

THE TOMB OF ALEXANDER - NEW EVIDENCES AND HYPOTHESES

Nicola Bonacasa

Two developments of great importance in Relation to the destiny of Alexandria have Occurred in The Last Two Years : The Alleged discovery of Alexander's Tomb at Siwah and The Hypothesis That underwater research east-north-east of Fort Qa'it Bay is revealing traces of the famous Pharos built by Sostratos of Cnidos.

With regard to Alexander's tomb, Iam rather sceptical of the discoveries at Siwah and prefer to follow the ancient written tradition according to which Alexandria is the final, amply documented, site of Alexander the Great's hural. (1)

My contribution today is based on the conclusions of a monograph by Achille Adriani which is about to be published for the first time by the Institute of Archaeology of Palermo University, through the courtesy of the General Direction of the Graeco-Roman Museum (2). This takes as its starting-point an element

of exceptional importance: the vast chamber consisting of six gigantic alabaster monoliths - an unicum in Alexandrine architecture- which occuppies a corner of the Latin Cemetery near the necropolis area of Shatbi east of Alexandria (3).

It may be that this important monument conceals the ruins of Alexander's tomb, and it is therefore necessary to make a critical survey of the ancient sources (4) in order to reply to a series of questions: I) Was there a first tomb of Alexander at Memphis?; II) how are we to interpret Pausanias' declaration (5) that in this first tomb Alexander was buried *noma ton Makedonon*?; III) which of the two Ptolemies ordered the move from Memphis to Alexandria, Soter or Philadelphus?; IV) what was the correct denomination of the tomb, which in the written tradition alternates between *sema* and *soma* ?

At the age of just thirty-three, after a reign of thirteen years which had changed the face of the world, Alexander died suddenly on 13 June 323 BC. In Babylonia, by the king's order, it was established that his mortal remains should be buried at Siwah, in the

distant oasis of Zeus Amon, where he had gone on a pilgrimage some ten years previously during his Egyptian campaign, and where he had been proclaimed the son of the god.

The decision of the transfere to Egypt was taken only after bitter dispute at court. There is however no doubt that the Macedon's remains were in fact despatched to Egypt. After Perdikkas' overthrow and elimination, and following the exclusion of the oasis of Siwah, Ptolemy - considering the prestige and great political importance which possession of the royal remains would confer on the capital and on himself - ordered that the funeral cortege should proceed to Memphis, where he created for Alexander the first burial place of which we have certain news (6).

Although Diodorus and Strabo, our most important sources, say nothing of the burial place at Memphis, it certainly existed. Curtius Rufus and Pausanias agree on the point, and it is also confirmed by a precious fragment of the "Paros marble" (7), which for the date corresponding to 321-320 BC bears both the news of Alexander's burial at Memphis and that of the death of

Perdiccas in Egypt.

Pausanias adds a further detail: according to him, Alexander was buried at Memphis *nomo ton Makedonon*. This expression most likely refers not just to the presence in Alexander's sepulchre of the traditional Macedonian funerary kline but also - and more importantly - to the tumulus - type architectural style of the tomb: the tumulus and funerary kline were traditional features of the Macedonian type of tomb, which boasted an ancient tradition and wide diffusion. Unknown in the Egyptian world, this type of burial, introduced by the Macedonians in Egypt to bury their king, was inevitably commented upon by Pausanias. Diodorus, Strabo, Curtius Rufus and the pseudo-Callisthenes (8) attribute the burial of Alexander at Alexandria to Ptolemy, son of Lagus, while Pausanias (9), speaking of Ptolemy II brother and husband of Arsinoe, says that it was he (and not Ptolemy I) who transferred Alexander's remains from Memphis. A number of scholars tend to the opinion that Pausanias' version is the more reliable; but the expression used by Curtius Rufus, *paucis post annis*, corresponding to the

time interval between the burial at Memphis and the move to Alexandria, scarcely favours the interpretation in favour of the second Ptolemy, which would require an interim period of at least forty years.

The surest and most explicit source regarding the Macedon's burial at Alexandria is Strabo (10), who in his precious description of the metropolis, which he visited between 24 and 20 BC, states that Alexander's sema was part of the royal quarters and that it was a peribolus containing the tombs of the Kings (i.e. the ptolemies) and of Alexander. A little further on Strabo says that Ptolemy (by whom he meant Ptolemy I) buried Alexander at Alexandria where he still lay in Strabo's own day, except that the King's remains were no longer in original Golden coffin, ever since Ptolemy XI - Alexander I (107-88 BC) had replaced it with one of alabaster. Strabo's words, "where [Alexander's body] still lies", have been rightly interpreted by el-Falaki, Breccia, Calderini, Adriana and other scholars in the most obvious way: "at Alexandria, in the same spot where it lies today" (11).

Further questions arise at this point: I) what was the

shape of Alexander's burial place ?; II) what is the topographical and architectural significance of the association of Alexander's tomb with those of the Ptolemies ?; III) where exactly in the city was the sema?

The first point I think can be answered with almost absolute certainty: The sema was great tumulus with underground chambers. This is the traditional type of Macedonian tomb, already temporarily adopted for the royal tomb at Memphis, and also chosen for the permanent tomb at Alexandria. This is proved, for Memphis, by Pausanias' already mentioned phrase: *nomo ton Makedonon*; for Alexandria, by a statement by Lucan (in his poem *pharsalia*), concerning the visit of Caesar, who *effossum tumuli cupide descendit in antrum*, and by another statement related to the *exstructus mons* of Lucan's other reference (12); and, finally, there is the fact that we see the term *sema* used by Herodotus in his description of the tomb of Aliaptes, at Sardis, to indicate a "tumulus" tomb. It is also significant that the tradition of the tumulus tomb, with a *peribolus*, was again taken up once again for the burial of Antony and Cleopatra.

Let us now pass to the second question; relative to the topographical and architectural relationship between Alexander's tomb and that of the Ptolemies.

we can set aside the reconstructive hypotheses of Thiersch (13) - taken up by Breccia and Bernhard - regarding the presence in Alexandria of numerous royal funerary construction, all different as regards shape, location and function: from Alexander's original sepulchre-temple, built by Ptolemy I, until the last of these isolated tombs, believed to be that of Antony and Cleopatra. All this is in open conflict with the concrete information of written tradition.

At the end of the first century BC, an eye-witness, Strabo, provides a definition of the sema that could not be clearer. The term sema, let us repeat, meant for a man of his time a peribolus which contained the tombs of Alexander and the Ptolemies. Except for Cleopatra's tombs - located separately, but certainly within the royal quarters, somewhere near the sea - we have no other reason to place the other burial places of the Ptolemies outside the "peribolus known as sema".

