

CREATING GREEK IDENTITY: HOW PHILIP II OF MACEDON  
USED THE THIRD SACRED WAR TO INFILTRATE GREEK  
POLITICS AND ESTABLISH MACEDONIA AS A  
GREEK STATE

by

Kate Mower

A thesis submitted to the faculty of  
The University of Utah  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of History

The University of Utah

August 2016

Copyright © Kate Mower 2016

All Rights Reserved



## ABSTRACT

In roughly 590 BCE, a “league of neighbors” developed in central Greece. The Amphictyony at Pylae joined together with Delphi to create the Delphic Amphictyonic League. The league gained political prowess throughout Greece through its protection of the sacred space of Delphi. Meanwhile in Macedonia, Macedonian kings sought Greek identity with the implementation of Greek culture in the Macedonian court. When the Thebans took Philip II of Macedon hostage as a teenager, they trained him in the central Greek military, political, and cultural tactics. This upbringing resulted in Philip’s understanding of the importance of the Delphic Amphictyony to not only the central Greeks, but to the Greeks as a whole. Philip used the Third Sacred War, fought at Delphi, and the Amphictyonic votes he was thereafter given to solidify Macedonia as a Greek state.

For my parents, who have taught me.

"...ένος δὲ ἀνδρὸς εὖ φρονήσαντος ἅπαντες ἂν ἀπολαύσειαν οἱ βουλόμενοι κοινωνεῖν τῆς ἐκείνου διανοίας." - Ἴσοκράτης

"... on the other hand, if a single man were to come up with a clever thought, all mankind who wished would benefit from that man's brilliance." — Isocrates, *Panegyricus*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
Chapters	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 CENTRAL GREECE AND PANHELLENIC POLITICS.....	6
Part I. <i>Άμφικτύονες</i> .....	6
Part II. The First Sacred War .....	12
Part III. The Second Sacred War .....	17
Part IV. The Result of the First Two Sacred Wars .....	21
3 MACEDONIAN STRUGGLE WITH GREEK IDENTITY AND PHILIP II'S RESOLUTION.....	23
Part I. Macedonian Participation in Greek Culture.....	23
Part II. Geographical Elements of Macedonian Distinction .....	30
Part III. The Theban Hostage.....	37
Part IV. Rise of Philip of Macedon.....	47
4 THE THIRD SACRED WAR, ATHENIAN BIAS AND RHETORIC .....	51
Part I. Origins of a Third Sacred War .....	51
Part II. The Third Sacred War and Intervention of Philip II as a Greek.....	57
Part III. Resolution.....	72
Part IV. Athenian Rhetoric and the Legacy of the Third Sacred War .....	74
5 CONCLUSION.....	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	87

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank each member of my Master's committee for the countless ways they each have improved my life. A special thank you goes to Professor Randy Stewart for his constant guidance in all matters Greek and Latin. He continually builds my confidence in these languages with his sincerity and kindness in recognizing my language shortcomings and addressing them with a special tact. Professor Isabel Moreira has spent considerable time reviewing not only this manuscript, but a myriad of writings I have asked of her — and she has done it in her very limited time — always making time for students. I have learned a great deal from Professor Moreira, but I wish to thank her specifically for her compassion and open-door policy, which allows students to constantly learn and grow outside of the classroom. As for Professor W. Lindsay Adams, I would never have attempted ancient history as a discipline without the passion of Professor Adams, a passion he bestows on all his students. The day we met I learned we shared an equal love for Thessaloniki, Greece, and I knew I wanted to work with a man who loved northern Greece as much as I did. I did not know that conversation would change my life entirely, but I was set on a path I hope to follow the rest of my life. I have Professor Adams to thank for a future in history.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Standing just a short distance from the final resting place of Philip II of Macedon, it is no wonder these tombs stayed hidden for millennia in Vergina, Greece. While outside the tombs, a slow incline acts as an undetectable burial mound. The modern and small entrance belies the invaluable riches found in her belly. Archaeologists did not lay eyes on the mausoleum dedicated to the father of Alexander the Great until 1977 supposed to be in tomb II, but found inside impeccable frescos and mosaics, glorious monuments, and the Macedonian sunburst inlaid on golden boxes. The majesty of the cultural and literal treasure found inside mesmerizes any visitor to the site. The man interred there had united the Greek states and then faded to the background of historical memory. Thus, the burial mound serves as an allegory for the life of Philip II of Macedon.

Macedonia sits at the top of the Greek peninsula, the land entrance into the peninsula and shield from non-Greeks. The crosshairs of trade intersect there, since the east to west trade route across the Mediterranean runs through Macedonia, as does the north and south trade route which links Greece to the greater Mediterranean by land.<sup>1</sup> N.G.L. Hammond begins his anthology of the *History of Macedonia* with the sentence,

---

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas Geoffrey Lemprière Hammond, *A History of Macedonia, vol. I Historical Geography and Prehistory* (Oxford: 1972), 3.

“Our first need is to define Macedonia not as a political area but a geographical entity.”<sup>2</sup>

Geographically Macedonia consistently held two important rivers within her boundaries — boundaries which constricted and swelled regularly — the Haliacmon and the Vardar. Each provided Macedonia with fertile plains and marshes essential to agriculture and timber, as well as access to the Aegean through the Thermaic Gulf.<sup>3</sup>

The geographical space of Macedonia has one unique characteristic that separates her from the rest of Greece; her climate is continental rather than Mediterranean. This climate automatically connects Macedonia spatially with the north, or continent, rather than with the south. In the late fourth century BCE, Macedonia had a tendency to look north, for political, diplomatic, and military support, rather than to the south. “Thessaly,” Hammond observes, “rather than Southern Macedonia is the transitional zone between the Continent and the peninsula.”<sup>4</sup> In addition to climate similarities, the continent shares with Macedonia a rich abundance of natural resources, bringing immense wealth to the regions. Macedonia is filled with gold, silver, copper, iron ore, and lead, all minerals found in Thrace as well. The natural resources and wealth of Macedonia made it essential to the prosperity of the rest of Greece, making just the space alone Greek in order for the Greeks to survive. Those things that should link Macedonia with the north make her indispensable to the Greeks, who could not afford to lose her to the continent.

The legitimate spatial divides between Greece and Macedonia led to a conflict in Macedonian identity. Scholars have spent the past century arguing the cultural

---

<sup>2</sup> Hammond, *HM vol. I*, 6-7.

<sup>3</sup> Hammond, *HM vol. I*, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Hammond, *HM vol. I*, 5.

similarities of the Macedonians and their Greek city-state neighbors.<sup>5</sup> Debate has raged about the participation of Macedonians in Greek cultural festivals, particularly the Olympic and Pythian Games, and whether such participation constituted Macedonia as a Greek State. Few scholars, however, have built an argument hinged on the Greek political identity of the Macedonians, particularly as a result of the Third Sacred War. Prior to the Third Sacred War, however, the erratic “activation” of Greek identity complicates the matter of Greek-ness for the Macedonians.<sup>6</sup> Macedonians call on their Greek heritage in certain instances, and not in others. That “activation” causes a reaction in the Greek world. The Third Sacred War acts as a resolution of Macedonian Greek identity for the Macedonians, as well as for the regions of central Greece.

Four Sacred Wars took place in Greece, all of which centered on the governance and administration of the sacred site of Delphi. Delphi — as a Panhellenic site located within the central Greek state of Phocis — had a nearly unavoidable spatial dilemma. Since all Greek states felt she belonged to them, the Greeks sought to wrestle Delphi from the grasp of Phocis, a struggle which lasted two and a half centuries. Like Macedonia, the perception, reaction to, and identity of Delphi differed in the eyes of each Greek state. All Greeks tried to act piously towards the site — all save for maybe Phocis — as a home to the god Apollo. As a place dedicated to the god, Greeks saw it as

---

<sup>5</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, Guy T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia, vol. II 550-336 B.C.* (Oxford: 1979), 100; Eugene Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus* (Princeton: 1990), 80; Ernst Badian, “Greeks and Macedonians,” *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, vol. 10 (1982), 35; W. Lindsay Adams, “Sport and Ethnicity in Ancient Macedonia,” *Macedonian Legacies: Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza* (2008), 58.

<sup>6</sup> An explanation of identity in terms of “activation” comes from Èric Rebillard. Èric Rebillard, *Christians and Their Many Identities in Late Antiquity: North Africa, 200-450 CE* (London: 2012), 4.

customarily autonomous, and therefore any governance or administration that acted on behalf of the site or Pythian Apollo had to make systematic decisions in an elevated manner in regards to the site, with no state or political motives in mind, only those centered on the interests of the god. The best way to do this, however, varied from state to state. Therefore a league — the Amphictyony or Amphictyonic League — was created in which states could vote on behalf of the sacred space of Delphi. This would determine the actions Delphi should take in matters of interstate politics and military intervention, leading to states taking military action on behalf of the god. Those militaries, then, ultimately saw themselves as divinely instated, a status each Greek state clamored to attain. By the end of the Third Sacred War, the last military force and state to attain that status was Macedonia.

Macedonian involvement in the Third Sacred War, however, did not come from an inherent interest from either Macedonia or their king, Philip II. Rather, Philip tried to appease two Greek states with whom he had diplomatic relationships, in order that one (Thessaly) end a debilitating civil war, and that the other (Thebes) not suffer a loss in a larger war with the Spartans, Phocians, and Athenians. Both Thessaly and Thebes had protected Macedonia in the past, and it was Macedonia's turn to aid their central Greek allies. The Macedonians — while acting as the avengers of the god — did not have an ultimate goal in the south in mind. Having been thrown into the Third Sacred War, they did not seek hegemonic power in Greece, but were granted it at the conclusion of the war, at which point Philip found himself the leader of the Amphictyonic League and hegemon of Greece, a title he accepted, but never sought — a title for which the Athenians vilified him, and destroyed his reputation. The Athenians had never wished to recover

diplomatic relations with Philip after Amphipolis, and struggled to convince the whole of Greece of his tyrannical tendencies. They named him the “barbarian conqueror,” the essence of which historical memory has never erased from Philip’s character. But the Athenian prejudice should not be taken at face value, and should be examined thoroughly.

## CHAPTER 2

### CENTRAL GREECE AND PANHELLENIC

### POLITICS

#### *Ἀμφικτύονες*

Herodotus and Pindar offer the earliest and most basic meaning of *ἀμφικτύονες* (*amphictyons*) as “they that dwell around.”<sup>1</sup> Later the Greek word *Ἀμφικτύονες* (Amphictyonic League) came to describe several multiregional religious organizations which appeared in Greece during the Archaic Period.<sup>2</sup> Only two lasted until the Classical Period, those centered on Delos and Delphi.<sup>3</sup> Each was set at a major sanctuary. Since the Amphictyonies were tied directly to these Panhellenic sanctuaries, the preservation of them at such sites indicates they shared a Panhellenic political, as well as religious, purpose.<sup>4</sup> This chapter investigates the role of the Delphic Amphictyonic League — referred to as simply the Amphictyony hereafter — as the embodiment of Panhellenic politics, certainly among central Greek states, but also extending to Athens and Sparta,

---

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. 8.104, Pind. *P.* 4.66, 10.8; Henry Liddell and Robert Scott, s.v. “*ἀμφικτύονες*,” *Greek-English Lexicon*, vol. I (Oxford: 1889), 92.

<sup>2</sup> Liddell, Scott, “*Ἀμφικτύονες*,” 92.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Scott, *Delphi: A History of the Center of the Ancient World* (Princeton: 2014), 77.

<sup>4</sup> Scott claims that the importance of the Amphictyony predates the importance and precedence of the sacred site. That is not to say the sanctuary itself did not exist before the Amphictyony, but that the Amphictyony and site grew at a similar rate to reach a prestige that helped both last into the Classical Period. Scott, *Delphi*, 77.

and in later chapters, finally to Macedonia.

The Amphictyony met twice a year, once at Delphi and once at Pylae — known later as Thermopylae.<sup>5</sup> Each of the states within the Amphictyony sent two representatives, called *hieromnemes* and *pylagoras*, to the councils at Delphi and Pylae.<sup>6</sup> These two groups of delegates, which made up a body of the council, were known together as the Amphictyons.<sup>7</sup> When the council met these representatives made court decisions, dispersing judgments, punishments, and rewards on any individual Greek or Greek city-state deemed fit for the action. According to the oath taken by all Amphictyons, each polis included in the Amphictyony was obligated to “make war and destroy” any polis that violated agreements made among those belonging to the Amphictyony, and the Amphictyons were charged with calling for such action.<sup>8</sup> The agreements banned the limiting or cutting off of a water supply or the razing of a member polis.<sup>9</sup>

Those states — or in some cases tribal cantons — which belonged to the Amphictyony originated with those associated with the Amphictyony before Delphi, the association during the time of Pylae. Aetolian tribes made up the bulk of the organization at that point.<sup>10</sup> Victor Ehrenberg states that the Amphictyony at Pylae must therefore have existed before the polis, but this claim is not substantiated by other modern scholars,

---

<sup>5</sup> Basil Petrakos, *Delphi* (Athens: 1971), 4; William Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography* (London: 1854).

<sup>6</sup> Petrakos, 4; Robert J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, “Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony,” *Classical Philology*, vol. 38 (1943), 1.

<sup>7</sup> Bonner, Smith, 1

<sup>8</sup> Aeschin. 2.115.

<sup>9</sup> Aeschin. 2.115; Bonner, Smith, 1; Ryder, T.T.B., *Koine Eirene: General Peace and Local Independence in Ancient Greece* (Oxford: 1965), 4.

<sup>10</sup> Larsen, J.A.O., *Greek Federal States* (Oxford; 1968), 205.

as addressed below.<sup>11</sup> Twelve states belonged to the Amphictyony and each had two votes. Ehrenberg believes that the two votes were awarded after Athens and Sparta made their way onto the Amphictyony, but, again, does not have substantial evidence.<sup>12</sup>

The Amphictyony was divided into two parts: those tribes north of Thermopylae, and those south of Thermopylae. The Thessalians, with their two votes, dictated the voting practices of the tribes north of Thermopylae. The Delphic site itself granted states the right to consult the oracle in a particular order, and the relationship each state had with Delphi determined the order they consulted. Anyone belonging to the Amphictyony had the chance to consult the oracle before nonmembers of the Amphictyony could.<sup>13</sup> This tradition of consultation automatically incentivized Greek states to join the Amphictyony, giving the League Panhellenic status.

The French school of thought has dominated the Delphic narrative in the twentieth century due to the French excavation of Delphi.<sup>14</sup> French archaeologists entered Delphi in 1892 to uncover the sacred site, and worked there for nearly a half century.<sup>15</sup> More particularly, twentieth-century French scholars have argued the Amphictyony was, in fact, not only Panhellenic, but a “prototype European Union.” The latter part of the twentieth century and early twenty-first century offer a different and more complex view of the Amphictyony, specifically among French scholars, but also

---

<sup>11</sup> Ehrenberg, Victor, *The Greek State* (New York, NY: 1960), 109.

<sup>12</sup> Ehrenberg, 111.

<sup>13</sup> Scott, 15.

<sup>14</sup> Scott, 267-74.

<sup>15</sup> Scott, 267.

among others.<sup>16</sup> These scholars insist that the Amphictyony was not Panhellenic, but instead a “multiregional ... old-fashioned, and yet supple institution that lacked permanence and continuity and drifted in and out of usefulness and power as and when it suited the needs of various of its members.”<sup>17</sup> Even N.G.L. Hammond and G.T. Griffith, in their complex and detailed account, *A History of Macedonia volume II*, label the Amphictyony an “Old Boys’ Club.”<sup>18</sup>

The main argument against the institution fitting nicely into the category of Panhellenism comes from a lack of source material explaining the happenings of the Amphictyony during the fifth century, particularly from Herodotus.<sup>19</sup> Simon Hornblower, however, disagrees and adamantly argues against this claim by using Plutarch, who states that the Spartans wished to control votes completely in 478.<sup>20</sup> He even derides the previous scholars who argue against Plutarch’s dates by saying, “[s]ome moderns disbelieve this, fancying in their modest way they know more about Delphi than

---

<sup>16</sup> Scott, 78, note 326. C. Tenekides, “L’Amphictyonie de Delphes et la Ligue de Corinthe, dans leurs affinités avec la Société des Nations,” *Revue Générale de l’Académie de droit international public* (1931), 5-20; G. Daux, *Amphictyony: An International Organisation in Antiquity*, Sather Lectures, Berkley (1957); G. Daux, “Remarques sur la composition du conseil Amphictionique,” *BCH*, vol. 81 (1957), 95-120; M. Sordi, “La foundation du college des naopes et le renouveau politique de l’Amphictionie au IVe siècle,” *BCH*, vol. 81 (1957), 38-75; C. Tenekides, “L’Amphictyonie delphique. Légende et réalité,” *Annuaire de l’Association des auditeurs et des anciens auditeurs de l’Académie de droit international de La Haye*, vol. 90, no. 2 (1958), 145-155; P. Amandry, “L’Amphictionie delphique,” in Zepos, J., ed. *Symposium L’idée delphique en l’Europe* (Athens: 1979), 123-136.

<sup>17</sup> Scott, 78.

<sup>18</sup> Hammond, Griffith, *HM vol. II*, 452.

<sup>19</sup> Scott, 78, 326. However, Plutarch writes his *De Herodoti Malignitate* to show precisely the bias Herodotus has against the central Greeks and central Greek politics, insisting that Herodotus does not show an accurate depiction of these types of matters.

<sup>20</sup> Plut. *Them.* 20; Simon Hornblower, “Did the Delphic Amphiktyony Play a Political Role in the Classical Period?,” *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean* (New York: 2009), 49-51.

did Plutarch, a Delphic expert.”<sup>21</sup> So then, since the fifth century did show a deliberate interest in the Amphictyony, by Sparta nonetheless, the argument against a consistent use of the Amphictyony showing it as non-Panhellenic cannot remain valid.<sup>22</sup>

Samuel Perlman offers a different perspective on the Panhellenism of the Amphictyony in his article “Panhellenism, the Polis and Imperialism.” He observes the Panhellenism of the Delphic Oracle and the Pythian Games at Delphi, but struggles with labeling any political entity Panhellenic, since the Greeks were not unified politically until Philip II’s hegemony.<sup>23</sup> He believes that “the ideology of *Panhellenism* is seen as an expression of the ambition to destroy the narrow framework of the Greek *polis*.”<sup>24</sup> This claim is interesting and insightful, but leaves no room for the existence of political unity between all Greeks, and relies on culture and language as elements that joined all Greeks together. This position is arguable, but only if the definition of Panhellenism indicates that all Greek states came to political unity as equals. If any state comes to a diplomatic or political organization, such as the Amphictyony, with greater political influence over the other states there, in Perlman’s argument, then that state practices imperial power over the weaker states, and Panhellenism cannot stand in the midst of

---

<sup>21</sup> Hornblower, 50.

<sup>22</sup> Hornblower continues on with this point as the latest in a series of scholarly exchanges between himself and the modern French scholar F. Lefèvre about the use and importance of the Amphictyony in the fifth century. Lefèvre agrees with Hornblower that the Amphictyony was in use, but disagrees in that he believes it was not important. Hornblower explains that Lefèvre says the Amphictyony during the fifth century was “not an instrument of power, but only of prestige.” Hornblower takes issue with the word ‘only,’ implying that prestige is power. Hornblower, 50; F. Lefèvre, *CID IV: Documents Amphictioniques* (Paris:2002).

<sup>23</sup> Samuel Perlman, “Panhellenism, the Polis and Imperialism,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, vol. 25 no. 1 (1976), 3-4.

