

Одделен отпечаток

ŽIVA ANTIKA
ЖИВА АНТИКА
ANTIQUITÉ VIVANTE

ANNÉE 62 ГОД.

Vojislav Sarakinski, Stefan Panovski

WHITHER THE WINDS BLOW:
PHILIP'S PERSIAN POLICIES, OR THE LACK THEREOF



SKOPJE – СКОПЈЕ
2012

Vojislav Sarakinski
Faculty of Philosophy, Skopje
Stefan Panovski
Institute for National History, Skopje

UDC:94(381)

WHITHER THE WINDS BLOW: PHILIP'S PERSIAN POLICIES, OR THE LACK THEREOF

Abstract: The question of the “Persian policies” of Philip II is still disputed; however, the data from our extant sources does not indicate that the Macedonian king had active plans to invade Persia before solving the question of hegemony in Greece proper. There is a reasonable amount of evidence that Philip kept the developments in Asia under close scrutiny, but not a single extant source shows much more than that. The answer to the question whether Philip had (or, whether he was aware that he should have) a Persian policy, depends on the connotation and weight that one chooses to assign to Isocrates’ Philippos; however, this does not imply that every Greek man of politics wished for such a development of events – but only that Isocrates, and several other members of his circle, dealt with the validity of a theoretical idea. The small amount of extant data prevents us from venturing into speculations about Philip’s intentions and final aims. If one wishes to make assumptions, it could be said that our sources indicate two things: that, as long as the Persians did not interfere in his endeavours in Thrace, Philip did not have clearly objectified ambitions in Asia; and that in no case did he show interest and ambition for the events beyond the Western satrapies.

1. The circumstances in Greece. – The major political, economic and diplomatic aftershocks that occurred towards the end of the V and in the early IV century BC – as well as the wars that had been borne out of them – revealed the fact that no Greek polis had economic and military resources to secure political dominance in mainland Greece.¹ The opposition to the latest Athenian and Spartan attempts for supremacy in the Greek world nurtured a

¹ So much has been written about the precarious economic state of the Greeks in the IV century BC, as well as the divisions that existed among them, that this issue has become a common topic of discussion in modern academic literature (Cf. Hammond, N. G. L. & Griffith, G. T. (1979): *A History of Macedonia, volume II, 550-336 BC*, Oxford), containing a detailed list of older works). Our topic of interest lies in the general state of affairs during which Philip created the foreign policy of the Macedonian kingdom and paved the way for future battles with his political rivals, and as such, providing a brief overview of the situation will be more than adequate.

new starting point for the political relations in Greece – autonomy for all poleis, regardless of size, economic or military power. By its very nature, this foundation was neither new, nor hitherto unheard of, as it had served as an underlying principle in all political agreements effective prior to the hegemonic attempts of Athens and Sparta; however, new rules had been established concerning the preparation, the conditions, and the implementation of the peace agreements. Apart from the first and most important requirement – that all Greek poleis be free and autonomous – there was a fairly noticeable tendency that these agreements cover (or at least pretend to cover) all Greeks, being equally binding not just for the two warring sides, but for everyone in Greece, regardless of whether they had played a part in the preceding war. Accordingly, these agreements were increasingly being called “Common Peace” agreements.

Predictably, these agreements did not do much to settle the crisis. Describing the situation after the battle of Mantinea, Xenophon claims that Greece was in an even greater imbalance after the battle, than before it.² We may assume that this conclusion is somewhat due to the disappointment of Xenophon, who yearned for restoration of Spartan power and supremacy; however, his assessment is essentially correct. Ever since the army of Xerxes had been ousted from Greece proper, this was the first instance where no Greek polis had the military force or economic support to at least aspire to the position of *hegemon*; the battle of Mantinea signalled the last failed attempt of a Greek force to establish supremacy in Greece. Of course, this does not mean that such a thing had become impossible in Greece; quite the opposite, in fact – for an external force aiming to gain decisive influence among the Greeks, there was hardly a better time to establish hegemony than after the battle of Mantinea.

Persia was the very force that had adequate military and financial resources, while at the same time, having traditional interests in Greece. Once they had sided with Sparta during the Peloponnesian War, the Persians became an inevitable factor in the foreign policy of any significant Greek polis. It is therefore hardly surprising that the Greeks immediately turned to the Great King, to whom they increasingly entrusted the role of patron of peace and stability in Greece.

From the point of view of the Persians, being involved in Greek affairs was an excellent opportunity to amend the image of Persia in the eyes of the Greeks, portraying the kingdom not just as a fair arbitrator and patron of peace, but also as an honourable

² Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.62.

friend and ally.³ Much can be said to describe the alleged philhellenism of the Great King, as well as the entire variety of ways in which this was steadily accentuated; the peak of these efforts would have certainly occurred at the peace negotiations in 368/7 BC, held in Susa.⁴ Upon the completion of these negotiations, the main Greek poleis were visited by Persian delegations, each carrying a written epistle in which the King asked the Greeks to take an oath of allegiance and respect of the agreement. Some of the poleis refused to do this, as this would have meant acceptance of Persia as an equal player on the Greek political scene.⁵ However, what cannot be escaped is the impression that at least some of the Greeks, as never before, thought that there could actually be an end to the Greek strife and the disputes, and that order could be achieved with the support of the Great King.

2. *The circumstances in Persia.* – We cannot determine whether this Persian approach was driven by a desire to establish a kind of indirect control over Greek matters and thus prevent the rise of a new Greek force that could imperil Persian interests, or whether the King had been merely awaiting a suitable moment to exploit Greek disunity and solve the problem on the western border. The Persians never received a proper chance to implement their intentions: domestic plights once again hindered the plans of the King and, instead of keeping an eye on matters by the sea, he had to deal with a series of internal unrests, often referred to as “the Great Satrapal Revolt.”⁶

³ A very detailed analysis concerning the reputation of the Persian king, as well as the position he held on the political scene in Greece is provided by Рунг, Э. В. & Холод, М. М. (2006): „Персидская политическая пропаганда в греческом мире в V – IV вв. до н.э.“, *МНМОИ, Исследования и публикации по истории античного мира под редакцией профессора Э.Д. Фролова*, Выпуск 5, Санкт-Петербург, q. v. Cf. Душанић, С. (1990): *Историја и политика у платоновим законима*, САНУ, посебна издања DCII, Одељење историјских наука, књига 15, with an analysis of the impact the situation brought about in modern scholarship.

⁴ Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.33-40; Plut. *Pel.* 30-31; Plut. *Artax.* 22.

⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.39-40.

⁶ A detailed overview of events is provided by Hornblower, S. (1994a): “Persia”, in *The Cambridge Ancient History vol. VI, The Fourth Century B.C.*, Cambridge University Press, 84-90; Hornblower, S. (1982): *Mausolus*, Oxford University Press, 170-82; Weiskopf, M. N. (1989): „The So-called “Great Satraps’ Revolt” 366-360 B.C.: Concerning Local Instability in the Achaemenid Far West, *Historia Einzelschrift* 63, Stuttgart. The main written source is the “Life of Datames”, one of the more important biographies by Nepos, containing information which cannot be found elsewhere; then, Diod. 15.90-93, with information about Artabazus in Book 16 as well; other sources that take information from Ephorus, such as Polyaeus; on Ariobarzanes, “Agesilaus” by Xenophon,

The four stages of this revolt – or, rather, the four different insurrections – lasted for approximately two decades; the second stage was of particular interest for the events in Europe. It all started in 368 BC in Delphi, when Philiscus of Abydos began hiring mercenaries with funds provided by Ariobarzanes, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia.⁷ The mercenaries were allegedly supposed to help Sparta, but it rather seems that they were needed by Ariobarzanes himself: after he refused to cede the satrapy to his nephew Artabazus,⁸ the King sent against him the satraps of Caria and Lydia, Mausolus and Autophradates, who he had been preparing to face near the bay of Adramyttium.⁹ Athens and Sparta sided with Ariobarzanes and dispatched troops led by Timotheus and Agesilaus;¹⁰ Xenophon tells us, however, that the families of Agesilaus and Mausolus had a long-lasting friendship, a fact that possibly explains the utter confusion that ensued: “[...] Autophradates laying siege to Ariobarzanes, an ally of Sparta, at Assos, took to his heels from fear of Agesilaus. [...] Again, Mausolus, laying siege to both these places with a fleet of a hundred vessels, was induced, not indeed by fear, but by persuasion, to sail for home. In this affair, too, his success was admirable; for those who considered that they were under an obligation to him and those who fled before him, both paid. Yet again, Tachos and Mausolus (another of those who contributed money to Sparta, owing to his old ties of hospitality with Agesilaus), sent him home with a magnificent escort.”¹¹

It can be speculated that behind these developments lay a particular agreement concerning the Greek mercenaries, perhaps in line with what Philiscus did in Delphi; this would mean that Mausolus and Autophradates were set on revolting while still fighting the other rebel, Ariobarzanes.¹² However, it is not the

and about Artabazus and the information from pap. Reiner, *FGrH* 105. Concerning the numismatic sources, v. esp. Moysey, R. (1989): „Observations on the numismatic evidence relating to the Great Satraps' revolt“, *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 91, pp. 107-139.

⁷ Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.27.

⁸ Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.40, if we were to assume that the mentioned “brother of Pharnabazus” is Ariobarzanes. Weiskopf, 1989 doubts this, and certainly cf. the comments by Hornblower, *The Classical Review* 40 (1990), 365.

⁹ This happened either in Adramyttium or in Assus; cf. Xen. *Ages.* 2.26; Polyæn. 7.29.6.

¹⁰ *V. Dem.* 15.9; Xen. *Ages.* 2.26.

¹¹ Xen. *Ages.* 2 (translated by G. W. Bowersock).

¹² Xenophon claims that on this occasion Tachos came in contact with Mausolus; concerning the issues that result from this claim, as well as one of the possible solutions, v. Hornblower, 1982: 174 sqq.

outcome of the revolt that draws our attention, but rather the relationship and the part that the Greeks played in it, revealing the priorities and the loyalty of the Greeks concerning Persian matters. Unfortunately, the behaviour of the Greeks during the revolt was unpredictable and enigmatic, so it is quite a challenge to determine the Greek participation in the events. Officially, the Greeks had declared that they had no wish to interfere in the revolt; judging by the dialect and the phraseology of the inscription, it would seem that the text itself (and the decision itself) was influenced by the Athenians.¹³ Of course, there are events that convey quite a different story – the Athenian intervention in Samos,¹⁴ “morally justified” as it was directed against Persia, and the establishment of a cleruchy, “technically justified” as Samos was not a member of the alliance. But were the Athenians acting against Persia in general, against Ariobarzanes, or against Mausolus? If anything seems clear enough, it is the fact that Athens was indifferent as to who would become satrap in Daskyleion, who would win and who would lose in the internal Persian turmoil. This attitude may have been a reaction to the decisions of the peace talks in Susa, particularly to the Persian support of the Theban proposal to dissolve the Athenian fleet, provoking the Athenian envoy to state that “it is time for Athens... to be seeking some other friend, instead of the King”.¹⁵ By this particular reasoning, the negotiations were not especially agreeable for Sparta either, as the King recognised the independence of Messenia. Therefore, putting the friendship of Agesilaus and Mausolus aside, we must at least allow for the possibility that Agesilaus accepted the Persian gift not for a want of money, but because he intended to cause further disarray among the warring parties.

Things become no clearer with the revolt of Artabazus, the fourth and final stage of unrest in the Persian west. On this occasion, the Athenian Chares ravaged Hellespontine Phrygia and managed to emerge victorious in the battle in Anatolia, graciously termed “the Second Marathon”;¹⁶ the King, however, threatened that he would start helping the displeased Athenian allies if the Athenians did not revoke Chares. After Athens withdrew from the theatre of war, Artabazus sought mercenaries from the Thebans,

¹³ Tod 145 = Harding 57, probably from 362/1 BC.

