

## The Borders of Ancient Makedonia II: from Philippos II to Andriskos<sup>1</sup>

John Melville-Jones  
Emeritus Professor of Classics and Ancient History  
University of Western Australia

Because more written and archaeological evidence relating to this period survives than the limited evidence for the period discussed in the first of these articles, the second part of this account will be even more of an epitome than the first. However, one thing is gradually becoming clearer: it is now increasingly possible to define the borders of Makedonia, even if the occasional raids made by neighbouring groups still caused them to fluctuate from time to time. It was during this period that this country took a form that is approximately equivalent to the modern Greek province of Makedonia (if we add a small triangle outside it to the north-west that includes Bitola). Also, it was during this period that the separate ethnicities of the different groups that existed in this area began to fade, and be replaced by a general Makedonian identity. Again, what must have been a diversity of slightly different dialects (most of which are lost to us) was gradually replaced from the late fourth century B.C. onwards by a version of the Attic dialect (later called the *koine* or common language) in Makedonia as elsewhere in the Greek world and in the eastern areas that had been conquered by Alexandros III.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The publications to which reference is made in the first part of this study remain relevant to this second section. In addition, the work by Ian Worthington, *Philip of Macedon*, New Haven and London 2008, will be found useful.

<sup>2</sup> The general development of a Makedonian nation, which included other groups who became “Makedonized”, while the original *Makedones* had a higher status, is briefly and accurately described by N.G.L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State*, Oxford 1989, pp. 192-5. In one respect, however, this précis is inaccurate, because it refers to “a standard form of Greek” and claims that Philippos “insisted on the use of the *koine* in the administration of his kingdom”. But in the middle of the fourth century B.C., although Attic Greek was certainly used by the Makedonian aristocracy, it could not be described as a “common form of speech” among Greek communities. The idea that there was a *koine dialektos* as early as this may have had its genesis in the occurrence of these words in a biography of the fourth century orator Isocrates by Dionysos of Halikarnassos (chapter 2). But in the context of that chapter, it is clear that what is meant is that Isokrates favoured a rhetorical style that was free from archaisms, elevated language and unusual expressions, more like the everyday speech that was commonly spoken in Athens, rather than the inflated and artificial style favoured by some orators. He was not referring to the common form of Greek that spread throughout Greece and the eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period, but to the speech of “the common people”. For an excellent recent study of the Makedonian dialect and other Greek dialects (one of which, Attic, later became the basis of the Greek language in Greece and elsewhere), see the article by Giorgios Babiniotes, “Ancient Macedonian: a Case Study”, *Macedonian Studies Journal*, 2014, 1, pp. 1-10. The Makedonian dialect is now not recoverable, because it was rarely if ever used for written communications, and the hundred or so words (as opposed to personal names) that were recorded by the lexicographer Hesychios, who wrote in the 5th or 6th century of the Christian era, using sources that had been created several hundred years earlier, were chosen because they were different from the forms found in Attic or *koine* Greek. So we do not know what the majority of the words used by the Macedonians might have been, and because we do not have complete sentences (except in

In the first part of this study, it was made clear that the borders of ancient Macedonia in the early centuries of its existence cannot always be delineated accurately. No ancient writer, and no other kind of evidence, enables us to describe its boundaries exactly, except when they were marked by the sea or a river or a mountain range, since it is often not clear whether the occupants of the outlying areas under Makedonian control should be considered as being *Makedones*, and their territory as being part of Macedonia, or whether they should be defined as allies or dependants of the *Makedones*. This situation continued to a lesser extent until the time of the Roman conquest, which led to a completely different arrangement. However, the general picture begins to become clearer during the fourth century B.C.

At first, however, there was no sign that this would happen. After the death of Perdikkas III in 359 B.C., after a reign of only five years, Macedonia was in a dangerous situation. The Illyrians on their western border, the Paionians to the north and the *Thrakes* to the east, all assumed that his successor, Philippos II, only twenty-three or twenty-four years old, would be no more successful than his immediate predecessors in ruling and protecting his country, and that they would be able to engage in looting, or to nibbling away at the territory nearest to them, with impunity. The Athenians, far away to the south, were also interested in expanding their influence because of the colonies that they had in northern Greece, although they did not make any immediate moves, while the Thebans were temporarily in a dominating position. Whatever their plans or ambitions were, if they thought of dominating Macedonia, they were all wrong. Philippos turned out to be one of the most successful generals in history, and not only secured the borders of Macedonia for centuries, but made it possible for his son Alexandros to move eastward and conquer an amazingly large area of the world, bringing the Greek language and Greek customs to many other nations.

