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Abstract

This dissertation was written as part of the MA in Classical Archaeology and Ancient History of Macedonia aiming to enlighten the reasons for Philip II’s marital policy and provide information in relation to royal Macedonian women in his court. Philip II was the third out of the three sons of Amyntas III of the Argead dynasty, who ruled the kingdom of Macedonia from the backwater of the Hellenic world. Prior to his reign the kingdom was weak, unstable, possessing an impotent army that could not deal with their many aggressive enemies. His ascendance to the throne, his innovations during his reign and his multiple marriages were crucial for the transformation and expansion of Macedonia.

Early in his reign he took five wives, part of his marriage policy to form alliances, aiming also to produce quickly male heirs to the throne. Two more weddings followed, the last one with a Macedonian noble probably of Argive descent that took place a little time before his assassination in 336 BC. All these royal women, including his mother queen Eurydice, his daughters and granddaughters seemed to play an important role in his monarchy and in shaping their dynasty’s image. Even his divinity was implied to project this image. Anyhow, his polygamy has possibly caused problems in his court and could be a reason for his assassination. Olympias, mother of his son Alexander and seemingly successor to his throne, was projected by some ancient authors, especially by Justin, as the mastermind behind his murder. The work of another ancient author, Plutarch’s Life of Alexander appears to have some elements in contrast with Alexander Romance, an epistolic novel with many alterations. What was the mirroring of these royal Macedonian women in these two?
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Preface

When in search of a subject for my dissertation as part of the MA in Classical Archaeology and Ancient History of Macedonia of International Hellenic University, I realized that I had a fair amount of knowledge regarding Philip II, king of Macedonia, and the Argead dynasty but I was not aware why he chose to be polygamous, unlike what was accustomed in the rest of the Hellenic world, or what the identity of his many wives was. Additionally, questions began to arise as to the identity, the role of royal women in his court, their exercise of power and their behavior as queens. Were royal mothers considered more important than spouses? How were they depicted in literary sources? The following paper will present some basic details around Philip’s life and kingship and dedicate separate chapters for his mother, queen Eurydice, and his consorts. It will, also, consider the role his many marriages played to his demonstration as a God and the possible role of Olympias to his assassination. At the end, an appendix will follow examining how these women were displayed in Plutarch’s *A life of Alexander* and *Alexander Romance*, a novel incorporating fiction and historical facts about Alexander that emerged in antiquity and lasted through Renaissance. Taking note of the above, we will be lead to conclusions in relation to his polygamy and to the identity of royal women in his court.
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Introduction

It is said that behind every great man stands a strong woman. In the case of Philip II, king of Macedonia (359 -336 BC) these were seven: Audata, Phila, Nikesipolis, Philinna, Olympias, Meda and Cleopatra. Much of the information we have regarding the marriages with these women derives from the fragmentary work of Satyrus the Peripatetic in his *Life of Philip*, preserved by Athenaeus in *Deipnosophistai* (13.557b-e). According to this famous passage, Philip II practiced polygamy and he “always” married “κατά πόλεμον”, a comment likely made by Athenaeus and not Satyrus himself.¹ Either part of the original fragment or not, Athenaeus begins by citing Philip’s seven marriages, thus providing us with valuable information regarding his consorts. A whole new marriage policy initiated by Philip is revealed, of which he became the master and which was imitated by the Argead kings who succeeded him in the throne. This shall be the dual attempt of this dissertation, i.e. a) to present the existing evidence regarding the royal women in Philip’s court and b) to unveil the marriage policy the Macedonian king adopted in order to strengthen his monarchy.

I. The role of Philip's mother

Born around 382 BC to Amyntas III (393-370) and Eurydice, Philip II was king of Macedonia (360/59-336) and father of Alexander III. His father had two spouses: Gygaea and Eurydice. The former, most likely first in line, gave him three sons: Archelaus, Arrhidaeus and Menelaus. His full siblings were Eurynoe, Alexander II (369-368) and Perdicas III (365-360/59), the last two having also served as kings of Macedonia before Philip II’s reign. Amyntas, skillful too in military tactics, invested in diplomacy by adopting the Athenian general Iphicrates and by allowing the Athenian general Timotheus to export timber to Athens. Amyntas died in 370/369 BC in advanced age.²

¹ Tronson 1984, 120.
² Roisman 2010, 160-161.
Philip’s mother, queen Eurydice (c. 410 - c. 340’s BC), was a princess of Illyrian or Lyncestian origin, daughter of Sirras and granddaughter of Arrhabeus of Lyncestis in Upper Macedonia. A portrayal of her ambiguous character can be outlined from the description of the favored by Philip, Aeschines, after her husband’s death: in 368/67 BC she appears to have met the Athenian general Iphicrates at her court, where she begged him, as their philos, to alter the Athenian position against Pausanias, the pretender to the Macedonian throne, in favor of her children. In that scene described, Eurydice put Perdiccas III in Iphicrates’ arms while she was embracing her younger son, Philip. The gesture was strong enough to make Iphicrates change his mind. This is the first recorded time a royal woman interfered in political issues in Macedonia and in this case Eurydice, employing her network of philia, acted for her children’s benefit. Moreover, an epigram in Plutarch’s Moralia (XIV 14.b-c) attests to a dedication she had made to female citizens and not to the Muses, as it was originally believed, in order to show her gratitude because she learned to read and write at an advanced age, when her children were still adolescents. Plutarch refers to Eurydice as an example of good parenting and a model for her children’s education, even though she was an Illyrian and an utter barbarian as he quotes. She acts as an example for other women too, urging them to become educated even when being elder, as she was. Plutarch thought education would impede women from bad behavior; a woman who studied geometry, for example, would be ashamed to become a dancer or she would not get involved in magic charms if she were under the words of Plato or Xenophon (Plut. Conjug. 48).

Albeit, in other sources that same woman did not seem to show the same affection for her family, as she seemingly conspired with her son-in-law and (presumably) lover, Ptolemy from Alorus (he was possibly married to her daughter Eurynoe), not only against her husband but against her own son Alexander II, whom Ptolemy killed in 368 BC (Athen. 14.629d = FGrH 136 F 11, Plut. Pelopidas 26–27, Justin. 7.4-7.8). Ptolemy of Alorus was likely fathered by

---

3 Carney 2017b, 142.
4 Roisman 2010, 163; Aeschines 2.26-29; Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 2000, 393; Lane Fox 2011, 258.
5 Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 2000, 401; Carney 2019, 4, 80-81.
6 Kempf 2017, 9.
Amyntas II\(^7\) and became a king or just acted as a regent for his minors at that time, namely Perdiccas III and Philip II. Perdiccas, in an act of revenge for his brother’s murder, assassinated Ptolemy in 365 BC (Diod. Sic. 15.77.5), thus taking his place to the throne. Perdiccas’ reign lasted until 360/359BC, when he died in the battlefield along with his men, facing the Illyrian invaders.\(^8\)

Elisabeth Carney rightly suggests not to take the allegations that Eurydice was an adulteress and a murderer seriously, especially when considering Justin’s statements as part of a 4\(^{th}\) century propaganda against Eurydice and her sons: a prejudice attested to other royal women of Macedonia too as we shall see below.\(^9\) Her arrival at the court, like that of Cleopatra’s, Philip’s last wife, caused turmoil in relation to the succession of Amyntas. His first wife Gygaea and her children, who, unlike Eurydice, originated from Lower Macedonia, tended to lower her origin and characterize her sons both of being barbarous and illegitimate to become kings. This was part of what Daniel Ogden names amphimetric strife between the many wives of a king and their children. *Amphimetores* are children of the same father but of different mother, a term defined by Hesychius and also used by Euripides in Andromache and in an Aeschylus fragment. It appears disputes did not exist between full siblings, as we can see in the case of Amyntas III and his sons where primogeniture functioned well, from the oldest to the youngest son taking the throne one after the other. On the contrary, amphimetric groups attempted to acquire legitimacy and a higher ranking by accusing each other of bastardy since no hierarchy existed regarding all these children from different wives.\(^10\)

The contemporaries to Philip Demosthenes and Theopompus, who engaged themselves in dealing with the Macedonian king’s life, were not eyewitnesses of the facts in the Macedonian court; quickly, though, they reproduced the accusations for the power-hungry, lustful and unmoral Eurydice to attack Philip and support the Athenian interests, showing no concern about historical accuracy. Her supposed non-Greek Illyrian ethnicity could also be part of this

---

\(^7\) For more information concerning his origin, please check Lane Fox 2011, 231-233 and Roisman 2010, 162.

\(^8\) Roisman 2010, 163.

\(^9\) Carney 2019, 55

\(^10\) Ogden 1996, x, 19-20.
propaganda. She seems foreign and barbarian to Southern Greece and her children are called spurious (Suda s.v. Karanos). Demosthenes in his speeches characterized Philip as an illegitimate son of Amyntas (Dem. 9.31). Attacks like these grew more with Philip’s growing success. Their example was later followed by authors like Diodorus, Justin/Pompeius Trogus and Plutarch who based their works on 4th c BC accounts. These authors seemed to select passages from the past that contained bad reputation for politically active queens to meet their own interests and make their public accept certain “truths” in relation to women of their period. Anyhow, the gender issue was always an issue for them, frequently picturing royal women as treacherous, murderous and unfaithful. ¹¹

Aeschines, who presents Eurydice in a positive way, was most likely a friend of Philip, and had probably acted in support of him with his works being part of Philip’s propaganda to present his mother as a traditional and caring mother and wife. Demosthenes had accused Aeschines of being bribed by Philip when he went to Pella in 346 BC as a delegate to negotiate a peace treaty with him (Dem. 18.51-52). ¹²

In the case of Eurydice, Justin does not describe Amyntas III in a negative way, even though he murdered another claimant to the throne and was not a great king. On the contrary, Eurydice appears to be the sole responsible for every wrong in the Macedonian court, with discrimination being expressed against her gender. The fact that Justin accuses her of Perdiccas assassination too, even though it was known that he was killed in battle, demonstrates how prejudiced he is against her (Justin. 7.5.4-8). Regarding her alleged infidelity, she may have not been sexually unfaithful to Amyntas and not have conspired to kill him but instead she may have wedded Ptolemy after her husband’s and daughter’s death. It sounds strange that Amyntas not only would forgive her infidelity but also such a conspiracy against him and remain married to her. A levirate marriage to Ptolemy of Alorus, common in such cases, would solve the problem of succession, thus avoiding amphimetric disputes and uniting the royal family

¹¹ Howe 2018, 12-14; Carney 2019, 26.
¹² Howe 2018, 9, Carney 2019, 67
against outside factions. The would-be successors tended to marry the royal widow or royal mother to usurp the throne, a similar occasion being that of Archelaus I wedding his father’s widow, Cleopatra.

Apart from the literary sources referring to the king’s mother, some statue bases have been unearthed at Aigai, at the sanctuary of Eukleia with dedications that she had made to the goddess, protectress of good repute and glory; her name Εὐκλεία, originating from the words εὖ + κλέος (meaning δόξα= glory), justifies her attributes. The names Ευρυδίκα Σίρρα Εύκλειαι (see Figure 2) are incised on these bases, in which she appears using only her patronymic and not the title queen Eurydice, something which has been attested for Philip’s women as well. A statue that has been discovered at this sanctuary is believed to be depicting her, manifesting her public role, her patronage and euergetism to the citizen women, since she probably had acted as a priestess of Eukleia’s cult, who used to be venerated in the agoras of ancient Greek cities (see Figure 3 and Figure 4). These dedications and the temple itself could have been part of Philip’s propaganda to present his mother as a traditional mother and wife to the slurs of his Argead or non-Argead rivals. Unlike the more private image we had for royal women, the dedication to a sanctuary in the agora of the city proves that royal Macedonian women appeared in public, had active roles in society, functioning as an example for other women. They may, though, have appeared publicly in veil and be recognized only by their attire (like Adea-Eurydice and Olympias, as we shall later see), remaining distant and approachable at the same time. The sanctuary of Eukleia along with the theatre and the palace of Aigai are taken as part of Philip’s urban planning and royal stagecraft. Details of how Philip set theatrical scenes to project his dynasty shall be addressed in a following chapter. Eurydice is believed to have been interred to the monumental tomb of Macedonian type at the royal cemetery NW of the city of Aigai (see Figure 1).

