NOTAE NUMISMATICAE
ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XVI

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2021

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE
ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XVI

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2021

Adres redakcji / Address of the Editorial Office:
Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie
ul. Marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego 12, 31-109 Kraków
tel. (+48) 12 433 58 50, e-mail: notae@mnk.pl
http://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1

Wersją pierwotną *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* jest wersja elektroniczna.
The electronic edition of the *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* is treated as its original version.

ISSN 1426-5435

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

RECENZJE / REVIEWS

KRONIKA / CHRONICLE

Tom XVI
Kraków 2021
NOTAE NUMISMATICAE
ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

DOI: 10.52800/ajst.1.16.a1

SŁAWOMIR SPRAWSKI
Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Institute of History
ORCID: 0000-0002-6904-5544

The Temenidae, Who Came Out of Argos. Literary Sources and Numismatic Evidence on the Macedonian Dynastic Traditions

ABSTRACT: The prevailing opinion is that, at least from Alexander I onwards, Macedonian rulers attached a lot of importance to the tradition of their Argive origin. There are also suggestions that various images placed on royal coins refer to the mythical founder of the dynasty and his foreign origin. But a review of these images does not provide convincing arguments to justify the above-mentioned opinion. The preserved fragments of poetry dedicated to Alexander I seem to speak rather in favor of his interest in the Trojan myth. If the Argive origin of the royal family is so strongly emphasized by Herodotus, Thucydides, and Euripides, then perhaps the "establishment" of the genealogical ties of the Macedonian kings with Temenidae of Argos took place in Athens. The Greek authors presented the Macedonian rulers with versions of the mythical past of their family linked to Greek tradition. But there is not much to indicate that the predecessors of Alexander the Great attached particular importance to them.

KEY WORDS: Macedonia, Temenidae, Alexander I, written sources, coinage

ABSTRAKT: Temenidzi, którzy przybyli z Argos. *Macedońskie tradycje dynastyczne w źródłach literackich i świadectwach numizmatycznych*

Przeważa opinia, że przynajmniej od Aleksandra I władcy macedońscy przywiązywali dużą wagę do tradycji związanej z pochodzeniem ich rodziny z Argos. Pojawiają się też sugestie, że wizerunki umieszczane na monetach królewskich nawiązują do mitycznego założyciela dynastii i jego obcego pochodzenia. Przegląd tych przedstawień monetarnych nie dostarcza jednak przekonujących argumentów na uzasadnienie tej opinii. Zachowane fragmenty poezji poświęconej Aleksandrowi I

zdają się przemawiać raczej na rzecz jego zainteresowania mitem trojańskim. Jeśli Herodot, Tukidydes i Eurypides tak mocno podkreślają argiwskie pochodzenie rodziny królewskiej, to być może to w Atenach „odkryto" genealogiczne powiązania królów macedońskich z Temenidami z Argos. Autorzy greccy przedstawili władcom macedońskim różne wersje mitycznej przeszłości ich rodu związane z tradycją grecką. Niewiele jednak wskazuje na to, by poprzednicy Aleksandra Wielkiego przywiązywali do nich szczególną wagę.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Macedonia, Temenidzi, Aleksander I, źródła pisane, mennictwo

The dynastic tradition of Macedonian kings has already been the subject of numerous analyses and the credibility of the account about their Argive origin and its role in the dispute about the Macedonians' Greekness have been examined. Recently, considerable attention has been paid to the role which Herakles played in building the dynasty's image.[1] The prevailing opinion is that at least from the times of Alexander I onwards, Macedonian rulers attached a lot of importance to this tradition, striving to achieve a strong position both among the Greeks and their own subjects.[2] Evidence of the propagation of the dynastic tradition by Macedonian kings are also sought in the royal coinage. Efforts have been made to show that the various images on the coins are references to the ancestor of the dynasty and the stories of his origins.[3] The aim of the article is to try to answer the question to what extent the alleged Argive origins played a significant role in the self-presentation of Alexander I and his successors.

I

Stories related to the dynasty's beginnings have been discussed many times, so for the purposes of our analysis we shall only recall their most important elements. The main ones, from the point of view of our reflections, come from the work of Herodotus. He places the first of two mentions in Book V of his work, when he finishes the story about the circumstances in which the Persians came into contact with Amyntas and his son Alexander. At this point, Herodotus (5.22) states that he knows and will show that *these descendants of Perdiccas are Greeks, as they themselves say*. He adds that they claim so themselves and that this claim was

[1] Cf. KOTTARIDI 2011: 15–24; MALLIOS 2011: 177–289; MOLONEY 2015: 50–72; MÜLLER 2016: 85–106.

[2] FRANKE 1952/1953: 107–108; HAMMOND 1979: 3–4; GREENWALT 1986: 122; BORZA 1990: 112–113; BADIAN 1994: 119, n. 13; DESPINI 2009: 50; ASIRVATHAM 2010: 100–102. Compare SARIPANIDI 2017: 111–114, 123.

[3] KRAAY 1976: 144; GREENWALT 1993: 514; MOUSTAKA 2000: 393–410; PSOMA 2000: 30–34; KREMYDI 2011: 163; TIVERIOS 2018: 195–212.

accepted by the judges of the Olympic Games. He then proceeds to tell a brief story about Alexander wanting to compete in the games and his rivals trying to prevent him from doing so, claiming that foreigners could not participate in the games. Alexander, refuting these claims, reportedly proved that he was descended from Argos and was allowed to participate in the race. The second mention (8.137–139) accompanies a description of an embassy to Athens, where Alexander went on Mardonios' wishes, bringing with him a proposal of a separate peace treaty. Herodotus first reminds the reader that Alexander was related to the Persians through his sister Gygaia, Bubares' wife. He then presents Alexander's family background, telling a story about his ancestor Perdiccas, who, together with his brothers, escaped from Argos and seized power in Macedonia. This short excurse ends with a list of six of Alexander's ancestors: *From that Perdiccas Alexander was descended, being the son of Amyntas, who was the son of Alcetes; Alcetes' father was Aeropus, and his was Philippus; Philippus' father was Argaeus, and his again was Perdiccas, who won that lordship* (8.139 Godley, trans.).

Thucydides seems to confirm this information, referring twice to the subject. The first time, he does so in a short description of Macedonia, on the occasion of reporting the invasion of the Thracian king Sitalkes. He states that Alexander's ancestors were *the Temenidae, who came out of Argos* (2.99.3). Meanwhile, when presenting the circumstances of Perdiccas II breaking off the alliance with Athens and starting a coalition with Sparta and Argos, he explains that in making this decision the king followed the example of Argos, as *he was himself of Argive descent* (5.80.2).

When Archelaos was the ruler of Macedonia, Euripides wrote the drama *Archelaos*, in which the eponymous character is presented as Temenus' son and founder of the dynasty. The play is known to us only from short surviving fragments, but it is likely that on the basis of its text Hyginus wrote his story about Archelaos.[4] Banished from Argos by his brothers, Archelaos, after many adventures, arrived in Macedonia where, following an oracle he received, he founded the city of Aigai on a spot showed to him by goats (*P.Hamb.*118a; Hyg. *Fab*. 2019. See also Dio Chrys. *Or*. 4.70–2).

Diodorus (7.16) recorded an alternative version of the myth, in which the oracle was given to Perdiccas. In yet another version, it was Karanos (Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.11). The latter figure was mentioned by Theopompos (BNJ 115 F 393) and Marsyas (BNJ 135–136 F 14) as the founder of the dynasty. Unlike Perdiccas, Karanos reportedly arrived in Macedonia from Argos leading an army. Introducing Karanos as the founder of the dynasty did not mean removing Perdiccas from the genealogy; he was believed

[4] DI GREGORIO 1988: 37–38.

to be his direct or three generations later descendant (Satyros BNJ 631 F 1; Just. 7.1.7; *Euseb.Chron*. 1.108.21).

It seems that in the times of Alexander the Great, Karanos was regarded as the progenitor of the family, which is why Plutarch (*Alex.* 2.1) was able to write that *As for the lineage of Alexander, on his father's side he was a descendant of Heracles through Caranus, and on his mother's side a descendant of Aeacus through Neoptolemus; this is accepted without any question* (Perrin, trans.). Diodorus (17.4.1) also noted a case where Alexander, looking for the Thessalians' support, referred to *his ancient relationship to them through Herakles*.

In the prevailing opinion, the story about Perdiccas told by Herodotus is the oldest version of the dynastic myth. The story about the oracle given to Perdiccas must have, at least in N.G.L. Hammond's opinion, been created before the end of the 5th century, when the kings' seat was moved to Pella. Euripides, writing his drama *Archelaos*, in which the king's namesake is presented as the founder of the dynasty, flattered his ambition. Archelaos himself might have initiated changes in the dynastic tradition, striving for strengthening its linkage to the more widely known by the Greeks tradition about the Heraclids and the kingdoms they founded. This thesis is supported by the tradition given by the *Vita Euripidi* (Ia.6 *TrGF*), which says that the poet spent the last days of his life at the Macedonian court and died in Macedonia in tragic circumstances.[5] On the other hand, it was supposed that the figure of Karanos was introduced in a period of political chaos in Macedonia after Archelaos' death, when members of different branches of the family competed for power.[6] Others argue that Karanos did not become a significant figure until the time of Philip II.[7]

Of key importance to our reflections is the version of the myth recorded by Herodotus (8.137–139). The story focuses on three brothers who found themselves in the service of a local ruler and were subjected to a test of character. The youngest one came out on top and consequently he became the king. A similar story of three brothers was placed by Herodotus (4.5–6) in the Scythian *logos*. In that case as well, the royal power went to the youngest of the brothers. In the story about Perdiccas, there are miraculous signs which legitimise his power (an exceptionally large loaf of bread, an unusual payment) and show divine protection of the dynasty (miraculous rise of the river's water level). Interwoven into this story is the motif echoing local myths associated with Mount Bermion (Midas, Sylen, unusual roses). The information about the process itself of Perdiccas coming to power in Macedonia is limited to one

[5] HAMMOND 1979: 5; GREENWALT 1985: 44; SCODEL 2017: 37–38; STEWART 2017: 125.