<sup>24</sup> Perlman, 4.

imperialism.<sup>25</sup>

However, political disparity exists between any two states, no matter their political similarities. In that case, political Panhellenism could never have existed in Ancient Greece, which is what Perlman essentially argues, and imperialism in Ancient Greece disguised itself as political Panhellenism. This claim leaves no intermediary space for Panhellenic politics between complete autonomy and imperialism. The Amphictyony designated an intermediary space for Panhellenic politics between those extremes, and was, in fact, intended to do so. Even though some states that met at the Amphictyony came in with a greater amount of political clout over other states, the power of any state in the Amphictyony was decided by the number of votes allotted to that state. Interestingly enough, states bartered their way into the Amphictyony, and therefore were not given votes based on their political power, but based on how much the Amphictyony — as a political body itself — wanted that state represented. The Panhellenic abilities of the Amphictyony can be emphasized in its ability to entice high-status political players — like Sparta, as will be explored — to join for a measly number of Amphictyonic votes.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> To illustrate this point, Perlman uses Pericles' policy after the Persian Wars. The argument suffers from the recognition by the author that the document was, indeed, a forgery, and can neither illustrate Panhellenism or imperialism due to that nature. Perlman, 6-15.

<sup>26</sup> Perlman uses A. Heuss to emphasize the point that, "this is not more than a consciousness of belonging to a common Greek society. There is no connection with *Panhellenism*." These two ideas seem to negate one another. If something is indicative of a common Greek society, it is then Panhellenic. Perlman, note 1; A. Heuss, "Die archaische Zeit Griechenlands," *Antike und Abendland*, vol. 2 (1946), 26-62.

## The First Sacred War

Herbert William Parke and John Boardman state that the First Sacred War was “an event whose historical importance [is] inadequately matched by the quality of our literary sources.”<sup>27</sup> The First Sacred War, which arose out of the competition between Delphi and Crisa over control of the Oracle, created the structure of the Amphictyony, a structure designed to support the Delphian claim against the Crisaeian claim.<sup>28</sup> The Amphictyony at that time was not much more than a religious organization — with little political power — between two major Greek states, Athens, and Sicyon, and one regional power, Thessaly.<sup>29</sup> The Amphictyonic decision to side with Delphi over Crisa was made by the Thessalians, since they dominated the votes within the embryonic form of the Amphictyony.<sup>30</sup> Delphi had two votes in the League, but Crisa had none.

Since the town of Crisa is situated equidistant to the sacred Delphic site that houses the Oracle, the stadium and amphitheater used in the Pythian Games, the sanctuary Athena Pronoia, and countless private and state-owned treasuries, such as the

---

<sup>27</sup> H.W. Parke, and John Boardman, “The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War,” *JHS*, vol. 77 (1957), 276.

<sup>28</sup> According to the *Merriam-Webster Geographical Dictionary*, the town of Crisa later became known as the polis Phocis. These two names are synonymous with the same space. Webster, Inc, “Crisa,” *Merriam-Webster Geographical Dictionary* (Springfield; 2007). Parke and Boardman explain that the town the Amphictyony took issue with is debated. They go through the sources which deliver the historical commentary for the First Sacred War, and the different town names the sources refer to. The ancient town of Crisa, it is concluded, was indeed the town which the Amphictyony initially fought, according to Parke and Boardman. The authors use the legend of Herakles’ rape of the tripod to understand the First Sacred War and its origins. They use the material culture and sculptures to determine the importance of the legend in comparison to the First Sacred War. Parke alone states, “[I]t would not surprise us to find that the attempt of the Crisaeians to assert their rights in opposition to the Amphictyony was seen as Herakles carrying off the tripod of Apollo.” Parke, Boardman, 276-282.

<sup>29</sup> Scott, 71.

<sup>30</sup> Petrakos, 7.

town of Delphi itself, the inhabitants of Crisa felt justified in making claim to the site. Competition for control of the site led to four sacred wars. Aeschines says that Crisa had been made up of “lawless tribes, who continuously committed sacrilege against the Delphic shrine and sacred offerings there.”<sup>31</sup> Diodorus Siculus and Pausanias offer similar accounts against the Crisaeans’ claim to the Delphic sacred space.<sup>32</sup>

In fact, the Crisaeans probably had an equal claim to the site as did the Delphians. Crisa’s economic prowess in the region provides one reason for the Amphictyony’s involvement in the dispute between Delphi and Crisa. Delphi had always been an independent city-state in the region of Phocis, according to Herbert Parke and Donald Wormell, while Crisa had been a dependent town in the same region.<sup>33</sup> The three states in control of the Amphictyony sought to diminish Crisa’s economic stronghold. Crisa dominated not only the fertile plain, but also the port of Cirrha on what Thucydides calls the Crisaean Gulf.<sup>34</sup> Crisaeans finally drew the full attention of the Amphictyony when they enforced a toll on pilgrims making their way to Delphi.<sup>35</sup> The Crisaeans’ growing economy threatened not only neighboring states, but neighboring regions, and provoked the Amphictyony to declare war on them. In 590 BCE the Amphictyony launched a war that would last ten years. She and her allies destroyed the town of Crisa and poisoned the inhabitants, making the site of the town unfindable as of today.<sup>36</sup>

It would then make sense that the oral tradition found in the *Homeric Hymn to*

---

<sup>31</sup> Aeschin. 3.107.

<sup>32</sup> Paus. 10.7.1; Diod. 9.16.1.

<sup>33</sup> H.W. Parke, Donald Ernest Wilson Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle, Volume I: The History* (Oxford: 1956), 100.

<sup>34</sup> Hdt. 8.32; Thuc. 1.107.3.

<sup>35</sup> Petrakos, 8; Scott, 71; Parke, Wormell, 100; Matthew Dillon, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London: 1997), 50-51.

<sup>36</sup> Scott, 72

*Pythian Apollo* circulated at the end of the First Sacred War, since it describes the Crisaeian Plain as being dedicated to Apollo, a feature enforced by the Amphictyony upon the destruction of the town.<sup>37</sup> Apollo was said to have spent considerable time searching the world for a place to build his temple. Eventually he found “rocky Pythos,” otherwise known as Delphi. Just as he realized he needed men to act as priests for the temple, he learned of a ship, then, turning himself into a dolphin, jumped onto this Cretan ship. The dolphin, with help from the breath of Zeus, shook the ship until it landed on the Crisaeian Gulf.<sup>38</sup>

As soon as it docked, Apollo took his anthropomorphic form, hovering above the plain. He describes Crisa as “the land of vines,” speaking to the fertile plain, and dedicates the land to himself in that moment. He goes on to take the sailors of the ship to Delphi, called Pythos, to teach them how to be priests. The *Hymn* mentions Crisa by name three times, clearly showing the importance of the plain and gulf to the sacred space dedicated to Apollo.<sup>39</sup> This story conveys the delegation of the plain and Crisaeian Gulf to the Delphian polis, and, in part, to the Amphictyony, as a result of the First Sacred War.

Prior to the First Sacred War, the Pythian festival consisted of one contest: the

---

<sup>37</sup> Hammond, in the *History of Greece to 322 BC*, claims the Hymn was written in the eighth century BCE, but Crisaeians inhabited the Crisaeian plain in the eighth century, and it therefore was not dedicated to Apollo as a sacred space not to be cultivated. For this reason, Hammond — and Boardman — change the date in *The Cambridge Ancient History Part III Volume 1* to indicate the poem had been written in the sixth century BCE. N.G.L Hammond, *History of Greece to 322 BC*, (Oxford: 1959), 171; John Boardman and N.G.L. Hammond, *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 3 Part III*, (Cambridge: 1982), 306.

<sup>38</sup> *Hymn. Hom. Pyth. Ap.* 3.495.

<sup>39</sup> *Hymn Hom. Pyth. Ap.* 21. 3.495.

singing of the hymn to Apollo.<sup>40</sup> The festival, in its humble beginning, took place every eight years, but after the First Sacred War — in 582 — it took place every four years, marking the third year between Olympic Games.<sup>41</sup> Parke and Wormell go further to suggest that the Pythian Games were established soon after the First Sacred War to celebrate the defeat of Crisa and were “held originally in the Crisaean plain where the stadium was marked out.”<sup>42</sup> Others suggest that the horse races were held in the plain of Crisa from the time it had been dedicated.<sup>43</sup>

Since both Crisa and Delphi had been located in the region of Phocis, it would seem most likely that Phocis would deal with the conflict herself, especially given Parke and Wormell’s claim that the Amphictyony at Delphi had not been established until after the First Sacred War — it involved itself in the conflict, then instigated a permanent force at Delphi from then on out, shared with Pylae.<sup>44</sup> Why would two regions — Thessaly and Sicyon — and a prominent city-state — Athens — involve themselves in a local battle, in a small region, barely noticeable? The economics and politics of Phocis should have never appeared on the radar of these states, but because it involved Delphi, a sacred Panhellenic site, the conflict mattered to other Greeks. In fact, H. D. Westlake remarks that a major result of the First Sacred War was that “the Amphictyony was transferred to Delphi, and its reorganization welded almost the whole of northern Greece into a

---

<sup>40</sup> The Homeric Hymn to Apollo should not be confused with the Homeric Hymn to the Pythian Apollo in this instance, since the latter was not written until after the First Sacred War. Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary: The Ultimate Reference Work on the Classical World, Third Edition*, (Oxford: 1999), 1285.

<sup>41</sup> Hornblower, Spawforth, 1285.

<sup>42</sup> Parke, Wormell, 108.

<sup>43</sup> Hornblower, Spawforth, 1285; Joseph Fontenrose, “The Cult of Apollo and the Games at Delphi,” *The Archaeology of the Olympics: the Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, ed. Wendy J. Raschke (Wisconsin: 1988), 130.

<sup>44</sup> Parke, Wormell, 101.

Thessalian empire.”<sup>45</sup> This approach differs from Parke and Wormell, who state that the Amphictyony either had not been created, or had no power previous to the First Sacred War. Either way, at the conclusion of the First Sacred War Thessaly held strict political control in the region of Phocis, and therefore also had great political influence and control in central Greece in addition to northern Greece.

The sacred site of Delphi, situated on the side of Mount Parnassus in central Greece within an area contested by Boeotia and Phocis, possessed at least two features that came to be seen by Greeks in general as belonging to all Greeks and not just some particular Greek state. These features are religious and cultural in nature. 1) The Delphic Oracle functioned as the religious center of the Greek world. Zeus was said to have sent two eagles from opposite ends of the world in search of the center of the Earth; they met at Delphi. There Zeus dedicated the *omphalos*, a beehive shaped stone, as the navel of the Earth.<sup>46</sup> 2) The Pythian Games played at Delphi.

The sacred site, however, was not under distress during the First Sacred War. Modern scholars agree the conflict began with tolls on pilgrims.<sup>47</sup> This was hardly reason for involvement by an Amphictyony without a presence already, let alone other major states outside the region. Because the conflict involved the Delphic site at all made it worthy of creating a Panhellenic association. One can then reason that the Amphictyony, because it thereafter involved the sacred site, was also a Panhellenic association. The Ancient Greeks themselves decided Delphic matters required both protection and consensus, and therefore instituted the Amphictyony after the First Sacred

---

<sup>45</sup> Westlake, 29.

<sup>46</sup> Pind. Frag. 54.

<sup>47</sup> Parke, Wormell, 104-105; Scott, 71, n. 1.

War to protect the site against another conflict, establish a governing body to make decisions about the site, and act as a Panhellenic institution. Interestingly enough, despite not having major votes within the Amphictyony, Delphi the polis was granted *προμαντεία* (*promanteia*), the right to consult the Oracle first.<sup>48</sup>

### **The Second Sacred War**

By 449, as a prelude to the Archidamian War, Delphic and Phocian politics had become so influential in Greek society it sparked the Spartans to send 1,500 hoplites and 10,000 allied troops to aid Doris against the Phocians.<sup>49</sup> J.A.O. Larsen questions the purpose behind taking so many troops against such an insignificant state power, and concludes it must have been for geographic reasons. He says that Sparta wanted to keep the route open into northern Greece. Larsen does indicate that Sparta had sentimental reasons that played a part in the use of such force. He tells that there “was also the additional consideration that only in connexion with the Metropolis [Doris] was Sparta represented in the Amphictionic League.”<sup>50</sup>

Despite growing tensions in Greece — particularly between Sparta and Athens — Sparta thought resolving the issue at Delphi and infiltrating the Amphictyony were so important they intensified pressure on Athens which wound up sticking its nose in Phocian politics. Much like the First Sacred War, the Second Sacred War involved political players that would otherwise be uninterested in such a small region, but because of the nature of Delphi — and the Panhellenic ability of the Amphictyony located there

---

<sup>48</sup> Michael Scott, *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Cambridge: 2010), 39; Liddell, Scott, “*προμαντεία*.”

<sup>49</sup> Thuc. 1.107.2; Diod. Sic. 11.79.4-6; Larsen, 122.

<sup>50</sup> Larsen, 123.

— Sparta escalated the conflict in order to maintain a voice in the Amphictyony.

On the heels of a Persian defeat, Athens basked in political dominance over nearly the whole of Greece. Through the Delian League, Athens had built an empire, which they used to snatch autonomy from a great number of Greek states and regions.<sup>51</sup> Sparta, however, took particular issue with the Athenians and their supremacy. Phocis and Delphi found themselves dragged into the battle as pawns between the two superpowers. Athens acted to provide Phocis with the control of the sacred site, while Sparta, in a countermove, tried to secure Delphi's autonomy over itself as a polis as well as the sacred site.

A decade before tensions escalated with the Spartans and Phocians, Pericles had instituted spending considerable funds on the building up of Athens with public works projects, but he also spent an extensive amount on building up Delphi.<sup>52</sup> Scott believes, “by 457 BC, Athens's influence had extended from dominating the Delphic complex through dedications to political dominance and control over all its neighbors.”<sup>53</sup> Given Athens' political supremacy, not only in the Phocian region but throughout all Greece, the Phocians believed that with the support of the Athenians they indeed had control of the sacred site.<sup>54</sup> No ancient author indicates whether control of the site included the *promanteia*, or if Athens reserved that for herself.

Thucydides, and Plutarch in *Pericles*, both give very brief explanations of the Spartans marching into Phocis to reclaim the site for Delphi. Their brevity indicates the Spartans had little trouble securing the site for the Delphians, but both authors mention

---

<sup>51</sup> Ehrenberg, 95.

<sup>52</sup> Plut. *Per.* 17.1; Thuc. 1.10.

<sup>53</sup> Scott, *Delphi*, 130.

<sup>54</sup> Parke, Wormell, 185.

that upon leaving, the Phocians immediately reinstated their control with the help of Athenian military force.<sup>55</sup> However, while the Spartans had been stationed there, they “accepted a grant of ‘*promanteia*’.”<sup>56</sup>

A lack of literary and epigraphic detail at Delphi gives way to an ambiguous ending to the Second Sacred War. Diodorus Siculus implies that the Delphians reclaimed control of the site — and the Amphictyony — when talking of a dream the Phocian leader Onomarchos had during the Third Sacred War, in which he reflected on the end of the Second Sacred War.<sup>57</sup> Debates in modern scholarship engage the question of when the Delphians took control, whether it happened immediately following the Second Sacred War, or if Phocian control lasted until the very start of the Archidamian War.<sup>58</sup>

Larsen, Parke, and Wormell list a series of misfortunes and skirmishes the Athenians suffered in politically relevant poleis and regions which stifled their political clout, the result being the inability to keep the Phocians in control of Delphi.<sup>59</sup> None of these modern scholars, however, indicate how the Delphians, a much smaller power than the Phocians, were able to regain control. The Delphians must have had military support from a power mightier than the Phocian forces, whether that had been Sparta or Doris remains unclear, but likely.

The back and forth of the Second Sacred War imitated the back and forth of the Peloponnesian War, which came just a few decades after the conclusion of the Second Sacred War. Control of the site, clearly a Panhellenic issue, occupied a great deal of time

---

<sup>55</sup> Thuc. 1.112; Plut. *Per.* 21.

<sup>56</sup> Parke, Wormell, 186.

<sup>57</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.33.

<sup>58</sup> Parke, Wormell, 187; Larsen, 126-127; Scott, *Delphi*, 131-132.

<sup>59</sup> Parke, Wormell, 186-187; Larsen, 126-127.

and military might of the two leading powers of the time in Greece. The importance and role of the Amphictyony during the Second Sacred War, however, do not make themselves manifest until the conclusion of the war. Diodorus Siculus and Pausanias specify the war ended with the Amphictyony issuing punishments and a fine on the Phocians for their impiety.<sup>60</sup>

The Second Sacred War was clearly fought over control of the sacred site of Delphi. All players involved sought to protect the site as well as extend their own influence, particularly by gaining *promanteia* for their polis. The Amphictyony seems to have little role in the whole alteration of power between the bigger players. Delphi itself, then, proves to be Panhellenic, while the politics of the Amphictyony take a back seat to the bigger politics at hand. With the given accounts of the Second Sacred War, concerning only those events in and around Phocis, this conclusion should prove valid. However, the missing information concerning the end of the Second Sacred War might hold a contrary conclusion.

Parke and Wormell and Scott only focus on the events which took place in and around Phocis in the discussion of the Second Sacred War, but Larsen, interested in the larger federal issues, expands on the events which took place at the same time in Thessaly and Boeotia. He notes that in those places there had been growing opposition to the Athenians. Sparta and Athens have a similar back and forth for control of Boeotia in particular, ending in Boeotian autonomy from Athens with the help of Sparta.<sup>61</sup> Who, then, could have helped the Delphians push the Phocians out of Delphic control? Not only could Sparta and Doris be responsible, but also Thessaly and Boeotia. If all had

---

<sup>60</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.33; Paus. 10.15.

<sup>61</sup> Larsen, 124.

joined forces against Athens, and by extension Phocis, they could have all helped expel the Phocians.

Sparta, Doris, Thebes — the main Boeotian polis — and Thessaly each had a stake in the Amphictyony, as did Athens and Phocis. Since the Amphictyony was split by its members' different incentives in the outcome of control of the site, no ruling could be reached either politically or diplomatically. Once the war ended, though, the victors — those states which had also suffered under Athenian imperialism — were able to band together and vote on a penalty which would ultimately punish the Phocians, and the Athenians by extension. The Amphictyony, in that case, acted as a major political force, and enforced a Panhellenic penalty on members of the Amphictyony who acted unjustly.

### **The Result of the First Two Sacred Wars**

The sacred site of Delphi captured the hearts of all Greeks, making it unquestionably a pinnacle of Panhellenism. The Amphictyony at the site had to earn such a status, but used its location and connection to the site to do so. It gained political power in central Greece only at the conclusion of the First Sacred War, when the strength of the small religious organization took care to demolish a wealthy coastal polis. That strength caught the attention of other major poleis and regions, which sought to join the Amphictyony afterwards.

Sparta was among the poleis trying to cling to their small influence within the Amphictyony at the onset of the Second Sacred War. Sparta and Athens spent considerable effort and energy to promote their own self-interests at the Panhellenic site of Delphi, and to prove the superiority of the state which could hold the most influence

on site and practice *promanteia*. Scholarship on the Second Sacred War focuses on the power hoped to gain from the site by different poleis, and barely considers the consequence of the war on the states involved. It also ignores the Amphictyony's influence on the outcome of the war. Neither Parke and Wormell, Larsen, nor Scott consider the missing information lacking in Diodorus Siculus' account about which states pushed Phocis out of Delphi, and also do not consider which of those states belonged to the Amphictyony. Yet to do so would illuminate the likely possibility that the Amphictyony was a Panhellenic organization and that its existence mattered to Greek states, as much as their involvement in the association did. By illustrating the importance of the Amphictyony to the Greek states themselves, one can better understand the potential Philip II of Macedon saw in the Amphictyony as a unifying force during the Third Sacred War.