---

13 The term “levirate” is not used with the strict sense of a man marrying his dead brother’s wife.
14 Ogden 1999, xix, 10; Carney 2010, 416.
15 Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 2000, 401.
16 Carney 2000, 46; the statue, in most likelihood, originally depicted the Goddess Eukleia. Its face was scraped off and the new depicting Eurydice was attached. You can find more details in Kyriakou & Tourtas 2015, 367-369.
17 Howe 2018, 9.
18 Carney 2010, 43-53; id. 2019, 84.
To sum up, Eurydice, despite the lessening of her origin, her presentation as adulterous, murderous and power-hungry, she managed to put on the throne not one but all of her sons and become the founding mother of the Argead dynasty. One of them, however, was the one that had a great impact both on Macedonia and the other Greek cities. It was now Philip’s turn to rule.

Figure 1: Eurydice’s tomb at Aigai (source: vergina.web.auth.gr)

Figure 2: the inscription on the statuary base discovered in 1990 in Eukleia’s sanctuary at Aigai (source: Kyriakou-Tourtas 2013, 304)
Figure 3: head and neck of the peplophoros statue attributed to Queen Eurydice (source: Kyriakou - Tourtas 2015, 370)

Figure 4: the statue unearthed at Eukleia’s sanctuary at Aigai (source: vergina.web.auth.gr)
II. Philip as a king

Philip II was 23 years old when he ascended to the throne. The circumstances under which he had to rule were not favorable at all: the Illyrians and the Paeonians were threatening his kingdom, the Macedonian army was annihilated a few weeks earlier and, what's more, his throne was claimed by pretenders like Argaeus and Pausanias. In order to face all these problems and become a strong monarch, Philip used every means he had in his possession: bribery, persuasion, diplomacy, threat, women surrounding him or even sex with men. He was a monarch and, as such, the Argead ruler concentrated all the powers of the state into his own hands, whether these were judicial, military or religious. The companions were there to advise him, but in the end he acted as he saw fit.

![Figure 5: Bust of Philip II from the Hellenistic period (source: en.wikipedia.org)](source: en.wikipedia.org)

---

19 Müller 2010, 167.
20 Carney 2019, 8.
Figure 6: Facial reconstruction of Philip II by Richard Neave. (source: https://www.thecultureconcept.com/treasures-of-antiquity-heracles-to-alexander-the-great)

A picture of his character can be formed by Theopompus’ description, in his forty-ninth book: Philip was passionately addicted both to women and drinking, an arrogant, insatiable and extravagant man, a bandit, who wasted money when he became master of great treasures (FGrHist 115 F 224). Still, Arrian presents him as a great leader through the speech of Alexander at Opis: a man who gave his soldiers cloaks to wear instead of sheepskins, who brought them down from the mountains to the plains, transformed them to a war machine, made them city dwellers and civilized them with good laws and customs. Perhaps, both descriptions of Philip are correct and the two opinions are not mutually contradicting each other. What the facts tell us is that as a new king Philip II secured peace for his kingdom and managed to expand the Macedonian territory (see Figure 7). He created the League of Corinth in 337 BC, thus becoming leader (ηγεμών) of the Greeks and head of the campaign against the Persians (Arr. Anab. 7.9.2). 21 He reformed his army; he was the one who created the phalanx and the one who, in most likelihood, introduced the Macedonian sarissa. His military strategy was probably influenced by the famous Theban general Epameinondas, whom he had met during his stay at

21 www.perseus.tufts.edu
the house of the Theban general Pammenes, his assumed lover, when he was a hostage there.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\caption{Expansion of Macedonia before and under Philip II’s reign (source: Roisman 2010, map 3)}
\end{figure}

It was when everything was back in order in his kingdom that he started his policy of conducting alliances through weddings, thus resulting in having seven wives. Nevertheless, a hypothesis had been expressed by Richard Gabriel that an eighth marriage might have additionally existed with the daughter of the Scythian king Atheas. The inference is drawn by Justin’s diction in his \textit{Epitome} of Pompeius Trogus (Justin. 9.2.1), where the Scythian king promised to adopt Philip and make him his heir to the throne, if the latter assisted him in the war he had with the Istrians.\textsuperscript{23} The marriage proposal to Philip brings to our mind the offer of Meda by the Thracian king Cothelas, as it is narrated in Athenaeus’ passage when he was defeated by Philip. A similar offer to Alexander by a certain Scythian king is attested in Plutarch (Plut. \textit{Alex}. 46). The story of Atheas might be related to truth, still, due to lack of further evidence, we should be rather cautious with the deduction that Philip did indeed marry Atheas’ daughter.

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotetext{22} Müller 2010, 169.
\footnotetext{23} Gabriel 2010, 15-16, www.attalus.org: “The king of the Scythians at that time was Atheas, who, being distressed by a war with the Istrians, sought aid from Philippus through the people of Apollonia, on the understanding that he would adopt him for his successor on the throne of Scythia.”
\end{footnotesize}
Philip’s policy for safeguarding his kingdom, both internally and externally, was twofold: in the interior of his kingdom he created strong ties with his nobles, by offering them land, loans, royal posts and by creating the institution of the royal pages (young boys who were educated together with the royal children, offering services and loyalty to the king).24 His policy abroad was different: he arranged marriages for political reasons for himself, for his sons, even for his daughters. In fact, he was the first Macedonian king to marry non-Macedonians.25 To keep his enemies close and avert any threat to his kingdom he wed their daughters. But it was more than that. Rulers of foreign lands were likely to appear useful to him when he wanted to start a new campaign, like in the Pixodarus affair. In this case, he intended to betroth his first son, Philip Arrhidaeus, to the daughter of Pixodarus, the satrap of Caria, aiming to have a secure place for his war preparations before his Asia Minor expedition.26

Furthermore, he gave in marriage his daughter Cleopatra to Olympias’ brother, Alexander of Epirus (Diod. Sic. 16.91.1, Justin. 9.6.1, 13.6.4) with whom she had two children, Cadmeia and Neoptolemus (Plut. Pyrrh. 5.5).27 By this, not only did he reconcile with his Epirote wife as we shall see below, but he also renewed his ties with the Epirote kingdom. After Alexander of Epirus died around 330 BC, Cleopatra attempted unsuccessfully to re-marry Leonnatus, one of Alexander’s bodyguards (Plut. Eum. 3.5).28 A second attempt was made with Perdiccass, the regent of the co-kings at Sardis in 322/21 BC (FGrH 156 F9.21). Perdiccass, instead, selected Nicaea, the daughter of Antipater, over her and was assassinated in 308 BC by Antigonus. Diodorus says (20.37.3-6) that other Successors like Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy and Antigonus were, also, willing to marry her. The pattern was repeated again and again with Cynnane, Adea-Eurydice and other members of his family.

---

24 Roisman 2010, 528.
25 Carney 2017b, 142.
26 Müller 2010, 180.
27 Carney 1988, 395.
The idea of polygamy, in most likelihood, was not inducted by Philip, a suggestion proven by the fact that no such criticism exists in the sources regarding his marital status. His father and other Macedonians before him were not monogamous, influenced from what it seems by other, non-Macedonian, royal dynasties. Such a practice was common to the Scythians, to the Thracians who resided in the area before the Macedonians and most importantly to the Persians (the latter were in control of Macedonia from around 510 to 479 BC).\(^\text{29}\) Marriage alliances in Macedonia had already taken place from the time of Alexander I, when he had arranged his sister Gygaea to marry the Persian official Bubares (Herod. 5.21), or when Perdicas II gave in marriage his sister Stratonike to Seuthes, a relative of Sitalkes, king of the Thracian Odrysian state, who constituted a danger to the Macedonian kingdom (Thuc. 2.101.6). Athenaeus reports the bad influence the wives of the Persian satrap Artabazus had on Philip’s wives, while he stayed in the royal court during his exile; they had introduced to the Macedonian court Persian customs and their way of living (6.256cd).\(^\text{30}\)

### III. Philip as a husband

When it comes to the women he married, questions arise as to whether these women enjoyed certain privileges depending on their origin or on the children they bore, especially the male ones who were potential candidates for the Macedonian throne. Did they all live in the palace? What were the relationships between them?

Regarding the place where these women resided, there are very few references to women’s quarters. Before Philip’s time, Herodotus speaks of the women’s apartments at the Aigai palace of that time and that women were absent from the symposium that Amyntas I held for the Persian envoys (Herod. 5.20). Plutarch speaks of the turmoil that existed in women’s residence because of Philip’s many women, referring to the quarrel concerning Cleopatra (Plut. Alex.

\(^{29}\) Greenwalt 1989, 22-29.  
^{30}\) Carney 2000, 15-23.
9.3). After the excavations conducted by Pavlos Chrysostomou at Pella, where Philip’s main palace was, archaeological evidence proves that building IV was designated for the accommodation of the king and his family.\textsuperscript{31} However, it is not certain that all his women lived there and/or to Aigai or to palatial houses that existed in Pella.\textsuperscript{32} When it comes to the marriages he conducted, Athenaeus implies that every one of them was connected to a war; dubious if these were before, after or for the avoidance of one.\textsuperscript{33} Some scholars have judged that the list is in chronological order; still this is disputable. We can have a closer look at Satyrus’ passage he preserved:

*Philip of the Macedonians did not lead women into war, as did Dareius (the one deposed by Alexander), who, throughout the whole campaign, led about three hundred concubines, as Dikearchus records in the third book of his History of Greece. But Philip always married in connection to a war. Anyway, in the twenty-two years in which he reigned, as Satyrus says in his Life of him, Philip, having married Audata an Illyrian woman, had by her a daughter Cynnane and he also married Phila the sister of Derdas and Machatas. Wishing to govern the Thessalian nation as well, he begot children by two Thessalian women, of whom one was a Pheraean, Nikesipolis, who bore to him Thessalonike, the other the Larissan Philinna by whom he fathered Arrhidaeus. And, in addition, he also gained the kingdom of the Molossians, having married Olympias, by whom he had Alexander and Cleopatra. And when he conquered Thrace, Cothelas, the king of the Thracians came over to him, bringing his daughter Meda and many gifts. Having married her also, he brought her in beside Olympias. In addition to all of these, having conceived a passion for her, he married Cleopatra, the sister of Hippostratus as well as the niece of Attalus. And, having brought her in beside Olympias, he afflicted everything in his whole life for right away, during the actual wedding festivities, Attalus said, "Now, at any rate, genuine not bastard kings will be born." And Alexander, having heard* 

\textsuperscript{31} Chrysostomou 2008,134.\textsuperscript{32} Ogden 1999, 274-275.\textsuperscript{33} Carney 2000, 54.
this, threw the cup which he held in his hands at Attalus and thereupon he threw his cup at Alexander. And after these things, Olympias went into exile among the Molossians and Alexander among the Illyrians and Cleopatra bore a daughter to Philip called Europa.

Keeping the above questions in mind, and, furthermore, keeping in mind the bias against royal women on the part of ancient authors, behold the list of Philip II’s wives, presented in the order according to Satyrus’ fragment.

a. Audata

The first woman Philip married was Audata, the Illyrian. She was, presumably, a relative of the Illyrian leader Bardylis who had defeated Perdiccas III in 359 BC, although no male relative of hers is mentioned in any ancient source. Philip’s marriage to her helped him secure his relations and frontiers with his Illyrian neighbors, as they had been posing a threat to the Macedonian kingdom since
his father's and brother's reign.\textsuperscript{34} Bardylis' area of power was following the length of lake Ohrid, east of the Prespa lakes and down to the region between Florina and Pentavrysos.\textsuperscript{35} After his defeat by Philip in 358 BC, Bardylis was driven to give Audata as a bride to his enemy and become his ally (Diod. Sic. 16.4.4-7). Another element we have on her, has as its source Photius' summary of Arrian (\textit{FGrH} 156, F 1.22). In that text, she is referred to as Eurydice, which could indicate a name change pointing to Philip's mother, Queen Eurydice and, thus, a status change, a wish to give her a more Greek name or an effort to demonstrate his succession to his father. Carney estimates that she could also have been related to Philip's mother.\textsuperscript{36}

Cynnane was the child born out of this marriage sometime after 358/57 BC. Audata trained her daughter to fight in battle, and she was competent enough to gain the command of a military troop of her half-brother's army and the only recorded woman to kill an enemy in battle. When she reached the age to get married, Philip II, a master in conducting marriages for diplomatic reasons, arranged his daughter's union with his nephew Amyntas, son of Perdiccas III, reinforcing this way the Argead clan and averting Amyntas temporarily from conspiring against him. According to the estimated birthdate of both, a possible date for the wedding is around 338/36 BC, shortly before Philip's planned expedition to Asia and his death. Amyntas' selection as a groom for his daughter could signify his nomination as an heir to the throne after Alexander.\textsuperscript{37} Nevertheless, Cynnane soon re-entered the wedding market as Alexander III killed her husband and used his half-sister to make one more alliance with Langarus, king of the Agrianes. The matchmaking, though, was not a successful one, as the latter got sick and died on his way home (Arr. \textit{Anab.} 1.5.4).\textsuperscript{38} She never got married again. She was killed by Perdiccas, the regent of Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV and his brother Alcetas in Asia, in her attempt to orchestrate her daughter's marriage with Philip III (Arrian, \textit{FGrH} 156

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{34} Carney 2000, 58.
\textsuperscript{35} Lane Fox 2011, 342.
\textsuperscript{36} Ogden 1999, 23; id. 2000, 58.
\textsuperscript{37} Carney 2006, 69-72.
\textsuperscript{38} Howe 2015, 137: in return for his help against the Autariatae who were about to attack him.
\end{flushleft}
Cassander buried her and her daughter along with her husband at Aegae, as stipulated by the royal custom (Diod. Sic. 18.52).

