

VOJISLAV SARAKINSKI

Faculty of Philosophy

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University

Skopje

UDC: 904:94(38:381)

MUSINGS ON THE FACTS AND PURPOSE OF RHAIKELOS

Abstract: The story of the foundation of Rhaikilos presents a rather problematic piece of history, with a marginal narrative based on sources removed from the actual event by several centuries. The chronology of the tyrannies and exiles of Peisistratos, as well as the possible location of the city, are issues which have been much discussed in modern scholarship. It is now almost certain that Rhaikilos was founded at what is now Peraia near Thessaloniki in 556 BC; however, numerous problems persist. I am of the opinion that Peisistratos actually helped in establishing an Eretrian emporium on the western coast of Chalkidike, the only resource that Eretria could get from there – and for which it was worthwhile to set up a specialised emporium on the coast – being timber from close-by Mt. Kissos. In addition, I argue that king Alketas was not even close to Rhaikilos to be in a state to allow for, or even to facilitate the establishment of a settlement, so that it is entirely possible that the establishment of Rhaikilos took place without the help, approval, participation or collaboration, maybe even without the knowledge of Macedon.

1. *The sources.* – The story of the second exile of Peisistratos, scarcely documented in the ancient tradition, is commenced by Aristotle, who reports that Peisistratos set off to the northern coast of the Aegean with the intention of amassing the means necessary to regain his authority in Athens:

[...] μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα [ώς] ἔξεπεσε τὸ δεύτερον, ἔτει μάλιστα ἔβδομῷ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον, (οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατέσχεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τῇ τοῦ Μεγακλέους θυγατρὶ συγγίγνεσθαι, φοβηθεὶς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς στάσεις ὑπεξῆλθεν). καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συνώκισε περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται Ραίκηλος, ἔκειθεν δὲ παρῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς περὶ Πάγγαιον τόπους, ὅθεν χρηματισάμενος καὶ στρατιώτας μισθωσάμενος, ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἐρέτριαν ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει τό<τε> πρῶτον ἀνασώσασθαι βίᾳ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχίρει [...]¹

¹ Arist. *Ath. pol.* 15.1-3.

Aristotle's reference is one of the very rare documented facts concerning the existence of a settlement called Rhaikelos. This toponym is made mention of on only three more occasions – the first being the poem *Alexandra* (or *Kassandra*) by Lycophron from Chalkis, in which Aeneas, the mythical founder of Aineia, is mentioned as having spent time in Rhaikelos as he makes his way to Italy:

ὅς πρῶτα μὲν Ῥαίκηλον οίκησει μολῶν | Κισσοῦ παρ' αἴπὺν πρῶνα καὶ Λαφυστίας | κερασφόρους γυναῖκας. ἐκ δ' Ἀλμωπίας | παλιμπλανήτην δέξεται Τυρσηνία | Λιγγεύς τε θερμῶν ρεῖθρον ἐκβράσσων ποτῶν, | καὶ Πīσ' Ἀγύλλης θ' αἱ πολύρρηνοι νάπαι.²

The next time Rhaikelos is mentioned is in the work of the grammarian and rhetorician Aelius Herodianus:

“Ολβηλος πόλις Μακεδονίας. Βάλακρος Μακεδονικῶν ... Ῥάκηλος πόλις Μακεδονίας.”³

Then, it appears in the *Ethnica* of Stephanus of Byzantium:

<Ῥάκηλος,> πόλις Μακεδονίας. τὸ ἔθνικὸν Ῥακήλιος.⁴

And, finally, in Tzetzes' scholia to Lycophron:

‘Υστερον δέ, τῆς Τροίας πορθουμένης [...] αύτὸς ὁ Αίνειας [...] οίκει πρῶτον περὶ Ῥαίκηλον καὶ Ἀλμωνίαν, πόλεις Μακεδονίας, πλησίον Κισσοῦ ὄρους κειμένας. Τὸ δὲ Ῥαίκηλον μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τούτου Αἴνος ἐκλήθη.⁵

There is no need to underscore the fact that we are confronted with a story in which the narrative is marginal. A cursory glance over the fragments is quite sufficient, so as to allow us to note several important details: (1) the authors are removed from the event they are describing from two (Aristotle) to fifteen centuries (Tzetzes); (2) only one of the preserved references, the one by Aristotle, is actually associated with Peisistratos; (3) all other instances in which Rhaikelos makes an appearance are essentially related to the text of Lycophron, who recounts Aeneas' escape from Troy; (4) it is highly probable that all references of Rhaikelos in the context of Aeneas are fundamentally erroneous, being a result of a later association of Rhaikelos with Aineia, which we

² Lycoph. *Alex.* 1236-1241.

³ Ael. Herod. *De pros.* 3.1.162.3 (Lentz)

⁴ Steph. Byz. 543.2

⁵ Tzetz. *Schol. Lycophr.* v. 1232, p. 970 (Müller). On Almonia/Almopia, see Ξυδοπούλος, I. (2011): “Οι αρχαίοι Ἀλμωπεῖς”, in *Η Ἐδεσσα καὶ η περιοχή της. Ιστορία-Αρχαιολογία-Πολιτισμός*. Επιστημονική Δημερίδα, 109-114.

shall look into more detail later;⁶ (5) bearing all this in mind, in terms of time, context and meaning, the information Aristotle presents is, in a manner, a *hapax*.

Inarguably, there is a sound explanation as to why the state of our sources is what it is, despite the fact that Peisistratos is a relatively well-known character in the history of archaic Greece. But we must first be clear on the fact that the Persian Wars represent not the rule, but rather the exception in the historiography of ancient Greece. The Persian Wars happen to be a prime example of an event extensively and thoroughly presented in ancient historiography, hence subjected to meticulous and minute study in modern scholarship; on the other hand, numerous other wars are presented within a wider and more general narrative, or are described as marginal elements in the context of a completely different process or occurrence.⁷ A notable example of this is the manner in which Herodotus presents the story of the Peisistratidae in Athens, or the stories of Histiaios and Aristagoras – as of secondary importance to the main narrative which deals with Persian imperialism, a mere piece of the mosaic in the narrative of the expansion of Persian control and authority to the West. Herodotus dedicates a single logos to the Peisistratidae,⁸ and even there with the main purpose of explaining the reason they were not chosen as Lydian allies in 546 BC.⁹ They reappear with a marginal role in the story of the Alcmaeonidae and their ascent to power in Athens, once again as a passing reference, while others attempt to help them resume their authority; we also get to see Hippias as an old man, but only in a segment of the events taking place during the Battle of Marathon.¹⁰ Rhaikelos has never been in the focus in any of these events, and it may be for this very reason that it has never been mentioned by Herodotus.

