

THE TOMB OF OLYMPIAS¹

MACEDONICA IV²

(PLATE 3)

THE SITE of ancient Pydna on the west coast of the Thermaic Gulf seems never to have been precisely determined, and I am not aware of any serious discussion of the problem of the city's location since that of Léon Heuzey written in the fifties of the last century.³ It is quite certain, however, that Pydna was the first important city of the north of the Pierian Plain, today the plain of Katerini, for otherwise the town would not have given its name to the great battle between King Perseus and the Romans in 168 B.C.⁴ It is equally certain that Pydna was located directly on the coast.⁵ It is true that Diodorus (XIII, 49, 2) states that King Archelaus in 410 B.C. moved the city twenty stadia inland from the coast, but it is abundantly clear that the coastal site had been reoccupied by the fourth century, probably during the disturbed period after the assassination of Archelaus in 399.⁶ Archelaus' Pydna, or New Pydna as we may call it, is very probably to be placed at, or near, the medieval and modern

¹ I am very deeply indebted to Professor Benedict Einarson of the University of Chicago for suggestions and criticism. Professor Einarson is of course in no sense responsible for the argumentation and conclusions of this study.

² The first two studies in this series have been published in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, LI, 1940, pp. 125-136. The third, "Cults of Thessalonica," has appeared in the *Harvard Theological Review*, XLI, 1948, pp. 153-204.

³ *Le Mont Olympe et l'Acarnanie* (Paris, 1860), pp. 160-177. The remarks of Leake (*Travels in Northern Greece*, III [London, 1835], pp. 433-435) are intelligent but hardly an attempt at a truly specific localization. Th. Desdèvises-du-Dezert, *Géographie ancienne de la Macédoine* (Paris, 1863), pp. 298-299, and Geyer, *R.E.*, XIV, col. 668, add nothing. J. Kromayer (*Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland*, II [Berlin, 1907], *Beikarte* on *Karte 9* at end of volume) places Pydna at Eski Kitros (now officially Palaión Kitros—British General Staff Maps, 1: 100,000 GREECE, Sheet E. 7 KATERINI, grid 0-587189), on the coast five kilometers northeast of Kitros and two kilometers southeast of Makriyalos. But Kromayer does not support this localization by argument.

⁴ Strabo, VII, Frag. 22 ("Epitome edita"): ἐν μὲν οὖν τῷ πρὸ τῆς Πύδνης πεδίῳ Ῥωμαῖοι Περσέα καταπολεμήσαντες καθέλιον τὴν τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλείαν, —. So also Plutarch, *Aemilius Paulus*, 16, 5: — πρὸ τῆς Πύδνης. [Scylax], 66 shows that ca. 360 B.C. Pydna was the first city on or near the coast to the north of Dion in Pieria. Pydna is also listed immediately after Dion in the great Delphian *theorodokoi* list (*B.C.H.*, XLV, 1921, p. 17, col. III, line 55), which here follows the main route from Tempe along the coast to Pella. Note that Zonaras, IX, 23, 4, states that Perseus encamped before Pydna: — καὶ πρὸς τὴν Πύδναν ἐπειχθεὶς πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο.

⁵ Thuc., I, 137, 1-2, and in particular the detailed and circumstantial account of Cassander's siege of Pydna in 317-316 B.C. given by Diodorus, XIX, 36 and 49-51. See also Polyænus, IV, 11, 3.

⁶ The appearance of Pydna in the Epidaurian list of *theorodokoi* (*I.G.*, IV², I, no. 94, I b, line 7) shows that the city was not subject to Macedon during the reign of Perdiccas III (365-359 B.C.), and the fact that in [Scylax], 66, which is to be dated to precisely the same period as the Epidaurian list, Pydna is designated as πόλις Ἑλληνίς also shows that ca. 360 it was not subject to the Argead king. The Ἀμύντιον constructed at Pydna in honor of King Amyntas III (W. Baegæ, *De Macedonum sacris* [Dissertationes Halenses XXII, 1, 1913], p. 208) does not necessarily imply

Kitros⁷ about four kilometers from the nearest point on the coast, where inscriptions and antiquities have come to light.⁸ It is not at all surprising that New Pydna should have continued to be inhabited after the older coastal site had been reoccupied. Heuzey⁹ has argued that Old Pydna, the coastal town, was situated on the promontory Cape Atheridha, which marks the northern end of the Pierian Plain proper on the coast, although Heuzey acknowledges that he detected no antiquities there.¹⁰ But the epigraphic evidence here to be considered very strongly suggests, if it does not certainly demonstrate, that the site of Old Pydna is to be sought on the coast about eight kilometers north of Cape Atheridha at the modern village Makriyalos and that the citadel of the ancient city is to be placed on the elevation fifty-six meters high directly on the coast due east of the village.¹¹ We may turn to the inscriptions.