Cynnane, in her turn, trained her daughter, Adea Eurydice, in weapons. Such a practice was something that mostly Illyrian women did (but not Greek), at least in the Classical period. Eurydice was the name attributed to her when she married Philip Arrhidaeus, Philip’s first son, a marriage her mother had orchestrated (Arrian, FGriH 156 F 1.23). After their marriage, when Polycperchon (the guardian of Arrhidaeus at that time) called Olympias to Macedonia, Adea Eurydice made Cassander responsible for her husband. In order to block Olympias’ forces from reaching Macedonia, she lined up with her army against Olympias’ land force in 317 BC at Euia (’Ευΐα), at the borders of Molossia and Macedonia (Diod. Sic. 19.11.2). Olympias was in Bacchant attire, while Adea Eurydice was donned in a Macedonian manner. Both women exploited their philia network to win their opponent and staged their images with their dress, imitating Philip’s royal stagecraft with his white cloak when he was assassinated at the theatre of Aigai. Adea Eurydice was slightly later killed on Olympias’ command and was buried along with her husband Philip III and her mother, Cynnane in the royal cemetery at Aigai by Cassander (Athen. 4.155’a). A debate exists if Tomb I or Tomb II hosts the bodies of Philip III and his wife.

The sources do not provide us with any other information regarding Audata. Nonetheless, we can assume that since she herself trained militarily her daughter, she must have been alive until Cynnane’s teens.

---

40 Carney 2000, 58; Loman 2004, 45.  
41 Palagia 2010, 35.  
42 According to Ptolemy, Euia, was a city in Macedonia that belonged to the Illyrian tribe of the Dassaretae (3.13.32). Euia has been identified by G. Karamitrou-Mendesidi with modern Polymylos near Kozani (see G. Karamitrou-Mendesidi, AEMTh 20 (2006), 847–56). For coordinates please check [https://topostext.org/place/404221UEui](https://topostext.org/place/404221UEui) (46°05'.40"15').  
43 Carney 2010, 46, Lyngsnes, 2018, 57.  
44 Carney 2000, 58.
b. Phila

The next to follow in the list was Phila, born probably sometime after 375 BC.\textsuperscript{45} Her father is assumed to be Derdas II from Elimeia in Upper Macedonia (see Figure 8) and her brothers Derdas and Machatas. Philip desired this wedding with a view to control the noble families of Upper Macedonia under one united and more strengthened Macedonia. The date of their marriage is potentially 359/58 BC after the incorporation of Elimeia to his kingdom.\textsuperscript{46} Despite the fact that there is no child attributed to her, it seems that she preserved a certain prestige in the court because of her family’s welfare. Until Cleopatra, she was the only Macedonian wife, a fact that could explain why some of her family members were leading men in Philip’s and Alexander’s court. One such person was Harpalus, Machatas’ son, friend and treasurer of Alexander III. Phila either did not produce any child at all or produced one that did not live long. This situation could have led her to promote her nephews instead which proves how prominent and powerful her faction was. The information we have on her comes only from Satyrus, thereby the date of her death remains unknown.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Elimeia as part of the Macedonian Kingdom (source: \url{https://en.wikipedia.org})}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{45} Heckel 2008, 207.  
\textsuperscript{46} Carney 2000, 59; Roisman 2011, 528.  
\textsuperscript{47} Carney 2000, 58-59.
c. Nikesipolis

Nikesipolis comes next, the niece of the tyrant Jason of Pherae (a dominant city-state of Thessaly) who had, also, been an ally of Philip’s father. Stephanus Byzantius clearly states that she was a wife of Philip and not a concubine, their marriage date, howbeit, is debatable. This must have taken place early in the reign of Philip and before his union with Olympias in 357 BC. Traditionally, the Thessalians were positive to an alliance with the Macedonians. A good relation with them, except for the access it provided them to Macedonian timber to build their ship (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.11), it assisted them with their internal problems for power against the Aleuadae.\(^{48}\)

Nikesipolis had a daughter by Philip named Thessalonike, born either in 351 BC after his victory at the Crocus field or in 346 BC after the Third Sacred War and hence resulted her name after Philip’s victory in Thessaly (Athen. 11.784c, 13.557c). It seems that Philip manipulated the personal names of his wives and daughters to serve his purposes and deliver a message, different each time. In this instance, he desired to commemorate this triumph. In both victories mentioned above, Philip gained significant prerogatives: in the first case he was elected archon of the Thessalian league whereas in the latter he was given two votes on the Amphictyonic Council, consequently being able to interfere in matters of Central Greece (Diod. Sic. 16.60.1-2).\(^{49}\) As Stephanus reports, Nikesipolis passed away twenty days after giving birth to her daughter. In reference to her name he, also, cites Lucius of Terrah. In his words Philip gave the baby to a woman named Nice to rear (Steph. Byz. s. v. Thessalonike).\(^{50}\)

A story is told about her from Plutarch in his letter “Advice to the Bride and Groom”. He writes that Nikesipolis was a witch who had made Philip fall in love with her using magic spells and potions. Olympias recognized her beauty, cleverness and good manners when she hurried to see the woman who bewitched her husband and seemed to remark: "Away with these slanders! You

\(^{48}\) Sprawski 2005, 32.
\(^{49}\) Graninger 2010, 314-315.
\(^{50}\) Heckel 2008, 342.
have your magic charms in yourself” (Plut. Moral. 141c). Yet, we should take this story with a grain of salt since Plutarch is known to be moralizing and as we shall see later on, for him only two categories of women exist: proper matronae and treacherous witches. By this story, he meant to emphasize that a woman who comes from a good family, does not need any magic to win a man over. Besides, if we take for granted that Satyrus' list is in chronological order, Nikesipolis preceded Olympias, therefore, he apparently invented such a scene just to teach ethics in relation to witchcraft and married women.

Olympias raised Thessalonike when the latter's mother died. She did not arrange a marriage for her, though, possibly to avert having one more rival against her daughter Cleopatra and her grandson Alexander IV. After the siege of Pydna where Thessalonike accompanied Olympias, having already 30 or 35 years of age, she married Cassander by force, Antipater's son, and bore three children: Philip, Antipater and Alexander. Cassander, now married to Philip’s daughter and Alexander’s sister, became the de jure heir of their kingdom and, thus, proceeded to a royal gesture: the foundation of a city named after his Macedonian wife around 316/15 BC. Thessalonike was murdered by her middle son, Antipater, possibly in 296 BC after his father’s and elder brother’s death. Antipater accused his mother of being fond of his younger brother, Alexander and possibly because she did not act as a succession advocate for him (Justin. 14.6.13, Diod. Sic. 19.52.1-2, 61.2, Plut. Demetr. 36.1-37.3, Paus. 9.7.3). Such a deed was defined as atrocious by Justin (16.1.3-4), as nothing wrong was performed on her part to deserve such a death. On the contrary, she must have denied favoring one son over the other. This fact, in combination with the lack of a military protection and her inexperience in power authority, explain why her son decided to assassinate her. In the forge Testament of Alexander (Ps-Call. 3.33.13), according to Waldemar Heckel, she is falsely attributed as a wife to Lysimachus.

51 Green 1991, 47.
52 Kempf 2017, 19.
A statue base (see Figure 9), dated to the second or third c. AD, has been found in a house at the city of Thessalonike, bearing the inscription Θεσσαλονίκην Φιλίππου βασίλισσαν (IG X 2.1 277). Along with it, two more incised statue bases have been revealed, one for Alexander III (IG X 2.1 275) and one for his son, Alexander IV (IG X 2.1 276) where both of them are referred to as the son of a god. All three statue bases probably hosted statues that depicted them which could mean that cults existed in their honor during that period in Thessalonike. 54 We hear nothing more of Nikesipolis and her daughter.55

![Figure 9: incised statue base bearing the name of Thessalonike (source: https://en.wikipedia.org)](https://en.wikipedia.org)

54 Carney 2000, 209.
55 According to a Greek legend, when Thessalonike heard that Alexander had died tried to drown herself in the sea. Instead of dying, she became a mermaid as her brother had bathed her hair with immortal water from the Fountain of Immortality. From that moment, she wandered in the Aegean and asked the sailors: “Is Alexander the King alive?” If they answered “He lives and reigns and conquers the world”, she allowed the ship to sail, if not she made it sink. (www.wikipedia.org).
d. Philinna

Nikesipolis was not the only Thessalian woman whom Philip took as a spouse; there was also Philinna: an obscure and common woman as Plutarch characterized her (Alex. 77.5), a dancing girl as Justin (9.8.2) and Ptolemy, son of Agesarchus, termed her (Athen. 13.578a). The wedding must have occurred in 358/357 BC soon after Philip ascended the throne. She was a widow with a child before her marriage to Philip and mother of Arrhidaeus, a half-brother of Alexander III, who was proclaimed king to rule along with Alexander's son after his death. Her first husband's name is unidentified. According to Heckel, her first son has been falsely correlated by certain scholars with Amphimachus who was distributed with the satrapies of Mesopotamia and Arbelitis by Antipater and the Treaty of Triparadeisos (Arrian, Successors FGH 156 F1.35; Diod. Sic. 18.39.6, 19.27.4). This certain Amphimachus was the brother of Arrhidaeus, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia.56

The bad reputation that followed Philinna is probably due to her not having royal blood, as it was believed, and to the fame Larissa had for its dancing girls and for its most competent witches. Taking into consideration the absence of prioritizing women in this polygamous family, these characterizations may also have been the result of rivalry between them, especially from Olympias and her son (Plut. Alex. 10). Arrhidaeus was the first in line for the throne after Philip, his age calculated at 20 when his father destined him as a groom for Pixodarus daughter. Alexander, after Olympias' incitement (Plut. Alex. 10.1), characterized his brother as a bastard to convince Pixodarus choose him over his brother for the marriage alliance. But as we have, already, seen in the case of queen Eurydice, authors were biased against royal women in Macedonia and especially those linked to magic.57

The above allegations could be linked to a papyrus of the 1st c BC, PGM XX, lines s 13-19, in which a spell for curing headaches exists attributed to the Thessalian Philinna. The hypothesis that the Philinna of the papyrus is the one and the same with Philip's wife has been made by Dickie in 1994 and other

56 Heckel 2008, 22.
57 Carney 2000, 61.
scholars as well.\textsuperscript{58} According to the sources, Philinna was the king’s mistress but Athenaeus (13.557c) implies that she was one of Philip’s wives and includes her in the list along with the other women.\textsuperscript{59} Both Elisabeth Carney and Daniel Ogden consider the above mentioned allegations unsubstantiated and evaluate that she could have been a descendant of the noble family of Aleuadae who were in control of Larissa, one more crucially located city. The Aleuadae were the most important aristocratic clan of Larissa until the Classical period and the rise of the opposite clan, the Pheraeans. A strong Thessaly was not in Philip’s interest, constituting a threat to Macedon, while, on the other hand, the Aleuadae being allies assisted him in staying close to the rest of the Greek cities. Thessaly was crucial for him both politically and militarily. Indeed, a marriage to a courtesan could not form a benefit to Philip, so one must conclude that she was definitely a wife and not a concubine.\textsuperscript{60}

We are unaware of the end of Philinna. Philip Arrhidaeus, as we shall see later, was killed on the orders of Olympias in 317 BC.

e. Olympias

Olympias (373-316 BC), the Molossian princess (for location of Molossia see Figure 10), originating from the Aeacid family, is the most known of Philip’s wives. She was the daughter of king Neoptolemus, descendant of Neoptolemus, son of the famous hero Achilles known from Homer’s Iliad.\textsuperscript{61} Her mother is thought to have been of Chaonian origin, because of the Trojan names her children were given.\textsuperscript{62} Her sister was called Troas and her brother was Alexander of Epirus, who got married to her daughter Cleopatra. Olympias’ name as a child is believed to have been Polyxena, an allegation to her Trojan connection with Polyxena, daughter of Priam, king of Troy (Hyginus, Fabulae §110).\textsuperscript{63} It is said that Philip fell in love with her during the Cabyrian mysteries in

\textsuperscript{58} Ogden 2007, 358; Dickie 1994, 119-122.
\textsuperscript{59} Carney 2000, 61.
\textsuperscript{60} Carney 2000, 61; Ogden 1999, 25, 260; id. 2007, 363; Graninger 2010, 311.
\textsuperscript{61} Fredricksmeier 1990, 304.
\textsuperscript{62} Chaonians were a tribe at the north of Molossia. They were said to originate from Andromache and Helenus, Priamus’ son (Just. 17.3.6).
\textsuperscript{63} Carney 2006, 5, 9.
Samothrace, yet her uncle Arybbas had arranged this marriage in 357 BC as a political alliance against the Molossians' and Macedonians' common Illyrian threat. Myrtale was her name back then, linked presumably to the myrtle plant employed in various cults, to one of which Olympias was initiated. Her name changed again to Olympias possibly after Philip’s horse won in the Olympic Games in 356 BC. The name Stratonike was also attributed to her, possibly after her battle with Adea Eurydice in 317 BC, which she must have kept until her death in 316 BC.

