

VOJISLAV SARAKINSKI  
Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje  
sarakinski@gmail.com

UDC: 94(381)''-05''  
929.731(381:=163.3)(091)

STEFAN PANOVSKI  
Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje  
panovski@fzf.ukim.edu.mk

## ΑΡΓΕΑΔΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΜΕΝΟΥ. THE TEMENIDAE / ARGEADAE DICHOTOMY REVISITED

*Abstract.* – The earliest sources on the kingdom of Macedon refer to its royal house as the Temenidae. Through this name, the Macedonian kings allegedly claimed descent from the royal line of Argos, i.e., they claimed the right to be recognized as descendants of Temenus, and through him of Hercules himself. Other ancient authors, as well as later lexicographers, refer to the Macedonian royal house as the Argeadae. There were two different explanations for this name even in ancient times: some interpreted it as an indication of the origin of the royal house from Argos Orestikon, a place in Orestis; others thought it was a patronymic, i.e. that it pointed to a descent from a mythical ancestor, the hero Argaeus. A careful analysis of the sources, as well as the historical circumstances in which they mention the ruling house and its name, shows that these names and the corresponding myths were used erratically, with irregular frequency, within a specific narrative with a political goal, to the point that one might even dispute the Macedonian origin of some interpretations. Thus, it is possible that the Macedonian kings before Philip II did not perceive themselves as either Temenid or Argead, and that Philip and Alexander only made masterful political use of the said names and interpretations. The new Hellenistic dynasties did their best to link with the old one in various ways: the Antigonidae highlighted their kinship with Argos, the Ptolemies opted for Argaeus, the Seleucids for Temenus. An examination of these examples shows that the term “Argeadae” had no exactness in historical reminiscence. In Hellenistic times – and that is precisely the time when it appears in common use – “Argeadae” was a general term that referred to the kings of Macedonia. Thus, it would be unwarranted to replace the term Temenidae with another, equally gratuitous, which ultimately lays claim to the same legendary origin, and was first attested a considerable time later; on the contrary, the Temenidae should remain an integral part of the narrative on the Macedonian ruling house.

From the fifth century BC onward, ancient sources depict Hercules as the forefather of the Macedonian Temenid dynasty, opening the way for the Macedonian kings to join a long list of rulers that claimed

descent from the famous hero<sup>1</sup> – and, of course, the right to be called “Heraclid”.<sup>2</sup> We may safely assume that the Macedonian rulers, just as any other ruler in antiquity or today, did not, in fact, descend from mythical, imaginary heroes; the mention of Heracles – Pindar’s ἥρωσ θεός<sup>3</sup> – and claiming descent from Temenus may have been a key part of the self-presentation of the Macedonian kings, meaning it had clear political and practical goals. In what follows, we shall go through several political implications of the term “Temenidae” in order to check its intended audience and to assess whether its use should be dismissed, as many modern scholars usually do; we shall then apply the same scrutiny to the term “Argeadae”, and its first occurrences in the sources, which will help us understand its actual meaning and the aims of its use.

1. What was the assumed public – and, accordingly, the assumed purpose and advantage – of a Temenid origin for the Macedonian rulers?<sup>4</sup> We should emphasize right away that the Macedonian kings did not do anything new or particular. The Aleuadae, the Macedonian friends and allies from Larissa, also claimed descent from Heracles through their progenitor Aleuas Pyrrhus, himself an offspring of Thesalus, the son of Heracles and Chalciopie.<sup>5</sup> Herodotus mentions that the kings of Lydia, too, arose from a son of the legendary hero;<sup>6</sup> furthermore, one of the many sons that Heracles had among the barbarians

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 8.138: ποταμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ταύτῃ, τῷ θύουσι οἱ τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀπ’ Ἀργεὸς ἀπόγονοι σωτήρι· οὗτος, ἐπεὶ διεβήσαν οἱ Τημενίδαι, μέγας οὕτω ἐρρῆ ὥστε τοὺς ἱπέας μὴ οἴους τε γενέσθαι διαβῆναι., etc.; Thuc. 2.99: τὴν δὲ παρὰ θάλασσαν νῦν Μακεδονίαν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Περδίκκου πατὴρ καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῦ, Τημενίδαι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὄντες ἐξ Ἄργου, πρῶτοι ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἀναστήσαντες μάχῃ ἐκ μὲν Πιερίας Πίερας, etc.

<sup>2</sup> On the general ideological background and the political evolution of the “Heraclid ruler” type, v. Huttner 1997, 1–17; cf. Patterson 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Pind. *Nem.* 3.22.

<sup>4</sup> It has become something of a habit in modern scholarship to denounce the term “Temenidae” as a forgery that only served to emphasize the Greek origin of the house and, consequently, their right to participate in Greek politics; v. Nilsson 1951, 99 *sqq.*; Rosen 1978; Badian 1982; Borza 1982; Borza 1990, 82–83, with an overview of the arguments presented until then; Ξυδόπουλος 1998, who explicitly argues that the false tradition of a Temenid origin arose from the Macedonian palace itself, in order to emphasize its own Greekness; Sverkos 2007, 28–29; and, *de rigueur*, the excellent overview and analysis by Μάλλιος 2011. We see the evident peak of this attitude in Borza and his bold statement (1982, 12) that the Temenidae should disappear from Macedonian history – and, most probably, be replaced by the term “Argeadae”.

<sup>5</sup> Apollod. 2.7.8: Χαλκιοπίης δὲ τῆς Εὐρυπύλου Θετταλός, Ἐπικάστης τῆς Αὐγέου Θεσπάλου, Παρθενόπης τῆς Στυμφάλου Εὐήρης, etc. Cf. Strabo 9.5.23.

<sup>6</sup> Hdt. 1.7: παρὰ τούτων Ἡρακλεΐδαι ἐπιτραφέντες ἔσχον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ θεοπροπίου, ἐκ δούλης τε τῆς Ἰαρδάνου γεγονότες καὶ Ἡρακλέος, ἄρξαντες μὲν ἐπὶ δύο τε καὶ εἴκοσι γενεᾶς ἀνδρῶν ἕτα πέντε τε καὶ πεντακόσια, παῖς παρὰ πατρός ἐκδεκόμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν, μέγρι Κανδαύλω τοῦ Μύρσου. Cf. Burkert 1995, 142–145.

was the eponymous hero of the Scythians.<sup>7</sup> Yet, no Lydian king or Scythian ruler made the effort of declaring himself Greek, nor attempted to enter Greek politics on the grounds of a Heraclid ancestry. This contrast between the Thessalians on one hand, and the Lydians and the Scythians on the other, is a strong hint that Heraclid ancestry was not routinely associated with Greekness, nor did it automatically open the doors of Greek politics for the claimant.

Herodotus has Alexander's descent scrutinized and acknowledged by the Hellanodicae;<sup>8</sup> however, even here, things are hardly straightforward. Remijsen has shown that Alexander's participation in the Olympic Games would not have been a contentious issue before the Persian Wars, nor is there any evidence that the Hellanodicae were supposed to inspect the ancestry of the competitors; on the contrary, one could claim that, at that time, there were still no Hellanodicae at all.<sup>9</sup> The author goes on to argue that the entire scene with the quarrel and the request to prove his ancestry was invented by Alexander I himself, as the question of his ancestry became relevant after the Persian withdrawal. Regardless of whether we agree with her conclusions, Remijsen raises several important issues which indicate that the story of the inspection of Alexander's Argive ancestry should be taken with great caution, if not entirely dismissed.

Hammond is seemingly right in assuming that the purpose of this Heraclid descent was not to build relations with the Greeks, but rather to differentiate the Temenids from other Macedonians and their local ruling houses.<sup>10</sup> All ruling houses connected to famous figures from myth and legend made use of their ancestry as an indication of a certain "historical right" to prestige and power, especially with their own subjects.<sup>11</sup> A place in the line of Heracles made the members of the family worthy owners of the throne, unique among the Macedonians. Through Temenus, the great-great-grandson of Heracles and eponym of the dynasty, the mythical ancestor passed onto them his abilities

<sup>7</sup> Hdt 4.10: *καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν Σκύθεω τοῦ Ἡρακλέος γενέσθαι τοὺς αἰεὶ βασιλέας γινομένους Σκυθέων, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς φιάλης ἐτι καὶ ἐς τὸδε φιάλας ἐκ τῶν ζωστήρων φορέειν Σκύθας· τὸ δὴ μόνον μηχανήσασθαι τὴν μητέρα Σκύθη. ταῦτα δὲ Ἑλλήνων οἱ τὸν Πόντον οἰκέοντες λέγουσι.* This was, in fact, Targitavah-Skuda, whom the local Greeks identified with Heracles, probably on the basis of the cattle-chasing episode from the Scythian genealogical myth. Also identified with Heracles was Sanerges, a Maeotid version of the same deity, the husband of Aphrodite Apatoura. On these heroic genealogies and identifications, v. Ustinova 1999, 29–66, 67–128; cf. Захарова, 2005.

<sup>8</sup> Hdt. 5.22.2: *Ἀλεξάνδρου γὰρ ἀεθλεύειν ἐλομένου καὶ καταβάντος ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο, οἱ ἀντιθευσόμενοι Ἑλλήνων ἐξεῖργόν μιν, φάμενοι οὐ βαρβάρων ἀγωνιστέων εἶναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων· Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέδεξε ὡς εἶη Ἀργεῖος, ἐκρίθη τε εἶναι Ἕλληνα καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενος στάδιον συνεξέπιπτε τῷ πρώτῳ.*

<sup>9</sup> Remijsen 2019, *esp.* 9–18.

<sup>10</sup> Hammond [& Griffith] 1979, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 2005, 32 *sqq.*

and virtues based in strength, power and heroic deeds – qualities accepted by all, and certainly by their subjects.<sup>12</sup> There is no way of telling what impression such stories left on the neighboring tribes and peoples – the Thracians, the local Greeks, the basileis from Upper Macedonia or the Paeonians. The events seem to show that these stories did not leave any particular impression, nor did they cause any special respect; once again, this shows that descent from Heracles had internal use.<sup>13</sup> Based on the connection with Temenus/Heracles, some authors argue that the Macedonian kings differed from their subjects by origin, the dynasty being Greek, while its subjects were not. However, Mallios is right to point out that the Macedonian kings and their subjects do not have to be distinguished by ethnicity at all, but only by value – the former being descendants of heroes and rulers, the latter being people of ordinary, if not lowly, origin.<sup>14</sup>

The kings took care to promote their Heraclid/Temenid origin in various ways; one of them was establishing settlements dedicated to Heracles. The oldest among them seems to have been Heracleum in Pieria, located on Platamona hill, followed by Heraclea Lyncestis and Heraclea Sintica, founded, respectively, in the valleys of the Erigon and the Strymon.<sup>15</sup> From the times of Perdiccas II, the kings issued coins depicting the ancestor of their royal house and his symbols, the club and the bow. Some scholars think that the imagery on the issues of Perdiccas II and of Archelaus had political motivations, the main being the alliance with Argos in 418 BC, followed by the revision of the founding myth of the dynasty, made during the time of Archelaus. If this is correct, it means that the dynasty only began publicly propagating the idea it had used internally for a long time already; in any case, from that moment on, the Macedonian kings officially entered the ex-

<sup>12</sup> A good example of this is the scene in Euripides' *Archelaus*, in which the protagonist is being persuaded to reveal his origins and prove himself worthy of his heroic ancestry by defending the interests (and rights) of his kingdom: v. *Archelaos* test. 8, *apud* Harder 1985, 138 *sqq.* Cf. Patterson 2010, ch. 5; *append.* 2.