⁶ Cf. I. Βοκοτοπούλου, “Η υδρία της Ανείας”, *ΑΜΗΤΟΣ. Τιμητικός τόμος στον καθηγητή Μ. Ανδρόνικο Ι*, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1987, 157; F. Papazoglou, *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*, Suppléments au *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 16, École française d'Athènes, 1988, 418.

⁷ See J. K. Davies, “The historiography of Archaic Greece”, in K. Raablaub & H. Van Wees (eds.), *A companion to Archaic Greece*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, 8-9. One could say that the same applies to prosopography: it is possible to write a biographical study of several characters from the classical and post-classical period, but of hardly any political figure from the archaic period. It is for this very reason that the tyrants of archaic Greece are often treated together in modern-day scholarship.

⁸ Hdt. 1.59-64.

⁹ C. Dewald, “Form and Content: The Question of Tyranny in Herodotus”, in Kathryn A. Morgan (ed.), *Popular tyranny: sovereignty and its discontents in ancient Greece*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003, 45.

¹⁰ The Alcmaeonidae: Hdt. 5.62–65, 70, 76, 90; Sparta: 5.93; the Persians: 5.96, 6.94, 7.6; Hippias: 6.107.

The next issue is that, in the time of Peisistratos, Athens still nurtures oral history; consequently, the earliest historiographers writing about the old tyranny depended on oral tradition, in which several parallel versions can exist. This way of recollecting events may decently cover a period of two or three generations – not even an entire century – while the information on more distant events tends to be rare, intermittent, anecdotal, and more legendary than historical in character. The period of the old tyranny – a century before Herodotus was born – stands on the bare limit of historical verification and reliability; what Herodotus recounts on the tyrants needs to be taken with a healthy dose of scepticism, and this goes without saying for authors from later times. Inarguably, a historical tradition existed in Athens reaching as far back to at least the period of the third tyranny of Peisistratos, but that in itself does not mean that the narrative is historically reliable. If we bear in mind the influence of later events and political experiences, the differing desires, needs and possibilities of later-day Athens, as well as the political filters through which these had to pass without fail, it becomes evident that around the mid- and late-fifth century BC in Athens there was not one, but rather several parallel, oft times contradicting traditions at play.¹¹ This will undoubtedly reflect on the question of the time, and especially on the purpose of the Rhaiklos settlement.

2. *The time.* – The chronology of the tyrannies and exiles of Peisistratos is an issue which has been much discussed. It is indeed difficult to resolve the chronology as, even though there is a general narrative which matches up in more than one source, the details differ not only from source to source, but also within the same source.¹² Sufficient analyses and possible solutions have been offered in modern scholarship,¹³ thus there is no need to take

¹¹ See K. Raaflaub, “Stick and glue. The function of tyranny in fifth-century Athenian democracy” Kathryn A. Morgan (ed.), *Popular tyranny: sovereignty and its discontents in ancient Greece*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003, 60 sqq.

¹² Hdt. 1.59-64, 5.94.; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 14.1-17.4. Here, too, I feel that the basis of the whole story not only lies in the oral tradition, but that it is possible to have two, if not more, parallel traditions.

¹³ J. E. Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens: a Revised Text with an Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes, Testimonia and Indices*, London: Macmillan and co., 1893, pp. 57-68; K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, I.2, *Die Zeit vor den Perserkriegen*, Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, p. 292; F. E. Adcock, “The Exiles of Peisistratus”, *The Classical Quarterly* 18.3/4, 1924, 174-181; *Idem*, “Athens under the tyrants”, in *The Cambridge Ancient History vol. IV, The Persian Empire in the West*, Cambridge University Press, 1926, 65; F. Jacoby, *Athis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford University Press, 1949, 152-196; M. Lang, “The Generation of Peisistratus”, *The American Journal of Philology* 75.1, 59-73; H. Berve, *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, C. H. Beck, München, 1967, 41-62; J. G. F. Hind, “The 'Tyrannis' and the Exiles of Pisistratus”, *The Classical*

up space in terms of re-examining the correlation of the sources. This issue does, however, require that a stand of some sort be taken and that some of these solutions are accepted, since it may be possible that the purpose of Rhaikelos depends precisely on the chronological context in which the whole story is set.

That the general narrative should commence in 560 BC is undisputed.¹⁴ What is a matter of dispute is the actual duration of the first tyranny,¹⁵ which serves to entangle the chronology of both the first exile and the second tyranny of Peisistratus. Fundamentally, I consider most acceptable one of the earliest solutions offered, that by Adcock, which I shall briefly deal with. Fixed dates in the narrative are the date of Peisistratos' decease, the duration of the reign of his son Hippias, and the fall of the tyranny following the Spartan intervention. Peisistratos died in 528/7,¹⁶ and his son Hippias remained in power for 17 years, up to 511/10, which marks the year he left Athens. Both Herodotus and Aristotle claim that the tyranny imposed by Peisistratos lasted for 36 years.¹⁷ I prefer to have this number serve as an orientation as regards the uninterrupted rule of the Peisistratidae, starting from the battle of Pallene;¹⁸ it is from that moment that the third and last tyranny of Peisistratos and the reign of Hippias last a total of 36 years.

There is also an alternative interpretation to this, in which this number is taken to refer to the total number of years of Peisistratos' reign – all three tyrannies added together – plus the years under the reign of his son. This calculation corresponds to various

Quarterly, New Series, 24.1, 1-18; B. M. Lavelle, *Fame, Money and Power. The Rise of Peisistratos and “Democratic” Tyranny at Athens*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005, 210-219; K. G. Walker, *Archaic Eretria: A Political and Social History from the Earliest Times to 490 BC*, Routledge, 2004; M. F. Olivieri, *La politica internazionale dei tiranni nella Grecia arcaica: il caso di Atene*, Tesi di dottorato, Università degli Studi di Padova, Scuola di Dottorato in Scienze Storiche, indirizzo Storia, ciclo XXIV, 2012, 61.

¹⁴ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 14.1; Id., *Pol.* 5.12 (1315b); *FGrHist* 239 A 40; Plut. *Sol.* 32.3. A Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants*, London: Prometheus Books, 1956, 100 sqq.