I will now briefly describe, on the basis of the written records, the various stages of the construction of the royal necropolis at Alexandria.

Alexander's sema, i.e. his tomb and his sepulchre-temple, we first erected in the area of the palace. This tomb, although evidently of majestic dimensions, must have been in the shape of a Macedonian tomb, i.e. of an underground burial place with a kline, built up and not just dug out of the rock, and surmounted by a tumulus. This can be deduced, as already said, from Pausanias' phrase *nomo ton Makedonon* and from the repeated expressions in Lucan of *antrum*, *exstructus mons*, and *tumulus*.

The first Ptolemies may have been buried in the body of the sema, but certainly in separate rooms from Alexander's funeral chamber, or in distinct but adjacent monuments. In either case, the clear distinction that was certainly made under Octavian between the tomb of Alexander and the Ptolemaion must go back to the ptolemaic age.(14)

Ptolemy IV must have faced the problem of a new

arrangement of the sema, and not the construction of a new mnema. Strabo's statement- if the interpretation of numerous scholars is, as I think, accurate - that the sema was in his day where Ptolemy I had placed it, rules out the possibility that the Philopator's mnema was something completely new, i.e. a new building where the mummy of Alexander was transferred. It would have been strange for Strabo to make no mention of this presumed new building erected by Ptolemy IV. This initiative by Ptolemy IV Philopator must have been either an extension or a rearrangement of the old sema, or, more likely, the construction of a monumental peribolus which united and isolated the sema proper and the tombs of the first Ptolemies, the Ptolemaion, possibly in a new architectural framework in the complex of the palace building. The mausoles and the pyramides (mentioned by Lucan) of Ptolemy IV's successors may have been added in the same peribolus, or somewhere in the vicinity. (15)

How can we now reply to the third question that we posed, relative to the precise location of the sema?

For this purpose, there are just three sources, regrettably not of equal clarity or certain interpretation: that of Strabo, who places the sema in the palace; that of Zenobius, who places it "in the middle of the city"; that of Achilles Tattius, who identifies a site known as Alexandrou topos, a few stadia within the Gate of the Sun (16). This site, which took its name from a monument related to Alexander, was in all probability the site of the Macedon's tomb.

According to Strabo, the palace was extremely large, covering an area corresponding to a third or a quarter of the whole city. In what part of it can we place the tomb? Fraser (17) sets it without hesitation near the sea for the simple reason that the tomb was in the palace. But Strabo also points out that part of the royal palaces was occupied by the Museum, adding in conclusion that part of the royal palaces consisted of the so-called sema, a peribolus containing the tombs of Alexander and the kings. In the more detailed list of the buildings which Strabo then provides, along the coast from east to west, from the Lochias to the Caesarem and beyond, as far as the Kibotos - the little port into which the canal from

Lake Mareotis emptied itself (18) - there is no mention of the sema, which would exclude its location by the sea. On the contrary the geographer enumerates the "inner" royal palaces, to the left of the Great Port, beyond the rocks and the Lochias headland, using particularly strong terms of admiration. These "inner" royal palaces must have been the noblest and most spacious part of the whole complex in the southern part, back of the coast, at the same time facing the northern part that stretched towards the sea. This explanation seems to me the most plausible.

The other two sources regarding the location of the sema, those of Zenobius and Achilles Tatius, provide us with further indication that enables to locate the sema with the further accuracy within the royal palaces. Zenobius, as we have seen, sets the sema in the centre of the city. However, Achilles Tatius' testimony regarding the Alexandrou topos places the sema at the junction of the two main streets. This crossroads, the beauty and elegance of which strike the imagination of the hero of Achilles Tatius' novel, the young Cleitophon, very likely corresponds to the city centre,

which would lend credibility to Zenobius' statement. The significance of Achilles Tatius' Alexandrou topos must be related to some building or monument which gave Alexander's name to the site, and this with utmost certainty must have been the sema.

We can rule out the stretch of the coast running from the Lochias headland to the Caesareum, because in that area Strabo's description does not include the royal necropolis. We must therefore direct our attention towards the inner part of the area bounded to the north by the coast and the Lochias headland, to the south by the great longitudinal L1 and to the east by the presumable limit of the Hellenistic city, at the level of the road known as R4 bis, which corresponds more or less to the presumed extension eastwards of the royal quarters (further on are the areas occupied by the necropolises of the Hellenistic period). The two streets are among those marked on the controversial but reliable map by Mohmoud el-Falaki (19). The city which this represents, as el-Falaki himself realized and as was subsequently confirmed, but in all probability it followed and extended the layout of the Hellenistic city.

As Zenobius (of the period of Hadrian) places Ptolemy IV's mnema in the centre of the city (20), we are inclined to seek the site in a part of the palace to the north of the great longitudinal L1, near one of the crossroads which the north-south sidestreets formed with it. The most important of these crossroads on el-Falaki's map is situated where the great longitudinal L1 intersects the great transversal R1. The trial excavations carried out by Noack (21), although not absolutely confirming the dimensions and the particular characteristic of R1 which el-Falaki had attributed to it, did however confirm that its width and certain other characteristics indicated that it could be regarded as the main transversal road. As we shall see, those who place the site of the royal necropolis at Kom ed-Dick (and that means particularly all scholars of Alexandrine topograph) locate the city centre at the crossroads between L1 and another transversal road, R4, which is considerably further west. This second crossroads may correspond to the centre of the Hellenistic city, which spreads less eastwards, but it does not correspond to the condition of being the crossroads of the two main streets of the Roman city. Whether We Like it or not, We

cannot ignore the identification of the great transversal road with RI on his map : we possess no other alternative equally supported by archaeological data.

Now, let us return for a moment to the decisive testimony of Achilles Tatius, who in Imperial period placed the Alexandrian topos at the junction of the two great colonnaded longitudinal and transversal streets. The site indicated by Achilles Tatius is just a few stadia within the Gate of the Sun, and only the L1/R1 crossroads on el-Falaki's map satisfies this condition.

That being so, the site of the sema is probably to be sought towards the inner part of the area universally recognized as being that of the palace, in the south-east sector, not far from the L1/R1 crossroads.(22)

Notwithstanding, nearly all maps of Alexandria place the sema in the Kom el-Dick area, at the junction of L1 and R4, giving rise to great historical and topographical confusion between the centre of Hellenistic Alexandria and the centre of Roman Alexandria (23). So it is the map presented by Wolfram Hoepfner in Berlin in 1988, re-proposed by Zsolt Kiss at

Tarragona in 1993 and accepted by w. A. Daszewski in Paris in 1994. Still doubtful, in 1993, the opinion of Harry E. Tzalas, Nebi Daniel or north-eastern quarters of the city. (24)

At this point we should perhaps describe a number of sensational "discoveries" all more or less recent and all quite imaginary, regarding Alexander's Tomb. But we haven't the time.