[6] HAMMOND 1979: 4; BADIAN 1982: 34–37; IDEM 1994: 119–121; GREENWALT 1985: 43; MÜLLER 2016: 100–104; VASILEV 2016: 41–42.

[7] See MARI 2002: 159–163.

sentence: *Thence they issued forth when they had won that country, and presently subdued also the rest of Macedonia*. Equally as brief is the information about the origin of Perdiccas and his brothers. We only learn that *three brothers of the lineage of Temenus came as banished men from Argos to Illyria*. A list of King Alexander I's ancestors, going back to Perdiccas, *who won that lordship*, completes the story.

According to Bruno Tripodi, discernible in this story is a trace of the ideological transformation of the way in which Perdiccas' rule is legitimised. Apart from references to religious signs and gestures, there are also references to heroic genealogy and conquest.[8] However, we might wonder whether this heroic genealogy was part of the story about the dynasty's ancestors from the very beginning. There is no doubt that it plays an important role in Herodotus' narrative, who, as announced in Book V, tells the story as proof that the *descendants of Perdiccas are Greeks, as they themselves say*. It is difficult to dismiss the impression that the entire story is eclectic and was built from various motifs, perhaps of different origin.[9] M.I. Vasilev, who analyses this problem, believes that Herodotus combined information obtained at the royal court with information received from citizens of one of the Macedonian cities he visited.[10] We could go further in these divagations and assume that the story about Perdiccas was, at some point, supplemented with information about his Argive origin.

The opinion about the time when this tradition was born was enormously influenced by a discussion on whether the information about the dynasty's progenitor's Argive descent can be treated as credible. Many were willing to see it as a local tradition, carefully handed down from one generation to the next.[11] This opinion was shared by N.G.L. Hammond, who believed that the Macedonian kings were in fact descendants of the Temenidae of Argos, who managed to assume power over the Argead Macedonians, one of the Macedonian tribes. This is confirmed by the conviction of Herodotus and Thucydides, who obtained their information directly from Macedonia, perhaps from members of the royal family. As the Temenidae, they believed themselves to be Herakles' descendants and it was this background that made them stand out among the other Macedonian families and guaranteed their sole right to kingship. According to Hammond, the version recorded by Herodotus was credible, unlike the later redactions of the myth.[12]

[8] TRIPODI 1993: 1623–1629. Cf. MALLIOS 2011: 183–184; MÜLLER 2016: 87–90.

[9] Baragwanath (2008: 150 and n. 81) points to examples of similar stories in Herodotus.

[10] VASILEV 2016: 35–37. Cf. GREENWALT 1986: 120–121; HATZOPOULOS 2003: 218; MALLIOS 2011: 185–187; MÜLLER 2016: 87–90.

[11] DASCALAKIS 1965: 97–101.

[12] HAMMOND 1979: 3–4.

Ernest Badian took a different position; he believed that Alexander did not refer to his descent from the Temenidae of Argos until after Xerxes' invasion. He did so when he demanded to compete in the Olympian Games, probably in 476 BC. Badian was sceptical as to the credibility of the tradition presented by Alexander, although he did admit that it was impossible either to prove or reject it conclusively. In his opinion, we cannot ignore the suspicion that the tradition was based on the random similarity of the *name of the Argead clan to the city of Argos*.[13]

Eugen Borza's doubts go much deeper, although he too shares the conviction that the version about the kings' descent from the Temenidae of Argos was commonly accepted by the Macedonians and that this was where Herodotus obtained his information. However, he doubts the credibility of the tradition as such. In his opinion, the Argeadae were a family descended from Mount Bermion, who – having gained a dominant position in Macedonia – for propaganda reasons started to refer to their alleged descent from Argos. The initiator of this innovation was probably Alexander I, who wanted to strengthen his claims to Greek origin in this way. His bold move turned out to be very successful and the subsequent Macedonian rulers regarded themselves as Greeks, the Temenidae of Argos and descendants of Herakles. Herodotus probably took this version of the dynastic tradition directly from Alexander, and Thucydides repeated it after him. The choice of Argos was dictated by the city's role both in Greek tradition and on the political stage in the 5th century. In his critique, Borza went even further, calling for rejecting the name Temenidae in reference to the Macedonian royal family and for retaining the name Argeadae.[14] It could be said that the discussion about the identity of the Macedonian royal family took on a new dimension as a result. In the literature published on the subject even the choice of the term *the Temenidae* or *the Argeadae* can be a declaration of conviction about the credibility of the tradition about the Greek descent of the royal family or a rejection of it.[15]

The opinions presented above are dominated by the conviction that Alexander I played the key role in creating the dynastic tradition going back to the Temenidae of Argos, and therefore to Herakles. Firstly, Herodotus notes that Alexander referred to Perdiccas when proving his Greek descent to the Olympic judges. Secondly, it is assumed that Herodotus visited Macedonia during Alexander's reign (498 or 495–454 BC) and could have heard the story directly from the king or from someone in his entourage. The problem appears, however, of when during his reign Alexander started to refer to this genealogy. Many believe that this took place already at the

[13] BADIAN 1982: 34–37.

[14] BORZA 1982: 10–13; IDEM 1990: 80–84; cf. GREENWALT 1986: 117–122.

[15] KING 2010: 376.

beginning of his long reign, while others tend to link this to the period after Xerxes' invasion.[16] The occasion to present the genealogy was supposedly Alexander's participation in the Olympic Games. The games of 496 or 476 seem the most likely.[17] However, some scholars reject the historicity of this event, believing it to be a family legend at best.[18] A fragment of Pindar's poem, written for Alexander, may serve as indirect evidence of Alexander's participation in the games. Many commentators believe it to be a fragment of an *epinikion*. However, it lacks any direct references to a sports competition, so it is possible that it is a genre that was not necessarily written to praise sports achievements.[19] If we disregard this testimony, only Herodotus' story remains. It is intriguing that the story meets the needs of proving Alexander and his family's Greek descent so well. To obtain confirmation, it would be difficult to find a better argument than a verdict of the Olympic judges.[20]

Doubts as to whether Alexander did indeed present his genealogy to the Olympic judges led scholars to propose alternative circumstances in which this tradition was born. According to J.W. Cole, such an occasion could have been presented by the political rapprochement between Argos and Macedonia, for which Themistocles was supposedly lobbying during his banishment from Athens (the early 460s). While staying in Pydna, he tried to persuade Alexander to build a bloc with Argos, which would be able to oppose Athens and Sparta (Thuc. 1.137.1–2).[21] Unfortunately, this is merely speculation based on the information that Themistocles, on his way to Persia, stopped over at Pydna, which belonged to Alexander. Moreover, according to Pausanias (7.25.6), when the Argives captured Mycenae, more than half of its inhabitants sought refuge in Macedonia, under Alexander's protection, which Diodorus (11.65) places in the year 468/7. This certainly indicates Alexander's contact with the Argolid, yet does not necessarily prove his good relations with Argos.

Therefore, what remains as a possible *terminus ante quem* for the beginning of this tradition is the time of Herodotus' visit to Macedonia, which according to E. Borza took place in c. 460 BC. The historicity of this event is based on the very late testimony of the *Suda Lexicon* (῾Ελλάνικος Μιλήσιος = BNJ 4 T 1). It mentions that Herodotus and Hellanikos visited Amyntas' court. It is generally assumed that the author made a mistake and the ruler who received the two historians was

[16] PATTERSON 2010: 171–172; ENGELS 2010: 90.

[17] ROSEN 1978: 7–8; HAMMOND 1979: 60; BADIAN 1982: 34–35; KERTÉSZ 2005: 115–126; MÜLLER 2016: 120–121.

[18] BORZA 1990: 111–112.

[19] BUDELMANN 2012: 176–177.

[20] BADIAN 1994: 120.

[21] COLE 1978: 46–49; BORZA 1990: 121–122.

Alexander.[22] However, this is not the only possible interpretation. The Macedonian king of whom we know that he invited Greek artists and writers was Archelaos, who ruled in 413–399 (BNJ 4 T 1 with F. Pownall's commentary). In the context of the traditional dating of Herodotus' work, this seems completely out of the question, but not so in the context of the recent studies of Elisabeth Irwin, who moves the publication date to the very end of the 5th century.[23] If Herodotus heard the information about the Argive descent of the royal family at Archelaos' court, then this tradition was not necessarily known and popularised in Alexander's times.

When interpreting this description, it is therefore crucial to answer to what extent what we find in Herodotus is a version of the Macedonian story recorded by him, and to what degree it is his own composition. The term he uses, *autoi legousi*, may indicate that the information came from members of the royal family.[24] However, the term is very generalising, like in many other places where *he always credits a community with knowledge about its own past.* This is conspicuous when comparing the mentioned fragments with two cases where he names his informers very precisely (3.55.2 and 9.16).[25] There is much to indicate that Herodotus, using local traditions, composes from the collected materials his own complex narrative and, as Maurizio Giangiulio noted *it is surely misleading to assume that local traditions were simple sort of small-scale historical account which Herodotus had only to fit into his narrative. This supposition would lead us not only to misunderstand the working of oral tradition, but also to misread Herodotus himself*.[26] Therefore, we cannot assume that his story about Perdiccas is identical with what Alexander I and his family said about their ancestors.