¹⁴ Dem. 15.9.

¹⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.37. It seems that these were not just empty threats; Ariobarzanes aside, an inscription, which should in all probability be dated to 364 BC, mentions an Athenian alliance with Straton, the King of Sidon. *V.* Tod 139 = Harding 40; cf. Moysey, R. (1976): „The Date of the Strato of Sidon Decree (IG II2.141)“, *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, pp. 182-189.

¹⁶ Information from the scholiast of Dem. 4.19, *FGrH* 105.

who had been economically exhausted by their participation in the Third Sacred War. Diodorus recounts¹⁷ that the Thebans amassed five thousand mercenaries, who had fought successfully until their leader Pammenes quarrelled with Artabazus, an act for which he paid with his life. It is possible that these mercenaries, whose subsequent fate is not known, entered the service of the Persian king because he was the only one willing and able to pay. As for Artabazus, after the venture had failed,¹⁸ he fled to Philip II – but we shall treat his case in due time.

3. *A vicious circle.* – Thus, it becomes obvious that the events in the first half of the IV century BC are so intricate, ambiguous and sparingly attested, that it is almost impossible to determine the political compass of the participants in the events. If a comparison is to be allowed with the events from a century before, it somehow seems that the secret and public policies, as well as the secret and public diplomacy, were meaningfully divided and became antithetical as never before. Clearly drawn alliances and defined policy guidelines gave way to a callous Realpolitik, in which allies were changed by necessity, while wars were started not for a clear benefit, but for building position, repaying debts, or simply – to the detriment of a third party.

Now, can a commotion of this kind really serve as proof that the Persian military and economic supremacy was a thing of the past, and that Persia rightly deserved to be called a paper tiger, as many contemporary historians would like? This may be, in fact, one of the methodological errors that have persistently reappeared in historical works up to the present. It is perfectly clear that Ephorus, the main source of Diodorus, neither invented the whole thing, nor wrote influenced by panhellenic fantasies. The revolts, the hostilities, the disarray – these were real; the problem is that all these events can be examined from different points of view and in different ways.

If things are approached objectively, based on what is written in the sources, it is obvious that the western satrapies did not experience a universal, thought out, coordinated uprising, but a series of local unrelated revolts that stretched over two decades. Contrary to the intentions usually attributed to Orontes and Dames, our sources offer no hint whatsoever that they intended to join forces or associate themselves with a third party in order to remove Artaxerxes II from the throne.¹⁹ In fact, it is questionable

¹⁷ Diod. 16.34.1.

¹⁸ Diod. 16.52.

¹⁹ Cf. the excellent analysis offered by Briant, P. (1996): *Histoire de l'Empire Perse*, Paris: Fayard, 692-694.

whether such a thing was within the realm of possibility, bearing in mind that the most remarkable feature of these revolts was the dissonance between the western satraps. The story of Datames tells of several successive betrayals; Ariobarzanes was betrayed by his own son; Orontes and Rheomitrans surrendered and exposed a number of plotters – the former “suspecting that he would obtain from the King... great rewards”, the latter “in order to appease him.”²⁰ For the whole time, the rule of Artaxerxes and the Achaemenidae was never contested; regardless of the fact that Diodorus speaks of a “*basileia*” in Hellespontine Phrygia,²¹ there are neither indications that the structure of power was amiss, nor hints of an alternative to the dynastic continuity in Susa in the form of a new independent kingdom or any other “personal” authority. The ideological cadre of the system of loyalty/royal mercy, which often instigated the satraps to enter personal feuds, apparently did not suffer radical changes a century after its conception.

However, the very fact that the western satraps were uncoordinated, discordant and unable to achieve more, makes us abide another perplexity. If the rebelling satraps were an estimable opponent that could call into question the order of the kingdom, how are we to explain the lack of action of the political centre and its inability to restore order? Despite the willingness and the preparations of the King, the Persians were unable to bring under sway the valley of the Nile; moreover, the only royal army mentioned in the West is the one that Ochus led against Tachos in the last years of his father’s reign. Did the King reckon that the forces of the loyal satraps were adequate to solve the problems (although one could hardly know which satrap was really loyal), or did he underestimate the situation, as satrapal riots were hardly a novelty?²² Be that as it may, after twenty years of disarray in the Persian west, the capital would have certainly realised that it was high time to react in a firm and resolute manner.

Taking all this into account, all arguments appear to bear approximately the same weight, the truth being once more somewhere in between. By themselves, the satrapal revolts are not an indication of a profound and irreversible military or economic decline of the Persian state; in fact, all they suggest is a lack of political coverage and poor control of the periphery – a problematic feature that had already been demonstrated a century earlier, but had apparently not been resolved by the time Philip II inherited the throne in Pella.

²⁰ Diod. 15.91, 92.

²¹ Diod. 15.90.3. It is very probable that Diodorus is reflecting the state of affairs from his time; cf. 16.90.2; 20.111.4; 31.19.1-5.

²² Cf. *Ctes.* § 50; § 52.

Thus, in the first half of the IV century BC, both the Greeks and the Persians appear to have fallen into a vicious circle. Due to the constant altercations between them, the Greeks too often turned to Persia; on the other hand, despite their attempts to influence the situation in Greece, the Persians could not take decisive steps to definitely solve the Greek problem as a consequence of internal strife. One could speculate how long this disordered situation in Greece would last – possibly years, even decades; in any case, at that moment, it seemed as though there was no political factor powerful enough to break this cycle.

4. *Philip and the events of 346 BC.* – However, a mere quarter of a century after the battle of Mantinea, the situation in Greece had changed fundamentally: the Greeks – some of them willingly, others reluctantly²³ – were preparing to take part in the forthcoming campaign against Persia. This change was due to the rise of Philip II, who inherited a kingdom emaciated through several decades of crisis and turned it into a commanding state. At this time, it will suffice to discuss the situation in 346 BC, to which modern historians attribute great importance as a point of introduction of Philip's Persian plans.

346 BC was indeed a year of great importance for the further policy of Philip towards Greece. It was the year that saw the end of the Third Sacred War, meaning that Philip was now in control of the Delphic Amphictyony; furthermore, it was the year of the Peace of Philocrates, a resolution of the war between Philip and Athens; in the same year, Isocrates published the pamphlet "Philippos" and, if Ellis is to be believed, Philip expressed for the first time his future plans to attack Persia.²⁴ Henceforth, we intend to focus on several vignettes, which are interpreted by several modern scholars as proof that Philip had already drawn up his plans to attack Persia.

Let us commence with the extant sources. Around the time of the Peace of Philocrates, our sources connect for the first time the name of Philip with some sort of a "Persian policy" and the idea of a war against Persia.²⁵ After describing the negotiations in Delphi and the return of Philip to Macedon, Diodorus adds that the king had invested a great deal of effort to prepare the ground for his future progress, "for he was ambitious to be designated general of Hellas in supreme command and as such to prosecute the

²³ v. Hammond & Griffith 1979, 632-3.

²⁴ Ellis, J. R. (1994): „Macedon and North-West Greece“, in *The Cambridge Ancient History vol. VI, The Fourth Century B.C.*, Cambridge University Press, 761.

²⁵ An analysis of the sources in Hammond & Griffith, 1979, 458 sqq.

war against the Persians”.²⁶ Now, Diodorus knew precisely how Philip’s story ended, much as we know it today, so it is possible that he offers his personal comments on the events; if this is the case, this piece of information is of no practical value. However, it is more likely that Diodorus simply appropriated what was said in the source he made use of – probably Demophilus’ “History of the War against Phocis”. It is also possible that he used either Theopompus, or a later author who had used Theopompus before him;²⁷ “The History of Philip” was a large, diverse and extensive work, probably a standard source for this period, and it is very unlikely that it was not used by later historians. All the same, whatever Demophilus and Theopompus wrote concerning the intentions of Philip in 346 BC was probably put on paper after 336 BC, when it was already common knowledge that Philip had been elected supreme commander of the Greeks and envisioned a war against Persia. It is quite unlikely that these two were by any means acquainted with the true intentions of Philip in 346 BC, and that they provided a proper assessment of them in their works.

A guideline for our interpretation is the fact that Diodorus – or his source – ascribes to Philip a plan to be appointed *hegemon* of the Greeks at such an early time. In order to acquire such an appointment, Philip would have needed to initiate a general convention of all Greeks, as well as a declaration of a new Common Peace. However, not only was Philip unable to organise such a convention at this time, but it also appears that he thought that a new Common Peace would not suit his interests at the moment. It is a known fact that one of the Athenian proposals during the negotiations for the Peace of Philocrates was that the new alliance be open to all, and eventually evolve into a Common Peace – a proposal promptly rejected by Philip.²⁸ If we choose to follow Diodorus, a decision of this kind would have seemed unreasonable, as Philip had lost the opportunity to be instantly appointed *hegemon*. However, should we reconsider the actual political developments instead of blindly following Diodorus (or, should we take his words as an anticipation of events that would follow a decade later), then this decision by Philip appears quite reasonable. Even if Philip had sought such a designation – for which there is no indication, excluding the sentence in Diodorus – he correctly held that the political situation in Greece was not yet ripe for a general convention of the Greeks. Moreover, if we put aside the alleged Per-

²⁶ Diod. 16.60.4-5.

²⁷ Concerning the sources of Diodorus v. Hammond N. G. L. (1937): „The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI“, *CQ* 31.2, 79-91.; Id. (1938): „The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI“ *CQ* 32.3/4, 137-51.

²⁸ v. Griffith 1979, 340; Ellis 1994, 755.

sian ambitions of Philip, the Athenian proposal could even be damaging to the interests of Macedon, a point Philip understood well.²⁹ Therefore, we believe that the words of Diodorus cannot be taken as an indicator of the plans and objectives of Philip in 346 BC.

5. *Isocrates and his works*. – Whether Philip was aware that he should have a “Persian policy”, and whether such a thing really existed, depends on the meaning and weight that one is ready to assign to Isocrates and his “Philippos”, written at about this time. It is certain that Demophilus and Theopompus were acquainted with this work; when (and whether at all) Philip had received it and read it, we can neither assume, nor is it of much importance. The truth is that Isocrates did not conspire for a war against Persia because he knew that Philip was entertaining similar thoughts and hoped that such an idea would please the king. Isocrates is the very person who for years, ever since his “Panegyricus” in 380 BC, yearned and conspired for a war against Persia. Somewhere in the middle of the “Philippos”, he goes to explain in detail how a war against Persia should be waged and writes about the attack on Asia as about something that has already been agreed,³⁰ however, there is no foundation to believe that this decision had been brought by Philip, and that Isocrates had somehow found out about it. The whole idea was clearly contrived by Isocrates, who does not show even the slightest intention of hiding this fact, but refers to an earlier statement at the beginning of the work and, in particular, to the “Panegyricus”, a point which is directly stated immediately below.³¹

In essence, Isocrates launched on a very delicate subject. On one hand, he had reason to fear that Philip would eventually try to establish military and political control over Greece, after which the poleis would lose their external autonomy and, perhaps, be forced to pay tax; in fact, this had already happened to some Greeks, primarily Amphipolis and some poleis “near Thrace”. On the other hand, the example of Thessaly had shown that control could be established in a manner that was much more unobtrusive and mild, and that one should take into account the possibility that all Greeks, as had the Thessalians before them, accept Philip as their leader. But could Isocrates be convinced that Philip would apply the same political methods to gain indirect, but effective control in middle and southern Greece, in a manner acceptable to

²⁹ cf. Carlier, П. (1994): *Демостен*, *Historia Antiqua Macedonica* 1, Скопје.

³⁰ Isoc. 5. 83.