## CHAPTER 3

### MACEDONIAN STRUGGLE WITH GREEK IDENTITY

#### AND PHILIP II'S RESOLUTION

#### **Macedonian Participation in Greek Culture**

These descendants from Perdiccas are Greeks, as they themselves say, I myself happen to know and will produce proof in the following account. It is so according to the Elean tribe which conducts the games at Olympia and is understood by the Hellenodikai. — Herodotus, *Histories*<sup>1</sup>

The past half century has seen this section of Herodotus come under fire from the leading Ancient Macedonian scholars. Herodotus's statement that the Macedonians are Greek and his specific clause, "I can prove it," are still a major point of contention, with neither side giving even a little. Eugene Borza and Nicholas Hammond argue back and forth the validity of Herodotus's account, particularly concerning the Argive origins that Alexander I of Macedon claimed that he participated in the 476 Olympic Games. Herodotus retells that Alexander I used his Argive ancestry to qualify to participate in the Games. If the tale proved true it would provide Alexander I, his house, and Macedonia with Greek heritage. Borza believes that Herodotus was not to be trusted in regard to the ethnicity of the Macedonians, while Hammond believes Herodotus to be reliable on this

---

<sup>1</sup>Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδίκκεω γεγονότας, κατὰ περ αὐτοὶ λέγουσι, αὐτός τε οὕτω τυγχάνω ἐπιστάμενος καὶ οἱ τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ διέποντες ἀγῶνα Ἑλληνοδίκαι οὕτω ἐγνώσαν εἶναι. Hdt. 5.22.

topic; their difference in opinion polarized scholars and scholarship thereafter. The argument is worth considering in its entirety, but in the end, this chapter takes the same stance W. Lindsay Adams does, “the point of the story is not that it is true, but that Alexander I used it to identify his Greek ethnicity.”<sup>2</sup> Beyond that, the Greeks themselves use Herodotus’s account to substantiate later claims to involve Macedonian participants in the Greek games.

One scholar of Late Antiquity, Èric Rebillard, offers a perspective of identity which can be applied to this instance of Macedonian identity. Rebillard examines Christian identities, and the distinction between Christians and non-Christians, but his sociological theories concerning identity imitate the polarity of cultural identity of the Macedonians between Greek and non-Greek.<sup>3</sup> In the case of the Macedonians’ Greekness, Macedonians have fluid identities, claiming Greek status when it suits them, and non-Greek status when it does not. The Greeks do the same for the Macedonians: they claim the Macedonians when they need their resources or help, but refuse to claim them as Greek at other times when it proves convenient.

Borza questions the validity of Herodotus’ story — even going so far to say that Herodotus had been persuaded of the truthfulness of the tale by the Macedonian royal house while he was there — by bringing up several factors which make the story seem improbable.<sup>4</sup> His argument depends on factors that cannot be known, mainly the age of Alexander I in 476, the year in which he was supposed to have participated in the Games. Borza makes an interesting argument, however, about the age of Alexander I in that year.

---

<sup>2</sup> Adams, 58.

<sup>3</sup> Rebillard, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Borza, 80. Badian makes the argument that the story comes directly from the Macedonian court previous to Borza. Badian, 35.

He says that Alexander I could have participated in those Games, not as a Greek, but as a man with a service record against the Persians during the Persian Wars, but claims Alexander I would have been much too old by then to actually compete as a sprinter. Therefore it was highly unlikely that Alexander I participated as a non-Greek during those Games.<sup>5</sup> Borza's argument offers a substantial alternative to Herodotus's account, but, while compelling, is not inherently more reasonable than Herodotus's own version.

Hammond trusts Herodotus' account linking Alexander I to an ancestor, Perdiccas, providing a way for the Macedonian King to participate in the 476 Games, and uses Thucydides as a second source on the story.<sup>6</sup> Thucydides, a critic of Herodotus and therefore unlikely to take this story at face value, connects Alexander I to Perdiccas, as a man originally from Agros.<sup>7</sup> It seems very likely that by the time Thucydides proceeded with the story, Macedonians would have been participating in Olympic Games — and the Pythian Games — for almost a hundred years. He most likely received the story not from Herodotus, but as common knowledge, since the Macedonians probably participated in the Games during Thucydides' lifetime.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to Alexander I, the Macedonian royal house produced one other potential games participant, Archelaus. A late source comes from Solinus and explains that Archelaus took part in both the Olympic and Pythian Games.<sup>9</sup> Adams addresses the controversy surrounding this source and its reliability, saying the main criticism of the

---

<sup>5</sup> Borza, 81-84.

<sup>6</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 100.

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. 2.99.

<sup>8</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, "Connotations of 'Macedonians' and 'Macedones' Until 323 B.C.," *CQ*, vol. 45 (1995), 124.

<sup>9</sup> Solinus. 9.16.

source is its late arrival.<sup>10</sup> Again Borza and Hammond argue the validity of the source, Borza claiming it to be too late to be trusted, while Hammond sees no reason to dismiss the story or the source.<sup>11</sup> The account does not have a more substantial basis than Herodotus's account of Alexander I, and is only relevant if Alexander I did not participate in Games. If Alexander I did not participate, but Archelaus did, the source is important since it implies Archelaus did not have to prove his Greek heritage.

Regardless of whether Alexander I or Archelaus participated in the Games — whether the Argive heritage had been fabricated or not — by the time of Philip II, Macedonians had participated in the Games. Interestingly enough, Borza steps back from attacking Herodotus's account about Alexander I to say that if the account had been truth, Alexander I suffered from the fact that he had to prove his heritage, something no other Greek would have to do. This, Borza suggests, makes him and Macedonia sub-Greek, a conclusion which leads to two different but significant conclusions. First, either Alexander I or some other royal Macedonian “proved” their Greek heritage before Philip II; or second, Philip II participated in the games without having to prove his heritage, since all Greeks assumed his Greek heritage. Borza daringly states, “No Spartan or Athenian or Corinthian or Argive felt constrained to prove to the others that he and his family were Hellenes.”<sup>12</sup> If that were the case, and the account in Herodotus about Alexander I was inaccurate, then Philip II was accepted as Greek to the Greeks, just like these other states. In fact, if the Herodotus account is false, it is more likely that the Macedonians were considered Greek, since they competed in the games but never had to

---

<sup>10</sup> In addition, Adams addresses the fact that the source comes from the same time period as Eusebius's *Victor List*, “which is accepted as standard.” Adams, 60, n. 12.

<sup>11</sup> Borza, 174-175; Hammond, Griffith, 150.

<sup>12</sup> Borza, 113.

prove it. Adams argues that there “is no account of [Philip II’s] having to prove his Greek ethnicity.”<sup>13</sup>

Borza concedes that “the Macedonian royal house that in some respects would become quite highly Hellenized by the time of Philip II and Alexander the Great found itself in the early to mid-fifth century having to plead with Greeks that it was of Greek descent.”<sup>14</sup> That statement could only be true if Borza believed the Herodotean account, which he clearly argues against. Either the Herodotean account is accurate, Alexander I successfully proved his Greek heritage, and participated in the Games as a Greek; or Borza is correct in arguing that Alexander I did not participate in the Games, and therefore either Archelaus or Philip II participated in the games without having to prove their heritage, assuming the Greeks took one or the other to be Macedonian and Greek.

Alexander I creeps back up again to complicate matters further. The Greeks — led supposedly by the Athenians — gave Alexander I an epithet which suggests a distancing between themselves and the Macedonian: the *Philhellene*.<sup>15</sup> Borza and Hammond give two interesting yet differing purposes for the epithet. Borza hits the main point directly, *Philhellene* “is a title reserved for non-Greeks.”<sup>16</sup> There seems no getting around the probability that the epithet gives the most accurate assessment of Alexander I’s Greek-ness, except that Hammond and Griffith provide evidence for another explanation. They point to the fact that the sources that use this epithet are late, leading to the conclusion that “it came into use to distinguish Alexander from his greater

---

<sup>13</sup> Adams, 61.

<sup>14</sup> Borza, 112.

<sup>15</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 101 n. 3.

<sup>16</sup> Borza, 113. Badian gives essentially the same comment, “surely not an appellation that could be given to an actual Greek.” Badian, 35.

successor of the same name.”<sup>17</sup> They go on to say that the use of epithets is common in the Hellenistic period for “homonymous kings.”<sup>18</sup> The consensus among scholars is that Hammond and Griffith are mistaken, and the more common belief is that the epithet is contemporary to Alexander I.<sup>19</sup>

Given these two stories of Alexander I — that he competed in the 476 Olympic Games and that he had been given the epithet *Philhellene* during his lifetime — scholars tend to side with one account’s accuracy over the other, but have not considered the possibility that both have credibility. Borza and Badian believe the Herodotean account cannot be trusted, and seem to even use the epithet to prove that Alexander I could not have competed in the Games, because he was merely a “friend of the Greeks.” Hammond and Griffith, on the other hand, argue that Alexander I competed in the Games, and he was only given the epithet sometime in the centuries following his death.

However, Alexander I could have taken part in the Games and also had the epithet *Philhellene* in his lifetime. The question is not of either being correct; both can represent differing perspectives on Greek identity. Neither claim necessarily negates the other; if both claims are taken as historically accurate, there appears a much more complex picture of Macedonian heritage created for and by Macedonians during antiquity and their ability to “activate” Greek-ness when able, and the Greeks allowed them to “activate” it when they believe it convenient. With both claims taken as having historical credibility, there appears a crack in the belief among Greeks that blood determines Greek-ness, a crack that gapes open in the next century when Isocrates issues his *Panegyricus*, which

---

<sup>17</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 101 n. 3. Badian argues against this conclusion after quoting it directly. He says that it is “unlikely” the case. Badian, 46 n. 19.

<sup>18</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 101 n. 3.

<sup>19</sup> Borza, 113; Badian, 46, n. 19.

indicates that Athens “has determined that the name ‘Greek’ no longer implies a race, but an intellectual capacity, and those that are called ‘Greeks’ share our culture rather than our common blood.”<sup>20</sup>

For Alexander I to hold the identities Greek and non-Greek at the same time may seem baffling, but, in fact, may show a more accurate picture of the complexity in Macedonian claims, as well as Greek claims concerning the Macedonians. Whether Alexander I competed in the Games or not, Herodotus believed he did, and Alexander I and the Macedonian court perpetuated that claim, signifying that Greek-ness meant something to the Macedonians and also that Herodotus found the Greek identity of the Macedonians viable. Just as the modern debate about the identity of Macedonians rages, so too could it have in ancient times, with some individuals — and perhaps even states — propagating a particular agenda.

Either way, the Macedonian court — as instructed by Archelaus — used Attic Greek, and conducted political business in Attic Greek.<sup>21</sup> “This use of Greek,” Borza suggests, “may be a result of the process of hellenization.”<sup>22</sup> Macedonians made a conscious effort in their political and diplomatic interactions to “pass” as Greek. Borza continues by saying that “it would appear that there is much in Macedonian society that was assimilated from Greece; but there is also a great deal that seems to be indigenous and non-Hellenic.”<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Isoc. *Paneg.* 50.

<sup>21</sup> Borza, 92.

<sup>22</sup> Borza, 92.

<sup>23</sup> Borza, 95.

### **Geographical Elements of Macedonian Distinction**

Macedonia had different relationships with different Greek states. While Athens, geographically separate from Macedonia by land, saw Macedonia in one light and reacted to the state in a particular way, Thessaly and Boeotia stressed much different relationships with Macedonia due to proximity, relationships that involved constant military, political, and diplomatic interventions. Athens had military and diplomatic relationships with Macedonia through the impressive Athenian sea power, but Athens lacked the proximity to Macedonia which strengthened Macedonia's relationships with Thessaly and Thebes. Thessaly and Thebes knew the importance of protecting Macedonia, since their proximity made them a target if Macedonia fell to non-Greeks. These relationships during the fourth century BCE instigated a perfect storm of events that would lead eventually to Alexander the Great's conquest, the chief catalyst being Philip II's adolescent experience and his relationship with the Theban political and military giants, Epaminondas and Pelopidas.

In addition to relationships, however, Macedonia — and in turn, the Greek states — faced challenges from powers to its sides during the reign of Amyntas III. These attacks illustrate the geographic complexity of Greek interests in Macedonian territory. The position of Macedonia at the top of the peninsula makes it both a geographic gateway into Greece from the north and a geographic shield against attacks and non-Greek influence. Much the same as examining Alexander I's experience as both Greek and non-Greek, examining Macedonia spatially results in labeling the territory as Greek and non-Greek, in that she was controlled by the culturally fluid, while at the same time she possessed materials essential to the Greek economy (namely timber) and was the first

line of defense against attacks. Greeks could not afford to lose Macedonian space — essentially the mouth of a funnel — to unstable societies. Athens learned this lesson when she required timber and intelligence from Macedonia during the Persian Wars — leading to Alexander I’s *Philhellene* title to begin with. Even Thessaly’s attachment to Macedonia could really be boiled down, again, to their proximity, suggesting that if Macedonia fell to non-Greeks, Thessaly would be next. Spatial politics cannot be discounted, since they intertwine with the cultural politics of the region.

Macedonia struggled to remain a power at all from the assassination of Archelaus in 399 to the accession of Philip II in 359.<sup>24</sup> Archelaus had brought even further Greekness to Macedonia, and incorporated Greek culture into everyday Macedonian life. “The creation,” Borza states, “of an impressive Macedonian center at Pella was, as we have seen, not only a political and military innovation, but also a cultural statement.”<sup>25</sup>

Archelaus made a conscious effort to establish Macedonia as a Greek epicenter. Borza and Hammond and Griffith point out that Archelaus’ purpose for the conscious changes toward Greek culture do not come from Archelaus’ desire to become a Greek state.<sup>26</sup>

While that is probably the case, Archelaus’ effort made it much easier for Macedonia to actually become a Greek state later on during Philip’s reign.

The period starts with five different kings taking command from 399 to 393.<sup>27</sup>

Orestes, Archelaus’ son and a minor, had been named to the throne with a regent,

---

<sup>24</sup> The second date comes from the chapter in *HM* vol. 2, “A Period of Instability, 399-359.” Other dates, such as 360, come from an ambiguous date of Philip II’s accession due to confusion in royal succession, and Philip’s acting as regent in the interim. Borza points to archaeological evidence which suggests a 360 date, but the traditional date of 359 will be used, since it is the standard and most accepted. Borza, 200.

<sup>25</sup> Borza, 171.

<sup>26</sup> Borza, 171; Hammond, Griffith, 148-149.

<sup>27</sup> Diod. 14.37,84.6,89.2,15.60; Hammond, Griffith, 168; Borza, 178.

Aeropus, who “usurped the throne.”<sup>28</sup> The years ruled by Aeropus (398/7-395/4) saw major changes in the way the Macedonians dealt with other Greek states.<sup>29</sup> The Spartans, led by Agesilaus, sought to expand their hegemony at the time by taking on the Persians. To do so required the Spartans to tromp through Thessaly and Macedonia, a prospect appreciated by neither the Thessalians nor Macedonians, who rebelled against the Spartan army, but lost the battle and were “forced to make a treaty with Sparta.”<sup>30</sup> The relationship between the Thessalians and Macedonians in this period would develop over the next fifty years to become an alliance, with the two states protecting one another’s interest in several political and military efforts.

Aeropus died in 394, and in 393 Amyntas III succeeded to the throne. The year between them saw two other kings take power with no significant happenings other than the indication of instability within the state.<sup>31</sup> Amyntas would remain in power until 369. For the entire reign of Amyntas III, Macedonia was pinched between Illyria and the Chalcidice. Amyntas tried to prevent a growing conflict between Macedonia and the Illyrians with a marriage to Eurydice, an Illyrian princess.<sup>32</sup> They had three sons: Alexander, Perdikkas, and Philip, but the marriage alliance did not keep the Illyrians out of Macedon, and by 393/2 the Illyrians had invaded.<sup>33</sup> Amyntas turned to Olynthus, the main force within the Chalcidian League, for aid, and offered them land which bordered theirs, since between 393 and 391, Amyntas had signed a peace treaty with the

---

<sup>28</sup> Borza, 178; Hammond, Griffith, 168.

<sup>29</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 168.

<sup>30</sup> Borza, 178; Polyaeus 2.1.17; Xen. *Hell.* 4.3, 10 and *Ages.* 2.

<sup>31</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 169-170; Borza, 178.

<sup>32</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 178.

<sup>33</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 172; Borza, 182.

Chalcidian League.<sup>34</sup> The treaty stated that the peace was between Amyntas, himself, and the Chalcidian League, that both participants would be allies for fifty years, and they would defend the other against “warlike intent.”<sup>35</sup>

Olynthus and the Chalcidian League had a complex history, attributed to the development of the League. Athens long before had sent colonists to the Chalcidic peninsula, who established colonies among the already developed kingdoms of the Thracians there.<sup>36</sup> Olynthus belonged to the Thracian tribe, the Bottiaean, until 479, after its inhabitants had been displaced from Macedonia until the beginning of the Greco-Persian Wars.<sup>37</sup> The Greek colonies, which remained close to the coastline, and the Thracian tribes, which took up areas inland, by 432, had formed a “genuine federal state,” with Olynthus as the capital — the Chalcidian League.<sup>38</sup> “It was one of the earliest federal states to admit cities which did not belong to the same ethnic group as the original founders.”<sup>39</sup>

Alliances within Greece were made even more complicated by the King’s Peace (387/6). Macedonia had been left out of the Peace due to Spartan belief that she was not Greek, leaving her vulnerable, without a solid alliance with the rest of the Greek states, and without the protection of Spartan hegemony. Amyntas maneuvered himself and Macedonia, but lost autonomy to the Illyrian tribes in the 380s, after his second battle

---

<sup>34</sup> Tod, *GHI* no. 111. Hornblower gives two different dates — 392 and 393 — in two different editions of his book *The Greek World 479-323 BC*, the most recent being 392. Hammond and Griffith give the date 391. Hammond, Griffith, 173; Borza, 182. Simon Hornblower, *The Greek World 479-323 BC*, Fourth Edition (New York: 2011), 236.

<sup>35</sup> Translation comes from Hornblower, *Greek World*, 236.

<sup>36</sup> Larsen, 58-59.

<sup>37</sup> Larsen, 58-59, 60.

<sup>38</sup> Larsen, 59.

<sup>39</sup> Larsen, 58.

with the tribes.<sup>40</sup>

Help against the Illyrians undoubtedly came from Olynthus, because of the alliance between the League and Macedonia, but also from the seemingly unlikely source, the Thessalians — more specifically Larissa — who agreed to side with and aid their ally once again after having supported the state a decade earlier against the Illyrians, and who reinstated Amyntas on the Macedonian throne.<sup>41</sup> Unfortunately for the Macedonians, the Olynthians proved to be as big a danger to the Macedonian state as the Illyrians. Xenophon and Diodorus both give lists of Macedonian cities taken by the Olynthians.<sup>42</sup> The weakness of the Macedonian state was exemplified by the weakness of Amyntas himself, illustrated by his pleading for aid from other major Greek powers.<sup>43</sup> By 383 the Macedonian hope rested on an alliance with Sparta, since Athens and Thebes showed interest in allying with the Olynthians. Sparta — with nominal help from the less accomplished Macedonian and Thessalian troops — immediately put an end to the Olynthian threat in 382 with the siege of Potidaea.<sup>44</sup>

The 380s demonstrated a constant change in Greek consciousness concerning the Macedonians, except for one state which stood by the Macedonians throughout it all.