¹⁵ Pisistratus' first tyranny lasted from a few months (P. J. Rhodes) to a few years (A. Andrewes). Cf. V. Gouschin, “Pisistratus' Leadership in A.P. 13.4 and the Establishment of the Tyranny of 561/60 B.C.”, *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 49.1 (1999), 14-23.

¹⁶ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 17.1.

¹⁷ Hdt. 5.65; Aristot. *Pol.* 5.12 (1315b).

¹⁸ Adcock (1924), 176-181; Jacoby (1949), 188-196; N. G. L. Hammond, “Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.”, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 4 (1955), 371-411, 389; Andrewes (1956), 100-107; C. W. Th. Eliot, “Where did the Alcmaeonidae live?”, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 16 (1967), 282 sqq; Lavelle (2005), 209-218.

dates mentioned by Aristotle, but it brings the date of the Battle of Pallene and the beginning of the third tyranny down to just a few years before the death of Peisistratos.¹⁹ This does not seem possible, since it does not correspond to the historical and political weight of the battle of Pallene; its date is near impossible to be uncertain, as it represents a reference point even in the oral tradition of Athens, also serving as a fixed point in terms of both prior and later events.²⁰ The sources are very explicit in pointing out that Peisistratos' first two tyrannies were short-lived and unstable, which makes them objectionable as reference points; on the other hand, both Aristotle and Herodotus concur that the second exile, which ended with the battle of Pallene, lasted for 10 years.²¹ Thus, according to this simple calculation, Peisistratos' second exile started in 556 BC.

3. *The place.* – In their attempt to connect up the events at Rhaikulos with a definite location, a great number of scholars have offered wide-ranging, oft-times contradictory hypotheses;²² these, however, can all be fundamentally reduced to three general lines of reasoning.

According to the first one, Rhaikulos is the name not of a city, but of an area; as such, Peisistratos did not establish a settlement called Rhaikulos, but was rather *oikistes* of the well-known Eretrian colony of Dikaia. This hypothesis is based on the view that Dikaia was located close to modern-day Ayia Paraskevi;²³ archaeological excavations, as well as epigraphic and numismatic sources, have in the meantime made it clear that Dikaia should be located at modern-day Nea Kallikratia,²⁴ hence, the the association of Rhaikulos with Dikaia should be rejected.

¹⁹ G. V. Sumner, “Notes on Chronological Problems in the Aristotelian Athenian Politeia”, *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, 11.1, 1961, 38 sqq..

²⁰ Cf. Olivieri (2012), 62-63.

²¹ Hdt. 1.62; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 15.2.

²² Π. Νίγδελης, “Αναζητώντας την αρχαία Ραίκηλο. Αριστοτέλους, Αθηναίων Πολιτεία 15.2 και μία νέα επιγραφή από την Περαία της Θεσσαλονίκης”, *Τεκμήρια* 10 (2011), 103-117, offers a most detailed overview of the articulated views, assumptions and conjectures.

²³ C. Edson, “Notes on the Thracian Phoros”, *Classical Philology* 42.2 (1947), 89; D. Viviers, “Pisistratus' settlement on the Thermaic Gulf: a connection with Eretria colonization”, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107 (1987), 193-195; Walker (2004), 149-150.

²⁴ On the process of excavation and the material finds, I would recommend consulting the series of articles: Μπιλούκα, Α., Βασιλείου, Σ. & Γραικός, Ι., “Αρχαιολογικές μαρτυρίες από τη Ν. Καλλικράτεια Χαλκιδικής”, *To Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στη Μακεδονία και στη Θράκη* 14, 2000, 299-310; Μπιλούκα, Α., & Γραικός, Ι., “Νέα Καλλικράτεια 2002. Η ανασκαφική έρευνα στον αρχαίο οικισμό”, *To*

The second general assumption states that Rhaikelos is, in fact, the name Peisistratos gave to Aineia, and that following Peisistratos' departure, Rhaikelos either reclaimed its previous name,²⁵ or assimilated itself into the 'real' Aineia, which must have been located in the immediate proximity.²⁶ This claim is extremely delicate, as there is no archaeological evidence, nor any epigraphic or numismatic proof which supports it; it is, rather, an exhibition in itself, stemming exclusively from the scholiasts of *Lycophron*.

In his comments on *Lycophron*, Theon refers to this town as Aineias: "After the fall of Troy, Aeneas went to Thrace and founded the city Aineias, where he buried his father"; Eustathius adds: "Ainos is a city that *Lycophron* calls Rhaikelos",²⁷ while Tzetzes rounds off the comments with a note concerning verse 1232, that "The city of Rhaikelos changed its name to Ainos, in honour of Aeneas."²⁸ The problem lies in the fact that there were two cities whose names were similar to the name of the Trojan hero Aeneas: Ainos (modern-day Enez)²⁹ on the coast of the river Hebros in Thrace, and Aineia (modern-day Nea Mihaniona)³⁰ on the coast of the Thermaic gulf. The scholiasts make use of numerous variations of their names, not clarifying distinctly where Aeneas dwelt and which city should be associated with Rhaikelos.³¹

Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στη Μακεδονία και στη Θράκη 16, 2002, 375-384; Idem, "Νέα Καλλικράτεια 2003. Η σωστική ανασκαφική έρευνα στον αρχαίο οικισμό", *To Arχαιολογικό Έργο στη Μακεδονία και στη Θράκη* 17, 2003, 379-389. The epigraphical evidence is covered in E. Βουτυράς & K. Σισμανίδης, "Δικαιοπολιτών Συναλλαγαί. Μία νέα επιγραφή από τη Δίκαια, αποικία της Ερέτριας", *Αρχαία Μακεδονία* VII, Θεσσαλονίκη 2007, (non *vidi*), *apud* Νίγδελης (2011); on the numismatical evidence, *cf.* the catalogue in Χρ. Γκατζόλης, *Η κυκλοφορία των χάλκινων νομίσματος στη Μακεδονία (5ος-1ος αι. π.Χ.)* διδ. διατριβή, *ined.*, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Θεσσαλονίκη, 483 sqq.

²⁵ J. W. Cole, "Peisistratus on the Strymon", *Greece & Rome* 22.1 (1975), 42-44.

²⁶ Edson (1947), 87-91.

²⁷ *Comment. ad Od.* 2.84.

²⁸ See A. B. Мосолкин, „Исторический комментарий к поэме «Александра» Ликуфона (стт. 1226-1280)“, *Античный мир и археология* вып. 13, Саратов, 2009, 398-418.

