"A Greek among Macedonians"

If Philip and Alexander’s kingdom was ultimately composed of royal landholders and locally self-governing communities, in which lived mixed populations, and where regionalism was virtually non-existent, and nationalism prior to Philip not discernible; where status was ultimately bestowed by the king, and the basic culture and language were Greek, then, in what sense could Eumenes be an object of discrimination? Further, Eumenes enjoyed a position of prominence as head of the imperial chancellery, the nerve center of the growing domains under the control of the Macedonian monarchs. Eumenes was also one of both Philip’s and Alexander’s hetairoi (Chapter 2, Stagakis 1970: 98 n. 40). After Alexander’s death, Eumenes became a satrap, a confidant of the regent Perdiccas, and ultimately royal general in Asia. He commanded sizable numbers of Macedonian troops beginning with his appointment as general in Asia Minor by Perdiccas in 320. Yet, Eumenes is recorded as personally referring to his handicap as a “Greek” (Plut. Eum. 3. 1; cf. Diod. 18. 60. 1, 3–4; Nepos. Eum. 7. 1–2). and modern scholars often refer to the long-standing hostility of Macedonians and Greeks towards one another (Badian 1982: 36–43; Borza 1990: 96, 280). As direct evidence for Macedonian hostility towards Greeks during the reigns of Philip and Alexander, few passages, however, can be cited.

Curtius (8. 1. 24) mentions a “seditio” arising among the “Macedonian soldiers” and the “Greek mercenaries” in which Philip was injured, and was only saved by Alexander’s direct intervention. But the cause of the conflict is nowhere stated, and no other source even confirms this incident.¹ Certainly between native troops and mercenaries any number of reasons for disagreement

¹ Curtius’ account occurs during his telling of the Cleitus episode, in which he presents numerous differences from what is found in Arrian and Plutarch. Indeed, the related events leading to the death of Cleitus are nowhere the same. Curtius (8. 1. 22–52) states that the quarrel began at a “convivio,” where Alexander belittled the achievements of his father and Parmenio, and Cleitus reproached Alexander for among other things the death of Attalus. In Arrian (Anab. 4. 8. 2–6), the incident is connected to a sacrifice to the Dioscuri during which various of Alexander’s courtiers express the opinion that Alexander was greater than Castor, Pollux, or even Heracles. Here, it is Cleitus who brings up Philip, declaring that Alexander owed a lot to his father. To this the courtiers respond, but not Alexander. Plutarch (Alex. 50) reports the sacrifice to the Dioscuri, but also relates an interrupted sacrifice being performed by Cleitus. Here the cause of initial complaint was a song composed to ridicule the generals who had recently been defeated in Sogdiana (cf. Arr. Anab. 4. 5. 2–9; 6. 1–2; Curt. 8. 1. 35).
might have arisen, not to exclude ethnic differences. Arrian (*Anab.* 2. 10. 7) in his description of the battle of Issus relates how between the Greek mercenaries serving Persia and the Macedonians there developed a Greek-Macedonian rivalry. However, the first explanation for the severity of the fighting offered by Arrian is that the Greeks were attempting to salvage a victory and the Macedonians did not want their reputation for invincibility tarnished (*Arr. Anab.* 2. 10. 5–6). In the case of the latter, it would appear that the “Macedonian” troops were far more concerned with their military reputation than with any ethnic hostility. Besides, certain Greeks participated fully in the Macedonian victory. The Thessalian and Peloponnesian cavalries, in particular, fought well holding back the Persian left wing (*Arr. Anab.* 2. 8. 1, 11. 2; Curt. 3. 11. 14; Diod. 17. 33. 6). While they nowhere appear in any author’s account of the fighting in any of Alexander’s three great battles against the Persians, there were 7000 allied Greek hoplites included in the force that crossed to Asia with Alexander (Diod. 17. 17. 3). Alexander may not have wanted to test their loyalty, but it is more likely that they simply have been omitted from our surviving accounts. Prior to the battle of Issus, Alexander had not only singled out Macedonian commanders for encouragement, but also “mercenaries who were conspicuous for their rank or some excellence” (*Arr. Anab.* 2. 10. 2; Curt. 3. 10. 8).

Given that a sizable number of the Greek mercenaries in Persian employ had probably been exiled from their cities as a direct result of Philip’s and Alexander’s campaigns, there was probably considerable hostility between these Greeks and Alexander’s forces. On the Granicus, Thessalians, Athenians, and Thebans were among those captured. For Philip’s former troops these

---

2 Diodorus (17. 33. 2–34. 9) makes no mention of this rivalry or of the role of the Greek mercenaries in the battle.

3 These cavalry units had also acquitted themselves well on the Granicus (*Arr. Anab.* 1. 14. 3, 16. 1–2; Diod. 17. 19. 6, 21. 4, cf. 17. 33. 2), and at Gaugamela (Diod. 17. 57. 3–4; Curt. 4. 13. 29, 16. 1–7; *Arr. Anab.* 3. 11. 10).

4 Neither Arrian, nor any other source provides an exhaustive review of troop dispositions for any of the battles. The only two references to specific “Greek” infantry units, albeit mercenary, with Alexander’s forces occur in the description of the battle at Gaugamela. “Those called the old mercenaries” are found on the right wing (*Arr. Anab.* 3. 12. 2; these are, perhaps, veterans of service with Philip, see Parke 1933: 188), and on the left the “Achaean mercenaries” (Diod. 17. 57. 4; cf. Parke 1933: 190).

5 Alexander apparently freed immediately the Thebans he captured, but sent to Macedonia to perform hard labor the surrendered Thessalians and Athenians (Plut. *Mor.* 181B; *Arr. Anab.* 1. 29. 5; 3. 6. 2). After Issus, Alexander discovered prominent Athenians and Spartans in the Persian camp (Curt. 3. 13. 15).