---

<sup>40</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.2. Hammond and Griffith and Borza give the date for Amyntas's loss of power during the first Illyrian invasion in 393-392, but Hornblower gives the date as some point in the 380s, during the second Illyrian invasion. Hammond and Griffith and Borza identify a puppet king in 393-392 as Argaeus, while Amyntas had fled the kingdom. Hornblower believes the source (Diod. Sic. 14.92.3-4) for Argaeus — a source criticized by Hammond and Griffith and Borza — to be invalid, and propaganda influenced by Xenophon's followers. I give Hornblower — the most recent scholarship on the matter — more weight than Hammond and Griffith and Borza. Hammond, Griffith, 172-173; Borza, 182-183; Hornblower, *The Greek World*, 236-237.

<sup>41</sup> Diod. Sic. 14.92; Hammond, Griffith, 173; Borza, 182; Hornblower, 236.

<sup>42</sup> Diod. Sic. 15.19; Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.

<sup>43</sup> Borza, 184.

<sup>44</sup> Diod. Sic. 15.19; Xen. *Hell.* 5.2; Hammond, Griffith, 177; Borza, 185.

The Thessalians saw the Macedonians not only as allies, but as kindred spirits — threatened by the same states and tribes, abused in the same way by more powerful Greek states, and peripheral. Amyntas and the Macedonians, however, had different relationships with different Thessalian powers. Amyntas and Jason of Pherae engaged in power struggles over Macedonian territory, but the Larissans aided Macedonia in all incidents with neighboring threats.

Henry Dickenson Westlake makes the point that although the Thessalians had an anti-Spartan policy in 381, they joined the Spartans to fight the Olynthians. He says, “This reversal of policy on the part of the Thessalians can be attributed to no more definite reason than a desire to be on good terms with the power which was temporarily supreme.”<sup>45</sup> Another reason may have just as easily been that the Thessalians allied themselves continually with the Macedonians and by default — in this instance — the Spartans. The Thessalians likely saw the Chalcidian League as a threat to their well-being just as much as it was to the Macedonians, since the next destination of conquest after Macedonia was Thessaly. This truth inherently tied Macedonia and Thessaly together in efforts to keep foreign threats out. In fact, the two were more unified than many other Greek states due to their geographic locations and political monarchies.

The symbiotic relationship between the two states would soon favor one over the other when Jason of Pherae became *ταγός*. The result made Amyntas subject to Jason, since Jason sought to create his own hegemony in Greece by means of Macedonian timber and a naval fleet rivaling Athens’.<sup>46</sup> With Olynthus put in check by Spartan

---

<sup>45</sup> Westlake, 65.

<sup>46</sup> *ταγός* was the title of the chief of Thessaly. Xen. *Hell.* 6.1; Diod. Sic. 16.60; Jack Cargill, *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?* (Berkeley: 1981), 83.

military dominance, Amyntas — and Macedonia — could breathe easier without the constant threat to either side. Sparta sought no recorded award for its efforts in northern Greece, and left the Macedonians and Thessalians to continue in whatever manner they saw fit.<sup>47</sup> One decade following the Spartan defeat of Olynthus, Amyntas had joined forces with the anti-Spartan Second Athenian League.<sup>48</sup>

In 371, Amyntas found himself in an interesting position between Athens and Sparta which continues to baffle scholars. Aeschines recounts the event, saying that Amyntas held a vote — he had sent a delegate to vote on his behalf — leading scholars to cope with the suggestion that Macedonia had been represented as a Greek state.<sup>49</sup> Hammond and Griffith, Borza, and Cargill all attribute the moment to a fluke or misrepresentation by Aeschines.<sup>50</sup> The German scholar Geyer “believed that Macedon was taking its place at the conference as a state on a par with, and equal in rights with the Greek powers.”<sup>51</sup> With the issue so contested it remains hard to argue that Amyntas was seen by the Greeks as a Greek at that moment — especially considering the benefits Athens would reap for having given Macedonia a charitable seat at the table — but it remains hard to argue that with a vote in this instance, Macedonia’s status as a Greek state, which participated in Greek politics, would seem more solidified had she been

---

<sup>47</sup> Borza, 186.

<sup>48</sup> Cargill, 85; Borza, 186.

<sup>49</sup> *συμαχίας γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων συνελθούσης, εἷς ὢν τούτων Ἀμόντας ὁ Φιλίππου πατὴρ καὶ πέμπων σύνεδρον καὶ τῆς καθ' αὐτὸν ψήφου κύριος ὢν, ἐψηφίσατο Ἀμφίπολιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων συνεξαίρειν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων Ἀθηναίσις. καὶ τούτων τὸ κοινὸν δόγμα τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τοὺς ψηφισαμένους ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων μάρτυρας παρειχόμεν.* Aes. 2.32; Hammond, Griffith, 179, n. 1; Cargill, 85-86; Borza, 186; F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich: 1930), 126.

<sup>50</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 179; Cargill, 86; Borza, 187.

<sup>51</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 179 n. 1; Geyer, 126.

given a vote in another Council — such as the Amphictyony.

Macedonia's relationships with different Greek states show the complexity of her Greek-ness during the reign of Amyntas. The relationship between Macedonia and Sparta swung back and forth between allies and enemies. With Macedonia left out of the King's Peace, it would seem Sparta did not acknowledge Macedonia's Greek-ness, but then again, Sparta came to support Macedonia against the Olynthians and the Chalcidian League, and brought Macedonia under the protection of Sparta, arguably for the benefit of keeping the territory out of non-Greek hands. Athens similarly showed Macedonia disinterest — hatred at times — and then used Macedonia as a tool to get what she wanted, at the expense of including Amyntas in Greek politics. Greek states typically aligned themselves with others states under the assumption that their state would benefit politically and economically, so alliances switched from year to year. Macedonia was no different, but the Greek states saw that she had to be brought into the Greek system more and more, leading to her protection by Sparta, and finally a say in Greek politics.

### **The Theban Hostage**

Amyntas died in 370/69, leaving three sons by Eurydice, the oldest of which, Alexander II, took the throne.<sup>52</sup> Alexander looked to keep Macedonia intact, while his mother, Eurydice, lusted for power, and sought to overthrow her son. To maintain order in Macedonia, Alexander had to invest in diplomatic relationships which included sending his brother Philip off, possibly twice, as a political hostage. History has nearly lost the entirety of the early life of Philip II of Macedon, but fortunately an invaluable

---

<sup>52</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 179; Borza, 189.

tidbit remains: that he was used as a diplomatic bargaining chip — a hostage — between Macedonia and Thebes from 368/7 to 365.<sup>53</sup> Both Justin and Diodorus refer to Alexander's struggles with the Illyrians once again, during which Justin says Alexander gave up Philip to the Illyrians as tribute to avoid war.<sup>54</sup> Alexander surely did give tribute to the Illyrians to keep from war, but whether Philip was taken to Illyria is not certain.<sup>55</sup>

Alexander inherited a struggling state from his father, one threatened by Illyrians and, soon after his ascension, the Thessalians. Jason of Pherae had been cut down by seven assassins, and his nephew Alexander of Pherae looked to expand Thessaly into Macedonian territory.<sup>56</sup> Larissa looked to gain back its independence from Pherae, and asked Alexander and his Macedonians to join forces with them.<sup>57</sup> With the threat of Thessalian hegemony curbed after the death of Jason, Alexander of Pherae still looked to control all Thessaly and Macedonia.<sup>58</sup> Plutarch even states that Alexander of Pherae was in open war with many Thessalian cities, and plotting against them.<sup>59</sup>

Alexander of Macedon took it upon himself to act as a protectorate for Larissa, however, and made her a Macedonian canton to keep her from Pherae. The battle for central and northern Greek territory would have continued, but a peacemaker entered the

---

<sup>53</sup> Using Hammond and Griffith's time table adopted from Justin. The authors provide all the potential dates that Philip may have spent as a hostage, but default to these dates without better ability to distinguish as of now. Hammond, Griffith, 205; Just. 6.9.7.

<sup>54</sup> Hammond, Griffith, and Borza all disagree on Philip's time in Illyria, and whether he actually had been sent there. Diodorus says that Amyntas gave Philip up as a hostage in 383, but Justin says he was taken by the Illyrians as tribute, and conceded by Alexander. Hammond believes Justin, while Griffith and Borza suggest Philip never spent time in Illyria. Just. 7.5.1; Diod. Sic. 16.22.2; Hammond, Griffith, 181, 204; Borza, 189, n. 28.

<sup>55</sup> Borza, 189.

<sup>56</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.31; Westlake, 100, 127.

<sup>57</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.4; Westlake, 130; Hammond, Griffith, 181; Borza, 191.

<sup>58</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.4; Westlake, 128-132.

<sup>59</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* 26.

territory, restored Larissa to independence, sent Alexander of Macedon home, and kept Alexander of Pherae in check.<sup>60</sup> The impressive statesman Pelopidas, from Thebes, commanded order in the surrounding regions, a window into the Theban hegemony he had then begun to build.

Alexander of Macedon had only to look back to Macedonia for more trouble, that coming from his mother and her lover, Ptolemy.<sup>61</sup> Ptolemy — a likely member of the Macedonian royal family, the Argeadae — and Alexander wrestled for control of the Macedonian state, which led to the bringing in of a third party for resolution, coming from Pelopidas making his way up the Greek countryside.<sup>62</sup> For his work in undertaking the issue in Macedonia, he took 30 sons of powerful men as hostages, among them, Philip.<sup>63</sup> Plutarch — a native Boeotian, and therefore a source nearly deifying Pelopidas — explains that Pelopidas had not only shown his own and Theban power by taking the hostages, but also the trust the other Greeks had in his justice.<sup>64</sup> Given the treatment of Philip by the Thebans, Plutarch probably was not far off base.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* 26; Diod. Sic. 15.67; Hammond, Griffith, 181; Borza, 191.

<sup>61</sup> Hammond and Griffith and Borza provide the references which could insinuate Eurydice and Ptolemy were lovers. Hammond, Griffith, 181-183; Borza, 190.

<sup>62</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* 26; Diod. Sic. 15.67; Hammond, Griffith, 181; Borza, 190.

<sup>63</sup> The ancient sources vary on how this took place, particularly set apart is that of Diodorus, who states Amyntas gave his son as a hostage. Diodorus' account is convoluted and most likely wrong on this point. Borza points out in his note that Diodorus and Justin suggest Philip went to the house of Epaminondas, but that is probably also inaccurate. Plutarch's account says that Philip became a pupil of Epaminondas, but was housed with a certain Pammenes. Plut. *Pelop.* 26; Diod. Sic. 16.2.2; Just. 7.5.3; Borza, 190 n. 31.

<sup>64</sup> ἐπιδειξάμενος τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὡς πόρρω διήκει τὰ Θηβαίων πράγματα τῇ δοξῇ τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τῇ πίστει τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Plut. *Pelop.* 26.4.

<sup>65</sup> Borza provides a speculative account of Eurydice's connection to Boeotia herself. He explains that a discovery of a statue base at Aegae — stating “Euridika Sirra Eukleiai,” or “Eurydice of Sirrhas (built this) for Eukleia” — suggests Boeotian influence on the Macedonian state. Borza, 193.

Philip during those three years in Thebes gathered, for the first time, valuable intel from inside the political house of the Thebans, and he would bring those Greek concepts back to Macedonia — the simultaneously Greek and non-Greek state — and formally incorporate Theban political and military practices to Hellenize the entire state. He built upon the legacy of cultural assimilation started by Archelaus to create a Greek state. Since he did this with Theban practices — a state constantly at odds with Athens and the Peloponnese — it is no wonder the Athenians and Spartans could not look upon Macedonia as truly Greek, since her definitive Greek substantiation developed from Theban — not Athenian or Spartan — influence. Since the Theban reputation was suspect, Philip's and Macedonia's reputation had to be as well.

The political structure of Boeotia, the region to which Thebes belonged, had undergone severe changes just a decade previous to Philip's arrival.<sup>66</sup> Unlike the monarchical political structure in Macedonia, Boeotia had an oligarchical representative government based on a republican constitution.<sup>67</sup> But with the creation of the King's Peace, Sparta had taken it upon herself to break up the Boeotian Confederacy.<sup>68</sup>

Sparta saw Thebes as a threat to her hegemony — with good reason, since Pelopidas was about to make a presence throughout all central and northern Greece — all the while Thebes sought her own hegemony and the expulsion of Spartans from Boeotia, but more importantly, from Thebes, under the direction of the Theban official Pelopidas.

---

<sup>66</sup> Larsen, 176.

<sup>67</sup> Larsen also points out that the recent understanding of the Theban state comes from the discovery of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* in 1906 (and publishing date of 1908). He says about this document: "it has added so much to our knowledge that any earlier account by a modern historian is practically useless." Larsen, 26.

<sup>68</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.35-36; Larsen, 175; John Buckler and Hans Beck, *Central Greece and the Politics of Power in the Fourth Century BC* (Cambridge: 2008).

In 379 the Thebans created and executed an elaborate plan to assassinate the Spartan administrators, *polemarchoi*, in Thebes.<sup>69</sup> Pelopidas rallied the troops and the Theban people to expel the whole Spartan garrison.<sup>70</sup> Once done, an assembly was called to elect new *Boeotarchs*.<sup>71</sup>

Thebes looked to take control of the region with the use of its allotted *Boeotarchs*, four in total, to “revive the Confederacy,” thus propelling Thebes to the status of other city-states which dominated their respective regions, while she also looked to create a Boeotian hegemony.<sup>72</sup> The votes by the Theban *Boeotarchs* to go into battle cast light onto the developing tensions and power struggles between the leading forces within Greece, in particular Sparta, Thebes, Athens, and Pherae.<sup>73</sup> Sparta sought to keep the Boeotians (and Athenians) in check with several short campaigns into Boeotia. A decisive battle at Tegyra in 375, however, showed the elite training of a new military powerhouse, when the Sacred Band of Thebes, under the command of Pelopidas, defeated handily the Spartan forces sent to the Boeotian city Orchomenus and the neighboring region Locris.<sup>74</sup>

By 371 two important events took place: the formal acceptance of the Common Peace and the Battle of Leuctra. The Spartans and Thebans had been fighting skirmishes,

---

<sup>69</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.8-9.

<sup>70</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 5.4; Plut. *Pelop.* 12.1-7.

<sup>71</sup> Plutarch calls the officials elected *Boeotarchs*. Buckler and Beck introduce the historiographic argument over the past century that “all four men were local Theban officials, specifically that Pelopidas, Melon, and Charon were *polemarchoi* and that Gorgidas was a *hipparchos*.” Buckler and Beck themselves do not give a substantial argument one way or another. Since they do not clear up the situation, and since Larsen uses the term *Boeotarchs*, I will adopt the term. Burckler, Beck, 90-93; Larsen, 176.

<sup>72</sup> Larsen, 176.

<sup>73</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6-7; Diod. Sic. 14; Paus. 9.

<sup>74</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* 16; Diod. Sic. 15.37.

with participation from allied powers for each state, and were locked in an endless match for hegemonic prowess when the Athenians, who were worn from fighting themselves for the Thebans, agreed to negotiate a peace and Sparta acquiesced. Xenophon relates an interesting element of the peace, saying that the Thebans wished the peace to read “Boeotians” rather than “Thebans,” but the Spartans refused.<sup>75</sup> The Thebans, led by Epaminondas, wanted the peace to reflect that Boeotia and Thebes were synonymous, but just like the near hegemony in Thessaly with Pherae, other Boeotians did not find Thebes to be an adequate representor of the entire region.<sup>76</sup> Without the change, however, the Thebans left Sparta without a peace. Athens and Sparta, however, began immediately to fulfill their terms of the peace between the two.<sup>77</sup>

Since the Common Peace did not settle the matter, especially for the Thebans, the two states continued fighting. Thebans were left to defend the principles and territory of Thebes by themselves. Seven representatives voted on whether to engage in battle with Sparta at Leuctra, a Boeotian town. Epaminondas directed the vote for battle, which ended in a four to one win for the Theban general.<sup>78</sup> Epaminondas led the Thebans into the Battle at Leuctra and crushed the Spartan will. The Thebans turned to Jason of Pherae, who sent cavalry which ultimately settled a peace between Sparta and Thebes, essentially ending the Spartan hegemony. Jason made his way back home through Phocis and celebrated his diplomatic success at Delphi and the Pythian festival.<sup>79</sup> With Spartan power dismantled, and with the assassination of Jason soon after, a power vacuum

---

<sup>75</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.18-20.

<sup>76</sup> Buckler, Beck, 41.

<sup>77</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.

<sup>78</sup> Paus. 9.13.6.

<sup>79</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.29; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 253.

resulted which both Athens and Thebes tried to fill.<sup>80</sup> Thessaly would also make a claim for hegemonic power, but with Jason out of the picture, Thessaly was left without a powerful leader capable of creating a Thessalian hegemony.

371 marked the end of Spartan advancement into central Greek territory, and the strengthening of Boeotian alliances between the Phocians, Aetolians, and Locrians.<sup>81</sup> In 370, the Thebans, instead, became the instigators, and moved into the Peloponnese to attack, with more alliances added: Eleans, Argives, and Arcadians.<sup>82</sup> Larsen indicates that “the Arcadian Confederacy was a product of the anti-Spartan revolt following the defeat of Sparta at Leuctra in 371.”<sup>83</sup> The Sacred Band being the elite fighting force — above the Spartans — now looked to bring the fight to Sparta with the help of her newly formed and strengthened alliances in the Peloponnese.

With the cities — namely Mantinea and Tegea — of the Arcadian League united both with Thebes and against Sparta, Sparta stood little chance.<sup>84</sup> Sparta looked to remain a force at Mantinea, leaving the Arcadians to rely on help from the Thebans — the Sacred Band led by Epaminondas — who pushed the Spartans back to Spartan territory, a threat to Sparta herself. As a final task, the Thebans released Messenia from under Spartan control, essentially ending Spartan “helotage.”<sup>85</sup> Not only had Thebes ended Spartan hegemony at that point, they crippled the state, leaving them with virtually no power over anyone but themselves. This venture into the Peloponnese by the Thebans

---

<sup>80</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.21; Buckler, Beck, 127. For power after Sparta, N.G.L. Hammond, *Philip of Macedon* (Baltimore: 1994), 10.

<sup>81</sup> Buckler, Beck, 166.

<sup>82</sup> Buckler, Beck, 166.

<sup>83</sup> Larsen, 180.

<sup>84</sup> Larsen, 180.

<sup>85</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.24; Diod. Sic. 15.57; Larsen, 183; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 255.

and Epaminondas solidified the status of Thebes and Boeotia as hegemon of Greece. This is the environment under which, two years later, Philip had been taken in to be educated by both Epaminondas and Pelopidas in the house of Pammenes.<sup>86</sup>

In 368, while Philip remained in Theban hands, a fascinating gathering (possibly an impactful moment on Philip) took place between Sparta and Thebes at Delphi, which, having been hijacked by a meddling Persian ambassador, failed.<sup>87</sup> The next year another peace conference took place at Susa. Pelopidas, again showing off his diplomatic skills, arranged for the official peace between Sparta and Thebes — with the help of Persian officials, which failed as the last.<sup>88</sup> Sparta and Athens, “the traditional great powers,” felt Thebes’ growing supremacy, and therefore could not submit.<sup>89</sup> Even with peace constantly at bay for the major Greek powers, Pelopidas worked constantly to try to resolve the conflicts through diplomacy.

In addition to providing means for peace between Athens, Sparta, and Thebes, Pelopidas worked to instigate diplomatic relations between Thebes and the threatening Alexander of Pherae. While in the midst of a diplomatic mission in Thessaly in 367, Pelopidas was taken by Alexander. Two Theban missions advanced to retrieve the Theban commander, the first of which failed due to Athenian involvement, and the second, while successful, came with conditions: the Thebans had to leave Thessaly, and not leave any military or political presence.<sup>90</sup> Hornblower comments, “The original mission of Pelopidas was speculative ... and was intended, surely, not so much to make

---

<sup>86</sup> Plut. *Pelop.* 26.5; Diod. Sic. 16.2.2; Just. 7.5.3; Hammond, Griffith, 205; Borza, 190, n.33.

