

Tekmeria

Vol 11 (2012)

γεγενῆσθαι. μνησεται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τέ τινων καὶ ἀκο-
 λούθων περὶ τῶν ἐπιπέδων τῆς ἑλλάδος καὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων
ΤΟΜΕΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΗΣ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ
 ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ • ΕΘΝΙΚΟ ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ
 SECTION OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQUITY
 INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH • NATIONAL HELLENIC RESEARCH FOUNDATION ἐν
 οἴκῳ ἐφ' ὕβρει· ὦν καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐπητιώοντο. καὶ
 αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
 ἐμποδῶν ὅτι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,
 καὶ νομίσαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
 λυνον καὶ ἐβόων· **Τεκμήρια** ἐπὶ δῆμον καταλύσει τὰ τε μυστικὰ καὶ
 ἢ τῶν Ἑρμῶν τῶν ἐπιπέδων εἴη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
 ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἐν τε
 τῷ παρόντι ΣΥΜΒΟΛΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΡΩΜΑΪΚΟΥ
 ΚΟΣΜΟΥ • CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE GREEK
 AND ROMAN WORLD • CONTRIBUTION À L'HISTOIRE DU
 MONDE GREC ET ROMAIN • BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE
 DER GRIECHISCHEN UND RÖMISCHEN WELT • CONTRIBUTI
 PER LA STORIA DEL MONDO GRECO E ROMANO αἰ ἐτοίμος ἦν
 πρὶν ἐκπεῖν· **11** ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιπέδων ἀπέστρεψε τὸν μένος ἦν (ἤδη
 γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῆς ATHENS 2013
 DIFFUSION DE BOCCARD - 11, RUE DE MEDICIS, 75006 PARIS αὐτοῦ
 ἐργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχει. καὶ
 ἐπεμαρτύρητο μὴ ἀπόντος περὶ αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ δὲ οὐκ εἴη, καὶ ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἴη
 μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν **(2012)** διαγνώσει, πέμπει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
 τοσοῦτοφ στρατεύματι. οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν δεδιότες τό τε στρατεύμα
 μὴ εὖνον ἔχειν, ἦν ἤδη ἀγωνίζηται, ὅ τε δῆμος μὴ μαλα-
 κίζηται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνον οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνοστράτεον
 καὶ τῶν Μαντινέων τιμές, ἀπέτρεπον καὶ ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
 ῥήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεγον νῦν μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγὴν, ἐλθόντα δὲ κρῖνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
 ῥηταῖς, βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἦν ἐμελλον ῥῆον
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποριεῖν, μεταστρέφον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
 νίσασθαι. καὶ εὖνον ἔχειν τοῦ ἐπιπέδου.

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρουσ μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγγύρετο

Innovation or Tradition? Succession to the Kingship in Temenid Macedonia

Selene E. Psoma

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.286](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.286)

To cite this article:

Psoma, S. E. (2013). Innovation or Tradition? Succession to the Kingship in Temenid Macedonia. *Tekmeria*, 11, 73–87. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.286>

SELENE E. PSOMA

Innovation or Tradition? Succession to the Kingship in Temenid Macedonia

Ptolemy I and Seleukos I designated their successors and in this way Ptolemy II and Antiochos I were placed in a strong position to take power after the death of their fathers.¹ Was this an innovation of these two Successors or a Temenid practice? This essay takes a fresh look at the evidence for succession in Temenid Macedonia and shows that this was also a practice under the Temenids.²

The epigraphic evidence

One of the most important pieces of evidence about succession in the Argead kingdom is the treaty between Athens and Amyntas III (IG II² 102) which is dated to the late 370s. This treaty was made between the Athenians on the one hand

1. For the Ptolemies see K. Buraselis, “Kronprinzentum und Realpolitik. Bemerkungen zur Thronanwartschaft, Mitregentschaft und Thronfolge unter den ersten vier Ptolemäern”, in V.A. Troncoso (ed.), *Διάδοχος τῆς βασιλείας. La figura del sucesor en la realeza helenística (Gerión Anejos 9, Madrid 2005) 91-102*. For the Seleucids see *ibid.*, A. Lozano, “La figura del heredero el trono en la dinastía seleucida”, 71-89 with previous bibliography. Cf. E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323-30 av. J.-C.) I. De la mort d’Alexandre aux avènements d’Antiochos III et de Philippe V* (2nd ed., Annales de l’Est, Mémoire 30, Nancy 1979) 88.

2. The topic was recently discussed by F.J. Fernández Nieto, “La designación del sucesor en el antiguo reino de Macedonia”, in *Διάδοχος τῆς βασιλείας* (see n. 1) 29-44. The conclusion is the following: “The successor’s figure tends to be established by means of the inheritance from fathers to sons. There are more possibilities for the first-born son of each marriage. It is impossible to establish if it was an original system that favours the brothers. The royal will is the rule that regulates successory order. Bearing in mind every antecedent, the Macedonian assembly consolidated very simple rules for the alternation of the kings. The potential candidates receive a special education. The candidate, who was called to be promoted, could be associated, with no title, into representative, administrative and governmental functions”. We need to note that the royal title *basileus* was not used by what we call the Macedonian kings before Alexander III: R.M. Errington, “Macedonian ‘Royal Style’ and its Historical Significance”, *JHS* 94 (1974) 20-37. For the epigraphic evidence see *infra*; for the boundary stone from Northern Chalcidice and Philip’s letter to the Katlestai see M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings. Vol. II: Epigraphic Appendix* (Meletemata 22, Athens 1996) nos. 4 and 5 and IG X 2, 2, 1 with previous literature. For the coins see H.A. Troxell, *Studies in the Macedonian coinage of Alexander the Great* (New York 1997) 92-93.