She was thought as the most significant among Philip’s consorts, perhaps because their son Alexander, born one year after their marriage, was meant to be Philip’s heir, since his brother Arrhidaeus was mentally disabled and far away from being “capax imperii”. Arrhidaeus was as a young boy gifted and dignified in attitude. Nonetheless, at some time his family realized that he had a mental disability that would forbid him in becoming a king. In the words of

64 Lane Fox 2011, 354-353.
65 Carney 2006, 9, 15-16.
Plutarch (Alex., 77.5), this was not a congenital defect, as Olympias had given him drugs that affected both his mind and body.\textsuperscript{66}

As the king’s wife, her opinion was valid in some matters at least, like her son’s education. Philip selected a relative of her, named Leonidas, to be Alexander’s tutor in his first steps, before Aristoteles took him over at Mieza (Plut. Alex. 5.4). Lysimachus from Acarnania was regarded too as his tutor, who called himself Alexander Achilles, Philip Peleus and “Phoenix”, like Achilles’ preceptor, Olympias’ famous progenitor. By making this choice, Olympias wanted to stress her Hellenicity and her heroic lineage being as great as Philip’s lineage from Heracles.\textsuperscript{67} Two Greek heroes Alexander had as his models, who were too connected via their tutor, the wise Centaur Chiron. With an origin like that, Olympias stood out in comparison to the other royal wives, especially those who bore only daughters or had no children at all. Otherwise, until the time Alexander was considered to have become Philip’s heir, her status had the same value with that of the other women as none had an official title.\textsuperscript{68}

But this queen was not just a mother and a wife. She had a public role and acted as a benefactor too, like her mother in law, from what we infer from a list from Cyrene with major benefactors of grain in a period of scarcity in a diplomatic effort, presumably to strengthen her son’s empire (SEG IX.2). In this list, she and her daughter Cleopatra appear without their patronymic, just their personal name, something accustomed only at inscriptions for male heads of state. In a period when reputable Athenian women would not be publicly referred to by their name, these royal Macedonian women had their own public identity, without owning a title. One more example displaying her patronage,

\textsuperscript{66} www.perseus.tufts.edu
\textsuperscript{67} Tanja S. Scheer in Erskine’s, A Companion to the Hellenistic World, 219-220 notes: “A common method of intellectual subjugation of unfamiliar lands consisted in making them accessible through eponymous heroes: every river, every tree, every region, according to the Greek view, was inhabited by local supernatural powers. Once the areas which they reached were mythically personalized, then the local family trees could easily be connected to well-known Greek heroes. Indeed if it was possible to recognize a prominent Greek hero as progenitor, then the new members could be regarded as having been success- fully fitted into the system. But in addition the propagation of parallels between Alexander and successful models from the past must have had positive consequences. The example of mythlcal wandering heroes and gods like Herakles and Dionysos, in whose footsteps they could imagine themselves to be following, helped the Macedonians cope with the pressures of an alien environment. The foreign land was not really unknown: their own ancestors had after all once passed through it victoriously (Arr. Anab. 5.26.5)”. \textsuperscript{68} Carney 2006, 6, 23, 37, 42.
euergetism and her public role, is the dedication of a phiale cup to Hygeia in which only her first name appears by Hypereides (Hyp. 4.19). Of vital importance for her were the various religious practices she performed. It is well known that she practiced the cult of Dionysus, also known as Bacchus, a priestess of whom she could have been and whom she worshipped with snakes. In fact, Plutarch remarked that Philip lost his sexual desire for her when he saw her sleeping next to one. This, he feared, could have been a superior being (reference to Alexander’s allegation that he was son of Zeus) or some witchcraft that Olympias might practice against him (Plut. Alex. 2.4). Plutarch also adds that the night before she got married a thunderbolt struck her belly (Alex.2.2), insinuating once more her close relationship with a god. If Olympias urged Alexander’s belief that he was son of Zeus or he created this idea on his own cannot be ascertained. Plutarch provides two versions in relation to this: in the first Olympias revealed to him the secret of his divine birth, in the second she advised him to stop defaming her to Hera (Plut. Alex. 3.2). In Conjugalia Praecepta Plutarch projects his belief about magic and women who use it: “Thus women that by the force of charms and philters endeavor to subdue their husbands to the satisfaction of their pleasure become at length the wives of madmen, sots, and fools.”

The Greek biographer adds to Olympias participation to the Orphic rituals and the Dionysiac orgies of the Klodones and the Mimallones (Plut. Alex. 2.5-6; Polyaenus, Strateg. 4.1), rituals similar to those performed by Edonian and Thracian women around Mount Haemus. Such was the ecstasy of Olympias.

---

69 Carney 2010, 45-46.
70 Lane Fox 2011, 210.
71 Carney 2006, 92. These elements might be an indication that the Molossians employed snakes in Dionysiac worship.
72 Kempf 2017, 17.
73 Kollia 2018, 14; Polyaenus, Strateg. 4.1: “In the reign of Argaeus king of Macedonia, the Taulantii under their king Galaurus made an incursion into Macedonia. Argaeus, whose force was very small, directed the Macedonian young women, as the enemy advanced, to show themselves from mount Ereboea. They accordingly did so; and in a numerous body they poured down from the mountain, their faces covered by wreaths, and brandishing their thyrsi instead of spears. Galaurus, intimidated by the numbers of those, whom instead of women he supposed to be men, sounded a retreat; whereupon the Taulantii, throwing away their weapons, and whatever else might retard their escape, abandoned themselves to a precipitate flight. Argaeus, having thus obtained a victory without the hazard of a battle, erected a temple to Dionysus Pseudanor; and ordered the priestesses of the god, who were before called Klodones by the Macedonians, to ever afterwards be distinguished by the title of Mimallones.”
according to Plutarch during these rituals, that not only did she experience it wilder than the rest but she also provided the companies in joy with tamed serpents which terrified men when these came out of their baskets. Carney supports that this custom could have been imported to Macedonia by Olympias herself, based on the plethora of snakes depicted on the Dodona votives; also Aelian wrote about living snakes in an Apollo prophetic cult at Epirus (Ael. N.A. 11.2) and that the Epirotes had a bad reputation like the Thessalians of being poisoners and of making curses. Perhaps this was one more reason that Attalus questioned Olympias superior origin.\textsuperscript{74} Plutarch considers her as a foreign, dangerous and manipulative woman who uses charms to attain her goals.\textsuperscript{75} Justin (9.5.9, 11.11.5) demonstrates anew his hostility to royal women of Macedonia and accuses her of adultery, just as he had done with Eurydice. He claims that she had conceived Alexander not with Philip but with a serpent. Hence, Philip denied of Alexander being his son, divorced her and then married the young Cleopatra.\textsuperscript{76} A divorce seems unlikely to have existed since Philip was polygamous and need not divorce one woman to marry another; something which is also confirmed by Satyrus’ passage (Athen. 13.557b-e) in which Philip is said to bring Cleopatra in beside Olympias.\textsuperscript{77}

In 323 BC her son was dead and Olympias did no longer have neither her husband’s nor her son’s authority to support her. She was on her own and had many enemies to deal with as no succession pattern existed but on the contrary many wannabe heirs to the Macedonian throne, Argeads and non-Argeads. One of her biggest enemies was Antipater, one of Alexander’s most important generals and aspired ruler of Alexander’s empire, whom she accused of killing her son (Diod. Sic. 19.11.8, Plut. Alex. 77.1). Antipater became regent of the two co-kings and in control of her grandson’s future whom she wanted to protect until his becoming of the age proper to rule.\textsuperscript{78} Arrian reports of Antipater’s many letters sent to Alexander in which he defines her as arrogant, harsh and interfering, inappropriate to be the king’s mother. Olympias in her turn accused him of being overambitious, aspiring to become first in rank of

\textsuperscript{74} Carney 2006, 92-93.
\textsuperscript{75} Kempf 2017, 30.
\textsuperscript{76} Carney 2006, 34.
\textsuperscript{77} Carney 2015, 72.
\textsuperscript{78} Carney 2006, 68.
Macedonians and Greeks (Arr. Anab. 7.12.5-7). Fortunately for Olympias, Antipater soon died and left Polyperchon in charge of Philip Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV, requesting her to go back to Macedonia and become a guardian for her grandson. Still, Antipater’s son, Cassander, remained to the fore and fought against Polyperchon for the regency of the kings. On top of that, Olympias had another rival, Audata’s granddaughter, Adea-Eurydice, who she married Philip Arrhidaeus and formed coalition with Cassander to vanish their common enemy. For her part, she was opposing Olympias in a struggle to secure her husband’s place on the throne and, thus, her power and safety, exploiting both her husband and Cassander. In 317 BC the two women stood against each other, ready to go into a battle that never occurred. The Macedonian army was ready to confront the army gathered by Polyperchon and king Aeacides (Olympia’s faithful nephew), part of the network of philia she had created. However, when they saw the mother of their former leaders standing in front of them, under the sound of a tympanum beating, out of respect perhaps or out of gratitude, they defected to her side (Diod. Sic. 19.11.2).\footnote{Carney 2006, 74.}

Albeit, this grandiose moment was over and soon after Olympias would be dead too, having committed a series of brutal acts decisive for her downfall. After capturing Adea-Eurydice and her husband Philip Arrhidaeus, she did not confine in just killing them as it was usually done in such cases. Instead, she chose to wall them up and feed them through an opening for many days. She had them killed merely after the Macedonians’ resentment: under her orders, Philip Arrhidaeus was stabbed and his wife, being given several options, chose to hang herself (Diod. Sic. 19.11.4-9). The possibility exists that their bodies were left unburied. Athenaeus in his fourth book states: “And Diyllus the Athenian says, in the ninth book of his Histories, that Cassander, when returning from Boeotia, after he had buried the king and queen at Aegae, and with them Cynna the mother of Eurydice, and had paid them all the other honours to which they were entitled, celebrated also a show of single combats, and four of the soldiers entered the arena on that occasion. (Athen. 4.155'a) ".
Cassander, like Philip had done on his daughter’s wedding day, set a scene to become accepted as a king by the Macedonian peoples.80

More brutalities followed, aiming at protecting herself and her daughter or to revenge Antipater and his sons for her son’s death; she believed Alexander was poisoned by them (Curtius, 10.10.14-19; Arr. Anab. 7.27; Plut. Alex. 77.1; Justin, 12.14; Diod. Sic. 17.118.1-2). Hence, she assassinated Cassander’s brother Nicanor, overturned the tomb of his other brother, Iolaus, and went ahead with multiple murders of the Macedonian elite.81