<sup>87</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7.1; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 259.

<sup>88</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7.1; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 259.

<sup>89</sup> Hornblower, *Greek World*, 259.

<sup>90</sup> Diod. Sic. 15.71; Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.28; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 258.

Thessaly into a Boiotian province ... as to win as many friends and followers as possible.”<sup>91</sup> Pelopidas feared the strength of Alexander, just as he had feared the strength of Jason, and worked to keep his hegemony alive, while at the same time implementing diplomatic tactics rather than military ones. Philip would use this tactic later, particularly during the Third Sacred War, and find it equally ineffective, and turn to military control, just as the Thebans had to do.

Hammond and Griffith make bold claims about Philip’s time spent in Thebes, giving much credence to the Thebans, particularly Epaminondas and Pelopidas. They admit doing so cannot be helped. The influence of these generals on Macedonia is evidenced through similar military strategies and tactics.<sup>92</sup> Hammond and Griffith pose the question that if Philip “had spent these same years as a hostage in Athens instead of in Thebes, free to be a pupil in action at its most sophisticated, should we perhaps have seen a king more serious and more enlightened than the one whom we do see presently?”<sup>93</sup> It is an interesting thought, but the reality is that if Philip spent the time in Athens, even at its height, he would not have had a place in history like he does now. Philip’s greatness rests on his own ability and intellect — as a teenager! — to absorb the tactics of the state employed by the Thebans, and also on the Thebans for taking the time to mentor the young Macedonian.

Hammond and Griffith also make the claim about Plutarch that he “writes sensibly that Philip learned a lot from Epaminondas — a lot about war. As for *arête* and the qualities that made up the *arête* of that great man, Philip was incapable of profiting

---

<sup>91</sup> Hornblower, *Greek World*, 258.

<sup>92</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 205.

<sup>93</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 205.

from the association.”<sup>94</sup> No stone should be cast at Plutarch for such a belief, since Plutarch, as a Boeotian, finds Epaminondas and Pelopidas to exude *arête*, enough so that not many can compare.<sup>95</sup> Few can fault Plutarch’s patriotism, since all historians suffer from biased conclusions of such a nature, but that is not to say it is any less wrong. In addition to military strategies, Philip learned *arête* from the Thebans. The Greek term *arête* itself describes a person possessing moral fiber, something built into their character, something that cannot be learned.

In a sense, Philip was then born with *arête*, but his time as a Theban hostage brought out the trait, which manifested itself in a very Theban way. Hammond and Griffith accurately explain that given Philip’s “devotion to war,” the impact of Epaminondas as a military leader is obvious.<sup>96</sup> What scholars fail to mention is the relationship between Philip and Pelopidas, and the Theban traits instilled in the young man by the equally important Theban general. Perhaps Philip learned military tactics from Epaminondas alone, but more likely he learned them from both Epaminondas and Pelopidas in tandem. Just as importantly, however, Philip became Hellenized through his experience in Thebes, and studied the political maneuvers of Pelopidas across Greek states and through different leagues and councils. Philip undoubtedly gained invaluable knowledge concerning the interworkings of Greek politics, including that of the Amphictyonic Council.

Westlake’s article “The Sources of Plutarch’s Pelopidas” shines a light on the

---

<sup>94</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 205; Plut. *Pelop.* 26.5.

<sup>95</sup> Liddell, Scott, “ἀρετή,” 238.

<sup>96</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 205.

historical frustration of Plutarch's library.<sup>97</sup> Plutarch had countless Boeotian sources from which he pulled the accounts he saw fit to tell his story of Pelopidas — and left alone those that he did not. Unfortunately his bias against Philip kept him from retelling all pertinent information for Philip's time in Thebes, and so the majority of literary evidence about the relationship Philip had with Pelopidas and Epaminondas comes from a limited amount Plutarch remarks on the matter. Evidence, however, could easily come from Philip's apparent imitation of these generals. That imitation should count as historical evidence enough, since the practices are not found in Macedonia before Philip.

### **Rise of Philip of Macedon**

During the time when Philip had been held in Thebes, Macedonia suffered from drastic changes in the royal house. In 367, Alexander II was assassinated, the lead suspect being Ptolemy.<sup>98</sup> The conspiracy against Alexander raises questions, but nevertheless, Ptolemy succeeded to the throne, with the strong-willed Eurydice by his side.<sup>99</sup> The usurpation of the throne by Ptolemy split the kingdom, half of which would remain loyal to a proper successor of Alexander II. Pausanias proved to be that successor, though through what blood lines remains unclear.<sup>100</sup> Athens — still in a power

---

<sup>97</sup> H.D. Westlake, "The Sources of Plutarch's Pelopidas," *CQ*, vol. 33 no. 1 (1939), 12.

<sup>98</sup> Diod. Sic. 15.71.1.

<sup>99</sup> See Hammond and Griffith for speculative accounts of an assembly called to investigate the death of Alexander II. Hammond, Griffith, 183-184. See Borza for a speculative account of Eurydice's involvement in the assassination of her husband and son on behalf of the Lyncestian-Illyrians. Borza, 191. Borza also includes Eurydice as a Macedonian ruler, "we must include her, even though 'officially' a woman could not rule," Borza, 193.

<sup>100</sup> Hammond and Griffith believe Pausanias to be a descendant of Archelaus, Hammond, Griffith, 184. Borza, the most recent source, believes the ties to be too ambiguous to make a clear conclusion, Borza, 193.

struggle with Thebes for hegemony — helped Ptolemy to rid Macedonia of Pausanias.<sup>101</sup> Pelopidas, with Philip still in his care, invaded Macedonia and subjected Ptolemy to “humiliating” terms.<sup>102</sup>

Ptolemy, in 365, lost power to Perdiccas III. “It is uncertain whether Ptolemy fell as the result of a plot against him by Perdiccas, or whether Perdiccas came of age, achieved his kingship and then disposed of [Ptolemy],” since Ptolemy may have been serving as his regent.<sup>103</sup> Athens and Thebes not only fought for political control of Macedonia — through supporting and appointing one king over another — but also for control of Macedonian economic commodities, mainly timber for shipbuilding. Perdiccas decided to provide Thebes with the timber over Athens, further infuriating the Athenians.<sup>104</sup> Later hatred for the Macedonians by the Athenians could stem from this transition from Ptolemy to Perdiccas, as well as the continuing fight for Amphipolis.

That same year Philip was returned home.<sup>105</sup> By 364 he had been given a *τάξις*, or fleet, and the opportunity to protect an area, Amphaxitis.<sup>106</sup> During this time Philip developed solid relationships with the military men he served with, as well as new military tactics. After spending time with the Theban military, Philip knew the benefits of the phalanx. To improve on the Theban formation he armed the infantry with the *sarissa*, a remarkable long pike to be wielded by hoplites.<sup>107</sup> While Perdiccas was caught between Athens and Thebes for political control of the Macedonian economy, Philip had

---

<sup>101</sup> Aeschin. 2.28-29.

<sup>102</sup> Borza, 194.

<sup>103</sup> Borza, 194-195, n. 46.

<sup>104</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 186-187; Borza, 194.

<sup>105</sup> Hammond and Griffith find Diodorus’ account that he fled the Thebans to come back home untrue, Hammond, Griffith, 186.

<sup>106</sup> N.G.L. Hammond, *The Miracle that was Macedonia* (London: 1991), 58.

<sup>107</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 19; Hammond, *Miracle that was Macedonia*, 59.

time to build an elite fighting force of his own. The time between Philip's return home and the beginning of his reign as king proved to be invaluable in creating something Macedonia lacked for centuries now, an army capable of competing with the rest of the Greeks. "The same soldiers," Griffith asserts, "when acting in conditions which called for endurance over rougher terrain were armed probably with the conventional hoplite spear and shield and were capable of marching far and fast."<sup>108</sup>

In addition to being used by both Athens and Thebes for purposes not Macedonian, Macedonia also faced yet another threat from the Illyrians. In 359, Perdiccas set out to fight a "pitched battle" with the Illyrians, one in which he lost his life, along with 4,000 of his men.<sup>109</sup> Hammond claims that with the death of Perdiccas, "the collapse of the Macedonian kingdom seemed to be almost inevitable."<sup>110</sup> The heir to the throne was Perdiccas's young son, Amyntas, and the Illyrians saw their chance to take the whole of Macedon. Athens backed one pretender to the throne, while the Thracians of Chalcidice backed another.<sup>111</sup>

Philip — whether acting as regent to the boy Amyntas, or as outright king — found himself surrounded on all sides by wolves ready to pounce, awaiting the fall of Macedon. To solve his problem, Hammond and Griffith say Philip needed time, and the way to gain time was through diplomacy. Like Pelopidas, and probably learned from

---

<sup>108</sup> G.T. Griffith, "Philip as a General and the Macedonian Army," in Philip of Macedon. Ed. Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulos (Athens: 1980), 59.

<sup>109</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.2.4-5; Hammond, Griffith, 188.

<sup>110</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 22.

<sup>111</sup> Just. 7.5.6-10; Hammond, Griffith, 208.

Pelopidas, “diplomacy was destined to be Philip’s favourite field of action.”<sup>112</sup> By some miracle, Philip and his ambassadors managed to negotiate a temporary peace with those on every side of the kingdom, including a peace with Athens over Amphipolis.<sup>113</sup> Athens had sent a military force to instate a puppet king, Argaeus, on the Macedonian throne. When the Athenian force realized the Macedonians would support Philip as king, they made their way back to their ships to go home. Philip stopped them and held them prisoner.<sup>114</sup> Ellis counters Demosthenes’ account with the claim that “the withdrawal from Amphipolis and the deliberately generous treatment of the prisoners taken near Methone had advertised the attractions of Philip as ally rather than enemy.”<sup>115</sup> Philip now had the time he needed to build an army — and kingdom — based on the fundamentals of the Theban Sacred Band.

---

<sup>112</sup> The matter of succession to the throne is debated between J.R. Ellis, Hammond and Griffith, and Borza. Borza, being the most recent, gives the most detailed account of each side. The evidence for Philip acting as regent to Amyntas comes from an inscription in Boeotia which calls Amyntas, son of Perdikkas, the king of the Macedonians, and from Justin. None of these scholars — Borza, Ellis, Hammond and Griffith — believe Philip acted as regent, and believe he took on all pretenders to the throne — including his only remaining half-brother, whom he had killed — to become king outright. J.R. Ellis, “Amyntas Perdikkas, Philip II and Alexander the Great,” *JHS*, vol. 91 (1971), 15-25; Hammond, Griffith, 209-210; Borza, 200.

<sup>113</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.3.4.

<sup>114</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.2-3.

<sup>115</sup> J.R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London: 1976), 51; Dem. 2.6.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE THIRD SACRED WAR, ATHENIAN BIAS AND RHETORIC

#### **Origins of a Third Sacred War**

Buckler begins his account of the Third Sacred War — the only monograph in English on the matter — with the Peace of 362 after the battle of Mantinea. He explains that the battle had been the end of the Theban hegemony without making reference to Epaminondas, since the battle also ended the life of Epaminondas. Much like the death of Jason, the general's death led to the slipping of the grip Thebes had on the rest of Greece. “Never again,” Buckler writes, “would any single Greek state win ascendancy over the others.”<sup>1</sup> Instead, it may be offered that yet another state lost hegemony — like Sparta had two decades earlier — and a power vacuum led to another Greek state climbing the ladder to hegemony: Macedonia. Theban hegemony, though, had made its mark on Greek political life from then on; “federalism is the great Theban legacy to fourth-century and hellenistic Greece.”<sup>2</sup>

Tensions escalated, however, not in 362, but in 364 with a series of major events. Buckler, like other scholars before him, underestimates the influence of Pelopidas on

---

<sup>1</sup> John Buckler, *Philip II and the Sacred War* (Leiden: 1989), 1.

<sup>2</sup> Hornblower, *Greek World*, 265.

Greek matters in favor of narratives highlighting Epaminondas. Even Xenophon favors the Epaminondas narrative over that of Pelopidas, saying, “there was still greater indecision and confusion than before in all Greece.”<sup>3</sup> In 364, on the other hand, Thessaly sought autonomy from Alexander of Pherae, a noble cause in the eyes of Thebans and Pelopidas. Pelopidas took up arms against Alexander of Pherae’s forces and was killed at the battle of Kynoskephalai. The Thebans, avenging their fallen leader, undertook a second mission on Alexander, wherein he was defeated and made to join the Boeotian League.<sup>4</sup> “The importance of this,” Hornblower believes, “was that it gave the Thebans a clear majority of votes in the Amphiktionic Council at Delphi.”<sup>5</sup> The naval fleet Epaminondas sought to build — thus the Theban relationship with Macedonia for timber — halted, since forces were spread thin.<sup>6</sup> This made way for the fall of the Theban hegemony in 362 when Epaminondas was killed.<sup>7</sup> With Thebes and Thessaly kept in check, Phocis vied for power and aimed first at Delphi, an autonomous site within Phocis.

After the Second Sacred War ended in 448, the Phocians controlled the Delphic shrine. Not until the end of the Archidamian War — concluding with the Peace of Nicias in 421 — did independence come to the site. The first two clauses of the Peace, as relayed by Thucydides, involved the Delphic Oracle. The first term indicated that any Greek could go to any temple or games within Greece without fear. The second term

---

<sup>3</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. Sic. 15.80.

<sup>5</sup> Hornblower, *Greek World*, 263.

<sup>6</sup> Hornblower, *Greek World*, 264.

<sup>7</sup> Epaminondas sought to build a mighty Aegean naval force to rival Athens. This led to his and Pelopidas’ interest in Macedonian timber. Buckler and Beck cover the process in their chapter *Boeotian Aulis and Greek naval bases*. Buckler, Beck, 180-198.

specified the independence of the Delphic shrine, and that the shrine should be governed by the Delphians themselves.<sup>8</sup> The feud between Phocis and Delphi subsided for nearly seventy years before it ratcheted up again in 356, starting the Third Sacred War.<sup>9</sup>

Scott suggests that the Third Sacred War “‘once again,’ seems to have been fought over the nature of Delphi’s administration and more specifically the balance of power within the sanctuary.”<sup>10</sup> Since Scott focuses mainly on the sacred site of Delphi, and not the politics of the cities and states surrounding the sanctuary, including the town of Delphi, he misses the larger context at play in Greece at the time of the Sacred War. While Scott is accurate in stating a power struggle erupted between the Phocians and Delphians for control of the site and for the Amphictyony, his claim does not account for the Theban and Thessalian interests in controlling the Amphictyony. The “administration” of the site does not only lead to power over the sanctuary, but gives the state in control the position of leading power in central Greece. The Thebans, as a central Greek state, knew the importance of controlling the Amphictyony in this way, as did the Phocians.

Diodorus and Pausanias provide differing accounts concerning the outbreak of the war. Diodorus, an anti-Phocian source, explains that the Phocian leader, Philomelus, a

---

<sup>8</sup> “τὸ δ’ ἱερόν καὶ τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Δελφοῦς αὐτονόμους εἶναι καὶ αὐτοτελεῖς καὶ αὐτοδίκους καὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἑαυτῶν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.”

“The divine space and temple of Apollo at Delphi and the Delphians are to be self-governed, by their own law, as well as taxed by their own state, and judged by their own judges, their earth and people, according to the customs of their state,” Thuc. 5.18.

<sup>9</sup> Petrakos, 5; Petrakos gives this as the first year of the Third Sacred War. Battles did not start until the spring of 355 BCE. This date comes from John Buckler. Buckler, *Philip II* (Leiden; 1989), 37.

<sup>10</sup> Scott, *Delphi and Olympia*, 124.

man with unusual audacity and lawlessness, took over the Delphic shrine.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, Pausanias states outright he does not know the truthfulness of stories he had been told about the outbreak, but retells the two sides that had come down to him. One side, the Phocians acted, against the Amphictyony, who then imposed a fine on them; the other side, a fine was placed on the Phocians because of the Thessalian hatred for them.<sup>12</sup>

Pausanias, while trying to remain impartial in his account, does not examine the possibility of the Phocian right to the sacred site. Crisa — a city within the region of Phocis — lost its right to the site when it had been razed to the ground during the First Sacred War. Crisa tried to implement the toll on pilgrims visiting the site, which seemed reasonable considering pilgrims travelled through Crisa and Phocis continually, without providing Phocis with due funds for maintaining the stretch. Since Delphi remained in the Phocian region, Phocis had a legitimate claim to the site, but could only fight for control of it when the hegemonic states controlling it and the Amphictyony were distracted with other endeavors of *stasis*. Neither ancient author acknowledges the entitlement Phocis had to — at very least — the Cirrhaean Plain, since it had been taken from the Phocians and only then dedicated to Apollo (as explored above).

The Phocians clearly knew the best times for their intervention at Delphi. They acted — and indeed cultivated the land — at a moment when they knew the great powers, namely Athens and Sparta, could or would not intervene. They did, however, believe

---

<sup>11</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.14.3. Diodorus also states here the war lasted eleven years, but at 16.23.1 he tells it lasted nine years, and finally at 16.59.1 ten years. The inconsistencies in Diodorus could lead to the interpretation Diodorus's full account of the war was inaccurate, but his specific details counter that claim.

<sup>12</sup> χρόνω δὲ ὕστερον κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς ζημιωθῆναι χρήμασιν ὑπὸ Ἀμφικτυόνων· οὐδὲ ἔχω τοῦ λόγου τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐξευρεῖν εἴτε ἀδικήσασιν ἐπεβλήθη σφίσι εἴτε Θεσσαλοὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐκ παλαιοῦ μῖσος γενέσθαι τὴν ζημίαν τοῖς Φωκεῦσιν ἦσαν οἱ πράξαντες. Paus. 10.2.1.

they had a right to the land, since it was taken from them in the First Sacred War. Whether the Phocians made an attempt to seize Delphi, or acted against the Amphictyony — or whether the Thessalians had it out for them — the Amphictyony heard the case against the Phocians and deliberated to consider the initial fine of 500 talents on the Phocians in 357 for impiety in relation to the cultivation of the sacred plain.<sup>13</sup> The Thebans, possibly for more power as their own dwindled, had the Amphictyony hear the case against Spartan impiety for attacking a Greek state during a time of peace in 382, and asked for a 500 talent fine on them as well.<sup>14</sup> Outraged, the Spartans took up the Phocian cause. Jeremy McInerney states that “the Thebans’ intentions were to isolate their ancient enemies from the rest of the Greek community, not to punish recent wrongdoing.”<sup>15</sup> The Amphictyony took the Theban side when they voted in 357 at Thermopylae to place an even larger fine on the Spartans of 1000 talents at the same time they voted to impose the fine on the Phocians, the result being an alliance between Phocis and Sparta against (what each state viewed as) Amphictyonic persecution.<sup>16</sup> Buckler examines Delphi’s ability to prosecute the Phocians at such a time, without

---

<sup>13</sup> As far as the date, Buckler’s date of 357, since he breaks down events year by year as they happened, is better than Hammond’s date of 356, since Hammond lumps the events of 357 and 356 together. Buckler, *Philip II*, 20; Hammond, *Philip*, 45-46. Buckler gives the historiography for the origins of the war. He discounts Aristotle’s version, which indicates the Phocians had been cultivating the land for multiple seasons, in favor of Diodorus’ account. In addition, Buckler cites Demosthenes as evidence for the argument of recent cultivation. Diod. Sic. 16.23.3; Arist. *Pol.* 5.3.4; Dem. 18.18; Buckler, *Philip II*, 18-20.