³¹ Cf. Isoc. 5.9, 5.84.

the Greeks?³² It seems that the orator believed – or, rather, wished – that such a thing would happen and that Philip could be trusted; otherwise, he would have hardly put his own reputation at stake by supporting a dubious man who posed a danger to Greece. Ultimately, the aim of his work was not to teach Philip how to handle the Greeks, but rather to attract the attention of the Macedonian to the other side: rather than tarry in Greece, have Philip consider Asia as an alternative sphere for the expansion of his kingdom.

Yet, Isocrates does not explain by what means and in what way Philip was to achieve what he recommends. True, it would be premature and excessive to expect that Isocrates could explain this, as his writing predated the resolution of the issue of Phocis; but if he aspired that his work be seen as something more than a rhetorical exercise or a political pamphlet, then he should have offered some recommendations – which, apparently, neither he, nor any other Greek was able to do. A panhellenic Congress, a Common Peace, an invitation to the poleis to unite in war against Persia – all these were things belonging to the political practice of the last generation of Greek political activists; all of this depended on the political moment, on who was pulling the strings and in whose favour things were progressing. Objectively speaking, 346 BC was still too early for all this: to accept these things as possible would mean to antedate the political situation by a decade, which is neither acceptable nor justifiable, even at the price of deferring Philip's "Persian policy" up to the time after Chaeronea.³³

³² Perlman (Perlman, S. (1969): „Isocrates' "Philippos" and Panhellenism“, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 18.3, pp. 370-374) holds an interesting view – that Isocrates was, in fact, making attempts to somehow influence the political methods of Philip, and by offering an equal alliance against Persia, to protect the poleis from the onrush of Macedonian imperialism. However, it can neither be claimed that Isocrates was speaking in the name of all Greeks, nor that he had any influence on Philip's intentions – which means that this way of looking at things is nevertheless a speculation that cannot be proven.

³³ *Contra* Cawkwell (Cawkwell, G. (2005): *The Greek Wars: The Failure of Persia*, Oxford University Press, 201), who claims that Philip “had his sights set on the East” as early as 346 BC and that he, in fact, had the same plans as Isocrates. However, as proof of this, the author provides only Isocrates' statements (for example, 3.3. from 338 BC), while there is nothing which would suggest what Philip might have said, which *a priori* leads us to believe that this claim can hardly be called objective. Something similar occurs in Markle, M. M. (1974): „The Strategy of Philip in 346 B. C.“, *The Classical Quarterly. New Series* 24.2, pp. 253-268. What is most important, though, is the question as to how Philip would have allowed himself to plan a showdown with Persia five whole years before finally settling accounts in Thrace, six years before heading towards the Athenian grain fleet, and eight years before the showdown on mainland Greece.

In the end, too much weight should not be ascribed to the letters of Isocrates as an indication of Philip's Persian plans. A mere decade earlier, he had been trying to persuade Archidamus, the new king of Sparta, to undertake the same task that he was now entrusting to Philip,³⁴ although in 356 BC, when this letter was published,³⁵ Sparta was unable to retake Messene, let alone organise a new expedition to Asia Minor. Ironically, Isocrates was appealing to the very state that reintroduced Persia to the centre of Greek politics and owed its short supremacy on the Greek mainland almost exclusively to Persian help. While surely aware of these facts, Isocrates did not desist from his attempt to enlist the Spartan king in his great cause. This may have been partly due to his disillusionment with the Second Athenian League, so he was simply reverting to the other traditional power in Greece. Yet, if we are allowed to speculate, there may have been another reason for this. Isocrates was already eighty years old, and it was quite probable that he would not live long enough to see the day when his greatest desire would be achieved; therefore he was hard pressed to find a champion who would be able to finally take up the cause of all the Greeks and fulfil his dream. This probably explains, partially at least, his great concern and distress after hearing that Philip had been seriously wounded, as well as his advice to the king not to expose himself needlessly to dangers;³⁶ by then, he must have become aware that Philip was his last chance. Disappointing though it might be that Isocrates, a most great and sincere panhellene, blessed with a long life, did not live to witness the realisation of his life-long ambition, that is an entirely different topic. At this instance, the example of Archidamus, who had not declared at any time that he was about to invade Persia, may serve as a serious *caveat* for anybody willing to take "Philippos" as firm proof that Philip was beginning to devise a strategy against Persia and reveal his ambitions to everyone.

Be that as it may, this brings us to at least one interesting conclusion – that at this time there were some circles in Greece who were entertaining the thought of a war against Persia; according to them, as Isocrates tells us, the best solution was to completely bring down the Persian kingdom, and if this proved impos-

³⁴ Isoc., *Ep.* 9. Unfortunately the letter is only partially preserved, and therefore it is impossible to compare the similarities between it and the "Philippos". The only obvious similarity is the example of the mistakes of Agesilaus, and Isocrates' assertion that whoever attempted to campaign against the Great King, must first reconcile all the Greeks (*Ep.* 9.13-4 ~ 5.86-8).

³⁵ Isocrates says that he was 80 years old when he composed the letter (*Ep.* 9.16).

³⁶ Isoc., *Ep.* 2.

sible, to conquer a territory as large as possible and divide Asia from Cilicia to Sinope.³⁷ However, more should not be read into this than is written; this does not mean that the Greek men of politics were planning such a development of events, but simply that Isocrates and several men of his circle were dealing with the validity of a theoretical idea. At that time, even if they had indeed contemplated such a thing, no Greek polis had the slightest chance of putting it into action; the only one who could achieve this was Philip – which is why, whether he liked it or not, he became the focal point of the political elaborations of Isocrates.

Furthermore, the fact that certain Greek circles considered a war against Persia possible does not routinely mean that Philip must have been contemplating it, much less that Isocrates was acquainted with Philip's plans. After all, Isocrates himself admits: ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ εἰδέναι μὲν φημι τὸ σαφές, οὐ γὰρ συγγεγενῆσθαι σοι πρότερον, οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' οἴεσθαι σὲ μὲν ἐγνωκέναι περὶ τούτων, ἐμὲ δὲ συνειρηκέναι ταῖς σαῖς ἐπιθυμίαις.³⁸ This presents quite clear and unambiguous proof that Isocrates does not know, but just *assumes* what Philip's plans might be. Ultimately, the fact that Isocrates published this pamphlet in 346 BC has no connection to the possible plans of Philip; in fact, what it pertains to is the Peace of Philocrates. No matter what ideals and ideas Isocrates had regarding Philip, he was certainly not an inexperienced man, so that he would publish a writing that would glorify the king of Macedon at a time when Macedon and Athens were at war. Therefore, the writings of Isocrates cannot be taken as evidence that in 346 BC Philip had made it clear that his ultimate goal was Persia.

Thus, it turns out that no written source from this period even hints, let alone confirms that in 346 BC Philip had articulated his plans for a Persian expedition, if he had such plans at all. This is hardly surprising; had he publicly announced an expedition to Asia, Philip would have had much to lose and little to gain. It is hard to believe that such a declaration by Philip would cause widespread enthusiasm among all Greeks, who would then unanimously place themselves under his command and embark to Asia; on the other hand, a public announcement would have instantly reached the King; unable to completely ignore the news, he would certainly have tried to help Philip's opponents in Greece, at least financially, thus convoluting the plans of the king of Macedon.

6. *The actions of Philip.* – Seeing that our sources do not offer acceptable information, we must examine closely whether

³⁷ Isoc. 5.120; an analysis of the plans in Hammond & Griffith, 1979, 462 sqq., with a list of older works and the views expressed.

³⁸ Isoc., *Ad Phil.*, 2.3.

Philip's actions at this time insinuated some sort of a Persian policy. The first fact to attract attention is that the Peace of Philocrates denoted a defensive, not an offensive alliance.³⁹ As Griffith deduces, this was indeed the usual procedure of concluding an alliance between two equal parties.⁴⁰ However, one may well wonder: if Philip had already planned a war against Persia, would he not be expected to insist on forming an offensive alliance, which could be used at the time to push Athens into war? Of course, the defensive alliance by itself did not exclude this possibility, given that Philip would certainly manage to find a pretext so as to portray the war against Persia as a defensive one. However, it is explicitly evident that, should the concluded alliance be defensive, his opponents in Athens would be left with space for manoeuvre and find an excuse for not helping Philip at a crucial moment. On the other hand, had Philip insisted on an offensive alliance, he would have been exposed to the danger of becoming hostage to Athenian desires and aspirations, which often had but a vague connection to the actual political situation; thus, he would either be forced to help Athens in its attempts for conquest (often at the expense of other allies, or at least sympathisers of Philip), or have to deny his help, thereby exposing himself to the invectives of his opponents in Athens. It is, therefore, not unusual that Philip opted for a defensive alliance. But this provision of the Peace of Philocrates also indicates that, at the given time and (at least) in the foreseeable future, Philip was committed to his plans and calculations in Greece, rather than Persia.⁴¹ The fact that Philip refused the proposition that the Peace and alliance be open to all Greeks clearly shows that Greece, not Persia, was a priority in his political plans.

³⁹ Here we accept the assumption put forward by Griffith (Hammond & Griffith 1979: 339), as opposed to the one by Carlier (Carlier 1994: 162 n.36), who believes that it refers to an offensive alliance. Indeed, the sentence in Demosthenes (19.143) upon which Griffith bases his assumption does not allow for a final conclusion to be reached. However, we are of the opinion that the very fact that only a couple of months later the Athenians would refuse to send their units in a show of support to Philip, speaks volumes in favour of the fact that it was this alliance was defensive; otherwise, their decision would be seen as an open and flagrant breach of peace and unity only months after it had been reached. In a situation when Philip already had the Thermopylae under his control and still counted the Thebans as his allies, it seems incredible that the Athenians would so arrogantly dare to test Philip's patience. As further proof of this, we can take the fact that Aeschines, despite criticizing Demosthenes for persuading the people to reject the request put forth by Philip to send him the Athenian forces, never accuses him of openly breaching the alliance. (Aesch., *De legatione*, 137-8).

⁴⁰ Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 339.

⁴¹ *Contra* Ellis 1994: 751, who believes that Greece was never the primary aim of Philip, but rather just a stop-over on his way to Asia.

This cannot change the fact that, throughout his reign, Philip handled Athens with a scrupulosity and patience that one might call extraordinary. Some scholars would have that this behaviour was motivated by Philip's need for the Athenian fleet in order to launch a successful attack on Asia Minor.⁴² Given the negligible power of the small fleet at Philip's disposal,⁴³ this interpretation appears to be extremely reasonable and likely. However, the Achilles' heel of this interpretation is that it is based on the assumption that Philip had already turned his sights towards Asia Minor, for which there is no clear and indisputable evidence. Moreover, to accept this interpretation would mean to portray Philip – a most proficient politician, rightly “more proud of his diplomatic, rather than military skills” – as a callow statesman who would base the security of Macedon, as well as that of his own troops in Asia, on a mere signature on a contract of alliance with the inconsistent Athenians. To accept this interpretation would mean to equate Philip to Neville Chamberlain, who confidently claimed to have secured “peace for our time” on the basis of a signature. Philip, however, was too clever and realistic to believe that the Peace of Philocrates would, in the long run, allow him to smoothly realise his plans in Asia.

