

Miroslav Vasilev
Museum of National Crafts – Troyan
Bulgaria

UDC:94(381)

HERODOTUS VIII. 137–139 AND THE FOUNDATION OF ARGEAD MACEDONIA

Abstract: the article looks at the information Herodotus provides about the founder of the Argead dynasty Perdiccas. It accentuates three major problems. First, it focuses on the chronology of the events under discussion, as the conclusion which has been arrived at places them in the first half or in the middle of the 7th c. BC. Later it is accepted that the founder of the dynasty bore the name of Perdiccas – a name mentioned by Herodotus. As far as Archelaus and Caranus as well as Coenus and Tyrimmas – mentioned in primary sources, are concerned, they are defined as non-historical characters included for political reasons in the Argead king list. Thirdly, it explores the route the three brothers probably followed. Herodotus' mentioning Illyria is also, for some political reasons, present here, intending to leave the reader with the impression that the ruling dynasty of the Argeadae led their roots from Argos in Peloponnese whereas it is possible that Perdiccas and his brothers were actually from Argos in Orestis. This is the precise point from which they reached the kingdom with the capital city Lebaea which might be identical to the village Λεβεία situated in Elimea. From here, running away from the ruler of Lebaea they crossed Haliacmon and reached the mount of Bermium where they found the Macedonian kingdom. Lastly, the conclusion is reached that despite the political propaganda and folklore elements in it, the legend Herodotus tells is historical at the core and relates to the earliest history of the Argeadae, their kingdom and, to a certain extent, to the people they ruled over.

In trying to reconstruct the events which led to the founding of the Argead kingdom, modern researchers are confronted with enormous difficulties. A considerable proportion of the sources for the events of the period is based on traditions of mythographical rather than historical nature. Of course, some of them do contain historical facts, but scarce, as a rule, providing no correct chronological, geographical and historical information. This is due both to the late records of the legends and also to the fact that the information in question derived from the Macedonian royal court, and so was meant to serve as propaganda; for this reason the authenticity of part of the legends may be doubted. Even so, however, they are of extremely high value, for the reason that they are the only literary sources imparting knowledge on the foundation of the Argead Kingdom.

There are extant some ten records of traditions, which have more differences than similarities. The disparities are striking – and not only in regard to geographical and chronological data; there is not even unanimity on the name of the dynasty's founder. This may be due not so much to the chronological remoteness of the events under consideration or the ignorance of the aforesaid traditions but rather to the influence of particular transitory political situations which, depending on the circumstances, needed either not such a big change or a more radical one. Herodotus' tradition therefore will be taken as a base and starting point. This account certainly also carries political burdens, but they can be attributed primarily to the attempt to trace the alleged Peloponnesian ancestry of the dynasty. This, along with the fact that Herodotus' account is chronologically the earliest tradition, may mean that it is the most reliable source of all the traditions related to the origin of the Argeadae, and thus to the earliest history of their kingdom. Here is what Herodotus wrote on this matter:¹