In an attempt to avoid Cassander after her return to Macedonia from Epirus, Olympias resorted to Pydna, possibly counting that the philia of Aeacides would rescue her once more. Along with her were Alexander’s wife Roxane, his son, Deidameia (king Aeacides’ daughter, who was engaged to Alexander IV while still a young girl; Plut. Pyrrh. 4.282), her step-daughter, Thessalonike, and other people of her clan. Trapped in Pydna without any assistance for escaping, deprived of food and other supplies, Olympias decided to surrender to Cassander in exchange for her safety (Diod. Sic. 19.50.6; Justin. 14.6.5). It was decided that her fate would be judged from an assembly consisted of relatives of the people she had earlier murdered (Just.14.6.6; Diod. Sic. 19.51.1). The verdict was anticipated: conviction to death.83 When Cassander’s men were approaching to execute her, she courageously stepped forward dressed once more in a costume, her regnal apparel. While waiting to die, she put her garments and hair in order, without any shout coming out of her mouth, so as to meet death in dignity and pride, as befitted this queen (Diod. Sic. 19.35.5, Justin. 14.6.9-12).84 Justin considers her admirable for the way she passed away, worthy of her male kin so that someone could see Alexander’s soul in his dying mother. Then again he continues his prejudice against her and her gender, explaining the reason Olympias did not live for long: “for having

80 Carney 2017b, 148.
81 Carney 2006, 64, 75-76.
82 Carney 2006, 170.
83 Ibid. 82.
84 Carney 2010, 50; Justin, 14.6.11-12: “she, at the same time, not shrinking from the sword or the blow, or crying out like a woman, but submitting to death like the bravest of men, and suitably to the glory of her ancient race, so that you might have perceived the soul of Alexander in his dying mother. As she was expiring, too, she is said to have settled her hair, and to have covered her feet with her robe, that nothing unseemly might appear about her.”
committed great slaughter among the nobility throughout the country, like a furious woman rather than a queen, she turned the favor with which she was regarded into hatred". She was considered worthy because of her husband and son, but her femininity lead her towards such barbarous acts. The shifting of characterization from a ruthless woman to a virtuous one, as she met death, is seen in the manner Cleopatra VII is portrayed in Horace’s Cleopatra Ode (Odes 1.37): a barbarian who carried away Mark Anthony in a battle against the Romans, praiseworthy, nevertheless, for the manner she died. They were two foreign, brutal women who dared to exercise political power.\textsuperscript{85}

Diodorus too, unlike a more objective narration of other events in Olympias’ life, becomes more subjective regarding her treatment to Adea Eurydice and Philip Arrhidaeus and her final days during the siege at Pydna. Not only does he condemn the way she behaved to them but he moreover gives right to Antipater for saying in his deathbed that a woman should not be first in a kingdom. Diodorus tended to add comments in his narrative for moralizing reasons, one of which might as well be the above.\textsuperscript{86} However, the cause of her defeat and failure to save her grandson is not truly her ongoing brutality, as it is said, but the inability of her philoi to assist her: Aeacides’ military troops were unable to reach Macedonia because of the passages blocked by Cassander and Polyperchon’s soldiers were bribed by the same person (Diod. Sic. 19.36.6). Both Diodorus and Justin condemn her use of violence, even if that aimed at protecting the succession to the Argead throne, but none comments of her loyalty to her grandson and her effort to safeguard his future. Just as Eurydice, she employed her network of philia to assist her grandson but contrary to her mother-in-law she used violence, something which lessened her in the eyes of the authors recording her deeds.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{85} Frank 2018, 47-49.
\textsuperscript{86} Carney 2006, 125-127.
\textsuperscript{87} Carney 2006, 78-87; id. 2018, 33.
Diodorus in his seventeenth book records that Cassander left Olympias’ body unburied (see Figure 11), a fact also confirmed by Porphyrius (FGrHist. II, No. 260, 3, 3). Three inscriptions, though, discovered in the village of modern Makriyalos at Pieria, may indicate that a burial did take place in that area. Charles Edson believes that the inscriptions prove the residence of a family in or near Pydna, a family originated from the Aeacids and Olympias, mother of Alexander the Great. Despite Cassander’s desire not to offer her a funeral, there probably were some Macedonians who wished to take care of her body and provide her with an informal interment. Her tomb could have been created after Cassander’s sons were removed from Macedonia authority. According to Edson, the terminus ante quem for the construction of the tomb is between 288 and 285 BC, when the Aeacid Pyrrhus, her great-nephew, ruled western Macedonia. The marble inscription Charles Edson came upon in 1937 (SEG

---

88 Diod. XVII. 18.2: “He murdered Olympias and threw out her body without burial, and with great enthusiasm restored Thebes, which had been destroyed by Alexander”
89 Carney 2006, 104.
90 Edson 1937, 93.
12.340 see Figure 12), at a farmer’s house in the above mentioned village, had the following epigram:

"Aeacid is my race,-my father, Neoptolemus,-my name, Alcimachus,-of those (descended) from Olympias. As a child whose intelligence was equal to that of men, Fate placed me at the age of three a corpse beneath this tomb."

![Figure 12: SEG 12.340 (source: Edson 1949, plate 3)](image)

G.P. Oikonomos published one more inscription (SEG 32.644) referring to the tomb of an Olympias, found in a private house in the same village:

![Figure 13: SEG 32.644 (source: Oikonomos 1915, no. 65 39-40)](image)
As you pass [the memorial] of [Neopol]olemos, [stranger, stay, that] you may see the tomb [of famed] Olympias. [Helenos, [bewailing] the race of impetuous [A]iakides], buried [his son in the bosom of] measureless [earth]...

Finally, a third epigram, perhaps from a member of the same Aeacid family, had been detected by Leon Heuzey at Kitros in Pieria that could refer to Pydna. Neopololemos is a name commonly used in Macedonia. Due, though, to the place where the stone was discovered and the fact that it is an epitaph in elegiacs, Edson believes that it refers to an Aeacid member who lived in that village.

Figure 14: the text as it is restored in: https://epigraphy.packhum.org/

Cassander may have succeeded to eliminate his enemy but not her legacy. Many authors of the Roman era loved to hate her, still her image remained alive through some minor works of art in which she has been recognized, accompanied by her son. One of such is a gold medallion discovered in a hoard in Aboukir, close to Alexandria, in 1902. On the obverse we can see Olympias’ portrait in profile to the right, wearing a chiton, a diadem on her hair and holding a veil with her left arm. On the reverse there is a sea monster which has the front legs and head of a bull and the tail of a fish. A naked woman is riding it,

91 Edson 1949, 84-95.
placing a diadem on the seagoing bull, identified with the nereid Thetis, Achilles’ mother and a founding mother of the Aeacid dynasty.\textsuperscript{92}

\textbf{Figure 15}: gold medallion depicting Olympias (source: www.amth.gr)

\textbf{Figure 16}: reverse of the medallion showing nereid Thetis on a monster (source: commons.wikimedia.org)

\textsuperscript{92} [www.amth.gr](http://www.amth.gr), Carney 2006, 121.
The fact that most of the written sources providing us with details about Alexander’s life, consequently his mother’s too, date from the period of Roman sovereignty, explains the establishment of the way we view both of them and the impact these sources had on works of art of that period. Examples of such works are two cameos, one from Vienna (see Figure 18) and one from St. Petersburg (see Figure 17), in most likelihood depicting Olympias and Alexander, mirroring the Augustan period during which monarchy’s existence was denied. Their superimposed profiles imply their divinity, leaving aside Philip, the monarch. Olympias’ memory remained vivid even after the collapse of the Roman Empire via Alexander Romance as we shall later see. Olympias was a woman with a strong personality, a turning point for royal women in Greek politics who followed her footsteps; several queens in the Hellenistic period became more active, acting as co-rulers and regents.\(^\text{93}\)

![Figure 17: Gonzaga cameo (source: http: en.wikipedia.org)](image1)

![Figure 18: Vienna cameo (source: Kunst Historiches Museum, Wien)](image2)

\(^{93}\) Carney 2006, 114-117.
f. Meda

The listing continues with Meda, daughter of the Thracian king of the Getae, Cothelas. The information we have on her are scarce, the only source being Athenaeus (13.557D) where Satyrus states that her father endowed her with many gifts for her wedding to Philip. The only other available source is Jordanes, a Goth of the 6th century who refers to Meda as Medopa (Getica, 10.65). Her marriage to the Macedonian king occurred at a moment when he was in need of money and, furthermore, needed to secure his kingdom. Due to the absence of further references, one can infer that she died young and did not give any heir to Philip. She remained at court for some years at least, posing no threat to Olympias and Alexander’s ascendance to the throne. Some scholars, Hammond included, have expressed their belief that she is the woman buried in the antechamber of Tomb II at Vergina who voluntarily committed suicide, following the Thracian custom described by Herodotus (Herod. 5.5.1). This view is further reinforced by two items of non-Macedonian origin discovered in Tomb II: a gorytus (a bow and an arrow-case of Scythian origin) and a pectoral comparable to interments of Macedonian and Thracian elite origin. Nonetheless, the new analysis performed by Antikas and Wynn-Antikas on both the male and female remains, claiming that the age of the deceased woman was close to thirty, does not accede to the age of Meda who in 336 BC must have been between 19 and 23.
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95 www.perseus.tufts.edu: “Those who dwell above the Crestonaeans have yet other practices. Each man has many wives, and at his death there is both great rivalry among his wives and eager contention on their friends’ part to prove which wife was best loved by her husband. She to whom the honor is adjudged is praised by men and women alike and then slain over the tomb by her nearest of kin. After the slaying she is buried with the husband. The rest of the wives are greatly displeased by this, believing themselves to be deeply dishonored.” Carney 2017a, 116.
96 Carney 2017, 122
97 Antikas and Wynn-Antikas 2015, 686.
98 Carney 2017a, 135.
g. Cleopatra

The brides’ list is completed with the young Macedonian maiden, Cleopatra, with a possible date of birth between 355-351 BC. Possibly originating from the Argead royal family, Cleopatra was not older than eighteen years of age when her uncle and guardian Attalus (instead of her father and brother Hippostratus who were most likely dead at that time) arranged her marriage to the Macedonian king in 337 BC.\textsuperscript{99} Arrian (3.6.5) calls her Eurydice instead of Cleopatra, a name change likely to have occurred in an important moment of her life. Perhaps this was meant to indicate that she, above other royal wives, was the queen mother like Philip’s mother, even though it has been proven that the name Eurydice was not a regnal name.\textsuperscript{100} A marriage with personal, according to Athenaeus’, and not only political motives that caused turmoil in the court, since any future male heirs could alter the succession to the throne.

During the wedding celebrations, Attalus insulted Alexander when he overtly expressed the belief that a legitimate Macedonian successor would be the outcome of this marriage, thus questioning Olympias’ fidelity to Philip, her superior origin and consequently Alexander’s too, insinuating he is foreign and barbarian (Plut. \textit{Alex}. 9.7; Athen. 13.557d-e). This brings to our mind the attack to Eurydice and her three sons, part of the amphimetric strife with Gygaea, who were characterized illegitimate and barbarians.\textsuperscript{101}

Alexander was furious and spoke unproperly to Attalus. Attalus belonged to a powerful faction of Macedonia and was assigned along with Parmenio to move to Asia with a vanguard of the army before the final expedition. Philip did not accuse him of this insult. Instead, he asked his son to apologize and drew his sword at him when Alexander refused. The offended Alexander and Olympias distanced themselves from the court, the former ending up to Illyria and the latter to Epirus and her brother, king Alexander.\textsuperscript{102} It is not without reason that Olympias could feel threatened by Cleopatra. She was too of a great lineage

\textsuperscript{99} Carney 2000, 73.
\textsuperscript{100} Carney 2000, 73-74; id. 2006, 153.
\textsuperscript{101} Howe 2018, 14.
\textsuperscript{102} Müller 2010, 179-180.
and also had an uncle who had arranged her marriage to Philip; but the difference was that Cleopatra originated from the Macedonian aristocracy, was an Argead herself and a future son of hers might indeed have a priority to the throne over Alexander. The case of Eurydice and her sons might have also crossed Olympia’s mind: she managed to put three sons on the throne but Gygaea, who was likely the first wife, none. No coincidence, Attalus was murdered by Alexander III in 335 BC.103

Cleopatra managed to give the king a daughter named Europa (named after her father’s occupation of the Greek peninsula), before they were both killed by the jealous Olympias after Philip’s assassination. The existence of a boy, though, is also attested in several literary sources (Justin. 9.7.12, 11.2.3; Paus. 8.7.5; Diod. Sic. 17.2.3) whose name was Caranos. Was this another child Cleopatra had? Could Europa and Caranos be one and the same baby, since their mother could not have given birth to two children in such a short period of time? Caranos existence and Justin’s and Pausanias’ credibility have been questioned by several scholars, offering more reliability to Satyrus’ passage. R. Lane Fox believes there was enough time for Cleopatra to give birth to two children, one after the other, if her marriage to Philip occurred in spring in 337 BC and keeping in mind Philip’s assassination estimated around late September 336 BC. He, furthermore, believes that Caranos is the neonate discovered in Tomb I of Aigai, a case that sounds reasonable; it has not been proved, though.104

Justin (9.7.3) speaks of a step mother Alexander had and a brother by her whom he feared as a rival to the throne. The name of Cleopatra mentioned before this phrase and the reference to Attalus right after it, could justify the belief that Philip’s last wife, Cleopatra, and this step mother are one and the same person.105 Later in the text follows the killing of Cleopatra’s baby

103 Gilley and Worthington 2010, 191.
104 Lane Fox 2011, 5, 385; Carney 2000, 33
105 Justin (9.7.2-3) in www.attalus.org:“...as Olympias had felt no less resentment at her divorce, and the preferment of Cleopatra to herself, than Pausanias had felt at the insults which he had received. As for Alexander, it is said that he feared his brother by his step-mother as a rival for the throne; and hence it happened that he had previously quarrelled at a banquet, first with Attalus, and afterwards with his father himself..."
daughter by Olympias in her mother's lap and her own too; she was forced to hang herself (Justin. 9.7.12).