and king Amyntas and his son Alexander on the other.³ The names of the king and his son were written in larger letters at the very end of the treaty.⁴ These were the only Macedonians who were to swear the oaths to the treaty (l. 2: ὄρ[χοι] παρὰ Ἀμύ[ντο καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρο]).⁵ In l. 2 there is space only for the name of Alexander.⁶ The names of the two Athenian *hipparchoi*, each one followed by the first letters of its demotic, are to be found each one in ll. 18 and 19, preceded by their title in l. 17.⁷ The names of Amyntas and Alexander with their patronymics followed in ll. 20-21. This treaty clearly shows that during the last years of the reign of Amyntas III, Alexander was the only one of the king's six sons associated in power by his father.⁸

There is another Athenian document that provides evidence about succession in the Argead Kingdom. This is the treaty between Athens and Perdikkas II that is followed by an Athenian decree making peace with Arrabaïos of Lynkos on the condition of reconciliation with Perdikkas II (IG I³ 89).⁹ Those who take the oaths were the Macedonian king Perdikkas II together with the leading men

3. For this inscription see M.N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to 323 BC* (Oxford 1946-1948) 90-92, no. 129. See also S. Koumanoudes, "Ἀττικὰ ψηφίσματα", *Ἀθήναιον* 5 (1887) 164-191, esp. 171-172, no. 4; *id.*, "Προσθήκη ἐπιγραφῶν", *Ἀθήναιον* 5 (1887) 323-340, esp. 332-333.

4. The restoration of the names of Amyntas and Alexander at the end of lines 20-21 was made by Koumanoudes (see previous note).

5. Fernández Nieto (see n. 2) prefers Ἀμύ[ντο καὶ τῶν παίδων] on the evidence of IG I³ 89, l. 38. He seems to ignore the last two lines of the text of IG II² 102.

6. D. Ogden, *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death: the Hellenistic Dynasties* (London 1999) 7 with n. 29. Ogden does not seem to realize that the names of those who gave the oath, Athenian archons and the Macedonian kings, were written one by line in the last lines of the inscription.

7. There were two *hipparchoi* during the 4th cent. BC (Dem. 4.26). The assignment of five tribes to each hipparch is revealed by Xen. *Eq. Mag.* 3.3: see P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) 685 *ad* 61 iv with literary sources and discussion.

8. The treaty mentions that an embassy was sent to Amyntas. This seems normal. It was at Pella that the ambassadors heard that Alexander was associated in power.

9. For this document see P. Goukowsky, "Les maisons princières de Macédoine de Perdikkas II à Philippe II", in P. Goukowsky and Cl. Brixhe (eds.), *Hellènika Symmikta: Histoire, archéologie, épigraphie* (Études d'archéologie classique 7, Nancy 1991) 43-44 with nn. 6 (p. 44) and 1 (p. 45).

of his kingdom and the kings of Upper Macedonia, Elimeia, Lynkos and Orestis.¹⁰ I believe that this treaty reflects at its very end the Macedonian list of succession.¹¹ All names are followed by their patronymics. The first person who gives the oath is the Macedonian king, Perdikkas, son of Alexander. After him, the oath was given by his brother Alketas and by the king's son, Archelaos. There is room for two other names with patronymics after the name of Archelaos, and then we find the name of the king's brother Menelaos followed by those of the two sons of Alketas: Agelaos and [. . .]υρος.¹² We may assume that the name missing after that of Archelaos, is Aeropos, a presumed son of Perdikkas ([Ἀέροπος Περδίκκο]: 15 letters).¹³ This restoration makes sense because the treaty was made with Perdikkas and the children of Perdikkas (l. 38: κ[α]τὰ τὸ[ς] παῖδ]α[ς] τὸ[ς] Περδίκκο]). In this treaty, the king of Macedonia appears together with his two brothers, Alketas and Menelaos and also with his own sons and some of his nephews. The other brother of the king, Philip, was already dead in 429 BC. Philip's son, Amyntas, had collaborated with Sitalkes and had therefore no place in the court of his uncle.¹⁴ The absence from the treaty of Amyntas, another brother of the king, can be explained by the fact that he spent his life as a private person.¹⁵ From this treaty we learn that the next person in the line of succession after Perdikkas II seems to be his brother, Alketas (l. 61). The name of the king's son Archelaos followed the name of his uncle (l. 61). Thus, Archelaos appears second in the line of succession in a treaty that dates from the late 420s.¹⁶ However, at Perdikkas' death, in 413 BC, it was not his brother Alketas but

10. On the dates proposed for this inscription see Ogden, *Polygamy* (see n. 6) 51 with n. 28 with previous bibliography.

11. Pace Ogden, *Polygamy* (see n. 6) 6-7 with no serious argument. See also W. Greenwalt, "Polygamy and Succession in Argead Macedonia", *Arethusa* 22 (1989) 19-45, esp. 24: "... acknowledged political clout in descending order".

12. For discussion about this name see S. Psoma, "Arepyros or A(u)re(lius) Pyros", *ZPE* 180 (2012) 202-204.

13. This was proposed by N.G.L. Hammond in N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II 550-336 B.C.* (Oxford 1978) 136.