²⁹ Hom. 4.519 sqq. [cf. Serv. *Aen.* 3.16]; Strab. VII fr. 51, 58; Ps.-Scyl. 67; Antiph. *De caede Her.* 20 sqq.; Thuc. 4.28; Ps.-Scymn. 696; Steph. Byz., s.v.; Athen. 8.44.4.

³⁰ Hdt. 7.123; Ps.-Scymn. 627 sqq.; Ps.-Scyl. 66; Strabo 7 fr. 21; Dion. Hal. 1.49; Steph. Byz., s.v.; Liv. 44.10.7; 45.30.4. Cf. G. Hirschfeld, "Aineia", *RE* 1894. Bd. 1. Sp. 1009-1010; Talbert (1985), 16.

³¹ As Νίγδελης (2011) points out, this view is based not only on the mix-up between Aineia and Ainos in our sources, but also on a spurious identification of

Were we to try to seek the first source of this confusion, I would have to say that the key character would have to be Theon, a commentator from the first century BC,³² the first to connect Rhaikulos with Ainos in Thrace instead of Aineia in Macedonia. Mosolkin is most probably right in locating the source of the confusion in the episode with the funeral of Polydorus, which Virgil sets in Macedonia, and Pliny in Thessaly;³³ what is more interesting is that Theon makes no mention of Thrace whatsoever, while it is Tzetzes who completes the muddle, in that he assumes that Theon made a mistake with Thessaly and throws Thrace into the story. In any case, it is obvious that the entire *galimathias* concerning the scholia of Lycophron not only proves to be unhelpful in unravelling the historical tradition, but it also serves to further complicate matters; the wisest course of action would be to completely disregard it in the discussions on the location of Rhaikulos, since it is nothing more than an improvisation without any grounds, either in historical memory, or in the real state of affairs.³⁴

The third – and in all probability the most accurate – hypothesis is that Rhaikulos was an independent settlement, a stronghold or a city, which should in any case be sought on the east coast of the Thermaic gulf. It has been set in different locations – on cape Megalo Karabournou itself or in its immediate proximity,³⁵ in the immediate neighbourhood of Aineia,³⁶ in modern-day Kalamaria,³⁷ Peraia,³⁸ Sedes,³⁹ or generally on the slopes of Mount

Kissos with Megalo Karabournou instead of Chortiatis in order to explain and/or justify the blunder: see B. D. Meritt et al., *The Athenian Tribute Lists I*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939, 465 and Lavelle (2005), 223; cf. Edson (1947), as well as P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, 207. Another scholar who identifies Rhaikulos with Aineia is R. J. A. Talbert, *Atlas of Classical History*, London: Croom Helm, 1985, (16 and 32).

³² C. Wendel, “Theon (9)” *RE* 1934; N. G. Wilson, “Theon (1)”, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, 1996.

³³ Cf. *Aen.* 3.13.68; *NH* 4.43.

³⁴ As opposed to the stories about Aeneas, it is well-documented that Ainos is a colony of Mytilene; v. Ephor. fr. 39, cf. Hansen & Nielsen (2004), no. 641.

³⁵ Edson (1947), 91; M. Zahrnt, *Olynth und die Chalkidier. Untersuchungen zur Staatenbildung auf der chalkidischen Halbinsel im 5. und 4. Jht.*, München: C. H. Beck, 1971, 218–219; Lavelle (2005), 227.

³⁶ Cole (1975), 43; cf. Rhodes (1981), 207.

³⁷ S. Casson, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria: Their relations to Greece from the earliest times down to the time of Philip, son of Amyntas*, Oxford University Press, 1926, 82–83.

³⁸ M. Tiverios, “Greek colonisation of the northern Aegean”, in. G. R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas II*, Brill, 2008, 26.

Kissos (modern-day Hortiatis). Lengthy discussions have been held as regards the status of Rhaikelos – whether it was a stronghold, a village, an independent polis, or simply a wider toponym. In any case, the latest excavations by the Greek archaeologists indicate that this issue should be finally resolved, thanks to a recently published inscription on a column found in the near vicinity of modern-day Peraia, about 20 km from Thessaloniki.⁴⁰ The archaeological authorities had been aware of the existence of this inscription, discovered in a field belonging to a local man, since 1926, and it had been taken to the Museum in Thessaloniki as early as 1961. It is completely understandable that one might wonder how much ink might have been saved, had its existence been made public right after its discovery.

In brief, the inscription contains the following text: Αρτεμιδει Ρηχειλία | εκ των εκείνης αχινών | ν ν επί ιερήν ν ν | 4 Ελιανής Μαντως | επιμελητού Γ(αῖον) 'Οϋλίου | τόν ναόν, ἔτους ζισ' | σεβαστού του και γλτ' | 8 μηνός Ι [ca. 11]. As with all other inscriptions from this region, this inscription is dated in two ways – 217th of the era of Actium and 333rd of the Macedonian era, which translates to 185/6 AD. The discovery of this inscribed column presents undisputed proof that Rhaikelos was located in the area surrounding modern-day Peraia; Nigdelis makes mention of three other material finds which may be used to finally close this issue, and there is no need to deal with them here. A single object of interest may remain the form of the name of the city, which had obviously by that time evolved into the form *Rhekheilos*;⁴¹ even at first glance, it is easy to note the expected phonetic development of the diphthong and the long closed /e/, to the manner of their notation. Nigdelis expresses a slight caution and reservation, which, in my opinion, is not so crucial.

This discovery is supported by additional circumstances. Firstly, there are definite points in the neighbouring area containing traces of human settlement as far back as prehistoric times, which had been continuously populated up to the times when Aristotle mentions Rhaikelos. The two most notable ones are found to the northeast of Peraia, near Platia Toumba and in Plagiari.⁴²

³⁹ N. G. L. Hammond & G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, volume II, 550-336 B.C., Oxford, 1979, 68 n. 2.

⁴⁰ Νίγδελης (2011).

⁴¹ Νίγδελης (2011) also lists epigraphic examples from the IG that seem to corroborate this claim, building on A. Panayotou, *La langue des inscriptions grecques de Macédoine (IVe s. A.C. - VIIe s. P.C.)*, Thèse de doctorat en Sciences du langage sous la direction de Claude Brixhe, Nancy, 1990, ined. (*non vidi*). .

⁴² Cf. the detailed bibliographical references and the list of archaeological reports supplied by Νίγδελης (2011).