In his text Diodorus (17.2.3) states that “Cleopatra had borne a child (νήπιον) to Philip a few days before his death”.\textsuperscript{106} Pausanias refers that Philip’s “son by Cleopatra, the niece of Attalus, was along with his mother dragged by Olympias on to a bronze vessel and burned to death”.\textsuperscript{107} Since the time from her marriage to Philip until his death was short, the birth of two children do not stand to reason. It is more likely she had only one child with more scholars pointing to Europa. However, Caranos name cannot have been invented. A boy with this name must have existed and such a name recalls to our memory the mythical founder of the Argead dynasty. Could there have been a more proper name for the son of Macedonia’s king, now leader of all Greeks, and his new Macedonian wife of the Argead clan? After all, the existence of a boy and potential heir and not a girl, justifies the animosity with which Olympias killed both of them. At the same period, Thessalonike, who was also daughter of Philip and at an age to be married, was not hurt by Olympias. Why would a baby girl, even with such a lineage, be such a threat to Alexander?

If Caranos existed, perhaps Cleopatra, who felt frightened by Olympias and Alexander’s reaction to the birth of a boy, especially after the quarrel at the banquet with her uncle, proceeded to the concealment of the real gender of the neonate, declaring the latter was a girl, Europa. The archaeological findings confirm that the bones traced in Tomb I are either those of a baby in its final stages in a womb or those of one who died around a week after it came to life.\textsuperscript{108}

Similar examples with the case of Cleopatra have been detected in the history of Macedonia. Young Cleopatra constituted a threat to the established adult son of Philip like Cleopatra, widow of Perdicas II and mother of their seven-year-old son, who joined in marriage his son Archelaus after his death. By this union, the latter was being legitimized as a king and had the opportunity to kill his wife’s son, his enemy. Potentially, Alexander too could have married Cleopatra
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\textsuperscript{106} www.attalus.org
\textsuperscript{107} www.perseus.tufts.edu
\textsuperscript{108} R. Lane Fox 2011, 6.
to safeguard his elevation to the throne and kill his rival, Cleopatra’s baby. As we have earlier seen, Ptolemy from Alorus may have attempted the same thing with Eurydice.\textsuperscript{109}

There is a scholarly debate on who are the persons occupying Tomb II of the great tumulus at Vergina, others in favor of Philip II and one of his wives (perhaps the Scythian princess, daughter of King Atheas, Cleopatra or Meda) and others in favor of his son Philip Arrhidaeus and Adea Eurydice because of the artifacts discovered in the antechamber that seem to commemorate a warrior woman. An opinion has been expressed that the woman buried in the antechamber of Tomb II, could be Cleopatra. She passed away shortly after her husband and a proper burial for her arranged by Alexander would pass the message that he had nothing to do with her murder.\textsuperscript{110}

Tomb II is dated from the second half of the fourth century BC. Several osteological analyses have been made on the human remains of both the main chamber and the antechamber that do not coincide the one with the other. The latest analysis by Antikas and Wynn Antikas claims that the man buried in the main chamber was 45±4 years old, while the woman of the antechamber had 32±2 years of age, having passed away briefly before or after her husband.; both man and woman were cremated but not on the same pyre. Both the man and the woman were horse riders. Several of the artifacts discovered in the antechamber point to a warrior identity (a Scythian gorytus, a pair of uneven greaves (see Figure 19), a pectoral, arrowheads and spearheads), puzzling, though, scholars as some of them are of foreign origin.\textsuperscript{111} Manolis Andronikos connected the warrior items with the male of Tomb II since he believed they were placed in the doorway to the main chamber. Antikas and Wynn Antikas’ analysis to the human remains of the woman has shown that the uneven greaves belong to the female of the tomb because of the injury discovered to her left tibia. Philip II had been injured on the thigh not on his tibiae (Justin. 9.III.2).\textsuperscript{112} Cleopatra was assassinated shortly after Philip II but she did not have anything to do with military matters; there is no evidence that she was a horse.

\textsuperscript{109} Ogden 1999, 10.
\textsuperscript{110} Carney 2017a, 133.
\textsuperscript{111} Carney 2017a, 112-133.
\textsuperscript{112} Andronikos 1984, 178-9; Antikas and Wynn-Antikas 2015, 682; Carney 2017a, 118-119.
rider. The belief that the antechamber had been connected to the main chamber shortly afterwards and the fact that Cleopatra was murdered shortly after Philip, made her and Philip II the right proprietors for Tomb II. Her husband was about 46 years old when he died, whereas Philip III was around 40. Her age at the time of death (20 being the oldest) does not match the one suggested by the latest analysis, whilst the question on the baby’s burial still remains: if it is Cleopatra buried in Tomb II, then where was her baby buried? Antikas and Wynn Antikas disagree with previous studies about the cremains in the chamber and antechamber of Tomb II, which they find insufficient or misinterpreted (Xirotiris & Langenscheidt, 1981; Musgrave et al 2010; Xatzopoulos 2008). Based on their finds, they reach the conclusion that the most compatible candidate for the woman is King Atheas’ daughter. Nevertheless, we should also take in mind what image the commemorator wanted to present. As Elisabeth Carney notes he wanted to incorporate in her burial Amazonian features; perhaps this suited his purpose. A definite answer to the identity problem does not seem visible at the moment.

Figure 19: gold quiver cover and pair of uneven greaves (source: www.archaeology.org)
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IV. Philip as a God

In 336 BC, Philip II, dressed in his white cloak, was lying dead at the entrance of the theatre of Aigai. He was killed at the age of 47 by his bodyguard and ex-lover Pausanias, in front of the representatives of the Greek cities, Macedonian nobles, hetairoi and opponents invited for the wedding celebrations of his daughter Cleopatra to Alexander of Epirus (Diod. Sic. 16.93-94; Plut. Alex. 10.6-8). This was his last performance as a king and perhaps as a God, as Diodorus talks about a procession of statues of the twelve gods accompanied with one more statue, that of himself enthroned (synthronos). Was he trying to introduce a ruler-cult?116

In all probability, Philip is the first king to have divine honors being attributed to him by his demand for reasons that meet his interests. The theatre was part of the same building program with the palace with a view to the place where the wedding would take place and from which Philip stepped out to begin his performance. It was part of his propaganda to legitimize Macedonian monarchy via his “divinity” to the Greek public and decline the characterization barbarian that was attributed to him by the Hellenic world. The term barbarian was invented in the first half of the fifth century to mirror their old enemy, the Persians who were dangerous, polygamous and incestuous and did not live in democratic city-states as the Greeks. When this enemy had been vanquished in Greece, a new one was invented in the face of Philip. Therefore, he had to show that his monarchy and polygamous family was nothing like that. On the contrary, it was almost divine. He turned the royal wedding of his daughter to a paneguris, a religious international event, unlike the more private character these had in the past, to show to the Greeks who were concerned from the quarrels in his court caused by his polygamous family (Plut. Alex. 9.6, Moral. 179c), that he faced no domestic problems before his Persian campaign.117

115 Müller 2010, 182; Diod. 16.93.1: “Every seat in the theatre was taken when Philip appeared wearing a white cloak, and by his express orders his bodyguard held away from him and followed only at a distance, since he wanted to show publicly that he was protected by the goodwill of all the Greeks, and had no need of a guard of spearmen.”
116 Lane Fox 2011, 362.
117 Carney 2000, 204; Patterson 1997, 91.
He had just married his seventh wife when Olympias and his heir, Alexander left the court agitated by the quarrel with Attalus. Projecting only himself as godlike (as Homer characterized warriors), and not his whole family like in the case of the Philippeum, he wanted to send a message for the immediate future: that the Persian expedition would not be jeopardized. Ratification of the Molossial alliance and reconciliation with his wife and son, his heir apparent, had been achieved. He, as a Macedonian, deserved to be leading the Panhellenic campaign against the Persians and as Elisabeth Carney remarks, Cleopatra’s wedding was a good opportunity to project the almost divine royal dynasty, to transform the domestic into the Panhellenic, the familial into the Olympian. The Gods accepted the polygamous monarch for this new task and so must the Greeks.\textsuperscript{118}

This plan was covered with a nice, luxurious wrap: it included costumes like his white cloak, sacrifices to the Gods, public performances, great banquets and processions, all projecting Philip’s Hellenicity, opulence and glamour. At Philip’s desire many delegations from city-states took part in the festivities so that they could see their new leader, his family and their way of doing things. This kind of marriage was an interactive event, as Carney characterized it, where the crowd approved or disapproved of the leader, the first one happening in this case since the crowd was already seated, and did not only praise him as he entered the theatre but gave him golden crown as well. Additionally, he preferred not to be escorted by his boduguards, just by his son and son-in-law, to show that the goodwill of Greeks and the Gods protected him. He was, indeed, an “impresario of monarchy” as Spawforth characterized him.\textsuperscript{119}

Yet, it is not merely his statue during the procession at Aigai which lead scholars to believe Philip was attempting to acquire a divinity status. There is, also, the tholos at Olympia, the most important religious and athletic center of Greece. This tholos, called the Philippeum, was built within the sacred area of the Altis, next to the temple of Hera and near the most important entrance to the

\textsuperscript{118} Carney 2000, 205, 210, 213.
\textsuperscript{119} Carney 2006, 37; id. 2010b, 46-47; id. 2015, xvii; Baynham 1994, 39.
sanctuary. Every person visiting the sanctuary of Zeus had first to pass by Philip’s monument. Ergo, it was inevitable not to see the chryselephantine dynastic statue group made by Leochares depicting Philip II, his father Amyntas III, Eurydice, Olympias and their son Alexander III, all being godlike. As per Pausanias (5.20.9-10), after his victory in Chaeroneia in 338 BC, Philip II had erected this round structure to show a message regarding the succession to the Macedonian throne and/or his power and domination since he became the de facto ruler of Greece. The Philippeum visualized what Philip wanted the Greeks to see, in the most explicit way. Like in the case with his godlike statue at Aigai, he wished the Greeks to comprehend his exercise of power: he was a monarch and the women in his polygamous family had an active role in his dynasty, they were part of basileia. Philip was innovative once more as he involved royal women in the formation of the Argead’s dynastic image, made them part of the presentation of Macedonian monarchy but also lifted the importance of the latter almost to divinity which was implied for women of his court too. Nevertheless, the image and the κλέος that Philip had created of his royal family was later ruined by the Greeks, when, according to Pausanias, they removed the statues of Eurydice and Olympias from the Philippeum and transferred them to the Heraeum. (Paus. 5.7.14) This, most likely happened during the period authors like Plutarch were active, in an attempt to disconnect these royal women from political power.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{120} Palaggia, 2010, 33; Paus. 5.20.10: “Here are set statues of Philip and Alexander, and with them is Amyntas, Philip’s father. These works too are by Leochares, and are of ivory and gold, as are the statues of Olympias and Eurydice”; Carney 1995, 380-381; id. 2000, 77; id. 2006, 109; id. 2010, 43; id. 2015, 62.
Figure 20: site plan of the sanctuary of ancient Olympia (source: www.wikipedia.org)

Figure 21: Philippium in Olympia, (source: www.britannica.com)
V. Philip as a dead king -The possible role of Olympias

No sooner had Philip entered the theatre with his son, Alexander III and his new son-in-law, Alexander of Epirus, than Pausanias stabbed him mortally in his chest. Horses were waiting for him at the gateway for a successful run away, still the king's bodyguards attained to catch him and kill him, without permitting him to explain the reasons of this fatal act. Philip had died and the question is whether Olympias had something to do with this. Pausanias, was the obvious assassin, one of Philip’s hypaspists with whom he had homosexual relationships. Relations between two adults were frowned upon by other Greeks since the usual thing was a Greek elder man (erastes) to initiate a young man (eromenos) into the adult world, acting as his mentor until he grew a beard.¹²¹

Despite their relationship, Philip neglected him over another Pausanias, to whom the first Pausanias made accusations of being a hermaphrodite. The insulted young man committed suicide by receiving on his body all the arrows intended for Philip, during a battle in 344 BC with the king of Illyrians, identified with Pleuratus. Since he had confessed he would commit this act to Attalus, just a general back then, he invited the future assassin to a dinner, where he made him drunk with unmixed wine. Afterwards, he surrendered him to muleteers who raped him. When Philip’s lover realized what had been done to him, he blamed Attalus in front of Philip, not receiving the support he would have hoped for. The fact that the Macedonian king did not punish his wife’s guardian but, instead, attempted to soften him with presents and a promotion over his other bodyguards (Diod. Sic. 16.93.3-9) lead him to kill his ex-lover. Perhaps Philip even employed sex with adult men who he intended to use as pawns, these either coming from royal families such as Olympias’ brother, Alexander or being royal pages and hypaspists such as Pausanias. The first one he needed to control Molossia when he would become king and the latter to be informed from the inside about things taking place in court.¹²² In a court full of conspiracies, assassinations and plots he needed as many more people as he could to support him.