<sup>14</sup> Phoibidas, a Spartan general, took hold of the Theban acropolis, for which the Thebans appealed to the Amphictyony, since this event took place during a time of peace. Diod. Sic. 16.23.2-3; Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.27; Buckler, *Philip II*, 15.

<sup>15</sup> Jeremy McInerney, *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis* (Austin, TX: 1999), 207.

<sup>16</sup> Buckler provides the price of the fine as 500 talents for both Sparta and Phocis. Buckler, *Philip II*, 20.

acknowledging that the Phocians probably waited until they knew they could get away with taking parts of their ancient land back. “Thessaly was too distracted by civil war to intervene,” Buckler admits, “and Athens, an ally of Sparta, too well disposed towards Phokis. Thebes was the only realistic alternative.”<sup>17</sup> The Thebans, having been granted *promanteia* with the death of Pelopidas, had not only a vested interest, but undoubtedly an assumed duty, in upholding the Amphictyony and protecting the sacred site.

Buckler remarks that the fines were unjust, since the Spartans had already been punished with the loss of hegemony and Theban advancements afterwards into the Peloponnese, and since the Phocians could not afford such a fine. If the Phocians could not afford the price, the other Greek states had to have known it. Thebes and the Amphictyony had to believe one of two things would happen. First, that the fine would bankrupt Phocians, failing in any attempt as an opposition power to Delphi and the Amphictyony. The vulnerability of the Phocians, then, would easily lead to a Theban take-over; second, the Phocians would fight back, starting a new sacred war. Either way, the Thebans saw Phocian territory as ripe for the plucking, and as a step towards hegemonic power again. Instead of attempting the diplomacy the Thebans excelled at before the death of Pelopidas, they sought to beat on a weaker foe. The decision would ultimately lead not to their elevation to Theban hegemony, but to the rise of the diplomatic and military power of Macedon.

---

<sup>17</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 18.

### **The Third Sacred War and Intervention of Philip II as a Greek**

Hornblower devotes a handful of pages to the Third Sacred War, since his monograph spans from the end of the Persian Wars to the death of Alexander, but provides the most succinct commentary of the effects of the war, saying, “the importance of this war (355-346) can hardly be exaggerated, because it was what brought Philip into Greece proper.”<sup>18</sup> Philip was brought into Greece, but what about the whole of Macedonia? Many scholars make sure to distinguish between Philip’s success as a Greek, and the inclusion of Macedonia as a Greek state. The distinction seems obvious to these scholars: Philip was Greek, but Macedonia was not.<sup>19</sup>

The inherent problem with considering Philip Greek while the rest of Macedonia fits under the category of non-Greek, is that Philip leads the Macedonians, a man backed by the Macedonian people over usurpers to the throne — some of whom could have taken it easily if not for the Macedonian loyalty to Philip. Philip, therefore, had to be Macedonian for the Macedonians to support him. His Greek-ness, clearly unhidden from the Macedonians, suggests the Macedonians saw no conflict or contradiction in either his allegiance or his identity. The Macedonians — particularly the Macedonian army who had, at the time of Philip, adopted Theban tactics — could likewise claim a Macedonian identity, while simultaneously claiming Greek identity. This would tie Philip to the Macedonians, rather than keeping the two at odds with one another. This circumstance gives more weight to reason than the deduction by scholars that a Greek led the Macedonian state. From this point forward, then, when speaking of Philip as the head of his state — rather than as an individual — he is assumed synonymous with Macedonia.

---

<sup>18</sup> Hornblower, *Greek World*, 275.

<sup>19</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 45; Borza, 228; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 275.

Events in central Greece shadowed the events taking place in northern Greece between Athens, Thessaly, and Macedonia between 357 and 355. Hammond provides a note linking them, “as a hostage Philip had observed the great achievements of Thebes and her control of the Delphic Amphictyony, and thereafter he watched the growing confusion from Macedonia.”<sup>20</sup> By 356 the Phocians assembled to discuss how they would deal with the fine. Philomelos, the Phocian leader, decided that the punishment from the Amphictyony was not only unjust, but that the seizure of the site from the Phocians over two centuries earlier was also unjust.<sup>21</sup> Philomelos claimed the Amphictyony had no right to the governance of the site, since the Phocians had the right taken from them.<sup>22</sup> He aimed to take back not only control of the site itself, but the governance of it, with aid from both Sparta and Athens.<sup>23</sup>

Philomelos travelled to Sparta himself to recruit help. The Spartans refused to send Spartan troops, but agreed to fund and supply mercenaries.<sup>24</sup> They may not have wanted to commit to another war just yet, since their troops and funds from the state were probably depleted, or they felt the Phocians were willing to take on the full force of the Thebans and members of the Amphictyonic League themselves, with little responsibility to fall on the Spartan state. Phocis then had the power to march on the sacred site of

---

<sup>20</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 45.

<sup>21</sup> Some modern scholars provide a specific term applied to the leader of the Phocian army, since they were typically also the leader of the state, but Larsen does not use any of these terms, saying they are all inaccurate. Larsen’s position holds the most weight, and use of the vague term “leader” is sound. Larsen, 300.

<sup>22</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.23.4; Buckler, *Philip II*, 23.

<sup>23</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.23.4.

<sup>24</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.24.1-3; Paus. 3.10.3.

Delphi, and did so in July 356, according to Buckler.<sup>25</sup>

Phocis had a cruel policy against the occupants of those in or around the town of Delphi, which was to kill or enslave all inhabitants. The Spartan commander Archidamos convinced him otherwise.<sup>26</sup> The Locrians immediately engaged the Phocians to try to take back the sanctuary, but were pushed back. Philomelos hurled the taken Locrian prisoners from the cliffs of the mountain, a punishment enforced on those who had committed sacrilege at Delphi. Buckler claims that “by subjecting the captured Lokrians to this fate, Philomelos emphasized the Phokian claim to the presidency of the sanctuary.”<sup>27</sup> By 356 Philomelos established alliances with pro-Phocian Delphians, those who also had alliances with Athens already.<sup>28</sup>

Previously in 357, when the Social War between Athens and the central and northern territories accelerated, Athens had taken back Euboea from Boeotia, but “badly over-extended [herself] financially.”<sup>29</sup> This war also resulted in an alliance between Macedonia and the Chalkidian League.<sup>30</sup> With Athens, Thessaly, and Macedonia preoccupied in the north, they had little time to contribute to the escalation at Delphi until

---

<sup>25</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.24. The dates provided by Buckler will be privileged throughout this chapter in terms of the Sacred War (excluding dates of Philip’s interventions outside of the theater of the Sacred War), since his region of expertise is central Greece. Hammond and Griffith offer different dates, but as historians of Macedonia, and since the *HM* had been published well before Buckler, Buckler’s dates seem more plausible. T.T.B. Ryder, in his review of Buckler’s *Philip II and the Third Sacred War*, gives no priority to either Buckler or Hammond and Griffith’s dates, saying either could be correct. Buckler, *Philip II*, 23; T.T.B. Ryder, “Review: Philip II and the Third Sacred War,” *CQ*, vol. 44, no.1 (1994), 102.

<sup>26</sup> Aeschin. 2.131; Diod. Sic. 16.24.2-3; Buckler, *Philip II*, 24.

<sup>27</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 24.

<sup>28</sup> Philomelos brought back Delphian exiles to Delphi to promote his cause. The Delphians with Athenian alliances were given positions of power in the city, and therefore were inclined to help the Phocians. Buckler, *Philip II*, 25.

<sup>29</sup> Ellis, 63.

<sup>30</sup> Ellis, 73.

355, when the Social War ended and the Sacred War began. “The Thessalians were now ready to support the Thebans positively.”<sup>31</sup>

Over the two years between the seizure of the site in 357 and the beginning of the war in 355, the Phocians created a military campus at the sacred site. They destroyed stone inscriptions which depicted them badly, specifically the *stelai* which had inscribed the charges placed against them by the Amphictyony. They fortified the site with walls and barracks.<sup>32</sup> The most irreligious part of the Phocian takeover was the reaction of Philomelos to the *Pythia*. He dragged her to her tripod and forced her to make a prophecy. Diodorus recounts that she uttered a sentence to Philomelos, which he took as an oracle: “It is within your ability to do as you wish.”<sup>33</sup>

Phocis believed herself to now preside over Delphi, with the ability to govern states’ wishes to participate in Delphic politics. With the oracle from the *Pythia*, Philomelos felt the site had transferred power in accordance with Apollo’s wishes. He sent ambassadors to the Greek states asking for their endorsement of the Phocian presidency at Delphi in agreement with the power bestowed on them anciently.<sup>34</sup> Sparta welcomed the Phocian ambassador, and sided with the Phocians. This Spartan policy proved beneficial not only to get back at the Amphictyony for the fine, but for more grand purposes like tying up the central Greeks in a war, leaving the Spartans to recover

---

<sup>31</sup> Ellis and Hornblower give small accounts of the Athenian Social War (“the war against their seceding allies,” Hornblower, 276), and shows that it had tied up the finances and naval strength of both Athens and Thessaly. Ellis, 63-65; Hornblower, *Greek World*, 268, 271-4, 276.

<sup>32</sup> Aeschin. 2.131; Buckler, *Philip II*, 25.

<sup>33</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.27.1.

<sup>34</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.24.5; Plut. *Mor.* 292.

the Peloponnesian territory they had lost to the Thebans.<sup>35</sup>

The Phocian ambassadors had less success among the central Greek states. The Locrians called upon the Boeotian League to avenge Delphi, the Amphictyony, and Apollo. The Thebans sent their own ambassadors to rally the participants of the Amphictyony, and arranged for a “special session” of the Amphictyony in the fall of 356 at Thermopylae to discuss plans of action. Buckler deduces, “Since Sparta and Athens had publicly declared for Philomelos, they may have boycotted the meeting.”<sup>36</sup> But as Larsen points out — and as has been mentioned previously — the Spartans had little influence on the Amphictyony to begin with.<sup>37</sup> The two biggest forces in the Amphictyonic League, the Thessalians and Thebans, supported a sacred war with enthusiasm.<sup>38</sup> The split of support between the central Greeks, Athens, and Sparta — producing a division of the Amphictyonic League — created *stasis* again in Greece. Xenophon laments that “there was still greater indecision and confusion than before in Greece.”<sup>39</sup> The Amphictyony, during the special session, voted to go to war with Phocis.<sup>40</sup> “The Amphictyonic declaration of war meant that Philomelos could expect a concerted attack in spring 355.”<sup>41</sup>

The year 355 had other significance in the north. The tyrants of Pherae had struck a peace with the rest of Thessaly three years previous under a watchful Macedonian eye, but tensions heightened again in 355 after the Thessalian League wished to vote in favor

---

<sup>35</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 26-7.

<sup>36</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 27.

<sup>37</sup> Larsen, 123; Hammond, *Philip*, 45.

<sup>38</sup> Diod. 16.28; Aeschin. 3.118; Buckler, 27.

<sup>39</sup> Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27.

<sup>40</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.28.28.

<sup>41</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 37.

of the Amphictyony. Larissa asked Philip to intervene. How long he took in Thessaly is uncertain, since more pressing escalations were taking place at the same time at Methone between Macedonia and the Athenian ally, but Philip restored order in Thessaly, much to the dismay of Pherae, but the rest of Thessaly would work mutually with Philip through the conclusion of the Sacred War.<sup>42</sup> Hammond notes, “Alliance with the Thessalian League brought Philip into the orbit of Central Greece.”<sup>43</sup> He now had the opportunity to influence Greek politics and had permission to intervene militarily.

By spring 355, Philomelos prepared for a two-front war — the Locrians and Thessalians threatening from the north, and the Boeotians from the east — with little support from either Athens or Sparta. The Achaeans, however, sent him 1500 men.<sup>44</sup> Philomelos took the more bold action of fighting the Locrians and Thessalians before the Boeotians arrived to fight in the east. He invaded Locris first, which fell easily without support. The Thessalians arrived to fight with the Locrians, but even together they fell at Argolas. They fought valiantly for a cause they truly believed in, and had not sent troops outside the borders of Thessaly since Jason of Pherae left for Leuctra.<sup>45</sup> The Boeotians made their way towards Locris to aid their allies. The Phocians fled, but some prisoners had been taken by the Boeotians. Two massacres took place thereafter, the Boeotians killing the Phocian prisoners as temple robbers, and the Phocians retaliating with the

---

<sup>42</sup> Thessaly and Pherae: Westlake, *Thessaly*, 160-172; Hammond, Griffith, 256; Ellis, 75-6. Methone: Hammond, Griffith, 254-58; Ellis, 77-80.

<sup>43</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 45.

<sup>44</sup> Buckler lists the numbers for all the armies involved, a better estimation than Diodorus’ own account, since Diodorus probably was inaccurate. Diod. Sic. 16.30.4; Buckler, *Philip II*, 39-41.

<sup>45</sup> Westlake, *Thessaly*, 170.

same punishment on their captives.<sup>46</sup>

The two armies met again soon after at Neon. The Boeotians beat the Phocians, which led the Phocians to flee to Mt. Parnassos. Philomelos had been injured in the battle, and launched himself off a cliff of Parnassos to avoid capture by the Boeotians, a sardonic ending for the Phocian leader. Onomarchos quickly took over and led the Phocian army to safety at Delphi, and the Boeotians returned to Thebes. The Boeotian commander, Pammenes, “won the greatest battle of his career, [but] he failed to use his victory to end the Sacred War.”<sup>47</sup> This mistake by Pammenes made way for more years of war, and for the emergence of Macedonia as hegemon.<sup>48</sup>

Diodorus provides inconsistent accounts about whether the Phocians used reserves from the Delphic treasury to fund the mercenaries fighting for them.<sup>49</sup> But doubtless, Onomarchos dipped into monies dedicated to the god to fund the war from 354 onward. Acting as tyrant, Onomarchos confiscated property of his Phocian political opponents. With the stolen funds, Phocis could now build an adequate army to face the rest of the central Greeks. The Phocians used dedications made of bronze and iron for the creation of weapons. Gold and silver dedications were melted down to make coins.<sup>50</sup>

While Onomarchos built his military might in 354, the Thessalians struggled again with civil war. While the Thessalian League had been away fighting Philomelos, the tyrants of Pherae seized the opportunity to take control of Thessaly yet again. Onomarchos kept track of the situation in Thessaly from Delphi with much enjoyment;

---

<sup>46</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.30.4.

<sup>47</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 45.

<sup>48</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 45.

<sup>49</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.28.2, 16.30.1, 16.56.3.

<sup>50</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.33; Aeschin. 2.131.

Philip, on the other hand, had “to deal with the Thessalian situation in person and with greater firmness than hitherto.”<sup>51</sup> Pherae had to appeal to Phocis for help mustering up an army to challenge Philip and the Macedonians. Hammond and Griffith note that Philip made a conscious decision to enter “Greek” affairs beyond Thessaly. Macedonia was already engaged in a struggle with Athens, and Hammond and Griffith observe that Philip, after taking the side of the Thessalian League, sought the support of anti-Athenian Greek states. This led him to a formal alliance with Thebes — although the two states had probably amiable relations for at least a half century — in addition to constant support of the Thessalian League.<sup>52</sup> With Philip aiding the Thebans in the Thessalian matter to maintain a coalition to fight the Sacred War, the Thebans were able to reciprocate by helping Philip settle matters in Thrace.<sup>53</sup> The diplomacy practiced between the two states illustrates the legacy left to each by Pelopidas and Epaminondas.

Onomarchos fought a diplomatic battle in the north to keep Thessaly preoccupied, while also fighting a physical battle, taking continual territory from Locris and Amphissa, a city within the borders of Phocis. He worked steadily to promote a pro-Phocian stance in Locris, and made headway with her leaders. In addition, Onomarchos provided the tyrants of Thessaly with Delphic funds to hire mercenaries and fight off the Thessalian League. “In fact,” Westlake remarks, “the Thessalians took no further part in the Sacred War until its closing stages were reached.”<sup>54</sup> When the Thessalian tyrants failed to overtake Philip’s troops in Thessaly, he sent his own army to Thessaly to take care of the matter. Diodorus explains that Onomarchos won two decided battles against Philip there,

---

<sup>51</sup> Westlake, *Thessaly*, 173.

<sup>52</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 263.

<sup>53</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 265-67.

<sup>54</sup> Westlake, *Thessaly*, 172.

and Philip retreated.<sup>55</sup> Philip said he was “retiring like a ram in order to butt the harder a second time.”<sup>56</sup>

The next campaign came in 353, and opened with Onomarchos marching into Thessaly, since he “now appeared to be invincible.”<sup>57</sup> Philip again came to the aid of the Thessalian League, and soon thereafter, the League appointed him the commander of their army.<sup>58</sup> Philip and Onomarchos finally met at the Crocus Plain. Philip’s men wore laurel wreaths as “warriors of Apollo,” and won decidedly and had the Phocian prisoners drowned as temple robbers, and Onomarchos hanged.<sup>59</sup>

At that point Philip exercised his second successful diplomatic policy. The Thessalian League looked to take over Pherae without any trouble, but Philip had other plans. He did not want to waste any more time in battle with the then powerless Pherae, when he could march south to assist in the Sacred War. His objective was to take the pass at Thermopylae. The mercenaries of Pherae had moved on to protect the pass, as

---

<sup>55</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.35.2-3.

<sup>56</sup> Polyæn. 2.38.2; Westlake, *Thessaly*, 174.

<sup>57</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 47.

<sup>58</sup> Buckler says at this point Philip was also made *archon* of the Thessalian League, but Hammond and Griffith say he was not granted the title until he came back from Thermopylae. Either way, Buckler agrees the title was given before Philip had seized hegemony. Hammond and Griffith argue against the naming of Philip *archon* between 344-342, saying at very least he was *de facto* ruler of Thessaly. Buckler, *Philip II*, 80; Hammond, Griffith, 280, 285.

<sup>59</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.35.6; Hammond, *Philip*, 47. Hammond and Griffith examine the claim that the Phocians and Onomarchos were, in fact, worthy of such a demise, with convincing evidence that they perhaps did not actually suffer it. The Phocians believed they had a right to the sacred land, especially the Cirrhaean Plain, which had been taken from them in the First Sacred War. Philomelos also worked diplomatically to find a way to fund the war without pillaging the site. It was only when Onomarchos had no other choice that the Phocians opened the Delphic treasuries. Hammond and Griffith suggest that Philip knew this and yet took such measures to please the Thebans. Philip, being far from Delphi, probably saw the Phocians as temple robbers without respite. He, being Hellenized by Thebans, understood the Theban position against the Phocians, and did not consider their plight. Hammond, Griffith, 275.

well as Phocians, Athenians, Spartans, and Achaeans. Philip, rather than facing the challenge, decided to take his troops back to Thessaly.<sup>60</sup>

“Despite the fact,” Buckler writes, “that the campaigning-season of 353 was a virtual repetition of 355, the Phokians once again rallied.”<sup>61</sup> Onomarchos’ brother, Phayllos, had been made commander of both the Phocian League and army. Before the next campaigning season began, Phayllos attempted what both his predecessors had — diplomatic coercion of Phocian allies to participate in the Sacred War, rather than relying on mercenaries. To attract the Spartans in particular, Phayllos changed the military strategy to focus on Thebes and Boeotian territory, rather than provoking Philip in Thessaly. With aid from their allies piling in, Phocis set out to take on Boeotia, where they lost battle after battle to the smaller numbered troops of the Boeotians. Phayllos could not manage as a general, and every battle he charged into against the Boeotians.<sup>62</sup> The failed skirmishes led by the Phocians against the Thebans lasted the entire campaign season of 352. Phayllos took time to consider his options during the offseason, and decided to go back to Onomarchos’ plan of taking out eastern and western Locris one city at a time, slowly making his way towards Thermopylae, an area critical to Boeotia. He took possession of three crucial cities leading to the narrow corridor. Having taken these cities, he made his way toward Boeotia. Phayllos managed to take the whole of eastern Locris, and pushed the Boeotians back, but was overcome with a disease in the midst of the seizure. Nevertheless, no longer did any territory separate Phocis from Boeotia.<sup>63</sup>

The timing of Phayllos’ death from illness benefitted the Boeotians, since

---

<sup>60</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.37.2-4; Westlake, *Thessaly*, 176-177; Buckler, *Philip II*, 81.