14. For Goukowsky, "Maisons princières" (see n. 9) 47, Agerrhos son of Philip (l. 62) was most probably a son of Philip that was pardoned by Perdikkas II.

15. Porph. fr. 1 *FHG* III 691 (Syncell. 261D). Cf. Goukowsky, "Maisons princières" (see n. 9) 50.

16. See n. 10. This might be explained by the very young age of Archelaos: M.B. Hatzopoulos, "Succession and Regency in Classical Macedonia", *Ancient Macedonia* IV (1986) 279-292, esp. 285. Contra Greenwalt, "Polygamy and Succession" (see n. 11) 24.

his son Archelaos who succeeded him. Ten years after the treaty with Athens, Alketas was probably dead. One recalls also that Plato blamed Archelaos for the assassination of his uncle Alketas and his young half-brother.¹⁷

These Athenian inscriptions show that there might be a hierarchy in the clan of the Argeads and that this was followed in practice.¹⁸ Alexander II succeeded his father Amyntas.¹⁹ Perdikkas II was succeeded in 413 BC by his son Archelaos, second in line of succession in the late 420s.²⁰ We do not know the reason Alketas, first in line of succession of his brother, never ruled, but we may guess with the help of Plato, who reports that Archelaos had Alketas killed.²¹ With this epigraphic evidence in mind, we need to turn now to the evidence provided by literary sources.

The other evidence

We have no information about Amyntas I, Alexander I and Perdikkas II. From the passage of Aristotle mentioning the weddings of the two daughters of Archelaos (Pol. 1311b, 6-15), we can deduce that it was the king's will to be succeeded by his son Orestes.²² Diodorus (16.1.3) and the Scholiast of Aeschines 3.51 report that Perdikkas III was succeeded by his brother, Philip, and not by his son, Amyntas, son of Perdikkas.²³ Philip became king and the *epitropos* (*tutor* in Latin) of his

17. Plato (*Grg.* 471; cf. Schol. *ad Aristid. Or.* 46.120.2) blamed Archelaos for the assassination of his uncle Alketas and of Alketas' son, Alexander. This Alexander may have been either another son of Alketas that did not sign the treaty with Athens or the name was not given correctly by Plato. For the names of the two other sons of Alketas see *IG I³* 89, l. 61. Plato further accused Archelaos of having killed his young half-brother. For a different interpretation see *infra*.

18. See also Just. *Epit.* 7.4.3: *per ordinem deinde successionis regnum Macedoniae ad Amyntam, fratris eius Menelai filium, pervenit.*

19. Diod. Sic. 15.60.4.

20. Pl. *Grg.* 471; Ael. *VH* 12.43; Aristid. *Rh.* 55 and *Or.* 46.120.2.

21. See n. 17.

22. This was the general conclusion of the volume *Διάδοχος τῆς βασιλείας* (see n. 1): V. Alonso Troncoso, "Conclusiones Generales" 241-256, esp. 249.

23. See the different traditions about Philip's accession, immediately after his brother's death (Diod. Sic. 16.2.4) or after some years of regency (Just. *Epit.* 7.5.6-10). For discussion see Hammond, *History of Macedonia II* (see n. 13) 208-210. *Contra* Griffith, *ibid.* 651, 702. For the numismatic evidence see Ch. Hersh, "An Unpublished Coin of Philip II of Macedonia, from his First Issue of Bronzes", *AJN* 1 (1989) 33-36, pl. 3. See also the very thorough analysis of Goukowsky, "Maisons princières" (see n. 9) 60-62, who also favours the direct succession. To

nephew and potential heir, the official term being *prostates*.²⁴ As it has been shown recently, “[t]hat Philip became king from so many potential rivals is a product of his ability, his being the surviving son of Amyntas, his close connection to his brother, the previous king; his governorship and his possession of an army at the time of the latter’s death and his guardianship of Amyntas Perdikka”.²⁵

Philip was appointed to be king in 360/359 BC because he was the only member of the royal family who could deal with the problems threatening the kingdom. After Perdikkas’ death he appeared as head of state and very successfully protected the kingdom and the line of his father from their various enemies.²⁶ Perdikkas’ son, Amyntas, who was very young, was placed under the protection of his uncle, who raised him at the court and later married him to his eldest daughter.²⁷ We hear also nothing about Philip’s half-brothers who may have remained faithful to the king and lived as private persons until the early 340s.²⁸ When Perdikkas II moved to the Chalcidic peninsula to fight the Athenians during the *Poteidaiatika*, he appointed Iolaos in his place (Thuc. 1.62.3). Perdikkas III left Philip at his place to run the kingdom.²⁹ It was in this way that Philip found the armed forces with which he moved against Argaios and the Athenians of Mantias.³⁰ This

this direction points also evidence from the number of the years he reigned given by the surviving king-lists: J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, 2nd edition (Berlin and Leipzig 1923) III2, 49-68. See also J.R. Ellis, “Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great”, *JHS* 91 (1971) 15-25; the so-called regency of Philip II was recently very convincingly explained by E.M. Anson, “Philip II, Amyntas Perdicca, and Macedonian Royal Succession”, *Historia* 58 (2009) 276-286.

