a great strategic importance and in particular the areas that were called Amphaxitis, Pella, Ichnae and a part of Mygdonia.⁴⁷

What is more, it is clearly stated that, due to the marriage of Bubares with Gygaea, the Macedonians and the Persians possibly had close bonds of friendship and had a peaceful collaboration when the Macedonians were subjugated to the Persians until the period of Xerxes and Darius.⁴⁸ On the contrary, Herodotus doesn't refer much to this fact and the most possible reason is that he felt more sympathy for Alexander. Nevertheless, the friendship of Macedonians and Persians was of great importance and needs to be underlined and taken into account.⁴⁹

Apart from the matter of the truthfulness of the Herodotean text modern scholars have also tried to figure out the real facts behind the tale and to shed light on various other issues such as the status of Macedonia and the relations between Persians and Macedonians before the campaign of Mardonius, the role of Alexander I and his propaganda, the wedding of Gygaea with Bubares etc. All the above mentioned issues will be discussed in the next chapters.

2. Herodotus and Macedonia

Herodotus is among the most important sources for the history of the ancient Greek world and the main source concerning the history of the early Macedonian

⁴⁶Borza 1990,103.

⁴⁷Hammond- Griffith1979, 59.

⁴⁸Sprawski 2010, 136.

⁴⁹Hammond- Griffith1979, 59.

kingdom. In the frame of his history Herodotus gives mostly piecemeal but very interesting and important information that can shed light upon the activities of the Macedonian kings, the participation and the role of Macedonia during the war with the Persian Empire, the relations of the Macedonians with the Persians, the neighboring tribes and the rest of the Greek world, the land of the Macedonian kingdom as well as upon other political, social and ethnological issues. Despite the fact that some facts and events that are described by the ancient historian have been rejected or have been characterized as questionable or controversial by modern scholars, the Herodotean text remains the most important and the basic source for everyone who is interested in the early Macedonian history. It is of utmost importance to stress here that Herodotus did not write a “history of Macedonia”. The main topic of the Herodotean text is the Great War between the allied Greek forces and the Persians. Since Herodotus was more interested in the Athenian and the Persian history, the references related to Macedonia are mostly piecemeal and incidental digressions in connection with military events and crucial moments of the Great War. Herodotus was very interested in Alexander’s personality. The ancient historian possibly has been aroused by Alexander’s double game during the war, his attitude as a king subjected to Persia, his will to support the Greeks during crucial moments of the war, his relations with Athens and possibly his connection with some Athenian officers. As a result Alexander is presented as the main and the only member of the Macedonian Royal house that participated in the war, while Alexander I’s activities are stressed by Herodotus as he appears at some important and crucial points of the war.

Alexander’s first appearance in the Herodotean text is in connection with the murder of the seven Persian envoys that were sent to king Amyntas, Alexander’s father, to ask for “earth and water”. As we have seen and analyzed in the previous chapter, Alexander slaughtered the Persian envoys and their servants, while their bodies were thrown, their equipment completely destroyed and everything related to the Persian envoys and their traces had vanished.⁵⁰ Although according to

⁵⁰ Herodotus V.17-21.

Herodotus very soon after the failure of the embassy a Persian mission came to search for the vanished envoys, Alexander managed to save his life and his country by offering a sum to the Persians and his sister Gygaea as wife of Bubares.⁵¹

In V. 22, Herodotus mentions the participation of Alexander in the Olympic games. According to the Herodotean text, the other athletes of the race denied the right of Alexander to participate in the Games because he was barbarian. Thus Alexander proved his Greekness, claiming that his descent comes from Argos⁵² and he was accepted by the judges of the Olympic Committee. As it has been analyzed in the previous chapter Alexander's participation in the Olympic Games still remains ambiguous and controversial. Xydopoulos suggests that this Herodotean reference is possibly a Macedonian invention, the basic aim of which was to stress the Greek Origin of the Macedonian Royal house and to bridge the gap with the rest of the Greek world.⁵³ Other Scholars (see chapter 1) accept as real incident the participation of Alexander in the Olympic Games claiming that this event possibly took place either in 496 or in 476 BC.⁵⁴

In VII. 173, the secret message of Alexander to the allied Greek forces at Tempe is mentioned. According to Herodotus, Greeks got together at Isthmus in order to decide how they were going to face the Persians. The Thessalians asked for the help of Greeks claiming that otherwise they were going to submit to Xerxes. Greeks accepted to help Thessaly and decided that the best place for defence and to face the large army of Xerxes was the narrow mountainous passage of Tempe valley between mountains Olympus and Ossa. As a result ten thousand Greek soldiers encamped at Tempe valley in order to defend the passage. According to Herodotus Greeks decided to retreat for two reasons. At first Macedonian king Alexander I sent envoys to the Greeks to inform them about the power of the Persian forces and

⁵¹ Herodotus V.21.

⁵² Herodotus V.22.

⁵³ Xydopoulos 1998, 50-51. Sprawski 2010, 142; Kertész 2005, 115-126.

⁵⁴ Cole 1978, 39; Hammond- Griffith 1979, 60; Borza 1990, 111; Sprawski 2010, 142; Kertész 2005, 115-126.

furthermore to warn them about their possible destruction since the Persian army was much stronger and more multitudinous than the Greek. The second and the main reason that caused the Greek retreat was the fact that they realized that there were also other passages leading to Thessaly and as a result the Tempi valley could be bypassed and there was the possibility of the Greek army being surrounded by enemy forces.⁵⁵

After the Greek defeat at Thermopylae, the Persian army penetrated into southern Greece. According to Herodotus, the Persians plundered the area of Phocis and then reached Boeotia. Boeotian cities have been saved due to Macedonians who had been sent by Alexander and they informed Xerxes that they had already medized and they will support the Persians.⁵⁶

Alexander is also connected with some incidents before the battle of Plataea. According to Herodotus, Alexander has been sent to the Athenians by Mardonius as an envoy for alliance. Mardonius chose Alexander because his sister was married with the Persian noble Bubares and, furthermore, because of the connection between Alexander and the Athenians, who had proclaimed the Macedonian king as euergetes and proxenus of their city. Alexander's speech before the Athenians is very interesting. He claimed that if Athens accepted the alliance, they would have the opportunity to govern their city according to their own laws, while that the Athenian sanctuaries that had been destroyed by Persian would be rebuilt by the Great King. Moreover, he tried to convince the Athenians to accept the offer emphasizing that there was no hope for Greece and that it was impossible to beat the strong Persian army. Spartan envoys gave a speech before the Athenians and asked them not to betray Greece. Athenians rejected the Persian offer and warned Alexander not to repeat such an offer in the future.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Herodotus VII.173. Borza1990, 107-108· Vasilev 2015, 188-190.

⁵⁶ Herodotus VIII.32-34.

⁵⁷ Herodotus VIII. 140-143.

Before the description of Alexander's mission to Athens as a Persian envoy is mentioned the ancestry of Alexander and it stresses his Greekness. According to Herodotus the Macedonian-Temenid Royal house was established by Perdikkas I, who was of Argive origin and descendant of Temenos.⁵⁸ Later at IX. 44-45 another incident is also described. According to the Herodotean text during the night on the eve of the crucial battle of Plataea Alexander left on horseback the Persian camp, reached the Greek one asking for an audience with the Athenian generals. Before the generals he claimed that he is also a Greek and that he is concerned about the future of Greece and that he does not want Greece to be enslaved. Moreover, he informed the Greeks that Mardonius will attack them the next morning. Furthermore, he stressed that if the Greeks are going to win they will have to remember his risky action and that he exposed himself to a great danger for them.⁵⁹ Moreover in VIII.121, it is mentioned that Alexander dedicated a gold statue at Delphi next to the statue that the allied Greeks dedicated to celebrate their victory over the Persians.

Based on the above mentioned Herodotean references it could be stressed that Herodotus attitude is clearly pro-Macedonian. By all means Alexander is presented as a king who betrayed the Persians and became "secret friend" and protector of the Greeks during Xerxes' campaign.⁶⁰ Alexander's double game is obvious. On the one hand he submitted to the Great King without resistance and on the other hand he is presented not only as worrying about the future of Greece and its possible enslavement by the Persians but also to act too risky in order to help and to support the Greeks as the incident at Tempe and his nocturnal visit to the Greek camp on the eve of the battle of Plataea indicate. Another issue that is highlighted in the Herodotean text is the Greekness of Alexander. He is presented as a Greek and Macedonian king who managed to be accepted to participate in the Olympic Games

⁵⁸ Herodotus VIII. 137-139.

⁵⁹ Herodotus IX.44-45.

⁶⁰ Vasilev 2015, 41.

by proving that he is of Argive origin. Moreover Herodotus mentions the ancestry of the Temenid Royal House as another evidence of Alexander's Greek nationality.

The personality and the activities of Alexander I aroused the interest of scholars who tried to explain the pro-Macedonian attitude of Herodotus. Scaife argues that Herodotus was not the mouthpiece for Alexander's propaganda⁶¹ and that Alexander's actions during the war were not of crucial importance, but their publication after the war was really useful in order to strengthen his philhellenic reputation.⁶² Badian believes that mainly the tale of the murder of the Persian envoys was an invention of the Macedonian propaganda in order to cover the submission to the Persians and the marriage between Alexander's sister and Bubares and as an excuse for the Macedonian medism.⁶³ Moreover Badian points that Herodotus himself downgrades Alexander's advice at Tempe since the Greeks retreated because they realized that there were also other passages leading to Thessaly and as a result the Tempe valley could be bypassed and there was the possibility the Greek army to be surrounded by enemy forces.⁶⁴ Furthermore, he claims that Herodotus mentions in purpose the Greek origin of Alexander twice in conjunction with two actions related to his medism, the marriage of his sister and his mission as a Persian envoy to Athens in order to muddy the waters.⁶⁵ Additionally, he believes that Herodotus disapproved the Macedonian medism and stresses only the events that indicate the philhellenic attitude of the Herodotean text. Borza claims that we have to reject the stories of the murder of Persian envoys, the nocturnal ride of Alexander at Plataea and of his participation in the Olympic Games. He believes that these stories have been created by Alexander himself possibly during the postwar period in order to build a connection with the Hellenic world.⁶⁶ It is also recently said that Herodotus adopted the *intepretatio Macedonica*, which

⁶¹Scaife 1989, 129.

⁶² Scaife 1989, 131.

⁶³ Badian1994,107.

⁶⁴ Badian1994,117.

⁶⁵ Badian1994,119-120.

⁶⁶Borza1990, 114.

most possibly would have been heard from Alexander I, in his attempt to bridge the gap with the Greek world.⁶⁷

Herodotus was very well informed regarding the activities of Alexander I and the Temenid dynasty as his history implies. Possibly he visited Macedonia as it could be indicated by his work itself and by the reference of the Lexicon of Suda.⁶⁸ The exact date of his arrival in Macedonia is not clear. It should be dated possibly during the last years of the reign of Alexander or in the beginning of Perdikkas II reign. According to Borza it possibly happened about 450 BC. There Herodotus had the chance to be informed about the Macedonian court tradition and the Macedonian version of Alexander's activities. If we assume that Herodotus just adopted and wrote the *intepretatio Macedonica* and that Alexander was a trusty ally of the Persians then several questions could be raised. Moreover, as far as the events between 480-479 BC are concerned Herodotus, underlines the help that Alexander provided to the Southern Greeks during the Persian wars as well as the expression of his Greek consciousness. We firmly believe that if Herodotus had tried to enhance the image and the prestige of Alexander I by mentioning completely false elements and by forging the history, this would have been rejected by the majority of the people and we may say that it would have been considered unbelievable.⁶⁹ Every effort to idealize Alexander himself and his actions would be impossible, since the events that Herodotus presented were very important for the Greek world. Moreover, the fact that Alexander dedicated a gold statue that stood next to the statue that the Greeks dedicated to celebrate their victory over the Persians, would be very strange and incomprehensible.⁷⁰ Furthermore, the positive image of Alexander within the Greek world is also indicated by the fact that even during the time of Demosthenes, the memory of Alexander's contribution was still strong.⁷¹

⁶⁷Xydopoulos 1998, 52.

⁶⁸ Xydopoulos 2016, 252, n. 61.

⁶⁹Xydopoulos 1998, 52-53.

⁷⁰ Xydopoulos 1998, 52.

⁷¹ Xydopoulos 1998, 55.