We shall merely say that they renege from the date of AD 400, with the first appearance of the name of ed-Daymas, associated to "ed-Demas" and the Greek soma; to the placing of Alexander's tomb at the centre of the city and in the ed-Demas area, in the tenth century, by the writer El-Mas 'udi, the site allegedly corresponding to the mosque of Dhu el-Karnayn, recalled in the ninth century by another Arab writer, Ibn 'Abd-el Hakam (25); Dhu el-Karnayn the "Lord of the two horns", was the attribute which Alexander received as the son of Zeus Amon; to the allusion to the same building by the Granada Geographer leo Africanus (1517), the same building being recalled some decades later, in 1546 and 1610, by the travellers Marmol and

Sandys; in the 18th century the site of the tomb and the sarcophagus (which is that of Nectanebus II) were identified in the church of St Athanasius, subsequently the el-'Attarin mosque, mentioned by R. Pococke and explicitly, in 1774, by the Florentine D. Sestini; until the 19th century, when only Saint Genis (1829) failed to give the traditional attribution; but a few years before (1805) E.D. Clarke had devoted a learned monograph to the monument, with the eye-catching title *The Tomb of Alexander the Great*; let us pass over Rhakotis and the ancient Serapeus, both indicated as the site of the tomb, an idea artfully repropounded after the second world war by Wace and Rowe, and before them, in naive good faith, by Hoghart. Towards the end of the nineteenth century it was widely held that the site of the royal tomb was at the foot of Kom ed-Dick, and more precisely beneath the Nebi Daniel mosque. This was universally asserted by nearly all scholars of Alexandrine topology, including Breccia. And the dream, for dream it is, still goes on today. In 1850, a certain Ambroise Schilizzi, a dragoman at the Russian Consulate in Alexandria, believed he had discovered the tomb in the underground chambers of the Nebi Daniel mosque. In 1893, an

Alexandrine Greek, Joannides, claimed to have identified the tomb at Campo Cesare (Caesar's Field), an eastern suburb of the city. There was even a local scholar of some repute, T. Neroutsos Bey, who affirmed that beneath the Nebi Daniel mosque there were "caveaux funeraires paiens les plus magnifiques", dating back to the Ptolemies. Another Alexandrine Greek, Stelic Kamutsos, claimed in 1960 to know the exact site of the tomb. And, to conclude, a man aged over a hundred, Mohamed Aly el-Toraby, stated that in his youth he had crossed the threshold of a long subterranean chamber which stretched beneath the area of the mosque and led to Alexander's tomb and that he was ready to reveal the site to the then Curator of the Graeco-Roman Museum, H. Riad (26).

But let us set aside these amateurish claims.

Much more worrying are the somewhat hasty statements of nearly all scholars of Alexanderine topography who firmly believe that it is possible to place the sema at Kom el-Dick. Very few deny this, but these include two authoritative scholars, M. Rodziewicz and F. El-Fakharani (27). To give just one example, we

may recall the fanciful thesis put forward in 1956 by M.L. Bernhard (28) regarding the outward appearance of the Macedon's tomb, based on the study of a type of Roman terracotta lamp with a sea-view of Alexandria. This would appear to show the sema on the coast, but Bernhard forgets that it is placed at the crossroads between the longitudinal L1 and the transversal R4, in the customary Kom el-Dick zone, i.e. inside the city. Moreover, we know direct from Strabo that the sema was not on the coast, and it would be ridiculous to suppose that the Kom el-Dick and the Nebi Daniel mosque were shown overlooking the sea, in the coastal sector of the royal quarter.

More generally we can affirm that as things stand today, bearing in mind our knowledge of the ancient sources and archaeological data, the alleged link between the Basileia and the sema situated in the Kom el-Dick / Nebi Daniel area is topologically speaking an utter absurdity.

This is the moment to advance a new hypothesis, that of Adriani, which we fully support. This hypothesis is based on a concrete and convincing monumental

testimony and a series of indications that appear to corroborate the hypothesis.

The idea came to Adriani as he viewed the ruins of the sumptuous and most singular monument, mentioned at the beginning of this paper, which is the colossal tomb of pink alabaster. Discovered in 1907, it was long largely ignored. Breccia (29) mentioned it briefly but did not explore it. In 1936 Adriani restored it and established some order (30). The site is in the present-day New Latin Cemetery, on the eastern edge of the presumed area of the ancient royal quarters, not far from the wellknown Hellenistic Age eastern necropolis (Shatbi and Hadra sectors).

This is unique monument in Alexandria as regards the quality of the material used, the finest oriental alabaster, which must have given the complete building great elegance, considering also its architectural style. Unfortunately it is no longer possible for us to form an idea of the vast trapezoid peribolus in which we are told the monument stood when it was discovered and which, as Breccia wrote, was bounded by a high wall, now demolished, "several metres" thick, made of rectangular

limestone blocks. Nor have we any trace or know what to make of the "ruins of a naos" which Breccia mentions together with the two "uprights" (of which today only one survives intact) and architrave of a door.

Adriani's trial excavations during the restoration work, in the narrow space available around the monument, did not reveal any conclusive evidence. He found only traces of a well and of a channels dug in the rock (31).

The monument consists of a simple rectangular flat-roofed chamber (2.62 metres by 3.45, and 2.70 metres in height), completely open to the north, with a deep corridor halfway along the south wall embellished by an elegant Doric-type relief framework (dimensions of the doorway: 0.93 metres by 2.05). The walls and ceiling are completely smooth, without any form of decoration - the beauty of the alabaster material enriched by the interplay of broad sinuous natural markings is sufficient in itself. Externally, the majestic blocks used to construct the chamber are roughly surfaced and cut in great irregular shapes, which must have been intended to be concealed from sight. The base

of the monument was formed by a great monolithic alabaster block, and the floor was flanked by two rows of limestone blocks supporting the side walls. The whole construction stood on a foundation consisting of a deep layer of earth and limestone blocks. The ceiling consisted of another monolithic block of alabaster (4.62 metres by 3.00 and 0.70 metres thick). The end wall was made of three blocks: one horizontal, forming the top of the corridor and including the upper part of the framework of the door, with two cavities on the flat ceiling, to the side, intended to bear bolts for the hinges of the leaves of a door; and two vertical blocks bearing the other horizontal covering block. The vertical elements of the door framework had been created in these two blocks.