1. On June 10th, 1937, I discovered the following inscription in Makriyalos.¹² The stone was lying loose in the yard outside the north wall of the house of the farmer Lazaros Simonidhis. The owner asserted that he had recently found the inscription

that Pydna was subject to Amyntas, particularly in view of the fact that Pydna struck coins during his reign (D. M. Robinson and P. A. Clement, *The Chalcidic Mint* [Excavations at Olynthus, Part IX, The Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology, No. 26, Baltimore, 1938], p. 309; Edson, *Classical Weekly*, XXXII, 1939, p. 174).

⁷ Kitros is identified with Pydna by the Byzantine epitomator of Strabo, VII, Frag. 22 ("Epitome edita"): — Πύδνα, ἣ νῦν Κίτρον καλεῖται, and in this instance the epitomator may well be correct, although I now feel that I was too forthright in unequivocally accepting the identification in *Classical Philology*, XLII, 1947, p. 102, note 102. The fact that the same identification is given in the worthless *Urbium Nomina Mutata* (Hierocles, *Synecdemus* [ed. Burckhardt], App. I, 43a: III, 117), definitely does not inspire confidence; see L. Robert, *Hellenica*, I (Limoges, 1940), pp. 88-89. But Kitros fits beautifully with the statements of Strabo and Plutarch (*supra*, note 4) that the battle was fought in the plain "before Pydna." Unfortunately one cannot determine from either Plutarch's or Livy's accounts of the Pydna campaign whether or not they conceived the town to be directly on the coast or some little distance inland. Livy's statement (XLIV, 10, 7) that Aenea was situated opposite Pydna (*adversus Pydnam posita*) implies a location on the coast. [Scymnus] (line 626) mentions Pydna specifically as a coastal city (ἐν παραλίᾳ δὲ Θεσσαλονίκη Πύδνα τε), and Dinarchus (I, 14) refers to the town in a context which proves that the orator conceived of it as being situated on the coast.

⁸ See Heuzey, *op. cit.*, pp. 163 ff.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 169-171.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 171: "Il est vrai qu'on ne trouve sur le cap Athéradha aucune ruine des murs de la place ni des ouvrages du port. Mais toute cette pointe est un terrain d'alluvion, formé par les terres que charrient, d'un côté, les grandes rivières de la plaine de Macédoine, et, de l'autre, les torrents de l'Olympe[!]. Comme tous les atterrissements qui se font sur le bord de la mer, elle a dû subir depuis l'antiquité des changements considérables, submersions, ensablements, déplacements du sol; surtout lors de la ruine des môles, des digues et des autres ouvrages. Ces bouleversements sont peut-être même la cause qui, à une époque incertaine, força les habitants de Pydna de se retirer à Kitros." I do not find this attempt to explain away the absence of antiquities on Cape Atheridha convincing.

¹¹ British General Staff Maps, 1: 100,000 GREECE, Sheet E. 7 KATERINI, grid 0-582210.

¹² The inscription has been mentioned by Professor D. M. Robinson, *Trans. A. P. A.*, LXIX, 1938, p. 43, note 1.

while ploughing “in the fields below the kastro” and that he had intended to break it up and use it for building material.

A marble stele. The top is finished in the form of a pediment with acroteria. The top extremity of the pediment itself is in the form of a sphere. The front surface which bears the text is quite plain, without any ornamentation whatsoever. Height, 1.08 m. Width, 0.54 m. Thickness, 0.11 m. Top of stone to top of first line, 0.635 m. Height of letters, 0.02 m. to 0.025 m. Vertical interspace, 0.008 m. to 0.01 m. Photograph of squeeze, Plate 3.

Ἀιακίδης γένος εἰμί· Νεοπτόλεμος δὲ πατήρ μου·
 οὄνομα δ' Ἀλκίμαχος· τῶν ἀπ' Ὀλυμπιάδος.
 νηπίαχον δέ με μοῖρα καὶ ἀνδράσιν εἶσα φρονοῦντα,
 τὸν τριετῆ τύνβῳ τῷδ' ὑπέθηκε νέκυν.

“Aeacid is my race,—my father, Neoptolemus,—my name, Alcimachus,—of those (descended) from Olympias. As a child whose intelligence was equal to that of men, Fate placed me at the age of three a corpse beneath this tomb.”

The text is complete, and there is no difficulty at all in the reading. The epigram can be dated only by the orthography and, in particular, by the letter forms which in my judgment are hardly earlier than about the middle of the first century B.C. The letters are elongated and crowded together so as to permit each line to contain a complete verse inscribed in as large letters as possible. This explains, for example, the form of the *mu* which at first sight seem almost to be Roman imperial. The large omicrons, omegas and theta make it all but impossible for the poem to be earlier than the first century. This dating is compatible with the absence of the *iota adscript* in the datives of line 4 and with the spelling *εἶσα* for *ἴσα* in line 3. In line 4 the delta of *τῷδ'* has been recut over a circular letter.