We should also stress that despite the obvious pro-Macedonian feelings of Herodotus, the ancient historian looked on Alexander's activities and attitude with a critical eye. It has been suggested that Herodotus mentions in purpose the Greek origin of Alexander twice in conjunction with two actions related to his medism, the marriage of his sister and his mission as a Persian envoy to Athens, in order to muddy the waters.⁷² Was the muddying of the waters the only reason for the mentioned combination of the information (Greekness-medism) that Herodotus provided? Possibly the ancient historian aimed also to criticize Alexander, since his Greekness was not an obstacle to his medism. In this way he highlighted the fact that the nationality was not the main criterion for Alexander's attitude and at the same time gives to his audience the opportunity to examine Alexander's actions and his double role.⁷³

The Macedonian or the Athenian pro-Macedonian sources (Alexander was proxenus and euergetes of the city of Athens already during the times of Herodotus) is difficult to be identified. The "Macedonian sources" that Herodotus used possibly based on works of earlier authors such as that of Hecataeus, on local verbal testimonies that he recorded during his stay in Macedonia and on evidence as a result of his own research.⁷⁴ Of course the possibility of fake or inaccurate references cannot be excluded. Taking into consideration the pro-Macedonian attitude of Herodotus we have to be cautious concerning the accuracy of the Herodotean text, but we believe that there is indeed a sperm of truth related to the activities of Alexander I.

⁷² Badian1994,119-120.

⁷³Fearn 2007, 124-125.

⁷⁴Gschnitzer 2003, 28-35.

3. MACEDONIA AND THE ACHAEMENID EMPIRE.

3.1 MACEDONIA AS A VASSAL STATE. THE CAMPAIGN OF MARDONIUS.

After the repression of the Ionian revolt (499-492), Mardonius was sent as leader of the Persian land and naval forces to restore the Persian control in the European satrapies. According to Herodotus, the Persian fleet subjugated peacefully the island of Thasos, as its residents did not offer any resistance.⁷⁵ Afterwards the Persian navy sailed along the coast of the mainland, reached the city of Acanthus and tried to circumnavigate the peninsula of Athos; the effort ended unsuccessfully due to a strong storm which destroyed almost three hundred ships and caused the death of almost twenty thousand people.⁷⁶

At the same time the Persian land forces occupied peacefully Thrace and Macedonia. The only case of resistance according to the Herodotean text was a nocturnal attack of the Thracian tribe of Brygi during the Persian's army's encampment in Macedonia. The aggression of the Brygi was so fierce that even Mardonius has been injured.⁷⁷ Despite their resistance, Brygi, as well as other Thracians and the Macedonians, were subjected to the Persian Empire. After the successful ending of the campaign, Mardonius and his forces, returned to Asia.

According to Herodotus, the purpose of the campaign of Mardonius was to conquer not only Thrace and Macedonia but also the rest of Greece in order to punish the Greek cities, mainly Athens and Eretria, for their entanglement in the

⁷⁵ Herodotus VI.44.

⁷⁶ Herodotus VI.44. Hammond- Griffith1979, 60; Borza 1990, 104; Sprawski 2010, 135.

⁷⁷ Herodotus VI.45. Hammond- Griffith1979, 60. The area where the attack of the Brygi against the Persians took place is still unknown. Despite the fact that Byrgi are referred in various ancient sources their settlement is located in different areas. According to Hammond-Griffith (Hammond-Griffith1979, 61) a possible location for them is the area between Lake Doiran and the Strumitsa valley⁷⁷ or at the peninsula of Chalkidice around Lake Bolbe as Vasilev argues (Vasilev 2015, 154).

Ionian revolt.⁷⁸ The mentioned statement of Herodotus has been rejected by some scholars. They believe that the above Herodotean reference is a supposition with no historical basis. Moreover they argue that the actions of Mardonius and his forces indicate that the main aim of the Persian campaign was to conquer Thrace and Macedonia and to enforce the Persian domination of the north Aegean.⁷⁹ Other scholars accept the statement of the ancient historian and adopt his reference that the main goal of the Persian was revengeful; the punishment of the Greek cities, mainly Athens and Eretria, for their entanglement in the Ionian revolt.⁸⁰

It seems possible that Mardonius's main aim was to conquer the area of Thrace and Macedonia and to restore the power of the Persian Empire on these areas which has been tottered during the Ionian revolt, as the fact that the Paeonians managed to escape from Asia (the population of Paeonians has been sent by Megabazus to be settled in Asia) and to return in Thrace possibly indicates.⁸¹ Before the Persian campaign of Datis and Artaphernes, two years later, at about 490 BC, Persian envoys have been sent to Greek cities asking for "earth and water", something that never happened in the case of Mardonius's mission. Moreover, another basic aim of Persian will of that time was the reinstatement of the last tyrant of Athens, Hippias. He participated in the Persian campaign of 490, but there are no references to connect him with Mardonius's mission.

Another very interesting and important issue is the relation between Macedonia and Persia. The statement of Herodotus that the Persians during Mardonius's campaign added Macedonians to their infantry of the tribes they had already subjugated (*τοῦτο δὲ τῶ περὶ τῶ Μακεδόνας πρὸς τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν οὐλοῦσιν προσεκτήσαντο*)⁸² raised questions and assumptions among scholars regarding to the status quo of

⁷⁸ Herodotus VI. 43-44.

⁷⁹ Bengtson 1996, 160-161· Scott 2005, 186-187· Sprawski 2010, 135· Vasilev 2015, 145.

⁸⁰ Daskalakis 1965, 171-172· Borza 1990, 104· Balcer 1995, 201.

⁸¹ Olbrycht 2010, 344· Vasilev 2015, 147.

⁸² Herodotus VI.44.

Macedonia before and after the Persian campaign of 492. Errington argues that Macedonia had become a vassal state of Persia in Alexander's reign rejecting as a tale the Herodotean reference concerning the Macedonian subjugation in Amyntas's times. Borza accepts the existence of diplomatic relations between Persia and Macedonia before the campaign of Mardonius but he argues that the submission of Macedonia took place in Alexander's reign. Badian suggests that the Macedonian submission indeed took place in Amunta's reign as Herodotus mentions and moreover that during the Ionian revolt Persia lost the control of Macedonia and when Mardonius reached Europe, Alexander submitted again.

Errington's argument that Macedonia could not have become a vassal of Persia during Amyntas' reign is based on the above mentioned Herodotean statement. He believes that Macedonia could not be vassal of the Persians two times (i.e. by Megabazus and by Mardonius) as Herodotus mentions. He argues that if Amyntas had already offered "earth and water" to Persia there was no reason to be referred by Herodotus that Macedonia was subjugated again by Mardonius and his forces.⁸³ Moreover, he denied the existence of relations between Persia and Macedonia during Amyntas' reign. He rejects the story of the murder of the Persian envoys by Alexander as a tale (see chapter 1) and believes that if the Persian envoys have been murdered in 510 BC there was no way the will of Amyntas to offer "earth and water" to Persia to be transferred to the Great King.⁸⁴ Moreover he uses the later reference of the Byzantine chronographer Syncellus (8th-9th c. AD) which refers that it was Alexander who gave "earth and water" (*Οὗτος δέδωκε τοῖς Πέρσαις ἕδαρκαὶ γῆν*)⁸⁵ and as a result the Macedonian submission must be related with the reign of Alexander and the campaign of Mardonius.⁸⁶ According to Errington, not only the issue of the murder of the envoys but the whole story is fiction and he thinks that only the wedding between Gygaea and Bubares is truthful and that the

⁸³Errington 1986, 140-141.

⁸⁴Errington 1986, 140.

⁸⁵Syncellus, 469, p. 247.

⁸⁶Errington 1986, 142.

story was created as an excuse for the wedding and in order to present to the Greek world Alexander's anti-Persian feelings even before he was king. Furthermore, Errington claims that the wedding of Gygaea with Bubares should be dated also during Alexander's reign, possibly at 492 BC, since according to Herodotus Alexander was responsible for his sister's destiny.⁸⁷

Borza claims that the submission of Macedonia had to be related with Alexander's reign rather than Amyntas' and thinks that the best way to explain the statement of Herodotus is that Macedonia had not been subjugated by the Persians before Mardonius' campaign.⁸⁸ However, he accepts the existence of diplomatic relations between Persia and Macedonia before 492, an evidence of which was the wedding of Gygaea with Bubares. He also believes that the wedding does not imply necessarily submission but a kind of alliance.⁸⁹ Furthermore he uses another reference of Herodotus (*ἡμέχρι Θεσσαλίας πᾶσα καὶ ἤνυπό βασιλέα δασμοφόρος, Μεγαβάζου τε καταστρεψαμένου καὶ ὕστερον Μαρδονίου*)⁹⁰ and claims that there was no reason Mardonius to be mentioned if Megabazus had already subjected Macedonia.⁹¹

Badian on the other hand expressed a very different opinion claiming that the only way of alliance with the Great king was only that of submission, as the Persian imperial ideology of that time indicates.⁹² As a result Amyntas indeed gave "earth and water" and Macedonia has been subjugated to Persia. Moreover, he tried to shed light to the story of the murder of the Persian envoys and to reconstruct the real story that is hidden behind the tale. According to Badian's thought, even before Megabazus reached the Macedonian borders, Amyntas was impressed by the Persian forces and was ready to offer "earth and water" and as a result Alexander has been

⁸⁷Errington 1986, 141-142.

⁸⁸Borza 1990, 104.

⁸⁹Borza 1990, 104.

⁹⁰ Herodotus VII, 108.

⁹¹Borza 1990, 104-105.

⁹²Badian 1994, 110.

sent as an envoy to meet Megabazus, exactly as was the case with Athens that had sent envoys to Sardeis, and negotiate the terms of submission. So, Alexander on his father's behalf offered "earth and water", an amount of money and his sister to be married with Bubares.⁹³ The above mentioned assumption explains not only the statement of Herodotus that Alexander was responsible for Gygaea's future and Syncellus' reference that Alexander offered "earth and water" to Persia, but also the tale of the murder of the Persian envoys. Furthermore, Badian believes that during the Ionian revolt Persia lost the control of Macedonia and when Mardonius reached again Europe Alexander submitted again.⁹⁴

All the above mentioned scholars, despite their different opinions about the relations between Persia and Macedonia, accept as a real event⁹⁵ the wedding between Gygaea and Bubares. Bubares was son of Megabazus and the bridal agreement was possibly signed at 513/2 BC and Bubares left Macedonia possibly when the Ionian revolt burst.⁹⁶ Moreover, Herodotus claims that one of the reasons that Alexander had been sent as an envoy to the Persians to Athens before the battle of Plataea was his relational connection with them.⁹⁷ Bubares is also mentioned by Herodotus as one the two responsible men for the digging of the Athos' canal during Xerxes's campaign preparations,⁹⁸ while the son of the couple was named Amyntas after his grandfather and he has been given by the Great King the city of Alabanda to rule.⁹⁹

To sum up, it seems possible that Amyntas or Alexander on his behalf-offered "earth and water" to Persia and that Macedonia was a vassal state of the

⁹³Badian 1994, 112-113.

⁹⁴Badian 1994, 116.

⁹⁵Errington 1986, 141· Borza1990, 103·Badian 1994, 109· Olbrycht 2010, 343·Sprawski 2010, 136·Vasilev 2015, 112.

⁹⁶ Herodotus VII.22. Vasilev 2015, 112.

⁹⁷ Herodotus VIII.136. Borza 1990, 102.

⁹⁸Herodotus VII.22. Borza 1990, 102· Badian 1994, 110.

⁹⁹ Herodotus VIII.136. Xydopoulos 2012, 29· Vasilev 2015, 112.

Great king in Amyntas' reign. During the Ionian revolt Persia lost the control of the European territories as the return of the Paeonians possibly indicates and the Persian power restored by Mardonius at 492 BC when Macedonia was subjected for second time.

About the terms of the negotiations between Macedonia and Persia during Amyntas' reign and the status of Macedonia we have no information. It could be assumed that through these relations Amyntas strengthened his and his state's position while the Persians gained an important ally in Europe.¹⁰⁰ The status of Macedonia is also unknown. Some believe that Macedonia was part of the satrapy of "Skudra" which includes the European territories subjected to Persia and that Bubares was governor (Satrap) or advisor of the governor.¹⁰¹ This statement cannot be confirmed. The phrase of Herodotus *ἀνήρ Ἕλληνα, Μακεδόνων ὑπαρχος*¹⁰² maybe indicates a local satrap¹⁰³ but the term *ὑπαρχος* is used by Herodotus in various circumstances to declare governors of cities or areas or officials of lower rank.¹⁰⁴ Amyntas at 506/505 BC as ruler of Macedonia had the right to offer to Hippias (the former tyrant of Athens) the city of Anthemous. It is possible that Macedonia had a special status based on a kind of autonomy that Herodotus does not mention and as a result is not easy to be defined.¹⁰⁵ As Xydopoulos suggests Macedonia possibly was "under a loose client status in Amyntas reign".¹⁰⁶ The servitude of Macedonia offered not only dynastic stability but also the Persian military protection of the Macedonian king and as a result there was not any reason for a Macedonian uprising against the Great King. The phrase of Herodotus that Macedonia was enslaved by Mardonius possibly indicates a more intense Persian military presence in the area than before. Moreover Amyntas is mentioned as

¹⁰⁰Vasilev 2015, 114.