The fact that Philip never attempted to mobilise a numerous and powerful fleet imposes a different conclusion regarding his motives. No one could disprove that Macedon had excellent resources for building a powerful fleet. Also, in spite of some reservations, Philip had at his disposal sufficient funds to afford the preparation of such a fleet. Indeed, our sources occasionally inform us about the alleged fiscal problems of Philip and the empty treasury of the kingdom; this is certainly based on Theopompus, who blithely describes Philip as an incapable, wasteful spender, spending quickly and thoughtlessly, scattering money away and being far too busy to calculate income and expenses.⁴⁴ But should this be true, we would expect the historiographer to explain by what means Philip managed to raise his realm from disorder to stability and wealth; we need not be surprised that there is not a trace of such an explanation. It seems that this picture of Philip and his fiscal policy is due to the later Hellenistic sources that, depending on taste and need, usually represent Alexander as heir to a small, bankrupt, or even indebted royal treasury, making his achievements even larger and more extraordinary. But if we put

⁴² e.g. Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 461; Cawkwell G. L. (1978): *Philip of Macedon*, London: 114 *sqq.* Concerning the view presented here *cf.* Carlier 1994: 164 *sqq.*

⁴³ v. Hammond & Griffith, 1979, 310 *sqq.*, 567 *sqq.*

⁴⁴ *FGrH* 115, fr. 17.

aside the later praises for the solvency of Alexander, we must still explain the fact that this supposedly bankrupt state managed to withstand acts of war by each and every neighbour, an expedition to Scythia, an extensive and expensive logistical enterprise against Perinthos and Byzantium, two years of military actions against the Greeks and finally, in 336 BC, a vanguard of not less than ten thousand people to Asia; it would be quite inaccurate to call this state financially weak. Things may be blurred by the fact that Philip practiced dynamic economy, using the income from one venture to finance another in the same fiscal year – something that the Greeks undoubtedly saw as an act of profligacy and economic folly; but regardless of how things appear, it is a fact that Philip, perhaps for the first time in the history of the kingdom of the Argeadae, left his successor a state rich in capital resources.⁴⁵

The later maritime programs of Antigonos Gonatas and Philip V affirm that building a respectable fleet did not present an impossible task for a Macedonian king; more importantly, several decades earlier, Epaminondas had created a fleet of 100 triremes in a much shorter time and with smaller funds. Of course, nobody expects a new fleet to immediately appear in the sources; however, we need to wait eight years before Philip reveals that he intends to turn to Asia, quite an adequate interval to build a sufficient number of ships and train their crews. The resources and funds are in place, the time at Philip's disposal is more than adequate, yet the fleet is nowhere to be seen; apparently, Philip had decided that a large fleet was not necessary at that point. Regarding the eventual eastern plans of Philip, this decision would have to be assessed as a big failure. Even if Philip had hoped to use the Athenian fleet in the planned campaign, he would have certainly tried to enlarge his own fleet, if only to reduce dependence on his unpredictable ally. In itself, this is not impossible – Philip was not immune to the occasional misjudgement. Still, whoever would blame him for this serious omission, must first prove that in 346 BC Philip really had Persia in mind.

But let us for a moment put aside the supposed Persian plans of Philip and see whether his actions during this period can be explained in any other way, or whether they fit into his former attitude and policy towards Greece. As regards the fleet, the answer is quite simple. It is obvious from the field of action that the main intention of Epaminondas was to undermine the influence of Athens in the Northern Aegean as much as possible, especially in the straits, where the Athenian grain fleet passed. Moreover, as Bury and Meiggs note: "It was the natural antipathy of the two neighbours, far more than any mature consideration of its own

⁴⁵ Cf. the analysis of this issue in Hammond & Griffith, 1979, *esp.* 670-71.

interests, which drove Boeotia to this indiscreet step.”⁴⁶ Philip again, if he had wanted to threaten the grain fleet of Athens, thanks to his expansion in Thrace, if anything, could have tried to do it by road. Therefore, there was no need whatsoever for additional expenses and risks in a field where the Macedonians had no previous experience.

Concerning the question of the relationship of the king to Athens, it should be mentioned that in the early days of his reign, when he found himself at the head of the kingdom in particularly difficult conditions, Philip showed moderation and tried to appease Athens; of course, this was not motivated by a plan to attack Persia, but simply, at a moment when he faced enemies on all sides, Philip wisely assessed that there was no need to antagonise Athens more than necessary. In other words, his attitude towards Athens at the time, quite predictably, was driven by the current conditions on the ground. This is not the time for a detailed analysis of the relationship Philip had with Athens during his entire reign, so we shall briefly deal with the issue of Philip’s motives for his conduct towards Athens in 346 BC.

From today’s perspective, the end result and the successes of Philip seem to have been inevitable, given the situation in the Balkans and Persia. However, in 346 BC, although all of that may have been in sight, it was still not guaranteed; Central Greece needed to be organised and seen whether it would be functional; one could not speak of full control of Thrace; the situation on the northern and north-western border, about which we have scant information, probably required several expeditions so that advantage would be definitely gained. Amidst all this, what stands out is Philip’s conduct towards Athens. First, it must be noted that we cannot speak of any particular kindness by Philip, as the Peace of Philocrates was achieved at the expense of Athens: Halonessus, Cersebleptes and Phocis were excluded from the Peace, and a recapture of Amphipolis, which the Athenians dreamed of, was out of the question. Thus, the claim that Philip somehow courted the Athenians and showed them special kindness seems dubious from the very beginning; Philip’s ‘scheming’ was undoubtedly to some extent due to his desire to convince the Athenians that this Peace was essentially benign for them, in which he achieved only limited success. This, however, does not change the fact that, from everything we know about the negotiations preceding the Peace of Philocrates, he seems to have been willing to sacrifice Thebes and Theban interests in order to appease Athens, hoping to turn it into a loyal ally.

⁴⁶ Bury, J. B. & Meiggs, R. (1978): *A History of Greece*, fourth edition with revisions, Palgrave, London, 378.

This would be a good occasion to remember one piece of advice given by Isocrates, who told Philip that he would be wise to reconcile Sparta, Athens, Thebes and Argos.⁴⁷ The mention of Argos is undoubtedly due to the alleged origin of the Argeadae from the city and the links that Philip had established with it.⁴⁸ On the other hand, Isocrates' opinion is clear: despite all the problems and recent crises, Thebes, Athens and Sparta called the shots in Greece. Of course, all this was clear to Philip and there was no need for Isocrates to point it out. This manifestation of idealism by Isocrates would ultimately prove impractical, even unacceptable for a skilled and pragmatic politician like Philip – the reconciliation of Sparta, Athens and Thebes would not only be impossible to bring about, but ultimately would be dangerous to the king of Macedon. We will never know Philip's original plan for the final resolution of the situation in Greece, given the fact that it was never realised owing to Athenian resistance. In any case, one thing was undoubtedly perfectly clear to Philip: if he was aiming to place southern Greece under his control without risking major land battle, such as he would eventually be forced to accept, he would have to find (if not for the long-term, at least for the short-term) an ally, one of the three forces in Greece. If we believe that Philip was really ready to offer numerous advantages to Athens, then his choice is obvious. However, must it have any connection with the Athenian fleet and his Persian plans?

A crystal clear fact in this bizarre triangle of love and hatred is that – given all past animosities and wounds in the better part of the century – there was no chance for rapprochement between Thebes and Sparta. This in itself immediately made these two poleis less desirable allies. Any assistance that Philip would receive as an ally of Sparta would be minimal, given that Sparta was never able to cope with the numerous enemies that limited it to the Peloponnese. Moreover, connecting with Sparta would undoubtedly cause Athens and Thebes to unite. Thus, Sparta fell out of the picture. On the other hand, Thebes remained the largest ground force among the Greeks, so that even if a rapprochement did occur between Athens and Sparta, it would not present a serious threat to a combined Macedonian-Theban force. However, the problem in all probability was that Thebes was too powerful to be a loyal, harmless, and useful ally. Moreover, as a major force in Central Greece, the interests of Thebes and Macedon intersected in too many places to expect that Macedonian interests would be protected without antagonising the ally. Philip probably remembered all too well the interventions of Pelopidas in Macedon, to be able to peacefully accept the strengthening of Thebes.

⁴⁷ Isoc., 5.30 *sqq.*

⁴⁸ *cf.* Hammond & Griffith 1979, 457-8.

And finally, there was Athens. As a ground force, it could never present a threat to the safety of Macedon. On the other hand, however, upset by an eventual close cooperation between Athens and Macedon, Thebes and Sparta would do everything possible, except negotiate a mutual agreement. Thus, however Philip might have pictured the final solution for Greece, his work would undoubtedly have been facilitated as the alliance with Athens allowed him to settle up with each opponent individually.⁴⁹ That made Athens a particularly attractive ally at that point. Therefore, if we are to believe that Philip already had a plan to attack Persia, then yes, his attempts for a peaceful settlement with Athens might be owed to the need for the Athenian fleet. However, in situations where there is no reliable piece of evidence, and there is but one extremely dubious indirect attestation – in all probability, due to retrospection of the author, whoever he might have been – it is easier and more likely to believe that at that moment Philip wanted to form an alliance with Athens primarily for his future plans in Greece. That, despite all of Philip's efforts, the project failed miserably in the end thanks to the Athenian suspicion and stubbornness, does not mean that in 346 BC there were no sufficient reasons to believe that it could be extremely useful for Macedon and Athens.

Only a decade later would Philip in fact prepare to take the decisive step and to invade Asia Minor. Therefore, we shall examine several specific events, which were also important for Philip's political career, and his relationship with the Persian king and the Greeks. In the very period we are discussing, an enterprise carried out by the king of Macedon caused renewed hostilities with Athens, and at the same time collided with the interests of the Persian king; Philip intended to conquer Thrace and thus move the eastern border of the kingdom to the west coast of the Hellespont.

The successful achievement of this task meant an almost complete elimination of the Athenian influence in the northern Aegean, as well as compromising its grain route, invaluable to the economic survival of the polis. It need not be pointed out that in all this, the Persian kingdom would acquire a new, very serious, and probably undesirable neighbour on the western border.⁵⁰ Ho-

⁴⁹ cf. Carlier 1994, 153-4, who accepts the idea that, had the Peace of Philocrates resulted in a sincere and efficient alliance, Philip's first target would have been Thebes.

⁵⁰ Kienast, D. (1973): „Philipp II. von Makedonien und das Reich der Achaimeniden“, *Abhandlungen der Marburger Gelehrten Gesellschaft* 6: 13-15 offers a thorough analysis of Philip's ambitions in Thrace, as well as the position Thrace held in his Persian politics.

wever, the move also hid certain perils, and it seems too early to think that the real aims of Philip at this time were the subordination of Athens, or even Persia. At that time, as a result of the operations in Thrace, it was realistic to expect war with Athens, with its allies and, perhaps, with yet another Greek polis – but Philip could not have known the scale and duration of this war.⁵¹ Although the control of Thermopylae had provided a good defensive position in the south, and some of the Greeks had been genuinely sympathetic, up to that point Philip had not received a legal act of formal obedience and loyalty by anyone.⁵² Risks could be incurred even by the outcome in Phocis; despite the fact that the locals were physically and politically divided with Macedonian and Theban military outposts, the territory was experiencing a political vacuum that Thebes could use to its advantage easier and faster than Macedon – as demonstrated by the Theban taking of Nicaea.⁵³ It was a time when Philip had to access things gradually and solve the problems one by one. Until things had been completed in Thrace, Philip could not even contemplate moving the army to the south, let alone consider an attack on Persian territory as a strategically reasonable circumstance.

Now, Philip renewed actions in Thrace in 342 BC; by the following year, he had managed to remove Cersebleptes⁵⁴ from the scene and to help Cardia in order to disrupt the local ambitions of Athens.⁵⁵ Despite the vocal complaints by the Athenian orators, Philip had every right to protect his Cardian allies from the aggressive attempts of Athens.⁵⁶ But no matter what the ulti-

⁵¹ In regard to the Athenian point of view concerning this issue, v. Carlier, 1994: 103-106 (with an analysis of the speech against Aristocrates) and 151-2 (following the second Athenian delegation sent to Philip).