II

At this point it is worth referring to sources from the times of his rule, which may shed some light on the way in which his image was being shaped. First of all, these include dedicated to him, although surviving only in fragments, poems by Pindar and Bacchylides, as well as images placed on his coinages.

Pindar (fr. 120 = Scholia on *Nem*.7), in the extant fragments of the *enkomion* written for Alexander, called him *the blessed offspring of Dardanus, Bold-counselling son of Amyntas*. This fragment does not contain a reference to the Macedonian king's genealogy, but the author undoubtedly links him to the figure of Alexander-Paris, son of the king of Troy. As David Fearn shows, also Bacchylides (fr. 20B) refers, in

[22] BORZA 1982: 8–9; MÜLLER 2016: 96–97; VASILEV 2016: 31–51.
[23] IRWIN 2013: 66–67.
[24] VASILEV 2016: 35 with n. 24.
[25] LURAGHI 2001: 150–151.
[26] GIANGIULIO 2001: 134.

his fragmentarily preserved *enkomion* for Alexander, to Homer and the Trojan myth. These allusions are not as clear as in the case of the quoted fragment of Pindar's poem, but when read together, the two texts seem to be complementary. Bacchylides focuses on the *symposion* which has the power to induce in its participants the thought of destroying cities, monarchical power, and Egyptian riches. Fearn interprets the reference to destroying cities as an allusion to Troy's fate. This enables him to propose the theory that *the essential "Trojanness" of this reference is fascinating given that Macedonian elite receptions of the association between Troy, Paris, and our own Alexander can be established*.[27] Pindar and Bacchylides build Alexander's image by referring to the Trojan tradition. It is difficult to say whether this stemmed from the interests of Alexander himself or whether the poets chose the motifs which, in their opinion, were the most suitable for an *enkomion* for a young ruler. However, there are reasons to suspect that the Trojan tradition may have played a role in Alexander's self-presentation. It is also worth mentioning that there are artefacts dating back to the 6th century that show that Macedonians may have been familiar with the Trojan cycle.[28] First of all, what draws our attention is the king's name, which has connotations with Alexander-Paris.[29] The name of Gygaia, carried by the king's sister, may also belong to the Homeric tradition. The catalogue of allies in the *Iliad* also lists two generals of the Maionians, who are described as sons of the nymph of *Gygean Lake* (Hom. *Il*. 2.865)[30] and Lykophron uses the epithet Gygaia in reference to Athena, venerated at Troy (*Alex*. 1152). The *Iliad* also mentions *Polymelos Argeades*, or Argeas' son as one of the Lycians killed by Patroklos (Hom. *Il*. 16.417). His patronymic brings to mind the name of the dynasty, although its use is attested much later. If the name was used earlier, it cannot be excluded that the Macedonian kings may have sought connections with the heroes of the Trojan War.[31] Perhaps echoes of this tradition were the sacrifices offered by Alexander the Great to the Trojan Athena and to Priam (Arr. *Anab*. 1.11.8). For comparison, let us recall that Trojan names appear in the royal family of the Epirote Molossians (Anonymous BNJ 776 F 2 (= *Scholia on Lykophron*, Alexandra 1439 with commentary).[32] It is worth noting that the inhabitants of the city of Aineia on the Pallene peninsula also claimed to be of Trojan descent.

[27] FEARN 2006: 34–74. Cf. MOLONEY 2015: 55–56; MÜLLER 2016: 134–136.

[28] Cf. SARIPANIDI 2017: 98.

[29] Cf. Kirk's commentary on Hom. Il. 3.16. It should be noted, however, that one of Alexander's sons was named Menelaus, and this is the first historical person to be attested to bear that name (IG I3 89; Ael. *VH* 12.43; Just. 7.4.3). Perhaps we are dealing only with the desire to raise the status by choosing a names referring to epic heroes (for the frequency and possible reasons for choosing Homeric epic names see KANAVOU 2015: 156–168).

[30] FEARN 2007: 115–116.

[31] Cf. Brügger's commentary ad. loc.; MACURDY 1919: 65; WATHELET 1988, s.v. Argeas. For the Argeads' names, see ROSEN 1978: 15–22; ZAHRNT 1984: 365–368; PSOMA 2015b: 15–26.

[32] MALKIN 1998: 138–139; ERSKINE 2001: 122–123.

The city was located not far from Aigai, although on the other side of the Thermaic Gulf. We also know that Amyntas, Alexander's father, was interested in this region, since he suggested to Hippias, banished from Athens, that he should settle in nearby Anthemus (Hdt. 5.94). According to the myth recorded by Hellanikos, the city was founded by refugees from Troy, led by Aeneas. The fact that this tradition is older is attested to by the image of this hero, which appears on early coinages from this city (Hallanikos BNJ 4 F 35 with commentary).

III

Now let us examine the images on the coins of the first Macedonian kings, which were seen as references to the dynastic tradition. A quite widely accepted thesis was that the coins were first struck by Alexander I, initially without placing his name on them. Consequently, various coins are attributed to him whose motifs recur in his coinages.[33] They include a series of staters and obols with the image of a kneeling male goat with his head turned back. Already in the early 20th century, the opinion solidified that they were issued in Aigai. The image of a male goat supposedly alluded to the etymology of the city and the myth according to which the progenitor of the royal family founded the city in a place picked by goats. This attribution is supported by the ligature ΔE, appearing on the reverse of some staters, interpreted as Edessa, which was the former name of Aigai according to tradition (Pl. 1, Fig. 1). The letters ΛA and AΛ, appearing on different variants, were interpreted as initials of the name Alexander. Consequently, the coins with the ligature ΔE were concluded to be civic coinage of Aigai, which was replaced by a series with the letters ΛA and AΛ, minted by Alexander.[34] This attribution was already criticised by Ioannis Svoronos, who mentioned that the symbols placed on the coins could not have alluded to the name of the city. The name Aigai may be associated with the name *aiges* – female goats, not *tragos* – male goat. He also proposed that the monogram ΔE and the letters ΛA should be read as the initials of the peoples of Derrones and Laiaioi. Together with the Bisaltai and the Graiaioi, they reportedly formed an alliance and issued coinages with the image of a male goat.[35] His opinion did not prove very popular, although there were some other voices which questioned the linkage between the goat coinage and Aigai. N.G.L. Hammond expressed a similar opinion, arguing that Aigai and Edessa were two different cities.[36]

[33] KRAAY 1976: 140.
[34] HEAD 1911: 198, Fig. 116; RAYMOND 1953: 49–52; KRAAY 1976: 141, no. 490.
[35] SVORONOS 1919: 34–35.
[36] HAMMOND 1979: 81–86; cf. BORZA 1990: 127–128.

The question of the goat coinage attribution became the subject of a lively discussion again at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries[2]. At that time, a number of arguments were presented in support of linking it to the coinages of the so-called Thraco-Macedonian tribes, settled east of the Strymon River, or located in the lands between the Axios and Strymon rivers.[37] It was also proposed to attribute these coins to the coinages of the Greek city of Galepsos, which in the first half of the 4th century, issued bronze coins with a male goat's forepart on the reverse (Pl. 1, Fig. 4).[38] The motif itself is interpreted as an allusion to the cult of Dionysus or Hermes. The link to the two gods is indicated by the caduceus and caduceus with an ivy leaf, which can be seen next to the male goat on some of Alexander's coinages.[39] Accepting the thesis that the motif of a male goat was not created in Aigai supports the theory that it was not directly linked either to the city's name or to the Macedonian dynastic tradition. Alexander I must have borrowed this motif to use it on the reverse of his tetradrachms.[40]

Catharine Lorber, who cites Thraco-Macedonian tribes as the source of the borrowed motif of a male goat, noted the motifs of domestic animals appearing on their coinages. On the earliest obverses of coinages of the Derrones, images of bulls were placed; later, the motif of a cart drawn by oxen appeared.[41] On the coins of the Orrescii, the Ichnai and Getas, king of the Edones, there is a man leading oxen (Pl. 1, Fig. 5).[42] A naked man or warrior leading a horse can be found on the coinages of the Bislatai and the Tynteni.[43] Images of domestic animals may have carried the symbolism of wealth, status in the tribal social hierarchy, as well as *specific cultic significance relating to the ideology of divine kingship*. The male goat, as a sacrificial animal, may have symbolised the king's role as the leader and mediator between the human and divine realms. Lorber also mentions the role of the male goat as a guide leading to new territories, which may have made him an attractive symbol for any tribe which had a recollection of migration in its more or less distant tradition. This description of the symbolism of a male goat was largely inspired by the myth about the foundation of Aigai, so it can hardly be taken into consideration in our further reflections.[44] However, it would be interesting to link the mentioned images of domestic animals with the dynastic myth recorded by

[37] PICARD 1995: 1071–1075; LORBER 2000: 113–133.
[38] PSOMA 2003: 237–242; cf. HEINRICHS 2017: 79, n. 4.
[39] WESTERMARK 1993: 20–21; cf. HAMMOND 1979: 86; PSOMA 2000: 121–122; IDEM 2003: 233–234.
[40] *Ibidem*: 236.
[41] HEAD 1911: 202, Fig. 120; JOSIFOVSKY 2006: 252–255.
[42] HEAD 1911: 195, Fig. 112; 199, Fig. 117; 201, Fig. 119.
[43] *Ibidem*: 199, 200, Fig. 118.
[44] LORBER 2000: 121–122; cf. FRANKE 1952/1953: 101–104.