¹⁰¹Hammond- Griffith 1979, 60; Badian 1994, 114.

¹⁰² Herodotus V.20.

¹⁰³Badian 1994, 114-115.

¹⁰⁴Balcer 1988, 1-6; Tripodi 2007, 74-85; Sprawski 2010, 138.

¹⁰⁵Olbrycht 2010, 343; Sprawski 2010, 137.

¹⁰⁶ Xydopoulos 2012, 28.

hyparchos, a man ruling over the Macedonians possibly on behalf of the Great king and acting as *hyparchos* he offered Anthemous to Hippias.¹⁰⁷

The Macedonian policy during the Ionian revolt remains unknown. Despite the fact that some scholars believe that during the revolution of the Greeks of Asia Minor against Persia nothing change in the relations between Macedonia and Persia that remain as friendly as before and that the Persian territories in Europe have not been affected,¹⁰⁸ Mardonius' campaign implies the opposite. A possible rejection of the vassal status of Macedonia either by Amyntas or by Alexander remains controversial as well as the reason for such an action. Was Macedonia obliged as a vassal state to send army in Asia Minor to support the Great King and Amyntas or Alexander denied doing so? Or was Macedonia responsible to control on behalf of Persia its European possessions? It is very difficult to shed light on these questions since there are no references in ancient authors about these issues. It seems possible that after the voluntarily submission of Macedonia there were not Persian garrisons at Macedonian cities. Moreover, Amyntas had not an important reason to reject his relations with Persia since they enforced his position as ruler of Macedonia and he had a kind of autonomy as the offer of Anthemus to Hippias possibly indicates. The pro-Persian feelings of Hippias are also well-known. Maybe Amyntas' offer was not an unilateral action but it was supported by the Great King's policy.¹⁰⁹ The fact that Alexander retained his position as local ruler after the second submission of Macedonia implies that possibly there was not a serious disturbance between the two sides. It seems that because of the Ionian revolt Persia was under serious pressure and that Persia lost temporarily the control of the Balkan area and as a result Macedonia was out of the Persian influence.¹¹⁰

Controversial are also the results of Mardonius' campaign and the status of Macedonia as well after the subjection. Scholars who claim that Macedonia was part

¹⁰⁷ Xydopoulos 2012, 29-31.

¹⁰⁸ Hammond- Griffith 1979, 60; Borza 1990, 103.

¹⁰⁹ Xydopoulos 2012, 21-37.

¹¹⁰ Vasilev 2015, 124-126.

of European satrapy already by the time of Megabazus believe that Macedonia continued to belong to the same status.¹¹¹ Others think that Macedonia was incorporated in the Persian administrative system after Mardonius' campaign¹¹² while some scholars believe that Alexander was under the same vassal status as Amyntas was.¹¹³ The reference of Herodotus that Mardonius subjected Macedonia by his infantry possibly indicates that the status of Macedonia was different after Mardonius' mission than it was at Megabazus' times and that Darius wanted after the Ionian revolt to enforce his power in Europe. It seems possible that now Macedonia has been added to the Persian administrative system and was in power of the Great King. However it is not clear whether Macedonia has been a satrapy or was part of another.¹¹⁴ Despite the ambiguous administrative status, it is obvious that Macedonia was a completely depended state. Its ruler had to pay tribute to Persia and Macedonian army had to support Persian forces. Moreover, it is not clear if there were Persian garrisons at the Macedonian cities. The fact that the allied Greeks did not attack Macedonia during the next years after the battle at Plataea indicates that either there were not garrisons in Macedonia or that they had already left.¹¹⁵ Badian suggested that Amyntas, the son of Bubares and Gygaea was predestined to succeed Alexander I as a satrap. He was the most appropriate choice, since he would be accepted by Macedonians and absolutely trusty for the Persians.¹¹⁶ But this plan was abandoned due to the Persian defeat.

Archaeological evidence confirms the connection of Macedonia with Persia during the late 6th and early 5th century AD. Artifacts unearthed in graves at Sindos and Vergina imply that practices and objects of eastern origin reached Macedonia during this period. This phenomenon cannot be necessarily related with the Persian military campaigns that took place during this period. We have to take into

¹¹¹Hammond- Griffith 1979, 60.

¹¹²Kanatsoulis 1964, 92-94.

¹¹³Delev 2007, 93.

¹¹⁴Vasilev 2015, 156-157.

¹¹⁵Vasilev 2015, 158-159.

¹¹⁶Badian 1994, 116.

consideration that ideas, practices and of course artifacts could be transferred from region to another, through the commercial routes that were in use.¹¹⁷

Coins are also a very valuable, interesting and important source of knowledge. A kind of Macedonian coin, the tetrobol depicts on the obverse a horseman holding a short sword possibly a Persian weapon named *akinakes*. This kind of depiction influenced possibly by the fact that Xerxes himself presented to Alexander with a gold *akinakes*. As a result, these coins possibly have been minted at about 480 BC during Xerxes' presence in Macedonia. Through these artifacts, depicting possibly Alexander with an *akinakes*, Macedonian king declared his power and his alliance with the Great King. After the Persian defeat at the battle of Plataea the existence of these coins was pointless and as a result they have been withdrawn. The fact that these coins conserved mostly very well indicates the short time period of their circulation.¹¹⁸ Despite the ambiguous statement that Xerxes presented with the gold *akinakes* and either Alexander is depicted or not on the tetrobols, the Persian influence on the Macedonian coinage confirms the strong connection between Macedonia and Persia.

3.1 MACEDONIA AS A VASSAL STATE. THE INVASION OF XERXES.

Immediately after the Persian defeat at Marathon and the failure of the Persian campaign under Datis and Artaphernes, Darius started to organize another campaign against Greece. The death of Darius at 486 BC did not change the Persian policy over Greece. Darius's successor Xerxes after the repression of rebellions in Egypt and in Babylon started to prepare for the campaign for the submission of Greece.

¹¹⁷Paspalas 2000, 550-551; Paspalas 2006, 100.

¹¹⁸Heinrichs-Müller 2008, 292-295; Olbrycht 2010, 345; Vasilev 2015, 156.

According to Herodotus for four years Xerxes prepared his campaign against Greece. During these years started the digging of the canal of Athos under Bubares and Artachaees in order to be avoided the dangerous circumvention of Athos peninsula that has caused the destruction of the Persian navy during Mardonius' mission. Furthermore, bridges started to be constructed over the Strymon and Hellespont while huge amounts of supplies were stored in various places such as LeuceActe, Tyrodiza, Doriscus and Eion. Herodotus refers also Macedonia but he does not mention where the Persian supplies had been stored exactly.

At 480 BC started the Persian campaign against Greece. Xerxes at the head of his land forces penetrated in Europe. The Persian army having reached Thrace directed westwards while the Persian fleet were sailing along the coast of north Aegean. Both land and naval forces got together around the area of Therme at the Thermaic Gulf and then the Persian Army through Macedonia and through mountainous passages continued its way to Thessaly and to southern Greece.

Unfortunately, we do not have any information about the policy, the behavior and the activities of Alexander during the Persian army's presence in Macedonia. The only reference of Herodotus is about an event related to the Tempe valley and the Greek allied army that had encamped there.

According to Herodotus Greeks got together at Isthmus in order to decide how they were going to face Persians. The Thessalians asked for the help of Greeks, claiming that otherwise they were going to submit to Xerxes. Greeks accepted to help Thessaly and decided that the best place for defense and to face the large army of Xerxes was the narrow mountainous passage of Tempe valley between mountains Olympus and Ossa. As a result, ten thousand Greek soldiers encamped at Tempe valley in order to defend the passage. According to Herodotus the Greeks decided to retreat for two reasons. At first, the Macedonian king Alexander I sent envoys to the Greeks to inform them about the power of the Persian forces and furthermore to warn them about their possible destruction since the Persian army was muchstronger and more multitudinous than the Greek. The second and the main

reason that caused the Greek retreat was the fact that they realized that there were also other passages leading to Thessaly and as a result the Tempe valley could be bypassed and there was the possibility the Greek army to be surrounded by enemy forces.¹¹⁹

After the Greek's army retreat the Persian army indeed did not use Tempe Valley to penetrate into Thessaly but another or various other passages such as Petra's and Volustana's passes and Thessaly subjected to the Great king.¹²⁰

It is not easy to understand Alexander's attitude towards the Greeks at Tempe and to shed light on the real incentives that led him to act as Herodotus mentions. Possibly enough it was not only his philhellenic feelings but his actions were actuated by his own and his state's interests. He wanted to avoid a possibly long term battle between Greeks and Persians in his territories, while a Greek resistance at Tempe would have caused the extension of the stay of the Persian army in Macedonia with negative consequences for Alexander's state.¹²¹ Moreover his double game was very important for Macedonia and very well balanced. Allied Greeks were grateful for the information that his envoys gave them and Persians were also satisfied for the Greek retreat.¹²² Moreover after the definitive Persian defeat, Alexander's action at Tempe was also used to the Greek world as an element for his philhellenic attitude. According to a different opinion, most of the Greeks were not in agreement with the so north place of defense and among them the leader of the Athenian forces Themistocles. Alexander's advice which perhaps had been inspired by Themistocles, was the perfect excuse for the Greek retreat. The fact that neither Athens nor Sparta punished their generals for the retreat, which indicates the Greek unwillingness to defend the pass of Tempe.¹²³ Furthermore Alexander maybe worked for the Great King and acted only as a Persian vassal. He

¹¹⁹ Herodotus VII.173. Borza 1990, 107-108; Vasilev 2015, 188-190.

¹²⁰ Borza 1990, 108; Vasilev 2015, 190-194.

¹²¹ Scaife 1989, 131; Vasilev 2015, 190.

¹²² Vasilev 2015, 190.

¹²³ Cole 1978, 41.

managed the Greek retreat and as a result Thessalians had no other choice but to submit and medize.¹²⁴

After the Greek defeat at Thermopylae the Persian army penetrated into southern Greece. According to Herodotus the Persians plundered the area of Phocis and then reached Boeotia. Boeotian cities have been saved due to Macedonians which had been sent by Alexander and they informed Xerxes that they had already medized and they will support the Persians.¹²⁵

From the very brief Herodotean reference above, some conclusions could be drawn. First of all is confirmed the presence of the Macedonians and Alexander himself at the battle of Thermopylae since the Macedonian men that Alexander sent to Boeotia were able to reach the area sooner than the Persians following a shorter route.¹²⁶ Furthermore it is clear the trust and the close connection between Xerxes and Alexander. The role of the Macedonian men is not easy to be clarified. Possibly they were envoys rather than garrisons¹²⁷ and their aim was to examine and to oversee the public feeling of the locals over the Persians.¹²⁸

Alexander is also connected with some incidents before the battle of Plataea. According to Herodotus Alexander had been sent to the Athenians by Mardonius as an envoy for alliance. Another very interesting action of Alexander during the Xerxes invasion is also described by Herodotus. Mardonius chose Alexander because his sister was married with the Persian noble Bubares and further because of the connection between Alexander and the Athenians who had proclaimed the Macedonian king euergetes and proxenus of their city. Alexander's speech before the Athenians is very interesting. He claimed that if Athens accepts the alliance they would have the opportunity to govern their city according to their own laws, while

¹²⁴Scaife 1989,131.

¹²⁵ Herodotus VIII.32-34.

¹²⁶Vasilev 2015, 199-200.

¹²⁷Kanatsoulis 1964, 95· Badian 1994, 117.

¹²⁸Olbrycht 2010, 345· Sprawski 2010, 139· Vasilev 2015, 200.

that the Athenian sanctuaries that have been destroyed by Persian would be rebuilt by the Great King. Moreover he tried to convince Athenians to accept the offer emphasizing that there was no hope for Greece and that it is impossible to win the strong Persian army. Spartan envoys gave a speech before the Athenians and asked them not to betray Greece. Athenians rejected the Persian offer and warned Alexander not to repeat such an offer in the future.¹²⁹

From this event it can be concluded that Alexander was completely trusted and that Mardonius believed that the Macedonian was the most appropriate for this very important issue and moreover that it was more likely for Alexander than anyone else to convince Athenians to accept Persian offers because of his relations with the city since he had been declared euergetes and proxenos of the city of Athens.¹³⁰ When exactly Alexander received those titles, for what reason and what is exactly their meaning, it is still unclear. All these issues will be discussed in chapter 3. The fact that Athenians warned Alexander not to repeat such an offer in the future maybe indicates that his influence was not as strong as it was believed.