24. E.M. Anson, “Craterus and the Prostasia”, *CP* 87 (1992) 38-43.

25. Anson, “Macedonian Royal Succession” (see n. 23) 276-286.

26. Diod. Sic. 16.2.6-3.6.

27. Amyntas was always considered a significant member of the royal family: see Hatzopoulos, “Succession and Regency” (see n. 16) 288-289. This is reflected also in the way he is mentioned in the Boiotian inscription (*IG VII 3055*, l. 5) and in the fact that his uncle preferred to give his sons other names than Amyntas, his father: Alexander for his dead brother and Arrhidaios for his paternal grandfather.

28. *Contra* Goukowsky, “Maisons princières” (see n. 9) 55. For Goukowsky it was Perdikkas III who expelled them from Macedonia in 364 BC.

29. For a similar practice of the Achaemenids see P. Briant, *Histoire de l’empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre (Achaemenid History 10, Paris 1996) 797-799.*

30. These forces were most probably the Macedonian garrison of Amphipolis in head of which Philip might have been placed: see M.B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings. Vol. I: A Historical and Epigraphic Study* (Meletemata 22, Athens 1996) 178;

was also the reason that made the population of the old capital, Aigai, suspicious to Argaios.³¹

We will turn now to the succession of Philip II.³² What we learn from literary sources about the duties of Alexander during the years preceding the death of Philip II indicates that Philip placed Alexander in a favorable position. According to Plutarch (*Alex.* 5), Alexander was receiving ambassadors of the Persian king and was asking them serious questions pertaining to military matters. Arrian (*Anab.* 1.5.2) reports that Laggaros, the king of the Agrianes, sent also embassies to Alexander and had a high esteem and affection for the young prince. At the age of sixteen, when his father was besieging Byzantion, Alexander was left as master of the situation in Macedonia, and in charge of the royal seal (Plut. *Alex.* 9). He campaigned against the Medes and founded Alexandropolis. His achievements as military leader in the battle of Chaeronea were well known to Greek historians (Plut. *Alex.* 9.2). We may assume that in the case of Philip II and Alexander III, his father might have associated him in power earlier than his own father Amyntas III his brother Alexander II.

In all previously mentioned cases, the successor was associated in power with the ruling king. Who then decided about the line of succession and how was this established? Was it the first son born in purple that succeeded his father?³³ Was the status of the mother of any significance?³⁴ Or was there competition among the children of the king born to different mothers with the strongest emerging as

Sélènè Psoma, *Olynthe et les Chalcidiens de Thrace. Études de numismatique et d'histoire* (Stuttgart 2001) 240 with n. 432.

31. Diod. Sic. 16.3.5-6.

32. Satyros (*FHG* III 161 fr. 5) in his *Life of Philip* notes: 'Ο δὲ Φίλιππος ἀεὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐγάμει. There follows a list of the king's weddings with foreign women, among which four royal princesses from Illyria, Epirus, Thrace and Elimeia (Phila was a sister of Derdas and Machatas and may have been the widow of Perdikkas III) and the king's greatest love, the very young noble Macedonian Cleopatra. Philip had children by two Thessalian aristocrats from Larissa and Pherai. From all these weddings the king had two sons, Alexander and Arrhidaios, and four daughters: Kynna from his Illyrian princess, Cleopatra from Olympias, Thessalonike from the Pheraian Nikesipolis and Europa from Cleopatra. Satyros used the term *egēmen* for Audata, Phila, Olympias, Meda and Cleopatra. For Philinna and Nikesipolis he used the term *epaidopoiēsato*.

33. Hatzopoulos, "Succession and Regency" (see n. 16), with previous bibliography.

34. Greenwalt, "Polygamy and Succession" (see n. 11).

the successor?³⁵ Or was it, as all matters of internal and external politics, economy, war and religion, a decision of the king himself?

The *porphyrogennetos*

One theory is that the first son born to the king after his accession (*porphyrogennetos*) became the legitimate successor to the throne. According to Herodotus (7.3), this was the rule in Sparta. In both the royal families of Sparta, the successor was not the first-born son but the first son who was born after his father became king.³⁶ There are some problems with this theory and this is considered “as problematic in Sparta as in the Achaemenid Persia”.³⁷ As far as the Macedonian kingdom is concerned, Greenwalt pointed out its weakness stressing the hypothetic character on which the theory was built.³⁸ One more argument against it could be the different way Spartan and Macedonian princes were educated. The Spartan princes did not participate in the *agoge* and lived apart from all other members of their family and also from their brothers who did participate in the *agoge*.³⁹ They were probably *syskenoi* of their fathers, the two kings, the four *Pythioi* and the royal *xenoi*. Agesilaos was, for reasons we all know, the first Spartan king who was educated *à la spartiate* (Plut. *Ages.* 1.1 and 1.3) and as a result had what all other Spartan kings were not allowed to have, his own circle of friends and supporters and contacts with other Spartans.⁴⁰ The custom was different in Macedonia, where the royal princes, among whom the person that should later be associated in power by his father, were educated and stayed a long time with the royal pages, boys who were about the princes’ age and came from the most prominent Macedonian families and also from the royal houses of Upper Macedonia.⁴¹ Macedonian monarchy was based on the

35. Ogden, *Polygamy* (see n. 6) xvii.

36. This information comes from Herodotus (7.3): Demaratos, the king of Sparta in exile, explains to Xerxes the law of succession in ancient Sparta. See also G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde* II (Munich 1926) 672-673.