Philippos had, before he succeeded his brother Perdikkas III, spent some time outside Macedonia. The strongest power in Greece at that time was Thebes, and the *Thebaioi* had a strong interest in controlling or at least stabilising Thessalia, and preventing the *Makedones* from exercising control over that area. Larissa, their most important polis at that time, had fallen briefly under Makedonian control, but this was reversed by the Theban general Pelopidas, and afterwards Philippos and a number of other Makedonian nobles were taken to Thebes as hostages for two or three years. There can be little doubt that he benefited from this. He would have taken note of the equipment of the Theban army, and the way in which Pelopidas and the other great Theban general Epaminondas handled their troops, and this experience would have been beneficial to him when he returned to his native land.

As king, Philippos had to begin by protecting his closest borders from the invasions that were beginning to take place. Here he used an ingenious combination of bribery and warfare. He bought off the Paionians for the moment with such gifts as he could afford, and the promise of future ones; as Diodoros Sikeliotes tells us:<sup>3</sup> “After sending an embassy to

---

the case of a tablet containing the text of a curse leveled against an enemy which was found at Pella), we do not know to what extent its grammar and syntax differed from other Greek dialects. A very useful list of Macedonian personal names and other words is provided by O. Hoffman in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 27 (= XIV, 1), Stuttgart 1928, columns 681-97.

<sup>3</sup> XVI, iii, 4.

the Paionians, and corrupting some with presents and persuading others with generous promises, he arranged to make peace with them for the present".<sup>4</sup> This did not last long, because soon afterwards, when an Athenian attempt to acquire Methone had been defeated, the Paionian king Agis died, and Philippos, who did not now need to keep such a large part of his forces near the southern border of Makedonia to guard against the Athenians, advanced into Paionia and was victorious there.

The subsequent relationship between the *Makedones* and the *Paiones* seems to be one of semi-alliance at this period. We hear no more of attempts to invade Makedonia from this direction, and the Paionians provided some cavalry later for the army of Alexandros III (which may also have meant that some of their best men who joined this expedition might not only have been hoping to bring back booty to their native land, but would have been serving as hostages in case their countrymen tried to take advantage of the absence of Alexandros in Asia).<sup>5</sup> However, in the fourth century and later, until the Roman conquest of Makedonia, they issued their own coins. The relationship is sometimes described as that of a "client kingdom", but this may be an exaggeration; Paionia should always be considered as separate from Makedonia until a quarter of a century after the Roman conquest.<sup>6</sup> Following this, as Diodoros again tells us,<sup>7</sup> Philippos turned his attention to his western border; and after a hard fought battle against Bardylis, the king of the Dardanians who were located north of Paionia, who had extended his power over the Illyrians, he defeated him and recovered the territory that had been recently annexed.

This victory was followed by moves to protect and extend the eastern borders of Makedonia by warfare and diplomacy. Chalkidike was not yet a part of Makedonian territory, and the Athenians had a strong presence there, because they had established a colony near its northern edge at Amphipolis, and had for some years placed their own settlers at

---

<sup>4</sup> In the same passage, Diodoros tells us that Philippos won over the king of the *Thrakes*, who was planning to attack Makedonia in order to install another member of its royal family called Pausanias, by "persuading him with gifts".

<sup>5</sup> Some interesting coins issued late in the 4th century B.C., studied by Nicholas L. Wright, "The Horseman and the Warrior: Paionia and Macedonia in the Fourth Century BC", *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 2012, pp. 1-26, show a Paionian horseman about to kill a fallen warrior who carries a shield of what is called the "Makedonian" type. But it would not be appropriate to interpret this as evidence for a battle at this time in which the Paionians were victorious, since this type of shield is also found outside Makedonia, in Illyria, for example, and recently at a site near Bonce. A good study of the coinage of Paionia has been published by Eleonora Petrova, "The coinage of the Paeonian Tribal Organisations and Paeonian Kings (VI to III Centuries B.C.), Coins and mints in Macedonia", in *Proceedings of the symposium held in honor of the 80th birthday and 50th anniversary of the scholarly and educational work of Ksente Bogoev, member of the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences*, ed. Cvetan Grozdanov, tr. Elizabeta Bakovska, Katerina Hristovska, Skopje 2001, pp. 13-27.