τοῦ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τούτου ἑβδομος γενέτωρ Περδίκκης ἐστὶ ὁ κτησάμενος τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. ἐξ Ἄργεος ἔφωγον ἐς Ἴλλυριοὺς τῶν Τημένου ἀπογόνων τρεῖς ἀδελφοί, Γαυάνης τε καὶ Ἀέροπος καὶ Περδίκκης, ἐκ δὲ Ἴλλυριῶν ὑπερβαλόντες ἐς τὴν ἄνω Μακεδονίην ἀπίκοντο ἐς Λεβαίην πόλιν. ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἐθήτεον ἐπὶ μισθῷ παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὃ μὲν ἵππους νέμων, ὃ δὲ βοῦς, ὃ δὲ νεώτατος αὐτῶν Περδίκκης τὰ λεπτά τῶν προβάτων. ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτὴ τὰ σιτία σφι ἔπεσσε: ἦσαν γὰρ τὸ πάλαι καὶ αἱ τυραννίδες τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενέες χρήμασι, οὐ μούνον ὁ δῆμος: ὅπως δὲ ὀπτῶη, ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ θητὸς Περδίκκεω διπλήσιος ἐγένετο αὐτὸς ἑωυτοῦ. ἐπεὶ δὲ αἰεὶ τῷτῳ τοῦτο ἐγένετο, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἑωυτῆς: τὸν δὲ ἀκούσαντα ἐσήλθε αὐτίκα ὡς εἴη τέρας καὶ φέροι μέγα τι. καλέσας δὲ τοὺς θήτας προηγόρευέ σφι ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἐκ γῆς τῆς ἑωυτοῦ. οἱ δὲ τὸν μισθὸν ἔφασαν δίκαιοι εἶναι ἀπολαβόντες οὕτω ἐξιέναι. ἐνθαῦτα ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ μισθοῦ πέρη ἀκούσας, ἦν γὰρ κατὰ τὴν καπνοδόκην ἐς τὸν οἶκον ἐσέχων ὁ ἥλιος, εἶπε θεοβλαβῆς γενόμενος “μισθὸν δὲ ὑμῖν ἐγὼ ὑμέων ἄξιον τόνδε ἀποδίδωμι,” δέξας τὸν ἥλιον. ὁ μὲν δὲ Γαυάνης τε καὶ ὁ Ἀέροπος οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔστασαν ἐκπεπληγμένοι, ὡς ἤκουσαν ταῦτα: ὁ δὲ παῖς, ἐτύγγανε γὰρ ἔχων μάχαιραν, εἶπας τάδε “δεκόμεθα ὧ βασιλεῦ τὰ διδοῖς,” περιγράφει τῇ μαχαίρῃ ἐς τὸ ἔδαφος τοῦ οἴκου τὸν ἥλιον, περιγράφας δέ, ἐς τὸν κόλπον τρεῖς ἀρυσάμενος τοῦ ἡλίου, ἀπαλλάσσετο αὐτὸς τε καὶ οἱ μετ' ἐκείνου. οἱ μὲν δὲ

*I am most grateful to professor Miltiades Hatzopoulos for his helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. I am also indebted to my friend and colleague Dr. Stephen O'Connor who kindly agreed to make revision of the English version of the text.

¹ Hdt. 8, 137.1-139.1 (Macan).

ἀπήσαν, τῷ δὲ βασιλεί σημαίνει τις τῶν παρέδρων οἷόν τι χρῆμα ποιήσσειε ὁ παῖς καὶ ὡς σὺν νόφ κείνων ὁ νεώτατος λάβοι τὰ διδόμενα. ὁ δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούσας καὶ ὄξυνθεις πέμπει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἱππέας ἀπολέοντας. ποταμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ταύτῃ, τῷ θύουσι οἱ τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἀπόγονοι σωτῆρι: οὗτος, ἐπεὶτε διέβησαν οἱ Τημενίδαι, μέγας οὕτω ἔρρῦη ὥστε τοὺς ἱππέας μὴ οἴους τε γενέσθαι διαβῆναι. οἱ δὲ ἀπικόμενοι ἐς ἄλλην γῆν τῆς Μακεδονίης οἴκησαν πέλας τῶν κήπων τῶν λεγομένων εἶναι Μίδεω τοῦ Γορδίου, ἐν τοῖσι φύεται αὐτόματα ρόδα, ἐν ἕκαστον ἔχον ἐξήκοντα φύλλα, ὄδμη τε ὑπερφέροντα τῶν ἄλλων. ἐν τούτοισι καὶ ὁ Σιληνὸς τοῖσι κήποισι ἦλω, ὡς λέγεται ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν κήπων ὄρος κεῖται Βέρμιον οὖνομα, ἄβατον ὑπὸ χειμῶνος. ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ ὀρμώμενοι, ὡς ταύτην ἔσχον, κατεστρέφοντο καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην. ἀπὸ τούτου δὴ τοῦ Περδίκκεω Ἀλέξανδρος ὧδε ἐγένετο: Ἀμύντεω παῖς ἦν Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἀμύντης δὲ Ἀλκέτεω, Ἀλκέτεω δὲ πατὴρ ἦν Ἀέροπος, τοῦ δὲ Φίλιππος, Φιλίππου δὲ Ἀργαῖος, τοῦ δὲ Περδίκκης ὁ κτησάμενος τὴν ἀρχήν.