⁵² Regarding the strategic importance of the Thermopylae at this time, v. for example Aeschin. 2.132; 2.138; 3.140; ps.-Dem. 1.1. 4; *cf.* invariably Buckler, 1989, 92-97.

⁵³ Philochorus, *FGrH* 328, fr. 56b deals with this.

⁵⁴ The correct form of the name of this ruler is Cersebleptes, found on an inscription (Tod 151, l. 10, 19, 21), as well as on a silver cup (Fol, A. *et al.*, *The New Thracian Treasure from Rogozen, Bulgaria*, British Museum Publications, London 1986; *non vidimus*). Diodorus (16.34.4) and Demosthenes (19.174, 181 *etc.*) call him Cersobleptes, with the majority of contemporary researchers following their lead.

⁵⁵ Concerning Cersebleptes, v. ps.-Dem. 10.5.8; Diod. 16.71.1-2; Iust. 9.1. Concerning Cardia, v. Dem. 8.14; 9.16; ps.-Dem. 10.60; ps.-Dem. 12.11; *cf.* ps.-Dem. 7.39-45. Both events are connected in ps.-Dem. 10.15-18 and Dem. 8.14.

⁵⁶ V. Diod. 16.34.4; *cf.* Dem. 5.25. Demosthenes admits as early as in 346 BC that with the Peace of Philocrates the Athenians had given up their rights to Cardia, as a result of which Philip had no reason whatsoever neither to deny anything nor to explain himself; *cf.* Dem. 8.14. ps.-Dem. 7.39-45.

mate goals and achievements of the king of Macedon were at this time, his endeavours caused a response many times greater than the given pretext. Philip was facing opponents who had been thinking in the long term and tried to respond with a political realignment that would provide priority even in ventures that the king of Macedon had not yet either plotted or assumed. Thus, it happened that not only did the Macedonian actions in Chersonese cause conflict between Philip and Athens, but that the whole affair opened up space for the Persians. Namely, when Philip set out towards the Greek poleis on Hellespont, where he was welcomed as an ally and protector,⁵⁷ the Athenians responded with accusations that Philip had broken the peace; Demosthenes appealed for envoys to be sent not only to other Greek poleis, but to the Great King as well, so as to halt any further advancement of the Macedonians.⁵⁸ Pseudo-Demosthenes attests that the Athenians considered sending envoys to Persia in order to seek alliance and a common front against Philip.⁵⁹ Elsewhere, Demosthenes warns that the King, unfortunately, has friendly feelings towards all Greeks except for the Athenians,⁶⁰ adding that the Athenians themselves deserved this, because they had previously rejected the attempts for reconciliation with the Persian king.⁶¹ To remedy this, the orator advised that envoys be immediately sent to the King,⁶² a nice finish to all of this is provided by pseudo-Demosthenes, who harshly attacks those who called the Persian king “a barbarian” or “a common enemy of all Greeks”.⁶³

Regardless of whether there is any truth to the story of this would-be delegation, one might say that, politically, it was possible and quite logical, since the proposed epimachy did not breach the Peace of Philocrates; in fact, pseudo-Demosthenes does not mention that the Athenians violated any peace treaty with this action. However, what is most interesting is certainly the mention and the constant reference to Persia; as alluded above (and on this occasion it clearly comes to light), the immediate political inte-

⁵⁷ Diod. 16.71.2.

⁵⁸ Dem. 9.71; however, in some works the very paragraph which deals with these delegacies is missing; some editors include it in the text, while others leave it out.

⁵⁹ ps.-Dem. 12.6-7.

⁶⁰ Dem. 10.52. Regarding the authenticity of the Fourth Philippic, v. Worthington, I. (1991): „The Authenticity of Demosthenes’ Fourth Philippic“, *Mnemosyne* 44, pp. 425-428; Carlier (1994: 295) feels that it is an authentic speech by Demosthenes.

⁶¹ Dem. 10. 34.

⁶² Dem. 10. 33.

⁶³ Didym. 6.63-64; Anaxim., *FGrH* 72, fr. 9.

rests made the Greeks forget the role of the Persian king as a traditional enemy and as a threat to their freedom. Apparently, at least some of the Athenians were more afraid of Philip than of Persia; ironically, in their eyes, the only one who could protect the common freedom of the Greeks was the Persian king.

As far as can be understood from the sources, the justification for this new marriage of convenience is that Philip had wronged both the Greeks and the Persians – while, in fact, he had not yet done anything of what had been attributed to him. As for the Greeks – if one excludes the wounded Athenian pride and the infamous downfall of its anti-Macedonian coalition approximately fifteen years earlier – Philip had yet to afflict them in any direct way, as he was still mainly managing things in Thrace.⁶⁴ In fact, the only faint evidence of any intent of Philip against Persia are the cases of Artabazus and Hermias of Atarneus.

7. *On Artabazus and Hermias.* – Once his rebellion against Artaxerxes had ended in failure, Artabazus and his son-in-law Memnon took refuge at the court of Philip;⁶⁵ however, the other son-in-law of Artabazus, Mentor, carried out his service as a Persian commander so well that he managed to obtain forgiveness for his relatives, who then continued to faithfully serve the Persian king.⁶⁶ In any case, while staying with Philip, both of them were removed from the political scene in Asia Minor and had neither significant resources nor control over actual events; the most they could do was to share their personal knowledge of the situation with Philip and perhaps help him establish contact with some rulers in Asia Minor. If there was a plan in place to attack Persia at that time, Artabazus and Memnon, sheltered in Macedon, were hardly able to serve Philip as useful agents. The examples of Alcibiades and Hannibal warn us that the fact that Artabazus decided to take refuge with Philip, as well as the fact that the king accepted him, can be interpreted in different ways, and cannot be taken as decisive evidence for an anti-Persian policy of the king of Macedon;⁶⁷ certainly, when Hannibal fled to Prusias, he did not expect the Bithynian ruler to challenge Rome. Still, what seems decisive in this whole case is the chronology. Artabazus and Memnon took refuge in the Macedonian court either in late 353 or in

⁶⁴ Diod. 16.34.4; cf. Bengtson, 1975: 308, 318; Wirth, G. (1985): *Philip II*, Berlin-Stuttgart: 121-123.

⁶⁵ Diod. 16.52.3; cf. Buckler, J. (1989): „Philip II and the Sacred War“, *Mnemosyne Suppl.* 109, pp. 114-142: 53, with a bibliography.

⁶⁶ Diod. 16.52.2; Arr. *Anab.* 1.12.9.

⁶⁷ *Contra* Hornblower 1994, 95 who sees Artabazus' acceptance as a sign of Philip's hostile attitude towards Persia.

early 352 BC.⁶⁸ At that time, there was no way of seriously considering an impending attack of Persia: the Third Sacred War was still in full swing (especially if the arrival of Artabazus preceded the victory of Philip over Onomarchus), and thus the definitive consolidation of Philip in Thessaly could still be put into question; even if the switch occurred after defeating Onomarchus, Philip still failed to take the Thermopylae, and thus, at least for the moment, southern Greece remained beyond his reach; the conquest of Thrace, which would be crucial in any attempt to attack Asia Minor, was far from over at that moment. Why would, then, Philip allow rumours to circulate about his alleged future plans in 353/2 BC, when this would only have attracted the attention of the Great King, and thus have made things more difficult in his own plans? If the question is why exactly Artabazus fled with Philip, then the answer is very simple – because the King of Macedon was the only one who could offer some protection and security. Defecting to Thrace, for example, was not an option, as Artabazus would remain uncomfortably close to the westernmost territories of Persia. Defecting in turn into a Greek polis would be just as risky – a single Persian request that he be sent back, supported either with financial aid or a threat, would probably immediately lead to his deportation. Philip, on the other hand, was a relatively safe distance away, at the same time being powerful enough to be able to guarantee security.

As for Hermias, he is traditionally held to be a Bithynian slave of Eubulus, the rich lord of the lands around Assus and Atarneus in Troas. Despite his modest origins, Hermias was highly esteemed by his master, who had at a young age sent him to Athens to study at Plato's Academy. Not much later, political disorder in western Asia Minor enabled Hermias to acquire significant wealth and influence, even political power. Upon completion of his education in Athens, Hermias returned to Atarneus to continue service with Eubulus; but his master soon passed away, and in 351 BC Hermias inherited his property and position, thus becoming ruler of Atarneus. Here we shall focus on a single aspect of his political career – the Athenian and Persian allegations that, starting from 342 BC, Hermias maintained an active political relationship with Philip and was even his “agent”.

Regarding the story of Hermias, it should be emphasised that the relationship between him and Philip was entirely devoid of conspiracy. To speculate about some sort of a secret relationship between Philip and Hermias is unreasonable and even impossible; if the ties were established in 342 BC, it means that Demos-

⁶⁸ Elis 1994, 751.

thenes and his entire audience learned of them only several months later.⁶⁹ The link between the two is well known to Theopompus, who sends Philip a letter in which he makes malicious remarks about Hermias in the present tense and warns Philip at a time when his connections with Hermias are very recent.⁷⁰ Finally, the relationship between Philip and Hermias was also known to Mentor of Rhodes, and through him to the Persians – if not from anybody else, then from Artabazus and Memnon, the brother of Mentor, whose return from exile, according to Diodorus, occurred before the capture of Hermias.

If there were no secrets in the assumed relationship between the king of Macedon and the master of Atarneus, that fact in itself casts a shadow over their alleged alliance. In 342 BC, when things were still happening in Thrace, would Philip have allowed the public in the Aegean to know that he had associated himself with Hermias, if for no other reason, than for future cooperation against Persia? And, ultimately, did Hermias, the master of the small Troas, deserve so much respect as to be entrusted a key role in Philip's plans – which, as we have seen, we are not even certain existed at this time?

Things are complicated to a level of hopelessness, as we know almost nothing about this political relationship – by whose initiative it was signed, what it implied and what its nature was. Out of all the ways in which Philip and Hermias could establish a political relationship, we can instantly eliminate the two that are the most improbable: that it was done by request and with the help of Aristotle, and that such a thing was requested by Philip. Aristotle had many opportunities to enter politics and acquire political influence in both Athens and Macedon, but there is not the slightest indication that he made any attempt to do so, nor that such a thing interested him at all; indeed, it could be said that Aristotle's career, beyond the theoretical scope of his philosophical works, was almost apolitical. As for the assumption that Philip used the familiarity of Aristotle to Hermias, and that the connection was made by the request and necessity of the king of Macedon – we ought to ask ourselves why, and with what intention Philip would do this in 342 BC. It is quite clear that Philip did not invite Aristotle to Macedon in order to use him as an agent or broker to win Hermias, but because of an entirely different matter; it has

⁶⁹ Dem. 10.31 sqq.; cf. Hornblower, 1994a: 94.

⁷⁰ Theopompus was in Macedon in the first half of 342 BC, and most probably, a longer period before and after this date. Bearing in mind the state of affairs, it is highly probable that this letter represents an actual message to Philip, and not a political pamphlet written in the form of an address. In greater detail in Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 521 sqq.

been clearly shown that the war against Persia at this time was not an impending option, whether it would be started by Philip, or by the equally unprepared Artaxerxes. In any case, even if it were a logistical move, geography suggests that Atarneus could hardly serve as a base for crossing to Asia Minor. If viewed from the standpoint of Philip, the fact that he had contact with Hermias does not necessarily (and probably does not) mean anything more than the fact that Philip was eager to maintain good relations with Hermias, with his associates in Troas, and in general – with every willing political factor at his eastern border.