Herodotus, in which Perdiccas and his brothers reportedly tended larger and smaller animals before they gained power. However, if there was indeed some link between the myth and these images, similar stories must have been known to other peoples issuing coinages with motifs of domestic animals. The story about a king who used to be a shepherd would have to be considered common heritage of northern tribes.

A completely different interpretation of goat coins was presented by Fischer-Bossert. In his opinion, many Greek cities whose names began with the syllable *aig-* minted coins with the image of a goat. This image served as a canting badge and referred to the popular etymology of the city's name. It can be assumed that this etymology and talking images could have inspired the formation of etiological myths such as the one about the herd of goats accompanying the founder of Aigai.[45]

Alexander started to mint coins with his name on the reverse after freeing himself from the Persian dependence. Expanding the limits of his power as far as the Strymon River, he seized control over silver mines, which enabled him to issue coinage on a large scale. Herodotus (5.17) mentions that the mint located on the west bank of the Strymon, at the foot of Mount Dysorn, at one point brought the king a daily revenue of one talent of silver. Doris Raymond distinguished three chronological periods in Alexander's coin production, to which three groups of coins corresponded: Group I: 480/479–477/476; Group II: 476/475–c. 460 and Group III: c. 460–451. They are characterised by a diversity of denominations, struck on a rather complex weight standard called the Thraco-Macedonian standard, as it was supposedly used by different cities on the Thracian coast and the neighbouring tribes. The motifs appearing on the coinages recurred in all three groups. This led Raymond to distinguish between three basic types of obverses and four types of reverses.[46] The first type of obverse is a horseman wearing a *petasos*, or a wide-brimmed hat, holding reins and two spears. Variants of this type bear a dog accompanying a horseman, in the form of a large hunting Molossus or, in a different variant, a small Maltese. The second type of obverse bears a horse and attendant. A man wearing a *petasos* stands behind a horse, holding the reins and two spears. The third type, which occurred on light tetrobols, is a horse unattended. On the reverses of octadrachms and octobols, there were legends bearing the king's name placed around a square (Pl. 1, Fig. 2). The second type, depicted on heavy tetrobols, was a lion's head or forepart. The third type, placed on tetradrachms and light tetrobols, was a male goat's head or forepart. Finally, the fourth type, placed on tetradrachms and light tetrobols, was a crested helmet (Pl. 1, Fig. 3).[47]

[45] FISCHER-BOSSERT 2007: 23–27.

[46] RAYMOND 1953: 85–99; cf. KRAAY 1976: 190–193.

[47] RAYMOND 1953: 68–69.

An analysis of the contents of the so-called Decadrachm hoard of Lycia, dated to c. 460 BC, enabled scholars to propose the thesis that Alexander did not start to mint coins until the mid-460s, which means that his entire minting activity fell to the last decade of his rule (463–454). According to Selene Psoma, Alexander struck coinage on the basis of various weight systems. For staters and their smaller fractions (tetrobols, trihemiobols, obols), he adapted the system used by Argilos, a city located at the mouth of the Strymon River. Additionally, he issued large coins, weighing 28.60–29.00 g, which were previously termed octadrachms, and according to Psoma's terminology – tristaters. Coins in this standard were minted in the 6th century BC by Abdera and later, known mainly from the names placed on coinages, by the Ichnaians, Orrescians, Laiaians, Bislatai and Getas, king of Edonians.[48]

The prevailing opinion is that the coinages of the Macedonian kings drew, both regarding the choice of denominations and the motifs the coins bore, from the issues of the neighbouring *ethne* and Greek cities. For instance, the motif of a man leading a horse can be found both on the coinage of Alexander and the Bisaltai, Edones and Mosess. Its choice was probably related to the coin's denomination and it was meant to facilitate trade or the funding of joint military operations.[49] The helmets on coins of Alexander and the Thracian tribes also suggest cooperation between them, interpreted as a military alliance or shared use of the mint.[50]

The motifs which appear on Alexander's coinages were selected from among already-existing types. Even if the decisions to choose them were dictated mainly by practical reasons, specific types always carried a symbolic meaning. A horseman wearing a *petasos* is one of the most consistently used motifs in the coinage of the Argeadae.[51] As a motif appearing on the coinages of the Thraco-Macedonian tribes, it was interpreted as an image of the Thracian hero Rhesos and seems to be linked to the Thracian Rider, well-attested in the later period.[52] Newer research shows that the horseman motif was borrowed from Poteidaia and Sermylia, Greek cities on the Chalkidic peninsula (Pl. 1, Fig. 6). Coins of the latter city bear a horseman holding a spear over his head. A variant of this image also shows a dog between the horse's legs, similar to Alexander I's later coins.[53]

---

[48] KAGAN 1987: 21–25; PSOMA 1999: 273–282; IDEM 2015a: 173–175. For an opposite view, see KOSMIDOU 2011: 439–445.

[49] RAYMOND 1953: 43–44; KRAAY 1976: 140; LORBER 2000: 128–129; PSOMA 2000: 34–35; IDEM 2003: 236; IDEM 2015a: 174–175; KREMYDI 2011: 161–162.

[50] TAČEVA 1992: 66; KOSMIDOU 2011: 444–447.

[51] See PRESTIANNI-GIALLOMBARDO, TRIPODI 1996: 311–355.

[52] SVORONOS 1919: 102, 105–106; RAYMOND 1953: 43–46 and 57–59.

[53] PSOMA 2000: 25–27, nos. 3–4; HEINRICHS 2017: 82–83, Fig. 2.

The horseman motif was interpreted as an image of the king himself[54] or as a representation of attributes associated with kingship.[55] An interesting example is the image borne on the obverse of a tetrobol attributed to Alexander. The horseman seems to be resting his right hand on the hilt of a short sword attached to his side, which Johannes Heinrichs and Sabine Müller identified as a Persian *akinakes*. The horseman on this coin should be interpreted as a representation of Alexander himself, and the *akinakes* would emphasise his special relationship with the Persian king and the status he achieved.[56] However, on most coinages the horseman is equipped for hunting, not for fighting. It seems, therefore, that we are more likely dealing with a hunting scene, and this is what the images of lions on the reverses of some types may be alluding to. Much has been written about the significance of hunting for Macedonian kings and aristocracy, and the choice of this motif seems to fit well with the world of values they shared. If Alexander wanted to build his image and prestige through the motif placed on his coinages, then he was alluding not to his descent but to the values associated with hunting.[57]

The coinages of Perdiccas II, Alexander's son and heir, were much more modest. During his long reign, he only struck coinages of low denominations, tetrobols and obols. They bore images which had appeared on his father's coins, although in a smaller selection. On light tetrobols, he placed a horse on the obverse and a crested helmet on the reverse. On the heavy tetrobols, he placed a horseman in a *petasos* holding two spears on the obverse and a lion's *protome* on the reverse (Pl. 1, Fig. 7).[58] From the point of view of our reflections, what is important is that Perdiccas II stuck to the same motifs throughout the forty years of his rule. This was despite the fact that during that time he changed alliances many times and became involved in various political projects.

The regal coinages became richer and more diverse again during the reign of Archelaos, who was the first to consistently put his name on all coinages. Apart from smaller denominations, he started to issue staters again, although they were slightly lighter than Alexander's. For the first group, probably struck at the beginning of his reign, he used the motifs from his grandfather's coins: a horseman on the obverse and a male goat's forepart on the reverse. On the second series of staters, he placed a young man's head with a headband (*tainia*) and a standing horse, respectively

[54] HAMMOND 1979: 46; BORZA 1990: 130.

[55] PICARD 1986: 75; GREENWALT 1993: 516–518; IDEM 2015: 346–348; WESTERMARK 1993: 20; FRANKS 2012: 41–45.

[56] HEINRICHS and MÜLLER 2008: 283–309.

[57] PSOMA 2000: 27; FRANKS 2012: 36–43; CARNEY 2015: 265–282; MÜLLER 2016: 36–37; ALONSO TRONCOSO 2018: 140–147. One of the variants depicts a horseman with a long spear (HEINRICHS 2016: 77–87, Fig. 1).

[58] RAYMOND 1953: 149–163.