To serve the objectives of this article, the adduced passage should be thoroughly considered in its chronological, geographical and historical aspects. Following Herodotus' exposition the researcher will, right at the beginning of the text, run across a series of problems widely discussed in the secondary literature. One of these is of purely chronological nature: Approximately when did the Argeadae establish themselves in the Macedonian lands and, hence, when did they begin their rule over the Macedones? A precise answer to this question appears impossible at present. There are, however, data in the available source base providing useful and relatively precise chronological information on the early Argeadae.² On the other hand, the records of the ancient authors often differ both as regards the lengths of reigns of particular kings, and the starting date of the rule of the dynasty founder. In addition, Caranus is taken as the founder of the Argead Kingdom in all the chronologies available to us, and Coenus and Tyrimmas are usually mentioned as his successors. It is generally considered that Caranus, Coenus, and Tyrimmas are non-historical persons added to the List of Kings for political reasons. If so, the period, in which these rulers are said to have reigned (between 73 and 103 years), should be regarded as fictional, and the date of the founding of the Argead Kingdom ought to be moved forward in time.³ In this context we should admit that the events described

² For a detailed review of the sources related to the chronology of the early Argeadae see Dascalakis (1965: 114-132). Also see the chronological data of the relevant ancient authors in Beloch's work (1923: 50-51).

³ According to the available chronological works, the beginning of Caranus' rule varies within the short period from the end of the 9th c. BC up to the

by Herodotus must have taken place around 700 BC. Yet, even this dating seems uncertain, too, and may need to undergo considerable corrections. This inference is imposed by the fact that the indicated years of rule of Perdiccas and his successors up to Amyntas I are obtained from the very same late authors, who also write about Caranus, Coenus and Tyrimmas; i.e. the data are unreliable and they might have been subsequently added at the discretion of some of these later authors. In support of this observation we can also point out the lack of any chronological data in the works of Herodotus and Thucydides regarding this problem. They either did not dispose of such information or they did not consider it necessary to present it to the reader. Yet, if we follow usual practice and take a period of thirty years per generation, we will arrive at the reasonable conclusion that the founding, and the ascent, of the Argead Kingdom should be referred to the first half or the middle of the 7th century BC.

The second issue to consider is related to the name of the dynasty founder. Herodotus is the only ancient author who names Perdiccas as the first Argead king, and thus also as founder of the Argead Kingdom. In spite of this, his account is of special merit for at least four major reasons. Firstly, as Herodotus himself mentions, he obtained his information on the early history of the Dynasty from the Macedones themselves.⁴ This almost legendary statement might represent the official version of the origin of the royal family. This presumption is in a way confirmed by the fact that Herodotus does not comment on the authenticity of the tradition, an uncommon occurrence in his work. He might possibly have obtained his information personally from Alexander the Philhellene or from some other member of the Dynasty. Secondly, there is no reason for denying the historicity of the kings listed by Herodotus, for the simple reason that here it is most likely a question of the tracing of lineage memory. This idea finds support in the fact that the name Perdiccas is of purely Macedonian origin. Thirdly, we can assert with a high degree of certainty that Thucydides adopted the same genealogy as Herodotus. Although he does not name the founder of the dynasty, he refers to the Macedonian kings as successors of Temenus⁵, and states that there have been eight ancestors of Archelaus⁶ – a number which coincides

beginning of the 8th c. BC; in almost all versions it is dated before the First Olympic Games (776 BC). The early dating is most likely a result of the need to fix some chronological frames for Caranus', Coenus' and Tyrimmas' reigns, as well as of attempts by the relevant authors to present the Argead Kingdom as more ancient than it really was.

⁴ Hdt. 5, 22.1.

⁵ Thuc. 2, 99.3.

⁶ Thuc. 2, 100.2.

with the account of Herodotus. Finally, Herodotus' account is chronologically the earliest, and hence the most reliable one, taking into consideration the afore-mentioned facts. These statements, along with the fact that the other traditions are relatively later, and the name *Perdiccas* was moved to a lower position for political reasons, can only lead to the conclusion that the founder of the dynasty bore the Macedonian name *Perdiccas*.