Another event related to Alexander's activities during the invasion of Xerxes is also referred by Herodotus. According to the herodotean text, on the eve of the crucial battle of Plataea during the night Alexander left on horseback the Persian camp, reached the Greek one asking for an audience with the Athenian generals. Before the generals he claimed that he is also a Greek and that he is concerned about the future of Greece and he does not want Greece to be enslaved. Moreover he informed Greeks that Mardonius will attack them the next morning. Furthermore he stressed that if the Greeks are going to win they will have to remember his risky action and that he exposed himself to a great danger for them.¹³¹

¹²⁹ Herodotus VIII. 140-143.

¹³⁰ Borza 1990, 109; Sprawski 2010, 139; Vasilev 2015, 200-202.

¹³¹ Herodotus IX.44-45.

The above mentioned story remains controversial. Some scholars accept it as a real incident,¹³² others reject it as myth¹³³ and others believe that Alexander acted as a Persian spy.¹³⁴ Was it possible Alexander to leave the Persian camp without to being perceptible by the guards? Why did he risk losing his throne and his life instead of sending an envoy? Moreover, Herodotus does not mention anything related to the attitude of the Macedonian army during the battle, something that implies Alexander's will to help the allied Greeks, even if he does mention such kind of actions by other Greeks (*τῶν δὲ ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων τῶν μετὰ βασιλέος ἐθελοκακούντων*).¹³⁵ Possibly the story or part of the story created or formed and enriched later by Macedonian sources to emphasize Alexander's philhellenic attitude and as an excuse for his submission to Persia and his participation in the campaign of Xerxes against southern Greece.

To sum up, it seems that Macedonia submitted two different times to Persia. At first, Amyntas-or Alexander acting as an envoy of his father's will- offered "earth and water". During the Ionian revolt Persia possibly lost its influence and the control of Macedonia and Thrace. Later at about 492 BC Mardonius restored the Persian power over the mentioned areas and as a result Macedonia submitted for second time. The status of Macedonia as a vassal state remains unknown and controversial. Possibly it had not been a satrapy or part of another scheme but it seems that it had special significance which cannot for the moment to be completely defined since the ancient sources are silent. Ambiguous is whether there were Persian garrisons at Macedonian cities or not. Being a vassal state Macedonia had to pay tribute and to support the Persian army. As a result, Macedonians fight against the allied Greeks in the battles of Thermopylae and of Plataea as well.

¹³²Daskalakis 1965, 194-198·Badian 1994, 118.

¹³³Borza 1990, 110· Vasilev 2010, 58.

¹³⁴ Barron 1988, 605-606· Green 1998, 258-260.

¹³⁵Herodotus IX. 67. Vasilev 2015, 206.

4. Alexander I as “Proxenos” and “Euergetes” of Athens.

4.1 Proxeny in the Greek world

One of the most interesting and controversial references of Herodotus related to Alexander is that which took place sometime before the important battle of Plataea. According to Herodotus, Alexander has been sent as an envoy to Athens by Mardonius. The reasons that led the Persian military leader on that decision were two. First of all he completely trusted Alexander because of the wedding of Alexander’s sister with the Persian noble Bubares and secondly because Mardonius knew the connection of Alexander with the Athenians, since Alexander has been proclaimed “Proxenos” and “Euergetes” of the city of Athens.¹³⁶

Proxeny was one of the most famous and important institutions widespread to all ancient Greek world possibly from the 7th or 6th century BC until the Roman period (2nd century AD).¹³⁷ Proxeny consists of the prefix “pro” which means “on behalf of” or “instead of” and of the term “xenos” which implies the foreigner or the guest friend.¹³⁸ Proxeny as even the same word implies has its origins in the Homeric epoch and in the ideal of *xenia* which means the hospitality or ritualized friendship within a private frame.¹³⁹ As a result proxenos is someone who acts on behalf of a foreigner or a guest friend. Through an evolutionary and gradual process the greek city-state formed its functional institutions and adopted the private institution of hospitality or ritualized friendship and transformed it into the public institution of proxeny.¹⁴⁰ The actual steps of the mentioned process cannot be completely defined because of the silence of the sources. Possibly at first rulers or members of local

¹³⁶ Herodotus VIII. 140-143.

¹³⁷ Wallace 1970, 189; Herman 1987, 130.

¹³⁸ Wallace 1970, 190; Engen 2010, 146.

¹³⁹ Herman 1987, 132.

¹⁴⁰ Herman 1987, 132-136; Engen 2010, 146.

elites from different city-states could enforce their power and their interest through the bond of *xenia* and *euergesia* supporting a city or a community.¹⁴¹

Generally speaking, a city-state offered proxenia to an individual foreigner in order to represent in his hometown the interests of the state that granted the proxenia. Apart from the city-state the grantor of proxeny could be also a community or a cult or another kind of association.¹⁴² According to Herman, the granting of a proxenia was based on preexisted private relationships between individuals of different states (*xenoi*)¹⁴³ but it seems that the officials of a city choose a foreigner to be their proxenos overlooking whether he was a *xenos* or not.¹⁴⁴ The main and the basic reason for a foreigner to be declared as a proxenos of a city-state was the benefaction (*euergesia*).¹⁴⁵ Proxenos has benefited the granted city in various ways and has proved his support in the city's interests. Moreover, proxenos could had also supported and benefited individuals from the granting city that lived or visited for a short time his city.¹⁴⁶ The granting of proxenia did not only have been honorary character but it also had a functional one. Through the granting of proxenia, the city-state not only honored its foreigner proxenos for his benefaction but also aimed at the continuity of friendly relations with its proxenos in the future as well.¹⁴⁷ The strong connection between "proxeny" and "euergesia" is also confirmed by the fact that Athens granted mostly both titles and rarely either the one or the other separately.¹⁴⁸ The term *euergetes* possibly denotes benefactions for the city-state as a whole. As a result the combination of the terms "proxenos" and

¹⁴¹ Herman 1987, 132-134.

¹⁴² Herman 1987, 130.

¹⁴³ Herman 1987, 137-138; Engen 2010, 147.

¹⁴⁴ Marek 1984, 134.

¹⁴⁵ Engen 2010, 147; Mack 2015, 38.

¹⁴⁶ Gygax 2016, 105.

¹⁴⁷ Engen 2010, 147; Mack 2015, 39.

¹⁴⁸ Engen 2010, 147; Gygax 2016, 103.

“euergetes” maybe implies the double direction of the benefaction, individually and communal.¹⁴⁹

The above mentioned rewards (proxenos and euergetes) have been never granted by the cities-states or by a community to native individuals or to a member of the community but only to foreigners (xenoï) a fact that confirms the origin of the institutions from *xenia*.¹⁵⁰ Apart from the granting of the rewards as a result of a real benefaction there were also the so called “proleptic”. In that occasion the city-state granted rewards in order to urge a benefaction and to further its own interests.¹⁵¹ On the other hand proxenos except the reward also acquired special social status and many privileges by the grantor-city as well. As a result the relation between the grantor of proxyeny and the granted was mutual, very strong and at least theoretically unbreakable.¹⁵²

4.2 Alexander I as proxenos and euergetes of Athens.

According to Herodotus, when Alexander had been sent as an envoy by Mardonius to the Athenians he was already a proxenos and an euergetes of Athens. The city–state of Athens rewarded the Macedonian king for his ambiguous and controversial benefaction on which we will try to shed light on the following pages. The fact that Athens granted both rewards indicates that Alexander benefited the city as a whole.

The statement of Herodotus attracted the interest of scholars who tried to offer possible and truthful answers and to shed light on various issues related to the mentioned Herodotean reference such as under which circumstances Alexander received the honorific titles of “proxenos” and “euergetes” and what was the

¹⁴⁹ Gygax 2016, 105.

¹⁵⁰ Herman 1987, 130; Engen 2010, 147.

¹⁵¹ Gygax 2016, 105.

¹⁵² Herman 1987, 135.

important reason that led the Athenians to dignify the Macedonian king. Since Herodotus is the only ancient source that informs us about the relations of Alexander with the Athenians, the effort to restore the true story is a difficult task and the already given answers remain controversial and ambiguous.

According to Badian, when Herodotus describes the mission of Alexander as an envoy he does not explain Alexander's connections with Athens as he does with Alexander's relations with Persia. It is just mentioned that Alexander was "proxenos" and "euergetes" of Athens. On the other hand, Alexander's relation with Persia is explained by the reference that Macedon's sister was married with the Persian noble Bubares.¹⁵³ This is an omission that is not accidental is not because Herodotus was not well informed but has been made on purpose by Herodotus in order to suppress an event that took place at Sardis many years before the fact of Alexander's mission.

At 507 BC Athenian envoys had been sent to Sardis to ask for alliance with Persia. The Persians ask "earth and water" to accept the alliance and the Athenian envoys acting with their own initiative and responsibility offered "earth and water" to Persia. According to Badian, Alexander helped the Athenians during the above mentioned occasion and as a result Athens declared him euergetes. A reference of the alliance between Athens and Persia would be inappropriate to be mentioned by Herodotus as an explanation of Alexander's relations with Athens especially in a period (when Herodotus is writing) during which Athens is believed to have been the savior of Greece.¹⁵⁴

About the reward of proxeny, Badian believes that Amyntas had already relations with the tyrants of Athens and that he was *xenos* with them and that this relation renewed later by the Athenian republic and has been transformed from *xenia* to Proxeny.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Badian 1994, 119, 121-122.

¹⁵⁴ Badian 1994, 121-122.

¹⁵⁵ Badian 1994, 122-127.

Badian's theory seems ambiguous and controversial while several objections can be raised. Possibly there were relations between the Macedonian royal house and the élite of the cities in southern Greece but it cannot be documented whether Athens rewarded king Amyntas with proxeny or not.¹⁵⁶ Moreover even if the Peisistratids had granted proxeny to Amyntas, the Athenian demos possibly would have cancelled it while there is no evidence to support that Alexander has inherited the reward from his father.¹⁵⁷

Badian's opinion about Alexander's reward of "euergesia" cannot be confirmed as well. Alexander's intervention into the negotiations for alliance between Athens and Persia cannot be documented. Furthermore Alexander was too young at 507 BC when Athenian envoys reached Persia to be involved in such an important international event.¹⁵⁸

A different point of view has been also offered by some scholars in order to explain the rewards of Alexander. According to it Alexander granted at the same time the rewards of proxeny and euergesia because of his great benefaction to support the Athenian naval program which took place at 482-480 BC under the auspices of Themistocles. Macedonian forests were a source of abundant and various kinds of timber. Moreover, Macedonia was very famous during antiquity for its excellent quality of timber. As a result, Macedonia could be one of the few places in Greece that could cover the necessities in quality and quantity of the Athenian naval program. At that time Persian controlled only the coast of Chalcidice and Thrace and even if the area of Strymon was under Persian occupation Alexander could also use in order to provide timber to Athens the forests of Olympus and Pierian mountains. Persia could not have access to control the mentioned area inside the Macedonian territories. Furthermore Macedonia was free to trade without Persian control especially during the period from the death of Darius and since Xerxes invasion when according to some scholars the Persian control over

¹⁵⁶ Xydopoulos 2012, 31-32.

¹⁵⁷ Cole 1978, 40.

¹⁵⁸ Vasilev 2015, 203.

Macedonia has been lost and Macedonia was almost independent. At the same time, Themistocles possibly in order to avoid Persian suspicions declared that the Athenian naval program was a preparation for a war against the island of Aegina.¹⁵⁹

Despite the fact that many scholars adopted as plausible the above mentioned theory several objections can be raised. Was Macedonia really independent after the Death of Darius? Herodotus mentions that during the preparations of Xerxes for his campaign against Greece, Persian supplies have been stored not only in Thrace but also in Macedonia¹⁶⁰ a reference that indicates the Persian presence into the Macedonian state. Moreover it is difficult to be accepted that all the activities to produce timber for the Athenian fleet took place secretly and without to be perceptible by the Persians. According to Herodotus the Persian preparation for the invasion in Greece started at least four years before 480 BC while almost at the same time Athens started to construct its fleet. It seems impossible that Macedonia as a vassal state during so crucial a period to have managed to supply in secret timber to the main enemy of the Great King.¹⁶¹

According to a different interpretation the rewards that Athens granted to Alexander was a result of his advice at Tempe.¹⁶² It seems that only that action at Tempe was not enough to cause Alexander's rewards.¹⁶³ Herodotus himself minimize the value of Alexander's activities at Tempe by mentioning that the main reason for the retreat of the allied Greeks was rather the fact that they realized that there were also other passages leading to Thessaly and there was the possibility the Greek army to be surrounded by enemy forces than Alexander's advices.¹⁶⁴ Moreover we can assume that if Alexander's actions at Tempe have caused the Athenians rewards Herodotus possibly would had mentioned it but he does not.