<sup>6</sup> The nearest thing to a precise definition of the relationship is the statement of Diodoros (XVI, iv, 2) that when after Agis, king of the Paionians, who had previously been bought off with gifts and promises, died in 359/8 B.C., Philippos moved into their territory, defeated them and "after defeating the barbarians forced the nation to be obedient (*peitharchein*) to the Makedones". These words are too vague for us to understand the precise relationship that developed after this, and there is certainly no sign of any linking of the nations administratively, politically or through royal marriages, other than support in the form of cavalry for the eastern campaign of Alexandros III. The incorporation of Paionia and other areas into a greatly enlarged "Makedonia" will be described in the third and final part of this survey.

<sup>7</sup> XVI, iv, 2-7.

Potidaia. Philippos, as Diodoros tells us, captured Amphipolis, and took Potidaia “for the Olynthians”, because at that time they were supporting him against the Athenians.<sup>8</sup>

At this time too, Philippos made war on the *Thrakes* at the request of the Thasians, who had established themselves in a city (which they called Krenides) on the mainland opposite their island, because it had access to rich sources of gold. Philippos took over this city, and, as Diodoros tells us, “increased its size with a great number of inhabitants and changed its name to Philippoi, naming it from himself”.<sup>9</sup> So Makedonia was now effectively expanded eastward as far as the Nestos river.

Also, now that his northern and western borders were more or less secure, Philippos could look to the east and south-east, and the result was that within a few years he had gained control of Chalkidike and its hinterland. An important event was his capture of Amphipolis in 357 B.C., and although that city, like Krenides/Philippoi, was allowed a certain amount of autonomy for a while, access to it gave him a base which was useful for transit towards Thrake. Later, because of its location on the River Strymon, it also became a naval base.

Marrying to gain an advantage for one’s country is common enough, but few kings can have practised this form of border protection as assiduously as Philippos, if we look at the list of his wives that is preserved in the *Deipnosophistai* of Athenaios. Athenaios attributes the passage that he quotes to an author, Satyros, most of whose work does not survive, who wrote at Alexandria in the time of the Ptolemies. It reads as follows:<sup>10</sup>

[Philip the Macedonian did not bring women to his wars like Dareios] ... but Philip always married with a view to war (*kata polemon egamei*).<sup>11</sup> “In the twenty-two years that he was king”, as Satyros says in his *Life* of him, “he married Audata the Illyrian, and had a daughter Kynane by her. He also married Phila, a sister of Derdas and Machatas. Because he also wished to make the race of the Thessalians his own, he produced children from two Thessalian women, one of them being Nikopolis of Pherai, who bore Thessalonike for him, and the other Philinna of Larisa, from whom

---

<sup>8</sup> Diodoros XVI, viii, 1-5. This good relationship with Olynthos lasted for less than a decade, and in 348 B.C. Philippos took the city and destroyed it.

<sup>9</sup> XVI, viii, 6. This is the first recorded example of the practice which later became so common of naming a city after a ruler or a member of a ruling family. In 348 B.C. Philippos also founded a city which he named Philippopolis (now Plovdiv in modern Bulgaria), and by doing this extended the area of Makedonian control further to the east.

<sup>10</sup> Athenaios, *Deipnosophistai* XIII, 557, b-d, printed as fragment 5 (with an incorrect ascription to Book XII) of the works of Satyros by Karl Müller in his *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, Paris 1849, at p. 161 of volume 3.

<sup>11</sup> The translation offered here is deliberately vague. The version offered by Charles Burton Gulick in the Loeb Classical Library edition of this work, “Philip always married a new wife with each war he undertook”, implies that his marriages should be dated in step with his campaigns against his neighbours. This has led to suggestions that the order of his marriages has been misreported in the passage that has been quoted here. No certainty is possible; the only thing that is certain is that with the possible exception of Kleopatra, all his wives were married because these alliances helped to protect his borders, and, of course, because their offspring, particularly if they were male, would not only have provided a pool of successors to Philippos, but would also strengthen relations with his neighbours. It is probably better to conclude that the marriages were undertaken in the hope of creating long-term alliances, rather than being connected with specific campaigns, when the conditions for creating a matrimonial alliance would have been less satisfactory.