<sup>13</sup> *Pace* Greenwalt 1985; cf. Μάλλιος 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Badian 1982; Borza 1982; Μάλλιος 2011 draws a parallel with a similar distinction between the Spartans and their basileis. On a subliminal level, Alexander's speech at Opis (*Arr.* 7.9) seems to point out rather well the evaluative difference between the ruler and his soldiers: [...] Φίλιππος γὰρ παραλαβὼν ὑμᾶς πλανήτας καὶ ἀπόρους, ἐν διφθεραῖς τοὺς πολλοὺς νέμοντας ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη πρόβατα ὀλίγα καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων κακῶς μαχομένους Ἰλλυριοῖς καὶ Τριβαλλοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὁμόροις Θραξίν, γλαμύδας μὲν ὑμῖν ἀντὶ τῶν διφθερῶν φορεῖν ἔδωκεν [...] πόλεόν τε οἰκήτορας ἀπέφηνε καὶ νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσι χρηστοῖς ἐκόσμησεν [...] καὶ τῶν μετᾶλλον τὴν ἐργασίαν ἀδεῆ παρέσχε [...] ταῦτα μὲν τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἐς ὑμᾶς ὑπηργμένα, *etc.*

<sup>15</sup> Gouнарopoulos & Hatzopoulos 1985; cf. Πουλάκη-Παντερμαλή 2007; Eadem 2008. On Philip's foundation policies, v. Ellis 1969; Adams 2007; on Heraclea Lyncestis, v. Papazoglou 1988, 259 *sqq.*, as well as IG X, 2, 2, 112, mentioning [φυλὴ Τηρ]άκλειος; on Heraclea Sintice, v. Миτрев 2002; Idem, 2003. On a possible Heraclea in Mygdonia / Heraclea upon Axios, v. Gouнарopoulos & Hatzopoulos 1985; Mallios 2011.

tended circle of noble/royal families with Heraclid descent. The following rulers continued to promote this with their own coinages, especially during the dynastical fights in the early fourth century BC.<sup>16</sup> Finally, the hero was honored with a series of appellations on cult inscriptions from all social strata.<sup>17</sup> Heracles was the progenitor and patron of all branches of the royal family, both main and collateral. The tholos of the palace in Aegae yielded an inscription dedicated to Heracles Patroos with a throne and bases of votive statues, which led Andronikos to interpret the tholos as a kind of a throne room; we also cannot exclude the possibility that the tholos served as a cult place of the ancestor Heracles within the palace.<sup>18</sup>

This genealogical and cultic exclusivity of the Temenids in relation to Heracles is also evident in myth. The link of the Macedonians with Heracles moved mainly through their kings; beside the foundation myth of their ruling house, there is no recognizable matrix in myth or legend that would connect Heracles and the Macedonians, apart from the Temenid tradition.<sup>19</sup> His heroic endeavors happen mainly outside of the Macedonian area, connecting with the northern Aegean only through minor episodes – the clash with Cycnus, the son of Ares and Pyrene; the murder of Alcyoneus, the tyrant of Pallene; the gift of Torone to Aristomachus, son of Sithon; and the clash with Emathion, probably the only episode from an older mythic stratum, which deserves a brief overview.<sup>20</sup> Emathion, the son of Tithon and Eo, who is usually linked to Ethiopia and Arabia, fought a duel with Heracles and died

<sup>16</sup> Rosen 1978, 8–10; Greenwalt 1994; Huttner 1997, 67–68; Moloney 2015, 58–59. Still, *cf.* Sprawski 2021, 29 *sqq.*, with a different interpretation and a detailed review of the opinions. We should do well to note that the Paeonian royal house also issued coins with the image of Heracles, seeking to maintain its uniqueness and independence in relation to the Macedonian kingdom; *v.* Paschidis 2018, 151–152.

<sup>17</sup> *Cf.* Baege 1913, 184 *sqq.*; *v. esp.* Hatzopoulos 1994, with examples of dedications to *Herakles Kynagidas*, *Kallinikos* and *Epinikos*, as well as an account of the respective cults; *cf.* Ριζάκης & Τουράτσογλου 1999, 953 *sqq.*

<sup>18</sup> *SEG* 46, 829. The exact date of this inscription was disputed until recently; however, even if the proposals to date it down to the time of the Antigonids prove correct, this will not change much, given the way the Antigonids relate to the Argeads, and through them again with Heracles (*v. infra*); on this issue, *v.* Sverkos 2007, 27; Μάλλιος 2011. For an interpretation of the tholos, *v.* Andronikos 1984, 38 *sqq.*; Andronikos 1987a, 1987b; *cf.* Ρωμαίος 1977, 270, 283 *sqq.*

<sup>19</sup> In general terms, the cult of Heracles in Macedonia was known, but not particularly widespread; *cf.* Hatzopoulos 1994, 91–92, 102; Chatzinikolaou 2010, 217; *esp.* Paschidis 2018, 152, who identifies only four or five attestations of a cult of Heracles in Upper Macedonia before the arrival of the Romans. This is why it is hardly surprising that there is no generally known mythical or legendary storyline which would permanently connect the hero with the territory, as was the case with the Peloponnese, for instance.

<sup>20</sup> On Cycnus, *v.* Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.11; on Alcyoneus, *Idem.* 1.6.1; on Aristomachus, *Speusipp.* 7 (*Ep. Socr.* 30 Hercher, ed. Bickermann & Sykutris, 1928); *v.* the detailed account on Emathion given by Μάλλιος 2011, 271–272. Also, *cf.* Tiverios 2013, 101 *sqq.*, covering all characters mentioned above.

after trying to stop the hero on his way to the garden of the Hesperides.<sup>21</sup> Later commentators link this Emathion to the region of Emathia, but no source mentions a clash between Heracles and Emathion on Macedonian soil; Justin is perhaps the only one who casually hints at this, saying that he displayed his courage in Emathia before going south to Ethiopia or Arabia.<sup>22</sup> If there really existed a living tradition with Emathion being a rival of Heracles in a Macedonian context, it could date back to the pre-classical period; Emathion would then represent the older local proto-state tradition, later replaced by the Macedonian ruling house, mythically embodied in the heroic figure of Macedon. This tradition could be logically connected with the presence of the Temenidae/Argeadae in the central Macedonian plain, specifically in Emathia. Another telling detail is that Heracles clashes with a local ruler, a part of a foreign pyramid of power,<sup>23</sup> not his own relative or descendant; in this scheme, he is an obvious personification of the ruling house that supplanted and replaced the holders of local power – precisely what Thucydides describes. But we should steer away from imagining a grand displacement of entire tribes, or even peoples; displacing their ruling houses should have been more than enough to establish a new network of political control.

To complicate matters even more, we cannot really tell if this story came from a classical, or a later source, as at a certain point the Heraclid/Temenid propaganda of the Macedonian ruling house was taken on even by some Greek authors. Isocrates, for example, writes that Philip is entitled to seek rule over the Greeks by virtue of his ancestry, as Heracles had been “a benefactor of all Greece.”<sup>24</sup> He goes on

<sup>21</sup> *RE*, s.v. Emathion (1); the sources are collected by Gantz 1993, 418. Apart from this Emathion, a rival of Heracles, ancient mythology knows of at least three other characters with the same name, who also have no connection to Macedonia: (I) the king of Samothrace, son of Zeus and Electra, brother of Dardanus and Eetion and ally of Dionysus (Nonn. *Dion.* 3.124); (II) the courtier of the Ethiopian king Cepheus (cf. Ovid. *Met.* 5.97); and (III) the lover of the naiad Pegasis and father of Atymnius, who was killed by Odysseus (Quint. Smyrn. 3.300); in addition, we know of Aeneas’ friend Emathion, a literary character in the Aeneid, who would be killed by an ally of king Turnus of the Rutuli. (*Aen.* 9.570)

<sup>22</sup> Iust. 7.1: Macedonia ante a nomine Emathionis regis, cuius prima virtutis experimenta in illis locis extant, Emathia cognominata est. Justin usually summarizes the narrative of Trogus; in this case, however, we cannot tell who his original source was; it is only certain that it was not Marsyas, who mentions Emathos or Amathos as a son of Macedon (*FGrHist* 135/6, f. 13); cf. Hammond 1991.

<sup>23</sup> According to Μάλλιος 2011, even a non-Greek, a barbarian; still, we saw above that the list of bearers of this name includes characters from common places in Greek mythology. The idea that Emathion represents the previous proto-state elements on Macedonian soil is interesting enough without insisting on the Greek/Barbarian dichotomy and delving into the issue of ethnic determination of these elusive characters and tribes.

<sup>24</sup> Isocr. 5.76: εἰ δὲ τῶν ἀπ’ Ἡρακλέους τινὶ πεφυκότων, ὃς ἀπάσης κατέστη τῆς Ἑλλάδος εὐεργέτης, ἐπιφέρει τὴν αἰτίαν ταύτην, εἰς τὴν μεγίστην αἰσχύνην ἂν αὐτὸν καταστήσειεν.

to include a eulogy for Heracles, recommending that Philip follows his ancestor as a role model;<sup>25</sup> through his Heraclid legacy, he links Philip to the four main Greek poleis, conveniently including Argos, the city of Temenus, Cyssus and Caranus;<sup>26</sup> he points out that Heracles considered all Greece his homeland, so it should not matter where Philip comes from;<sup>27</sup> Speusippus adds that Philip, being a Heraclid, may be eligible for Athenian citizenship.<sup>28</sup> It is clear that Heracles was chosen due to current political interests and needs: the claims of the Macedonian rulers to their own ancestry, the image of Heracles as a unifier and conqueror of Troy/Asia and, of course, the fear in some Athenian circles that Philip was working against Greek interests. The arguments of Isocrates and the commendations of Speusippus may be subtle, but what matters here is that they are brought into play at all. Were Philip and his house not considered Heraclid/Temenid, but only Argead, the case of Isocrates and Speusippus would be untenable.

It is clear thus far that the Heracles/Temenus origin story served its intended function. As we saw above, such myths had a rather simple function, to justify the power of one group over another, i.e. of one family over others, by separating the privileged group either from local power structures, or from the common subjects. In this case, we should probably distinguish two levels on which this story operated. One level was apparently its domestic use, as a way to project a certain image of the dynasty and emphasize its status in local relations. On another, external level, in a time of passionate arguments over war or peace with Philip and military leadership of the Greeks, descent from Heracles was a universal political tool, which would work very well in foreign policy.

2. Other ancient authors and later lexicographers name the Macedonian royal house “Argeadae”.<sup>29</sup> This name was interpreted in many different ways even in ancient times: some authors assumed it was a patronymic that derived from the name of the mythical ancestor and hero Argaeus, while others thought that it indicated the origin of the royal dynasty from a city by the name of Argos.

<sup>25</sup> Isocr. 5.105, 5.109-112; cf. Guth 2011, 207.

<sup>26</sup> Isocr. 5.32: Ἄργος μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ σοι πατρίς, ἧς δίκαιον τοσαύτην σε ποιῆσθαι πρόνοιαν ὄσσην περ τῶν γονέων τῶν σαντοῦ, etc. Cf. the comment of Guth 2011, 208.

<sup>27</sup> Isocr. 5.127: Προσῆκει δὲ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις τοῖς ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους πεφυκόσι καὶ τοῖς ἐν πολιτείᾳ καὶ νόμοις ἐνδεδεμένοις ἐκείνην τὴν πόλιν στέργειν, ἐν ἧ τυχάνουσι κατοικοῦντες, σὲ δ’ ὥσπερ ἄφετον γεγεννημένον ἅπασαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα πατρίδα νομίζειν, ὥσπερ ὁ γεννήσας ὑμᾶς, etc.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Guth 2011, 212; v. also the analysis of these specific mythological elements, as well as the overview of how they were shaped according to political needs, in Markle 1976, esp. 94–96.