It seems more logical and more likely that the first step in this connection, perhaps even through Aristotle, was carried out by Hermias himself, who could certainly sense that he was to expect trouble with the King, with his satraps and commanders. Persia had finally recovered from the turmoil of the last two decades, had managed to restore order in the western satrapies and had just taken back Egypt thanks to Mentor of Rhodes, who now enjoyed special powers in the satrapies in Asia Minor.⁷¹ Hermias expanded his territory owing to the indifference, weakness or even approval from the local satraps. It looks as if everyone believed that the central government was too remote, or too busy; therefore, it becomes clear why he should now fear for his own position. If he had already been perturbed by the thought that he would have to answer for his actions, it was of vital importance for Hermias to establish friendship with someone who would be strong enough to help him survive and, if necessary, provide him shelter in Europe. In short, it was more important to Hermias to secure the friendship of Philip, than it was to Philip to have Hermias of Atarneus at his disposal, then or in the near future.

Our bad luck with the sources has taken care to conceal what kind of agreement was concluded, if there was ever such a thing; there is no evidence of any formal political alliance between the two, nor an epigraphic attestation of an agreement between them. In fact, except for the accusations made by pseudo-Demosthenes and the story by Diodorus about the trial of Hermias, there is no evidence that things were indeed as they had been described by these two sources. Finally, regardless of the main indictment against Hermias, his short but colourful career provided the Persians with sufficient reason to punish him without ever mentioning Philip. For example, while the Persian control in Asia Minor was hanging in the balance, an inscription⁷² records an alliance between Hermias and Erytra. Theopompus mentions that the master of Atarneus was linked to Chios and Mytilene, on whose account he

⁷¹ Diod. 16.52.2.

⁷² Tod 165 = Harding 79.

was expected to conquer territories on the Asian *peraiia*, but that he withdrew after these two failed to pay his mercenaries.⁷³ Above all, his relationship with Chios went directly against the interests of Ada, who performed the duties of satrap of Caria in the territory comprising the island.

Bearing all this in mind, it becomes more than clear that the contact Hermias had with Philip was the least important reason for his removal from the scene. It is very difficult to distinguish any embodied political stance, let alone a logistical or ideological matrix in his endeavours, in order to even assess his moves. Despite the indisputable dramatic excitement in Hermias' career, it is unlikely that this political adventurer and mercenary, who used the disorder in Asia Minor to expand his influence in Troas, was important enough to initiate a serious feud between Philip and Persia – and it is even more difficult to believe that Philip seriously considered his services. Finally, even the fact that he supposedly told the Persians nothing, even when tortured, is probably due to the fact that he had nothing in particular to tell, rather than owing to some kind of loyalty, political friendship or philosophical principle.⁷⁴

8. *Perinthos and Byzantium.* – The first open conflict between Persia and Macedon, and the first genuine cooperation between Persia and Athens, occurred during the siege of Perinthos and Byzantium.

As stated above, since the mid-summer of 342 BC, the initial objectives that Philip had focused nearly all his attention and energy to were to the east, in Thrace. However, Thrace was not the sole target of his actions; of equal importance were the Greek poleis on the Propontis and the Bosphorus, through which he could indirectly threaten the Athenian interests in the entire region.⁷⁵

Experience had taught Philip that in order to prevent the supply of grain from Pontus, he would need to either destroy the Athenian fleet (a feat impossible at the time), or to hamper Athens' access to Pontus and the Propontis. The least that Philip could do was attempt to establish control over the bases on the European coast; although it was impossible to control the coast from the Asian side as well, no one could be sure what the mood

⁷³ *FGrH* 115, fr. 291; cf. Lane Fox, R. (1986): „Theopompus of Chios and the Greek world, 411-322 B.C.“, in Boardman, J. and Vaphopoulou-Richardson, C. E. (eds.), *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios* 1984: 111, no.3.

⁷⁴ An excellent comment by Buckler, J. (1994): „Philip II, The Greeks, and The King, 346-336 B.C.“, *Illinois Classical Studies* 19, pp. 99-122.

⁷⁵ Cf. Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 545.

of the Persians would be, and what conditions they would seek of the Athenians. In any case, with the actions on the Hellespont and Bosphorus, Philip would certainly cause problems in Athens, which meant that there was a military target deserving attention.⁷⁶ In this direction, Philip commenced with activities against Perinthos, and shortly afterwards against Byzantium.

The sources do not explain how everything begun; in any case, it must be admitted that the Macedonian accusations that served as *casus belli* were, to say the least, questionable.⁷⁷ Philip, as did later Alexander, claimed that Perinthos turned against Macedon, and that Byzantium refused to raise arms against its neighbour, thus violating the agreement with Macedon. In any case, if we take a look at the contracts and alliances that had at that time been concluded between the interested parties, we could say that everyone, in different ways, could blame the others for virtually everything. For example, at the time Byzantium, and quite possibly Perinthos, were no longer members of the Second Athenian League;⁷⁸ therefore, the two cities neither had to respect the agreements that obliged the members of the League, nor had a stake in the Peace of Philocrates – which in a sense undermined the legal position of the Athenians, who had been complaining about the actions carried out by Philip. Moreover, in the meantime Philip and Byzantium concluded a contract which was held to be exclusively defensive; but the Byzantines were not convinced that Perinthos had attacked Philip, and therefore refused to comply. To add to the confusion, the contracts with Artaxerxes II were never officially rescinded, so the Persian king still called on the right to act “fairly” – and, of course, on that legal basis he could intervene against Philip in order to “defend” the autonomy of the Greek poleis.

However, Philip had no intention of dallying with the legal implications of his actions. As Byzantium had a solid defence,⁷⁹ in the spring of 340 BC the Macedonian army began actions against Perinthos. In theory, this city should have presented a smaller and easier target; however, its excellent natural position, its solid walls and the persistence of the defenders created serious

⁷⁶ Cf. Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 569 sqq., containing a detailed analysis of the events and the state of affairs in 340 BC.

⁷⁷ Cf. Dem. 18.87; ps.-Dem. 12.2; Diod. 16.74.2; Arr. *Anab.* 2.14.5; Iust. 9.1.2-5. Interestingly enough, no mention of Perinthos is ever made in Philip’s letter (ps.-Dem. 12), while the reply deals with these events extensively (ps.-Dem. 1.1.3, 5).

⁷⁸ Plut. *Dem.* 17. 2; cf. Cargill, J. (1981): *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?*, Berkeley: University of California Press: 181.

⁷⁹ Paus. 4.31.5.

problems for the Macedonian engineering corps, trained by Thesalian Polyidus.⁸⁰ We should not forget to add the assistance that Perinthos would get from the outside. The Byzantines were at first hesitant, as they believed that all this was some sort of a diversion, but they finally agreed to help their neighbours and sent firing machines, weapons and supplies, as well as selected commanders and fighters.⁸¹ Assistance from Byzantium continued to flow by mid-summer, and the prospect that the siege would end successfully diminished day by day. However, things would not have fared any better even had Byzantium not sent any help; the Perinthians received support from the “satraps of the coast”, who began to help the city with money, numerous mercenaries, weapons, grain and other supplies.⁸² Though Philip’s fleet could cause minor inconvenience, it could not prevent the Persians from coming into contact with the besieged city. Thus, Philip was left with only one course of action. By some logic, the generous aid that Byzantium had sent to Perinthos should have reduced the economic power, the supplies and the combat readiness of the Byzantines;⁸³ therefore, on leaving part of the military in Perinthos and Selymbria in order to maintain the lines of supply, Philip set out for Byzantium.

The Persian actions in Perinthos are attested in numerous sources, some of them contemporary with the events. According to Pseudo-Demosthenes, the King had become involved with such expedience that the mercenaries of the satraps of Asia Minor threw Philip out of Perinthos.⁸⁴ Theopompus writes that in the service of the Persian commanders was one Aristodemus of Pherae, who later commanded a detachment of Greek mercenaries against Alexander III.⁸⁵ Anaximenes also mentions mercenaries of the Great King, who fought on the side of Perinthos against Philip.⁸⁶ Diodorus writes that the King ordered the satraps of the coast to help Perinthos with mercenaries, money, food and raw ma-

⁸⁰ Diod. 16.74-76.

⁸¹ Diod. 16.74.4, 16. 75.2.

⁸² Cf. Diod. 16.75.1; Dem. 11.5, Arr. *Anab.* 2.14.5; Paus. 1.29.10. Concerning the aid Diopeithes received from Persia (in all probability, the previous year), v. Arist. *Rhet.* 2.1386a, 13. Hammond correctly claims that the assistance meant for Perinthos should not be described as “unofficial” because, though it technically consisted of mercenaries, and they were paid by the satraps who were closest to what was going on, no attempts were made to conceal the fact that it was indeed assistance from Persia, approved by the King himself.

⁸³ Diod. 16.76.3.

⁸⁴ ps.-Dem. 11.5; Philoch., *FGrH* 328 fr. 54; Diod. 16. 75. 1.

⁸⁵ *FGrH* 115, fr. 222.

⁸⁶ *FGrH* 72, fr. 1.

terials,⁸⁷ while Pausanias adds that one of the commanders of these mercenaries was Apollodorus of Athens, sent by Aristes, satrap of Phrygia.⁸⁸ The mention of the satraps of the King in Philochorus, as well as the way Diodorus presents things, suggest that this was not an independent initiative of the satraps, while the single satrap mentioned by name is Arsites; what happened in Byzantium, in turn, suggests that satraps from all the way to Caria to the south were involved in this operation, which excludes independent action and testifies that the head of the entire enterprise was still the Persian king.⁸⁹

The siege of Byzantium began soon after the capture of the Athenian grain fleet. The siege has not been fully narrated in any source,⁹⁰ only some parts have been preserved, which nevertheless inform us that this was a large-scale enterprise with full military power, which lasted for at least several months – from October 340, to probably the spring of 339 BC.⁹¹ The sources contain vignettes about the siege machinery that Philip had at his disposal, about the undermining of the walls, about the defeat of Philip's fleet, about Chares and his base near Chalcedon, about the trusted Phocion who brought reinforcements, as well as about the Athenian fortifications in the city and the harbour.⁹² Philip hoped for betrayal from within, but it never happened.⁹³ The old allies of the city – Rhodes, Chios and Cos – fulfilled their duty and provided support, as did Tenedus and surely other Athenian allies.⁹⁴

⁸⁷ Diod. 16.75.1-2.

⁸⁸ Paus. 1.29.10; Strab. 16.3.5.

⁸⁹ *Contra* Errington, R. M. (1990): *A History of Macedonia*, University of California Press: 55, who, in this whole affair, sees a private enterprise carried out by the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, who is concerned that Philip would disrupt his "comfortable position on the coast of Hellespont and Propontis". However, the view put forward by this author is not followed by adequate discussion, and thus it is not clear whether this is just a general impression or a conclusion founded on research and analysis.

⁹⁰ *cf.* Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 578-9.

⁹¹ The chronology of the events has still not been sufficiently clarified. The Athenian announcement of war should be dated in October; the announcement was followed by a decision to send in reinforcements under the command of Phocion, which are often believed to have arrived as late as the spring of 339, even though it seems more logical that it had been sent straightaway, without delay. The end of the siege can be dated in the early spring, because Philip had also been planning to carry out a large-scale enterprise in the north that same year.

⁹² *V. Dem.* 18.87; *Iust.* 9.1.2, 5; *Plut. Phoc.* 14.2-3; *Frontin.* 1.3.4.

⁹³ According to Suidas (*s.v.* Leon), Philip had his hopes pinned on Leon, whom he had attempted to bribe, without success, this is analysed in Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 574, no.1.