As for Archelaus and Caranus, regarded with good reason by modern researchers as mythological persons, they must have been added to the List of Kings much later, and obviously for political reasons. Chronologically the appearance of Archelaus in the sources precedes that of Caranus. The earliest mention of him is found in Euripides' *Archelaus*, (which is not extant; the part relating to the origin of the dynasty is preserved in Hyginus).⁷ There the author asserts that Archelaus, son of Temenus, driven away by his brothers, arrived in Macedonia after wandering for some time, where he – led by a goat – founded the city of Aegae. The drama was staged in 408/407 BC in Macedonia⁸, where Euripides lived for a year and a half at the court of king Archelaus. This king, known for his philhellenism, patronized a number of erudite Hellenes. It is no wonder therefore, that Euripides replaced the name of the founder of the dynasty with the name of king Archelaus as a sign of honour and gratitude to his benefactor. This novelty was apparently viewed with suspicion already in Antiquity, as – except for a dialogue of Dio Chrysostom⁹ – there is no mention of Archelaus in the multitude of later traditions, presumably because he was supposed to have been a product of Euripides' attempt to appeal to the Macedonian king.

For different although unclear reasons, Caranus was also added to the List of Kings, on political grounds.¹⁰ There are various hypotheses both regarding the date of the interpolation, and also the motives for the inclusion of Caranus and his supposed successors, Coenus and Tyrimmas, into the List of Kings. Most plausible appears to be Greenwalt's hypothesis, according to which Caranus, Coenus and Tyrimmas were presumably added to the List of Kings for the purpose of propaganda in the period immediately after the death of Archelaus (400/399 BC), when a vio-

⁷ Hyginus *Fab.* 219.

⁸ For references to the dating of the play and to the place of its staging, see Harder (1985: 125-127).

⁹ Dio. Chrysost. *Orat.* 4, 70-72.

¹⁰ Caranus is mentioned by FGrH 115 F 393; FGrH 135-6 F 14; Euseb. *Chron.* 1, p.227 = Diod 7, 15; Just. 7, 1.7-12; Paus. 9, 40.8; Plut. *Alex.* 2, 1; Sol. 9, 12; Satyros FGrH 631 F.1; Schol. Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2, 11; Syncel. 373; 498-499 (Dindorf); Const. Porphy. *Peri Thematōn* 2, 22.

lent struggle for the Macedonian throne was being waged between the three branches of the dynasty.¹¹ A more important consideration seems to be the fact that, no matter which of the adduced hypotheses one takes as most plausible, it will by all means confirm the inference that Caranus cannot be accepted as founder of the Argead dynasty.

The third problem to be taken into consideration concerns the route followed by Perdicas and his brothers. According to Herodotus, the first leg implied a shift from Illyria to Upper Macedonia and settlement in the city of Lebaea, where the brothers, receiving salaries, served the local ruler.¹² This itinerary was obviously based on three major points: Illyria, Upper Macedonia, and its city Lebaea. These points cannot be taken as a reliable geographical guide to the reconstruction of the events, since the term ‘Upper Macedonia’ seems too broad, whereas Herodotus’ mention of the city of Lebaea is a hapax in the ancient sources.

Apart from this, if the Argeadae really came from Orestis¹³, then – for purely geographical reasons – Perdicas’ residence in Illyria would turn out to be fictional. Illyria was most probably interpolated into the text for political reasons: geographically viewed (for this Macedonian king was attempting to prove his Peloponnesian provenance, being born in Orestis) it would be most convenient if the founder of the dynasty came from Illyria; it does

¹¹ Greenwalt (1985: 43-49).

¹² Unlike Herodotus, who does not mention the name of the king, some later authors report a ruler Cisseus (Hyginus *Fab.* 219; Paus. 9, 40.8). The name Cisseus was mentioned for the first time by Euripides, i.e. several decades after Herodotus. And since both of the authors tell the official Macedonian version of the origin of the Argeadae, an inference seems to prevail – that Euripides must have used another, but certainly likewise official tradition, or that he just revised the old one adding here Cisseus. The second presumption seems more plausible, not merely because of Euripides’ modifications related to the name of the founder of the dynasty, but also because of the probability that the author may have drawn the name from the *Iliad* (Hammond, Griffith 1979: 10), where Cisseus is mentioned (Hom. *Il.* 11.223).