¹⁵⁹ Wallace 1970, 199-200· Cole 1978, 41-42· Gerolymatos 1986, 75-76· Borza 1990, 108-109.

¹⁶⁰ Herodotus VII. 25.

¹⁶¹ Vasilev 2015, 204.

¹⁶² Daskalakis 1965, 170-171.

¹⁶³ Cole 1978, 41· Borza 1990, 109· Vasilev 2015, 204-205.

¹⁶⁴ Herodotus VII.173.

Another opinion mainly based on two references of Demosthenes claims that Alexander received later the Athenians rewards after the retreat of Persians.¹⁶⁵ As a result Alexander had not the titles of proxenos and euergetes when he visited Athens as a Persian envoy. Demosthenes mentions that after the battle of Plataea Perdikkas defeated the retreating Persian army and as a result he has been granted with the Athenian citizenship reference to Demosthenes. The second text of Demosthenes (?) refers that Athens granted Perdikkas with ἀτέλεια. We can assume that the mention of Perdikkas is totally wrong and the above mentioned references of Demosthenes must be related with Alexander.¹⁶⁶ The possibility of a Macedonian attack against the retreating Persian army cannot be documented. Moreover it is clearly mentioned by Herodotus that Alexander was proxenos and euergetes of Athens already before the battle of Plataea and that was one the reasons that the Macedonian King has been sent as an envoy to Athens by Mardonius.¹⁶⁷

All the above mentioned interpretations try to offer a plausible answer to the question when and for what reason Alexander I has been granted as proxenos and euergetes of Athens. Each theory that has been presented has its “weak points” and several objections can be raised against it. Regarding the time of the granting, we think that there is no important reason to reject Herodotus’ mention and as a result it could be possibly dated before the battle of Plataea. Concerning the reason of the granting, it seems that there is no at least for the moment a totally convincing answer and therefore the question “Why Athens granted proxeny and euergesia to Alexander?” still remains open for further discussion.

¹⁶⁵ Xydopoulos 1998, 53-55, n.91.

¹⁶⁶ Trevett 2011, 235-236· Vasilev 2015, 202.

¹⁶⁷ Vasilev 2015, 202-203.

5. Macedonia after the Persian retreat

The defeat of the Persians in the battleship of Salamis and mainly the victory of the allied Greeks over the Army of the Great King in the battle of Plataea was the definitive reason –at least for that moment– for the collapse of the Persian plans concerning the conquest of Greece. At first, Xerxes after the battleship of Salamis and later Artabazus after the battle of Plataea and the death of Mardonius, returned to Asia leading a part of or the whole defeated Persian army. Both crossed Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace in order to reach Asia Minor.

The years after the Persian defeat, the allied Greek forces conducted naval and land war operations all over the Hellenic world against the Persians. At the same time under the pretext of confronting the danger of a possible Persian counterattack the rivalries among the Greek cities-states have been increased, while the Athenian imperialism also started to be obvious.¹⁶⁸

The role and the participation of the Macedonian king in the developments during the period that succeeded the Persian defeat still remains an object of research. The ancient sources are almost silent and puzzling, and sometimes also contradictory and conflicting. As a result, the enterprise to scrutinize the activities of the Macedonians and the political, economic and international situation of Macedonia after the battle of Plataea is really difficult to be defined. Several scholars offered various proposals both about internal and foreign policy of Alexander I from 479 BC since 452 BC when he possibly died. Since the ancient sources are conflicting and offer piecemeal information the already expressed opinions about the Macedonian History of the period seems to be ambiguous and controversial.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁸ Meiggs 1972; Hornblower 2002; Low 2008.

¹⁶⁹ Daskalakis 1965, 200-201; Edson 1970, 26; Vasilev 2015, 207; Xydopoulos 2018, 12.

After the battle of Plataea and the death of Mardonius, Artabazus was at the head of the Persian army. He engaged to lead the retreated Persian army in safety to Asia. According to Herodotus, the Persian Army crossed safely Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace and arrived at Byzantium from where by ships reached Asia Minor. During the Persian march no one offered resistance except some Thracian tribes which are not named by Herodotus and is mentioned that they attacked the retreated Persians. Many Persian soldiers died during the hostilities between Persians and Thracians while many others died because of the hardships, the lack of supplies, the exhaustion and the hunger.¹⁷⁰ It is very important to be referred that no conflict between Macedonian and Persian army is clearly mentioned in the Herodotean text but also it is not even insinuated. Even if Herodotus does not mention something relevant to a Macedonian attack, many scholars expressed the opinion that Alexander I with the Macedonian army defeated the retreated Persian army.¹⁷¹ The above mentioned argument is based not on Herodotus but on other sources, such as the orator Demosthenes and Aristodemus. Demosthenes mentions that the Macedonian king, who is wrongly referred to as Perdikkas, with the Macedonian army attacked and completely destroyed the retreated Persian army and contributed to the complete discomfiture of the Great King.¹⁷² The same event is also described by the late historiographer Aristodemus, who as it seems didn't use Demosthenes as a source, since he names correctly Alexander as the Macedonian king of that period.¹⁷³ Another source attributed also to Demosthenes, the *Philipp's Letter*, mentions that Macedonia was the first state that attacked and occupied the Persian settlement of "Nine-Ways" the afterwards site of Amphipolis and that Alexander dedicated a gold statue at Delphi for that reason, made by plunders taken from the Persians. The text also mentions Persian captives. ¹⁷⁴

¹⁷⁰Herodotus IX. 89.

¹⁷¹ Geyer 1930, 45; Dascalakis 1965, 200-201; Edson 1970, 26.

¹⁷² Demosthenes 23.200, 13.24.

¹⁷³ FgrH 104, 1.3.1.

¹⁷⁴ Demosthenes 12. 20.

Despite the fact that Herodotus does not mention anything about a Macedonian attack to the retreated Persian army, some scholars accepted that statement mainly based on Demosthenes references. The silence of the Herodotean text raises doubts about the possibility of a conflict between Persians and Macedonians. Herodotus is very well informed about the activities of Alexander I. Moreover it can be assumed that in the frame of pro-Macedonian attitude of Herodotus a so crucial and important event that could raise the prestige of Alexander all over the Greek world it would be mentioned and emphasized by the ancient historian.¹⁷⁵

Furthermore taking into consideration the historical and the political grounds of that period a Macedonian attack over the Persian army is still dubious. The Macedonian army as it is mentioned by Herodotus also participated in the battle of Plataea against the allied Greek forces and possibly after the battle retreated together with the Persians. Even if it is assumed that Alexander reached faster at Macedonia than Persians, it seems that there was not enough time for the Macedonians to prepare and organize an attack against the Persians.¹⁷⁶ It must be also stressed that according to Herodotus when Artabazus reached Thessaly, Thessalians did not know yet anything about the events at Plataea and the outcome of the battle.¹⁷⁷ In addition a Macedonian attack against the retreating Persian army would be too risky for Alexander I and his kingdom. The political and the military circumstances at that moment were not stable but very changeable, while the Persian intentions related to Greece and to the Balkan Peninsula in general were still unknown and unpredictable. It must be also stressed that the neighboring area of Thrace was still under Persian occupation and additionally there was still the Persian garrison at Eion. As a result a hostile Macedonian attitude towards Great King's army would have caused a general Persian counterattack with unpredictable, important

¹⁷⁵ Vasilev 2015, 207·Xydopoulos 2018, 12.

¹⁷⁶ Vasilev 2015, 208.

¹⁷⁷ Herodotus IX. 89.

and negative consequences for Macedonia.¹⁷⁸ The attitude of Alexander as a whole and his double play during the war indicates dedication to the interest of his state and at the same time a total submission to the will of the Great king. Alexander endowed with perspicacity, opportunism and was a great diplomat. It seems that there is not an important evidence to suggest that Alexander's attitude changed dramatically after the battle of Plataea and led him to reconsider his policy by attacking the Persians, endangering at the same time his personal and his state's interests.¹⁷⁹

According to a source that is attributed to Demosthenes -the *Philipp's Letter* – Alexander conquered the Nine Ways and for that reason he dedicated a gold statue at Delphi celebrating on that way his victory over the Persians.¹⁸⁰ The above mentioned statement is doubtful and cannot be confirmed. The eastwards enlargement of the Macedonian kingdom around the area of Strymon River is also controversial and still a matter of debate and it will be discussed on the next chapter. The capture of the Persian settlement of Nine Ways by the Macedonians seems to be dubious. When Herodotus describes the Athenian efforts to conquer and to colonize the Nine Ways and the area of Strymon he only mentions conflicts between the Athenian mission and the local tribes.¹⁸¹ There is no reference or insinuation that could confirm the Macedonian occupation of the area or the presence of the Macedonian army near Nine Ways the years after the battle of Plataea. It is important to stressed that the historical credibility of the *Philipp's Letter* is questionable at least related to the real events that followed the end of the Persian war since it is a later text which presents the Macedonian arguments and propaganda in connection with the Macedonian rights over the area of Amphipolis.¹⁸² The existence of the golden statue as a dedication of Alexander is

¹⁷⁸ Vasilev 2015, 208.

¹⁷⁹ Xydopoulos 2016, 258.

¹⁸⁰ Hammond 1989, 45.

¹⁸¹ Herodotus VII. 107. Thucydides I. 98.

¹⁸² Vasilev 2015, 209. Xydopoulos 2016, 257-258.

confirmed by Herodotus but is not connected neither to a Macedonian attack to the retreated Persian army nor to a Macedonian capture of the settlement of the Nine Ways. Solinus also mentions that Alexander dedicated a gold statue at Olympia without mentioning the statue of Delphi.¹⁸³ There is no reason to assume that Alexander dedicated two statues. The ancient writers refer only one statue and it is possible that Solinus confused the two places and wrongly mention Olympia instead of Delphi.¹⁸⁴

Except the Macedonian activities in the east around Strymon basin which will be discussed in the next chapter Alexander expanded his kingdom westwards defeating local tribes or establishing diplomatic relations with other Macedonian tribes. Possibly after the Persian defeat Alexander defeated Eordi, expelled them and captured the area western of mount Vermio.¹⁸⁵ Alexander also connected with western Macedonians who may be accepted a kind of vassalage but possibly they kept a kind of autonomy. Argeads possibly established relations also with Elimeia that lies southern of Eordaea. It is mentioned that Alexander I (he or his sister) used marriage in order to be connected with the local royal family of Elimeia.¹⁸⁶

Another interesting aspect regarding Alexander's actions during and after the Campaign of Xerxes against Greece was his possible connection and his relation with the protagonist of the Greek resistance Themistocles. According to J. W. Cole,¹⁸⁷ common interests, same political goals, visions and possible time serving circumstances connected the two leaders with strong bonds already before the Xerxes' campaign. After the Persian retreat and during the post-war period Themistocles and Alexander reinforced their relationship by political collaboration.

¹⁸³ Solinus 9. 13.

¹⁸⁴ Errington 1990, 12, 266 n. 11.

¹⁸⁵ Edson 1970, 27-28· Borza 1990, 124.

¹⁸⁶ Borza 1990, 124.

¹⁸⁷ Cole 1978, 37-49.

According to the scholar, the two men met each other at the celebration feast at Olympia during which Alexander proclaimed as a Greek by the Olympic committee and managed not only to participate in the games but also to win the race. Themistocles was there and had the opportunity in the frame of his future political career to create relation and friendship with an important noble of northern Greece and member of the Macedonian royal house. On the other hand a bond with an ambitious Athenian would be also in Alexander's advantage as an important connection with southern Greece. According to Cole that event took place sometime before the Campaign of Darius against Greece possibly at 504 or 500 BC.¹⁸⁸

The next important step in the common course of the two leaders was the Athenian naval program that took place after 500 BC and before 480 BC. Macedonia was already famous as an important source of timber and could offer exceptional quality and great capacity of timber in order to cover the Athenian demands to construct their fleet. Alexander offered the necessary timber to Athens and as a result he proclaimed *proxenos* and *euergetes* of the city of Athens. According to Cole Themistocles as protagonist and pioneer of the Athenian naval program was possibly responsible not only for the negotiations with Alexander but also for the granting of the honorific degrees to Alexander. The next events that connected the two men were Alexander's advice at Tempe and also Alexander's mission at Athens before the battle of Plataea as a Persian envoy when he had maybe the chance to meet up again with Themistocles.¹⁸⁹

According to Cole, the connection and the collaboration between the two men based on the above mentioned bonds continued also during the post-war period. Macedonia under the rule of Argeads had the opportunity to be enlarged and to secure the lands that had been occupied during the Persian presence at the area. Alexander conquered also the area of the Strymon with the important metalliferous sources. On the other hand the same area has been also claimed by

¹⁸⁸ Cole 1978, 39.