<sup>29</sup> Strab. 7 fr. 11, 20; Paus. 7. 8. 9; Appian. *Syr.* 333; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀργέου νήσος. Cf. Badian 1982, 45; Hammond 1972, 431 sqq.; Hammond [& Griffith] 1979, 26 sqq.

This mythical Argaeus would surely be the ruler mentioned in the legendary list of Macedonian kings as the second king of the Macedonians, son of Perdiccas, the founder of the state.<sup>30</sup> Later authors accept this line of succession, although some of them mention Caranus as the founder, a problem discussed below. According to one version, preserved in Satyrus of Alexandria, Argaeus was the son of Perdiccas I and Cleopatra.<sup>31</sup> Making use of Diodorus, Eusebius calculates that he spent thirty years on the throne.<sup>32</sup> Argaeus is also the protagonist of two aetiological myths that explain certain customs of the ancient Macedonians. The first myth, attested in Justin, discloses the prophecy of his father Perdiccas concerning the burial of the members of the royal house; the second myth, preserved in Polyaeus, relates to the establishment of the cult of Dionysus Pseudanor.

According to the story in Justin, shortly before he died, Perdiccas revealed to his son Argaeus the place where he wanted to be buried, ordering all his heirs to be buried in the same place and foretelling that their family would keep the throne as long as the members of the ruling house are buried there. Justin also mentions the belief that the dynasty lost power in Macedonia precisely because Alexander was not buried in the place Perdiccas indicated.<sup>33</sup> We cannot tell whether this

<sup>30</sup> Hdt. 8.139: Ἀπὸ τούτου δὴ τοῦ Περδίκκεω Ἀλέξανδρος ὧδε ἐγένετο· Ἀμύντεω παῖς ἦν Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἀμύντης δὲ Ἀλκέτεω, Ἀλκέτεω δὲ πατὴρ ἦν Ἀέροπος, τοῦ δὲ Φίλιππος, Φιλίππου δὲ Ἀργαῖος, τοῦ δὲ Περδίκκης ὁ κτησάμενος τὴν ἀρχήν.

<sup>31</sup> Satyr., *FGrHist* 631 F1: Λέγει οὖν ὁ Σατυρος οὕτως [...] Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Διὸς, οἴμαι, Ὑλλων, τοῦ δὲ Κλεόδημον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀριστόμαχον, τοῦ δὲ Τήμενον, τοῦ δὲ Κεῖσον, τοῦ δὲ Μάρωνα, τοῦ δὲ Θέστιον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀκοόν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀριστοδαμίδαν, τοῦ δὲ Κάρανον, τοῦ δὲ Κοινόν, τοῦ δὲ Τυρίμμαν, τοῦ δὲ Περδίκκαν, τοῦ δὲ Φίλιππον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀέροπον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀλκέταν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀμύνταν, τοῦ δὲ Βοκρον, τοῦ δὲ Μελέαγρον, *etc.* On the other hand, Satyr. *POxy* 2465: ... ἰστορεῖται γὰρ εἶ[ναι] Διονύσου καὶ (Ἀλθαίας) Δηάνειρα, Δη[ανείρας δὲ καί] Ἡρακλέους Ὑλλος, τούτ[ο]ν δ[ὲ] καὶ Ἰόλης] Κλεοδ[αί]ον, Κλεοδ[αί]ου δὲ [καὶ Περιδέας] Ἀριστόμαχον, [Α]ριστο[μάχου] δὲ Τημενόν, [Τη]μενοῦ [δὲ κ]αὶ Δωρ[...] Κεῖσον, [Κεῖσο]ν δὲ Μάρωνα, το[ύ]το]ν δὲ Θέστιον, [Θεσ]τίου δὲ Ἀκοόν, [Ἀκοοῦ] δὲ Ἀριστοδαμίδαν, Ἀριστοδαμ[ίδα] δὲ Κάρανον, Καράνου δὲ καὶ Λαν[...] Κοινόν, Κοινοῦ δὲ Τυρίμμαν, [Τυ]ρίμμα δὲ καὶ Κλεονίκης Περδίκκαν, Π[ερδ]ίικκου δὲ καὶ Κλεοπάτρας [Ἀργαῖον], Ἀργαῖου δὲ καὶ Προθόης Φίλιππον, [Φι]λίππου δὲ καὶ Νεικονόης Ἀέροπον, *etc.* One should always bear in mind Gambetti's note (*BNJ* 631): "[...] in genealogical matters a different or missing name cannot be considered a scribe's slip of the pen or an accidental mistake, but a possible different tradition."

<sup>32</sup> Euseb. Chron., p. 227: ... Karanus regionem obtinuit regnavitque in ea annis XXX, tempore senectutis e vita excessus (excedebat); cuius principatum filius eius, qui Kojinus nominatus est, excepit et dominatus est annis XXVIII. Post eum regnavit Tirimmus annis XLIII. Perdikas annis XLII. Hic regnum suum adaugere volebat (ac propterea) Delphos misit. ... Perdikas annis regnavit XLVIII imperiumque Argaeo reliquit. Huic uno supra XXX annos regnanti Philippus in imperio suffectus est; qui annos triginta tres regnavit et potestatem Ajeropae reliquit, *etc.*

<sup>33</sup> Justin.7.2: Siquidem senex moriens Argeō filio monstravit locum quo condi vellet, ibique non sua tantum, sed et succedentium sibi in regnum ossa poni iussit, praefatus, quoad ibi conditae posterorum reliquiae forent, regnum in familia mansurum; creduntque

narrative was based on an older aetiological legend, one that explained why the center of the cult and the burial place of the dynasty were located in Aegae; but the connection between the prophecy of Perdiccas and the burial of Alexander obviously comes from a later historiographer, if not invented by Trogus or even of Justin himself.<sup>34</sup> The author refers to Argaeus, who has no role in the common Greek myths, but is a part of the tradition of the ruling house, a fact that hints that Justin's information is based on a Macedonian source; in that sense, Hammond is probably right to attribute the passage to Marsyas of Pella, a Macedonian author from the fourth century BC.<sup>35</sup>

Argaeus is represented as the guardian of another important dynastic tradition. Polyaeus relates that Argaeus had invented a strategy with which he defeated the Illyrians in battle: namely, when Galauros and the Taulantes attacked Macedonia, Argaeus did not have an army large enough to defend his kingdom, so he ordered that, at a given moment, Macedonian maidens suddenly appear on the ridge of Mount Ereboia. When the Illyrians arrived on the battlefield, the girls came into view and began descending the slopes of the mountain with thyrsos in their hands and garlands on their heads. Galauros thought he was seeing warrior men, so he ordered retreat. As a sign of gratitude to his divine protector, Argaeus founded a sanctuary of Dionysus Pseudanor; the girls who worshipped Dionysus, until then called Clodones, were subsequently named Mimallones.<sup>36</sup> This myth not only explains the appellation of Dionysus Pseudanor, but also explains why the Bacchantes of Macedonia were called Mimallones. Some scholars think that Polyaeus follows an older source, perhaps Callimachus;<sup>37</sup> in any case, authors in Hellenistic, and especially in Roman times recognized the Mimallones and the Clodones as an authentic Macedonian characterization of the female followers of Dionysus.<sup>38</sup> Still, the Macedonian myth shows some peculiarities: the main hero of the story is neither

---

hac superstitione extinctam in Alexandro stirpem, quia locum sepulturae mutaverit. Cf. Hammond & Griffith 1979, 12-13; Greenwalt 1987, 52.

<sup>34</sup> Μάλλιος 2011, 256 *sqq.*; Hammond & Griffith 1979, 12. Mallios thinks that this could not have been Theopompus.

<sup>35</sup> Hammond 1991, 497 *sqq.* V. Suda μ 227; *FGrHist* 135-6; Heckel 1980.

<sup>36</sup> Polyaeus. *Strateg.* 4.1: Ἀργαῖος βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων, Ταυλάντιον Γάλαυρος· Ταυλάντιοι στρατεύουσιν ἐπὶ Μακεδόνας. Ἀργαῖος, ἦν γὰρ αὐτῷ χεῖρ ὀλίγη, κελεύει τὰς παρθένους τῶν Μακεδόνων, ἐπειδὰν οἱ πολέμοι προσάγωσι τὴν φάλαγγα, αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους τῆς Ἐρεβείας ἐπιφανῆναι. οἱ μὲν δὴ προσῆγον. αἱ δὲ ἐπεφάνησαν καὶ κατήεσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους παρθένοι πολλαὶ θύρσους ἀντὶ δοράτων πάλλουσαι καὶ στεφάνοις τὰ πρόσωπα σκιάζουσαι. Γάλαυρος ἐξεπλάγη ἄνδρας εἶναι τὰς παρθένους ἀπὸ μακροῦ νομίζων καὶ τὸ ἀνακλητικὸν ὑπεσήμηνεν. Ταυλάντιοι δὲ ἔφευγον τὰ τε ὅπλα ἀποβαλόντες καὶ τὰ σκευοφόρα καταλιπόντες. Ἀργαῖος ἀμαχεὶ κρατήσας ἱερὸν ἰδρύεται Διονύσω Ψευδάνορι καὶ τὰς παρθένους, ἃς πάλαι Κλώδωνας ἐκληζον οἱ Μακεδόνες, αὐτὸς κλήζειν ἔταξε διὰ τὴν μίμησιν τῶν ἀνδρῶν Μιμαλλόνας. Cf. Macurdy 1913.

<sup>37</sup> Call. fr. 503. Cf. Hatzopoulos 1994, 75, discussing instances with similar motifs.

<sup>38</sup> Strab. X 468; Plut. *Alex.* 2; Lycophr. *Alex.* 1464.

Dionysus nor the Clodones, but Argaeus, the inventor of the stratagem. The Clodones do not take part in a Dionysian ritual, but show themselves on the slopes of Mt. Ereboia in order to help Argaeus; the victory is still an accomplishment of the king. Yet, the happy ending must be validated by Dionysus, so the god receives a new cult, that of Pseudanor.

3. The traditions handed down by Polyaeus and Justin had served as a basis to depict Argaeus as the founder of certain cultic traditions that arguably had an important future impact on the Macedonian ruling house and its subjects. Obviously, the establishment of these traditions in Macedonia cannot be attributed to a concrete historical person, let alone to an early legendary hero. However, what is important here is not the exact origin of the traditions, but rather the fact that the Macedonians in later times believed that these accomplishments belonged to Argaeus.<sup>39</sup> Argaeus was important not as an attested historical character, but rather as a figure from the collective historical memory of Macedonians in later times.<sup>40</sup> Still, concerning the propaganda about the origin of the ruling house, the introduction of Argaeus as an eponym changed literally nothing.

The same is true with the post-Herodotean changes in tradition, which added a number of names between Temenus and Perdikkas. During his stay with king Archelaus, Euripides invented an Archelaus, son of Temenus, with the intention of glorifying his current patron by praising the achievements of his fictitious eponymous ancestor. The first Archelaus becomes the founder of the Macedonian royal house and takes the place that Perdikkas had in Herodotus; but this new tradition probably did not prove successful, as his name does not appear in later Macedonian genealogies.<sup>41</sup>

Another, more substantial post-Herodotean variation comes from Theopompus, who lists the direct descendants of Temenus that are not found in Herodotus. But Theopompus now skips Perdikkas and

<sup>39</sup> Greenwalt 1987, 52.

<sup>40</sup> This may be the reason that the name of Argaeus reappears in the royal family. We know of an Argaeus who ruled for a short time and is counted among the sons of Archelaus; another Argaeus – or perhaps the same one – appears at the beginning of the reign of Philip II as a pretender for the Macedonian throne. On this Argaeus, v. Borza 1990, 296, with scholarship relevant at the time; Hammond & Griffith (1979, 175) have Argaeus as one of the three sons of Archelaus, putting him on the throne in 392/1 BC. *Contra* Heskell, 1996.