(Pl. 2, Fig. 8). On smaller denominations, he put the motif of a standing horse, and on the reverse a helmet or an eagle with turned head. On the smallest issues, for the first time in Macedonian coinages, there is an image of Herakles wearing a lion's scalp. Two types of this image can be distinguished, a bearded and clean--shaven Herakles. The reverses of these coins bear a club over a lion's or, in another variant, a wolf's head (Pl. 2, Fig. 9). An important innovation of the king was to put bronze coins into circulation. Contrary to earlier suggestions, this may have taken place as soon as in the first years of his reign. On their obverses he put a lion's mask facing, and on the reverses a bull's or a boar's forepart.[59] Archelaos' types of silver coinages were repeated by Areopos, who introduced his name on them. He also struck small silver coinages with Herakles on the obverse. However, for bronze coinages he introduced his own types. On their obverses, he consistently put the head of a young man wearing a *petasos*. The reverses bear a wolf's head and a boar's or a lion's forepart (Pl. 2. Fig. 10).[60] A stater of the type used by his predecessors (a young man's head with a *tainia* on the obverse and a horse on the reverse) bearing the king's name is attributed to Amyntas II. A series of bronze coins with a new type of obverse, the head of a young man without a headband or *petasos*, is also attributed to him. The obverse bears a helmet or a wolf's forepart or head.[61] Archelaos' successors used his motifs of silver coinages. At the same time, each of them introduced his own obverse for bronze coinages.[62] The examples of cities which were the first to introduce bronze coinages show a similar practice. Coinages were issued over a short period of time, and in the event that a new series needed to be minted, a new type was introduced.[63] Herakles, first put on coins by Archelaos, became the main motif in Amyntas III's issues. The king struck two series of staters. On the first one, he put the motif of a horseman in a *petasos* paired with a lion crushing a spear in his mouth. On the other series of coins, Herakles was depicted on the obverse and a standing horse on the reverse (Pl. 2, Fig. 11). The obverses of the other silver denominations and on bronze coins consistently bear Herakles' head, bearded or clean-shaven.[64]

The brief overview of the coinages of Alexander's successors presented above enables us to observe that it was not until Archelaos that the motifs of a young man wearing a *tainia* and of Herakles were introduced, which might be interpreted as

[59] WESTERMARK 1993: 17–22; PSOMA 2000: 25–30; KREMYDI 2011: 163–164; GATZOLIS 2013: 125.
[60] WESTERMARK 1993: 304, Pl. LXIX 12–18.
[61] *Ibidem*: 305, Pl. 19–23.
[62] *Ibidem*: 304–305.
[63] GATZOLIS 2013: 127.
[64] WESTERMARK 1993: 307, Pl. LXX 31–38.

the Argive origin propaganda.[65] In Kraay's opinion, the young man wearing a *tainia* on Archelaos' staters *may represent Perdiccas I, the semi-mythical founder of the Macedonian dynasty*.[66] Many shared his conclusions, while others proposed different possible interpretations: Herakles, Ares and Apollo. Ulla Westermark supported the latter identification in her studies on Archelaos' coinages. She noted that the image of a headband instead of a laurel wreath does not necessarily rule out the identification with Apollo. The motif of a young man's head recurred on coins of later Macedonian kings and in some of its variants on Philip II's coinages he appears in a laurel wreath. Archelaos' interest in the motif of Apollo may have been related to the new redaction of the dynastic myth done by Euripides, in which the hero Archelaos receives the order to found a city from the Delphic oracle.[67]

Although Westermark's opinion became widely accepted, there were also some arguments against it. First of all, it was pointed out that on the coinages of the Chalkidian League struck contemporaneously in Olynthos, Apollo's head was always depicted in a laurel wreath. Moreover, on the coinages of Chalkidic cities there are images of heads of hero-founders.[68] A tetradrachm of the city of Aineia, dated to c. 500 BC, bears the image of Aeneas, who was believed to be the city's founder, carrying his father. Smaller denominations bear the hero's head in a helmet and an inscription of his name.[69] In c. 480 BC the coinage from Skione bore a head wearing a helmet, with the inscription *Protesilaos* (Pl. 2, Fig. 12). According to the myth recorded by Conon, the hero survived the Trojan War and during his return journey home he reached land at Pallene and subsequently founded a city there. This late version of the myth is partially confirmed by Thucydides, who recorded that according to the inhabitants of Skione their city was founded by the Peloponnesians who had been washed up on the shore by a storm during their return from Troy.[70]

The coinages of Chalkidic cities Aineia and Skione bearing their mythical founders may have been used as models for the Macedonian regal coinages. It is worth noting that both cities were located near the heart of the Macedonian kingdom, situated on the other side of the Thermaic Gulf. Aineia also neighboured Anthemunt, which had close relations with king Amyntas already in the late 6th century (Hdt.5.94.1). It has been suggested that the hero wearing a *tainia*, introduced by Archelaos, was not necessarily the first representation of this type.

[65] BORZA 1990: 172–173; cf. MÜLLER 2016: 93–95.

[66] KRAAY 1976: 144, no. 505.

[67] WESTERMARK 1989: 303; EADEM 1993: 21.

[68] PSOMA 2000: 30–34; KREMYDI 2011: 163.

[69] KRAAY 1976: 134, no. 469; SNG Cop. 33; PSOMA 2000: 32, Figs. 12–13.

[70] KRAAY 1976: 134, no. 470; PSOMA 2000: 33, Figs.14–15. Myths of Skione: Thuc. 4.120.1; with commentary in HORNBLOWER 1996: 377–378; Conon BNJ F1.13 with commentary.

An obol attributed to Alexander I or Perdiccas II bears the head of a young man in a *petasos*, which according to Selene Psoma is also an image of a hero. Similar images later appeared on Aeropos' bronze coinages.[71] This interpretation becomes intriguing if we try to link the two types of images, *petasophoros* and *tainiophoros*, to two alternative dynastic traditions known from literary sources: the one about Perdiccas and the one about Karanos. Before we draw further conclusions from this observation, however, we must take note of other possible interpretations of the motif of a head in a *petasos*.

It has been pointed out that a similar motif appears on the coinage of the city of Ainos, far away from Macedonia. The *petasos* has a distinctly different shape, it does not have a wide brim and fits the head closely. The caduceus shown on the reverse of these coinages indicates that the figure on the obverse is Hermes. On this basis, it can be supposed that the *petasophoros* on Aeropos' coins may also be a representation of this god.[72] An image of a head wearing a *petasos* was also placed on a rare hemiobol attributed to Alexander I.[73] According to Heinrichs, the motif was borrowed from the coinage of the Thessalian city of Larissa. He pointed out the hemidrachms bearing the head of a man in a *petasos* on the obverse and a sandal on the reverse. The shoe is what allows us to link these images with the myth of Jason losing his sandal.[74] The validity of this interpretation largely depends on what chronology of Thessalian coinage is accepted; what matters for the purpose of our reflections is that if the figure on the coin is Jason, its choice had nothing to do with the Macedonian dynastic myth.[75] A head in a *petasos* on silver coinage can also be interpreted only as a motif used for small denominations, repeating a fragment of the motif placed on large denominations. In this case, this would be a fragment of the image of a horseman in a *petasos* placed on terobols.[76]

The images of the Illyrian helmet, which were placed on the coins of Alexander and his successors, also became the subject of discussion. This type of helmet was probably invented in the Peloponnese and later became popular in Macedonia. According to Aliki Moustaka, the choice of the crested helmet was a clear reference to the Argive origin of the dynasty.[77] Elpida Kosmidou doubts that the Argive origins of the Illyrian helmet on royal coins were legible to users of these coins.

[71] RAYMOND 1953: 124, 135, Pls. IXd, XIb; PSOMA 2000: 30–31, Fig. 10.

[72] WESTERMARK 1989: 304–305, Pl. LXIX: 15–18.

[73] HEINRICHS 2017: 81, no. 1.2b.

[74] SNG Cop. 89; MOUSTAKA 1983: 69–70, no. 172, Pl. 4.

[75] HEINRICHS 2017: 87–91. Cf. KAGAN 2004: 79–86; LORBER 2008: 122; HOOVER 2014: 134–135, nos. 393–407.

[76] RAYMOND 1953: 124; LIAMPI 1996: 118; GATZOLIS 2013: 119.

[77] MOUSTAKA 2000: 393–410.

In her opinion, the symbol should be interpreted as a reference to the armed forces.[78] Tiverios noticed that some coins had a helmeted head, which, by analogy to the aforementioned Skione and Ainos coins, he interpreted as the image of Karanos, the mythical ancestor of the royal family. In his opinion, this identification is supported by the fact that there are similarities between the name of Karanos and the word helmet (kranos). The image of the helmet could therefore serve as a canting badge.[79]

Coins with the image of Herakles' head are the most interesting. The motif first appears on the obverses of small silver coins struck by Archelaos. The hero is shown bearded in one variant and clean-shaven in other variants, but the correct identification is confirmed by a lion's scalp. On the reverses of these coins we see a club placed over a wolf's head, or in a different variant – a lion's head.[80] A similar representation appears on the coinages of later rulers, from Archelaos to Perdiccas III.[81]

The motif of Herakles seems to be the least ambiguous reference to the tradition of the Macedonian kings' origin.[82] In some descriptions, the term *Herakles Patroos* is even applied, using the divine epithet known from an inscription found in the ruins of the royal palace at Vergina.[83] According to W. Greenwalt, the motif took on a special significance for Amyntas III, who in choosing it alluded both to Archelaos, who used it first, and to Herakles as the progenitor of the dynasty. Emphasising his dynastic connections in this way, he wanted to strengthen his claim to the throne using his Argive credentials.[84] The link between representations of Herakles and the dynastic tradition is also supported by the fact that the known myths about Herakles' expeditions and exploits are related to places outside Macedonia. In other words, in Macedonia there is a lack of myths such as the one about Abderos, Herakles' companion and founder of Abdera.[85]

The image of a wolf on the reverse of the coins with Herakles was also associated with the dynastic myth. The animal's forepart is depicted on them, next to a club. This type of representation is very well-known from Argive coinages. In that case it is interpreted as an allusion to the cult of Apollo Lykeios and the myth about

[78] KOSMIDOU 2013: 15–27.

[79] TIVERIOS 2018: 195–212.

[80] WESTERMARK 1989: 304, Pl. LXIX 6–8.

[81] PRICE 1974: 24, Pl. X.50. Raymond (1953: 60, 126, 164, Tabl. XIf.) attributes to Perdiccas II a diobol with an image of Herakles' head on the obverse and a reverse with a club and bow in incuse square, as well as the legend PER. Cf. HEAD 1911: 220. But Kraay (1976: 145 n. 1) attributed it to Perdiccas III, as did Westermark (1989: 309, n. 56).

[82] KRAAY 1976: 145; FRANKS 2012: 45.