<sup>61</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 85.

<sup>62</sup> Bucker, *Philip II*, 85-87.

<sup>63</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.38-61; Buckler, *Philip II*, 92-97.

developments in the Peloponnese demanded their attention. The Spartans, taking advantage of the Boeotian preoccupation in central Greece, took the opportunity to renew an attack on Megalopolis. The Boeotians came to the aid of their Peloponnesian ally, along with others that Sparta saw fit to recapture. Though the Boeotian forces were depleted from the Sacred War, they managed to hold Sparta to a standstill, which eventually led to each side venturing back to their own territories, leaving the allies without capture.<sup>64</sup> Thebes had “succeeded in putting Sparta out of the Sacred War.”<sup>65</sup>

The Sacred War’s campaign season of 351 ended with Boeotian forces returning from the Peloponnese to put down fronts placed by two new leaders of the Phocians, neither of which had commanding experience, and who fell easily to the Boeotians on multiple fronts, including at Neon.<sup>66</sup> Running out of money, allied support, and commanders, the Phocians were nearing the end of their prowess in central Greece. The Boeotians as well, however, struggled to finance the costly Sacred War, in addition to campaigns into the Peloponnese, and resorted to appealing to the Persian king to finance the war effort, which he did.<sup>67</sup>

In the north, Philip had ventured back to Macedonia no doubt to work on administrative dealings during the Olympic Truce to finish the year, and took care of business in Thrace while he was in the north.<sup>68</sup> He did find himself again in Thessaly soon after, when the Thessalians awarded the position *tagos* of the Thessalian League,

---

<sup>64</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.39.6-7; Buckler, *Philip II*, 97-98.

<sup>65</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 98.

<sup>66</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.38.

<sup>67</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 99-100.

<sup>68</sup> Buckler believes Philip goes straight back to Thessaly to solidify political alliances, but Hammond and Griffith say that he likely had to go back to Macedonia. Hammond and Griffith also point out that Philip still had Thracian uprisings to put down in the midst of all these affairs. Hammond, Griffith, 281. Buckler, *Philip II*, 99.

and Philip had taken some of their western territory. Philip, though, did not have to take any territory by force from either side of the Thessalian political bodies. He won *tageia* and the territories by use of diplomacy, in a region in desperate need of such a concept. “The Thessalians,” Westlake adds, “owed to him a very real debt of gratitude for removing the Pheraean tyranny,” but Philip did not promote Macedonian monarchy over Thessaly.<sup>69</sup> He acted as archon, but with little political control of the region, in order to keep the peace. He understood replacing one tyranny with (what could be construed as) another would not bode well for him or his state.

The campaign season of 349 opened with strong Boeotian force to rid Locris of Phocian presence.<sup>70</sup> Battles took place along the borderlands which, overall, the Phocians won. Again the Phocians threatened western Boeotia, and took cities which the Boeotians could not defend well. “The campaigning-season of 349 left the Thebans in desperate straits.”<sup>71</sup> Philip was not much better off in Thessaly. Buckler takes Demosthenes’ account as fact, saying that the Thessalians grew tired of Philip, so Philip had to assert his control.<sup>72</sup> Neither Hammond, Griffith, nor Westlake agree with this account, and believe Demosthenes to have exaggerated.<sup>73</sup> The most unbiased of these scholars is probably Westlake, since his scholarship deals directly with Thessaly. Athens made its way into the Thessalian fight, hoping to oust Philip. Since Philip acted continually in Thessalian interests, Athens gained little traction, and the Thessalians

---

<sup>69</sup> Westlake, *Thessaly*, 180.

<sup>70</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 101. McNerey, the Phocian historian, disagrees with the rest of the historiography that the Boeotians began the season on the offensive, saying that Phalaicos advanced on the Boeotians. McNerey, 215.

<sup>71</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 104.

<sup>72</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 105.

<sup>73</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 291; Westlake, *Thessaly*, 183-4.

repeatedly upheld Philip as *tagos*.<sup>74</sup> Buckler also argues that Philip had a greater interest in pursuing Thrace and the Chalkidice than he did in pursuing the Phocians. Again, the Macedonian scholars and Westlake disagree, stating that Philip's interest lay in pursuing that which pertained to Thessaly. If Philip had cared more for territories in the north, he would have spent considerably more time there; instead, he occupied himself with the northern territories when they posed a threat.<sup>75</sup>

The Thebans — struggling to keep up with the Phocians — were dealt another blow. Phalaikos attempted to take Euboea in 349. Tyrants had political domination on the island, with allied support from Athens, but the Phocians decided to provide the Euboeans with mercenaries to secure the island from the Boeotians. The Athenians acted quickly to stop the overthrowing of one tyrant for a Phocian-appointed tyrant with mercenary support, and sent their decorated commander, Phocion, to Euboea. The Euboeans requested the help of Philip against the Athenians. Philip did not respond, but the Euboeans were able to claim autonomy once again by defeating the Athenians in 348. With the Athenians distracted, however, Philip was able to take the northern city Olynthus, which both the Athenians and Macedonians had contested since the beginning of the Social War.<sup>76</sup>

Philip promised the Thessalians he would intervene in the Sacred War on their behalf, in order to win back the complete loyalty of the League and outside members of Thessaly. Unlike his predecessors, Phalaikos did not want to intrude in Thessaly, since he knew it would bring down the might of the Macedonian army. He instead focused his

---

<sup>74</sup> Westlake, *Thessaly*, 183-5.

<sup>75</sup> Hammond, Griffith, 291-2; Westlake, *Thessaly*, 185.

<sup>76</sup> Aeschin. 2.169, 3.86-88; Diod. Sic. 16.57.1. Dem. 18.43.

attention on Boeotia and the pass of Thermopylae.<sup>77</sup> The Thebans took the offensive in 348, cutting off supply lines at Neon to the Phocians, weakening them considerably. The Phocians retaliated, pushed the Thebans back, and defeated them handily in battle. Once again, the Thebans faced the end of a campaign season with nothing much to show, and with an imposing threat to western Boeotia by the Phocians for the next campaign season.<sup>78</sup>

In 347 the Phocians mounted an attack on Boeotian soil, one which ended with the burning of yet another of Apollo's temples, this one at Abae. The impious act outraged the Thebans, who knew at that point they required help from another source.<sup>79</sup> During the summer, they requested the help of Philip. "This was the situation that Demosthenes had feared at least as early as 349, when he warned that the fall of Olynthus might be followed by joint Theban-Macedonian action."<sup>80</sup> While in the midst of the peace talks, Philip did not seem willing to jeopardize the diplomacy he had begun to undertake with Athens when the Thebans approached him. Westlake says that he had to be convinced by the Thessalians to keep his promise to them, which required him to enter the Sacred War on behalf of the Thebans and Thessalians.<sup>81</sup> Buckler takes the account of Demosthenes to heart here, saying that Philip had been lusting to enter the war, and sought to be the savior of not only the Thebes he loved, but Apollo.<sup>82</sup> This is a romanticized belief of Philip that does not fit his character entirely. Given his tendency to lean toward diplomacy and to not seek military action when it was unnecessary, he

---

<sup>77</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 110.

<sup>78</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.56. Dem. 19.148-49

<sup>79</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.58.4-6. Dem. 18.19.

<sup>80</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 113.

<sup>81</sup> Westlake, *Thessaly*, 185.

<sup>82</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*. 113.

more likely had to be convinced to enter the war on behalf of the Thebans and Thessalians.

Philip managed diplomatic talks between the Athenians and the Theban allies, all of which sent him envoys during the winter of 347/6. Phalaikos, giving Philip the attention he deserved, sent considerable forces to the mouth of Thermopylae to defend against the able Macedonian army. The fear of Philip led the Phocians to eject Phalaikos from his position as leader of the Phocians in general as well as the army, but after a short-lived diplomatic mission to Athens and Sparta for aid failed, the Phocians reinstated Phalaikos. This was a decision that left the Phocians and their allies wary of any ability to win the war. The Athenians voted on the matter in spring, deciding to go ahead with the Peace of Philocrates, and declaring peace with the Macedonians. This decision developed a break in the relationship between Athens and Phocis, and Phocis suddenly found herself standing against the Macedonians and their allies alone. Phalaikos, understanding his impossible situation, surrendered to Philip.<sup>83</sup>

“Aeschines,” Edward Harris concedes, “had admitted Philip’s goal of ending the war was just.”<sup>84</sup> Athens struggled to come to terms with the impossibility of winning the war, or even regaining their supremacy in Greece as hegemon. Athens, led by the rhetoric of Demosthenes, saw the potential of Philip and the Macedonians. But upon seeing the loss of their power, the Athenians took advantage of their situation to make a deal with Philip, while abandoning the Phocians. The decision took time that the Athenians did not have, and was debated endlessly among Aeschines and Demosthenes.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Aeschin. 2.129; Diod. Sic. 19.278.

<sup>84</sup> Edward M. Harris, *Aeschines and Athenian Politics* (Oxford: 1995), 94.

<sup>85</sup> Harris, 88-94.

## Resolution

The initial treaty did not include the Phocians. Philip and his Macedonians marched toward Thermopylae to ensure the peace took place. Athens still feared retaliation from the Macedonians and tried their best to please them, including abandoning their Phocian allies. The Macedonians brought with them the Amphictyonic contingent from both Thebes and Thessaly to ensure the end to the Sacred War and the reinstatement of the Amphictyony. Since the war split members of the Amphictyony, it had not existed as a body in nearly ten years. The Athenians decided to join the Amphictyonic League coming in with Philip.<sup>86</sup> Concerning the Athenians, Buckler remarks “in fact, they abandoned an ally in its hour of peril to save their own skins.”<sup>87</sup>

Phalaikos struck a deal with Philip — and by extension the Amphictyony — which stated that if Philip would let Phalaikos and his men leave Phocis without harm, they would allow Philip to pass through Thermopylae without restraint. Philip took the deal, and marched into Phocis. The Phocian cities surrendered not to the Amphictyony, but only to Philip. Buckler here makes the observation that Philip “presented himself as a major figure in Greek politics, without at the same time seeming to be a barbarian intruder.”<sup>88</sup> One would be hard pressed to argue that the Thessalians and Thebans, as they walked into Phocis with him, would consider Philip a barbarian. Philip had solid relationships with both states, not as an invasive king, but as the head of a Greek state with diplomatic ties to each.

Part of the punishment to the Phocians laid upon them by Philip included the

---

<sup>86</sup> Aeschin. 2.123.

<sup>87</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 138.

<sup>88</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 140.

breaking up of the Phocian League, which had appointed such leaders that saw fit to pillage Delphi. They would not be permitted to form another league until 338, which was granted by Philip.<sup>89</sup> The Amphictyony issued punishments on the rest of the Phocians, none of whom were hurled from cliffs for their impiety; rather, the weapons of the Phocians were thrown from the cliffs. They did have to pay a 60-talent a year repayment until the amount that had been pillaged had been repaid. The most interesting punishment enforced on the Phocians was their loss of votes on the Amphictyonic League. The Amphictyony gave Philip and his descendants the Phocian votes in the Amphictyony.<sup>90</sup>

Buckler ends his account of the Third Sacred War with the ascription, “Although recent scholarship has generally portrayed Philip as the reluctant conqueror, he showed as early as 353 after the Crocus Plain that he had designs in the south.”<sup>91</sup> This attribution goes against the evidence provided not only by Macedonian and Thessalian scholars, but against the evidence Buckler himself provides, as seen in this chapter. Philip had the chance to enter the south well before 346, in fact the Thessalians begged him to do so from 355 onward. He could have ended the conflict well before he did, but chose not to, like — for instance — after the battle at the Crocus Plain, when he could have taken the war to Phocis after the death of Onomarchos.

Instead of portraying Philip as the man who ended the Sacred War, modern scholars resort to the ancient tactic of using him as the scapegoat for the misdeeds of all the Greek states which participated. In fact, the Thebans, Phocians, Spartans, and

---

<sup>89</sup> Larsen, 300.

<sup>90</sup> Diod. Sic. 16.59-60.1.

<sup>91</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 146.

Athenians were all at fault above the Macedonians for the Third Sacred War, and to blame Philip and the Macedonians for “invading” Greece when they walked in, without intimidation, and with three Greek states at their side, would be to dismiss the obvious evidence for personal assumptions.<sup>92</sup> To project the results of the next several years onto Philip and the other political giants at the conclusion of the Third Sacred War would be to make the fatal teleological mistake of the historian, making conclusions based on the knowledge of the outcome. No one — not even Philip — could predict the course the Greeks would take following the Sacred War. In fact, Philip tried desperately to be part of the “old boys club,” meaning the Greek states, and participate in Greek politics the way all the other states participated, and only when that failed, did he try something else.

### **Athenian Rhetoric and the Legacy of the Third Sacred War**

Sources give a specific perspective of politics and identity which highlights certain biases belonging to the region which the author is from or writes for. Two Athenian rhetoricians, however, highlight the distinctions and biases within Athens concerning Philip of Macedon: Demosthenes and Isocrates. Demosthenes, on the one hand, used rhetoric to advance his own propaganda and career to instill fear into the Athenians. Isocrates, on the other hand, endorsed peace with the Macedonians to further the Greek schema in Persia.

“Demosthenes’s ringing denunciations of [Philip] the Macedonian have left a highly Atheno-centric view of the events of the mid-fourth century that has had little material evidence and few new interpretations of literary sources to prompt a revisionist

---

<sup>92</sup> Buckler, *Philip II*, 146.

view.”<sup>93</sup> But, arguably, the same could be said for Athenian views of all central and northern Greek states. Demosthenes promoted the imperialistic agenda of the Athenians, and made room for blatant Athenian patriotism to support the imprudent idea of recovering the Athenian Empire. He first attempted to describe Philip in a slightly less threatening manner, suggesting that Philip was like a boxer, conceding that Philip showed finesse in military and political matters. No punches thrown by the Athenians land, while Philip dominates the ring.<sup>94</sup> This clever image gave Demosthenes his start in rhetoric against the Macedonian, and the propaganda built from there.

“Isocrates, a political thinker at Athens, believed that Philip was a king of culture and intelligence, and that he alone in 346 might be able to unite the Greek city-states and lead them in a war against Persia.”<sup>95</sup> Isocrates used another tactic entirely. While Demosthenes used successful political rhetoric to build upon itself — and used his position of power within the Athenian state — Isocrates used the study of politics, ethics, and rhetoric to develop well-conceived thoughts to influence contemporary politics, especially foreign policy.<sup>96</sup> Much like Philip, Isocrates saw the benefit in diplomacy, and did not shy away from either humility or vulnerability. Isocrates’ ultimate goal had always been Panhellenism.<sup>97</sup>

Both Demosthenes and Isocrates saw a bigger picture; both knew the talents of Philip and the threat of Persia. Demosthenes used his foresight to perpetuate fear and

---

<sup>93</sup> Borza, 198.

<sup>94</sup> Dem. 4.41-2.

<sup>95</sup> Hammond, *Miracle that was Macedonia*, 81.

<sup>96</sup> S. Usher, “Isocrates: Panegyricus and To Nicocles,” *Greek Orators – III* (Wiltshire: 1990), 7.

<sup>97</sup> S. Perlman, “Isocrates’ ‘Philippus’ – a Reinterpretation,” in *Philip and Athens* ed. S. Perlman (Cambridge: 1973), 105.

warmongering — a political approach not so far removed from politics today — while Isocrates used it to sponsor peace and diplomacy. The distinction of who was right and who was wrong does not get to the heart of the matter, but rather whose rhetoric did the Athenians indulge? Certainly history shows at the end of the day that Demosthenes' rhetoric came out ahead. Probably this did not come from any lacking trait from Isocrates' rhetoric, but from the failure of the Athenians to protect the Phocians at the end of the Sacred War, and the failure of Aeschines as an orator. Demosthenes hammered Aeschines on two matters of diplomacy: the Peace of Philocrates, and the betrayal of the Phocians by Athens. Although Aeschines helped to organize the end of the Sacred War, preventing further Phocian and Greek carnage, Demosthenes organized a case against Aeschines set to play out in court. Demosthenes accused Aeschines of treason, and although the court never heard the case, the damage Demosthenes wished to inflict had been done.<sup>98</sup>

H.B. Dunkel examines whether Demosthenes was indeed Panhellenic or not. He shows that in matters of foreign policy — for instance, the potential of a Persian invasion — Demosthenes calls upon all Greeks to unite against the foreign power. But in more relevant positions — more relevant since Persia showed no desire or ability to invade Greece at this time — Demosthenes exudes Athenian patriotism. “In short,” Dunkel concludes, “Demosthenes is not urging a policy of ‘balance of power’ but hopes so to weaken both Thebes and Sparta that Athens may be supreme in Greece.”<sup>99</sup> This inconsistency in Demosthenes' own rhetoric illustrates the complexity of Athenian

---

<sup>98</sup> Harris, 94-5.

<sup>99</sup> H.B. Dunkel, “Was Demosthenes a Panhellenist?,” *Philip and Athens* (Cambridge: 1973), 134.

policy. Hammond underscores Demosthenes' own delusion about Athenian abilities in not only the Sacred War, but also in the Social War, saying Demosthenes "assumed that Athens could have saved Olynthus and Phocis and kept Philip out of the Amphictyonic League, if only the Assembly had followed [his] advice and not been deceived by corrupt orators."<sup>100</sup> Plutarch gives the most accurate depiction of the attempt by Demosthenes to restore Athens in his introduction to the *Parallel Lives* for Demosthenes and Cicero when he quotes Ion, saying, "The dolphin's might is useless upon the dry ground."<sup>101</sup>

Isocrates believes, however, that the Greeks will never recover from endless war, unless they take the fight outside of Greece, and work together on the same side. "For there is the problem," Perlman points out from his reading of Isocrates, "of the impoverished Greeks who as roaming bands of mercenaries are a menace to the existing social and economic structure of Greece."<sup>102</sup> To succeed with this rhetoric, Isocrates tries not only to convince Athenians, but writes to Philip to address this same issue, reasoning with Philip to unite the Greeks in an effort against Persia.<sup>103</sup>

The rhetoric of Demosthenes against Philip, as well as the central Greek states, comes from a longing for the return of the Athenian Empire that could not prevail, and in fact finally gives way to the rising Macedonian state. The "Atheno-centric" view in modern scholarship likewise cannot prevail.<sup>104</sup> Isocrates, in his ability to speak frankly to both Athenians and Macedonians, offers the best insight into the pivotal moment the Third Sacred War ushers in, that of the rise of Philip and his Macedonians in Greece

---

<sup>100</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 102.

<sup>101</sup> Plut. *Dem.* 3.

<sup>102</sup> Perlman, *Isocrates*, 113.

<sup>103</sup> Isoc. *Phil.* 123-6.