⁹⁴ Accordingly, *Diod.* 16.76.3; 16.77; on Tenedus, probably *Tod* 175 = *Harding* 97, *esp.* line 10. on Tenedus

However, the sources do not explicitly make mention of any Persian aid to Byzantium. At first sight, this is rather odd, and modern authors often speculate on any political implications that would serve as explanation.⁹⁵ But such attempts to explain things seem neither logical nor convincing. The Persians were very zealous in defending Perinthos, and it would be naive to expect that things were overturned in such a brief time. Persia still shared a common interest with Athens, which had entered into an open war against Philip – using all the means they had at their disposal to prevent Philip from advancing on this territory, so the assumptions about a Persian distrust of Athens do not sound convincing. The Persians could not (and did not need to) hope that both sides would tire each other out, because in this situation they were not neutral; it especially cannot be claimed that they were passive because they could not gather mercenaries in October.⁹⁶ In fact, if we look at things more closely, the Persian passivity in Byzantium needs neither an explanation, nor a justification, because no such passivity existed. It was mentioned earlier that the “debt” to Byzantium was met by Rhodes, Chios and Cos, and it seems that the error is very simple. At that time, these islands were under satrapal control of the Hecatomnidae, a fact acknowledged by Athenian sources;⁹⁷ meaning, behind Chios and Rhodes stood the satrap of Caria, and in fact, the islands accommodated Persian military guards up until the time of Alexander. In this case, their support should not be seen as a manifestation of independence or alliance with Byzantium; rather, what they did is the very Persian action which is reportedly missing from the sources.

In his actions against Perinthos and Byzantium, Philip had to come to terms with failure, but his endeavours nevertheless brought Athens and Persia together. Whether acting independently or in collaboration, they had a clearly objectified common interest – to stand in the way of Philip. As before, the Athenians had again hoped that the King would “hire” Athens to stop the king of Macedon.⁹⁸ Indeed, if the Persians had never had any opportunity

⁹⁵ This is concerning the well-known story about the Persian delegacy, which young Alexander received, in the absence of Philip (Plut. *Mor.* 342b-c, *Alex.* 5.1, *cf.* 9.1). The historical accuracy of this anecdote has been called into question for a long time, yet Griffith (Hammond & Griffith, 1979, *ad loc.*) believes that such a delegacy did indeed exist and that this was the right moment for it.

⁹⁶ Dem. 11.5-6; *cf.* Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 572-3.

⁹⁷ Dem. 5.25; *cf.* Dem. 9.71, *FGrH* 115 fr. 164; it would be inaccurate to claim that these islands were independent simply on the basis that various works contain the information that they maintained diplomatic relations with Athens.

⁹⁸ ps.-Dem. 11.6.

to impose in Greece by military means, now they were given the chance to do precisely that, with little risk to their reputation. Regardless of the current mood of the Greeks, and no matter what peace agreement they observed, the Persian king persistently acted in accordance with the original King's Peace. Now, more than ever, he could argue that he was protecting the freedom of the Greeks from Macedonian aggression. But this situation could not last forever, as the final showdown for hegemony in Greece was imminent; two years later, the Great King had irreversibly lost the political points he had won at Perinthos and Byzantium due to a skilful diplomatic manoeuvre by Philip, which will be discussed shortly.

9. *The implications of the letter of Darius.* – Every so often, these events are linked to the alleged agreement for alliance and friendship between Philip II and Artaxerxes, attested in a single, highly suspicious source context.⁹⁹ Arrian says that after the battle of Issus, Darius sent Alexander a letter in which he discussed the Persian-Macedonian contract; Darius claimed that, when Arses took over the Persian throne, Philip was the first to cause him harm, and that Alexander did not send a delegation to the King to confirm their old friendship and the concluded alliance. This complaint seems unreasonable and makes us doubt the full story. By the time Alexander had come to power, Parmenion had led a Macedonian vanguard already quite deep into Asia Minor, and the first encounters with the King's forces were within sight. Why would Alexander send a delegation to the King for a confirmation of friendship and alliance, when both forces had been at war?

The prevailing opinion in modern scholarship is that this alleged letter sent by Darius to Alexander is not a reliable document, but a rhetorical exercise by Arrian. Yet, even if we put the question of its existence aside, we should examine whether there is any truth in the aforementioned alliance. It is difficult to find an opportunity in which Philip and Artaxerxes could bond. There are opinions that it happened in the early years of Philip's reign, in 356/5 BC; in 351 BC, when Ochus first tried to reconquer Egypt; in 344/3 BC, before his second successful attempt at reconquering, or even in 342 BC, after all these events.¹⁰⁰ At a theoretical level, as opposed to what was happening on the ground, none of these dates is completely impossible; indeed, there are even other possible occasions when this alliance could have been concluded.

⁹⁹ Arr. *Anab.* 2.14. Concerning this, v. Bengtson, 1975: 333; Bosworth, A. B. (1980): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, Oxford: *ad loc.*, with a list of older works.

¹⁰⁰ A detailed overview of all the opinions, with a list of works, as well as a brief analysis of each one, can be found in Hammond & Griffith, 1979: *ad loc.*

However, all other contemporary sources are silent, a fact which implies that there was probably nothing of the sort. Considering the failings of Diodorus and Justin, especially in areas relating to this period, it could be said that their silence does not necessarily need to be decisive; however, it is indeed very interesting that Demosthenes would have missed the opportunity to address something that, in his eyes, would present the ultimate threat to the freedom of Greeks. In the speech on the liberty of the Rhodians, in 351/0 BC, Demosthenes mentions Philip and the Great King next to each other, but makes no connection between them;¹⁰¹ on the contrary, the orator argues elsewhere that some Athenians rumoured that Philip was plotting with the King, and then immediately adds that these people are fools.¹⁰² In the Second Philippic, in 344 BC, the orator emphasises that, at the time of Xerxes, the ancestor of Philip was among those who medised – but, Philip was apparently clean on this matter.¹⁰³ If the union were public, and if it were concluded before 346 BC, Isocrates could have never written the “Philippos”, which is full of encouragement to attack Persia; on the other hand, if such an alliance were concluded between 343 and 341 BC, then we have six speeches by Demosthenes which should contain at least a hint of it, but Demosthenes is once again silent. The only answer would be that it was a secret alliance – but if we bear in mind the position of the putative participants, it is clear that for them, the only thing that would make sense would be a public and well-documented union. The last argument against the alliance between Philip and Artaxerxes is based on the fact that, for a secret deal, there needs to be a common goal or enemy, against whom the alliance is directed. But with the exception of Greece, there was nowhere that Persia and Macedon could cooperate with each other without causing direct harm to one another; and despite all the efforts, it is unlikely that Philip would enable the Great King to intervene in something which he already considered his sphere of interest and influence.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ Cf. the detailed analysis of this speech in Carlier, 1994: 83-86. We should bear in mind that the author, most likely accurately, dates this speech in 353/2 BC: *contra* Buckler, 1994, who insists on the first dating of it.

¹⁰² Dem. 4.48-9.

¹⁰³ Dem. 15.24, 6.11.

¹⁰⁴ Carlier 1994: 177, though doubting the authenticity of the source, still allows for the possibility that agreement in which the sides promised not to attack one another was reached in 343 BC. However, it seems that he overestimates the threat from Philip at the given moment; until Philip had assumed firm control of Thrace, he could not have even considered attacking Persia. The fate of the Roman army, which was returning from Asia Minor following its victory over Antiochus III, best illustrates the importance of having complete and firm control of the whole Thracian-Macedonian coast.

Thus, no other source, nor the events of that time testify in favour of what Arrian has written. Finally, not even Alexander, in his alleged response, admits that such a thing ever occurred. Moreover, Alexander argues that the Persians were the first to begin the hostilities and to have caused countless injustices to the Macedonians and the Greeks; but most interesting of all is that these words are equally false. In fact, Alexander argues that, at some unspecified moment, Ochus sent an army to Thrace, which was then under Macedonian influence¹⁰⁵ – a charge for which there is no credible basis. On what occasion could this happen? Theopompus writes that Philip attacked the Thracian Tetrachorites, also called Bessi, to which Polyaeus adds that Antipater played a significant role in that venture;¹⁰⁶ there are opinions that this event should be dated to 340 BC.¹⁰⁷ However, even without doubting the authenticity of the Macedonian actions, this is not an episode to which the Persians can be connected in any logical way. The geography of the terrain is the first argument against the alleged Persian intervention in northern Thrace, either at this time or later; besides, it is incomprehensible how a Persian attempt to help the Bessi would be strategically relevant to the events in Perinthos and Byzantium. The distance would be too large, the supply lines would be too long and unreliable, and the military force of the mercenaries could easily be cut off from the base. If this complaint by Alexander holds some veracity, which seems doubtful, it would have to refer to events in Perinthos. The allegations of Alexander may prove that the initial bone of contention between Philip and Persia was Thrace; but regardless, the stories about a correspondence between Darius and Alexander are, in all probability, literary fabrications.

10. The Common Peace. – As we have previously seen, there is enough evidence to testify that Philip was interested in Asian matters before 340 BC – but, unfortunately, the sources do not reveal anything more than that. There is speculation that Philip was surely interested in Persia, as no other venture had such open possibilities for valuable financial gain. Conquering several Persian satrapies in Asia Minor meant collecting an annual tax of two thousand talents,¹⁰⁸ more than Greece and Thrace would have provi-

¹⁰⁵ Arr. *Anab.* 2. 14. 5.

¹⁰⁶ Theop. *FGrH* 115, 217-18; Polyaeus. 4.4.1. On the Tetrachorites and the Bessi, v. Hdt. 7.3.2; Liv. 44.7; Steph. Byz., s.v.; cf. How, W. W. & Wells, R. (1989): *A Commentary on Herodotus: With Introduction and Appendices*, Volume I (Books I-IV), Volume II (Books V-IX), Oxford University Press, 168.

¹⁰⁷ For example, Bosworth, 1980: 231.

¹⁰⁸ According to Herodotus (3.90), the four western satrapies gave a total of 1760 talents in tax. Cf. Austin, M. M. (1993): „Alexander and the Macedonian

ded together, if they could be made to pay tax; in addition, unlike the Greeks and the Thracians, such a state of affairs was deemed normal by the peoples of Asia Minor, so it seems likely that the population would not have caused any problems concerning taxation. It is almost certain that Philip, like any other ambitious statesman, dwelled on these things; but the question is how clearly defined his plans were by 340 BC.¹⁰⁹

As far as we know, in the years after 346 BC – not to mention the time before – Philip made absolutely no mention of his intentions towards Persia, neither officially, unofficially, nor in any other way that would have warned the Persians to expect war. It is quite likely that the Greeks were also kept in the dark. There are numerous preserved orations dating from 344, until the beginning of 341 BC; every single one of them is dedicated to foreign policy, but one cannot even sense what was brewing. The Fourth Philippic, from the summer of 341 BC, is the only place where mention is made of “Philip’s plans against the Great King” as something that is known to all,¹¹⁰ but this simply means that there was some awareness that Philip was preparing something; in his letter of the summer of 340, Philip talks about the relationship between Persia and the Greeks, and in particular, with Athens – but once again, Philip does not utter a single word in excess.¹¹¹ All in all, it seems quite certain that, before the showdown at Chaeronea, the king of Macedon did not allow any publicity to be made concerning the issue of war against Persia. It is impossible to say whether this meant that he had not prepared any course of action, or that he just did not allow it to become public.¹¹²

invasion of Asia: Aspects of the historiography of war and empire in antiquity“, in J. Rich & G. Shipley (eds.), *Warfare and Society in the Greek World*, Routledge: 200 sqq.

¹⁰⁹ It seems that Borza (1990: *In the Shadow of Olympus: the Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton, New Jersey: 228) overemphasises the role the Asian wealth played in Philip’s plans, claiming that mainland Greece was just a stop-over on his way to the East; allegedly, Greece was too impoverished to be considered a legitimate aim of the king of Macedon, who coveted the wealth of Asia.

¹¹⁰ Dem. 10.32.

¹¹¹ Cf. the analysis in Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 461, no. 2.