[83] LIAMPI 2010: 63–79; KREMYDI 2011: 163–164; KOTTARIDI 2011: 8–9, Figs. 8, 11. Cf. HEAD 1911: 193–195.

[84] GREENWALT 1993: 514.

[85] RAYMOND 1953: 60.

Danaos. Since a wolf rarely appears on Greek coinages, it has been assumed that this is a deliberate borrowing of the motif from Argos, as the homeland of the dynasty's founder (Pl. 2, Fig. 13).[86] However, it is worth noting that the motif also appears on the coinages of Macedonian neighbours. A wolf's *protome* appears on the obverse of an obol minted in c. mid-5th century by the Perrhaiboi (Pl. 2, Fig. 14) and on later coins of the Thessalian city of Phaloria.[87] Both in the case of the Perrhaiboi's and Phaloria's coins it would be difficult to find reasons why the wolf motif might indicate their special connection to Argos. It seems much more likely that the wolf and the lion appear on the reverses of Macedonian coinages with Herakles due to their association with hunting. Equally as likely, Herakles on Archelaos' coinages could have been referred to as the Hunter – Herakles Kynagidas, known only from a slightly later inscription from Beroia.[88]

Although Archelaos introduced new motifs on his coinages, the grounds for interpreting them as *the Argive origin propaganda* are not very strong. It should also be added that in the case of pre-Hellenistic coins there are doubts to what extent the choice of images placed on them was motivated by the desire to achieve a political or propaganda goal.[89]

IV

The conclusions drawn from the above reflections cannot be definitive. The coinage of the first historical Macedonian kings do not support the theory that Alexander I and his immediate successors were particularly interested in promoting a tradition about their family's origin. It seems that there is sufficient evidence to propose an alternative view on the circumstances in which the Macedonian dynastic tradition was born. If anything, they indicate that if he was indeed building a positive image of himself, it was through referring to symbols and values which were already highly valued by both the Macedonians and their neighbours.[90] This contrasts the idea of foreign origin, which stresses pointing out differences between the dynasty and its environment. The idea is, on the other hand, very strongly stressed in Herodotus' and Thucydides' texts. We might therefore wonder whether in their case we are not dealing with a particular point of view, perhaps present in Athens, but not necessarily corresponding with the viewpoint of the Macedonian kings. They

[86] KRAAY 1976: 96, no. 287.

[87] Perrhaiboi: LIAMPI 1996: 110, no. 6; Triton XV, no. 538. Phaloria: Trtion XV, no. 595; ROGERS 1932: 150, no. 459.

[88] PSOMA 2000: 27; ALONSO TRONCOSO 2018: 145. For the meaning of the lion see FRANKE 1952/1953: 107; RAYMOND 1953: 46, 60; cf.: 140, no. 500; BORZA 1990: 130, n. 74.

[89] Cf. FISCHER-BOSSERT 2018: 133–141.

[90] See PRESTIANNI-GIALLOMBARDO, TRIPODI 1996, 327–328.

did not necessarily have to be obsessed with proving their Greek descent. As Borza noticed *it was not recognition as a Hellene that Archelaus wanted, but respect*.[91]

It is worth noting, however, that something certainly happened during Archelaos' rule, when he came into very close contact with the Athenians and opened up to new aspects of Greek culture. Towards the end of his reign, Alexander I may have been perceived by the Athenians as a ruler at whose expense they could get rich. Perdiccas was a useful, although volatile, ally who needed to be called to order. Archelaos, on the other hand, was seen as an indispensable ally, who should be courted. As Hammond noted, this change of attitude is illustrated well by the tone of two Athenian inscriptions of 415 and 407/6 BC. In the former, the Athenians oblige Perdiccas to sell oars only to them. In the latter, they thank Archelaos for supplies and help with building ships, calling him and his descendants *proxenoi* and *euergetai* (*IG* I^2. 71 and 105). Archelaos became a popular figure because the entire state took advantage of his generosity when, after losing many allies, it was forced to continue an exhausting war. Individual citizens also sought favour with him and could count on being well received. Andokides (2.11) mentions that he received from him the right to fell trees and supply oars, which must have taken place in 411 BC at the latest. Artists and poets also sought favour with the king and were well received at his court.[92] In this atmosphere, Thucydides (2.100.2) wrote a short praise of his rule and Euripides created *Archelaos*. It cannot be excluded that Herodotus also stayed at his court, gathering materials for his work. Perhaps it was at that time that Archelaos was fed myths and genealogical connections linking his family to Greek tradition. It was a form of flattery, but it might have been based on the findings of Greek genealogists. To Thucydides (5.80.2), the origin of the royal family of Argos must have already been *the clear truth* which served him to explain the reasons behind Perdiccas breaking the alliance with Athens.[93] We do not know what evidence Thucydides trusted. Going by his own declarations (1.21–22), it is difficult to believe that this was bragging on the part of the royal family. It is worth noting that at the same time Hellanikos, who was also supposedly a guest at the royal court, in his *Priestesses at Argos* presented a different genealogy of Makedon than the one in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. He derived him not from Thyia, Deukalion's daughter, but from Aiolos, Hellen's son. In this way, he established a direct genealogical connection between Makedon and the eponymous ancestor of

[91] BORZA 1990: 176–177.

[92] HAMMOND 1979: 138–139; BORZA 1990: 171–177; GREENWALT 2003: 138–139; ROISMAN 2010: 154–158; HATZOPOULOS 2011: 58–60; HECHT 2017: 182–191. Plato (*Gorg.* 470d–471d) recorded a more negative image of Archelaos.

[93] HORNBLOWER 1996: 70–71.

the Hellenes (Hellanikos BNJ 4 F 74 with commentary of F. Pownall).[94] Thucydides (1.97) rejected Hellanikos' chronological achievement, but *Priestesses at Argos* may have had an impact on the creation of a genealogy connecting Macedonian kings with the Temenidae of Argos. For Thucydides (2.99), reasoning based on a similarity of names could also play an important role, as evidenced by his picture of the formation of the Macedonian kingdom.[95]

Philip II enjoyed similar interest in Athens after 346 BC. It was at that time that Athenian intellectuals were in a way competing for providing the Macedonian king with ideas of how to conduct politics and with arguments for legitimising it based on his descent from Herakles.[96] If such a phenomenon took place during Archelaos' reign, perhaps in a short period of time different versions of myths proving his Hellenic roots were created.[97] Herodotus could have recorded a version which adapted the existing Macedonian myths by linking Perdiccas and his brothers to Argos. At the same time, he skilfully combined this story with the figure of Alexander I, Archelaos' great ancestor. Euripides proposed his own, more developed version of the myth. Perhaps the version with Karanos was born around the same time, which for one reason or another became the most popular one.

The Greek authors presented the Macedonian ruler with versions of the mythical past of his family linked to Greek tradition, similarly to Dionysius of Halicarnassus later proving the Trojan past of the Romans.[98] The almost simultaneous emergence of several variants of the myth would go towards explaining why we know of as many as three founders of the Macedonian state. In the first redactions of the myth, Herakles did not play a very important role and the interest in him as the progenitor of the Macedonian kings did not grow until the 4th century BC. In the 340s BC it remained a poorly investigated topic, which gave the Athenian writers an opportunity to show their inventiveness to Philip II. Although the kings probably had no reason to reject the new versions of myths about their family, there is not much to indicate that they attached particular importance to them, at least not until the times of Alexander the Great.[99]

[94] ENGELS 2010: 90; FOWLER 2013: 155–157. For Hellanikos see also MÖLLER 2001: 241–262.

[95] SPRAWSKI 2010: 132–134; CORCELLA 2006: 41 – *those who first traced the name of the Persians back to Perseus, or postulated a migration of Teucrians from Crete to Troy by observing that the same name, Ide, occurred in both places, were probably persuaded they had* discovered *historical truths – not unlike today's scholars when they argue about Ahhiyawa and Achaeans, or about river-names attested in different areas.* Cf. FOWLER 1996: 72–73.

[96] MARKLE 1976: 80–99; SQUILLACE 2004: 43–48; MOLONEY 2015: 63–72.

[97] Badian (1982, 34) suggested that alternative versions of the myth were already created during the reign of Alexander I: *as might be expected, it was by no means the only version. Flatterers accepting the king's hospitality might extend the pedigree to Temenus himself.*

[98] See ERSKINE 2001: 23–26.

[99] Cf. HUTTNER 1997: 65–85.

ABBREVIATIONS

BNJ = I. WORTHINGTON (ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby,* Jacoby Online 2006–.
IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin 1903–.
SNG Cop. = *Sylloge Numorum Graecorum Copenhagen: The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals,* Danish National Museum, Copenhagen 1942–1979.
TrGF = B. SNELL, R. KANNICHT and S. RADT (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vols. I–VI, Göttingen 1971–2004.