¹⁸⁹ Cole 1978, 40-44.

the Athenian imperialism and mainly during the post-war period by the policy of Cimon who was the main political competitor of Themistocles.

The post-war political career of Themistocles was really soon. The reason for his political disappearance is not still clear but it seems that political strifes in Athens led to his exile from Athens at about 471 BC.¹⁹⁰ Based on Pausanias who mentions that after the capture of Mycenae by the Argives a number of refugees from Mycenae resettled in Macedonia¹⁹¹ J. W. Cole assumed that Themistocles after his exile from Athens he reached Peloponnese and that he was involved in Anti Spartan activities and conspiracies and furthermore that he persuade Alexander to support the democratic faction in Argos. According to the same scholar Themistocles and Alexander tried to create a third power in Greece that could compete Athens and Sparta.¹⁹² The absence of Themistocles from Athens, Cimon's policy with imperialistic ambitions in Northern Greece had deteriorated the relations between Athens and Macedonia. As a result Alexander had enough reasons to support Themistocles visions. After the collapse of the plan of the two leaders for their common role in the Greek world Themistocles was undesirable everywhere in Greece and he decided to flight to Asia. The role of Alexander in this event is still unknown but Cole claims that possibly the two men met each other in the Macedonian capital before the departure of Themistocles from Pydna to Asia.¹⁹³

Despite the fact that the assumptions above cannot be confirmed and still remain ambiguous, it seems that Alexander and Themistocles possibly had a kind of relationship and connection. Macedonia under the rule of Alexander and after the Persian retreat was a strong and stable kingdom. Alexander managed to enlarged his borders both westwards and eastwards (the Macedonian expansion eastwards will be discussed in the next chapter) and to create the strongest force in the northern

¹⁹⁰Borza 1990, 120.

¹⁹¹Pausanias 7. 25. 6.

¹⁹² Cole 1978, 45-47.

¹⁹³ Cole 1978, 47-49; Borza 1990, 121.

Aegean and also developed a kind of court life. Moreover, the Macedonian kingdom became wealthy not only through the commercial activities such as timber but also through the exploitation of important metalliferous sources as the coinage evidence indicates. Macedonia as a state in the periphery of Greek world did not follow exactly the social and political evolution of the southern Greek cities but Alexander was the pioneer of the connection of his Kingdom with the rest of the Greek world.

6. The conquest of Bisaltia and the Macedonian eastern boundaries.

The land of the Macedonian kingdom during the reign of Alexander I and after the Persian retreat is still a matter of debate among the scholars. Many scholars based on ancient sources tried to shed light on Alexander's activities and to determine the accurate land of his kingdom and mainly its eastern boundaries. Despite the fact that the ancient sources are almost silent and puzzling and sometimes also contradictory and conflicting we will try to offer a convincing answer concerning the conquest of Bisaltia and the Macedonian eastern boundaries taking into consideration literary, historical and archaeological evidence.

Bisaltia was a very important and among the most powerful Kingdoms of the area of the lower Strymon.¹⁹⁴ It was located western of Strymon River, eastern of the neighboring area of Crestonia, along the mount Kerdylion and Dysoron.¹⁹⁵ Bisaltia have never been submitted by the Persians. According to Herodotus at 480 BC Bisaltae who also controlled the area of Crestonia refused to participate in the Persian campaign against Greece.¹⁹⁶ Possibly the period from 480 BC till the Macedonian conquest was the most powerful and wealthy for the kingdom of

¹⁹⁴ Xydopoulos 2016, 255.

¹⁹⁵ Borza 1990, 45.

¹⁹⁶ Herodotus VIII. 116.

Bisaltia. During the 5th century BC the Bisaltae have been conquered by the Macedonians and have been incorporated into the Macedonian kingdom.¹⁹⁷ The exact time of the conquest of the Bisaltae by the Macedonians is still ambiguous and controversial.

Many scholars argue that the eastern expansion of the Macedonian Kingdom and the incorporation of Bisaltia into it took place soon after the Persian withdrawal.¹⁹⁸ Hammond claims that Alexander I exploited the vacuum potestatis that has been caused in the area as a result of the Persian withdrawal. He also maintains that the Macedonians conquered Edonians and Bisaltae immediately after the Persian departure before these tribes had the opportunity to be organized and to be prepared to resist. As a result, Alexander I managed to control the rich metalliferous sources of the area, the mines near Kilkis, the gold of Echedoros river, the rich mine at Theodoraki and the gold mine of Nigrita and he concludes that Macedonia had for the first time the necessary means to issue coinage.¹⁹⁹ He also places the Macedonian capture of the settlement of Nine Ways in 477 BC and he believes that Alexander had enough wealth then to celebrate his success by dedicating two gold statues at Olympia and at Delphi.²⁰⁰ Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou suggest the Macedonians immediately conquered Mygdonia and Lower Paeonia and after Anthemous, Crestonia and Bisaltia.²⁰¹

On the other hand, some scholars place the eastern expansion of the Macedonian Kingdom and the incorporation of Bisaltia into it not immediately after the Persian withdrawal but much later at about 460 BC.²⁰² The arguments of the last statement are strong and based on archaeological and coinage evidence. The results

¹⁹⁷ Vasilev 2015, 96·Xydopoulos 2016, 255.

¹⁹⁸ Edson 1947, 95, n. 56· Cole 1975, 42, n. 1· Hammond-Griffith 1979, 102· Hammond 1989, 45.

¹⁹⁹ Hammond 1989, 45-46.

²⁰⁰ Hammond 1989, 45.

²⁰¹ Hatzopoulos-Loukopoulou 1992, 15-30.

²⁰² Archibald 1998, 114· Psoma 2002, 42-43· Vasilev 2015, 96· Xydopoulos 2016, 255-256.

of the study of the well known Bisaltaean Decadrachm Hoard can shed light on the date of the annexation of Bisaltia and on the Macedonian expansion to the east. The Bisaltaean coinage should be dated from 480 BC to 460 BC.²⁰³ Moreover the coinage that is attributed to Alexander I dated at 465-460 BC.²⁰⁴ The Bisaltaean coinage possibly implies that the Kingdom of Bisaltia reached the peak of its power during the period between 480-ca.460 BC,²⁰⁵ while the interruption of the produce of local coins indicates that the annexation of the Bisaltiae to Macedonia should be dated at ca. 460 BC.²⁰⁶ The similarities between the coins that are attributed to Alexander I (465-460 BC) and the Bisaltaean coinage implies the new status quo of the region and the transition to the Macedonian control of Bisaltia.²⁰⁷ The above mentioned statement could be also reinforced by Herodotus. When the ancient historian refers the mission of the seven Persian envoys to the king Amyntas, he also describes not only the course which they followed in order to reach Macedonia but also the region in general. Concerning the region he mentions the lake Prasias and the mount Dysoron and continues stressing that later *-ὑστεροντούτων-* Alexander drew a daily revenue of a talent of silver from that region.²⁰⁸ It could be suggested that by the phrase *ὑστεροντούτων* Herodotus means that the area of Dysoron was under Macedonian control after the end of the war against Persians and not after the mission of the seven Persian envoys.²⁰⁹ As a result we believe that as literary and archaeological evidence indicate the annexation of regions eastern of Axios river

²⁰³ Fried 1987, 9; Kagan 1987, 23; Heinrichs-Müller 2008, 295; Vasilev 2015, 96; Xydopoulos 2016, 255.

²⁰⁴ Psoma 2002, 42-43; Heinrichs-Müller 2008, 295; Xydopoulos 2016, 256.

²⁰⁵ Vasilev 2015, 96.

²⁰⁶ Psoma 2002, 42-43; Vasilev 2011, 20-21.

²⁰⁷ Xydopoulos 2016, 264.

²⁰⁸ Herodotus V. 17.

²⁰⁹ Xydopoulos 2016, 256.

such as Mygdonia, Crestonia and Bisaltia to the Macedonian kingdom should be dated at ca. 460 BC.²¹⁰

Another interesting issue that is at the same time ambiguous and controversial is the determination of the eastern boundaries of the Macedonian kingdom during Alexander's I reign. The expansion of the Macedonian domination over the areas that are located eastern of Strymon and the time that this possible expansion took place are still matters of debate. A very important fact that is strongly connected with the above mentioned Macedonian expansion is the capture of Nine Ways by the Macedonian king.

As we proved in the previous chapter there were no conflicts between Macedonians and the retreating Persian army. On the other hand, Hammond claims that at 477 BC, when it was clear that a Persian counterattack was impossible, Alexander attacked the Persians and captured the Nine Ways. He also argues that Alexander dedicated a gold statue at Delphi to celebrate that victory.²¹¹ Hammond's argument is based on the source *Philipp's Letter* that is wrongly attributed to Demosthenes. Another source that mentions the Macedonian capture of the Nine Ways is also *The Letter of Speusippus to Philip II*. The occupation of the Nine Ways by the Macedonians immediately after the retreat of the main part of the Persian army cannot be confirmed and cannot be accepted for several reasons. First of all the Herodotean text is silent and there is no reference concerning the Macedonian capture of the Nine Ways. It is only mentioned that Alexander dedicated a gold statue at Delphi but this is not connected neither with a Macedonian victory over the retreated Persian army nor with the occupation of the Nine ways.

Taking into consideration the fact that Herodotus is very well inform concerning Alexander's activities and furthermore his pro-Macedonian attitude it could be assumed that if the Macedonians had captured the Nine Ways Herodotus would have mentioned so crucial an event. On the so called *Philipp's Letter* Philip

²¹⁰ Xydopoulos 2016, 256.

²¹¹ Hammond 1989, 45.

argues in order to advocate his rights over Amphipolis that have been disputed by the Athenians. He also claims that Macedonia has more rights over the area than Athens since Alexander I was the liberator of the area and the first ruler after the Persian deportation by the Macedonians. *Philipp's Letter* and *The Letter of Speusippus to Philip II* are both subsequent and additionally are both based on Macedonian propaganda of their time and as a result their historical accuracy is dubious.²¹²

Furthermore, taking into consideration the historical and the political grounds of that period a Macedonian expansion eastern of Strymon and an attack on the Nine Ways immediately after the Persian withdrawal seems to have been impossible.

The Athenians had already expressed their interest of the area of the lower Strymon basin in the frame of their anti-Persian and imperialistic policy. At 476 BC Athens expelled the Persians and conquered the base of Eion.²¹³ At the same time Thassos was also interested in the area and mainly in the Bisaltaean mines as archaeological evidence indicates.²¹⁴ Moreover, other tribes whose attitude was not friendly towards Macedonians were settled in the area. Edones were a very powerful tribe of the area. At 465/4 they managed to exterminate the Athenians colonists at Draviscus.²¹⁵ Pierians and Almopians who had been expelled from their homeland by the Macedonians were resettled at the lands eastern of Strymon.²¹⁶ According to Herodotus, the Pierians were a strong tribe that even for the Persians it was difficult to defeat them.²¹⁷ Additionally there were also local independent Thracian tribes that possibly had attacked the Persians during their retreat as is mentioned by Herodotus.

²¹² Vasilev 2015, 209; Xydopoulos 2016, 258.

²¹³ Borza 1990, 119; Xydopoulos 2016, 259.

²¹⁴ Tiverios 2008, 69; Xydopoulos 2016, 259-260.

²¹⁵ Borza 1990, 122.

²¹⁶ Xydopoulos 2016, 260.

²¹⁷ Herodotus VII. 112.

As a result it is difficult to assume that Alexander managed to defeat all the above mentioned forces that were interested in or had settled in the area and to conquer the lands eastern of Strymon. Even if we suggest that they did not resist the Macedonian expansion it is also difficult to accept that Alexander expanded his kingdom and managed to keep control of the area eastern of Strymon that was full of competitors and enemies.