<sup>41</sup> Hyg. *Fab.* 219. V. Harder 1985, 125–272; Collard et al. 2004, 333–335; Gambettti 2012. Cf. Moloney 2015, 61–62, who compares this “deliberate re-presentation of a quite specific Macedonian royal pedigree”, certainly intended for internal use, to the practice in Sparta, where the lists of basileis took the form of a “genealogical charter” that confirmed the place of the Agiadae and the Eurypontidae in the social pyramid. In that sense, one can interpret the experiment with Archelaus as the first official attempt at dynastic revision directed against rival branches of the family.

makes Caranus seventh in line, beginning with Temenus.<sup>42</sup> Although the genealogy of Theopompus was incomplete, as it did not explain the relationship between Caranus and Perdikkas, it became part of the official tradition: already in the time of Trogus, and certainly in the time of Plutarch, Perdikkas is nowhere to be found, while Caranus is the undisputed founder of the Macedonian royal house.<sup>43</sup> We do not know what caused these new interventions in the genealogical order of the dynasty. It is certain that it was once again a manipulation in the context of the power struggles during the fourth century BC;<sup>44</sup> but in this case we only have names of which we know nothing more, so the chances for a concrete answer, let alone a historical interpretation, are pretty much hopeless.

As it stands, this was not the end of parallel traditions and interventions in Temenid genealogy; Syncellus rightly points out that Theopompus is but one of many authors interested in Macedonian royal genealogy.<sup>45</sup> For instance, we also have Diodorus, who knows of two completely different traditions that emphasize the role of Caranus.<sup>46</sup> Of these, the second partial genealogy, from Temenus to Caranus, has nothing in common with the ones preserved in other places, not even the seven-generation matrix; among the genealogies, there are also prophecies that explain the distant connection of Caranus with

<sup>42</sup> *FGrH* 115 fr. 393. Gambetti (2012) argues that this was no coincidence and that Theopompus was following Herodotus, who often uses the matrix of seven generations in heroic genealogies. After all, according to Herodotus, Alexander himself was the seventh generation, starting from Perdikkas.

<sup>43</sup> *Iust.* 7.1.; *Plut. Alex.* 1. Trogus and Justin have this Caranus come from Argos on the Peloponnese; *cf.* *Vell. Pat.* 1.6; *Diod. Sic.* 7.17, 318 *Didot.*

<sup>44</sup> Greenwalt 1985; Sprawski 2010. *V.* the detailed analysis of these interventions into the royal line in *Μάλλιος*, 2014.

<sup>45</sup> *FGrH* 115 fr. 393.

<sup>46</sup> *Diod.* 7.15 (Euseb. *Chron.* 1, p. 227): “Karanus ante primam olimpiadem rerum cupiditate motus copias collegit ab Argivis et ab altera (regione) Peloponesiaca, et cum exercitu expeditionem in partes Makedoniorum suscepit. Eodem tempore Orestarum regi bellum erat cum vicinis suis, qui vocantur Eordaei, rogavit Karanum, ut ipsi auxilio esset: suaque regionis mediam partem ei se daturum pollicitus est Orestarum rebus compositis; et rege fidem exsolvente Karanus regionem obtinuit regnavitque in ea annis XXX, tempore senectutis e vita excessus (excedebat); cuius principatum filius eius, qui Kojinus nominatus est, excepit et dominatus est annis XXVIII. Post cum regnavit Tirimmus annis XLIII. Perdikas annis XLII. Hic regnum suum adaugere volebat (ac propterea) Delphos misit. [...] Perdikas annis regnavit XLVIII imperiumque Argaeo reliquit. Huic uno supra XXX annos regnanti Philippus in imperio suffectus est; qui annos triginta tres regnavit et potestatem Ajeropae reliquit. Hic vero cum annis XX dominatus esset, regni successionem excepit Alketas, qui annis XVIII imperavit, reliquitque potestatem Amintae, etc.; *cf.* *Diod.* 7.17 (Syncellus, p. 499): “Γενεαλογουσι δ’ αὐτὸν οὕτως, ὡς φησιν ὁ Διόδωρος καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν συγγραφέων, ὧν εἷς καὶ Θεόπομπος. Κάρανος Φειδωνος τοῦ Ἀριστοδαμίδα τοῦ Μέρπος τοῦ Θεστίου τοῦ Κισσίου τοῦ Τημένου τοῦ Ἀριστομάχου τοῦ Κλεοδαίου τοῦ Ὑλλου τοῦ Ἡρακλέους. ἔνιοι δὲ ἄλλως, φησι, γενεαλογουσι, φάσκοντες εἶναι Κάρωνον Ποίαντος τοῦ Κροίσου τοῦ Κλεοδαίου τοῦ Εὐρυβιάδα τοῦ Δεβάλλου τοῦ Λαχάρου τοῦ Τημένου, ὃς καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Πελοπόννησον.”

Perdiccas. Finally, we have the traditions in Satyrus, which confirm that by the second century BC the dynastic connection between Temenus and Caranus was already well-established.<sup>47</sup>

Thus, in the final, developed form of the dynastic genealogy, going back from Argaeus, through Perdiccas, Tyrimmas, Coenus and Caranus, we come once again to Temenus. This is very important because, through their insistence on a mythical Argaeus, the Macedonian ruling house may have become Argead, but it obviously remained fully Temenid<sup>48</sup> – a prime example of a distinction without a difference. From the point of view of the Temenid/Argead dichotomy, based on mythical ancestors and progenitors, the difference between these two names is obviously only a product of an imperfectly asked question, which gave rise to a perception that there had been a historiographical problem.

4. Again, the fact that the term “Argeadae” was at some point associated with an Argaeus, son of Perdiccas, does not necessarily mean that the name was a patronymic from the very start; it is equally possible that it was a toponym indicating the origin of the dynasty from a city by the name of Argos. But was it the renowned Argos on the Peloponnese? According to a late tradition preserved by Appian, the origin and the name of the ruling house stem from Argos Orestikon, a town in Orestis. Appian reveals this piece of information in his eleventh book, while describing the Roman-Seleucid relations, more precisely, in an anecdotal part that refers to the death of Seleucus. The gist of this extract is that Seleucus was to stay away from places called Argos; Appian lists several cities with that name, including the said Argos Orestikon.<sup>49</sup>

This passage from Appian gave basis for the assumption that the Macedonian ruling house was called “the Argeadae” not because of Argaeus, the son of Perdiccas, but because it came from Argos – not the one in Peloponnese, but Argos Orestikon.<sup>50</sup> Hatzopoulos is convinced that it was clear even in ancient times that the Argeadae did not come from the Peloponnese, and that the entire clan that led the conquest of lower Macedonia was named after Argos in Orestis. But this

<sup>47</sup> Gambetti 2012.

<sup>48</sup> Even in Euripides, with Archelaus as the progenitor, the father of the hero is still Τήμενος δ’ Ὑλλου πατρός, ὃς Ἄργος ὠικησ’ Ἡρακλέους γεγώς ἄπο (*TrGF* fr. 228b., 17-18). The “Archelaus” was a part of a trilogy, with the second and the third tragedy being the “Temenos” and the “Temenidae”; v. Scullion 2003, 194.

<sup>49</sup> The connection of the city with the origin of the Argeadae is made by an inserted relative clause, which does not allow us to tell if it is an organic part of the narrative; cf. Argos in Italy, just below, which is said to have been founded by Diomedes, but in such a manner, that the fact cannot be detached from the main narrative. Μάλλιος (2011) suspects that the part may have been added later.

<sup>50</sup> Edson 1970, 20; Borza 1982, 8; Borza 1990, 78; Hatzopoulos 2003, 215.

is hardly the question we are exploring; for the purpose of this paper, we are not interested in the real origin of the ruling house, but only in the name that it used, and by which others called it, in the context of their official royal imagery and propaganda. In this sense, a city of Argos that would serve the royal propaganda could only be located in the Peloponnese, and this may well be the source of the confusion. The Macedonian ruling house had to maintain its prestige in the eyes of its subjects, not least when dealing with other ruling houses, by stressing the difference to them; it would make no sense to propagate a Heraclid origin claiming that the dynasty came from a petty town in upper Macedonia, to the extent that this would be common knowledge to a historiographer from Roman times.<sup>51</sup>

Some scholars are not entirely convinced this is true and try to explore other possibilities. Not happy with having to choose between the two Argoses, Hammond suggests that the Argeadae be considered as something distinct from the Temenidae. He imagines that the Argeadae were initially a Macedonian tribe from Orestis, who may have given Macedonian kings before the Temenids; however, later the Macedonians moved from Orestis to Lower Macedonia and came under the rule of the Temenidae, who in turn arrived from Argos in the Peloponnese. On the other hand, Daskalakis suggests that the Macedonian Temenidae were a branch of the original tribe, but did not move south like the other Temenidae, who in turn moved from Pindus to central Greece, where they participated in shaping the historical Dorians.<sup>52</sup> All we can gather from such interpretations – which supposedly tend to resolve differences in traditions and explain events unattested anywhere in the sources – is that they themselves resemble myths and legends, and rest on equally unrealistic conjectures.

5. The later manipulations by the new Hellenistic dynasties appear to bring additional confusion into the issue, having invoked, among other things, the presumed kinship with the old ruling house in order to build their own legitimacy during the battles for the inheritance of Alexander III. The wars between the Diadochoi and, later, between

---

<sup>51</sup> The actions of the kings seem to confirm this: in Cilicia, Alexander exempted from tax the citizens of Malos on the grounds that they, like him, also hailed from Argos. Arr. *Anab.* 2.5.9: καὶ τοὺς ἀόρους, οὓς βασιλεῖ Δαρείῳ ἀπέφερον, ἀνήκεν, ὅτι Ἀργείων μὲν Μαλλοῦται ἄποικοι ἦσαν, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπ' Ἀργούσων τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν εἶναι ἠξίου). Also from Argos comes the tripod with an inscription, found in Tomb II in Aegae; cf. Ανδρόνικος 1984.

<sup>52</sup> Hammond 1972, 431; Hammond & Griffith 1979, 26; Hammond 1982, 283; Δασκαλάκης 1957-8, 117. What is proposed by Le Bohec-Bouhet (2002) is similarly complicated: namely, that the first kings were descendants of Argaeus, son of Macedon, and, therefore, they were called Argeadae, but that they submitted to Perdikkas, who, in turn, came from Argos in the Peloponnese, so they remained Argead, but also became Temenid. A more detailed overview of the proposed solutions is provided by Sprawski 2021, 17–18, *q. v.*

the dynasties they founded, just like how they built their own legitimacy and identity, represent complex issues that partially go beyond the scope of this paper and cannot be examined in detail;<sup>53</sup> nor is there any reason to dwell on the Diadochoi that failed to establish new states or dynasties. Therefore, we will briefly focus only on the Antigonidae, the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae, in that particular order.

To our surprise, the surviving sources bear no mention that the first Antigonids pointed out, much less insisted on, any connection with the Argead dynasty.<sup>54</sup> It is probably true that they issued bronze coins depicting Heracles as early as the reign of Gonatas;<sup>55</sup> but this iconography was based on the coins of Cassander, or rather of Philip II, so it should preferably be taken as an attempt to establish a link with the previous rulers, than a manifestation of kinship with the Argeadae.<sup>56</sup> Of particular interest is the “Monument of the Progonoi” that Gonatas had set up on Delos, displaying a number of statues of his ancestors.<sup>57</sup> The ruins seem to show that the first statue was larger than the others, allowing Edson to assume that the sequence began with Heracles or Temenos<sup>58</sup> – a reasonable, even tempting assumption. However, with the monument being in a dire state, it is impossible to draw a decisive conclusion about who the line of “ancestors” began with, that is, who was the progenitor of the Antigonids according to Gonatas.<sup>59</sup> More interesting are the letters that his heir Demetrius sent to Harpalus, referring to various aspects of the status and the finances of the temple of Heracles in Beroea.<sup>60</sup> We cannot tell if this correspondence reflects a special interest of the ruling house in the cult of Heracles, or if it simply represents an intervention of the central government

<sup>53</sup> A short overview is offered by Lianou 2010, 123-125.