REFERENCES

ALONSO TRONCOSO, V. 2018. "The Animal Types on the Argead Coinage, Wilderness and Macedonia". In. T. HOWE and F. POWNALL (eds.), *Ancient Macedonians in the Greek and Roman Sources. From History to Historiography*, Swansea: 137–162.
ASIRVATHAM, S.R. 2010. "Perspectives on the Macedonians from Greece, Rome, and Beyond". In. J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Chichester: 99–124. DOI: 10.1002/9781444327519.ch6
BADIAN, E. 1982. "Greeks and Macedonians", *Studies in the History of Art* 10: *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*: 33–51.
BADIAN, E. 1994. "Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: a Study in Some Subtle Silences". In. S. HORNBLOWER (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford: 107–130.
BARAGWANATH, E. 2008. *Motivation and Narrative in Herodotus*, Oxford. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199231294.001.0001
BORZA, E. 1982. "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House", *Hesperia. Supplement* 19: 7–13. DOI: 10.2307/1353964
BORZA, E. 1990. *In the shadow of Olympus. The emergence of Macedon*, Princeton.
BUDELMANN, F. 2012. "Epinician and the symposion: a comparison with the encomia". In. P. AGÓCS, CH. CAREY and R. RAWLES (eds.), *Reading the Victory Ode*, Cambridge: 173–190. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139017626.014
CARNEY, E.D. 2015. *King and Court in Ancient Macedonia: Rivalry, Treason and Conspiracy*, Swansea.
COLE, J.W. 1978. "Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles", *AC* 47: 37–49.
CORCELLA, A. 2006. "The New Genre and its Boundaries: Poets and Logographers". In. A. RENGAKOS and A. TSAKMAKIS (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, Leiden: 33–56. DOI: 10.1163/9789047404842_003
DASCALAKIS, A. 1965. *The Hellenism of Ancient Macedonians*, Thessaloniki.
DESPINI, A. 2009. "Gold Funerary Masks", *AntK* 52: 20–65.
DI GREGORIO, L. 1988. "L'Archelao di Euripide: tentativo di reconstruzione", *Aevum* 62: 16–49.
ENGELS, J. 2010. "Macedonians and Greeks". In. J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Chichester: 81–98. DOI: 10.1002/9781444327519.ch5
ERSKINE, A. 2001. *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford.
FEARN, D. 2006. *Bacchylides. Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199215508.001.0001
FEARN, D. 2007. "Narrating ambiguity: murder and Macedonian allegiance (5.17–22)". In E. IRWIN and E. GREENWOOD (eds.), *Reading Herodotus. A Study of the* logoi *in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories*, Cambridge: 98–127. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511482205.004
FISCHER-BOSSERT, W. 2007. "Die Ziegen von Aiagai", *SNR* 86: 23–27.

FISCHER-BOSSERT, W. 2018. “Imitations and Remodelings of Sicilian Coin Types: Fashion or Politics?”. In. P. IOSSIF, F. de CALLATAŸ and P. VEYMIERS (eds.), *TYΠOI. Greek and Roman Coins Seen Through Their Images: Noble Issuers, Humble Users?*, Liège: 133–141.
FOWLER, R.L. 1996. “Herodotos and His Contemporaries”, *JHS* 116: 62–87. DOI: 10.2307/631956
FOWLER, R.L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 2: *Commentary*, Oxford.
FRANKE, P.R. 1952/1953. „Geschichte, Politik und Münzprägung im frühen Makedonien”, *JNG* 3/4: 99–111.
FRANKS, H.M. 2012. *Hunters, heroes, kings. The Frieze of Tomb II at Vergina*, Princeton.
GATZOLIS, CH. 2013. “New evidences on the beginning of bronze coinage in northern Greece”. In. C. GRANDJEAN and A. MOUSTAKA (eds.), *Aux origines de la monnaie fiduciaire. Traditions métallurgiques et innovations numismatiques*, Bordeaux: 117–128.
GIANGIULIO, M. 2001. “Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writting of History. The Case of Cyrene”. In. N. LURAGHI (ed.), *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford: 116–137.
GREENWALT, W.S. 1985. “The Introduction of Caranus into the Argead King List”, *GRBS* 26: 43–49.
GREENWALT, W.S. 1986. “Herodotus and the Foundation of Argead Macedonia”, *Ancient World* 13: 117–122.
GREENWALT, W.S. 1993. “The Iconographical Significance of Amyntas III’s Mounted Rider”, *Ancient Macedonia* 5: 509–518.
GREENWALT, W.S. 2003. “Archelaus the Philhellene”, *Ancient World* 34: 131–153.
GREENWALT, W.S. 2015. “Thracian and Macedonian Kingship”. In. J. VALEVA, E. NANKOV and D. GRANINGER (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Malden–Oxford: 338–351. DOI: 10.1002/9781118878248.ch22
HAMMOND, N.G.L. 1979. “The Development of the Macedonian State and the Struggle for Survival”. In. N.G.L. HAMMOND and G.T. GRIFFITH (eds.), *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II: *550–336 B.C.*, Oxford: 3–200.
HATZOPOULOS, M.B. 2003. “Herodotos (8.137–8), the Manumission from Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley”. In. P. DEROW and R. PARKER (eds.), *Herodotus and his World. Essays from Conference in Memory of George Forrest*, Oxford: 203–218. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199253746.003.0012
HATZOPOULOS, M.B. 2011. “Macedonians and other Greeks”. In. R.J. LANE FOX (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC–300 AD*, Leiden–Boston: 51–78. DOI: 10.1163/9789004209237_005
HEAD, B.V. 1911. *Historia Numorum. A Manual of Greek Numismatics*, London.
HECHT, CH. 2017. *Zwischen Athen und Alexandria. Dichter und Künstler beim makedonischen König Archelaos*, Wiesbaden.
HEINRICHS, J. 2017. “Coins and Constructions. The Origins of Argead Coinage under Alexander I”. In. S. MÜLLER et AL (eds.), *The History of the Argeads. New Perspectives*, Classica et Orientalia 19, Wiesbaden: 79–98. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctvbcd2nw.9
HEINRICHS, J. and MÜLLER, S. 2008. “Ein Persisches Statussymbol auf Münzen Alexanders I. von Makedonien: Ikonographie und Historischer Hintergrund des Tetrobols SNG ABC, Macedonia I, 7 und 11”, *ZPE* 167: 283–309.
HOOVER, O.D. 2014. *Handbook of Coins of Northern and Central Greece: Achaia Phthiotis, Ainis, Magnesia, Malis, Oita, Perrhaibia, Thessaly, Akarnania, Aitolia, Lokris, Phokis, Boiotia, Euboia, Attica, Megaris, and Corinthia, Sixth to First Centuries BC*, Lancaster.
HORNBLOWER, S. 1996. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 2: *Books IV–V.24*, Oxford.
HUTTNER, U. 1997. *Die politische Rolle der Heraklesgestalt im griechischen Herrschertum*, Stuttgart.

IRWIN, E. 2013. "'The *hybris* of Theseus' and the date of the Histories". In. K. RUFFING and B. DUNSCH (eds.), *Source References in Herodotus – Herodotus' Sources: Conference in memoriam Detlev Fehling*, Classica et Orientalia, Wiesbaden: 7–93.
JOSIFOVSKI, P. 2006. "The Beginnings of Minting Among the Paeonians (Derrones)", *Folia Archaeologica Balkanica* 1: 251–262.
KAGAN, J.H. 1987. "The Decadrachm Hoard: Chronology and Consequences". In. I. CARRADICE (ed.), *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires*, BAR International Series 343, Oxford: 21–28.
KAGAN, J.H. 2004. "The So-called Persian Weight Coins of Larissa". In. M. OIKONOMIDES (ed.), *Coins in the Thessalian Region: Mints, Circulation, Iconography, History Ancient, Byzantine, Modern. Proceedings of the Third Scientific Meeting*, *Obolos* 7, Athens: 79–86.
KANAVOU, N. 2015. *The Names of Homeric Heroes: Problems and Interpretations*, Sozomena 15, Berlin–Boston. DOI: 10.1515/9783110421972
KERTÉSZ, I. 2005. "When Did Alexander I Visit Olympia", *Niekephoros* 18: 115–126.
KING, C.J. 2010. "Macedonian Kingship and Other Political Institutions". In. J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Chichester: 371–391. DOI: 10.1002/9781444327519.ch18
KOSMIDOU, E. 2011. "Macedonian and Thracian relations in northern Greece after the Persian wars with particular reference to the coinage and politics of Alexander I". In. *Travaux de symposium international le livre. La Roumanie. L'Europe. Troisième edition – 20 à 24 Septembre 2010, La quartième section – latinité orientale*, Bucarest: 439–452.
KOSMIDOU, E. 2013. "Further thoughts on the coinage and politics of Alexander I". In. A. RUFIN SOLAS (ed.), *Armées grecques et romaines dans le nord des Balkans*, Akanthina 7, Gdańsk–Toruń: 15–27.
KOTTARIDI, A. 2011. "The Legend of Macedon: a Hellenic Kingdom in the Age of Democracy". In. I. GALANAKIS and D. McCARTHY (eds.), *Heracles to Alexander the Great. Treasures from the Royal Capital of Macedon, a Hellenic Kingdom in the Age of Democracy*, Greece 17. Ephoreia Proïstorikōn kai Klasikōn Archaiotētōn, Oxford: 1–24.
KRAAY, C.M. 1976. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, London.
KREMYDI, S. 2011. "Coinage and Finance". In. R.J. LANE FOX (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC–300 AD*, Leiden–Boston: 159–178. DOI: 10.1163/9789004209237_010
LIAMPI, K. 1996. „Das Corpus der Obolen und Hemiobolen des Thessalischen Bundes und die politische Geschichte Thessaliens im 2. Viertel des 5. Jahrhunerts v. Chr.". In. W. LESCHHORN, A.V.B. MIRON and A. MIRON (eds.), *Hellas und der Griechische Osten. Festschrift für Peter Robert Franke zum 70. Geburtstag. Studien zur Geschichte und Numismatik der griechischen Welt*, Saarbrücken: 99–126.
LIAMPI, K. 2010. "Macedonia until the time of Philip II". In C. ZACHOS, K. LIAMPI and D. TSANGARI (eds.) *Alexander the Great – From Macedonia to the Edge of the World*, Athens: 53–79.
LORBER, C.C. 2000. "The goats of 'Aigai'". In. S. HURTER and C. ARNOLD-BIUCCHI (eds.), *Pour Denyse: Divertissements numismatiques*, Bern: 113–133.
LORBER, C.C. 2008. "Thessalian Hoards and the Coinage of Larissa", *AJN* 20: 119–142.
LURAGHI, N. 2001. "Local Knowledge in Herodotus' Histories". In. N. LURAGHI (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford: 138–160.
MACURDY, G.H. 1919. "The North Greek Affiliations of Certain Groups of Trojan Names", *JHS* 39: 62–68. DOI: 10.2307/624870
MALKIN, I. 1998. *The returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity*, Berkeley.
MALLIOS, G. 2011. Μύθος και Ιστορία. Η περίπτωση της Αρχαίας Μακεδονίας, Thessaloniki.