37. P.A. Cartledge, *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta* (Baltimore 1987) 100.

38. Greenwalt, “Polygamy and Succession” (see n. 11) 21-25.

39. P. Carlier, “Le prince héritier à Sparte”, in *Διάδοχος τῆς βασιλείας* (see n. 1) 21-28.

40. See previous note.

41. S. Psoma, “Entre l’armée et l’oikos: l’éducation dans le royaume de Macédoine”, in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M.B. Hatzopoulos and Yvette Morizot (eds.), *Rois, cités, nécropoles. Institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine. Actes des colloques de Nanterre (décembre 2002) et d’Athènes (janvier 2004)*, (Meletemata 45, Athens 2006) 285-300 with literary and epigraphic evidence.

network of the king's connections with these representatives of aristocracy.⁴² From this point of view the Macedonian kingdom was very much different from Sparta and thus could not share the same law of succession. In Macedonia there was also no political body similar to the Gerousia or the Ephors which enforced the Spartan rules of succession and decided disputed cases.⁴³ "Argead Macedonia lacked the regularity and constitutional nature of the contemporary Spartan dual kingship".⁴⁴

The status of the mother

In a state that could never be ruled by women,⁴⁵ the status of the mother of a king's son seems also of limited significance as far as succession is concerned. However, some scholars have drawn on African and Merovingian parallels of polygamous kings and proposed another theory that stresses the status of the mother and the network of her family's relations.⁴⁶ These scholars point to Alexander's distress over Philip's marriage to Cleopatra and note Attalus' hopes that the new marriage would produce a "legitimate" heir for the kingdom (Plut. *Alex.* 9.6-11). On the basis of this incident that took place when Attalus was very drunk it has been argued that "the Macedonians preferred their queens to be home grown and that a queen's position at court could affect the succession even of an established heir apparent".⁴⁷ One should however note that Eurydice, the mother of Philip II and of two other Macedonian kings, was not of Argead origin

42. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions I* (see n. 30) 267, 334-336.

43. Cartledge, *Agesilaos* (see n. 37) 111. The Gerousia and the Ephors in combination acted as a court of law in the trials of the kings (Paus. 3.5.2: the trial of Pausanias in 403 BC), the succession of Anaxandridas II (Hdt. 5.42.1), the succession dispute between Areus (I) and Kleonymos in 309 BC (Paus. 3.6.2). Cf. the information about the succession of Agis II by Agesilaus II: Xen. *Ages.* 1.5; *Hell.* 3.3.4. For Xenophon the decision between Agesilaos and Laotychidas rested with the *polis*.

44. Anson, "Macedonian Royal Succession" (see n. 23) 278.

45. Plut. *Alex.* 68.5.

46. Greenwalt, "Polygamy and Succession" (see n. 11) 23ff. For polygamy in the Macedonian kingdom see Ogden, *Polygamy* (see n. 6) 3-29 on the Argeads with some interesting points and a large number of misinterpretations and inaccuracies.

47. For Greenwalt, "Polygamy and Succession" (see n. 11) 39 with n. 80: "even though we know that the Macedonians did not disqualify the offspring of foreign queens from the succession, enough testimony exists to support that they harbored prejudices against non native queens".

but a daughter of Sirrhas of Lynkos.⁴⁸ According to Plato, the mother of Archelaos, Simiche, was a slave.⁴⁹ Olympias, the mother of Alexander III, was a princess of Epirus and Rhoxane a Persian. The origins of these ladies were never taken into consideration in matters of succession. Whatever Plato says about Archelaos and the origin of his mother, Archelaos was the second in line of succession after his uncle in the list of prominent Macedonians. If Gygaia was a Macedonian princess, she was much more significant than the princess of Lynkos for a king like Amyntas III who had to struggle to find support from the Macedonians (Porph. fr. 1, *FHG* III 691).⁵⁰ The ties with the Aeacids through his mother, the Epirote princess Olympias, certainly did not bring Alexander III to the Temenid throne. Alexander was a genius compared to his brother Arrhidaios, the future Philip III, who was not stupid as modern scholarship often claims he had been, but a quite anti-social and certainly not a very clever prince.⁵¹

The so-called amphimetric strife

It has been argued that “Kings were spurred on to sire many heirs by the expectation that amphimetric strife would carry off many of them”.⁵² I think that there is no reason to believe that the Argead kings were very different from all other men in the world. They married women from the same social class and of different origins and were seduced by daughters of kings, young aristocrats and slaves. For the Argead kings all their children, male and female, were valuable in the game of dynastic politics. Girls could serve the kingdom’s foreign policy, as Gygaia, Stratonike, the eldest daughter of Archelaos, Cleopatra and Kynna (Arr. *Anab.* 5.4). Boys were supposed to rule and to fight for the kingdom and the king. The Argead kings, as all normal fathers, loved their children and tried to protect them. Although they married many women and they had children with many others there is no indication that they encouraged them to compete ruthlessly with one another. Philip’s affection for Alexander is noted by literary sources (Plut. *Alex.* 9.4), while Archelaos tried to get allies for his young boy Orestes by giving his

48. Chr. Habicht, “Zwei Angehörige des lynkestischen Königshauses”, *Ancient Macedonia* II (1977) 511-516; Ogden, *Polygamy* (see n. 6) 12 with n. 58. Cf. Str. C326.