The personal name Neoptolemus, of course taken from that of the son of Achilles, the legendary founder of the Molossian dynasty,¹³ was borne by two kings of the Epirote royal house, the Aeacidae.¹⁴ Another Neoptolemus, whose exact position in the pedigree of the royal family cannot be determined, is the individual mentioned by Arrian (*Anab.*, II, 27, 6: — *Νεοπτόλεμος τῶν ἐταίρων τοῦ Αἰακιδῶν γένους*) as the first man over the walls of Gaza when Alexander stormed the city in 332.¹⁵ He is probably identical with the *ἀρχιῤασπιστής* of Plutarch, *Eumenes*, 1.¹⁶ A fourth Neoptolemus of the Aeacid house is the dedicant in an epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (*A.P.*, VI, 334, line 6: — *Αἰακίδεω δῶρα Νεοπτολέμου*) which must be

¹³ See G. N. Cross, *Epirus: A Study in Greek Constitutional Development* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 6, note 2 and p. 7.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, genealogical chart at end of volume.

¹⁵ H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* (Munich, 1926), II, no. 548 on p. 273.

¹⁶ So Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 106 and Berve, *loc. cit.* See also O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und Volkstum* (Göttingen, 1906), p. 202, note 119.

dated to the years after Pyrrhus' return from Italy in 275 B.C. Alcimachus seems not to be known as a personal name in the Aeacid family. It appears as the patronymic of the three *theorodokoi* at Pydna in the great Delphian list of about 190-180 B.C.¹⁷

Our epitaph for the intelligent infant, Alcimachus, son of Neoptolemus, proves that by the first century B.C. there resided at the ancient site near the modern village Makriyalos a family which claimed descent from the Aeacid kings of Epirus and thus, as is specifically asserted in the poem, from Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great. This is indeed an extraordinary claim, and one is at first tempted to dismiss it as an unjustified and pretentious imposture. But the ancient site at Makriyalos was either Pydna itself or in the near vicinity of Pydna, and it was at Pydna in 316 B.C. that Cassander besieged Olympias, starved her forces into submission, caused her to be condemned to death by the Macedonian " army assembly " ¹⁸ and executed by the relatives of those Macedonians whom she herself had so recently put to death.¹⁹ It can hardly be fortuitous that Alcimachus' family, which claimed descent from the Aeacidae and from Olympias, lived at or very near the place where the most celebrated of Aeacid princesses met her death. In fact, there is other epigraphic evidence from Makriyalos which specifically mentions a tomb of Olympias.

2. G. P. Oikonomos has published the following very curious inscription which he discovered in a private house at Makriyalos.²⁰ I translate his description of the monument:



Fig. 1

¹⁷ *B.C.H.*, XLV, 1921, p. 17, col. III, lines 55-56: ἐν Πύδναι Ἀρχίας Φίλιππος Διο[ν]υσογένης Ἀλκιμάχου.

¹⁸ See F. Granier, *Die Makedonische Heeresversammlung (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte)*, Munich, 1931), pp. 86-91.

¹⁹ Diodorus, XIX, 50-51. From Diodorus' account there can be no doubt whatsoever that Olympias was put to death at Pydna.

²⁰ Γ. Π. Οικονόμος, *Ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Μακεδονίας (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας)*, Athens, 1915), no. 65 on pp. 39-40; photograph of squeeze: *Εἰκ.* 28 on p. 39. Oikonomos saw the stone in the house of one Stelios Tsioukas. I located this house, but the family had moved to Katerini and the house was locked. I carefully examined the walls and the yard but found no inscriptions. Residents of Makriyalos suggested that the stone had probably been used in construction.

“Fragment of an Ionic capital in second, funerary use,—inscribed on the top surface. The stone is finished on both sides above. It is damaged mostly on the left, slightly on the right and below along the entire width. Letter forms of about the second century B.C. Width, 0.32. Height, 0.28. Thickness, 0.12. Height of letters, 0.02. Said to have been found in Makriyalos.”²¹

Since Oikonomos' publication is not everywhere readily available and since it is not practicable to reproduce his photograph of the squeeze of the somewhat damaged surface, I give in Figure 1 a drawing of the text based on his photograph of the squeeze. In the drawing the vertical interspace, which on the stone was about 0.01, is somewhat exaggerated.

It is apparent that we have to do with a fragmentary elegiac poem. The dimensions of the stone forced Oikonomos to conclude that each line of the inscription contained a half verse, and he read as follows:

Εὐπ]τολέμοιο παραθροίσκων | [εἰσαθ]ρήης τύμβον Ὀλυμπία,
μ]εν ὄς θούρου γένος, | [—] κρύψεν ἀπειρές.
 -----]λεδου ποσι χεν[| -----]ΛΙ[-----

But from this text no consecutive meaning emerges. It remained for the genius of Adolf Wilhelm to grasp the significance of the document.²² Wilhelm concluded, and rightly as we shall see, that each line preserved on the stone was the portion of a complete verse. Although Oikonomos' description of the stone misled him into believing that the space available for restoration was all but exclusively towards the left, he evolved the following brilliant restoration:

[σῆμα Φίλωνος εὐπ]τολέμοιο παραθροίσκων, [παροδίτα],
 [κνδαλίμης εἰσαθ]ρήης τύμβον Ὀλυμπία[δος],
 [Πυθναίων ἦν τιό]μενος θούρου γένος [e. g. Ἄλκᾱ]
 [δῆμος ἅπας δακρύοις] κρύψεν ἀπειρεσ[ίοις]
 [ὄσσα νόμος τ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι δ]εδουπόσι χεύ[ματα χεύειν?]
 [.....]ΛΙ[---

Wilhelm saw that the damaged epigram contained a reference to the tomb of Olympias, and his insight has been splendidly confirmed by the new epigram published above. His restoration as a whole, however, is hardly satisfactory. In particular the heptameter in line 1—a restoration motivated solely by Wilhelm's belief that most of the space available for restoration was to the left²³—is intolerable. As so frequently, one must reconsider the physical nature of the stone.

²¹ — τεμάχιον κιονοκράνου Ἰωνικοῦ, ἐν δευτέρῳ ἐπιτυμβίῳ χρήσει ἐπιγραφὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄνω ἐπιπέδου μέρους. ὁ λίθος περατοῦται ἐκατέρωθεν ἄνω, εἶναι δὲ ἀποκεκρουμένος πλείστον ἀριστερὰ καὶ ὀλίγον δεξιὰ καὶ κάτω δι' ὅλου τοῦ μήκους. σχῆμα γραμμάτων τοῦ 2ου περιόπου π. X. αἰῶνος. --- λέγεται ὅτι εὐρέθη ἐν Μακρυγιάλῳ.

²² Adolf Wilhelm, Ἑλληνικῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων ἐξάς, Ἀρχ. Ἐφημ., 1924, pp. 50-62; no. 3 on pp. 54-55.

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 54: --- λόγῳ δὲ τοῦ ἰπολειπομένου ἀριστερόθεν χώρου συγχωρητέον καὶ ὅτι ὁ πρῶτος στίχος τοῦ ποιήματος ἦτο ἐπτάμετρος ἀντὶ ἐξάμετρος, ---.

Few things are more curious than a funerary epigram inscribed on the top surface of a capital. It is difficult to imagine a more remarkably awkward and inefficient grave monument. Moreover, Oikonomos' photograph of the squeeze shows that the relatively large (0.02 m.) letters were carefully inscribed. It is odd that the stonemason should have gone to the trouble. Wilhelm very rightly pointed out that Oikonomos' assumption that each line of the inscription corresponded to a half verse did not permit restoration.²⁴ But if we retain, as does Wilhelm, Oikonomos' description and interpretation of the stone, Wilhelm's own restoration runs into insuperable difficulties. The letters in this inscription are two centimeters high, and we shall err on the side of conservatism if we estimate the average width of the letters at 0.015 m. The shortest line in Wilhelm's restoration is line 4 with—counting iota as a half space—thirty-two letters. But, with an average width of 0.015 m. per letter, thirty-two letters give us a length of at least 0.48 m. for line 4, and the width of the stone as reported by Oikonomos is only 0.32 m.! Oikonomos' conclusion, that each line of the text was a half verse, does not permit restoration; Wilhelm's, that each line was a full verse, causes the restoration to exceed the dimensions of the stone. This apparent dilemma is in fact the solution. We are *not* dealing with an epigram inscribed on the top surface of an Ionic capital but, on the contrary, with an Ionic capital which has been cut out of a previously inscribed stone. Since an architrave of course rested on the capital, the letters were invisible when the stone actually functioned as an architectural member. The minimum width of the original stone can only be determined by restoration. The restoration itself is in no way conditioned by the extant dimensions of the reworked marble.²⁵

Now that the true nature of the stone has been determined, the problem of restoration is clarified. It would, however, be most unsound method first to restore this fragment and then to use the restoration as historical evidence. It is obvious that only the preserved portion of the text can have any evidential value. But the new, complete epigram published above creates a means of control, denied to Wilhelm, which markedly elucidates the problem of interpretation.

Line 1: The good Aeacid name Neoptolemus appears as the patronymic of the dead Alcimachus in the new epigram. Hence at the beginning of this line we are surely to read Νεοπ]τολέμιο. Oikonomos, followed by Wilhelm, read παραθροίσκων, but the photograph of the squeeze shows only the upper portion of the supposed omicron. One is to read παραθρωίσκων, a nominative masculine present participle, "going (literally: 'running' or 'leaping') past," in agreement with the now missing subject of the main verb in line 2.²⁶

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 54: *ὑποθέσας ὅτι ἕκαστος στίχος τοῦ λίθου περιέχει ἡμιστίχιον τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος, ὁ σοφὸς ἐκδότης ἠμποδισθῆναι νὰ καταλήξῃ εἰς δυνατὴν συμπλήρωσιν* —.