On the other hand, the Athenian presence is made evident through the existence of a pottery workshop at the head of the Thermaic Gulf which is dated to the mid-sixth century BC, i.e. at the very time when Peisistratos allegedly makes his appearance there.⁴³ Finally, Rhaikelos, Kissos (modern-day Hortiatis)⁴⁴ and Dikaia have yielded large and impressive necropoleis from the Archaic and Classical period.⁴⁵

As a matter of equal importance, this inscription serves to prove that both the name and the settlement of Rhaikelos continued to exist five centuries after the time of Aristotle, and almost seven centuries after it was founded by Peisistratos – which throws a shadow of doubt over the story that Rhaikelos had been abandoned very quickly after Peisistratos had left, as a result of having been exclusively tied to his interests. There is obviously more to the story than meets the eye.

The means. – Once he had been exiled from Athens, Peisistratos fled to Eretria, where he expected to receive significant support. For reasons of its own, Eretria warmly welcomed him, his family, and his followers. This was not the last time Eretria would get directly involved in the internal politics of Athens. Now would be a good time to ask who took advantage of whom, and who helped whom – but, let us first take a look at the reason why it was Eretria itself.

Regardless of the fact whether Peisistratos did or did not have lengthy family ties with Eretria (and in all probability he did, as did the Alcmaeonidae and the Gephyraioi), he was in any case well-versed in how things stood in Eretria. His town of birth, Brauron,⁴⁶ was located right next to the important harbour Prasiai,

⁴³ Tiverios (2008), 26; Cf. B. Σαρπανίδη, *Εισαγμένη και εγχώρια κεραμική στο βορειοελλαδικό χώρο: η περίπτωση της Σίνδου, διατριβή (ined.)*, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Θεσσαλονίκη, 2012, 11 sqq.

⁴⁴ P. Flensted Jensen, “Thrace from Axios to Strymon”, in M. H. Hansen & T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation, Oxford University Press, 2004, 810-853; cf. Eadem, “Some Problems in Polis Identification in the Chalkidic Peninsula”, in T. H. Nielsen (ed.), *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Historia Einzelschriften 117, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997, 117-128.

⁴⁵ See K. Λ. Σιμανίδης, “Το αρχαϊκό νεκροταφείο της Αγίας Παρασκευής Θεσσαλονίκης. Πρώτη παρουσίαση και πρώτες εκτιμήσεις”, in ΑΜΗΤΟΣ, *τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μανόλη Ανδρόνικο*, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1987, 787-803.

⁴⁶ Cf. A. French, “The Party of Peisistratos”, *Greece & Rome* 6.1, 1959, 45-57; for the general picture, Idem, *The Growth of the Athenian Economy*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964, Ch. 1-3.

right opposite of Euboia. Besides that, it was the centre of an ancient cult of Artemis Iphigeneia, closely connected to Artemis Amarysia, the goddess that was celebrated in Amarinthos on Euboia.⁴⁷ The cult centres of Artemis were located one next to the other along the eastern and northern coast of Attica, opposite of Euboia, something which hints at cult ties existing between the Eretrian *chora* and the coast on the other side. Peisistratos, thus, hailed from a region which, at that time, held great commercial significance for Athens, whose trade routes were under direct Eretrian economic control, and which had prehistoric religious, linguistic and tribal ties with Euboia, and especially with the area surrounding Eretria.⁴⁸

In order to determine the role of the actors in this specific *callida iunctura*, we need to make a decision concerning one of the two opinions on the state of the Athenian economy in the period immediately preceding the events with Peisistratos. On one hand, Forrest writes about a thirty-year-long economic boom immediately preceding Peisistratos, a period of prosperity owing to the new commercial class, politically officialised only after Peisistratos took the control in Athens; this kind of connection between Peisistratos and Athenian economic expansion would make the exiled tyrant a strong independent player, and Eretria subject to his political influence.⁴⁹ Holladay, however, disagrees with this; he submits proof as regards the relative lack of economic strength of Athens at that time and explicitly claims that, at this time, Athens was no maritime or commercial power whatsoever,⁵⁰ adding that Athenian merchandise must have been transported with the help of a foreign commercial fleet.⁵¹

Eretrian activity in the transport and placement of goods, as well as in overseeing the trade routes through the straits to the north, is a clear indication as regards the question whose fleet could transport the Athenian exports:⁵² from the harbour Prasiai, quite active at that time, the only commercial fleet able and willing to do so was the Eretrian one. A further argument to this is the question concerning who was first responsible for the establishment and the upkeep of the trade routes. Hammond and Walker do

⁴⁷ Walker (2004), 29 sqq., esp. 32–38.

⁴⁸ *Idem*, 180.

⁴⁹ W. G. Forrest, *The Emergence of Greek Democracy*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1966, 176–178.

⁵⁰ J. Holladay, “The followers of Peisistratus”, *Greece & Rome* 24 (1977), 42; 47–52.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 48.

⁵² Walker (2004), 181.

well to note that, despite the traditional belief that Chalkis was the first city to colonise to the north, the geographical evidence does not support this claim. Not only are the Pierian coast and Pallene – where Eretrian colonies are dominant – the first locations for disembarkment, but they are also the most fertile regions in all of Chalkidike and its surrounding area. Athos is entirely mountainous; while Sithonia holds several smaller plains, it is nevertheless not a very attractive location for non-reliant, self-sufficient colonies. Chalkis obviously had to be satisfied with a second-place position, and colonise in places which were available at the time.⁵³

The last issue we need to deal with is the nature of these ties. Being deeply involved in the commercial class of Athens, Peisistratos certainly had links with the commercial oligarchy that ruled Eretria. The long-standing involvement of Eretria in sea transport and land-based commerce in central Greece positively attests that a number of traders in Athens had commercial ties with Eretrians, especially with those who were in power. Was the commercial cooperation that existed between Athens and Eretria the result of interpersonal relations, or was it the opposite – was Peisistratos later welcomed and supported by the Eretrians as a result of inter-state relations? In other words, was the connection made at individual, or at communal level?