¹³ App. Syr. 63: “Ἄργος τὸ ἐν Ὀρεστείᾳ ὄθεν οἱ Ἀργεάδαι Μακεδόνες.” The Argeadae are referred to as kings, i. e. dynasty, in App. *Mac.* 2; Paus. 7, 8.9 and Plut. *Alex.fort.* 1, 10. The Argeadae are also mentioned by Strabo 7, fr. 11, 20 (Meineke) and Stephanus of Byzantium (*Ἀργέου*), who do not specify whether they are writing of a dynasty or an ethnos. The discovery of the great “stele of the Kytenians” (see the inscription in Bousquet 1988: 14-16), where the Argeadae are again referred to as kings, confirmed that the available written evidence concerned a dynasty named Argeadae, and not a supposed ethnos with this name. Moreover, it is obvious from this inscription that these Argeadae are the same dynasty which Herodotus (8, 137.1; 138.2) and Thucydides (2, 99.3) defined as Temenidae (lines 40-42: “καὶ μάλιστα τῶι βασιλεῖ Πιτ[ο]λεμιαῶι ὄντι συγγενεῖ Δωριέων κατὰ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους Ἀργεάδας.”)

not make any radical changes in respect of his arrival from west, nor does it mention Orestis, which had already become fairly inconvenient, though not yet forgotten.

Based on the accounts of Herodotus and Appian we can presume that the Argeadae left their native land Orestis leading an unknown number of people to Upper Macedonia, which was supposed by Herodotus to cover the area of the Pierian Mountains, north of Mt. Olympus.¹⁴ The cause for the departure, as well as the ethnic origin of the people led by the Argeadae, are not known. Several different scenarios appear possible:

1. The Argeadae and their Macedonian followers left the land under pressure from the Orestae. This assumption is chronologically consistent, as the first localization of the Orestae in the area of Orestis by Hecataeus¹⁵ is probably to be dated to the second half of the 6th c. BC, and the reign of the founder of the Argead dynasty is dated to the first half of the 7th c. BC. So the Macedones could possibly have peopled down in the Orestis prior to the Orestae, before later being driven away by them.

2. The Argeadae may have led Orestae, not Macedones. In this case the abandonment of Orestis could hardly have been related to pressure from outside; rather, it might have been the result of overpopulation or, still more likely, of some internecine conflicts. What seems interesting in this scenario is that the Orestae were not Macedones – Hecataeus defined them as Molossi¹⁶, and Strabo, reflecting the later state of affairs, described them as Epirotae.¹⁷ Hatzopoulos adopts this reconstruction of events: for him, a considerable number of Orestae left their settlements under the leadership of the Argeadae, heading for Lebaea and further on – to Lower Macedonia, mingling with the local Macedones on their way. According to Hatzopoulos, the Macedones are supposed to have spoken Aeolic, whereas the Orestae spoke some northwest-Greek dialect; therefore the resulting mixture between the two ethne seems to provide a satisfactory explanation for the mixed character of the Macedonian dialect and calendar.¹⁸ It is, in fact, not very important for the issue at hand here, whether the Argeadae were leading Orestae or Macedones. More important is the fact that we can positively assert that the dynasty descends from Orestis.

¹⁴ For what exactly Herodotus' idea of Upper Macedonia covered, see Rosen (1978: 12-13); Zahrnt (1984: 346-347, 352-353) and Hatzopoulos (2003: 207-213).

¹⁵ FGrH 1 F107.

¹⁶ FGrH 1 F107: Ὀρέσται Μολοσσικὸν ἔθνος.

¹⁷ Strabo 7, 7.8; 9, 5.11.

¹⁸ Hatzopoulos (2003: 216-218).

There has been a lot of speculation in modern scholarship on Herodotus' exact idea of Upper Macedonia and on the localization of Lebaea. Because of the lacunose nature of our sources, however, the location of the city remained unknown for a long time. It is only recently, after the discovery of an inscription from the sanctuary of Leucopetra, that an opportunity has arisen for the localization of Lebaea. According to this inscription (to be dated to AD 252-253), Aurelius Rufus from Ἀλεβία, a village in Elimea, bestowed on the sanctuary a slave of his, along with her daughter.¹⁹ There is a considerable phonetic likeness between the name of the village Ἀλεβία and the polis of Λεβαίη mentioned by Herodotus, which led to some researchers identifying both settlements and thus localizing Lebaea in the western part of Pieria²⁰ or even more precisely, in the foothills of the Pierian Mountains, but not in Pieria itself, since this would be inconsistent with Herodotus.²¹ An additional argument supporting this supposition could be Herodotus' presumption that the adduced lands lay in Upper Macedonia²², which, for him, corresponded to the mountains rising north of Mt. Olympus. Considering the location of Ἀλεβία and the similarity of the names, the identification of the two settlements appears logical.