²⁵ The original thickness was 0.12 m. plus. This makes it possible, though of course not certain, that the original stone was a stele.

²⁶ The only instance of the verb παραθρώσσω in the extant literature seems to be in Dionysius Periegetes, line 286. Aside from the text here considered, the only example known to me of the

Line 2: At the beginning of this line we must read]ρῆις, the remains of a verb in the second person singular active subjunctive.²⁷ The accusative τύμβον is of course the object of the preceding verb. The name of Olympias is completely preserved, save for the termination, and is very evidently dependent syntactically on τύμβον. In view of the explicit claim to descent from Olympias made in the completely preserved epigram (line 2: -- τῶν ἀπ' Ὀλυμπιάδος), there can surely be no doubt that Wilhelm's restoration, τύμβον Ὀλυμπιά[δος], the second half of a pentameter,²⁸ is correct. In this distich the poet addresses someone passing by (παρθρωίσκων) the body, grave or memorial of Neop]tolemus, and it is apparent that the " tomb [of] Olympia[s]" was in some way associated with the deceased. The simplest explanation is that the grave of Neoptolemus was in physical propinquity to Olympias' tomb. We have, therefore, epigraphic evidence for the tomb of an Olympias at or near Makriyalos, and this evidence is in no real sense dependent on conjectural restoration. In view of the claim made in the new epigram, there can be little doubt that the tomb here mentioned is that of the great queen.

Line 3: The first four letters are most probably the remains of a personal name or of a middle or passive participle in the nominative singular masculine in agreement with the subject of the verb in line 4 and governing γένος. γένος recalls the beginning of the new epigram: Διακίδης γένος εἰμί. Thus we have in the text preserved in Oikonomos' fragment three elements which appear in the complete epigram: the proper names Neoptolemus and Olympias and the word γένος. It will hardly be argued that these correspondences are fortuitous. At the end of this line one can detect on the photograph of the squeeze the probable remains, not read by Oikonomos, of a left diagonal stroke as of an alpha or lambda.²⁹ This trace is surely the initial letter of a

use of the word in inscriptions is from the same area, from Dion in Pieria, in an epitaph of the second or third centuries A.D. (Oikonomos, *op. cit.*, no. 11 on p. 15): τόνδε τοι Ἐρμαδίωνα | παρθρωίσκων ἐσάθρησον --. Cf. Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

²⁷ Wilhelm restored ἐσαθ]ρῆις which he took as a late spelling for ἐσαθ]ρεῖς. In support of this interpretation he cites W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig, 1903), p. 37, note 3. Actually Crönert gives examples of ηι>ει in late Greek for the subjunctive, but not of εἰ>ηι. In fact the spelling suggested by Wilhelm would be unusual in a well-cut inscription of the second century B.C. No orthographical irregularities appear in the preserved text, and hence any restoration which assumes such irregularities must raise doubts.

²⁸ It is quite clear that we are concerned with an elegiac poem. Sixteen letters (counting iota as a half space) are preserved in line 2; the same space in line 1 contains seventeen and a half letters. Thirteen letters are preserved in line 4; the same space in line 3 contains fifteen letters. We are to conclude that the stonecutter in the course of inscribing lines 2 and 4 tended progressively to space the letters more widely in order to give the inscribed text the desired symmetrical appearance. It is therefore evident that lines 2 and 4, so far as concerns the actual number of letters in each line, were definitely shorter than lines 1 and 3. This observation confirms Wilhelm's interpretation of the fragment as that of an elegiac epigram.

²⁹ Wilhelm (*op. cit.*, p. 55) observed this trace, but he held that it could not be connected with any specific and appropriate letter and hence concluded that it was probably merely a chance injury to the surface of the stone (ἴσως πρόκειται περὶ τυχαίας βλάβης τοῦ λίθου). But Wilhelm stated that the remaining space after the final sigma of line 3 made it not improbable (οὐκ ἀπίθανον) that the

proper name in agreement with *θούρου*. I submit A[ιακίδαο. The adjective *θούρος* is ordinarily employed as an epithet of Ares, but cf. *A.P.*, VI, 126 (Dioscourides) line 2: *θούρος ἀνήρ*, and Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, p. 131, line 14 of Greek text: *θούρος ἀνήρ Γαλάτης*.

Line 4: The person of the verb has changed from the second person in the first distich to the third person in the second distich. The first distich addresses the passerby. The second distich describes an act of burial.

This examination of the preserved text of Oikonomos' fragment demonstrates that it is to be closely associated with the new epigram. The salient point, of course, is that this fragmentary epitaph specifically mentions the tomb of Olympias. The above observations have, I believe, given us the historical information desired and without recourse to the uncertain and necessarily subjective problem of the restoration of the poem as a whole. If I now venture upon a restoration of the first four lines of the fragmentary poem, it is only to suggest how the beginning of the complete epigram may have read and without any pretense that the restoration has any value other than that *exempli gratia*. A mandatory feature of any restoration is that it must more or less maintain the left margin of the poem. When plotted upon graph paper with iota counting as a half space, the greatest variation between the left margin of the lines of the epigram, as restored, is that between lines 2 and 3,—one letter space. This is well within the limits of possible variation.