The chamber is the only surviving part, and certainly not the most important, of a complex of at least three rooms, which we can imagine located successively along the same axis, a complex with an ample double vestibule and an inner, more secluded chamber that must have constituted the main nucleus of the monument; but the whole building may have been richer

and more extensive - we have no means of knowing. This would appear substantially to be a reflection of the concept of Alexandrine underground chambers in "oikos" style, with their single-axis plan(32). The inmost chamber, to the south, would appear to be the burial chamber, very likely with a bed-sarcophagus, the royal kline; this must have been the most important room in the complex. Access to it was through a two-leaf door, Possibly made of alabaster with bronze fittings, the existence of which is testified by the two large hinge-cavities situated practically in the lintel of the architrave. A simple and elegant Doric-type framework (33), as we have said, surrounded the corridor externally. But what must have characterized this chamber tomb, distinguishing it from all others found in Alexandria, is not just the richness of the material used but also, and more particularly, its architectural design. Here we had a monument constructed and not dug out of the rock, and the outward rough appearance of the blocks clearly indicates that they were meant to be hidden from sight, almost certainly beneath a tumulus proper, in the manner of Macedonian-type tombs; while the extraordinary

thickness of the blocks would seem to be related to the weight of the earth and the structures they were intended to support. The result is a hypogeum in the Macedonian tradition, quite unlike any of the Alexandrine open-court hypogea.

Breccia surmised that the chamber might be a surviving element of the Nemeseion (34), an edifice which Caesar caused to be constructed to house the head of the ill-starred Pompey, killed by order of Ptolemy, which had been presented to Caesar on his arrival in Egypt.

At first Adriani (35) accepted Breccia's hypothesis but later, on the basis of his long studies on Alexandrine topology, he changed his mind and eventually put forward a new and revolutionary hypothesis, which we share (36).

Is it not more plausible that this chamber - so exceptional as regards the quality of its material (in Alexandria, coloured marbles and alabasters were very frequently imitated in wall coverings, but were rarely conserved) (37) and the technique of its construction,

quite different from that of any other hypogeum in Alexandria, even among the most important - is in fact an element of the sema ?

Before giving a positive answer to this intriguing question we should first consider the relationship of the chamber to Macedonian-type tombs, a relationship which proves to be very close. Firstly, as regards the type of construction: like most Macedonian tombs, this chamber was constructed with blocks and was intended to be underground, i.e. not dug out of the rock, as was the case with Alexanderine hypogea. Secondly, there can be no doubt of the presence of a great tumulus of earth that completely covered the chamber that has been preserved as well as those that are no longer extant. The base of the tumulus was very likely provided with a crepidoma in masonry. The chamber was the midpoint between the burial recess proper and another room to the north. The dromos or access stairway, a customary feature in Macedonian, probably led to this other room. The burial chamber - quite small, about half the size of that still extant - must have contained the sumptuous royal funeral bed, which is a characteristic feature of

Macedonian tombs. There are a number of other traditional but consistent minor features common to Macedonian tombs and this construction in Alexandria : the use of a Doric framework for the access door to the burial chamber; the existence in the tomb at Alexandria of one of those two-leaf doors of which there are such beautiful examples in the "Macedonian" tombs. In our case the two parts of the door may also have been made of alabaster : in Macedonian hypogea, doors were mostly made of marble and sometimes of wood, with or without bronze fittings. It is probably no coincidence, but very likely due to observance of the traditional architectural design that we have suggested, that the reduced dimensions of the underground chambers also correspond to the Macedonian model (the chamber in Alexandria measures 2.63 metres by 3.45, while the rooms in Macedonian tombs vestibules and burial chambers - measure some 2.00 metres by 3.40) (38).

None of the architectural elements surviving in Alexandria enables us to restore to the alabaster tomb any of the architectural facades that were frequent in Macedonian. But it is legitimate to hypothesize their

presence even in this tomb in Alexandria, a city where the taste for architectural facades was common in later hypogeal constructions. One need only consider the fine architectural facades of the Shatbi hypogea and numbers one and three of the Mustapha Pasha necropolis (39). This architectural facade, also in alabaster, was certainly of the Doric order, marked by pillars or columns, and surmounted by a tymapanum or attic. Contrary to Adriani's belief, it is likely that this facade was directly connected to the present-day alabaster chamber, without there being any need of a third room to the north. The reason for this is that typical Macedonian tombs consist of just two parts and that also, even when the vestibule has a flat covering, the burial chamber nearly always a vaulted roof. In our case, for the burial recess, we should therefore imagine an analogous construction, vaulted, constructed in blocks, stuccoed and painted internally to resemble alabaster (40).

The hypothesis alabaster-tomb / sema takes up strength from another impressive datum.

We mentioned that in the first brief announcement of the discovery Breccia reported that the

monument was in the area of the vast trapezoid peribolus bounded by a lofty wall several metres thick, made of rectangular blocks (41). This peribolus inevitably brings to mind the peribolus where Strabo claims the sema was located.

If the above observations confirm the Macedonian nature of the tomb in Alexandria, it is not equally certain that we can identify it as a surviving part of the sema, which brings us back to the question that we posed. This luxurious Alexandrine tomb could have been constructed for some other personage of the court of the Ptolemies, as some, including Poulsen (42), have thought. But the "topographical data" are here in our favour. The tomb is in the area of the Bassiléia. This is confirmed by elements that can refer only to the sema, i.e. to the location in an area of the city that can be identified with the *tópos Alexándrou* of Achilles Tatius near the crossroads of the two main streets L1/R1 and at the city centre, as can be inferred for the sema from the evidence of Zenobius, and also near the alleged site of the Dhu el-Karnayn mosque, the "Lord of the two horns", which very likely takes its name from Alexander. Further evidence that persuades us to seek