---

he got Arrhidaios. He also gained the kingdom of the Molossians by marrying Olympias, by whom he had Alexandros and Kleopatra. Then, when he took Thrake, Cothelas the king of the Thrakians, who brought his daughter Meda and many gifts. And after marrying her, Philip added her to Olympias. And in addition to all these, he married Kleopatra, the sister of Hippostratos and niece of Attalos, after falling in love with her, and by making her an addition to Olympias he confounded his whole life. For immediately after this, at the actual wedding, Attalos said, "Now indeed legitimate rulers will be born, not bastards". And when Alexandros heard this, he threw the drinking cup that he was holding at Attalos, and he threw his own cup back at him. And after this Olympias fled to the country of the Molossians, and Alexandros to the Illyrians. And Kleopatra bore to Philippos a daughter who was called Europa.<sup>12</sup>

If we look at the individual marriages, the first, with Audata, the daughter of the Dardanian king Bardylis (who is called Illyrian here, because he had gained control of areas occupied by the Illyrians, including Kosovo), was obviously beneficial to the *Makedones*, and if Audata had produced a son, the course of history might have been changed.

Phila, Derdas and Machatas were probably the children of Derdas II, who ruled the independent kingdom of Elimiotis along the Haliakmon river. Although their kingdom had not been as dangerous to the *Makedones* as the kingdom of Bardylis, this marriage also made sense as a symbol of an intended peaceful relationship, and would have been acceptable to the Elimians, after Philippos had shown his prowess as a commander of an armed force. Satyros does not record any births from this second marriage. There is no record of Audata's death, and it can hardly be imagined that Philippos put her away, so it may be assumed that this and later marriages were polygamous (and his father Amyntas certainly had more than one wife at the same time).

The marriage between Philippos and Nikesipolis (who died shortly after giving birth to a daughter Thessalonike) was obviously intended to cement relations with Thessalia, and at about this time Philippos was elected as the leader of the Thessalian League. It should be remembered that although the rulers of Makedonia before and after Philippos II all wanted to exert control over Thessalia, they never tried to incorporate it formally into their kingdom. This is understandable, since contact with this southern area was always difficult because of the existence of Mount Olympos, which created a natural barrier or boundary.

Thessalonike was later given in marriage to Kassandros, the son of Antipater, a trusted lieutenant of Philippos, and he later honoured her by founding the city that still bears her name.<sup>13</sup>

The best known of the wives of Philippos is Olympias, a Molossian princess (the Molossoi had not at this time been absorbed into the Epeirote confederacy). This marriage would in the first place have been only another way of safeguarding the borders of Make-

---

<sup>12</sup> The story of Attalos's anger repeats a passage in the life of Alexandros by Ploutarchos (IX, 7).

<sup>13</sup> It is sometimes in ancient texts called Thessalonikeia, the form that would more naturally (like Alexandria) be used for a city named after someone, but its name is now more generally spelt in the same way as the name of Kassandros's wife.

donia, in this case in its south-west corner, but Olympias became the mother of Alexandros III, so of course she played a much greater part in subsequent history.

The fifth wife in Satyros's list, Philinna of Larisa, must have been chosen in order to maintain the good relations between Philippos and the rulers of Thessalia. She gave him another son, named after his father, but also called Arrhidaios (a name of uncertain meaning).

The last marriage that Philippos undertook for diplomatic reasons was designed not only to protect but also to expand his territory. He was given Meda, the daughter of King Cotys, who ruled a group called the Getai in Thrake on the southern side of the Danube, in 339 B.C.

The last marriage in Satyros's list was to Kleopatra, a member of an aristocratic Makedonian family and perhaps the only wife that Philippos took for love, although again there might have been political reasons as well as his desire to make more sons.

Moving on from Philippos's attempts to protect his borders through appropriate marriages, we should now attempt to show how he gained fresh territory through warfare, and in so doing modified the nature of the population of his enlarged territory. He not only enlarged the Makedonian army, but in doing so included men from a number of the different groups that existed in the territory that he controlled. This had two effects. The first was that he created a much greater degree of unity, so that groups that might have considered themselves non-Makedonian came in succeeding generations to accept that they were now Makedonian and that their territory was permanently a part of Makedonia (a development which has, in different forms, occurred in later times).<sup>14</sup> The second effect was that this enlarged army could not be allowed to stand idle, and after he had, with some difficulty, subdued the Greek states that were unwilling to accept his authority, he was beginning to turn his attention towards the Persian Empire when his life was abruptly terminated.<sup>15</sup>