[μνήμα Νεοπ]τολέμοιο παραθρῶσκων, [ξένε, στήθι],
 [κνδίστης ἐν' ἀθ]ρήϊς τύμβον Ὀλυμπιά[δος],
 [μυρόμενος δ' Ἐλ]ενος θούρου γένος Α[ιακίδαο],
 [υῖὸν γῆς κόλποις] κρύψεν ἀπειρεσί[ης]

I have assumed that we have to do with the burial of a son by his father; this is not at all to suggest that there are no other possibilities. The restoration of the proper name Ἐλενος in line 3 is, of course, only a suggestion. The name occurs in the Aeacid house and was borne by a son of Pyrrhus.³⁰ The name is of course taken from Helenus, the son of Priam.³¹ I render:

“As you pass [the memorial] of [Neop]tolemus, [stranger, stay, that] you may see the tomb [of famed] Olympia[s. Hel]enus, [bewailing] the race of impetuous A[eacides], buried [his son in the bosom of] measureless [earth — — — —].”

next letter was triangular, and, for obvious metrical reasons, that it could only have been an alpha. I have repeatedly examined Oikonomos' photograph of the squeeze with the aid of a strong magnifying glass and am convinced that the trace at the end of line 3 is not at all a chance abrasion on the surface of the stone but is in fact the lower portion of a left diagonal bar.

³⁰ See Cross, *op. cit.*, Index *s. v.* and genealogical chart at end of volume.

³¹ Euripides, *Andromache*, lines 1243 ff.; Theopompus, *Fr. Gr. Hist.*, II, No. 115, Fr. 355; Vergil, *Aeneid*, III, lines 329 ff. See also Cross, *op. cit.*, Appendix I, “The Descendants of Achilles,” pp. 100-102, and Robert, *Hellenica*, I, pp. 102 ff.

3. Another fragmentary epigram, very possibly for a member of the same family, was seen by Heuzey at the nearby Kitros, only five kilometers southwest of Makriyalos: ³² “ Dans les murs d’Hos Konstantinos—une—inscription presque effacée, où l’on fait, en distiques, l’éloge d’un guerrier macédonien—.” ³³

.ENNANEΘITTOΛEMOIO MA
 KEISAIETTEYT'''
 ANHPENMAKETA
 HPΩΩNG-----AMENO
 EYΔAIMONI-----ΛEΓOIO
 ΘNHΣKEIN-----IΓAA
 A
 M · ΛYOV T

Line 1: Heuzey restored [γ]έννα νέ[η] πολέμοιο, but this restoration violates his own “epigraphic” text. It is apparent that we must read [γ]έννα Νεοπτολέμοιο, and it is for this reason that a connection with the two elegiac epitaphs of Makriyalos suggests itself.³⁴ The second person singular of the verb at the beginning of line 2 would seem to indicate that we are to take γέννα rather in the sense of “offspring” than that of “race” or “family.” Νεοπτολέμοιο is probably the patronymic of the deceased whose own name appeared in the missing portion of this line. It *can*, however, be the son of Achilles, the legendary founder of Aeacid rule in Molossis.

Line 2: Heuzey made no attempt to restore or interpret the preserved letters after ἐπ’. I am confident that we must read κείσαι ἐπ’ εὐτει[χεῖ], “thou liest at the well-walled —.” The adjective, as restored, shows that we have to do with either a city or a structure. The city can only be Pydna. It is possible, then, that this line ended in such locutions as Πύδνη ἀποφθίμενος or πατρίδι θαπτόμενος. The line, however, may have ended τύμβω Ὀλυμπιάδος. Naturally this is mentioned only as a possibility.

³² Heuzey, *op. cit.*, p. 164 and text no. 40 on p. 482. I visited Kitros on June 7th, 1937 but succeeded in finding only one inscription, *C.I.G.*, no. 1957 b, which stood embedded upside down in the earth directly in front of the entrance to the church of St. Constantine. Kitros is now largely inhabited by refugees from Anatolia and most of the ancient marbles once reported in the village seem to have been used for building purposes by the refugees. Even the churches are now almost entirely of recent construction.

³³ I am doubtful as to the entire accuracy of the letter forms in Heuzey’s text. The lunate omegas in line 4 provoke suspicion, and I do not feel that the letter forms as given by Heuzey can safely be used to date the poem. I have myself seen a number of the inscriptions published by Heuzey in *Le Mont Olympe et l’Acarnanie*, and, although the letter forms given in his “epigraphic” texts are usually correct, they are by no means invariably so.

³⁴ Neoptolemus is well attested as a proper name in Macedonia; see O. Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, Index IV (1) *s. v.* (p. 280) and *R.E.*, XIV, col. 689. But the location of the stone and the fact that the inscription is an epitaph in elegiacs do, in my opinion, create at least a presumption that this poem also commemorates one of the Aeacids of Makriyalos.