<sup>54</sup> On the basis of *Anth. Pal.* 6.171, Edson (1934, 220-223) tries to prove that even Antigonus the One-Eyed and Demetrius Poliorcetes insisted on descent from Heracles / kinship with the Argeadae – a conclusion accepted by many, including Walbank 1993, 1729. However, Jones (2014) proves that the epigram should probably be interpreted in the context of Philip’s clash with the Rhodians, more than a century later than Edson’s assumed dating.

<sup>55</sup> Mørkholm 1991, 134 *sqq.*; Драганов 2001, 91.

<sup>56</sup> Huttner 1997, 164. Moreover, Heracles, or his club, appear on the “autonomous” coins of Amphaxitis, and later still on the issues of the *merides*. (Price 1974, nos. 79, 82, 83; Mørkholm 1991, 165 *sqq.*; Драганов 2001, 113-125). Walbank (1993, 1728) sees this as a sign that Heracles may no longer have been associated exclusively with the ruling house, but rather with Macedonia in general.

<sup>57</sup> A part of the dedication reads: [βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος] βασιλέως Δημητρίου Μα[κεδόν] [τοὺς ἐ]αυτοῦ προγόνους Ἀπόλλωνι (*IG XI,4 1096*).

<sup>58</sup> Edson 1934, 217-219.

<sup>59</sup> We are even unable to tell how many statues the group was made of (for various proposals, v. Jones 2014, n. 29). Huttner (1997, 164 *sqq.*) even allows that the sequence began with Apollo, to whom the complex was dedicated; furthermore, he is right to warn that, due to the condition of the complex, we cannot claim with certainty that there was no other statue that was also larger than the others.

<sup>60</sup> *EKM* 1.3.

in resolving the conflict between the city authorities and the temple.<sup>61</sup> However, the popularity of the cult in the time of Philip V, as well as the fact that Perseus honored Heracles just before the decisive battle at Pydna,<sup>62</sup> seem to point toward the impression that this was a cult to which the Antigonids were particularly attached.

At any rate, from the time of Philip V there are many more indications of kinship with the Argeadae – and, in that context, of the significance of the cult of Heracles Cynagidas. Numerous sources affirm that Philip V made conscious efforts to display the antiquity of his dynasty and the connections with the Argeadae. This is already made evident by his coin emissions, with one of the dominant elements being a depiction of Heracles or his club.<sup>63</sup> The devotion to the cult of Heracles Cynagidas is also attested by three votive epigrams with paeneyric traits, mentioning a dedication of the fur and horns of a wild bull, killed on the slopes of Mount Orbelos.<sup>64</sup> While it is true that these pieces of information could be interpreted as evidence of a personal affection of Philip V to the cult of Heracles, the destruction of the Athenian Cynosarges and its surroundings in 200 BC<sup>65</sup> testifies against this impression. Philip's devotion to the cult of Heracles should rather be set in a political and propaganda context,<sup>66</sup> but this does not change the fact that Philip presented himself as a descendant of Heracles. Equally symbolic of Philip's politics and propaganda is the second dominant element of his coinage, an overall novelty in Antigonid coinage – the mythical hero Perseus,<sup>67</sup> after whom he named his son and heir. The prominence of Perseus clearly points to the ancient connections between the Argeadae (and thus the Antigonidae), and Argos.<sup>68</sup> All this fits nicely with what we learn from Polybius – that Philip V was constantly trying to prove that he was related by blood to Philip II and Alexander,<sup>69</sup> a claim that was later reiterated by his successor Perseus.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Huttner 1997, 165 sqq.

<sup>62</sup> Plut. *Aem.* 19. However, as Plutarch himself points out, in this case we are dealing with a hostile tradition that was passed down by Polybius; a different assessment of Perseus' behavior, more favorable to the Macedonian ruler, was also in circulation.

<sup>63</sup> Huttner 1997, 168–170.

<sup>64</sup> *Anth. Pal.* 6.114–116; Huttner 1997, 166 sqq., 170.

<sup>65</sup> Liv. 31.24.17–18. cf. Diod. 28.7.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Huttner 1997, 171.

<sup>67</sup> Драганов 2001, 103.

<sup>68</sup> cf. Walbank 1993, 1728; *contra* Mørkholm 1991, 136, who reservedly accepts the assumption that the appearance of Perseus on the coins of Philip V symbolizes his ambitions for global domination.

<sup>69</sup> Polyb. 5.10.10: ὁ δ' ἴνα μὲν καὶ συγγενῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Φιλίππου φαίνεται μεγάλην ἐποιεῖτο παρ' ὅλον τὸν βίον σπουδῆν, ἴνα δὲ ζηλωτῆς οὐδὲ τὸν ἐλάχιστον ἔσχε λόγον.

<sup>70</sup> Plut. *Aem.*, 12.5: καὶ ταῦτ' ἔπραττεν οὐ Λυδῶν τινας οὐδὲ Φοινίκων γεγονῶς, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Φιλίππου κατὰ συγγένειαν ἀρετῆς μεταποιοῦμενος *etc.* Cf. Zon. 9.4.:

Since the fascination with his illustrious predecessor is well known and supported by the sources,<sup>71</sup> the question that arises is whether this return to the past and the links with the Argeadae are a result of traditional Antigonid policy or a reflection of Philip's personal obsession. If it was a novelty propagated by Philip V, we would expect it to meet with some resistance, if not ridicule from his opponents and his contemporaries in general. However, the sources actually show the opposite. For instance, we have the famous Sibylline "prophecy", mentioned in Appian and Pausanias:

αὐχοῦντες βασιλεῦσι Μακεδόνες Ἀργεάδησιν,  
 ὑμῖν κοιρανέων ἀγαθὸν καὶ πῆμα Φίλιππος.  
 ἦτοι ὁ μὲν πρότερος πόλεσιν λαοῖσι τ' ἄνακτας  
 θήσει· ὁ δ' ὀπλότερος τιμὴν ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ὀλέσσει,  
 δμηθεῖς ἐσπερίοισιν ὑπ' ἀνδράσιν ἠώοις τε.<sup>72</sup>

By this point, it is hardly surprising that this "prophecy" makes use of the term "Argeadae" to refer to all Macedonian kings, regardless of dynasty. No distinction is made between the Argeadae and the Antigonidae: in the eyes of the author of these verses, both mentioned Philips are Argead. This resembles the practice of Polybius, who uses the expression οἰκία Μακεδόνων for the Antigonidae and the Argeadae without distinguishing between the two dynasties.<sup>73</sup> Polybius was clearly not alone in this interpretation. In 208 BC the citizens of Argos entrusted Philip with presiding over the Heraean and Nemean Games, because the Macedonian kings allegedly came from this city.<sup>74</sup> Given the political situation and the ongoing war, this act should perhaps not be given too much weight; after all, in the past, Cassander also presided over the Nemean Games.<sup>75</sup> Yet, it seems that this case is not entirely about flattery and attempting to win over the king's favor, as one of the asserted reasons for Argos to stay out of the war against Philip

---

οὕτως ὁ Περσεὺς ὁ δι' εἴκοσι βασιλέων αὐγῶν γεγονέναι, καὶ πολὺν μὲν τὸν Φίλιππον, πλείω δὲ θρυλῶν τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀπόλεσε καὶ αἰχμάλωτος γέγονε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπινικίοις ἐπόμπευσε, δεσμῶ μετὰ τοῦ διαδήματος περικείμενος.

<sup>71</sup> Thus, for example, we know that Philip V commissioned an abridged edition of the work of Theopompus in 16 books, which included only the exploits of Philip II (BNJ 115 T31). At the same time, the bearded portraits of Philip V and Perseus, another novelty in Antigonid coins, should probably be interpreted as an allusion to the well-known depictions of a bearded Philip II (Thoneman 2015, 158-160). Philip V's obsession with Philip II is captured by Pausanias (7.7.5), who, in a cynical note, comments that he was not his ancestor, but his master (τὰ Φιλίππου τοῦ Ἀμύντου, προγόνου μὲν οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ, τῷ δὲ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ δεσπότης).

<sup>72</sup> Paus. 7.8.9; App. *Mak.*, 2.

<sup>73</sup> Walbank 1993, 1725-1727.

<sup>74</sup> Liv. 27.30.9: ibi curatione Heraeorum Nemeorumque suffragiis populi ad eum delata quia se Macedonum reges ex ea ciuitate oriundos referunt.

<sup>75</sup> Diod. 19.64.1.

in 198 BC was the kinship with the Macedonian kings.<sup>76</sup> Perhaps the most important argument that the kinship between the Argeadae and the Antigonidae was met with general acceptance is none other than the silence of Polybius: if it was indeed an invention of Philip V, the Achaean historiographer would hardly miss the opportunity to comment on it and criticize the Macedonian ruler.<sup>77</sup> By all accounts, no matter when this Antigonid propaganda began, by the time of Philip V it was public knowledge that the Antigonidae were direct descendants of the Argeadae and, in fact, were a part of the same ruling house. Whether this was accomplished with successful and convincing propaganda, or was simply due to the fact that the Antigonid dynasty ruled over Macedonia, is irrelevant for our argument – just like the question of whether there was any truth to such a claim.<sup>78</sup>

As for the Ptolemies, the sources for their kinship with the Argeadae are numerous and come from different places. We learn from Theocritus that Ptolemy I was a descendant of Heracles, just like Alexander.<sup>79</sup> Even more interesting is an epigram by Posidippus:

ἀετὸς ἐκ νε[φέω]ν καὶ ἄμα στεροπὴ καταβᾶ[σα]  
 νίκης οἴων[οἱ δε]ξιῶι ἐς πόλεμον  
 Ἀργεάδαις βα[σιλε]ῦσιν, Ἀθηναίη δὲ πρὸ ναο[ῦ]  
 ἵχνος κινή[θὲν δε]ξιὸν ἐκ< μολύβου·  
 οἶον Ἀλεξά[νδρ]ωι ἐφάνη τέρας, ἠνίκα Περσ[ῶν]  
 ταῖς ἀναρ[ιθμ]ήτοις πῦρ ἐκύει στρατιαῖ[ς].<sup>80</sup>

Although the identification is not explicit, the eagle and the lightning bolt, symbols characteristic of Ptolemaic coins,<sup>81</sup> make the association very clear. The choice of these symbols is, again, not accidental, as both the lightning and the eagle are found on the coins of the Argeadae since Archelaus.<sup>82</sup> Given that these poets worked at the court of the Ptolemies, we can interpret these verses as part of the official propaganda, a message that the dynasty wished to convey.<sup>83</sup> As much

<sup>76</sup> Liv. 32.22.11: iam Argiui, praeterquam quod Macedonum reges ab se oriundos credunt, priuatis etiam hospitibus familiarique amicitia plerique inligati Philippo erant.

<sup>77</sup> Pace Edson 1934, 216 sqq.

<sup>78</sup> Edson (1934, 220–222, 226) deduces that the Antigonidae were related to the Argead dynasty in actual fact. Although a definitive conclusion is impossible due to the lack of sources, the criticism of Errington (1976, 154 n.2) seems convincing: he points out that if the Antigonidae were indeed related to the Argeadae, Antigonos the One-Eyed would certainly not have failed to mention it during the wars against Cassander – so, in that sense, his silence is decisive.