The reconstruction of the second part of the peregrination of the three brothers is also based on three main points: an unknown river, the Gardens of Midas, and Mt. Bermium. Here, too, as in the first part, these basic points, except Mt. Bermium, seem uncertain and cannot serve as a precise geographic guide. The river, not identified by Herodotus, is usually taken to be the Haliacmon. In fact, this presumption seems very reasonable, since the latter is deep enough to be related to the flood described by Herodotus. The presumption seems all the more reasonable given that the Haliacmon flows through Orestis, the presumable native land of the Argeadae, and through Elimea, where Lebaea may possibly be located.

It is really odd that Herodotus fails to specify this notable river in his work. This might either be owing to his reluctance to name it, or to the fact that another, less significant river was meant, which he did not find necessary to mention. Yet, this presumption also raises well-founded doubts. According to Herodotus, even in his lifetime the Argeadae were making sacrificial offerings to the river which had saved the three brothers, i.e. even

¹⁹ Petsas, Hatzopoulos, Gounaropoulou, Lucrèce and Paschidis (2000: 166 n. 106. See also 89-90 n. 12).

²⁰ Hammond (1989: 3).

²¹ Hatzopoulos (2003: 211).

²² Hdt. 7, 128. 1; 7, 173. 4.

though small, the river must have been extremely important to the members of the dynasty. That is why it is so amazing here, that its name is not indicated by Herodotus. It should be observed, however, that, if the Argeadae really did come from the city of Argos in Orestis, they will have inevitably shown some favour towards the Haliacmon which flowed through their land. And this favour, no matter what exactly it is, probably underlies the legend told by Herodotus.

It is hard to specify where precisely the three brothers crossed the Haliacmon. Building on the presumption that Ἀλεβία and Λεβαίη referred to one and the same settlement, Hatzopoulos arrives at the conclusion that they passed the river somewhere near Polymylos, and that their route from there led through the Kastanian Gorge and Leucopetra to the Gardens of Midas.²³ His presumption appears logical; the itinerary he describes matches quite well with the geographical characteristics of the area.

The localization of the second basic spot, the Gardens of Midas, seems in a way easier, thanks to Herodotus' remark that they must be situated somewhere close to Mt. Bermium. They are usually localized east or southeast of Mt. Bermium²⁴ but not to the west, where the almost arid Eordaea Plateau stands. No doubt, this part of the tradition is related to the early expansion of the Argeadae, since the territories east/southeast of Mt. Bermium were among the earliest conquests of the dynasty.²⁵ From these lands, enclosed between the lower courses of the rivers Ludias and Haliacmon, the Argeadae conquered τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην.

After mentioning that Perdiccas and his brothers conquered Macedonia, Herodotus lists the names of the Argead kings known to him and this, in fact, is how his excursus on the early history of the dynasty ends. Unfortunately, he makes no mention of how and with whose assistance the Argeadae managed to come to power, nor does he refer to the capture of Aegae and their subsequent expansion. The lack of information on Perdiccas' ascension to the throne may be in some way related to a forcible seizure of power with alien, non-Macedonian, assistance or to the ousting from power of some local Macedonian dynasty. As to the seizure of Aegae and the subsequent expansion of the Argeadae, the lack of information on this issue must be first and foremost due to the fact

²³ Hatzopoulos (2003: 212).

²⁴ As a whole the differences in the localization of Midas' gardens seem insignificant. Rosen (1978: 13) localizes them on the southern slopes of Mt. Bermium, Borza (1992: 81) places them somewhere close to Mieza, and Hatzopoulos (2003: 212) in the surroundings of Beroea.