the site of the royal necropolis towards the eastern sector of the city and toward the royal quarters is, in conclusion - apart from what Strabo tells us - the existence of two Latin texts that recall a Procurator Neaspoleos et Mausolei (43). The association of the Neapolis and the Mausoleum in the functions of the procurator entitles us to argue that very probably there was a strong topographical relationship between the two sites, which may have been one of vicinity or even of identity (the Mausoleum would have been an important element of the Neapolis). If the Roman Neapolis is to be placed in the north-east sector of the city, it follows which is that of the Ptolemaic-age royal quarters and also that in which the alabaster chamber was located.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) N. Bonacasa, in *Giornate di studio in on. di A. Adriani*, Rome 26-27 nov. 1948 (stmisc, 28), Roma 1991, P.3 ss.; Id., in *Alessandro Magno, storia e mito*, (Catalogo Mostra Fond. Memmo), Roma 1995, PP 264 -266.
- (2) A. Adriani, *La Tomba di Alessandro : realtà, ipotesi, fantasie*, Roma 1996 (in Printing).
- (3) Adriani, *Annuaire du Musée Gréco-Romain 1935-1939, Alexandrie 1940*, pp. 15-23; Id., in *EAA*, I, 1958, pp. 213-214; Id., *Repertorio d'arte dell 'Egitto greco-romano, Serie C, I-II, Palermo 1966*, pp. 22 ss., 28 ss., 140 ss. (n. 89), 242 ss.; J. Fedak, *Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age*, Toronto 1990, p. 129 ss. Inexplicably, the tomb is unknown (?) to R. Pagenstecher, *Nekropolis*, Leipzig 1919.
- (4) Collected by A. Calderini, *Dizionario dei nomi geografici e topografici dell 'Egitto greco-romano*, I, 1, Cairo 1935, p. 149 ss.; Adriani, *Repertorio*, pp. 242 ss., 267 ss. See also, A. Bernard, *Alexandrie la Grande*, Paris 1966, p. 229 ss.; H. Thiersch, in *Jdl*, 15, 1910, p. 55 ss.; M.L. Bernhard, in *RA*, 47, 1956, p. 129 ss.; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972, I, p.

3 ss., II, pp. 1-111 passim, III, p. 71 (s.v. sema); H.E. Tzalas, in *Graeco-Arabica*, V, 1993, p. 333 ss.

- (5) Pausanias, I, VI, 23.
- (6) Pausanias, I, VII, 2.
- (7) Diodorus Siculus, XVIII, 28, 4 ss.; Strabo, XVII, 1, 8; Curtius Rufus, X, 10, 20; Pausanias, I, VI, 23 e I, VII, 2; IG, XII (5), p. 109, n. 444.
- (8) Diodorus Siculus, XVIII, 28, 4; Strabo, XVII, 1, 8; Curtius Rufus, X, 10, 20; Pseudo Callisthenes, III, 34, 1.
- (9) Pausanias, I, XVII, 2.
- (10) Strabo, XVII, 1, 6-8.
- (11) Cfr. Adriani, Repertorio, pp. 242-245.
- (12) Lucanus, Fars., VIII, 694 ss.; X, 19.
- (13) Thiersch, in *Jdl*, 15, 1910, p. 55 ss.
- (14) For many famous visitors (Augustus, Caligola, Septimius Severus, and Caracalla) : Suetonius, Aug., 18; Calig., 52; Flavius Josephus, *contra Ap.*, II, 57; Dion Cassius, L1, 16; LXXV, 13; Herodian, IV, 8, 9; Suda, s.v. Antoninos. The destruction of sema comes before the second half of IV Cent. A.D. when St. John Chrysostom claim in his *Omelia*, XXVI, 5: "Tell

me, where the sema of Alexander is ?" (J.P. Migne, *Patr. Graeca*, LXI, Paris 1862, Ioann. Chrys. X., col. 581).

- (15) Lucanus, *Fars.*, VIII,694 ss.; X,19.
- (16) Strabo,XVII,1,8; Zenobius, 94; Achilles Tatius, V,1ss.
- (17) Fraser, *Ptol. Alexandria*, I, P.3 ss.; II, PP. 1-111 *Passim*; III, p.71 (S.V. Sema).
- (18) Adriani, *Repertorio*, P. 235; F. El Fakharani, in *Stmisc*, 28, 1991, p. 21 ss.
- (19) Mahmoud Bey el-Falaki, *Mémoire sur l'antique Alexandrie*, Copenhague 1872.
- (20) Zenobius, III, 94.
- (21) F. Noack, in *AM*, 25, 1900, P. 215 ss.; Adriani, *Repertorio*, PP. 23 ss., 73 (n. 27).
- (22) Adriani, *Repertorio*, P.244.
- (23) Searchs and excavations under the mosque of Naby Daniel : K. Michalowski, in *Alexandria University, Bull. Of hte Fac. Of Arts*, 12, 1958, p. 37 ss.; L.Dabrowski, *ibid.*, 14, 1960. P.39 ss. See also. Breccia, *Le Musé Gréco-Romain 1925-1931*, Bergamo 1942, PP. 48-52.

- (24) W. Hoepfner, in *Akten XIII. Inter. Kongress Klass. Archaeologie*, Berlin 1988, Mainz am Rhein 1990, P. 275 ss., Abb.2 Z. Kiss, in *Actes XIV Congrès Inter. Arqueologia Cláss.*, Tarragona 1993, I, Tarragona 1994 P. 261 ss., Fig. 1; W.A. Daszewski, in *CraI*, Avril-Juin 1994, p. 423 ss.; Tzalas, in *Graeco-Arabica*, V, 1993, P. 329 ss.
- (25) Ibn Abd El-Hakam, *Futuh el Misr* (ed. Torrey), New Haven 1922, P. 4.
- (26) Cfr. Adriani, *La Tomba di Alessandro*, Cit, P. 000; Bonacasa, in *Stmisc*, 28, 1991, P. 18, nota 27.
- (27) M. Rodziewicz, *Les habitations romaines tardives d'Alexandrie (Alexandrie III)*, Varsovie 1984, PP. 12 ss., 28-31, 54, 57, 58, 116; in *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano (Atti II Congr. Inter. Italo-Egiziano, Alessandria 1992)*, Roma 1995, P.227 ss.; F. El Fakharani, in *Alexandria University, Bull. of the Fac. of Arts*, 18, 1964, PP. 190-191.
- (28) Bernhard, in *RA*, 47, 1956, PP. 137, 152 ss.
- (29) Breccia, *Rapport du muée Gréco-Romain 1907*, P.7; Id; in *Esocarchal*, 10 , 1908, P. 230; Id., *Alexandrea ad Aegyptum*, Bergamo 1914, P.88 e *Bergami 1922*, P. 102; Id., *Rapport du Mus. Gr. Rom. 1919-1920*, PP. 70-71, tav. XI.