49. Pl. *Grg.* 471; cf. n. 17.

50. See Hatzopoulos, “Succession and Regency” (see n. 16) 281.

51. For Arrhidaios see E. Carney, “The Trouble with Philip III Arrhidaeus”, *AHB* 15 (2001) 63-89.

52. Ogden, *Polygamy* (see n. 6) xvii.

daughter to a possible enemy.⁵³ One should recall that we have evidence for feelings and affection for brothers and other relatives. Philip named his famous-to-be son after his assassinated brother and took his nephew Amyntas, the son of Perdikkas, under his protection. Alexander got angry with Olympias because of the execution of his half sister, Europa and her mother, Cleopatra (Plut. *Alex.* 10.7). His half-brother Arrhidaios was safe with him during the Persian campaign, far away from Olympias, his monstrous *noverca*.

Strife among the king's relatives was a threat to the kingdom. It was in the king's interests to prevent chaos after his death. This was sometimes impossible but always remained his wish. It was not only a matter of peace inside the frontiers of the kingdom but also of the kingdom's own security against outside powers. During periods of dynastic strife, the kingdom could easily become the prey of ambitious neighbors, as the Illyrians, the Odrysians and the ambitious Chalcidians of Thrace. Such a situation could also create the possibility of intervention by major powers in southern Greece, such as Athens and Thebes.⁵⁴ Weddings of members of the royal family as well as the king's own weddings were aimed at gaining allies for the kingdom or at neutralizing enemies inside the kingdom. Strife inside the royal family was to be avoided.

A decision of the King

In Temenid Macedonia the king was absolute ruler in time of war and peace; he decided about alliances, economic matters and royal monopolies. All treaties mentioned by Thucydides were made with the king.⁵⁵ It is also the case of the

53. The king also tried to find allies within the royal family for the future king; Aristoteles reports that Archelaos offered the hand of his youngest daughter to another member of the royal family to gain his support for his son with Cleopatra (Arist. *Polit.* 1311b 1-15).

54. For the efforts of Athens to intervene during the Peloponnesian war by using Philip, the king's brother and Philip's son Amyntas see Thuc. 2.95-101 and the analysis of L. Mitchell, "Born to Rule / Succession in the Argead Royal House", in W. Heckel, L. Tritle and P. Wheatley (eds.), *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay* (Clairemont, CA 2007) 61-74. For Theban intervention in the 360s see R.J. Lane Fox, "The 360s", in R.J. Lane Fox, *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC - 300 AD* (Leiden and Boston 2011) 257-269, esp. 259-263.

55. Perdikkas used to be an ally of Athens: 1.57.2; the war against Perdikkas: 1.59.2; alliance with Perdikkas: 1.61.3 and 62.2; Sitalkes, Athens and Perdikkas: 2.29.5.6 and 7; Sitalkes' war against Perdikkas: 2.95.1 and 2; war against Perdikkas: 4.82.1; treaty with Perdikkas: 4.132.1; received ambassadors: 5.6.2 and 80.2; war with Perdikkas: 5.83.4; war against Perdikkas: 6.7.3 and 4; ally of Athens: 7.9.

Peace of Philocrates and of all treaties we know epigraphically.⁵⁶ These are the following:

- a) the treaty between Athens and Perdikkas II that is followed by an Athenian decree voting peace with Arrabaïos of Lynkos under the condition of reconciliation with Perdikkas II (*IG I³ 89*),
- b) the treaty between the Chalcideans and Amyntas III (Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions* [see n. 2] 19-20 no. 1),
- c) the treaty between Amyntas III, his son Alexander and Athens (*IG II² 102*),
- d) the treaty between Philip II and the Chalcidean League (Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions* [see n. 2] 20-21 no. 2),
- e) the treaty between Alexander III and Athens (*IG II³ 443* [= *IG II² 329*]).

Embassies were sent to the king and were sent by him.⁵⁷ It was the king himself who had taken the oath for the peace of Philocrates.⁵⁸ It was the king who made grants of land to his followers.⁵⁹ The king decided about the export of timber and resources and he also imposed taxes. We learn about timber from literary sources,⁶⁰ from two of the treaties mentioned *supra* and also from the letter of Alexander III to the city of Philippi.⁶¹ Evidence about taxes (the *ellimenion*) derives from the *Oeconomica* of Pseudo-Aristoteles (1350a 16-22), a work which informs us

56. For the Peace of Philocrates and its terms see [Dem.] 7.26 and Schol. *ad* 7.18 and 24; Dem. 19.78; 5.25 and 19.174 for Cardia; 19.48 for the peace; Dem. 19.143 and 158 for the oaths of the allies and for the oath that Philip himself had taken at Pella; Dem. 18.32; [Dem.] 12.2 and 7.14 for the safety of the seas. See also E.M. Harris, *Aeschines and Athenian Politics* (New York/Oxford 1995) 63-70.

57. See *IG II³ 443* (= *IG II² 329*) and also Dem. 18.24; 73; 75; 155; Plut. *Alex.* 58.7.

58. Dem. 18.32 and also Hammond, *History of Macedonia II* (see n. 13) 344, n. 4.

59. For donations of land see Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.2: Peisistratos at Raikelos; Thuc. 1.58.2: donation of land to the Chalcideans by Perdikkas; donation of land to the Chalcideans by Amyntas III: Diod. Sic. 14.92.3; 15.19.2; donation of Anthemous (Dem. 6.20; Lib. *Hypoth. Dem.* 1.2; cf. Diod. Sic. 16.8.5) and Potidaea by Philip II to the Chalcideans: Dem. 2.7; 6.20; 8.62; 10.64; 10.67; cf. Diod. Sic. 16.8.5. See also Diod. Sic. 16.3.3: donations of land to Macedonians by Philip; Plut. *Alex.* 15.3: donations of land to the *hetairoi* in Macedonia by Alexander III before the Persian campaign.