<sup>79</sup> Theoc. *Id.* 17.13–27, esp. 26–27: ἄμφω γὰρ πρόγονός σφιν ὁ καρτερὸς Ἡρακλεΐδας, / ἀμφοτέρωι δ' ἀριθμεῖνται ἐς ἔσχατον Ἡρακλεῖα.

<sup>80</sup> *AB* 31, with the emendations in Angiò et al., 2021.

<sup>81</sup> Mørkholm 1991, 63–67, 101–111.

<sup>82</sup> Lianou 2010, 129f.

<sup>83</sup> Lianou 2010, 128.

as we can gather from the sources, the legitimization through association with the Argeadae proceeded on three grounds: the association with Alexander III; the “father” of Ptolemy I; and his ancestors in general. There is no need to look into the connections with Alexander III, which are relatively clear anyway;<sup>84</sup> nor is there anything new to add to the well-known legend that Ptolemy was the illegitimate son of Philip II.<sup>85</sup> Regardless of who began circulating this story, and when,<sup>86</sup> the goal was obviously to establish even more firmly the connections between the Argeadae and the Ptolemies.

We find the “official” genealogy of the Ptolemies on the famous inscription of Ptolemy III from Adulis,<sup>87</sup> which informs us that the king came from Heracles on his father’s side and from Dionysus on his mother’s side – both of them sons of Zeus.<sup>88</sup> The standardized and, in fact, the most detailed genealogy at our disposal is that of Satyrus of Alexandria, compiled somewhat later;<sup>89</sup> this version tells us that the Ptolemies are related to the Argeadae because they also come from Temenus and Caranus, but the two dynastic houses split after the death of Amyntas I.<sup>90</sup> The only son of Amyntas mentioned by name in

<sup>84</sup> V. Lianou 2010, 125-128; cf. Errington 1976, 143-145, 154-156.

<sup>85</sup> Curt. 9.8.22; Paus. 1.6.2; Suda, Α 25. cf. Ael. fr.285.

<sup>86</sup> Historians do not agree on the validity of these rumors, nor when they began to spread. V. Collins 1997 (Ceraunus in Macedonia), Jones 2014, 146 (Ptolemy II), Lianou 2010, 129, Worthington 2016, 151-154 (Ptolemy I).

<sup>87</sup> *OGIS* 54.1-5: βασιλεὺς μέγας Πτολεμαῖος, υἱὸς βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλίσσης Ἀρσινόης θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν, τῶν βασιλέω<ς> Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλίσσης Βερενίκης θεῶν Σωτήρων ἀπόγονος, τὰ μὲν ἀπὸ πατρός Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Διός, τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ μητρὸς Διονύσου τοῦ Διός.

<sup>88</sup> Gambetti (2012) thinks that an artificial division by mother and father was made in the genealogical sequence to make room for Dionysus, but that this does not change anything in the genealogy of the family, as Ptolemy III was the son of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II. However, Ptolemy III’s mother is Arsinoe I, the daughter of Lysimachus, not Arsinoe II. On the other hand, the inscription apparently lists Arsinoe II as his “official” mother, so the interpretation could perhaps be accepted because of this, especially as we learn that Arsinoe II adopted the future Ptolemy III (*Schol Theoc.* 17.128). But this conclusion does not quite correspond with the detailed genealogy in Satyrus, who does not seem to assume any “division” among the parents of Ptolemy III. Accordingly, we should also take into account the opinion of Dittenberger (*ad loc.*), that this is a matter of division as early as the origin of Hyllus, the son of Heracles and Deianeira, the daughter of Dionysus; cf. Huttner 1997, 125. In any case, regardless of the solution, noone can dispute the fact that the Ptolemies insisted on descent from both Dionysus and Heracles.

<sup>89</sup> The genealogical overview in Satyrus ends with Ptolemy IV.

<sup>90</sup> Satyr. *BNJ* 631 F1: Διονύσου καὶ Ἀλθαίας τῆς Θεστίου γεγενῆσθαι Δηϊάνειραν, τῆς δὲ καὶ Ἡρακλέους τοῦ Διός Ὑλλον, τοῦ δὲ Κλεοδαῖον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀριστόμαχον, τοῦ δὲ Τημενον, τοῦ δὲ Κεῖσον, τοῦ δὲ Μάραωνα, τοῦ δὲ Θέστιον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀκοόν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀριστοδαμίδα, τοῦ δὲ Καρανόν, τοῦ δὲ Κοινόν, τοῦ δὲ Τυρίμμαν, τοῦ δὲ Περδίκκαν, τοῦ δὲ Φίλιππον, τοῦ δὲ Αἰρόπον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀλκέταν, τοῦ δὲ Ἀμύνταν, τοῦ δὲ Βόκρον, τοῦ δὲ Μελέαγρον, τοῦ δὲ Ἀρσινόην, τῆς δὲ καὶ Λάγου Πτολεμαῖον τὸν καὶ Σωτήρα, τοῦ δὲ καὶ Βερενίκης Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλᾶδελφον, τοῦ δὲ καὶ Ἀρσινόης Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Εὐεργέτην, τοῦ δὲ καὶ Βερενίκης τῆς Μάγα τοῦ ἐν Κυρήνῃ βασιλεύσαντος Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλοπάτορα.

Herodotus is, of course, Alexander I; but Satyrus conveys the tradition of another son, named Bocrus – a brother of the well-known Philhellene, of whom Ptolemy I Soter was a descendant through his mother Arsinoe.<sup>91</sup>

Given this genealogy, it is hardly surprising that Heracles played a prominent role in dynastic self-representation. Beside Theocritus' praise poem for Ptolemy Philadelphus and the idyll dedicated to Heracles, there are very frequent depictions of Heracles in Alexandrian art that indicate that the hero was very popular.<sup>92</sup> Still, it should be noted that, compared to the devotion of the Ptolemies to Dionysus,<sup>93</sup> Heracles played a secondary role. This is confirmed by the fact that Dionysus enjoyed a central place during the great pomp of Ptolemy II,<sup>94</sup> but also by Satyrus, who names this god as the ἀρχηγέτης of the dynasty. Of course, this does not mean that Heracles was completely marginalized; on the contrary, he could again be thrust into the foreground, depending on the assumed audience. A prime example of this is the decree of the city of Xanthus concerning the request of the representatives of the Doric city of Cytenium. The representatives of Cytenium asked for financial help from Xanthus in order to rebuild the rampart of their city, which the Macedonians had previously demolished; they based their request on the kinship ties that had connected the two cities since mythical times, but did not fail to mention that help from Xanthus would please both the Aetolians and the Dorians, especially King Ptolemy, a relative of the Dorians “κατὰ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους Ἀργεάδας”.<sup>95</sup> Several lines down, the people of Xanthus accept the arguments of the Cytenians and together they honor the Ptolemies, the descendants of the Argeadae. The text of the decree testifies unmistakably that the Ptolemies simultaneously claimed Heraclid ancestry and kinship with Philip and Alexander – which made them Argeadae as well.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>91</sup> The unusual name Bocrus is attested on an inscription from Delos, which mentions an Admetus, son of Bocrus from Thessalonica; v. Gambetti 2012, with relevant references.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Huttner 1997, 124–145, who offers an extensive analysis and discussion.

<sup>93</sup> Jones 2014, 146. V. Fraser 1972, i.201–208.

<sup>94</sup> Kallix. *BNJ* 627 F2 ~ Athen. 196a–203d. Not only does Dionysus clearly have a dominant role in the pomp, but Heracles is not mentioned at all. Indeed, Athenaeus does not transmit the entire text of Callixenes, but he, nevertheless, brings forward the most important aspects. Therefore, even supposing that Heracles had a part in the pomp, the fact that Athenaeus does not mention it, shows that it was evidently of secondary importance.

<sup>95</sup> *SEG* 38.1476: Χαριεῖσθαι τὲ ἡμᾶς ὑπακούσαντας εἰς ταῦτα οὐ μόνον αὐτοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Δωριεῦσι πάσιν, καὶ μάλιστα τῷ βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ ὄντι συγγενεῖ Δωριέων κατὰ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους Ἀργεάδας. Detailed analysis and translation of the inscription in Bousquet 1988. On the date and the historical context, v. Walbank 1989; cf. Scholten 2000, 170–171.

<sup>96</sup> Incidentally, the expression τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους Ἀργεάδας is an argument against the assumption that the terms Temenidae and Argeadae denote two

In comparison with the Antigonid kings, the sources for the kinship between the Ptolemies and the Argeadae are obviously more in number and go back to the time of the first rulers. We cannot tell for sure if this is a mere coincidence due to the surviving sources; but before we continue, let us briefly reflect on another interesting piece of information. Namely, Stephanus of Byzantium mentions that the Ptolemies also dedicated a small island to Argaeus, the eponymous ancestor of the Argeadae.<sup>97</sup> We should perhaps place in the same context the information that Ptolemy I had a son by the name of Argaeus.<sup>98</sup> If this is indeed true,<sup>99</sup> then we have two symptomatic examples of direct allusion to the alleged Argead roots of the Ptolemies. Although the scarce sources prevent us from making a solid conclusion, we would cautiously point to another difference regarding the propaganda of the Ptolemies and the Antigonidae: the former seem to have emphasized more heavily the kinship with the Argeadae through Argaeus, while the latter focused on the connections with the city of Argos. Unfortunately, we have no idea what this difference in approach was due to.<sup>100</sup>

Information on the eventual claim of kinship between the Seleucid kings and the Argeadae is practically non-existent. In the Xanthus inscription mentioned above, we learn, among other things, that the Aetolians allowed the inhabitants of Cytenium to send ambassadors to

---

different things (dynasty/subjects/people); rather, Hatzopoulos (2003, 218) is right to treat these terms as having the same meaning, but being different in age, so that one occurs in older sources, and the other exclusively in later sources.

<sup>97</sup> Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀργέου νήσος: § A112.7 Ἀργέου [νήσος], νήσος μικρὰ πρὸς τῷ Κανώβῳ Αἰγυπτία, ἀπὸ Ἀργέου τοῦ Μακεδόνο, ἀφ' οὗ Ἀργεάδαι. οἱ οἰκίητορες Ἀργεῶται, ὡς τῆς Νικίου Νικιώται καὶ τῆς Χαιρέου Χαιρεῶται. καὶ αὐτὰ γὰρ Αἰγύπτου πόλεις.

<sup>98</sup> Paus. 1.7.1.

<sup>99</sup> Although the information is generally accepted by modern historians, de Ruiter (2013) doubts its accuracy and suggests that this may be another illegitimate son of Alexander III. If this is really so, we have an interesting parallelism in the names of Alexander's illegitimate sons – Heracles and Argaeus. We are, by all means, bound to ask whether this means that, although he did not openly acknowledge these sons, with the names he had chosen, Alexander meant to, at least, indicate that they were his children? While there is no question that this theory is tempting, a serious problem arises from the fact that his name was not mentioned at all during the negotiations in Babylon, especially since the question of Heracles was opened. Obviously, with the sources at our disposal, a definitive solution is impossible.