¹²¹ Mortensen 2007, 378.
¹²² Carney 2006, 29.
What makes scholars believe that Pausanias was instigated by someone else to murder Philip, is the huge gap of more than a year from his humiliation to Philip’s murder. He could not have kept his anger for such a long time.\textsuperscript{123} Olympias’ contemporaries were likewise suspicious of her involvement. She had not returned to Macedonia after the quarrel Alexander had with Attalus and was probably not present at her daughter’s wedding festival and consequently at Philip’s murder. Even if the above is true, Justin implicates her in the murder presenting information not attested to other sources, emphasizing again on the bad, manipulative and murderous character of royal women. Her motive for the assassination is supposed to be jealousy and resentment when Philip sidelined her for Cleopatra and divorced her on the grounds that she had cheated him with a snake; a story that only he reports and that does not appeal reliable. He could have been influenced by *Alexander Romance* on this. Another reason for the end of their marriage could be the prompt to her brother for waging war to Philip in revenge, a plan thwarted by the marriage he arranged for Alexander of Epirus with their daughter Cleopatra (Justin. 9.7.7). Justin does not, however, connect this intrigue with the alleged divorce. He implies both hers and Alexander’s involvement in Pausanias’ act and reports that Olympias had horses waiting for him to escape (Justin. 9.7.9). He even goes further with his accusations against her saying that only she would have dared to put a gold crown on the assasin’s head, burn his body, prepare a tomb in the same place with her husband and dedicate the murder weapon to Apollo under her previous name, Myrtale. It seems to him that Olympias did everything in her power to make evident her involvement in this murderous act, actually honoring her husband’s assasin (Justin. 9.7.11-14).\textsuperscript{124} Unlike Diodorus who criticizes Olympias for her violent actions in 317 BC, Justin views these as a result of her being a woman and is more interested in her possible role to Philip’s murder, not even in the murder of Cleopatra and her baby. His aim in writing is for providing “pleasure or material for moral examples (*Prefat*. 4”).\textsuperscript{125} Both Plutarch and Justin talk about Pausanias instigation by Olympias to the fatal act, and her son’s involvement in this who is said to have recited to Pausanias the iambic

\textsuperscript{123} Badian 2007, 393-394.
\textsuperscript{124} Carney 2010, 47; Badian 2007, 389-390.
\textsuperscript{125} Carney 2006, 129.
verse of the “Medeia” upon Philip’s lack of support to him: “the giver of the bride, the bridegroom, the bride”, suggesting the murder of Attalus, Philip and Cleopatra (Plut. Alex. 10.4; Justin. 9.7.1; cf. 9.7.8).

As Elizabeth Carney notes, it is true that Alexander and Olympias benefited by his death. The former became the new king and the latter was the heir’s mother who could interfere with politics just as her mother-in-law, Eurydice, had done.\textsuperscript{126} This was assumed by the bad relations both of them had with Philip. Olympia’s pride was wounded by reason of her ancestry disesteemed and her son’s possible rejection to the throne. If another person was to be promoted for a king, then her days would be over at the court. Plutarch remarks that Philip was fond of his son (Plut. Alex. 9.3), which seems to be true as Alexander became the regent of Macedonia in 340 BC, being only sixteen, during the absence of his father and, moreover, was assigned an important position at the battle of Chaeroneia in 338 BC, signs that he destined him for his successor (Plut. Alex. 9.1).\textsuperscript{127} This must have turned out to be a positive outcome for Olympias too who stood out from the other wives at that time. However, with the bad character she had, as Plutarch remarks, she evoked many quarrels between father and son, as well to the women’s apartments for she was a jealous and sullen woman (Plut. Alex. 9.4-5).

Alexander, on his part, whilst his father display of preference to him, seemed to have a better relationship with his mother: Alexander’s secured future meant a secure position for his mother in addition, who was working hard to accomplish that. He, even, wished to have her deified (Quintus Curtius Rufus, Historiae Alexandri, 9.6.26-27). A closer tie between father and son was difficult to be achieved, Philip being away often on expeditions and his son being absent in Mieza with Aristotle. Additionally, Alexander seemed to be antagonistic and jealous of his father. Each time Philip took a famous city or achieved something, Alexander was not glad and told his comrades: “Boys, my father will anticipate everything; and for me he will leave no great or brilliant achievement to be displayed to the world with your aid” (Plut. Alex. 5.4).\textsuperscript{128} What’s more, the incident with Pixodarus demonstrates the insecurity mother and son felt when

\textsuperscript{126} Carney 2006, 48.
\textsuperscript{127} Badian 2007, 402.
\textsuperscript{128} Fredricksmeyer 1990, 300-308.
they heard of the marriage scheduled for Arrhidaeus. They probably thought Philip had other intentions for his other son.\textsuperscript{129}

Even that being the case, no matter how insecure and insulted they felt, they would not plan to kill Philip on the wedding day of their daughter Cleopatra with Alexander, king of Molossia and brother of Olympias, since it was part of their reconciliation. Should Philip wish to alter his successor, he would not have made such a reconciliation attempt to honor Olympias’ Aeacid insulted family. Additionally, Philip did not have any profit in designating a new heir for his throne. He was about to leave for his new expedition in Asia and instability would have to be avoided.\textsuperscript{130}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{129} Carney 2006, 38. \\
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid. 33-37.
\end{flushright}
VI. Epilogue

Philip II, king of Macedonia, was no doubt a great leader, warrior and king. What makes him unique, though, is not only his success to create successful alliances via his polygamy but, furthermore, his ability to provide the longed-for κλέος to the Argead dynastic image with the proper stagecraft and make the rest of Greece accept his monarchy, his many marriages and him as their leader. His innovations formed the image he wished to project. After securing his kingdom from his enemies with the foundation of a strong army and state and in an effort to expand Macedonia, he started creating alliances. He wedded, therefore, his enemies’ daughters and converted his foes to his friends and supporters. Marrying non-Macedonian women was part of Philip’s marriage policy so as to establish his power in the beginning of his career and quickly produce children for his throne. For this reason, he took five foreign wives in the early years of his reign to create unity and wedded the pure Macedonian last in line when he had been established as a leader both internally and externally.\footnote{Carney 2015, 141-142}

While studying the above, the impression conveyed about these royal women is that they were either too quiet or too barbarous and aggressive. The reason for the first one is the scarcity of available sources and for the second the hostility of authors towards Macedonian women and monarchy. We need to comprehend why.

The sources at our disposal regarding the Macedonian monarchy come from authors not familiar with Macedonian customs, customs unknown to writers from the rest of Greece and to Roman authors too.\footnote{Carney 2000, 14; id. 2019, 3, 55.} Macedonian kings, who followed the archaic model for royal marriages, were seen in the eyes of other Greeks as old-fashioned since they were polygamous. During Roman Republic and Imperial Rome, the ideal Roman woman had to show privacy, simplicity and self-denial. All this, in conjunction with the existing roman anti-monarchical feelings led to the creation of a negative reflection of Macedonian royal women. Perhaps these women were not simple and quiet as they wished, but this also
stands to royal men as well, who, according to the authors, always had an excuse for their brutal acts or were even praised for them. For Justin, (Marcus Junianus Justinus, Roman historian of the 3rd c. AD who wrote the epitome of the Philippic Histories of Pompeius Trogus), royal women with political action are foreign, barbarous and tend to weaken their husbands and their power. Pompeius Trogus was a Roman historian who lived at the time Augustus was an emperor, the first one of the Imperial period and beneficiary of Alexander’s territories. Augustus, while a monarch himself, attempted for a while to imitate Alexander but denied the execution of such a form of government, creating thus a prejudice for monarchy and for those who had practiced it. The Romans judged a king to be something separate from the emperor. Augustus had introduced several moral reforms like Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis throughout his rule, since a sexual liberation had been noticed to women of high birth, including his daughter Julia, which was frowned upon by men, including authors who reckoned it as dangerous. A similar approach was followed by the emperors of the Principate that succeeded him. This explains why Eurydice and Olympias were such good examples of amoral female behavior for Roman authors of the Augustan period.

Theopompus of Chios (c. 380 BC – c. 315 BC), who most likely is the main source for Book 7 of Justin’s Epitome of Pompeius Trogus, is on the same wavelength criticizing the Macedonian court as extravagant and barbaric (FGρH 115 F 224-225 a-b). It is true that he had visited the Macedonian court but as a person who had spent time in 4th c. Athens, he portrayed things in an Athenocentric point of view not in a Macedonian.

Plutarch (c. 46 AD- 120 AD) was a Greek author who had lived and worked in Rome around 100 AD and possibly had encountered Emperors Trajan and Hadrian who ruled during the Second Sophistic Period, a revival of the Greek rhetoric and a comeback to old Greek traditions. For Plutarch, as a Second
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134 Carney 2006, 117.
136 Carney 2019, 2.
137 www.livius.org.
Sophistic writer, Homer set the good example, a model Alexander followed too for constructing his picture. In the Second Sophistic period. Emperors employed Greek philosophy and a Graeco-Roman culture for the Empire and for cities once connected to Alexander. Plutarch, loyal to the Homeric model and to the Aristotelian ethics, is noted for using royal women to provide moral lessons. Like Justin, he depicts them as manipulative, bad and witchlike. The attitude of some of them is exemplary like Penelope, while that of others is a counterexample like the witch Circe or Olympias.

Diodorus Siculus was too a Greek writer who had lived in Rome during Augustus time as well. The model he followed for writing was to have one main source for his passages, which he flourished with his own comments of ethical character. This is what Roman writers did: they selected what stories to insert in their books and chose how to interpret them so as to teach moral lessons. Not being able to directly comment on politicized women of their time like Livia, Fulvia or Cleopatra VII of Egypt they used women of the past with political activity, such as Eurydice or Olympias, to show the amorality and corruption that arose with their involvement in politics. As Justin admits in the epitome of Pompeius Trogus: “I omitted what did not make pleasurable reading or serve to provide a moral”, (praef. 4, translation Yardley, 1994).138

Ergo, their plays definitely display the roman point of view; hence, we should be skeptical when we draw conclusions on Macedonian royal women based on these sources.139

In reality, Philip’s royal women do not resemble women in other parts of the Hellenic world. They do not even own an official title (reference to them is being made by their personal name and their patronymic). It is true that they had more freedom and a reinforced public role than other women in Greece that recalls to our memory the aristocratic women of the archaic period. Still, they were not allowed to be present at the banquets organized in the palace, where only men and courtesans attended. Olympias and Cleopatra seemed not to be present during Alexander’s quarrel with Attalus. However, in some cases exceptions

139 Carney 2006, 117-125; id. 2-4, 68, 70.
could have existed as Angeliki Kottaridi has concluded, from the banqueting vessels discovered in the tomb of the Lady of Aigai, that Royal women were present in some symposia reminding us the queens of the Homeric epics.\textsuperscript{140}

Albeit, despite their potential to interfere in politics and/or even in military matters, royal women were used as pawns. Firstly, they were considered important because their father or other important members of their family could conduct a marriage alliance with a king like Philip. Their eminence in his court was subject to the significance of their family, a status that could change with the opportunity they were given to become the mother of the potential heir to the throne. Those lucky enough to bear children, especially males, were connected to the fate of their sons but as we have earlier noted, none had an official title and neither did Philip.\textsuperscript{141} Nonetheless, even bearing a daughter could influence things. A woman with Argead blood gave legal power to the prospective grooms for candidacy to the Macedonian throne. Marrying an Argead gave Alexander’s generals the right to rule his empire after his death. Acting as regents to a child, like in the case of Antipater with Alexander IV or Olympias with Alexander’s or Cleopatra’s son held out hope of keeping the control of things. As Elisabeth Carney successfully notes the “Argeads offered greater legitimacy than any of the regents”.\textsuperscript{142} For instance, Cassander preferred to kill Alexander’s son and marry Alexander’s half-sister, Thessalonike, instead of acting as a regent to the kid, so as to achieve the necessary status and become king of Macedonia.