¹¹² There are problems of a similar nature in connection with Philip’s motives for a war against Persia; the sources contain only speculations or philosophical explanations. If we were to eliminate the propaganda explanation of a war of “revenge” (which had obviously been meant for the Greeks), then the yearning Philip had to acquire the wealth of Asia (which has probably been exaggerated), as well as the fight for hegemony in the Aegean (which presents a completely legitimate motive, but only after the battle at Chaeronea), it is very challenging indeed to find a fully justified motive for a conflict with Persia,

In any case, even if he had not yet planned any bigger ventures, Philip had to monitor the situation in Asia Minor and to try to establish a minimum of friendly contacts – if for no other reason, than to safeguard the territory of his conquests in Thrace. This is the direction taken by the episode with Pixodarus of Caria,¹¹³ who tried to get closer to Philip and asked for a dynastic marriage. While this contact did not produce any quick or immediate benefit, it testifies not only to the interest of Philip in Asia Minor, but also to the fact that the local dynasts finally figured out that Philip could be an ally against the central government. But this still did not promise much; nothing could be done in Asia until Philip had settled matters in Greece.

The Macedonian victory over the Athenians and the Thebans at Chaeronea signalled the end of the open war with the Greeks. This victory allowed Philip to ensure the obedience not only of his enemies of yesteryear, but of the whole mainland Greece. Soon afterwards followed the assembly in Corinth, where Philip announced his intentions to initiate a “war of revenge” against Persia.¹¹⁴

We could ask whether there was any logic in asking the Greek poleis to engage, *en general*, in an offensive war against Persia based solely on the commitments to the hegemon of the Common Peace. As for “circles of power” in Greece, it can hardly be claimed that they had any real enthusiasm for a war against Persia. Even if it were successful, this war would not bring immediate advantage to any Greek polis; in political terms, the only real winner would be the *hegemon*. The annexation of territories in Asia would increase the power and wealth of Philip, not of the Greeks.¹¹⁵ Moreover, for the anti-Macedonian party in Athens, the attenuation of Persia meant ruin for the political balance in the Aegean and an end to the Greek hopes that, by skilfully balancing between the two opposing sides, they would acquire political independence. However, it must not be forgotten that the Common Peace was not adopted by negotiation, but rather by a military and

which would at least have been mentioned in the sources. Austin, 1993, deals with this problem, with a detailed analysis of the corpus of source information and an overview of the views expressed in scholarship.

¹¹³ Plut. *Alex.* 10.1-3; Arr. *Anab.* 1.23.7; cf. Bosworth, 1980: *ad loc.*

¹¹⁴ Diod. 18.89.1-2; *FGrH* 255, fr. 5; Iust. 9.5.5, 8; cf. Borza, 1990: 225-226.

¹¹⁵ On the other hand, it could be said that the Greeks were at this time very interested in a new colonization, as a way to solve the problems which had accumulated concerning land ownership and fiscal stability; cf. Carlier, 1994: 167. On the social situation in Athens at this time, v. definitely Душанић, 1990: 256-260.

political dictate, and in that sense, everything the *hegemon* should do was to find a legal basis for action. This was readily provided. The Persian king could not break a peace agreement he had not signed, but on the other hand, it could be said that he had impeded the autonomy of the Greeks in Asia – something that, if required, was promoted as a natural right of all poleis in the Aegean. Moreover, Philip decided to play another card and, from what we know of his propaganda in Greece, began to talk of revenge for the Persian crimes committed during the expedition of Xerxes.

What really deserves respect is the fact that Philip, in fact, did not offer the Greeks anything new and unheard of, but acted in full accordance with the traditional order of things. For the Greeks it was quite common to settle their disputes *en gros* and to choose a *hegemon* before going off to war. The Delian League was established before the natural political resolution of the disputes in Greece, and Athens was chosen *hegemon*;¹¹⁶ in the IV century BC, regardless of previous political disputes in Greece, Athens had called on the Greeks to establish a coalition to maintain the existing King's Peace; in 378 BC, Agesilaus commanded the allies to stop their mutual hostility, for he intended to invade Boeotia.¹¹⁷ Common to all these examples is the sense of external threat, the need to pool resources and military force and, finally, the agreement to choose a *hegemon*, who would be honoured without objections as long as he himself observed the provisions of the alliance. In this sense, the Greeks who gathered in Corinth did nothing new or different from what their ancestors had done – suggesting that the *hegemon* was able to perform a masterful political move.

The novelty lay in the fact that Philip was able to implement a general peace among the Greeks and simultaneously prevent the Persian king from taking any part in it – which in the IV century BC seemed absolutely impossible. Basically, Philip isolated the King from Greek affairs and freed Greece from the political interference of Persepolis, which clearly placed Persia once again behind the boundary of the Aegean and, from a collaborator and a supervisor, turned it once again into a legal and valid target. With this, the intentions of Philip had already become crystal clear. The peace in Europe provided the general framework, the Common Peace was a necessary component for political alignment in the Aegean, and the undisputed hegemony was a prerequisite and an instrument in carrying out his plans. Whether it was imagined in 346 BC, in 340, or even following the outcome of

¹¹⁶ Cf. Bengtson, 1975: 130, 132, 257.

¹¹⁷ Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.37.

Chaeronea, the war against Persia was no longer a possibility, but a reality.

13. *The anticlimax*. – In the spring of 336 BC, a Macedonian vanguard led by Parmenion, Attalus and Amyntas of Lyncestis crossed the Hellespont to Abydos.¹¹⁸ We have scant information regarding the actions, primarily because Diodorus and Polyaeus linger almost exclusively on the career of Memnon of Rhodes; however, it can be assumed that the initial events did not go in favour of the Persians. During the fighting in Troas, a statue was destroyed which Ariobarzanes had erected in the temple of Athena of Ilium.¹¹⁹ Persian-appointed rulers were exiled from power on Lesbos, on Chios, in Ephesus and perhaps in Iasos.¹²⁰ In the temple of Ephesian Artemis, as well as in several cities on Lesbos, statues of Philip were erected, while Parmenion granted authority to people who were deemed to be “pro-democratic”.¹²¹ The Macedonians ensured victories and Parmenion managed to advance to Magnesia ad Sipylum¹²² – a fact which shows the laxity of the first Persian defensive lines, something that is often attested both in the V and in the IV century BC.

On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that our sources are partial, often biased even, and that they sometimes contain conflicting testimonies. For example, Diodorus writes¹²³ that the Persian king had previously commenced major preparations, that he had equipped a number of triremes, that he had put together a numerous land army and chosen the best commanders. The sources often tell us about Memnon, who was given 5,000 mercenaries to capture Cyzicus;¹²⁴ however, Memnon was not the only active Persian commander, nor did he lead this venture alone. The financial stratagems attributed to the Rhodian¹²⁵ reveal that he was one of many commanders in the Persian army, who collected contributions from cities and thus fed and paid his troops. It is especially interesting to note that almost no mention is made of Arsites, the satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia, as well as of Spithri-

¹¹⁸ Polyaeus. 5.44.4; Diod. 16.91.2; Iust. 9.5.8. A detailed description of the events is provided by Ellis, 1994: 785-790 and Briant, 1996: 837-8.

¹¹⁹ Diod. 17.17.6.

¹²⁰ *V.* definitely Briant, 1996: 837, with numerous other examples.

¹²¹ *cf.* Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.11.

¹²² Polyaeus. 5.44.

¹²³ Diod. 17.7.1

¹²⁴ Diod. 17.7.2-3. On the career of Memnon, v. Panovski, S. & Sarakinski, V. (2011): „Memnon, the Strategist“, *Macedonian Historical Review* 2, pp. 7-27.

¹²⁵ Ps.-Arist. 2.29.

dates of Sardis, although the fighting took place mostly in their satrapies; it may be assumed that, as in 341 and 334 BC,¹²⁶ on this occasion too Arsites received and implemented the orders of the King. In general, though Diodorus attempts to convince us that the Persians hardly made a move until the arrival of Alexander,¹²⁷ the truth is probably different; however great were the problems that vexed Persepolis or the satrapies – certainly smaller than usually assumed – there was quite enough time for Arsites to warn the King, and for the King to take appropriate measures. In short, it can be freely expected that both Artaxerxes IV and Darius III quickly became aware of the problems in Asia, but our sources do not show this. Unfortunately, the academic interest in the first direct military conflict between the Macedonian and the Persian kingdom will probably never be fully satisfied.

At the time when preparations were being carried out for the wedding of Cleopatra and Alexander Molossus in Aegae, the troops of Parmenion were penetrating the coast of Asia Minor. However, the death of Philip halted the largest enterprise in the history of the kingdom so far, and its second phase was never achieved.¹²⁸ If we can speculate at all about the chronology of events in this uncertain year, we may say that Philip's main campaign was not supposed to start until the following spring; by October, the fighting season was almost finished and the Greeks were not issued new orders, neither regarding the military, nor in terms of finance. Yet, the upper hand had not been taken. Alexander promptly sent new troops to Asia Minor under the command of one Hecataeus,¹²⁹ but his arrival caused unrest in the Macedonian army and Attalus was killed by his own guards.¹³⁰ In the course of the year, almost nothing was left from the achievements of Parmenion. Memnon, indeed, failed to reach Cyzicus,¹³¹ but pro-Persian tyrants were once again sent to Lesbos and Ephesus,¹³² while the Persians managed to emerge victorious in several altercations in the Troas.¹³³ In early 334 BC, only Abydos remai-

¹²⁶ Respectively, Paus. 1.29.10, Arr. *Anab.* 1.12.8-10.

¹²⁷ Diod. 7.2.

¹²⁸ The principal source about Philip's murder is Diodorus (16.91.4-16.94.4). V. Hammond & Griffith, 1979: 684-691, as well as Borza, 1990: 227, who feels that the reason for Philip's murder are Pausanias' hurt feelings; *contra* Hatzopoulos, M. B. (2005): „The reliability of Diodorus' account of Philip II's assassination“, in Bearzot, C. & Landucci, F. (eds.), *Diodoro e l'altra Grecia*, Milano: Vita e pensiero – who unequivocally rejects this.

¹²⁹ Cf. Briant, 1996: 837-8.

¹³⁰ Curt. 7.1.3; 8.7.5.

¹³¹ Diod. 17.7.8; Polyae. 5.44.5.

¹³² cf. Arr. *Anab.* 1.17.12, about Syrophax and his brothers.

¹³³ Diod. 17.7.10.

ned in Macedonian hands;¹³⁴ Alexander had to return to the drawing board.

But our actual loss is not reflected in the failed ventures of Parmenion and Philip in Asia Minor; finally, we know how the whole thing concluded, and based on what happened later we can assume the general lines of action in the foregone expedition of 335 BC. A much greater dilemma lies in the question as to the final goals of Philip II, which are also missing from our sources.¹³⁵ The only thing certain is that, if Philip had had an elaborate plan of action at all, he never made it public, nor did he share it with anyone who could provide us with the information. If we were to make an assumption, our sources indicate two things: that Philip did not have clearly objectified ambitions in Asia until the Persians had interfered with his ventures in Thrace, and that in no case did he show interest and ambition for actions outside the western Persian satrapies. All contacts that Philip had with Persia, were it refugees, rebels, dynasts or satraps, were confined to the Aegean and to the immediate neighbourhood of his kingdom; the sources do not provide any basis for speculation that Philip seriously contemplated about the territories beyond Cilicia and Taurus, let alone about conquering the Persian kingdom. This was another, entirely different story, that fate bestowed on his son and successor, Alexander III.

¹³⁴ *cf.* Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.5.

¹³⁵ Regarding this issue, v. esp. Ruzicka, S. (1985): „A Note on Philip's Persian War“, *American Journal of Ancient History* 10.1, pp. 84-95, who provides an overview of the opinions expressed, as well as the older works; *cf.* Buckler, 1994.