

CHAPTER 1

NATURE OF EVIDENCE

This thesis is based on evidence that can be distinguished in three categories: the ancient written sources, the archaeological evidence and the 19th and 20th century bibliography.

As regards the ancient sources, no full history of Macedonia survives, since the majority of them -at least the preserved ones- were concentrated on the history of main Greece. Therefore, there are mainly indirect references to Macedonia -so as to prove a point or link it to main Greece- and not a consistent account of its history and geography. In addition, apart from myths (that do not constitute pure historical evidence) and Scylax's «Περίπλους» (a 6th century BC partial geographical description, the date of which is in question²), there is no reliable information applying to the era before Herodotus. Consequently, Herodotus' books I, V, VI, VII, VIII and Thucydides' books I, II, IV, V serve as the earlier reliable but incidental narratives, referring respectively to Macedonia as an area involved in the Persian Empire's expansion in Europe, in the former case, and as the main passage to Thrace (one of the main battlefields) during the Peloponnesian war, in the latter one. Moreover, there are other later, contemporary to the Classical and Hellenistic era, writers such as the Classical Demosthenes, Aeschines and Xenophon (referring to Macedonia indirectly, in the terms of its relations with Athens during Philip II's reign) or the Hellenistic Polybius (writing quite consistently for the Hellenistic history of Macedonia); however, although they produced a fuller account, an adequate picture of the Macedonian State can not be reconstructed. Finally, there are several other Roman (e.g. Diodorus, Strabo, Livy, Pliny, Plutarch, Pausanias, Ptolemy, Arrian) or even Byzantine authors (e.g. Stephanos Byzantius, Malalas etc.), that actually belong to an era beyond the chronological limits of this study. Nevertheless, the historical (e.g. Livy) and geographical descriptions (e.g. Strabo, the Roman Itineraries for the Via Egnatia), espe-

2. Many scholars claim that the preserved text belongs to Ps-Scylax, a much later writer, and not to the original one of the 6th BC.

cially of the early Roman period, -being straight forward related to Hellenistic or even Classical sources, and preserving a fuller account of events or places- are quite valuable as indirect evidence or an indication. The only problem that arises, is that, unless it is made absolutely clear, it can not be determined if a place existed in an early period or constituted a subsequent development in the Roman era³. Last but not least, the epigraphic material (listed for instance in IG, SIG, SEG, ATL or other individual publications), consisting of ancient written texts, was also included in this category of sources, although it actually was the result of archaeological research or excavation. In addition to the collected inscriptions in Macedon were taken into account others located out of Macedon, that however refer to places of the Macedonian State. Very few of those inscriptions dated to the Classical or Hellenistic period, while there are several Roman ones, which although they can not serve as direct information for the organisation of the State, on the other hand can identify locality or certain place-names. Obviously, the ancient written sources should always be taken into account with certain reservation, because, although they usually constitute the most direct evidence, the information transmitted through manuscripts could have been subjected to error (whether by bad copying or by false emendation); furthermore, apart from this practical aspect, the personal feelings of the writer (e.g. Demosthenes' bias against Philip II and Macedon) could also result in misleading information.

The historical circumstances (such as wars, Turkish occupation etc.) that affected present-day Macedonia, unfortunately made that area inaccessible, and retarded the development of serious interest in its archaeology, almost until the beginning of 20th century. Even then, multiple reasons -such as the imminent 2nd World War and its sequels, the insufficient means, the unfavourable physical conditions (e.g. marshes), the construction of modern cities immediately above the ancient ruins (e.g. Beroia) thus leaving nothing visible to attract the researchers, and even more the prevalent tendency to focus all the attention on the archaeology of southern Greece (that presented more attractive evidence)- resulted in the carrying out of only small-scale excavations in some places. However, in the last decades, when the practical conditions became more favourable and more light was shed on the importance of ancient Macedonia, extensive and fully organised excavations are conducted by the archaeological service, the Uni-

3. In those cases, when there is no evidence so far, that would prevent the possibility of their existence in the pre-Roman era, the unidentified places are included in this thesis as an indication for the future study.

versity of Thessalonike and also foreign archaeologists (e.g. Wardle in Assiros, Hansel in Kastanas, Piccard in Thassos etc.). Consequently, there is now a great amount of archaeological excavations that had produced important new information about the history, the geography and also the urbanization of Macedonia, as it will be obvious in the relevant references in the main section of this study. I myself collected all the relevant evidence studying publications and articles dating until May 1996, attending conferences, participating in excavations and visiting the majority of the sites that were approachable. Nevertheless, there is still a lot more to be done in the future, so as to have a full archaeological record of Macedonia and hence be able to reconstruct a uniform picture of its past.

The studies of the 19th century Greek or foreign geographers and topographers (e.g. Delacoulonche, Desdevises-du-Dezert, Heuzey, Leake, Cousinery, Δήμιτσας), that came out as a result of their personal travels around Macedonia, constitute invaluable sources that pioneered some archaeological excavations. Namely, the descriptions of places or the record of ruins or artifacts, no longer visible or extant, were of unique value; however, the majority of their historical or archaeological assumptions, should be regarded with certain reservation, since sometimes they can be refuted by the new archaeological evidence. Finally, there are several studies of scholars of the 19th (e.g. Mannert, Muller, Geyer, Forbinger, Abel etc.) and more often the 20th century (e.g. Κανατσούλης, Hammond, Σαμσάρης, Errington, Borza etc.) concerned with the history, the geography or the archaeology of the Macedonian State or some of its sites, along with numerous archaeological studies and articles (the number of which is really great, and thus can not be quoted here). Those studies and articles have provided important information as concerns this thesis (and are mentioned in several different references within the text and in the general Bibliography at the end). Nevertheless, these assumptions should also be considered in contradiction to the constantly growing archaeological record.

The originality of this study is based on several different facts. In first place, there is only one general study⁴ (of the 19th century) that presents similarities with the main Part of this thesis, on the basis of its subject (it also takes into account the Macedonian districts and their sites). However, the present thesis takes into consideration many more different aspects of the districts and the sites. Moreover, the present study relies on up-to-date evidence (including the excavation-results up to the excavations' period

4. i.e. the study of Δήμιτσας, «Αρχαία Γεωγραφία της Μακεδονίας».

1999), in contrast with other isolated studies (including the above mentioned general one that is outdated). Finally, the Conclusions, that are gathered by the particular approach of the main Part from several different aspects, are, in some cases totally original, or in others original in their new details.