The official borders of Makedonia seem to have remained stable during the reign of Philippos's son Alexandros III<sup>16</sup>, after a short period when a northern tribe, the Triballoi, attempted an attack, which was swiftly repressed. An earlier attempted revolt from the control that was exercised from Makedonia over their southern neighbours, led by the Athenians and Thebans, had led to their defeat at the battle of Chaironeia in 338 B.C., and the locating of a Makedonian garrison on the acropolis or Kadmeia of Thebes; and when

---

<sup>14</sup> An interesting and highly relevant note on this process survives in the later *Epitome* of the *Historiae Philippicae*, a work composed by a Gaulish writer called Pompeius Trogus in the early years of the Roman Empire, and epitomized by a certain Justin. The relevant passage (VIII, v, 7) reads as follows: "On returning to his kingdom [probably in 345 B.C. to judge from the context], just as shepherds transfer their flocks into winter pastures at one time and summer pastures at another, he moved peoples and cities hither and thither as he wished, according to whether he thought that their populations needed to be filled up, or left deserted". The comparison with shepherding is less than fully satisfactory, since it may be assumed that these transfers were permanent.

<sup>15</sup> For an overview of this process, see in particular the article by J.R. Ellis (once my student, but in relation to this topic my teacher), "The Dynamics of Fourth-Century Macedonian Imperialism", in *Archaiia Makedonia II*, Thessaloniki 1977, pp. 103-114.

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps this is even less surprising when we remember that, in addition to leaving Makedonia and invading Asia, Alexandros had also succeeded his father as *hegemon* of the League of Corinth, which had been formed after the battle of Chaironeia, and his destruction of Thebes would have made other groups very wary of doing anything that might attract attention from him.

there was a further revolt in 326 B.C., the destruction of Thebes, or at least of the Kadmeia, meant that further resistance was not likely to occur, even when Alexandros left for Asia and left Makedonia under the control of Antipatros. This period of relative calm is perhaps also not surprising, since some of the groups that might have attempted to encroach on areas under Makedonian control, such as the Paionians and Thessalians, contributed troops to his army when he moved eastward. Their domestic armies were therefore weakened, and they would also have been in no doubt that if Alexander heard that they were attempting to seize any of his territory, they would never see the relatively small number of their men who were marching or riding with him again.

Alexandros died in 323 B.C., and the heirs that he left were too young and inadequate in other ways to succeed him successfully. As a result, his enormously enlarged kingdom was split, and ruled by separate *Makedones* who each took the title of *basileus*. In Makedonia itself, after a brief war (323-322 B.C.) when Athens and the Aitolians attempted to overthrow Antipatros, who was still acting as regent in Makedonia, their defeat in what is now generally called the Lamian War led to the removal of this threat, and the battle-hardened Makedonian veterans who had served with Alexandros, together with the troops that had never left Makedonia, were able to discourage any other attempts to take Makedonian territory that might have eventuated. In addition, Makedonia now exerted control over much of the southern Greek world.

However, in 280-277 B.C. there was a threat in the form of invasions from what is now Croatia of large numbers of *Keltoi* (usually called Gauls in English). The large number of these invaders, and their unwillingness to fight in the proper Makedonian fashion, led to their overrunning large areas of land in Makedonia and Thrakia, and their penetrating even as far as Delphoi. But fortunately they then retreated, and after being occasionally defeated, were finally settled in Asia in the area that was named Galatia after them. So although the Makedonian state and its economy was severely damaged, its borders stayed the same, although there were frequent raids by the Dardanians which penetrated Paionia and came as far as the northern areas of Makedonia.<sup>17</sup>

This situation continued until the second century B.C., when after a series of wars the Romans defeated the last king of Makedonia, Perseus (named after the legendary ancestor of the royal family), at Pydna in 168 B.C. In the following year, the conquerors attempted to weaken the identity of Makedonia and its people by imposing an unusual arrangement on the country. Our sources for this are the Roman writer Livy<sup>18</sup> and, with more detail, Diodoros Sikeliotes.<sup>19</sup> The latter tells us that in addition to stopping production from the gold and silver mines in the area (so that precious metal could not be provided to sup-

---

<sup>17</sup> In an attempt to defend his country against the Dardanoi, Philip V, whose armed forces had been reduced following the treaty that had been made at the end of the Second Macedonian War, arranged with another Thraco-Illyrian tribe, the Bastarnai, to invade their territory, aiming to assist them to settle there, so that with their help he could gain more territory. But he died as they were beginning to move, and they were soon chased away. This was one of the reasons that led the Romans to suspect that Philip's successor Perseus would also be less than loyal to them, and so they declared war on him in 171 B.C.