<sup>100</sup> The answer should perhaps be sought in Posidippus, who explicitly states that the Ptolemies had Eordaeian descent (AB 88). Although he worked at the Ptolemaic court, Posidippus was in fact born in Pella, with Macedonia almost constantly present in his epigrams (v. Stephens 2004), so he must have been aware that by emphasizing their Eordaeian origin, he was depriving the Ptolemaic dynasty of an eventual connection with Argos – either Oresticon, or on the Peloponnese. If this is true, then perhaps the descent of Lagos (and, subsequently, of Ptolemy I) from Eordaea was sufficiently known, so that it could render difficult the attempts to connect the Ptolemies with Argos. On the other hand, for the Antigonidae, who maintained friendly relations with Argos, and even had indirect control over the city after the formation of the Hellenic Symachy in 224 BC, building such relations, regardless of where they came from, was much easier.

all Dorians, including the kings who were descended from Heracles, that is, the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.<sup>101</sup> To this, we could attach the legend mentioned by Libanius in his eulogy for Antioch, stating that, through Temenus, Seleucus was also a Heraclid.<sup>102</sup> We should, however, keep in mind that this is a much later source, so we cannot confidently tell if Libanius is transmitting an authentic tradition from more than five centuries before his time, whether it is a rhetorical exaggeration, a later fabrication, or simply a mistake that usually occurs during the transmission of old traditions and genealogies.<sup>103</sup> In any case, even if we accept the legend as true, on the basis of these two pieces of information<sup>104</sup> there is not much more to say on the Seleucid propaganda and their kinship with the Argeadae.<sup>105</sup> After all, as early as Antiochus I, the Seleucid kings promoted Apollo as their progenitor, that is, father of Seleucus I.<sup>106</sup>

<sup>101</sup> *SEG* 38, 1476.73-76: Ἐδοξε τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς πρεσβείας δόμεν τοῖς Δωριεῖσι ποτὶ τε τὰς πόλεις τὰς συγγενεῖς καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἡρακλέους Πτολεμαίων καὶ Ἀντίοχον.

<sup>102</sup> *Lib. Or.*, 11.91: καὶ ταχὺ μὲν ἡ πόλις ἤρετο, ταχὺ δὲ τὸ ποιηθὲν ἐπίμπλατο τῶν τε ἐκ τῆς Ἰόνης εἰς αὐτὴν καταβάντων Ἀργείων καὶ Κρητῶν καὶ τῶν ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους, οἷς ἦν, οἶμαι, συγγένεια Σελεύκῳ κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν Τήμενον, καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων αὐτῷ Σελεύκῳ στρατιωτῶν τῆδ' ἐλομένων οἰκεῖν.

<sup>103</sup> *Cf.* Errington 1976, 157 n.1; Jones 2014, 146; Erickson 2019, 36f.

<sup>104</sup> Antiochus I of Commagene appears to have claimed descent from Alexander III on his mother's side, through the Seleucidae (*OGIS* 388-401). However, without additional sources, this data is of limited value. Among other problems, we cannot tell if what we have in front of us is an authentic Seleucid tradition, a later tradition, or an invention by Antiochus I of Commagene himself (Errington 1976, 157 n.1; Erickson 2019, 36 *sqq.*) The fact that Alexander III was not included as an ancestor in the official Seleucid ruler cult speaks against this assumption (Van Nuffelen 2004, 293). The numismatic sources are also not very helpful: not only did Seleucus I issue coins with well-known depictions taken from the issues of Alexander III, but among the most common depictions is specifically that of a youthful Heracles. Still, other series show deviation from the traditional Argead motifs; from the time of Antiochus I, the iconography had already developed in another direction (Mørkholm 1991, 71-76, 113-127). Antiochus I and Antiochus II issued new series depicting Heracles, but these series must be placed in the context of the political situation and the events in Asia Minor (Erickson 2019, 131-136). Nevertheless, the importance of Heracles should not be minimized. Apart from several cities bearing his name, there is also the legend that he was the first founder of Daphne, which was originally called Heraclis (Mal. *Chron.* 204). Besides Daphne in the heart of the Seleucid tetrapolis, there is also the myth of the fight with the river Orontes, from which the new field of Heracles arose (Opp. *Cyneg.* 2.109-153). This context includes the legend transmitted by Libanius, that the Heraclids settled a long time ago in a quarter named Heraclia, in the place where Antiochia would later grow (*Lib. Or.*, 11.56). Despite the paucity of sources, there are still enough indications that Heracles was part of the Seleucid propaganda, and probably part of the official genealogy as well. For a more detailed view, v. Ogden 2017, 50-54, *passim*.

<sup>105</sup> Ogden (2017, 50 *sqq.*) accepts the information of Libanius and speculates that their kinship with the Temenidae could derive from Laodicea – the mother of Seleucus I, or from his “earthly” father Antiochus; thus Seleucus would also have two fathers (Apollo and Antiochus), conforming to the tradition of Alexander III (Zeus-Ammon and Philip II).

<sup>106</sup> *Just.* 15.4.2-7. Sherwin-White & Kuhrt 1993, 27 *sqq.*; Erickson 2019, 63-71. On the genesis of the dynastic cult among the Seleucids, v. Van Nuffelen 2004.

It has now become evident that the new Hellenistic dynasties made conscious effort to associate themselves with the old ruling house in various ways: the Antigonidae highlighted their kinship with Argos, the Ptolemies opted for Argaeus, the Seleucids for Temenus. The examples are late, but that is precisely why they matter even more, as they show that the term “Argeadae” had no exactness in historical reminiscence. In Hellenistic times – exactly the time when it appears in common use – “Argeadae” was a general term that referred to the kings of Macedonia. This situation seems to have persisted for quite some time; a third century inscription from Thessalonica mentions one of the local *θηρσκευτὰι καὶ σηκοβάται* (or one of his relatives) as a descendant “*Ἡρακλειδῶν ἀπὸ Τημένου*”.<sup>107</sup>

6. To sum up, the sources confirm that the Macedonian kings – regardless of whether they recognized Perdiccas, Archelaus or Caranus as their progenitor – primarily presented themselves as Temenidae. This, in itself, involved a corresponding descent from Argos in the Peloponnese, without highlighting any additional or collateral branches of the family. Most importantly, the Macedonian kings are mentioned as Temenidae since the first attested episode in the historical sources. This origin may or may not have been fully accepted: the Hellanodicae at Olympia supposedly accepted it, while the Spartans in the Athenian assembly rejected it with contempt. But no one contested it where it was important – in Macedonia and its immediate surroundings. In spite of the different versions and variants, the stories of Perdiccas, Archelaus and Caranus contain of consistent structures: the descent from Heracles; the prophecies that the three heroes receive;<sup>108</sup> the migration from Argos to the Peloponnese; the wandering towards a transitional place near the heart of the future state; the divine validation of the founding of the state; the development of antagonism with local rulers; and, hence, a clash with the local population other than these Macedonians, regardless of the exact meaning of this term.<sup>109</sup>

The name “Argeadae” does not appear in any source before the Hellenistic period, nor – certainly a historiographical irony – was it known before the fall of the Macedonian dynasty which we refer to by

<sup>107</sup> IG X 2.1,16.7: —]ων Ἡρακλειδῶν ἀπὸ Τημένου διαδεξαμε | [v —. V. Steimle 2006, 31.

<sup>108</sup> For the oracle concerning Perdiccas, v. Diod. 7.16; for Caranus, *Schol. Clem. Alex.*, *Protrept.* 2.11; for Archelaus, *Hyg. Fab.* CCXIX.

<sup>109</sup> V. Karadimitriou 1987, 130–131; Μάλλιος 2011; Koulakiotis 2013; Stewart 2021. The reason for this is not far to seek. Koulakiotis (125) is right to point out that “... [il] faudrait éventuellement voir dans ces trois protagonistes des aspects complémentaires d’un même personnage, c’est-à-dire un roi héroïque, fondateur de la monarchie macédonienne: Perdiccas et ses avatars, Archélaos et surtout Caranos, incarnent le héros qui à la fois reçoit des prodiges et des oracles, et sait les interpréter et les réaliser correctement”. Cf. Tripodi (1993, 627 *sqq.*), who presents an outline of a “typology of a founding king” that concerns all members of the Temenid lineage.

that name. Seemingly, it was only then that this term replaced the older one, “Temenidae”. The new name, likewise, reflected the kinship with Argos on the Peloponnese and emphasized the natural continuity with the great Macedonian kings of the past, but it was more wide-ranging, easier to manipulate and, most importantly, it included the royal houses that emerged in the stormy years of the wars between the Diadochs. Moreover, the new name for the old Macedonian ruling house was associated with a named hero, Argaeus, the son of Perdiccas I – a choice that was not accidental, as it was based on the position that Argaeus held in Macedonian mythical and royal tradition.

The historically attested names of the Macedonian ruling house and their mythical justifications – not necessarily including the real origin, which is the least important from the perspective of the ruler’s ideology – deserve a more cautious approach. The two names, Temenidae and Argeadae, alternate as terms to denote the Macedonian rulers, but the former occurs much earlier in the sources and is arguably the only – if any – name used for the dynasty in classical times. It was only after the foundation of the Hellenistic kingdoms ruled by Macedonian dynastic houses that the name Argeadae entered a wider circulation as a neutral term that allowed the new royal houses to be associated with the house of Alexander III. It follows that it would be unwarranted to replace the term Temenidae with another, equally gratuitous, which ultimately lays claim to the same legendary origin, and moreover was first attested a considerable time later. The Temenidae should remain an integral part of the narrative on the Macedonian ruling house.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, W. L. “The Frontier Policy of Philip II”. In *Ancient Macedonia VII: Macedonia from the iron age to the death of Philip II*. Papers read at the Seventh International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 14-18, 2002. Thessaloniki, 2007, 283–291.
- Ανδρόνικος, Μ. *Βεργίνα. Οι βασιλικοί τάφοι και οι άλλες αρχαιότητες*. Εκδοτική Αθηνών, Αθήνα, 1984.
- Ανδρόνικος, Μ. “Βεργίνα. Ανασκαφή 1987”. *AEMΘ* 1, 1987, 81–84.
- Andronikos, M. “Some Reflections on the Macedonian Tombs”. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 82, 1987, 1–16.
- Angiò, F. et al. “New Poems attributed to Posidippus – a text in progress (Version 14).” @ <https://classics-at.chs.harvard.edu/classics1-epigrams/>