- (30) Adriani, *Ann. du Mus. Rom. 1935-1939, Cit., PP. 15-23.*
- (31) Adriani, *ibid, PP. 15-16, fig. 1; Id., Repertorio, P. 140 ss. (n.89).*
- (32) Adriani, *La nécropole de Moustafa Pacha, Ann. du Mus Gr. Rom. 1933-1935, Alexandrie 1936, PP. 45 ss., 71 ss., Id., Repertorio, PP. 28-33, 124, 128 s., 138 s., 141, 146 s., 170, 188, 192 s., 194, 195s., 157.*
- (33) Adriani, *Ann. du mus. Gr. Rom. 1935-1935, cit, P.92; Id., Repertorio, p. 134 ss. (n. 85).*
- (34) Appianus, II, 90. Cfr. Breccia, *supra*, nota 4.
- (35) Adriani, *Ann. du Mus. Gr. -Rom. 1935-1939, cit., pp. 22-23; Id., epertorio, pp. 142, 230. Cfr. Calderini, Dizionario, cit., I. 1, p. 132.*
- (36) Adriani, *Ipotesi ardite e meno ardite sulla tomba di Alessandro Magno, March 1962, during the two lectures, Alexandria and Cairo, and the public national meeting, Accademia dei Lincei, Rome May 8, 1971. Now in his volume, La tomba di Alessandro, cit, p. ooo.*
- (37) Adriani, *Ann. du Mus. Gr.-Romm. 1933-1935, cit., p. 113 ss., figg. 50, 55-56, tav. XIV; Id., Ann. du Mus. Gr.-Rom. 1940-1950, Alexandrie 1952, p. 61 ss., 87*

ss., tavv. XXXVI,1; XXXIX, 1; XL,1; Id., Repertorio, pp. 192 ss. (n. 142), 195 ss. (n. 145).

- (38) Cfr. Ph. Petsas, *O táphos tón Lefkadion*, Atene 1966; Id., in *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano* (Studi in on. di A. Adriani), III, Roma 1984, p. 744 ss.; M. Andronikos, *Vergina I*, Atene 1969; B. Gossel, *Makedonische Kammergraeber*, Berlin 1980; S.G. Miller, *Macedonians Tombs*, Washington D.C. 1982 e 1993; M. Andronikos, *Vergina, the Royal Tombs*, Athens 1984; H. Lauter, *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*, Darmstadt 1986, pp. 220-221.
- (39) Adriani, *Ann. du Mus. Gr.-Rom. 1933-35*, cit., pp. 15 ss., 53 ss.; Id., *Repertorio*, pp. 124-127, 130 ss., 135 ss.
- (40) J.G. Miller, *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles. A painted Macedonian Tomb*, Mainz am Rhein 1993, pp. 106 (2A), 107 (4I), 108 (10A), 112 (28A).
- (41) Breccia, *Rapport du Mus. Gr.-Rom. 1919-1920*, cit, p. 70 ss.
- (42) Fr. Poulsen, in *from the Collect. of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*, II, 1938, p.4.
- (43) CIL, VIII, 8934; XIII, 1808. Cfr. Calderini, *Dizionario*, p. 150.

Argyro B. Talaki

Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity

National Hellenic Research Foundation

MACEDONIAN PRESENCE IN ALEXANDRIA

New surroundings give to settlers the opportunity for new creations and Alexandria could not be an exception to that. In dealing with the Hellenistic period one is aware that the Macedonians and the other Greeks who came to settle in Alexandria had already many things in common without however having lost yet their special local characteristic. Thus the settlement of Macedonians in Egypt and in Alexandria can be traced in various ways which⁽¹⁾. I will try to sketch here.

Initially there are two approaches for the examination of their presence in the population. The use of the ethnic *Makedwv* is the first one, which certainly in the early attestations, especially those from Alexandria, had a more realistic content than it had later for the settlers of the Fayum. A safer indication than the ethnic is the existence of Macedonian personal names attested even after the first two centuries from the time of their

owners arrival, as the analysis of the onomasticon shows. It is essential to point out here that some of the names considered by the specialists as typically Macedonian are known only from their attestations in Egypt, for example the names Βιλιστιξη and ΑοΒιοζ and others; ⁽²⁾ in addition to that many well known Macedonian names, such as Βαλακποζ , Μαχαταζ and ιλωταζ , to mention only a few, have been preserved in inscriptions found in Alexandria with or without the use of the ethnic. ⁽³⁾ Dozens of other well known Macedonian names are preserved in Egyptian papyri, to mention only some of those starting with letter Α: Απυνταζ, Αρπαλοζ, Αρριδαιοξ, Ατταλοζ. ⁽⁴⁾ Since on the other hand we know that many Macedonians had common Greek names without any local characteristics, ⁽⁵⁾ it is reasonable to reach the conclusion that a substantial part among the holders of names belonging to this category were also of Macedonian descent, a conclusion that can be reinforced by considering the other factors that we will discuss next.

Many Macedonian prototypes can be traced in the institutions, the administration and even more in the organisation of the Ptolemaic court as it can be studied on the basis of the works of P.M. Fraser and R. Bagnal;⁽⁶⁾ the analogies observed can support a better understanding of the archetype that is often less explicitly documented. The role of the Macedonian household troops in the approving of the new sovereign, the Friends and the First Friends of the king, the bodyguards, the employment of the term *επιστάτης* for defining the governor of a city with civil authority in the Ptolemaic administration,⁽⁷⁾ are all features very much characteristic of the Macedonia administration, as known by the historians of Alexander or as attested in inscriptions found in Macedonia.⁽⁸⁾ For the Macedonian court the royal envoys abroad were naturally members of the aristocracy including persons of the family of the king, as can be observed in an early source, the treaty of Perdikkas II with the Athenians.⁽⁹⁾ In these relatives of the Macedonian kings most probably originates the term *συγγενής*, used often by Ptolemaic envoys abroad;⁽¹⁰⁾ the other definition used: *των πρωτων φιλων* (among the First Friends) of

the king, is also a well documented feature of the royal administration of Macedonia. ⁽¹¹⁾

Some religious features, not very common in the rest of the Greek world, can also be traced in Macedonia. Heracles' very important place in Macedonia is widely attested; his worship is accompanied with many different epithets, as inscriptional and literary sources show. ⁽¹²⁾ One of them is for Heracles Kallinikos, attested only once in Beroea, ⁽¹³⁾ a city that lies in the heart of the Macedonian kingdom. A dedication to this god with the same epithet constitutes the only epithet of Heracles epigraphically attested in Egypt and most probably comes from Alexandria. ⁽¹⁴⁾

Another cult, not very common in the rest of the Greek world, is that of θεα καλη, attested only once in Macedonia, in the town of Lete; it has been recently published and discussed by M.B. Hatzopoulos, which associated her with the cult of Demeter and kore and the rites of Passage for young girls. ⁽¹⁵⁾ The same goddess, θεα καλη, is also attested once in Alexandria. ⁽¹⁶⁾