We firmly believe that a Macedonian expansion eastern of Strymon after the Persian withdrawal was impossible. It has to be stressed that after the retreat of the main part of the Persian army there were Persians garrisons at Eion and at Doriscus. After the conquest of Eion by the Athenians and the expulsion of the Persian garrison it still would have been too difficult for Alexander to manage to compete with all forces and tribes that were active in the area and to establish the necessary steadiness in the region eastern of Strymon so that it was possible for the Macedonians to exploit the mines and to gain a daily revenue of a talent of silver.²¹⁸

According to Xydopoulos, the Macedonians believed themselves to be apparent heirs to the Persians over the North Aegean. As a result, they could claim that they had rights all over the former Persian possessions. In the frame of that ideology maybe the Macedonians tried to expand their Kingdom eastern of Strymon. Perhaps their efforts were unsuccessful or they had short term results. If Alexander managed to expand his kingdom eastern of Strymon even for a short period of time it could be suggested that the ancient sources and mainly Herodotus would have mentioned it.²¹⁹

A period of time that was ideal for Alexander I to conquer lands eastern of Strymon was after 465/464 BC. Thassos has been defeated by the Athenians, while Athens failed to colonize the Nine Ways because at Draviscus the Athenians had been exterminated by Edones. It was supposed that Alexander's attitude towards Athens was hostile because of Athenian activities in the area of Strymon. The

²¹⁸ Xydopoulos 2016, 260.

²¹⁹ Xydopoulos 2016, 261.

hostility between Athens and Macedonia is based on Plutarch who mentioned that Cimon after the defeat of the Thassians did not attack Macedonia because he has been bribed by Alexander.²²⁰ Moreover some scholars believed that Alexander supported Edones and other local Thracian tribes to defeat the Athenian colonists.²²¹ According to this point of view Alexander was then free to capture Nine Ways since all the obstacles had been removed, Athens and Thassos had been defeated and the local Thracians were allied with the Macedonians since the last supported them to face the Athenians.

The above mentioned opinion is not acceptable for several reasons. First of all, Plutarch is a subsequent source and as a result the reference about the bribery of Cimon by Alexander is ambiguous.²²² Possibly the accusation against Cimon exudes the propaganda of the Anti-Cimonian political part at Athens.²²³ Moreover the fact that Cimon did not attack the Macedonians possibly indicates the Athenian or his will to keep relations with Alexander and not to deteriorate them. It has to be stressed that the Macedonian timber was still necessary for the Athenian fleet and that Alexander was still *proxenos* and *euergetes* of the city.²²⁴ The assumption that Alexander supported the Thracian tribes to defeat the Athenians cannot be confirmed. Moreover Eion was an Athenian base and Athens could use it as a base of operations for its interests related to the Strymon basin. In addition if we accept the above mentioned opinion then we will have to accept the identification of mount Dysoron with Menoikion²²⁵ that we believe that is wrong. According to Herodotus the Persians did not manage to subjugate the area of Pangaion and the tribes that settled there. It is very difficult to assume that Alexander to manage what the

²²⁰ Plutarch, *Cimon*, 14. 2-5. Hammond-Griffith 1979, 103.

²²¹ Kanastoulis 1964, 14; Cole 1978, 48-49.

²²² Xydopoulos 2016, 261.

²²³ Borza 1990, 122-123.

²²⁴ Xydopoulos 2016, 262.

²²⁵ Missitzis 1985, 13; Faraguna 1998, 375; Picard 2006, 270; Hatzopoulos 2008, 20; Dahmen 2010, 50; Zannis 2014, 84.

Persian failed to do. Moreover it would be extremely difficult for the Macedonians not only to conquer the area around Pangaion but also to exploit the mines there. Furthermore the reference of Herodotus that after mount Dysoron Macedonia can be reached easily does not suit with the location of mount Menoikion which is east of Strymon and north of mount Pangaion and the Angites river. As a result the approach from Menoikion to Macedonia is far from easy. If someone wants to reach Macedonia from Menoikion he has to firstly cross Strymon and then the mountain of Kerdyllion. As a result, we believe that mount Dysoron should be identified with mount Flamouri which is located west of Strymon.²²⁶

To sum up, we believe and we proved based on archaeological and literary evidence that Alexander did not occupy Bisaltia immediately after the Persian withdrawal but at ca. 460 BC. Moreover we think that the eastern boundaries of Macedonia during Alexander's I reign was the Strymon river. The assumption of a Macedonian expansion east of Strymon is based on subsequent sources and is a later invention based on Macedonian propaganda that aimed to support the rights of Macedonia over the areas east of Strymon. Furthermore, taking into consideration the political, military and financial circumstances and the competitions among the states and the tribes as well during that period we think that Macedonia was not able to conquer and to control areas so deep in the Thracian inland. The identification of the ancient mount Dysoron that is mentioned in the sources with the mount Flamouri fits satisfactorily with the descriptions of Herodotus and with the historical circumstances of that period. Alexander had already occupied the neighboring area of Bisaltia and he had managed to expand his kingdom until the Strymon river and to control this area. The area east of Axios was settled by mixed population consisting of Greeks and local tribes. This lack of homogeneity of the local population was possibly an obstacle for the total control of the area by the Macedonians. The similarities between Alexander's coinage after 465 BC and the Bisaltaean indicate probably the trial and the will of Alexander to control and to assimilate the local tribes that have been incorporated into his kingdom.

²²⁶Xydopoulos 2016, 262, 264.

Conclusions

Herodotus is among the most important sources for the history of the ancient Greek world and the main source concerning the history of the early Macedonian kingdom. In the frame of his history Herodotus gives mostly piecemeal but very interesting and important information that can shed light upon the activities of the Macedonian kings, the participation and the role of Macedonia during the war with the Persian Empire, the relations of the Macedonians with the Persians, the neighboring tribes and the rest of the Greek world. Possibly he visited Macedonia as it could be indicated by his work itself and by the reference of the Lexicon of Suda. The exact date of his arrival in Macedonia is not clear but it should be dated possibly during the last years of the reign of Alexander or in the beginning of Perdikkas II reign. There Herodotus had the chance to be informed about the Macedonian court tradition and the Macedonian version of Alexander's activities. The Macedonian or the Athenian pro-Macedonian sources (Alexander was proxenus and euergetes of the city of Athens already during the times of Herodotus) is difficult to be identified. Herodotus history concerning Macedonia and Alexander I's activities based on works of earlier authors such as that of Hecataeus, on local verbal testimonies that he recorded during his stay in Macedonia and on evidence as a result of his own research. Possibly some Herodotean references should be characterized as inaccurate or tales. The murder of the seven Persian envoys by the young Alexander, the participation of Alexander in the Olympic Games and the Argive origin of the Macedonian-Temenid Royal house are possibly Macedonian inventions. The above mentioned tales has been invented and propagated by the Macedonian Royal house as an effort to bridge the gap between the Southern and the Northern Greeks. On the other hand we firmly believe that a total rejection of the Herodotean history concerning Alexander I's activities is false and that there is indeed a sperm of truth related to Alexander's attitude. If Herodotus had tried to enhance the image and the prestige of Alexander I by mentioning completely false elements and by forging the history, this would have been rejected by the majority of the people and we may say

that it would have been considered unbelievable. Every effort to idealize Alexander himself and his actions would be impossible, since the events that Herodotus presented were very important for the Greek world. Moreover, how could be interpreted Alexander's dedication of a gold statue at Delphi that stood next to the statue that the Greeks dedicated to celebrate their victory over the Persians? Furthermore despite the clear pro-Macedonian attitude of Herodotus, the ancient historian is also critical of Alexander since it is stressed that his Greekness was not an obstacle to his megalomania.

Despite the fact that the relations between Macedonia and Persia and the status quo of the Macedonian kingdom during the Persian occupation still remain ambiguous and controversial, some interesting and important conclusions could be drawn based on historical and archaeological evidence. The Macedonian king Amyntas offered "earth and water" to the Persian Great King while Amyntas daughter Gygaia married with the Persian noble Bubares. As Xydopoulos suggests Macedonia possibly was "under a loose client status in Amyntas reign". The servitude of Macedonia offered not only dynastic stability but also the Persian military protection of the Macedonian king and as a result there was not any reason for a Macedonian uprising against the Great King. The phrase of Herodotus that Macedonia was enslaved by Mardonius possibly indicates a more intense Persian military presence in the area than before. Moreover Amyntas is mentioned as *hyparchos*, a man ruling over the Macedonians possibly on behalf of the Great king and acting as *hyparchos* he offered Anthemion to Hippias.

The reference of Herodotus that Mardonius subjected Macedonia by his infantry possibly indicates that the status of Macedonia was different after Mardonius' mission than it was before after Megabazus' campaign. It seems possible that after the campaign of Mardonius and during Alexander I's reign, Macedonia has been added to the Persian administrative system and was in power of the Great King. However it is not clear whether Macedonia has been a satrapy or was part of another. Despite the ambiguous administrative status, it is obvious that Macedonia was a completely depended state. Its ruler had to pay tribute to Persia and

Macedonian army had to support Persian forces. Moreover, it is not clear if there were Persian garrisons at the Macedonian cities. The fact that Alexander I retained his position as local ruler after the submission of Macedonia implies that possibly there was not a serious disturbance between the two sides.

Archaeological evidence confirms not only the Persian existence in Macedonia during the late 6th and the beginning of the 5th century BC but also indicates a Macedonian economic development that can be connected with the Persian existence in the area. Moreover the coinage also implies the Persian influence since Persian elements can be found on Macedonian coins that circulated during Persian occupation.

During the invasion of Xerxes in Greece Alexander and the Macedonian army followed the Persian forces. Alexander is presented during some crucial moments of the war to support the allied Greek forces. At first at Tempe he advised the Greeks to retreat since there was the possibility to be surrounded by the Persian army. Later he saved some cities in Boeotia and he had been sent as a Persian envoy for alliance by Mardonius to the Athenians. According to the Herodotean text, on the eve of the crucial battle of Plataea during the night Alexander left on horseback the Persian camp, reached the Greek one asking for an audience with the Athenian generals. Before the generals he claimed that he is also a Greek and that he is concerned about the future of Greece and he does not want Greece to be enslaved. Moreover he informed Greeks that Mardonius will attack them the next morning.

After the Persian defeat and their withdrawal from Greece, Macedonia was a strong and stable kingdom. Despite the fact that some scholars believe that Alexander attacked the retreating Persian army and immediately after the Persian withdrawal occupied territories even east of Strymon it seems that these assumptions cannot be confirmed. A Macedonian attack against the retreating Persian army would be too risky for Alexander I and his kingdom. The political and the military circumstances at that moment were not stable but very changeable, while the Persian intentions related to Greece and to the Balkan Peninsula in general

were still unknown and unpredictable. It must be also stressed that the neighboring area of Thrace was still under Persian occupation and additionally there was still the Persian garrison at Eion. As a result a hostile Macedonian attitude towards Great King's army would have caused a general Persian counterattack with unpredictable, important and negative consequences for Macedonia and consequently we firmly believe that never happened. Moreover an expansion of the Macedonian borders towards Strymon or eastern of Strymon immediately after the Persian withdrawal seems to be implausible.

The incorporation of Bisaltia into the Macedonian kingdom should not be dated immediately after the Persian withdrawal but much later at about 460 BC as archaeological and coinage evidence indicates. The results of the study of the well known Bisaltaean Decadrachm Hoard can shed light on the date of the annexation of Bisaltia and on the Macedonian expansion to the east. The Bisaltaean coinage should be dated from 480 BC to 460 BC. Moreover the coinage that is attributed to Alexander I dated at 465-460 BC. The Bisaltaean coinage possibly implies that the Kingdom of Bisaltia reached the peak of its power during the period between 480-ca.460 BC, while the interruption of the produce of local coins indicates that the annexation of the Bisaltae to Macedonia should be dated at ca. 460 BC. The similarities between the coins that are attributed to Alexander I (465-460 BC) and the Bisaltaean coinage implies the new status quo of the region and the transition to the Macedonian control of Bisaltia. The above mentioned statement could be also reinforced by Herodotus. When the ancient historian refers to the mission of the seven Persian envoys to the king Amyntas, he also describes not only the course which they followed in order to reach Macedonia but also the region in general. Concerning the region he mentions the lake Prasias and the mount Dysoron and continues stressing that later *-ὑστεροντούτων-* Alexander drew a daily revenue of a talent of silver from that region. It could be suggested that by the phrase *ὑστεροντούτων* Herodotus means that the area of Dysoron was under Macedonian control after the end of the war against Persians and not after the mission of the seven Persian envoys. As a result we believe that as literary and archaeological

evidence indicate the annexation of regions eastern of Axios river such as Mygdonia, Crestonia and Bisaltia to the Macedonian kingdom should be dated at ca. 460 BC.

Concerning the Macedonian expansion eastern of Strymon it seems that never happened since the historical circumstances were prohibitive. According to Xydopoulos, the Macedonians maybe believed themselves to be apparent heirs to the Persians over the North Aegean. As a result, they could claim that they had rights all over the former Persian possessions. In the frame of that ideology maybe the Macedonians tried to expand their Kingdom eastern of Strymon. Perhaps their efforts were unsuccessful or they had short term results. If Alexander managed to expand his kingdom eastern of Strymon even for a short period of time it could be suggested that the ancient sources and mainly Herodotus would have mentioned it.