60. Hermippos, *Phormophoroi*, *PCG V* fr. 63, l. 8: καὶ παρὰ Περδίκκου ψεύδη ναυσὶν πάνυ πολλαῖς. Cf. Dem. 49.26.

61. For this letter see Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions II* (see n. 2) 25-28 no. 6.

on the precious advice of Kallistratos of Aphidna to the king.⁶² Plutarch (*Alex.* 15.3) speaks also of the distribution by the king of revenues from ports and settlements (*συννοικίας*). We learn also from Arrian that Alexander III granted *ateleia* to the parents and the children of those that were killed in the battle of Granikos.⁶³ It was also the king who distributed booty.⁶⁴ In wartime, the king led the army and decided about alliances.⁶⁵ It was the king that gave permission to a foreign army to cross the territories of the kingdom.⁶⁶ The hostages delivered to the ally should have a very close relation to the king himself (Plut. *Pel.* 27.2 to 9; Just. *Epit.* 7.5.1). It was also the king who decided about hostages and captives (Dem. 23.149-150; 19.196f; 229, 305f; 309). Under Alexander the royal *prostagmata* that were addressed to the Greek cities ([Dem.] 17.16), to the satraps of Asia (Diod. Sic. 17.111.1), to the cities and the inhabitants of Asia (Diod. Sic. 17.114. 4-5; cf. Arr. *Anab.* 7.14; Plut. *Alex.* 72.3) and to the Macedonian heads of the army (Diod. Sic. 18.60-61; cf. Polyaeus *Strat.* 4.8.2; Plut. *Eum.* 13.2-8), were all issued in the name of the king himself and were signed by him.⁶⁷ It was also the case of the *diagrammata* of Philip III, of Alexander III and their father Philip II.⁶⁸ It was also the king who was the supreme judge; his decisions could not be challenged.⁶⁹ The Macedonian king was the one who could defy the *mores* (customs) *Macedonum*.⁷⁰ It was the king who

62. See I.N. Kalléris, “Ἡ Μακεδονικὴ παράδοσις εἰς τὸ ἐλληνιστικὸν δίκαιον”, in A. Biscardi, J. Modrzejewski and H.J. Wolff (eds.), *Μνήμη Γεωργίου Ἀ. Πετροπούλου (1897-1964)* (Athens 1984) 423-440, esp. 431 with n. 28. For the foundation of a Thasian colony at Krenides see also the new fragment of the so-called “*stèle des braves*”, published by J. Fournier and P. Hamon, “Les orphelins de guerre de Thasos: un nouveau fragment de la stèle des Braves (ca. 360-350 av. J. -C.)”, *BCH* 131 (2007) 309-381.

63. Arr. *Anab.* 1.16.5: τῶν τε κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἀτέλειαν ἔδωκε καὶ ὅσαι ἄλλαι ἢ τῷ σώματι λειτουργίαι ἢ κατὰ τὰς κτήσεις ἐκάστων εἰσφοραί.

64. Plut. *Alex.* 39.

65. Xen. *Hell.* 5.3.9. It is the king that is leading out the army: Plut. *Alex.* 16.2.

66. Polyaeus *Strat.* 2.1.17.

67. Kalléris, “Μακεδονικὴ παράδοσις” (see n. 62) 428-429. See also Plut. *Alex.* 34.2: Alexander to Greek cities about tyrannies and to the Plataeans with promises to rebuild their city. See also Plut. *Alex.* 76.5: ὅτε δὴ τοῖς ἡγεμόσι διελέχθη περὶ τῶν ἐρήμων ἡγεμονίας τάξεων, ὅπως καταστήσωσι δοκιμάσαντες.

68. Kalléris, “Μακεδονικὴ παράδοσις” (see n. 62) 429.

69. See Kalléris, “Μακεδονικὴ παράδοσις” (see n. 62) 423 with n. 1 and 438. Kalléris is based on Plut. *Mor.* 178E-179A. See also Plut. *Alex.* 42.2.

70. Kalléris, “Μακεδονικὴ παράδοσις” (see n. 62) 434 with nn. 42 and 44, 438 with n. 67.

issued coinage minted in his name.⁷¹ Demosthenes explicitly says that the great advantage of the Macedonian kingdom was that the king decided by himself.⁷²

Ancient sources about the Macedonian kingdom show that in Temenid Macedonia all decisions about all matters concerning the kingdom and the royal family were in the hands of the king. Because the King was the final arbiter in all other matters, we should expect to find that he was the one who decided about his successor. The treaty with Athens dating from the last years of the reign of Amyntas III clearly shows that this could be done by the association in power of his successor. Amyntas III associated his son Alexander in power before his death. It is interesting to note that this was also the way the Diadochi designated their successors. Seleukos I and Ptolemy I designated their successors by associating them in power. Literary sources, inscriptions and coins show that during the last years of his reign, Seleukos I was co-ruler with his son Antiochos I.⁷³ There is also evidence about the Ptolemaic kingdom. Ptolemy I associated in power his son from Berenice, Ptolemy Philadelphos, and passed over the grandson of Antipater, Ptolemy Keraunos, with all known consequences.⁷⁴ Antigonos Monophthalmos ruled jointly with his son Demetrios.⁷⁵ These associations took place under normal circumstances that can be compared with the last years of Amyntas' reign. In Temenid Macedonia under Amyntas III and in the houses of Seleukos I and Ptolemy I these took place during the last years of the king's reign.