Line 3: Heuzey read ἀνὴρ ἐν Μακέται[s, but the iota does not appear in his “epigraphic” text. Though Μακέτα, an adjective, is possible, Heuzey’s interpretation seems preferable.

The Kitros epigram is too damaged to permit restoration of any evidential value. But it does give us a probable third instance of epigraphic evidence for the family of Aeacid pretensions attested by the two epitaphs found at Makriyalos. The stone was not *in situ* when seen by Heuzey, and it can easily have been transported the short distance from Makriyalos to Kitros for use as building material.

The inscriptions considered above show that by the second century B.C. a family claiming descent from the Aeacidae, the royal house of Epirus, and thus from Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, resided at the ancient site near Makriyalos. As we have seen, in the second epigram the tomb of Olympias is specifically mentioned. These facts create two main problems: (1) When and under what circumstances was the tomb of Olympias constructed, and (2) When and for what reason did members of the royal family of Epirus come to reside in this part of Macedonia?

(1) After the execution of Olympias at Pydna, Cassander, according to Diodorus and Porphyry,³⁵ refused her body proper burial and caused it to be cast into the open. But there were surely those in Macedonia who would see to it that the corpse of the mother of the great king received interment, however informal. Because of the circumstances it is understandable that the initial and necessarily surreptitious burial should have been at or near Pydna. Given Cassander’s notorious hatred for Olympias, it is unlikely that a formal tomb was constructed for the queen’s body during his reign or even during that of his sons, that is, from 316 down to 294 B.C. The *terminus ante quem* for the construction of Olympias’ tomb is the years 288 to 285 B.C. during which Pyrrhus of Epirus, himself of course an Aeacid, ruled the western half of Macedonia within which Pydna was situated.³⁶ Pyrrhus would surely have seen to it that the body of his famous cousin received proper burial, had such burial not already taken place during the short reign of Demetrius I (294-288 B.C.).³⁷

³⁵ Diodorus, XVII, 118, 2: — τὴν τε γὰρ Ὀλυμπιάδα φονεύσαντα [i. e., Cassander] ἀταφον ρίψαι —; Porphyry, *Fr. Gr. Hist.*, II, No. 260, Fr. 3, 3 (from the Armenian version of Eusebius): “— die Olompia aber liess er [i. e., Cassander] sogar unbegraben ins freie werfen.”

³⁶ Tarn, *C.A.H.*, VII, pp. 85 and 89.

³⁷ One might perhaps argue that Olympias’ body would rather have been interred in the sepulchre of the Macedonian kings at Aegae or in the graves of the Aeacid kings in Epirus. But, entirely apart from the epigraphic evidence here considered, the literary sources seem clearly to imply the contrary. Pausanias (I, 9, 7) states that Hieronymus of Cardia (*Fr. Gr. Hist.*, II, No. 154, Fr. 9) in his account of the invasion of Epirus by Lysimachus in 285/4 asserted that Lysimachus plundered the graves of the Aeacid kings and scattered the bones about (τὰ ὀστᾶ ἐκρίψαι). Pausanias professes to find this statement unbelievable, for, he holds, in so doing Lysimachus was not only violating the ancestors of Pyrrhus but also those of Alexander the Great himself, who was of Aeacid descent through his mother, Olympias. It is, I think, legitimate to conclude that, had Olympias been buried with the Aeacid kings, Hieronymus would certainly have recorded the fact and that Pausanias would not have omitted to mention Hieronymus’ statement. Diodorus (XXII, 12) says that Pyrrhus’

(2) When did a member or members of the Aeacid family settle at Makriyalos? Our knowledge of the internal history of the Epirote monarchy after the death of Pyrrhus in 273³⁸ is too slight to permit anything save conjecture. The relations between Antigonid Macedonia and King Alexander II of Epirus (273-ca. 240 B.C.) were ordinarily hostile or at best strained. Conceivably there can have been quarrels within the Aeacid house which caused some one of its members to flee to Macedonia. But for this there is no evidence at all. There is one occasion, however, which would motivate the appearance of members of the Epirote royal family in Macedonia. Shortly before 229 B.C. the dynasty in Epirus was overthrown by a popular revolution and its members put to death.³⁹ At this time the wife of Demetrius II, king of Macedonia, was the Aeacid princess, Phthia.⁴⁰ Had any members of the Aeacid house—small children, for example—lived through the revolution, Demetrius II would have made every effort to save them and to give them refuge in Macedonia. And nothing would have been more appropriate than for the Aeacid survivor or survivors to have received a land grant (*δωρεά*) from the Macedonian king at the place where was located the tomb of Olympias, the most celebrated of Aeacid princesses. I suggest, though there can as yet be no certainty on the matter, that it became the custom for the Aeacid family after settling at Makriyalos to bury their dead in the immediate vicinity of Olympias' tomb. This explanation best motivates the mention of the tomb in Oikonomos' fragmentary epigram and adds point to the claim to descent from Olympias made in the epitaph for Alcimachus.