Certainly it is not only in those rare but characteristic examples, just mentioned, where the Macedonian presence can be traced. The Argeads claim to Heraclid ancestry, a claim that was later embraced also by the Antigonids, ⁽¹⁷⁾ found an early imitation by the Ptolemies, who, in order to establish their relationship to the Argead house, made up a descent from Dionysos and his son-in-law Heracles. ⁽¹⁸⁾ Ancestry of the Argeads from Dionysos is mentioned by Plutarch, in the work On the fortune or the virtue of Alexander, where in the discussion of the king with the philosopher Diogenes he asks from him to be forgiven for imitating Heracles ... and "follow in the footsteps of Dionysos, the divine author and progenitor of my family". ⁽¹⁹⁾ The dominant place of Dionysos in Macedonian life is testified by numerous literary references, to mention only the descriptions by Arrian of several sacrifices to him, ⁽²⁰⁾ the notice that there was a day kept sacred to Dionysos by the Macedonians and that Alexander used to sacrifice to him yearly on that day and also the description of Alexander's arrival in the town of India called Nysa, a foundation of Dionysos. ⁽²¹⁾ The dominant presence of Dionysos in

Alexandria is best seen in the procession of Ptolemy Philadelphos which contain many important elements that allow us to suppose a very close connection with Macedonia. This text of Kallixeinos preserved by Athenaeus in the fifth book of the Deipnosophistai, translated and thoroughly discussed by E.E. Rice,⁽²²⁾ gives very important information and allows for a new way of looking at and interpreting the contents of some Macedonian tombs. The text that is excerpted from a more extended work by Kallixeinos called About Alexandria, describes for its greater part the procession of Dionysos and his followers.⁽²³⁾ The richness of the objects, wreaths and colossal statues in this procession can be paralleled with the three day triumph of Aemilius Paulus, adorned with what he had carried to Rome from Macedonia, as described by Plutarch.⁽²⁴⁾ But the actual description, the followers of Dionysos and some of the objects carried by them can be recognised in many features of the objects and decorations found in the large royal tomb of Aegae (modern Vergina), that the excavator M. Andronikos believed to be Philip's tomb.⁽²⁵⁾ On reading this extraordinary text one should naturally ignore the

exaggeration in the size of the objects mentioned, as e.g. the nine feet tall altars and the equally huge thymiateria (incense burners), or a silver krater holding 600 measures. ⁽²⁶⁾ Other objects, mostly of gigantic size, that appeared in large numbers in the Alexandria procession and can be seen among the Vergina finds in more moderate sizes include oinochoai and phialai, basins and araters, all objects connected with drinking and mixing of wine, all objects suitable for symposia. ⁽²⁷⁾ Almost everything in this royal tomb is connected with Dionysis and his cult. Satyrs and Silenoi decorate most of the objects and Dionysos himself is represented in an ivory plaque. ⁽²⁸⁾ Other objects mentioned in the procession include tripods, golden crowns of ivy worn by the statues of Alexander and Ptolemaios I Soter and a golden crown of olive worn by the statue of Arete, all finding a material from in the finds of Vergina and also those of other Macedonian tombs. ⁽²⁹⁾ Thymiateria can be recognised, as I believed, in the lantern, as the excavator interpreted it, found in the same Vergina tomb. ⁽³⁰⁾ Participants in the procession were also, according to the same text, Macedonian women called Mimallones, Bassarai and Lydai, explained as Maenads,

described as having hair streaming loose and some holding daggers in their hands, others snakes; ⁽³¹⁾ they are also illustrated in Macedonian funerary finds and primarily on the Derveni krater. ⁽³²⁾ The features connected with the cult of Dionysos have made their appearance not only in Vergina, where their presence is overpowering, but also at other sites where Macedonian tombs were excavated. One cannot forget the relationship of Dionysos to Orpheus and the Underworld, which is so eloquently demonstrated in another funerary find, that of the unique Derveni krater. ⁽³³⁾ The pyre of another Derveni tomb contained an also unique find, for Greece, a papyrus with an Orphic text; ⁽³⁴⁾ inside the same tomb a gilded thymiaterion similar to the one of Vergina was found. ⁽³⁵⁾

Another feature close to the Macedonian originals, but in general of lower quality, is the painting preserved in funeral monuments of Alexandria. ⁽³⁶⁾ The recent discoveries in Macedonia have revolutionised our knowledge of ancient painting, and now the origin of these Alexandria creations can be more easily traced than at the time of their publication. In the funerary

architecture, features such as false doors and windows and funerary klinai,⁽³⁷⁾ also point the same cultural background and reinforces our belief that many Macedonians came and worked in Alexandria from the start, besides the eponymous architect of the city Deinokrates. That the architect, who was ordered by Alexander to lay out the plans of a city in his name, was a Macedonian, is an information of Vitruvius; another source, PsCallisthenes, calls him Rhodian.⁽³⁹⁾

We will conclude with an area in which the contribution of the Alexandrian literary achievement is in particular recognised: the creation of the epigram.⁽³⁹⁾ We should not underestimate the fact that one of the most famous Alexandrian epigrammatists, the man who lived at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphos and composed the poem designed to celebrate most probably the erection, of the Pharos, was the Macedonian Poseidippos from Pella.⁽⁴⁰⁾ It seems that it is no coincidence that although most of their works are lost we know of many Macedonians who contributed to this and other related fields of poetic creation as e.g. epic and tragic poetry. Epigrams inscribed on

Macedonian funerary monuments are quite numerous; the earliest comes from Pella and is dated in the first half of the 4th century B.C.; ⁽⁴¹⁾ next are the epigrams from Vergina that are dated as early as the second half of the 4th century B.C. ⁽⁴²⁾

Macedonian Presence in Alexandria

NOTES

* The following references support indicatively the presentation of the subject that was not intended to be exhaustive.

- 1- See the discussion of the ethnic by P.M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria (Oxford 1972) I 49-50, 53-54, 58, 63, particularly 80, 129, 22-23.
- 2- I. Russu, "Macedonica. Osservazioni sull' lingue e l'etnografia degli antichi Macedoni, "EphDac 8 (1938) 180, 199. O. Masson "sur le nom de Bilistiche, favorite de ptolemee II, "studia in honorem I.Kajanto (1985) 109-112 = Onomastica Graeca Selecta II 467-70.
- 3- E. Breccia, Catalogue general des antiquites egyptiennes du Musse d ' Alexandrie: Isrizioni Greche e Latine (Cairo 1911, repr. 1976) index.
- 4- On the basis of F. Preisigke, Namenbuch (Amsterdam 1967).
- 5- As has been concluded in recent studies: Argyro B. Tataki, Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and

Society (Meletemata 8; Athens 1988) 334, 339, 415, 449.