Alexander was a very interesting personality and a charismatic king dedicated to his own and to Macedonia's interest. During his reign the Macedonian kingdom became wealthy not only through the commercial activities such as timber but also through the exploitation of important metalliferous sources. Alexander managed to enlarge his borders both westwards and eastwards and to create the strongest force in the northern Aegean and also developed a kind of court life. Alexander was also endowed with perspicacity, opportunism and was a great diplomat. He was vassal of the Great King and at the same time he supported the allied Greek forces in many ways. As a result he had managed to secure the "victory" for him and his kingdom regardless the outcome of the war. It is not easy to understand Alexander's attitude and to shed light on the real incentives that led him to act as Herodotus mentions. Possibly enough it was not only his philhellenic feelings but his actions were actuated by his own and his state's interests. The attitude of Alexander as a whole and his double play during the war indicates dedication to the interest of his state and at the same time a total submission to the will of the Great king. His later characterization as "Philhellene" possibly indicates his positive image within the Greek world.

Bibliography

- Archibald 1998 Archibald, Z. H. 1998, *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace. Orpheus Unmasked*, Oxford.
- Archibald 2010 Archibald, Z. H. 2010, "Macedonia and Thrace.", J. Roisman - I. Worthington, (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, 326-41. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Badian 1994 Badian, E. 1994, "Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in Some Subtle Silences", Hornblower, S. ed., *Greek Historiography*, Oxford, 107-130.
- Balcer 1988 Balcer, J. M. 1988, "Persian Occupied Thrace", *Historia* 33, 1-21.
- Balcer 1995 Balcer, J. M. 1995, *The Persian Conquest of the Greeks 545–450 BC*, *Xenia* 38, Konstanz.
- Barron 1988 Barron, J. P. 1988, "The Liberation of Greece", *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol IV, *Persia, Greece and the Western Mediterranean c. 525-479 BC*, 592-622.
- Bengtson 1996 Bengtson, F. 1996, *Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die Zeit der römischen Kaiser*, München.
- Borza1990 Borza, E. N.1990, *In the shadows of Olympus: the emergence of Macedon*, New Jersey.
- Cole 1977 Cole, J.W. 1977, "Not Alexander but Perdikkas (Dem. 23.200 and 13.24)", *GRBS* 18, 25-32.
- Cole 1978 Cole, J.W. 1978, "Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles", *AC* 47, 37-49.
- Dahmen 2010 Dahmen, K. 2010, "The Numismatic Evidence», ROISMAN, J.- WORTHINGTON, I. (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, London, 41-62..
- Daskalakis 1965 Daskalakis A. B. 1965, *The Hellenism of the ancient Macedonians*, Thessaloniki.
- Delev 2007 Delev, P. 2007, "Tribes, Poleis, and Imperial Aggression in the Lower Strymon Area in the 5th Century B.C.", Ιακωβίδου Α. (ed), *Η Θράκη στον ελληνο-ρωμαϊκό κόσμο*, Αθήνα, 110-119.

- Edson 1947 Edson, C. F. 1947, "Notes on the Thracian 'Phoros' ", *CP* 42, 88-105.
- Edson 1970 Edson, C. F. 1970, "Early Macedonia", Laourdas, B.-Makaronas, Ch. (eds), *Ancient Macedonia I. Papers read at the first international symposium held in Thessaloniki, 26-29 August 1968*, Thessaloniki, 17-44.
- Engen 2010 Engen, D. T. 2010, *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece 415-307 B.C.E.*, Michigan.
- Errington 1981 Errington, R. M. 1981, "Alexander the Philhellene and Persia", Dell. H., ed., *Ancient Macedonian Studies in honor of Charles F. Edson*, 139-143.
- Errington 1986 Errington, R. M. 1986, *Geschichte Makedoniens*, München.
- Faraguna 1998 Faraguna, M. 1998, "Aspetti amministrativi e finanziari della monarchia macedone tra IV e III secolo a.C.", *Athenaeum* 86, 349-395.
- Fearn 2007 Fearn, D.W. 2007, "Herodotos 5.17-22. Narrating Ambiguity: Murder and Macedonian Allegiance", Irwin E., Greenwood, E. (eds), *Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi of Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories*, Cambridge, 98-127.
- Fehling 1994 Fehling, D. 1994, "The art of Herodotus and the margins of the world", Martels., Z. V. ed., *Travel Fact and Travel Fiction, Studies on Fiction, Literary Tradition, Scholarly Discovery and Observation in Travel Writing*, Leiden-New York-Köln.
- Flensted-Jensen 2004 Flensted-Jensen, P. 2004, "Thrace from Axios to Strymon", Hansen, M. H. - Nielsen, T. H. (eds), *An inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 810-853.
- Fried 1987 Fried, S. 1987, "The Decadrachm Hoard: an introduction", I. CARRADICE (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires, The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History, BAR International Series 343*, Oxford 1-20.

- Gerolymatos 1986 Gerolymatos, A. S. 1986, "The proxenia of Alexandros I of Makedonia.", *LCM* 11, 75-76.
- Geyer 1930 Geyer, F. 1930, *Makedonien bis zur thronbesteigung Philipps II*, München und Berlin.
- Green 1998 Green, P. 1998, *The Greco-Persian wars*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- Gschnitzer 1977 Gschnitzer, F. 1977, *Die sieben Perser und das Königtum des Dareios. Ein Beitrag zur Achaimenidengeschichte und zur Herodotanalyse*, Heidelberg.
- Gschnitzer 2001 Gschnitzer, F. 2001, "Herodot's makedonische Quellen", Barcelò, P., Rosenberger, V. und Dotterweich, V. (eds), *Humanitas – Beiträge zur antiken Kulturgeschichte. Festschrift für Gunther Gottlieb zum 65. Geburtstag*, München, 89-96.
- Gschnitzer 2003 Gschnitzer, F. 2003, *Kleine Schriften zum griechischen und römischen Altertum*, v. II. [Historia Einzelschr. 167], Stuttgart.
- Gygax 2016 Gygax, M. D. 2016, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City. The Origins of Euergetism.*, Cambridge.
- Hammond-Griffith 1979 Hammond, N.G.L. - Griffith, G. T. 1979, *A History of Macedonia*, II, Oxford.
- Hammond 1989 Hammond, N.G.L. 1989, *The Macedonian State. Its Origins, Institutions, and History*, Oxford.
- Hatzopoulos-
- Loukopoulou 1992 Hatzopoulos M. B. – Loukopoulou, L. 1992, *Recherches sur les marches orientales des Téménides, Ière partie*, Athènes, *MEΛETHMATA* 11.
- Hatzopoulos 1996, Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1996, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, v. I – II, Athens, *MEΛETHMATA* 22.
- Hatzopoulos 2008 Hatzopoulos, M. B. 2008, « Retour à la vallée du Strymon », L. D. LOUKOPOULOU, L. D. –Psoma, S. (eds), *Thrakika Zetemata I*, Athènes, *MEΛETHMATA* 58, 13-54.
- Heinrichs-

- Müller 2008 Heinrichs, J. – Müller, S. 2008, “Ein persisches Statussymbol auf Münzen Alexanders I. von Makedonien. Ikonographie und historischer Hintergrund des Tetrobols SNG ABC, Macedonia I,7 und 11”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 167, 283-309.
- Herman 1987 Herman, G. 1987, *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, Cambridge.
- Hornblower 2002 Hornblower, S. 2002, *The Greek world 479-323 BC*, London and New York.
- Kagan 1987 Kagan, J. H. 1987, “The Decadrachm Hoard: Chronology and Consequences”, I. CARRADICE (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires, The Ninth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History*, BAR International Series 343, Oxford, 21-288.
- Kanatsoulis 1964 Kanatsoulis, D. 1964, *Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας μέχρι του Μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου*, Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Kertész 2005 Kertész, I. 2005, “When Did Alexander I Visit Olympia?”, *Nikephoros* 18, 115-126.
- Lateiner 1989 Lateiner, D. 1989, *The historical method of Herodotus*, Toronto.
- Lexicon of Suda Bekker., I. A. 1854, *Suidae Lexicon*, Berlin 1854.
- Low 2008 Low, P. 2008, *The Athenian Empire*, Low, P (ed), Edinburg.
- Mack 2015 Mack, W. 2015, *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford.
- Marek 1984 Marek, C. 1984, *Die Proxenie*, Frankfurt.
- Mark 2009 Mark, J. J. 2009, *Ancient History encyclopedia*.
- Meiggs 1972 Meiggs, R. 1972, *The Athenian Empire*, London.
- Missitzis 1985 Missitzis, L. 1985, “ A Royal Decree of Alexander the Great on the Lands of Philippi, *AncW* 12, 3-14.

- Olbrycht 2010 Olbrycht, M. J. 2010, "Macedonia and Persia", Roisman, J., Worthington, I. eds, *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 342-369.
- Paspalas 2000 Paspalas, S. A. 2000, "On Persian- Type Furniture in Macedonia: The Recognition and Transmission of Forms", *American Journal of Archaeology* 104, 531-560.
- Paspalas 2006 Paspalas, S. A. 2006, "The Achaemenid Empire and the Northwestern Aegean", *Ancient West and East* 5, 90-121.
- Psoma 2002, Ψωμά, Σ. 2002, «Το Βασίλειο των Μακεδόνων πριν από τον Φίλιππο Β': Νομισματική και Ιστορική Προσέγγιση», *Η Ιστορική Διαδρομή της Νομισματικής Μονάδας στην Ελλάδα*, Αθήνα 2002, 25-45.
- Picard 2006 Picard, O. 2006, "Mines, monnaies et impérialisme : Conflits autour du Pangée (478-413 av. J.-C.)», Guimier-Sorbets, A. M.-Hatzopoulos, M. B. (eds), *Rois, Cites, Necropoles. Institutions, Rites et monuments enMacédoine*, Athènes, *ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ*45, 269-283.
- Rood 2006 Rood, T. 2006, "Herodotus and foreign lands", Dewald. C. – J. Marincola, J. eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge, 290-305.
- Scaife 1989 Scaife, R. 1989, "Alexander I in the Histories of Herodotos", *Hermes* 117, 129-137.
- Scott 2005 Scott, L., 2005, *Historical commentary on Herodotus Book 6*, Leiden-Boston.
- Sprawski 2010 Sprawski, S. 2010, "The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I", Roisman, J., Worthington, I. eds, *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 127-144.
- Tačeva 1992 Tačeva, M. 1992, "On the Problems of the Coinages of Alexander I, Sparadokos and the so-called Thracian-Macedonian Tribes", *Historia*41, 58–74.
- Trevett 2011 Trevett, J. 2011, *Demosthenes Speeches 1-17*, Texas.
- Tripodi 2007 Tripodi, B. 2007, "Aminta I, Alessandro I e gli hyparchoi in Erodoto.", *Ancient Macedonia* 7 (Papers Read at the Seventh

International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki, 14–18 October 2002), 67–85. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.

- Vasilev 2015 Vasilev, M. I. 2015, *The Policy of Darius and Xerxes towards Thrace and Macedonia*, Leiden-Boston.
- Wallace 1970 Wallace, M.B. 1970, "Early Greek Proxenoï", *Phoenix* 24, 189-208.
- Xydopoulos 1998 Ξυδόπουλος, Ι.Κ. 1998, *Κοινωνικές και πολιτιστικές σχέσεις των Μακεδόνων και των άλλων Ελλήνων. Συμβολή στην έρευνα της γραμματειακής και επιγραφικής παράδοσης για την αρχαία Μακεδονία*, Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Xydopoulos 2012 Xydopoulos, I. K. 2012, "Anthemus and Hippias. The policy of Amyntas I", *Illinois Classical Studies* 37, 21-37.
- Xydopoulos 2016 Xydopoulos, I. 2016, "The eastern Macedonian border in Alexander I's reign", Γιαννοπούλου, Μ., Καλλίνη, Χρ. (eds), *ήχάδιν II, Τιμητικός Τόμος για τη Στέλλα Δρούγου*, Αθήνα.
- Xydopoulos 2018 Xydopoulos, I. K. 2018, «Τα ανατολικά σύνορα της Μακεδονίας επί Αλεξάνδρου Α': Άργιλος», Bonias, Z.-Perreault, J. (eds) Άργιλος, 25 χρόνια έρευνας. Οργάνωση πόλης και χώρας στις αποικίες του βόρειου Αιγαίου, 8^{ος}-3^{ος} αι. π Χ., Thessaloniki.
- Zannis 2014 Zannis, A. G. 2014, *Le pays entre le Strymon et le Nestos. Géographie et histoire, (VIIe-IVe siècle avant J.-C.)*, Athènes, ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ71.