71. For the Macedonian coinage from Alexander I to Philip II see D. Raymond, *Macedonian Regal Coinage to 413 B.C.* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs 126, New York 1953) and U. Westermark, "Remarks on the Regal Macedonian Coinage ca. 413-359 B.C.," in G. Le Rider *et al.* (eds.), *Kraay - Mørkholm Essays: Numismatic Studies in Memory of C.M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm* (Numismatica Lovaniensia 10, Louvain-la-Neuve 1989) 301-315.

72. Dem. 1.4-5: οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' ἐπιεικῶς, ὧς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῦθ' ὁ δυσμαχώτατον ἐστὶ τῶν Φιλίππου πραγμάτων, καὶ βέλτιστον ὑμῖν· τὸ γὰρ εἶναι πάντων ἐκεῖνον ἓν ὄντα κύριον καὶ ῥητῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτων καὶ ἅμα στρατηγὸν καὶ δεσπότην καὶ ταμίαν, καὶ πανταχοῦ αὐτὸν παρεῖναι τῷ στρατεύματι, πρὸς μὲν τὸ τὰ τοῦ πολέμου ταχῆ καὶ κατὰ καιρὸν πράττεσθαι πολλῶν προέχει, πρὸς δὲ τὰς καταλλαγάς, ἃς ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιήσαιτ' ἄσμενος πρὸς Ὀλυθίου, ἐναντίως ἔχει.

73. The Seleucid Empire was an *imperium macedonicum*: see Ch. Edson, "Imperium Macedonicum: The Seleucid Empire and the Literary Evidence", *CP* 53 (1958) 153-170.

74. For literary sources and previous bibliography see Buraselis, "Kronprinzentum und Realpolitik" (see n. 1) 91-102.

75. Diod. Sic. 20.53.2-4: ὁ δ' Ἀντίγονος πυθόμενος τὴν γεγενημένην νίκην καὶ μετεωρισθεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ μεγέθει τοῦ προτερήματος διάδημα περιέθετο καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐχρημάτιζε βασιλεύς, συγχωρήσας καὶ τῷ Δημητρίῳ τῆς αὐτῆς τυγχάνειν προσηγορίας καὶ τιμῆς.

Thus the practice used by the Diadochi to design their successors, the so-called Epigoni, was not their invention and innovation but an Old Macedonian practice.⁷⁶ In the Macedonian kingdom and also in the early Hellenistic kingdoms, it was the king himself who chose his successor among his sons and brothers,⁷⁷ on the basis of his qualities as military leader and governor. As Philip said to Alexander “you will become king not only because of me, but, also because of yourself and your qualities”.⁷⁸

One recalls that Hector also expected to succeed Priam as king of Troy because of his military talent.⁷⁹ In the Homeric world, as in the Macedonian kingdom, “c’est à Priam qu’il revient de transmettre la royauté”.⁸⁰ What seemed to be a practice of the Diadochi, was also a practice in Temenid Macedonia and might go back to the Homeric society.⁸¹ The successor was appointed by the king himself. It seems that as for all matters, also for succession, “what is arranged by the king is right”: δίκαιον εἶναι τὸ πρὸς βασιλέως ὀριζόμενον (App. Syr. 326). This does not mean that the king’s will was accepted.⁸² “Even if the reigning king expressed a preference for his successor, the best chance the king-elect could have was if he also inherited an influential and stable social network from his predecessor”.⁸³

Selene E. Psoma
University of Athens
spsoma@arch.uoa.gr

76. Kalléris, “Μακεδονική παράδοσις” (see n. 62) 423-440.

77. Plut. *Dem.* 38.10-11: ἐκ τούτου τὸν Σέλευκον ἐκκλησίαν ἀθροίσαντα πάνδημον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι θούλεται καὶ διέγρωκε τῶν ἄνω πάντων τόπων Ἀντίοχον ἀποδείξαι βασιλέα καὶ Στρατονίκην βασιλίδα, ἀλλήλοις συνοικοῦντας. Cf. App. *Syr.* 321-327.

78. Plut. *Reg. et Imperat. Apophth.* 178E.

79. Hom. *Il.* 6.477-80. See also P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg 1984) 188.

80. Carlier, *Royauté* (see previous note) 189.

81. E. Carney, “Regicide in Macedonia”, *PP* 211 (1983) 206-272, esp. 269; *ead.*, *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia* (Norman 2000) 5.

82. See Mitchell, “Succession in the Argead Royal House” (see n. 54) 67-74.

83. Mitchell, “Succession in the Argead Royal House” (see n. 54) 73.

Summary

This article attempts to show that the free designation of the successor to the throne by Ptolemy I and Seleukos I, and the association in power of the successor during the last years of the king's reign, was not an innovation of the age of the Diadochi but an old Macedonian practice. Using *IG II/III*² 102, the treaty between Athens, Amyntas II and his son Alexander as a starting point, this work collects all the evidence for the designation of the successor to the throne in the Temenid Kingdom, discusses previous theories about succession, and argues that the successor was designated by the king himself, who appears to have had full jurisdiction to decide on the matter freely, unimpeded by custom or law.