- 6- P.M. Fraser, *ibid.* *supra* n. 1, I 93-131; R. Bagnol, The Administration of Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt (Leiden 1976).
- 7- P.M. Fraser, *ibid.* *supra* n. 1, I 69, 80, 100, 102-104, 118, 129-30.
- 8- Discussed by M.B. Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions under the Kings (Meletemata; Athens 1996 forthcoming).
- 9- IG I, 31, 89.
- 10- P.M. Fraser, *ibid.* *supra* n. I 103, II 187n. 74; L. Mooren, The aulic titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt (Brussels 1975) 232-44 nos 00198-00349.
- 11- L. Mooren, *ibid.* *supra* n. 10, 226-32 nos 00124-197; for Macedonia see Sylvie Le Bohec, "Les Philoi des rois Antigonides," REG 98 (1985) 93-124, in particular pp. 118-19. On the First Friends of Perseus see Polyb. XXIX 3, 3; Livy XLII 39, 7; XLIV 23, 2, 45, 2.
- 12- W. Baeye, De Macedonum Sacris (Halle 1913) 184-198; Ch.F. Edson, "The Antigonids, Heracles

and Beroea," HSCP 45 (1934) 213-46. See also G. Bakalakis, M. Andronikos, Delion 25 (1970) B 394 and M. Andronikos, Vergina: the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City (Athens 1984) 38, 42, 226 for Heracles Patroos.

- 13- M.G. Demitsas, È Makedonia en lithois phthegomenois kaimnemeiois sozomenois (Athens 1896), repr. title: Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum et Latinarum Macedoniae (Chicago 1980) nos 18 and 291; W. Baege, *ibid.* supra n. 12, 141; A.B.Tataki, *ibid.*, supra n. 5, 243 no 1000.
- 14- OGIS 53; P.M. Fraser, *ibid.* supra n. 1, I 195; for other attestations of Heracles with the same epithet see Giulia Ronchi, Lexicon theonymon rerumque-sacrarum et divinarum ad Aegyptum pertinentium quae in papyris ostracis titulis Graecis Latinisque in Aegypto repertis laudantur III 568.
- 15 - M.B. Hatzopoulos, Cultes et rites de passage en Macedoine (Meletemata 19; Athens 1994) 44, 49-50.
- 16 - E. Breccia, *ibid.* supra n. 3, 372-73 no 117.
- 17 - Ch. F. Edson, *ibid.* supra n. 12.

- 18- W.W. Tarn, "The Lineage of Ptolemy I," *JHS* 53 (1933) 57-61; P.M. Fraser, *ibid. supra* n. 1, I 44-45, 202-203, 208.
- 19- Plutarch, Mor. 332A-B.
- 20- Arrian, Anab. IV 9, 5. Cf. J.P. Corregge, Le cultes de Dionysos en Macedoine (Paris 1992, M.A. Thesis, unpublished) 97-99. See also M.B. Hatzopoulos, *ibid. supra* n. 15, 63-85 for the discussion of the most recent epigraphical attestations on the cult of Dionysos in Macedonia.
- 21- Arrian, Anab. IV 8, 1; VI, 1.
- 22- Athen. 197C-203B = FGH 627 F2; E.E Rice, The Grand procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus (Oxford 1983).
- 23- Athen. 197E- 202A.
- 24- Plutarch, Aem. 32, 4-34.
- 25- M.Andronikos, Vergina : the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City (Athens 1984).
- 26- Athen. 197E, 197F, 198B.
- 27- Athen. 198B, 198D, 199C, compared to M. Andronikos, *ibid. surpa* n. 25, 145-158 and figs

104-107, 109-14, 115.

- 28- M. Andronikos, ibid. supra n. 25, figs 90, 114-16.
- 29- See the tripod from Philip's tombs : M. Andronikos, ibid. supra n. 25. A golden crown of ivy found in a tomb in Pieria (now in the Archaeological Museum of Dion) is illustrated in the catalogue of the archaeological exhibition in Montreal entitled : Greek Civilisation : Macedonia the Kingdom of Alexander the Great (Athens 1993) 233 fig. 276. From the golden crowns of olive see the one found in Derveni (now in the Archaeological Museum of Thessalonike), illustrated in the catalogue of the archaeological exhibition in Melbourne entitled : Ancient Macedonia (Athens 1988) 287 fig. 236.
- 30- M. Andronikos, ibid., supra n. 25, 162-63 figs 130-31.
- 31- Athen. 198E; see the discussion by E.E. Rice, ibid., supra n. 22, 61-62.
- 32- E. Giouri, O krater tou Derveniou (Athens 1978); illustrated in many publication, see e.g. M.B. Sakellariou (ed.), Macedonia : 4000 years of Greek History and Civilization (Athens 1983) 106-108 figs 71-73.

- 33- Ibid. supra n. 32.
- 34- M.L. West, The Orphic Poems (Oxford 1983) 68-115; published originally by St. Kapsomenos, Deltion 19 (1964) A 17-25 pls 12-15; Cf. ZPE 47 (1982) 1-12.
- 35- Ch. Makaronas, Deltion 18 (1963) B 193 pl. 225 b; illustrated also in the catalogue of the archaeological exhibition in Melbourne entitled; Ancient Macedonia (Athens 1988) 283 fig. 232.
- 36- Blanche R. Brown, Ptolemaic Paintings and Mosaics and the Alexandria style (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1957); A. Gazal, Graptai Stelai tes Ellenistikikes Alexandreias (Athens 1964).
- 37- For Alexandrian false doors see B. R. Brown, ibid., supra n. 36, 34, 86 and bibliography; on klinai see I. Noshy, The Arts in Ptolemaic Egypt (London 1937) 22-23, 143. For Macedonia see the discussion by Ph. Petsas, O taphos ton Leukadion (Athens 1966) 72 and n. 2, 77 and n. 2 and M. Andronikos, "The Macedonian Tombs" in R. Ginouves, M.B. Hatzopoulos (eds), Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest 154-61; id., Vergina, the Royal Tombs and the Ancient City

(Athans 1984) 31, 32, 35, 122, 123, 219.

- 38- Vitruv. II 1-4; PasCallisth. I 31; E. Fabricius, RE IV (1901) 2392-93 no 6.
- 39- P.M. Fraser, ibid. supra n. 1, I 553-617, II 791-869.
- 40- W. Peek, RE XXII (1953) 428-46 no 3; P.M. Fraser, ibid. supra n. 39; he was one of the Macedonians honoured with proxenia in Thermon: IG IX 12 117 line 24.
- 41- SEG 27 (1977) 298.
- 42- Chryssoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Ta epitaphia apo ten Megale Toumpa tes Verginas, Epeteris tes Philosophikes Scholes tou Aristoteleiou Panepistemiou Thessalonikes Suppl. no 50 (Thessalonike 1984) no 3 p. 44, no 6 p. 79, no 22 p. 168.