Some scholars claim that commerce can never be used as an explanation for the policies of archaic Greek poleis;⁵⁴ others allege that it does not reveal much anyhow, as archaic Greek poleis had no concept of long-term, predictive commercial planning.⁵⁵ Though it does not seem wise to be so rigid in exclusion, they are nevertheless right to a certain point. In all probability, commerce was not pre-planned in nature, and could not be used to explain the policies of the polis at all times, but one can easily understand the reasoning behind the existence of foreign commercial routes

⁵³ N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia*, volume I, Historical Geography and Prehistory, Oxford, 1972, 426. Cf. the list supplied by Walker (2004), 149–150: “The Eretrian colonies in the north Aegean (certain or possible) were: Methone, Pydna, Dion, Eion, Aloros, Aineia (Ainos), Mende, Sane (on Pallene), Skione, Apollonia (on the Thermaic Gulf), Therambos, Aige and Neapolis (on the Toronian Gulf coast of Pallene), Olophyxos, and Akrothooi (on Athos). Other likely Eretrian foundations were Kharadria, Palaion and Pharbelos. [...] Most other Eretrian colonies in the northern Aegean were merely emporia rather than poleis. Apart from their names, we know virtually nothing of most of them”.

⁵⁴ C. Starr, *The Origins of Greek Civilization*, London: Jonathan Cape, 1962, 347 sqq.

⁵⁵ J. Hasebroek, *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*, London, 1933 (non vidi), apud Walker (2004), 158 sqq.

and stable trade alliances among the aristocrats, who created policies at an individual level. The rulers and traders of archaic poleis were certainly aware of the conflict of commercial interests with a certain community, yet they were also clear as regards the possibility of working together without necessarily being competitive, on the basis of which they formed alliances. The colonies founded by commercial centres are proof that mother *poleis* had sent off colonists with certain commercial or political goals in mind; it would be naive to believe in anything different. The tyrants Periander and Thrasyboulos certainly shared similar interests and political aims, more important and set at a higher level than their friendship. Nevertheless, before 550 BC, the majority of the links that existed among the *poleis* were rather unstructured and personal, a kind of an alliance among certain families and individuals brought together by their wealth, social class, political influence and perspective.⁵⁶

Whatever the case may be, in 556 BC, Peisistratos received a warm welcome in Eretria. From their point of view, the Eretrians felt that a ruler of Athens in temporary exile, originating from the east coast of Attica, would be very receptive to their commercial interests, and would make a powerful ally against Chalkis.

4. *The purpose.* – The interests at play for both parties should serve as a warning that Peisistratos' northern activities are dealt with and portrayed rather loosely, and above all in a one-sided manner. The standard story exists that, while he was in the north, Peisistratos intended to amass a fortune largely through mining and trade of precious metals, and thus finance armed forces which would help him reclaim his authority in Athens.⁵⁷ However, to set the story up in this way, and then continue without a comprehensive analysis – or even evaluate it and reach the same conclusions again – means not to move any further from Herodotean methodology, a way of doing things open to criticism on all grounds imaginable.

It may be that one of Peisistratos' goals was indeed to explore the mineral wealth around Pangaion. What kind of exploration, however, would be possible from the western part of Chalkidike? Rhaikulos has no logical geographical link to Pangaion, and I fail to grasp the way it could be a part of the same plan. If he did depart for Rhaikulos first, Peisistratos should then have sailed another 300 km to the east around Pallene, Sithonia and Athos, where storms and shipwrecks – as the Persians were to learn later – were a common occurrence, and on top of that, the coasts of which

⁵⁶ Walker (2004), 158-159.

⁵⁷ Hdt. 1.64, 5.23. Cole (1975); B. Isaac, *The Greek settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian conquest*, Leiden, 1986, 13-43; Olivieri (2012), 76-80.

ch boasted numerous Chalkidian colonies. Otherwise, he might have decided to travel on land, in which case the distance to be covered would be three times shorter, but then he would have to pass areas on the organisation of which we have no information, most probably under the control of several local *basileis*, with no tangible network of communication – which was later also experienced by Alexander the Philhellene – and, once again, in the *hinterland* of Chalkidian colonies. It goes without saying that, if he was to obtain any kind of consistently frequent communication or transport, he would need much more serious logistical support.

Why is it then, that Peisistratos – if he did indeed spend most of his ten-year exile in the north – would put his loads with bullion in danger by sending them off towards Rhaikelos, an intermediate destination, and would then organise from scratch the transport to Eretria, his final base, from which he finally moved to Attica?⁵⁸ It is highly improbable that, having been exiled, this Athenian (at a time before Athens became any kind of a maritime power) owned his own fleet of ships of some note, which he might have made use of. As we noted earlier, the ships were almost certainly Eretrian, as Peisistratos did not have any particular choice in terms of who and what he would use, nor could he depend on anyone other than Eretria. If he sought to import bullion to Eretria – and if the hypotheses of Hammond and Walker are accurate – there is the possibility that he could have achieved that in Skabala, a settlement in the close vicinity of Pangaeon.⁵⁹ Ultimately, he neither organised things on his own, nor did he do so without any logistical support from his own men in Euboea – such as Hippias, who managed Peisistratos' means and followers; there are also those of the opinion that the tyrant himself did not spend most of his ten years in exile in the north, but rather in Eretria.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Xydopoulos ("Anthemus and Hippias: The Policy of Amyntas I", *Illinois Classical Studies* 37, 2012, 23) does not find any of this suspicious, claiming that "Rhaeculus had been used as Pisistratus' base for his activities in the lower areas of the Strymon River and around Mt. Pangaeus, where there were gold- and silver-mines that were exploited by the exiled Athenian. Therefore, Pisistratus' influence in the area would have been substantial."

⁵⁹ Walker (2004), 183, drawing on St. Byz., s.v., as well as N. G. L. HAMMOND, "Illyris, Epirus and Macedonia", in *The Cambridge Ancient History* vol. III.3, *The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.*, Cambridge University Press, 1982, 650 sqq. However, one has to keep in mind D. W. Bradeen (*The Chalcidians in Thrace*, *The American Journal of Philology* 73.4 (1952), 356–380), who presumes Skabala was not an Eretrian, but rather a Chalkidian colony.