Some of them being foreign were allowed to bring with them the customs from their homeland, like Audata and Olympias.\textsuperscript{143} Even so, foreign women were not easily accepted by the Macedonian elite. They lacked the support from the base and this explains why Cleopatra was in a favorable position over Olympias. Cleopatra belonged to their clan and in Macedonia the power was defined by clan rather than by office.\textsuperscript{144} Even Alexander’s wives were not taken into

\textsuperscript{140} Kottaridi 2004, 69.
\textsuperscript{141} Carney 2017b, 139.
\textsuperscript{142} Carney 2006, 69.
\textsuperscript{143} Carney 2000, 14.
\textsuperscript{144} Carney, 1995, 382.
consideration because they were Asian. These women created networks of *philia* inside the court that would assist them to reach the throne and were, furthermore, part of amphimetric groups in rivalry one with another. Alliances, though, between wives could have existed such as that between Nikesipolis and Olympias, as we have already, seen; the fact that Nikesipolis had a daughter and not a son perhaps makes the difference.

All these name alterations (Audata-Eurydice, Adea - Eurydice, Cleopatra-Eurydice, Philip-Arrhidaeus) perhaps occurred for the purpose of acquiring the legitimacy everyone around Philip desired. Philip III adopted his father’s name when he became co-king with Alexander’s son to show that he was the legitimate heir. Likewise, women adopted queen Eurydice’s name to display they were equally powerful with the queen mother except for Olympias who need not substitute her own’s since she had her passport to legitimacy: Alexander, Philip’s son, the one and only able to rule after his father.

Valued possessions, is what Homer thought of women unlike Hesiod who regarded them as an evil. Philip, perceiving what a valuable tool his consorts could be for his image and his politics, both internally and externally, he shaped his women to fit the Homeric model having also in mind Homeric heroes like Achilles, Olympias’ famous progenitor. Despite his monarchy and polygamy, this icon would give him the passport for the rest of the Hellenic world, a signature of his Hellenicity. With his innovations, he managed to stand out from previous Argead rulers, whilst the strengthening and projection of his dynasty through his marriage policy was emulated by Hellenistic rulers, successors of Alexander’s empire. Costumes, processions, statues, attempts to divinity were all adopted to shape the image of his monarchy and make his family way of living attractive to Greeks. He succeeded, thus, in elevating the institution of monarchy in Macedonia and royal women along with it. In his kingdom royal women stood out and played important political roles acting as “diplomats” between their homeland and their new home. Not only were they not set aside, on the contrary they were prominent and part of the public image of the
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145 Carney 2006, 114.
146 Carney 2018, 29.
Argead’s dynasty. They displayed their wealth and power through their weddings (like that of Cleopatra’s with Alexander of Molossia), their funerals (Eurydice’s tomb, Tomb II), their dedications and monumental buildings (Eukleia’s sanctuary, the Philippeion). Even the names they were given were part of Philip’s propaganda projecting his victories or image: Olympias, Thessalonike, Europa, Cleopatra (*kleos+pater*). Following his paradigm, they emulated Philip’s marriage policy acting as succession advocates for their children and securing the future of both, since a royal mother was far more prominent than a royal wife or a royal widow. It is true that sources were not kind to them, the prejudice of which makes practically unattainable to become familiar with the real image of their personality. What we may conclude is that with Philip’s contribution, royal Macedonian women, after Eurydice and especially after Olympias become important personalities who act as co-rulers, regents and commanders of an army, defending the kingdom in men’s absence. They are the women behind the man.\textsuperscript{147}

\footnote{Carney 1987, 38; id.,14, 78, 203; Donlon 1999, 27.}
Appendix

Philip’s women in later literary tradition: Alexander Romance and Plutarch’s A life of Alexander

In two works dedicated to Alexander’s life and of different literary genres, we can see the different way in which Philip’s women are showcased. The first one is Plutarch’s A life of Alexander and the second is Alexander Romance, an epistolary novel which is for the most part fictional. Plutarch was a Greek biographer and a Second Sophistic author, who lived in the Roman Empire c. 45-125 CE, and whose ethographic works do not persist in historical detail; rather, they emphasize among others on amorality shown by women. Among his numerous works are attributed the Parallel Lives, where he presents the lives of famous Greek and Roman men in pairs, having as aim to compare their character and their morality. What follows is his reports in the introduction of the Life of Alexander, in which he refers to Alexander the Great and Caesar: it is not Histories he is writing about but characters. For Plutarch, the role model of a woman is the one that resembles the Homeric wives, demonstrating obedience and loyalty. Conversely, those whose behavior is similar to that of Homeric witches can only be characterized in a negative manner. Second Sophistic writers used to draw their subjects from the Greek past, with favorite themes being the Persian wars, Philip II’s invasion to Greece and Alexander’s campaign to Persia. They tended to imitate 4th century orators, especially the anti-Macedonian Demosthenes who had accused Philip of his way of life. Since the Greek world was part of the Roman Empire, the Second Sophistic was one way of maintaining the Greek identity; still, most of all these glorious moments of the past could have an effect in Roman present time. Under this context, the general picture with which Plutarch portrays Philip’s women and their gender is anticipated: they are dangerous, witchlike and should not violate gender roles by interfering in politics (Plut. Alex. 2.2-4; 9; 68.3; 77.5). In particular, the story with Olympias sleeping with a serpent sounds similar to a story seen also in Alexander Romance, where she had conceived Alexander with Zeus Ammon in the form of a snake. In Plutarch this scene is rejected by Philip. In the

Romance, though, her alleged infidelity is not presented in a negative manner. On the contrary, the men he is writing about are expected to be admired and imitated by his audience.\footnote{149 Kempf 2017, 5; Whitmarsh 2005, 66.}

The Alexander Romance although it contains some historical facts, it cannot be considered historical neither a biography, the literary genre to which Plutarch’s work belongs. The Romance, has been falsely attributed to Callisthenes of Olynthus, a Greek historian who wrote of Alexander’s expedition. Since this work refers to Alexander’s death as well, Callisthenes has to be ruled out as its author.\footnote{150 Carney 2006, 111.} As Ausfeld has proven pieces of the original text cannot be dated later than the 3rd c BC and the beginning of the 2nd c. BC. The first complete version of the text possibly comes from the 3rd c. CE. It enjoyed great popularity having received many alternations along the centuries until Renaissance both in the West and in the East, the reason for having so many recessions of it and of being translated to so many languages such as Latin, Syrian, Armenian, Persian, German, English etc.\footnote{151 Mitsakis, 2001, 7-8} The book on which we are going to rely is “Διήγησις περὶ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ τῶν μεγάλων πολέμων”, edited by Karolos Mitsakis and Recession a of the Greek text, translated by E.H. Haight.

In Mitsakis’ book, when Alexander went to Egypt and his army was besieging the castle, the people of Egypt begged him to spear them: he, allegedly, being a king and son, not of Philip, but of their own god Nectanebo. Alexander, confused from what he had heard, stopped fighting and asked for clarifications. Nectanebo had in the past told the people of Egypt that he could not clash with Darius the Persian, hence, a young man would come in thirty years from then who they would understand he was his son from a sign: a wreath that stood on a statue would fall on his head when he approached the middle of Egypt. This having taken place with Alexander the people kneeled before him. Later in the text, Alexander sent a letter to Darius where he refers to himself as the son of Philip and Olympias.\footnote{152 Mitsakis, 2001, 71.}

In recession a of Alexander Romance Olympias is presented in having close relation with witchcraft and magic. She seems to be connected with the last
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Pharao of Egypt and astrologer Nectanebo with whom she produced Alexander.\textsuperscript{153} Worried that Philip would divorce her, not for being unfaithfully as Justin claims, but for not producing a child, she addresses the “prophet” Nectanebo unaware that he is, actually, a king. During his visit to the palace while Philip was away at war, he was bewildered by her beauty and advised her the following: “For fate has decreed, according to the hour of your birth which you gave me, that you should meet an earth-born god, and be embraced by him and conceive a son, your own child, an avenger of the sins of Philip”. With the proper herbs he bewitched the sleep of Olympias so she saw a horned Ammon embracing her coming first as a serpent with a hissing sound and said: “Madam, in your womb you carry your avenger” (1.4). The fruit of this association is Alexander. Olympias continues this relationship aware that she is being unfaithful, while later she admits to Philip her adultery and that Alexander is not his son. Philip is dubious about the divinity of her lover. This is a scenario adopted also by Justin who is possibly influenced by the Romance (9.5.9, 11.11.5). What’s more, Pausanias, Philip’s bodyguard, who was also in love with Olympias, asked her to abandon her husband for him but she denied. Driven by his desire for her and wanting to abduct her, he assassinates her husband when she rejects him (1.24).\textsuperscript{154}

The Romance presents a different picture of women emphasizing on their sexuality. It is more tolerable and unbiased towards women, taking into consideration Olympia’s infidelity which is shown in a more sympathetic way unlike the presentation of Philip. She seems here to be not a jealous, sullen and out of control woman as Plutarch characterizes her (Plut. Alex. 2.6), but a caring and tender mother who has a good relationship with her son, not interfering in his issues. Alexander supports his mother for her actions and blames his father for his unjust treatment to his wife. He is to blame for taking one more wife because he is ill in his soul (1.22).

\textsuperscript{153} Ogden, 2007, 365.
\textsuperscript{154} Carney, 2006, 112, 128.
The impact *Alexander Romance* had is visible on depictions of Olympias that have been attested after this period. A mosaic of the 4th century AD found in a villa at Baalbek (see Figure 22), presents the story of Alexander’s divine birth, very similar to the story described in Chapter X, Book 1 of Alexander’s romance. One scene of this depicts Olympias on a couch stretching her right hand to a snake climbing on her lap and Philip sitting beside her, probably the time when he becomes aware that Alexander was conceived by a divine snake. Other scenes in the mosaic display Alexander’s birth and his bathing by a nymph.  

![Figure 22: mosaic from Baalbek representing Alexander, Olympias with a snake and Philip (source: www.livius.org)](image)
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One more depiction of Olympias is on a medallion of the late 4\textsuperscript{th}-5\textsuperscript{th} c AD. (see Figure 23) in which the obverse shows Alexander in lion’s skin headdress and the reverse Olympias half-naked, sitting on a couch feeding a snake: an insinuation perhaps to Zeus Ammon. The inscriptions above and below her confirm her identity: “Olympias” and “\textit{Regina}”.\textsuperscript{157}

\textit{Figure 23}: Olympias reclined on a couch feeding a snake (Source: www.britishmuseum.org)

\textsuperscript{157} Carney 2006, 122.
## List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ael. N.A.</td>
<td>Aelian, <em>De Natura Animalium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arr. Anab.</td>
<td>Arrian, <em>Anabasis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athen.</td>
<td>Athenaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diod. Sic.</td>
<td>Diodorus Siculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGrH</td>
<td><em>Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod.</td>
<td>Herodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyp.</td>
<td>Hypereides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td><em>Inscriptiones Graecae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paus.</td>
<td>Pausanias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut. Alex.</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Alexander</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut. Conjug.</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Conjugalia Praecepta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut. Demetr.</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Demetrius</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut. Eum.</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Eumenes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut. Pelopidas</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Pelopidas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut. Pyrrh.</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Pyrrhus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyaenus, Strateg.</td>
<td>Polyaenus, <em>Strategemata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaf.</td>
<td><em>Praefatio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-Call.</td>
<td>Pseudo Callisthenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td><em>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph. Byz.</td>
<td>Stephanus Byzantius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td><em>sub verbo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuc.</td>
<td>Thucydides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xen. Hell.</td>
<td>Xenophon, <em>Hellenica</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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