<sup>18</sup> XLV, 17-18.

<sup>19</sup> XXI, viii, 6-9.

port a revolt),<sup>20</sup> the region was to be divided into four separate republics, or cantons as they might be called. Diodoros described these areas in the following words:

The first contained the area between the Nestos River and the Strymon, the forts to the east of the Nestos except those of Abdera, Maroneia and Ainos, and to the west of the Strymon the whole of Bisaltike, with Herakleia Sintike; the second the area with its boundary on the east being the Strymon River and on the west the river called the Axios and the lands bordering it; the third the area bordered by the Peneios River on the west and Mount Vernon on the right, with the addition of a little of Paionia, and including the major cities of Edessa and Veroia; fourth, and last, the area beyond Mount Vernon, extending as far as Epeiros and some districts of Illyria. Four cities became the capitals of the four cantons, Amphipolis of the first, Thessalonike of the second, Pella of the third and Pelagonia of the fourth.

We are also told that severe restrictions were placed on the occupants of these cantons, for example in relation to trade, and to marriage between persons living in different cantons. Also, soldiers were allowed to be stationed only on the borders of the country, to protect against foreign invasions. Similar restrictions were applied to persons living in Illyria, which was divided in the same way. The primary objective of this experiment (and it was an experiment, because it was so unusual) must have been to destroy the Makedonian identity that had been formed in the preceding centuries, after Philippos II had welded together the original *Makedones* and the other groups over whom he ruled, so that they began to think of everyone living within the boundaries of the kingdom that he had established as Makedonian.<sup>21</sup>

Not surprisingly, this experiment failed. There was enough resistance to it for a pretender to emerge after a couple of decades, a certain Andriskos, whom we first hear of in 150 B.C. He claimed to be another Philippos, a son of Perseus, and gathered enough support in Thrake to invade Makedonia and take control of it briefly, even issuing coins in the name

---

<sup>20</sup> This would have been easy to do, because the booty collected in precious metal by the Roman general Aemilius Paullus was so extensive that it could have enabled the Romans to do without any more silver and gold for a number of years. Mining of precious metals in Makedonia was resumed after nine years, presumably because the Romans needed more silver and gold, and perhaps also because they felt that the informal “pro-vice” that they had created was quiescent. We learn this from an entry in the early Byzantine *Chronicon* of Cassiodorus, dated by the names of the Roman consuls for 158 B.C., which tells us that in that year the mines were *instituta* (which must refer to a re-opening, since they had been functioning for a long time before this), and we associate with this re-opening the issuing of silver coins by two of the cantons (the first, *Makedonia Prote*, whose capital was at Amphipolis, where most of these coins were produced, and had previously issued a small number of silver coins immediately after the division into four *merides*, and *Makedonia Tetarte*, whose capital was at Pelagonia). *Makedonia Deutera* also issued some bronze coins. These mintings must have received approval from Rome. Note: the reading *instituta* which is quoted above is the only one that can be found in the manuscripts of Cassiodorus. Mommsen printed *reperta* (“discovered”) in the text of Cassiodorus’s *Chronicon* which he published in the series *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. It is tempting to emend this to *reaperta* (“reopened”), even though this form is found only in mediaeval Latin, but on the whole it is probably better to ignore it.

<sup>21</sup> For an analysis of this alleged “freeing” of the people of Makedonia from the supposed “tyranny” of their kings, see Hammond and Walbank, *History of Macedonia*, volume 3, pp. 564 ff.



of “Philippos”. But in 148 B.C. he was defeated by the Roman army that had been sent to deal with him.

Since the experiment of breaking Makedonia up into separate cantons had failed, the Romans then tried again, this time with greater success, to destroy Makedonian identity. They created a much larger province, of which Makedonia was only a part, although they retained the name for this much larger area, and thus made “Makedonia” a geographical and administrative name rather than the name of the area occupied by a distinct people. This will be the subject of the third and last part of this survey.



Inscribed base of a statue of Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, permanent exhibition (© Hellenic Ministry of Culture).



Waiting for the announcement of the restoration of the Constitution in front of the *Konak* and the *Saatli* mosque on the morning of July 24, 1908, in Thessaloniki.