- Badian, E. “Greeks and Macedonians”. In Barr-Sharrar B. & Borza E. N. (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*. Studies in the History of Art 10. National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C., 1982, 33–51.
- Baegel, W. *De Macedonum Sacris*. Halis Saxonum, 1913.
- Borza, E. N. “Athenians, Macedonians and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House”. In *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*. Hesperia, Suppl. 19. Princeton, 1982, 7–13.
- Borza, E.N. *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon*. Princeton, 1990.
- Bousquet, J. “La stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos”. *Revue des Études Grecques* vol. 101, no. 480/481, 1988, 12–53.
- Burkert, W. “Lydia Between East and West or How to Date the Trojan War: A Study in Herodotus”. In Carter, J. B. & Morris, S. P. (eds.). *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*. University of Texas Press, 1995, 139–148.
- Chatziniakolaou, K. “Locating Sanctuaries in Upper Macedonia According to Archaeological Data”. *Kernos* 23, 2010, 193–222.
- Collard, C. et al. (eds.). *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays 2*. Aris and Phillips Classical Texts. Oxford, 2004.
- Collins, N. L. “The Various Fathers of Ptolemy I”. *Mnemosyne* 50.4, 1997, 436–476.
- Courmarie, P. “L’autorité entre masque et signe. Le statut du corps royal dans la Grèce ancienne (IVe-IIe siècle av. J.-C.)”. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences sociales* 71.3, 2016, pp. 683–707.
- Δασκαλάκης, Α. “Αργεάδαι – Τημενίδαι. Καταγωγή και ιστορική απαρχή του βασιλικού οίκου της Μακεδονίας”. *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 8, 1957-8, 35–125.
- De Ruiter, B. F. O. “Argaeus, an Illegitimate Son of Alexander the Great?” *ZPE* 187, 2013, 206–210.
- Драганов, Д. *Монетите на македонските царе*, част 2. Издателство „Я“, Ямбол, 2001.
- Edson, C. F. “The Antigonids, Heracles, and Beroea.” *HSCP* 45, 1934, 213-246.
- Ellis, J. R. “Population Transplants by Philip II”. *Μακεδονικά* 9, 1969, 9–17.
- Erickson, K. *The Early Seleukids, their Gods and their Coins*. Routledge, London & New York, 2019.
- Errington, R. M. “Alexander in the Hellenistic World.” In Badian, E. (ed.). *Alexandre le Grand*. Fondation Hardt, Genève, 1976, 137-179.
- Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. 1–3. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1972.
- Gambetti, S. “Satyros of Alexandria (631)”. In Worthington, I. (ed.). *Brill’s New Jacoby*. Brill Online Reference, 2012.
- Gantz, T. *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1993.
- Gounaropoulou, L. & Hatzopoulos, M. B. *Les milliaires de la Voie Egnattienne entre Héraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique*. Meletemata 1. Centre de recherches de l’antiquité grecque et romaine, Athènes, 1985, 62–71.
- Greenwalt, W. “The Introduction of Caranus into the Argead King List” *GRBS* 26.1, 1985, 43–49.
- Greenwalt, W. “Argaeus in the Macedonian Religious Tradition”. *The Ancient History Bulletin* 1.3, 1987, 51–53.
- Greenwalt, W. “The Production of Coinage From Archelaus to Perdikkas III and the Evolution of Argead Macedonia”. In Worthington, I. (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994, 105-134.
- Guth, D. S. *Character and Rhetorical Strategy: Philip II of Macedonia in Fourth Century Athens*. Dissertation. University of Michigan, 2011.
- Hammond, N. G. L. *A History of Macedonia, volume I*. Oxford, 1972.
- Hammond, N. G. L. & Griffith, G. T. *A History of Macedonia, volume II, 550-336 B.C.* Oxford, 1979.

- Hammond, N. G. L. “The Sources of Justin on Macedonia to the Death of Philip”. *The Classical Quarterly* 41.2, 1991, 496–508.
- Hammond, N. G. L. “Illyris, Epirus and Macedonia”. In Boardman J. & Hammond N. G. L., *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup>, vol. III, part 3: *The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.* Cambridge University Press, 1982, 261–285.
- Harder, A (ed.). *Euripides’ Kresphontes and Archelaos*. Introduction, Text and Commentary. Mnemosyne suppl. 87. E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1985.
- Hatzopoulos M. B. *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine*. Meletemata 19. Centre de recherches de l’antiquité grecque et romaine, Athènes, 1994.
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. “Herodotus (8.137-8), the Manumissions from Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley”. In Derow P. & Parker R. (eds.). *Herodotus and His World: Essays From a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*. Oxford University Press, 2003, 203–218.
- Heckel, W. “Marsyas of Pella, Historian of Macedon”. *Hermes* 108, 1980, 444–462.
- Heskel, J. “Philipp II and Argaios: a Pretender’s Story”. In Wallace R. W. & Harris E. M. (eds.). *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History 360-146 B.C., in honor of E. Badian*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1996, 37–56.
- Huttner, U. *Die politische Rolle der Heraklesgestalt im griechischen Herrschertum*. Historia, Einzelschriften 112. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1997.
- Huxley, G. “Argos et les derniers Téménides”. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 82.1, 1958, 588–601.
- Jones, K. R. “Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V and the Colossus of Rhodes.” *CQ* 64.1, 2014, 136–151.
- Καραδημητρίου Α. Κ. “Οι Μακεδόνες βασιλείς και οι χρησιμοί”. *Μακεδονικά* 26, 1987, 126–138.
- Koulakiotis, E. “Aspects de la divination dans la monarchie macédonienne”. *Kernos* 26, 2013, 123–138.
- Le Bohec-Bouhet, S. “The Kings of Macedon and the Cult of Zeus in the Hellenistic Period”. In Ogden D. (ed.). *The Hellenistic World. New Perspectives*. The Classical Press of Wales, 2002, 41–57.
- Lianou, M. “The Role of the Argeadai in the Legitimation of the Ptolemaic Dynasty.” In Carney, E. & Ogden, D. (eds.). *Philip II and Alexander the Great*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, 123–133.
- Macurdy, G. H. “Klodonos, Mimallones and Dionysus Pseudanor”. *The Classical Review*, 27.6, 1913, 191–192.
- Μάλλιος, Γ. Κ. *Μύθος και ιστορία: η περίπτωση της αρχαίας Μακεδονίας*. Διδακτορική διατριβή. Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2011.
- Μάλλιος, Γ. Κ. “Cui bono; Ο πρώτος βασιλιάς των Μακεδόνων Κάρανος και οι σκοπιμότητες που επέβαλαν τις αλλαγές στον δυναστικό μύθο της ίδρυσης του μακεδονικού κράτους”. *Η Έδεσσα και η περιοχή της. Ιστορία και πολιτισμός*. Πρακτικά Γ΄ Πανελληνίου Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου. Έδεσσα, 11–12 Δεκεμβρίου 2010. Έδεσσα, 2014, 211–230.
- Markle, M. M. “Support of Athenian Intellectuals for Philip: A Study of Isocrates’ Philippus and Speusippus’ Letter to Philip.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 96, 1976, 80–99.
- Митрев, Г. & Тараков, Т. „Civitas Heraclaeotarum – Новооткрит епиграфски паметник с името на античният град при Рупите, Петричко.“ *Археология* 4, 2002, 25–32.
- Mitrev, G. “Civitas Heraclaeotarum: Heraclia Sintica or the Ancient City at the Village of Rupite (Bulgaria)”. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145, 2003, 263–272.
- Moloney, E. “Neither Agamemnon nor Thersites, Achilles nor Margites: The Heraclid Kings of Ancient Macedon.” *Antichthon* 49, 2015, 50–72.
- Mørkholm, O. *Early Hellenistic Coinage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- Nilsson, M. P. *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece*. Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, 1. Gleerup, Lund, 1951.
- Ogden, D. *The Legend of Seleucus*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017.

- Papazoglou, F. *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*. Suppléments au Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique 16. Paris, 1988.
- Paschidis, P. "Artemis Ephesia and Herakles the Greatest God in the Northwestern Macedonian Confines: Aspects of the Religious Landscape of Roman Macedonia". In Maksimović, L. & Riel, M. (eds.). *Τῆ προσφιλεστάτη καὶ πάντα ἀρίστη Μακεδονιαρχίση. Students and Colleagues for Prof. Fanoula Papazoglou*. Belgrade, 2018, 137-161.
- Patterson L. E. *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*. University of Texas Press, Austin, 2010.
- Price, M. *Coins of the Macedonians*. British Museum Publications, London, 1974.
- Πουλάκη-Παντερμαλή Ε. "Πλαταμών Ολύμπου (Ηρακλείου) και η εποχή του Σιδήρου". *Αρχαία Μακεδονία* VII. Θεσσαλονίκη, 2007, 625-643.
- Πουλάκη-Παντερμαλή Ε. "Κρανιά-Ηράκλειο. Τρία Πλατάνια, Κομπολόι, Βάλτος". *Αρχαιολογικές Τροχιδοδρομήσεις από τη Θεσσαλονίκη στον Πλαταμόνα*. Αθήνα, 2008, 116-153.
- Remijnsen, S. "Only Greeks at the Olympics? Reconsidering the rule against non-Greeks at 'panhellenic' games". *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 67, 2019, 1-61.
- Ριζάκης, Α. & Τουράτοσγλου, Ι. "Λατρείες στην Άνω Μακεδονία. Παράδοση και νεωτερισμοί". In *Ancient Macedonia* VI, vol. 2. Papers read at the Sixth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 15-19, 1996. Thessaloniki, 1999, 949–965.
- Ρωμαίος Κ. Α. "Βεργίνα. Τά ευρήματα του τάφου του Φιλίππου καὶ ἡ λαογραφικὴ ερμηνεία τους". *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Ερεύνης της Ελληνικής Λαογραφίας* 25, 1977, 251–289.
- Rosen, K. "Die Gründung der makedonischen Herrschaft". *Chiron* 8, 1978, 1–27.
- Scholten, J. B. *The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279-217 B.C.* University of California Press, 2000.
- Scullion, S. "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the 'Frogs'". *The Classical Quarterly* 53.2, 2003, 389–400.
- Sherwin-White, S. & Kuhrt, A. *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1993.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and others. Myth, ritual, ethnicity*. Martin P. Nilsson Lecture on Greek Religion, delivered 1997 at the Swedish Institute at Athens. Stockholm, 2005.
- Sprawski, S. "The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I". In Roisman, J. & Worthington, I. (eds.). *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*. Wiley – Blackwell, 2010, 127–144.
- Sprawski, S. "The Temenidae, Who Came Out of Argos. Literary Sources and Numismatic Evidence on the Macedonian Dynastic Traditions". *Notae Numismaticae* 16, 2021, 13–42.
- Steimle, C. "Das Heiligtum der ägyptischen Götter in Thessaloniki und die Vereine in seinem Umfeld". In Bonnet, C. et al. (eds.). *Religions orientales. Neue perspectives – nouvelles perspectives – prospettive nuove*. Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 16. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2006.
- Stephens, S. "Posidippus' Poetry Book: Where Macedon Meets Egypt." In Harris, W. V. & Ruffini, G. (eds.). *Ancient Alexandria between Egypt and Greece*. Brill, Leiden & Boston, 2004, 63–86.
- Stewart, E. "Tragedy and Tyranny: Euripides, Archelaus of Macedon and Popular Patronage". *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 2021, Supp. 21, 79–101.
- Sverkos, I. "Macedonia in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods". In Koliopoulos, I. (ed.), *The History of Macedonia*. Museum of the Macedonian Struggle, Thessaloniki, 2007, 23–49.
- Thoneman, P. *The Hellenistic World: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- Tiverios, M. "The presence of Euboeans in the north Helladic region and the myths of Heracles". In: Bodzek J. (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization* 17, Dedicated to Professor Ewdoksia Papouci-Władyka. Kraków, 2013, 97–110.
- Tripodi, B. "Tipologia e ideologia di Perdicca, primo 'Fondatore' della regalità macedone. In *Ancient Macedonia* V, vol. 3. Papers read at the Fifth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 10-15, 1989. Thessaloniki, 1993, 1623–1630.

- Ustinova, Y. *The Supreme Gods of the Bosporan Kingdom: Celestial Aphrodite and the Most High God*. Leiden, Brill, 1999.
- Van Nuffelen, P. “Le culte royal de l’empire des Séleucides: une réinterprétation.” *Historia* 53.3, 2004, 278–301.
- Walbank, F. W. “Antigonos Doson’s Attack on Cytinium (REG 101 (1988), 12-53).” *ZPE* 76, 1989, 184–192.
- Walbank, F. W. “Η ΤΩΝ ΟΛΩΝ ΕΛΠΙΣ and the Antigonids.” *Ancient Macedonia V*. Papers read at the fifth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 10-15, 1989. Thessaloniki, 1993, 1721–1730.
- Worthington, I. *Ptolemy I: King and Pharaoh of Egypt*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016.
- Ξυδόπουλος, Ι. *Κοινωνικές και πολιτιστικές σχέσεις των Μακεδόνων και των άλλων Ελλήνων: συμβολή στην έρευνα της γραμματειακής και επιγραφικής παραδόσεως για την αρχαία Μακεδονία*. Διδακτορική διατριβή. Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Θεσσαλονίκη, 1998.
- Захарова, Е. А. “К вопросу о матримониальных связях греческих героев в Северном Причерноморье”. *Мнемон* 4, 2005, 359–372.