²⁵ For this issue see Vasilev (2011: 93-96).

that these events seem to be outside Herodotus' narrative aims here – to prove that Alexander the Philhellene and his ancestors had Hellenic origins.²⁶

To what extent does Herodotus' record reflect real events? It has been already mentioned that the Temenid origin of the dynasty is supposedly nothing but a political propaganda, whereas the events taking place under the king of Lebaea include many folkloric elements.²⁷ There must certainly be a historical core as well, however, concerning the wanderings of the Argeadae, as well as the people following them. The tradition of the three brothers also seems very interesting. Scholars have conjectured that these may have founded three separate dynasties: Gauanes the Elimiot, Aeropos the Lyncestid, and Perdikkas the Macedonian.²⁸ This hypothesis seems to find confirmation in Thucydides' narrative: for unknown reasons, ethnic or political, he counts the Lyncestae and the Elimiotae among the Macedones.²⁹ On the other hand, the royal family of the Lyncestae proclaimed their provenance from the Corinthian Bacchiads.³⁰ Of course, this, too, was political propaganda, but the claim reflects attempts to differentiate between the two dynasties, and also the unwillingness of the Lyncestaen kings to identify themselves with the Argeadae. It is obviously hard to provide satisfactory answers to these issues. More important, however, is the fact that, in spite of the existing folkloric elements and political propaganda, Herodotus' account represents a unique source of valuable information on the earliest history of the Argeadae, their kingdom, and even on the people they ruled.

²⁶ The purpose of the whole excursus is certainly to prove the Hellenic origins of the dynasty; this is evidenced by Herodotus' statement at 5, 22.1: "Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδίκκεω γεγονότας, κατὰ περ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτὸς τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖσι ὀπίσθε λόγοισι ἀποδέξω ὡς εἰσὶ Ἕλληνες, πρὸς δὲ καὶ οἱ τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διεπόντες ἀγῶνα Ἕλληνοδίκαι οὕτω ἔγνωσαν εἶναι.

²⁷ On this issue see Kleinknecht (1966: 134-146). See also Greenwalt (1986: 120-122) – who assumes, that in this myth which has elements supposedly borrowed from the Thracian Pieres, the Argeadae placed an *insurmountable obstacle* to any pretenders to the throne who were not members of the ruling dynasty.

²⁸ Hammond, Griffith (1979: 30); Borza (1992: 84).

²⁹ Thuc. 2, 99.2. See Vasilev (2011: 103-104)

³⁰ Strabo 7, 7.8.

CITED LITERATURE

- Beloch, K. 1923: *Griechische Geschichte*. Vol. III.2. Berlin und Leipzig.
- Borza, E. 1992: *In the Shadow of Olympus*. Princeton.
- Bousquet, J. 1988: La stèle des Kyténiens à Xanthos de Lycie. – *Revue des Études Grecques*, 101, fasc. 480-481, 12-53
- Dascalakis, A. 1965: *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians*, Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniche.
- Greenwalt, W. 1985: The Introduction of Caranos into the Argead King List. – *GRBS*, 26, 1, 43-49.
- Greenwalt, W. 1986: Herodotus and the Foundation of Argead Macedonia. – *The Ancient World*, 13, 117-122.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1989: *The Macedonian State. Origins, Institutions, and History*. Oxford.
- Hammond, N.G.L., Griffith, G. T. 1979: *A History of Macedonia*. Vol. II. Oxford.
- Harder, A. 1985: *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos*. Leiden.
- Hatzopoulos, M. 2003: Herodotos (8. 137-8), The Manumissions from Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley. – In: *Herodotos and his World. Essays from a conference in Memory of George Forest*. Ed. By Derow P., Parker R., Oxford, 203-218.
- Kleinknecht, H. 1966: Herodot und die makedonische urgeschichte. – *Hermes*, 94, 134-146.
- Petsas, Hatzopoulos, Gounaropoulou, Lucrece and Paschidis 2000: *Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux Autochtone de Leukopetra (Macédoine)*, MEAETHMATA, 28.
- Rosen, K. 1978: Die Gründung der makedonischen Herrschaft. – *Chiron*, 8, 1-27.
- Vasilev, M. 2011: Thucydides II.99 and the Early Expansion of the Argeadae. – *Eirene*, 47, 1-2, 93-105.
- Zahrnt, M. 1984: Die Entwicklung des makedonischen Reiches bis zu den Persekriegen. – *Chiron* 14, 325-368.