MARI, M. 2002. *Al di là dell'Olimpo: Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo ellenismo*, Melethmata 34, Athens–Paris.
MARKLE, M. III. 1976. "Support of Athenian Intellectuals for Philip. A Study of Isocrates' Philippus and Speusippus' Letter to Philip", *JHS* 96: 80–99. DOI: 10.2307/631225
MOLONEY, E. 2015. "Neither Agamemnon nor Theristes, Achilles nor Margites: The Heraclid Kings of Ancient Macedon", *Antichtion* 49: 50–72. DOI: 10.1017/ann.2015.2
MÖLLER, A. 2001. "The Beginnings of Chronography: Hellanicus' *Hiereiai*". In. N. LURAGHI (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford: 241–262.
MOUSTAKA, A. 1983. *Kulte und Mythen auf Thessalischen Münzen*, Beiträge zur Archäologie 15, Würzburg.
MOUSTAKA, A. 2000. "Πελοπόννησος και Μακεδονία. Παρατηρήσεις στα λεγόμενα κράνη Ιλλυρικού τύπου". In. P. ADAEM-VELANI (ed.), *Μύρτος. Μελέτες στη μνήμη της Ιουλίας Βοκοτοπούλου*, Thessaloniki: 393–410.
MÜLLER, S. 2016. *Die Argeaden. Geschichte Makedoniens bis zum Zeitalter Alexander des Großen*, Paderborn. DOI: 10.30965/9783657777686
PATTERSON, L.E. 2010. *Kinship myth in ancient Greece*, Austin.
PICARD, O. 1986. "Numismatique et iconographie: le cavalier macédonien", *Iconographie classique et identités régionales* (*BCH* Suppl. 14). Paris: 67–76.
PICARD, O. 1995. "Les monnaies au bouc attribuées à Aigai", *BSFN* 50: 1071–1075.
PRESTIANNI-GIALOMBARDO, A.M. and TRIPODI, B. 1996. "Iconografia Monetale e Ideologia Reale Macedone: I tipi del cavaliere nella monetazione di Alessandro I e di Filippo II", *REA* 98: 311–355.
PRICE, M.J. 1974. *Coins of the Macedonians*, London.
PSOMA, S. 1999. "Monnaies de poids réduit d'Alexandre I et de Perdiccas II de Macédoine", *ZPE* 128: 273–282.
PSOMA, S. 2000. "Το βασίλειο των Μακεδόνων. Νομισματική και Ιστορική Προσέγγιση". In Η Ιστορική Διαδρομή της Νομισματικής Μονάδας στην Ελλάδα, Athens: 25–46.
PSOMA, S. 2003. "Les 'boucs' de la Grèce du Nord. Problèmes d'attribution", *RN* 159: 227–242. DOI: 10.3406/numi.2003.2513
PSOMA, S. 2015a. "Did the So-called Thraco-Macedonian Standard Exist?". In. U. WARTENBERG and M. AMANDRY (eds.), *KAIROΣ. Contributions to Numismatics in Honour of Basil Demetriadi*, New York: 167–190.
PSOMA, S. 2015b. "Naming the Argeads", *Ktema 40:* 15–26.
RAYMOND, D. 1953. *Macedonian Regal Coinage to 413 BC*, Numismatic Notes and Monographs 126, New York.
ROGERS, E. 1932. *The Copper Coinage of Thessaly*, London.
ROISMAN, J. 2010. "Classical Macedonia to Perdiccas III". In. J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Chichester: 145–165. DOI: 10.1002/9781444327519.ch8
ROSEN, K. 1978. „Die Gründung der makedonischen Herrschaft", *Chiron* 8: 1–27.
SCODEL, R. 2017. "The Euripidean Biography". In. L.K. McCLURE (ed.), *A Companion to Euripides*, Chichester: 27–41. DOI: 10.1002/9781119257530.ch3
SARIPANIDI, V. 2017. "Constructing Continuities with a "Heroic" Past: Death, Feasting and Political Ideology in the Archaic Macedonian Kingdom". In. A. TSINGARIDA and I.S. LEMOS (eds.), *Constructing Social Identities in Early Iron Age and Archaic Greece*, Études d'archéologie 12, Bruxelles: 73–135.
SPRAWSKI, S. 2010. "The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I". In. J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Chichester: 127–144. DOI: 10.1002/9781444327519.ch7

SQUILLACE, G. 2004. *Βασιλεῖς ἢ τύραννοι: Filippo II e Alessandro Magno tra opposisione e consenso*, Soveria Mannelli.
STEWART, E. 2017. *Greek Tragedy on the Move: The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form c. 500–300 BC*, Oxford. DOI:10.1093/oso/9780198747260.001.0001
SVORONOS, J.N. 1919. *L'Hellénisme primitif de la Macédoine prouvé par la Numismatique et l'Or du Pangee*, Paris.
TAČEVA, M. 1992. "On the Problems of the Coinages of Alexander I Sparadokos and the So-called Thracian-Macedonian Tribes", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 41 (1): 58–74.
TRIPODI, B. 1993. "Tipologia e ideologia di Perdicca, il primo 'fondatore' della regalità macedone", *Ancient Macedonia* IV: 1623–1630.
TIVERIOS, M. 2018. "Κάρανος, ο γενάρχης της μακεδονικής βασιλικής δυναστείας. Η νομισματική μαρτυρία", *AE* 158: 195–212.
VASILEV, M.I. 2016. "The Date of Herodotus' Visit to Macedonia", *AWE* 15: 31–51.
DOI: 10.2143/AWE.15.0.3167460
WATHELET, P. 1988. *Dictionnaire des Troyens de l'Iliade*, Liège.
WESTERMARK, U. 1989. "Remarks on the Regal Macedonian Coinage ca. 413–359 BC". In. G. LE RIDER (ed.), *Numismatic Studies in Memory of C.M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm*, Louvain--la-Neuve: 301–315.
WESTERMARK, U. 1993. "The Staters of Archelaus*:* a Die Study". In. M.J. PRICE, A. BURNETT and R. BLAND (eds.), *Essays in Honour of Robert Carson and Kenneth Jenkins*, London: 17–30.
ZAHRNT, M. 1984. "Die Entwicklung des makedonischen Reiches bis zu den Perserkriegen", *Chiron* 14: 325–368.

Translation: Anna Sosenko

Author's address:

Sławomir Sprawski
Jagiellonian University, Institute of History
13 Gołębia Street, 31-007 Kraków, Poland
slawomir.sprawski@uj.edu.pl

PLATE 1

Fig.1. Aigai, AR, stater; 510–490 BC
Photo: © American Numismatic Society; http://numismatics.org/collection/1967.152.181

Fig. 2. Alexander I (498–454 BC), AR, octadrachm; Aigai 498 BC
Photo: © American Numismatic Society; http://numismatics.org/collection/2011.21.539?lang=pl

Fig. 3. Alexander I (498–454 BC), AR, light tetrobol; Aigai, 480/479–477/476 BC
Photo: CNG 82, Lot: 403 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=146859

Fig. 4. Galepsos, Æ, unit; c. 360/359–357 BC
Photo: CNG 397, Lot: 50 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=335812

Fig. 5. Edones, Getas, AR, oktadrachm; c. 492–464 BC
Photo: Triton XXIV, Lot: 434 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Lot.aspx?LOT_ID=24787

Fig. 6. Sermylia, AR, tetrobol; c. 480–450 BC
Photo: CNG © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=22883

Fig. 7. Perdiccas II (451–413 BC), AR, heavy tetrobol; c. 437/436–432/431 BC
Photo: CNG © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=59681

PLATE 2

Fig. 8. Archelaos (413–400/399 BC), AR, stater; Aigai, Group II, Series 2
Photo: CNG Electronic Auction 482, Lot: 69 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Lot.aspx?LOT_ID=25883

Fig. 9. Archelaos (413–400/399 BC), AR triobol, Aigai
Photo: CNG Electronic Auction 487, Lot: 99 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Lot.aspx?LOT_ID=31269

Fig. 10. Amyntas II (395/394–393 BC), Æ, dichalkon; Aigai or Pella
Photo: CNG 82, Lot: 408 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=146864

Fig. 11. Amyntas III (393–370/369 BC), AR, stater; Aigai
Photo: CNG © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=77877

Fig. 12. Skione, AR, tetradrachm; c. 480–470 BC
Photo: Triton VI, Lot: 142 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=27254

Fig. 13. Argos, AR, triobol – hemidrachm; c. 330–270 BC
Photo: CNG 448, Lot: 112 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=385512

Fig. 14. Perrhaiboi, AR, obol; c. 462/461–460 BC
Photo: Nomos 8, Lot: 136 © cngcoins.com; https://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=243795


1


2


3


4


5


6


7


8


9


10


11


12


13


14