⁶⁰ See Walker (2004), 183–4: "How are we to interpret in Ath. pol. 15, 2? Could it mean that he returned 'again' or 'afterwards' to Eretria from the north? Such is my opinion and that of e.g. Cole (1975). But it may simply 'mark this peri-

If this is the case, then the real source of our problem becomes evident: we are still implying that Peisistratos (1) set off to establish Rhaikelos and (2) entered into the business of the mines of Pangaion within the framework of one and the same idea – and for this reason we automatically and unconsciously imply that those two things are not only connected, but even a part of one and the same plan of action. We leave the less-informed with the impression that those two places are located relatively close to one another, or that they belong to one and the same geographical or political scene in the north, a claim which has absolutely nothing to do with reality. Rhaikelos holds no meaning for a possible undertaking along the course of the Strymon and in the area of Pangaion, and I am of the opinion that the riddle may be solved only if we divide the main narrative and accept the fact that Rhaikelos and Pangaion represent two separate, different episodes linked with Peisistratos' activities in the north, which might not even have taken place one after another or successively, or might even have not occurred in a close time-frame.⁶¹

What needs to be answered, then, is what Peisistratos was doing at all in Rhaikelos, what possibilities he saw there, and how Rhaikelos would be of any benefit to him compared to what he was able to achieve around Pangaion. The answer must once again be sought in the circumstantial evidence – not the least in the behaviour of Hippias who, having been exiled from Athens, did not set off for Eretria, nor to Rhaikelos, but rather decided to make his way to Sigeion in the Troas. Now, Sigeion was an extra-territorial Athenian or, more likely at that time, a personal possession of the Peisistratidae in Asia Minor, over which Peisistratus

od as the latest in the A.p.'s series of intervals of time' (P. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian 'Athenaion Politeia'*, Oxford, 1981, 208), and thus it was only 'after' ten years that Peisistratos made his next attempt".

⁶¹ Let us not forget that the narrative concerning Peisistratos' second exile reveals only that he was in Eretria, then in Rhaikelos, then around Pangaion, then back in Eretria; I am not willing to base an entire reconstruction of events of a ten-year period merely on the words 'έκειθεν δὲ παρῆλθεν' by Aristotle, who writes two centuries later, and I feel that the author neither knew, nor could have known whether Peisistratos right after Rhaikelos – and from there – set sail towards Pangaion with no further preparations. His narrative is connected in such a manner not in the least as to why these events have only less than one paragraph devoted to them; it is entirely probable that some time had passed between the two episodes (and there was time aplenty), and were we to speculate, it is possible that once Rhaikelos had been established, Peisistratos returned to Eretria once again, and from there set sail to Pangaion – otherwise, with which followers, fleet, and finances, of which a major part should have remained in the settlement, did he set off towards Pangaion?

had appointed his son Hegesistratos as governor;⁶² apart from the fact that it was in all probability founded by an Athenian and populated by Athenian colonists on two occasions, Sigeion was a focal point of Athenian foreign policy in an area into which great amounts of funds were poured.⁶³ In brief, Sigeion was a place which boasted “the most suitable characteristics for a reformulation of a Panhellenic tradition to support and honour the Peisistratid clan”.⁶⁴ On the other hand, we have Rhaikelos – a place undeserving even a simple mention in the bulk of literary works before Aristotle.

The sources we have at our disposal, as well as the analysis above, create numerous additional problems: (1) Can we truly confirm that we are talking about a genuine polis – since Rhaikelos is termed a polis for the first time by Aelius Herodianus in the second century AD, at a time when this term referred to any organised settlement and had no connection whatsoever to the *pol-eis* of Peisistratos’ times? (2) Were we to put aside the pottery mentioned above – with no written traces about Rhaikelos even in Athenian sources, is there anything to support the idea that the settlement had a link to Athens, be it prior or successive? (3) Should we accept that the Rhaikelos episode and the Pangaion episode represent two separate events – is there a serious reason why the two episodes should be linked to Peisistratos’ desire to accumulate wealth? This is understandable for Pangaion, but is there any basis as to why it should be ascribed to the activities taking place in Rhaikelos? (4) Finally, the verb *synokise* is a clear indication that Peisistratos did not act on his own; there are scholars who explain the verb with the fact that there were local tribes in the settlement, or mention local Greek pre-existing settlements, or who claim that Peisistratos was a ‘co-founder’ together with his companions – but there is absolutely no need for this; can *synokise* truly refer to anyone else, other than the Eretrians?

⁶² Hdt. 5.94.1; cf. V. Parker, “Tyrants and Lawgivers”, in H. A. Shapiro (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*, Cambridge University Press, 2007, 31.

⁶³ On Physkon as the probable *oikistes*, see Strab. 13.1.38; Athenian control was contested by the Mytilenians in the early sixth century, but was consolidated under the Peisistratid tyrants (Hdt. 5.94.2). Under the leadership of Miltiades the Elder, several Athenian colonies in the area were either founded or refounded (Ps.-Skymnos 699–702). A century later, Sigeion was a member of the Delian League (IG I³ 263.IV.25, IG I³ 287.II.9).

⁶⁴ F. Condello, “Antono Aloni, *Da Pilo a Sigeo. Poemi cantori e scrivani al tempo dei Tiranni*, Alessandria (Edizioni dell’Orso) 2006”, recensione, *Eikasmos* 19, 2008, 511.

Applying the *lex parsimoniae* in this case should be enough to establish a sufficient basic framework of events, according to which Peisistratos actually helped (or just took part) in establishing an Eretrian emporium on the western coast of Chalkidike, and that is the one single version of the story that can come to grips with the previous notes and questions. If one must speculate on the need for this emporium, it is the surroundings themselves that dictate the answer. Euboea fundamentally lacks timber for shipbuilding; thus the only resource that Eretria could get from there – and for which it was worthwhile to set up a specialised emporium on the coast – was timber from close-by Kissos (modern-day Hortiatis), densely forested even today. The Eretrians had a very definite use for Rhaikulos, unlike Peisistratos and the Athenians; and in the general context of the events, it is now understandable why it was deemed too small and insignificant to merit longer mention in the sources.

5. *The implications.* – It has already been mentioned that, in the political context of archaic Greece, the bearers of external political activity were powerful individuals, most often tyrants, who made use of pre-established connections and routes in order to set up a network of contacts and relations. They kept a careful watch over their own power and the interests of other aristocrats, in order to create a foreign policy which, in most instances, they implemented to the advantage and satisfaction of the whole community.⁶⁵ The application of this rule over the activities of Peisistratos – taking into consideration the successive economic and commercial history of Athens – steered numerous researchers into recognising the first contact between Athens and Macedon in the founding of Rhaikulos. The story about the first contact between Peisistratos and the Argeadae is tirelessly repeated, gaining a general placement in historiographical works even without a thorough analysis. As an illustration, here is how things are presented in both editions of the Cambridge Ancient History, published almost sixty years apart:

“On the northern coasts of the Aegean there was still room for a determined adventurer, and Peisistratus settled at Rhaeculus in the north-west of the Chalcidic peninsula. There he united the people of the countryside into a city and won the friendship of the