The inscriptions show that the Aeacids of Makriyalos continued to reside there after the destruction of the Antigonid monarchy by the Romans in 168 B.C. The family after coming to Macedonia must have belonged to the highest aristocracy of the country. According to the terms of the settlement of Macedonia by the Senate and the ten Roman commissioners as proclaimed by Aemilius Paulus at Amphipolis in 167 B.C., the Macedonian nobles with their children of more than fifteen years of age were to be transported to Italy.⁴¹ Our Aeacids would of course have come into that category. Perhaps a boy less than fifteen years of age in 167 made it possible

Gauls in 274 B.C. plundered the tombs of the Macedonian kings at Aegae and scattered the bones about (*τὰ δὲ ὄστᾶ τῶν τετελευτηκότων διέρριψαν*). Plutarch (*Pyrrhus*, 26, 12) has the same story (*— τὰ δ' ὄστᾶ πρὸς ὕβριν διέρριψαν*). The accounts of Diodorus and Plutarch are so similar in content and in language that they must derive from a common source, and this source is surely Hieronymus. If Olympias had been buried at Aegae when Pyrrhus' Gauls pillaged the royal tombs, even our inadequate literary sources would hardly have omitted to mention the fact, particularly Plutarch, who was greatly interested in just such sentimental detail. The evidence of the authors against the burial of Olympias either in Epirus or at Aegae is as strong as is possible for any argument from silence.

³⁸ See Cross, *op. cit.*, Chap. IV, pp. 88-96.

³⁹ Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 96 and n. 5; Tarn, *C.A.H.*, VII, p. 747.

⁴⁰ For Phthia see now Tarn, "Phthia-Chryseis," *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson* (*Harvard Studies*, Suppl. I, Cambridge, Mass., 1940), pp. 483-501.

⁴¹ Livy, XLV, 32, 3: *nomina deinde sunt recitata principum Macedonum, quos cum liberis maioribus quam quindecim annos natis praecedere in Italiam placeret.*

for the family to maintain itself. But there was one group of Macedonians who were not subject to the terms of Aemilius' proclamation. These were the βασιλικοὶ παῖδες and other Macedonians who had fled with Perseus to Samothrace after the disaster at Pydna. In return for abandoning the king, the Romans promised them their liberty and confirmed them in the possession of their property.⁴² It is very possible that a member of our Aeacid family may have been one of the Royal Pages or other Macedonians who accompanied Perseus to Samothrace and later took advantage of the Roman offer. The attested presence of this family in Macedonia in the period after the fall of the monarchy does not, therefore, cause any real difficulty. It is among the ironies of history that descendants of Pyrrhus should have continued to reside in Macedonia over a century after the Antigonid royal house itself had been deported to Italy.

The epigraphic evidence discussed in this study does, I submit, create the very strong presumption, admittedly not complete proof, that the ancient site at Makriyalos was in fact Pydna. Makriyalos and its immediate environs deserve serious investigation by competent archaeologists. Only further archaeological and epigraphic finds can determine whether the ancient site was Pydna.⁴³ If, as is probable, the tomb of Olympias was one of the characteristic underground Macedonian chamber tombs,⁴⁴ it may still exist and await discovery.

CHARLES EDSON

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

⁴² Livy, XLV, 6, 7-9: *pueri regii apud Macedonas vocabantur principum liberi ad ministerium electi regis* (cf. Arrian, *Anab.*, IV, 13, 1; Curtius, VIII, 6, 2-6); *ea cohors persecuta regem fugientem ne tum quidem abscedebat, donec iussu Cn. Octavi pronuntiatum est per praeconem regios pueros Macedonasque alios, qui Samothracae essent, si transirent ad Romanos, incolumitatem libertatemque et sua omnia servaturos, <quae> aut secum haberent aut in Macedonia reliquissent. ad hanc vocem transitio omnium facta est, nominaque dabant ad C. Postumium tribunum militum.*

⁴³ To the best of my knowledge Makriyalos has never been the subject of any real archaeological investigation. Residents of the village informed me that antiquities were frequently found there. In addition to the first inscription published above, I also discovered in the village a badly damaged late Hellenistic grave stone with relief and two inscribed fragments of a Roman sarcophagus, both in private houses. The limited time at my disposal made it impossible for me to examine the village thoroughly.

⁴⁴ For the new "Macedonian" chamber tombs at Sedhes, Tsayesi and, in particular, Palatitsa see *B.C.H.*, LXIII, 1939, pp. 315-16.



C. EDSON: THE TOMB OF OLYMPIAS



I. G., II², 3899



I. G., II², 3897, 1-3



I. G., II², 3897, 4-6

I. G., II², 3897, 7-9



Agora I 5485



I. G., II², 3513, 1-7

A. E. RAUBITSCHK: PHAIROS AND HIS ROMAN PUPILS