<sup>104</sup> Borza, 198.

proper, and his presence within Greek politics from that moment until his death. Both Demosthenes and Isocrates see it coming, but only Isocrates knows how to properly transition into the new direction of Greece, hence Demosthenes' romanticizing of Athens. His love for Athens, and his belief that she could rise again, speaks to not only the end of the Classical Period and the decline in full swing of Athens, but to the longing for its height to return. No wonder those with an "Atheno-centric" view despise Philip and Macedonia, not because of their actions in particular, but what they represent for Classical Athens.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

In 380 BCE, Isocrates, at the end of his *Panegyricus*, urged the Greeks to come together to fight a greater power, rather than continuing to quarrel among themselves. He pleads for Panhellenism to enter into Greece, to let Athenian generals fight alongside Spartan generals in order to accomplish one Panhellenic objective: defeat the Persians.<sup>1</sup> Isocrates saw the potential for a united Greece, and saw room to fit Philip and Macedonia in with it. He saw Philip as the catalyst for this, but could never have predicted what would happen in just a quarter century from the end of the Sacred War.

The city-state was on its way out, hence the romanticizing of the individual city-states at the end of the Classical Period. “From 348 onwards,” Hammond relates, “[Philip] was concerned not to destroy but to utilize the great potential of the city-states of the Greek mainland.”<sup>2</sup> Philip appreciated the tradition of the city-state as much as any other Greek, and gained more of an appreciation for them than any other Macedonian, due to his time spent in Thebes. Greek city-states by their very nature, however, allowed little room for political Panhellenism. Federations in the form of leagues maintained alliances, but no overall political unification, save for one: the Delphic Amphictyony.

---

<sup>1</sup> Isoc. *Paneg.* 185-8.

<sup>2</sup> Hammond, *Philip*, 69.

Due to the nature of the sacred space at Delphi, the Greeks saw it as incorruptible, and therefore worthy of a consistent alliance and protection. The need for a federation to protect the site came from the First Sacred War, when Delphi relied on the power of the states with a vested interest in the security of the site — all states which participated in Delphic sacred matters, save for the lone state exploited during the Sacred War — after Delphi felt its autonomy and sanctity was threatened. In that case, the members of the federation attacked the town of Crisa to establish a united front. The legacy left by the razing of Crisa to the ground made way for a two-and-a-half century struggle Phocis sustained to legitimately reclaim lost space. The result of the First Sacred War proved that Greek states could secure the site while never taking control of the site. The sacred site of Delphi belonged to the god Apollo, with particular Greek states interested in fighting on behalf of the god to prove their loyalty to not only the god, but Greece as a whole. Despite its small size then, this unique site benefitted from a divine authority which bested any dominant political authority in Greece.

Preeminent evidence for this exemplary power of the Amphictyony comes from the Second Sacred War in which the Spartans — despite struggling for hegemony against the Athenians during the Archidamian War — fought on behalf of the Delphians to maintain autonomy and leading voice on the Amphictyony in order that Sparta could preserve a loosely held vote. Interestingly enough, the battle between Sparta and Athens for political dominance at Delphi led to the subjugation of the town of Delphi to the Spartans, and the region of Phocis to the Athenians. Since the elite positions of both the sacred site of Delphi and the Amphictyony carried so much weight, the Spartans and Athenians did not see the advantage in threatening either, but sought the next best thing,

which was domination over the smaller states that had immense influence on the site and Amphictyony. With the two most powerful states, Sparta and Athens, struggling in a widespread conflict, devoting so much time to a seemingly insignificant region points to the Panhellenic nature of the Delphic site, and the federal power that controlled it.

The Second Sacred War illuminated, though, how little influence Sparta and Athens had in central Greek politics. The Amphictyony, while Panhellenic and of interest to all Greeks, was dominated by the central Greeks. The sacred site of Delphi played a role in all Greek politics and military actions. It held a significant role in all Greek state matters, and the Amphictyony was not separate from Delphi, but a branch of the divine presence there. For this reason Phocis — and by extension Athens — accepted the punishment laid upon them by the Amphictyony at the end of the Second Sacred War. Rather than withdraw from the Amphictyony and condemn it as an institution, these two states took their punishment and worked to earn back their place on the Amphictyony.

Macedonia's establishment as a Greek state depended on its participation in Greek — particularly central Greek — politics before the Third Sacred War. Investigations into key concepts of space and identity show how Macedonia interacted with Greek states, and how she developed Greek-ness over time, in order that Philip could end the Third Sacred War and participate fully in Panhellenic Greek politics. Macedonians contended for Greek identity from the time of Alexander I of Macedon. Alexander pandered to Herodotus when the latter stayed in the Macedonian court, and told glorified stories proving his Greek heritage and participation in the Olympic Games. Although the story comes under fire in modern scholarship, facts remain: first, that Alexander I thought himself Greek; second, that Herodotus believed Alexander to be

Greek. Whether or not Alexander participated in the Games, Herodotus believed he did, and at very least “passed” as Greek in the eyes of the Greek historian. Likely Alexander had been accepted as Greek by some Greek states and not by others. Athens — having given the name *Philhellene* to Alexander — probably did not recognize the Macedonians as Greek, at least not during the lifetime of Alexander. But Athens did not dictate who qualified as Greek and who did not, and in fact other Greek states probably recognized Macedonian as Greek, mainly the central Greeks. The initial “passing” as Greek by Alexander made way for others later on, such as Philip, to assimilate much more easily into Greek diplomacy and politics.

Not only did Greek states react differently to the identity of the Macedonians, Greek states interacted differently with Macedonia-based spatial politics. Macedonia acted as a shield against enemies entering into Greek territory, since she was located at the top of the peninsula. Those most aware of the threats to Greece if Macedonia could not hold back the non-Greek enemies were those most vulnerable to attacks after Macedonia. Thus Thessaly and Boeotia inevitably had better relationships with Macedonia, and interacted with Macedonians more to make sure they were not victims of obliterating attacks. These relationships required political, diplomatic, and military mediations, leading to a strong bond between the Macedonians and these states. Thessaly and Boeotia, then, were probably more likely to see Macedonians as Greek than other Greek states not interacting as much with either Macedonians or these states.

Macedonia struggled to remain a state due to these threats from either side of her. Illyria and Thrace worked in unison to nearly wipe out Macedonia during the reign of Amyntas III and Alexander II. The Thessalians and Olynthians worked to make sure

Macedonia did not fall to the non-Greek invaders. Eventually even Sparta came to aid the Macedonians. Amyntas joined whatever force he believed would keep his kingdom afloat, and in 371 joined forces with the Second Athenian League, and was given a vote by Athens. This turn of events, although contested, suggests that by 371 even Athens considered Macedonia Greek on some level. With the death of Amyntas, his eldest son Alexander II took over the kingdom at a time when unexpected threats looked to strangle Macedonia. The Thessalian tyrant Alexander of Pherae pursued a takeover of Macedonia. During this time the Thebans were making a move for hegemonic power, led by Pelopidas and Epaminondas. Pelopidas had travelled to both Thessaly and Macedonia to solve difficult matters with diplomacy. His ability to do so came at a price, and Alexander was required to send his youngest brother Philip home with Pelopidas as a political hostage.

During Philip's time as a hostage he learned not only military tactics and strategies — as many scholars have discussed and analyzed— but also diplomatic devices, particularly from Pelopidas. The Thebans were able to wrestle hegemony from the Spartans while Philip was in Thebes, where he recognized and learned the Theban military maneuvers. Pelopidas' relationship with the northern Greeks and Thessaly would have also been of interest to the young Philip, and Philip would have paid special attention to how Pelopidas treated his brother in Macedonia. Since Pelopidas treated the Macedonians with a heavy hand, but also with respect, Philip would have remembered this later on.

A year after Philip had been sent to Thebes, in 367, Alexander II of Macedon was assassinated, leading to another power vacuum in Macedonia. Ptolemy and then

Perdiccas III fought for power. Perdiccas won eventually and took the side of the Thebans against the Athenians for economic goods, particularly timber. The Macedonians would not gain favor with the Athenians again during the era of the city-state. The same year, Philip returned home to Macedonia and was given his own *τάξις*, whom he taught Theban military tactics. By 359 Philip took control of Macedonia politically and militarily. Three years later, Greece entered into the Third Sacred War. Philip had by then gained the support and loyalty of the Macedonian military. Those three years proved to be enough for Philip to build a foundation in Macedonia — while at the same time Thessaly fell apart and sought the support of their Macedonian allies — that would lead to an eventual hegemony.

No particular state controlled the Amphictyony from its creation after the First Sacred War in 590. That is until 359 and beginning of the Third Sacred War, when the Thebans controlled the votes and the Amphictyony did the Thebans' bidding. Under the protection of the god Apollo, the Amphictyony could exploit states and regions surrounding them — particularly Phocis, the region wherein Delphi belonged — but remained autonomous under the protection of the Greek states belonging to the Amphictyony. The Thebans challenged the Amphictyony's ability to remain Panhellenic when it used her authority to implement penalties on states for which no penalty should have been enforced, particularly against the Spartans for an event which took place in 382. Thebans — undoubtedly — spouted pro-Delphian and religious rhetoric, which the majority of the central and northern Greek states bought.

While Thebes fought against the Spartans, Athenians, and predominately the Phocians, the Thessalians asked Philip to come into Thessaly to help fight against the

tyrants of Pherae. Thebes — being stretched thin and therefore coming close to losing their hegemony— took on the major powers, but needed help from the Thessalians. The Thessalian League came to the Thebans' aid, but their civil strife made it impossible for constant Thessalian support for the Thebans. The Thebans, then, benefitted from Philip's influence in Thessaly, but they could not continue to take on the rest of Greece to their east and south without support and without going bankrupt. The Third Sacred War split Greece in two, with the central and northern Greeks taking on the rest of the Greek states. Philip and his Macedonians fit nicely with the Thessalians and the Thebans, and neither would have had a problem with recognizing the Macedonians as "one of them." The Thebans benefitted from Philip's intervention in Thessaly specifically when he defeated the Phocians there and killed Onomarchos, and again when the Thebans asked Philip to intervene in the central Greek theater to end the war. Central Greece from that point on essentially gave Philip permission — and in fact encouraged him — to enter into Greek politics and military endeavors. Macedonia maintained Greek-ness, at very least, among the central Greeks.

The Athenians saw the Macedonians in a much different light than the central Greeks saw them. The Athenians had been wrapped in constant skirmishes with Macedonia in the north for two decades, and the Macedonians continually fell on the opposite side of the Athenians in Greek conflicts. To make matters worse, Athenians went to great lengths to romanticize the fallen Athenian Empire, and to create and produce patriotic rhetoric in hopes it might rise again. No wonder, then, that the Athenians villainized the Macedonians and Philip, since the Macedonians obviously would prevent them from such lofty goals. Isocrates saw the potential the Macedonians

brought with them into Greece, but Demosthenes could only manage to spit hate and fear. Unfortunately for the Macedonians and Philip, the rhetoric of hate and fear lingers much longer than that of peace and unification.

Hate and fear linger also in the historical memory concerning the ancient Macedonians. The Macedonians ushered in the end of the city-state — and hence the end of the Classical Period in Greece — and no one can blame or judge the Athenians' romanticism for it to continue. Those features made Greece unique, and even modern scholars look to romanticize them. But Philip and the Macedonians cannot be blamed for the failure of Greece to unite in a way that would preserve their city-state heritage; the city-state was on its way out no matter the hegemonic state in control, because the Greeks could see the vulnerability of the Persians, and looked to exploit that. It just so happened that the Macedonians led the charge. Luckily for the rest of the Greeks, Macedonia had been made a Greek state officially at the end of the Third Sacred War, and Greek culture, tradition, military, and politics were able to spread from the Dalmatian Coast to the Indus, from the Balkans to North Africa.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Ancient Sources

- Aeschines. *Speeches*. Translated by Charles Darwin Adams. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1944.
- Demosthenes. *Orations I-XVII, XX, Olynthiacs, Philippics, and Minor Public Orations*. Loeb Edition. Vol. I. Translated by J.H. Vince. Edited by G.P. Gould. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Books 11-12.37.1: Greek history 480-431 B.C. The Alternative Version*. Translated by Peter Brown. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Books XV.20-XVI.65*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. VII. Translated by Charles Sherman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Books XVI.66-XVII*. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. VIII. Translated by C. Bradford Welles. Edited by G.P. Gould. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Eusebius. *The Olympic Victor List of Eusebius: Background, Text, and Translation*. Translated by Paul Christesen and Zara Martirosova-Torlone. Edited by Paul Christesen and Zara Martirosova-Torlone. *Traditio*, vol. 61 (2006), 31-93.
- Herodotus. *The Histories: The Landmark Herodotus*. Translated by Andrea L. Purvis. Edited by Robert B. Strassler. New York: Panethon Books, 2007.
- Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo*. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Isocrates. *Isocrates: Panegyricus and To Nicocles – Greek Orators – III*. Translated by S. Usher. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1990.
- Isocrates. *Letter to Philip II*. Translated by George Norlin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

- Justin. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Translated by J.C. Yardly. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones and H.A. Ormerod. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- Pindar. *Pythian Odes*. Translated William H. Race. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Plutarch. *The Age of Alexander*. Translated by Ian Scott-Kilvert. New York: Penguin Books, 1973.
- Plutarch. "The Life of Demosthenes." *The Parallel Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Plutarch. *Moralia: Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata, 177-178*. Vol. 3. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1931.
- Plutarch. "The Life of Pericles." *The Parallel Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- Polyaenus. *Strategems of War: Volume I (Books I-V)*. Translated by Peter Krentz and Everett L. Wheeler. Edited by Peter Krentz and Everett L. Wheeler. Chicago: Ares Publishers, Inc., 1994.
- Solinus. *Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium*. Translated by Kai Brodersen. Edited by Kai Brodersen. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2014.
- Theopompus. *Theopompus the Historian*. Translated by Gordon Spencer Shrimpton. Edited by Gordon Spencer Shrimpton. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.
- Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War. The Landmark Thucydides, A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Richard Crawley. Edited by Robert B. Strassler. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1996.
- Xenophon. *Hellenika. The Landmark Xenophon's Hellenika*. Edited by Robert B. Strassler. Translated by John Marincola. New York: Pantheon Books, 2009.
- Xenophon. "Agesilaus." *Xenophon in Seven Volumes, VII*. Translated by E.C. Marchant and G.W. Bowersock. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

### Modern Articles and Essays

- Adams, W. Lindsay. "Sport and Ethnicity in Ancient Macedonia." *Macedonian Legacies: Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene Borza* (2008), 57-78.
- Amandry, P. "L'Amphictionie delphique." In *Symposium L'idée delphique en l'Europe*, edited by J. Zepos, 123-136. Athens: Centre Culturel Européen de Delphes, 1979.
- Badian, Ernst. "Greeks and Macedonians." *Macedonia and Greece in the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, vol. 10 (1982), 33-51.
- Bonner, Robert J., and Gertrude Smith. "Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony." *Classical Philology*, vol. 38, no. 1 (1943), 1-12.
- Cawkwell, George. "Philip and the Amphictyonic League." In *Philip of Macedon*, edited by Miltiades B Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulos, 78-89.
- Cawkwell, George. "Philip and Athens." In *Philip of Macedon*, edited by Miltiades B Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulos, 78-89.
- Daux, G. "Remarques sur la composition du conseil Amphictionique." *BCH*, vol. 81 (1957), 95-120.
- Dunkel, H.B. "Was Demosthenes a Panhellenist?" In *Philip and Athens*, edited by S. Perlman, 127-143.
- Ellis, J.R. "Amyntas Perdikka, Philip II and Alexander the Great." *JHS*, vol. 91 (1971), 15-25.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. "The Cult of Apollo and the Games at Delphi." In *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, edited by Wendy J. Raschke, 121-140.
- Griffith, G.T. "Philip as a General and the Macedonian Army." In *Philip of Macedon*, edited by Miltiades B Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulos, 78-89.
- Hammond, N.G.L. "Connotations of 'Macedonians' and 'Macedones' Until 323 B.C." *CQ*, vol. 45 (1995), 120-128.
- Heuss, A. "Die archaische Zeit Griechenlands." *Antike und Abendland*, vol. 2 (1946), 26-62.
- Hornblower, Simon. "Did the Delphic Amphiktionion Play a Role in the Classical Period?" *Mediterranean Historical Review*, vol. 22, no. 1 (2007), 39-56.

- Parke, H.W., and John Boardman. "The Struggle for the Tripod and the First Sacred War." *JHS*, vol. 77 (1957), 276-282.
- Perlman, S. "Isocrates' 'Philippus' – a Reinterpretation." In *Philip and Athens*, edited by S. Perlman, 103-115.
- Perlman, S. "Panhellenism, the Polis and Imperialism." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, vol. 25 no. 1 (1976), 1-30.
- Ryder, T.T.B. "Review: Philip II and the Third Sacred War." *CQ*, vol. 44 no. 1 (1994), 102-103.
- Sordi, M. "La foundation du college des naopes et le renouveau politique de l'Amphictionie au IVe siècle." *BCH*, vol. 81 (1957), 38-75.
- Tenekides, C. "L'Amphictyonie de Delphes et la Ligue de Corinthe, dans leurs affinités avec la Société des Nations." *Revue Générale de l'Académie de droit international public* (1931), 5-20.
- Tenekides, C. "L'Amphictyonie delphique. Légende et réalité." *Annuaire de l'Association des auditeurs et des anciens auditeurs de l'Académie de droit international de La Haye*, vol. 90, no. 2 (1958), 145-155.
- Westlake, H.D. "The Sources of Plutarch's Pelopidas," *CQ*, vol. 33 no. 1 (1939), 11-22.

### **Modern Monographs and Anthologies**

- Boardman, John, and N.G.L. Hammond, *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 3 Part III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Borza, Eugene N. *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Buckler, John, and Hans Beck. *Central Greece and the Politics of Power in the Fourth Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Buckler, John. *Philip II and the Sacred War*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1989.
- Cargill, Jack. *The Second Athenian League: Empire of Free Alliance?* Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1981.
- Dillon, Matthew. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge Press, 1997.
- Ehrenberg, Victor. *The Greek State*. New York: Basil Blackwell and Mott LTD, 1960.

- Ellis, J.R. *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1976.
- Geyer, F. *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II*. Munich: Verlag von R. Oldenbourg, 1930.
- Hammond, N.G.L. *History of Greece to 322 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Hammond, N.G.L. *A History of Macedonia, Vol. 1 Historical Geography and Prehistory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Hammond, N.G.L., and G.T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia, Vol. 2 550-336 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Hammond, N.G.L. *The Miracle that was Macedonia*. London: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Hammond, N.G.L. *Philip of Macedon*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Harris, Edward M. *Aeschines and Athenian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Hornblower, Simon. *The Greek World 479 – 323 BC, Fourth Edition*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- Hornblower, Simon, and Antony Spawforth. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary: The Ultimate Reference Work on the Classical World, Third Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Larsen, J.A.O. *Greek Federal States*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stewart Jones, and Rodrick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon, Two Volumes, New Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
- McInerney, Jeremy. *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1999.
- Parke, H.W., and D.E.W. Wormell. *The Delphic Oracle, Vol. I: The History*. Oxford, Alden Press, 1956.
- Petrakos, Basil Chr. *Delphi*. English ed. Athens: "Esperos" Edition, 1971.
- Rebillard, Eric. *Christians and Their Many Identities in Late Antiquity, North Africa, 200-450 CE*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Ryder, T.T.B. *Koine Eirene*. London, New York: Published for the University of Hull by the Oxford University Press, 1965.

Scott, Michael. *Delphi: A History of the Center of the Ancient World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Scott, Michael. *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Webster, Inc. *Merriam-Webster Geographical Dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Incorporated Publishers, 2007.

Westlake, H.D. *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* London: Methuen & Co., 1935.

### **Archaeological Documents**

Lefèvre, F. *CID IV: Documents Amphictioniques* (Paris: 2002).

Tod, M.N. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions vol. 1 (second edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946.