⁶⁵ M. Stahl & U. Walter, “Athens”, in K. Raaplaub & H. Van Wees (eds.), *A companion to Archaic Greece*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, 151 sqq., with added emphasis on the cultural rise of Athens and the newly-found economic prosperity; cf. M. Stahl, *Aristokraten und Tyrannen im archaischen Athen: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung, zur Sozialstruktur und zur Entstehung des Staates*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 1987, 201–228.

king of Macedon, so that when his dynasty was finally overthrown the shelter of Macedon was offered to his son Hippias...⁶⁶

“First Pisistratus settled a place named Rhaeculus on the Thermaic Gulf (the later Aenea; this implies good relations with Macedon, and Eretria with its important colonies could help him in this area). Then he went to the region of Mt Pangaeus, from which he got money to hire troops. Among the mercenaries were Argives, and Lygdamis, a Naxian volunteer, also brought money and men.”⁶⁷

Thus we are expected to believe that, at the time Rhaikelos was being founded, Peisistratos managed to establish contact and forge a friendship with Alketas, the ruler at Aegae. However, in order to consider such a reconstruction of events reliable, it would be good to know a great deal more than we currently do. The truth is, there is scarcely any information on the first five historical kings of the Argead dynasty⁶⁸ – not just because we do not have at our disposal any sources for the period prior to the early 5th century BC, but also due to the fact that the ties of the Argeadae with the Hellenic world would have been very rare. It is only on the eve of the Persian wars that we attain more information concerning Macedon and its rulers, Amyntas I and Alexander the Philhellene; these events, however, take place almost half a century after Peisistratos’ stay in Rhaikelos. In terms of Alketas, we only have the approximate years of his rule (cca. 573 to cca. 541 BC), as well as a single bit of later information of uncertain veracity – that he had been taken as a baby to the battlefield in a cradle,⁶⁹ due to the belief that victory on the battlefield could only be secured by the presence of the king of heavenly origin.⁷⁰ It seems most perplexing to me to be discussing hypothetical meetings, establishing political relations, even providing Athenian *proxenia* to the royal house of Macedon, without any written support, nor any material source to act as proof.

It is the material sources themselves that deal the final blow to this hypothesis. The 6th century BC was a decisive period for the affirmation of the territorial control of the Argeadae. Only in the previous century had their power been consolidated in Lower

⁶⁶ Adcock (1926), 64.

⁶⁷ A. Andrewes, “The tyranny of Pisistratus”, in *The Cambridge Ancient History* vol. III.3, *The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.*, Cambridge University Press, 1982, 398–399.

⁶⁸ Н. Проева, *Историја на Аргеадите*, Графотисок, Скопје, 2004, 144 sqq.

⁶⁹ Iust. 7.2.

⁷⁰ Проева (2004), 144; more on the characteristics of the royal rule in Macedonia, in Н. Проева, *Студии за античките Македонци*, Скопје, 1995, 55–58.

Macedonia; in the early 6th century, the eastern border of the Argeadae had settled on the bank of the Axios, the territory on the other bank being held by neighbouring, local autonomous houses. Even Amyntas' last years in power were marked by political and military conflicts with autonomous Macedonian tribes;⁷¹ we need not dwell further on the state of things during the time of Alketas. The most serious pressure on the state of the Argeadae was at that time exerted from the lower course of the Axios, where the resistance of the Paeonians, loud opponents of the central authority of the Argeadae, was felt. The Paeonian control in mid- and low Amphaxitis lasted until the arrival of the Persians; if not right away, then soon after these events the Argeadae managed to establish control over the former Paeonian territories, and the archaeological excavations provide evidence of Paeonian settlements gradually dying out. With the arrival of the Persians, the Paeonians found themselves between a rock and a hard place, being pressed by the Persians in the east and by their traditional enemies, the Argeadae, in the west. Once the Persians and the Argeadae had reached an agreement, moving northward, to territories that did not interest either, was not only a logical, but indeed the only option which could afford them continued political independence. It is impossible to reconstruct all the unknown elements in the Paeonian equation,⁷² however, the only solution here is to allow for the option that there was a conscious withdrawal by one or more large Paeonian groups to the north, along the Axios. Yet, we are not interested in the succeeding history and fate of the Paeonians, but rather in the cold facts which emerge from the situation as it was in 546 BC: namely, Alketas and the Argeadae were not even close to Rhaikulos to be in a state to allow for, or even to facilitate the establishment of a settlement; and if they so wished to set up relations and contacts, even through Eretria, they could have done so in a much simpler fashion in Methone or Pydna. Thus, it is entirely possible that the establishment of Rhaikulos took place without the help, approval or participation, maybe even without the knowledge of Macedon.

Finally, this serves to explain why it is methodologically erroneous to link the events around Rhaikulos in 556 BC with those in 509 BC, when Amyntas I offers Hippias a safe harbour in Anthemous – the difference has to do with the absence of the Paeonians and the presence of the Persians. The offer of Anthemous was undeniably seen as a good deed, an *euergesia*, but there is

⁷¹ *FGrHist* 1 fr. 148 sqq.; Проева (2004), 147. At the end of the 6th century, when Amyntas made his offer to Hippias, the sources considered the area to the east of the Axios to be inhabited by Paeonians.

⁷² See Проева (1997), 105, who provides an overview of scholar works, as well as results from archeological excavations.

hardly any basis – other than the will of modern-day historians – to consider it a part of a chain of established relationships.⁷³ This will certainly leave us with a partially answered question of the *proxenia* of Alexander the Philhellene, which may need to be brought down to almost 480 BC;⁷⁴ be that as it may, I feel that it would be wiser to leave that question open, rather than to reconstruct fifty years' worth of regional and local history.

⁷³ *Contra* Olivieri (2012), 82: “Una “buona azione” (euergesia) come quella che il macedone Aminta compì nei confronti di Ippia nel 504 doveva senz’altro fare parte di una catena di relazioni consolidate [...]”, as well as Xydopoulos (2012, 22), who thinks that “this offer of Anthemus to Hippias and the foundation of Rhaecalus by Pisistratus himself must somehow be connected to each other”. Cf., however, the *caveat* of Cole (“Alexander Philhellene and Themistocles”, *L’antiquité classique* 47.1, 1978, 37): “The problems of reconstructing such relationships, once the likelihood of their existence is conceded, are considerable, ranging from the absence of direct evidence to the obvious danger of circularity. With respect to the latter, one has no option but to admit that one starts with the conclusion and then examines the indirect evidence to see whether it will sustain it.”

⁷⁴ Cf., among many others, Cole (1978) and Borza (1990), 108.