
Lysimachos and Eurydike, Macedon and Thrace

by Waldemar Heckel
 University of Calgary
waldemarheckel39@gmail.com

ABSTRACT The events that ended the kingships and the lives of Lysimachos and Seleukos have been much discussed by modern scholars. Considerable attention has also been given to the roles of Arsinoë and Ptolemy Keraunos in the sordid court intrigue that ended with the murder of Lysimachos' heir, Agathokles, and the flight of his wife from the court at Lysimacheia. On the other hand, little has been said about the wives of Kassandros' sons, Alexander and Antipatros, and their claims to the Thracian and Macedonian kingdoms. The position of Lysimachos' daughter, Eurydike (widow of Antipatros), has been almost entirely neglected. This paper reconsiders the relative positions of Lysimachos' last wife, daughter and daughter-in-law, and indeed of Lysimachos himself, in the turmoil of the late 280s.

KEYWORDS Macedonia, Thrace, Lysimachos, Keraunos, Seleukos, Eurydike, Lysandra, Arsinoë.

In 287¹, the last living son of Kassandros was murdered by his own father-in-law, who had either come to realize that Antipatros had virtually no chance of recovering and holding Macedon as his birthright² or simply wanted the kingdom for himself. Thus, Lysimachos, a longtime and steadfast supporter of the house of Antipatros³, not only usurped the throne of his official homeland⁴ but also deprived his daughter of the queenship to which she aspired from birth and was entitled to by marriage⁵. She spent her final days “imprisoned” in Lysimacheia for her vociferous support of her husband’s rightful claims and appears to have followed him to an early grave. Her name, Eurydike,

¹ For his career see HECKEL 2021a, n° 128. He was the second of three sons of Kassandros and Thessalonike, and his dubious claim to fame is summed up in the *epiklesis* “the matricide” (D.S. 21.7.1: τὸν μητραλοΐαν), which he earned by murdering his own mother because she supported the claims of his younger brother, Alexander V (HECKEL 2021a, n° 42), to the sole kingship of Macedon (Justin 16.1.1-4; Plu. *Pyrrh.* 6.3, *Demetr.* 46.1).

² Antipatros’ chances were diminished both by the fact of his crimes against mother and brother and by the power of those who coveted his kingdom, namely Demetrios Poliorketes and Pyrrhos.

³ Even after the murder of Thessalonike, Lysimachos remained faithful to the Antipatrid house and attempted to bring about a negotiated settlement of the claims of her two sons. But his measures in 294 may reflect the fact that he had more pressing concerns elsewhere, namely Thrace.

⁴ The question of Lysimachos’ ethnic background —was he Macedonian or Thessalian— see HECKEL 2021a, n° 673; 1992, 267-268; YARDLEY–WHEATLEY–HECKEL 2011, 257. His father, Agathokles, was in all likelihood a Thessalian *hetairos* of Philip II; the sons were raised at the court in Pella.

⁵ She was almost certainly the daughter of Nikaia, sister of Kassandros. BELOCH 1927 [IV² 2], 142; GRAINGER 2019, 217 (tentative). If Lysimachos had other, younger, daughters, neither their names nor those of their mothers are known. I do not mean to say that, in her youth, she aspired to the queenship of Macedon specifically, but that it was natural that she should expect one day to become a “royal wife.”

which had all but become synonymous with Macedonian queenship⁶, all but vanishes (Justin 30.1.7 mistakenly calls Arsinoe, sister-wife of Philopator, Eurydike) from the ruling families of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

If it is true that, unlike the other marshals of Alexander's army, Lysimachos accepted an appointment in Babylon that offered relatively limited independence in return for a major military investment, we must ask why he was content to accept the *strategia* of Thrace when others of equal or even lesser status were awarded satrapies that presented them with greater opportunities to expand their personal powers⁷. One of the aspects of the study of history that befuddles attempts to view events through the eyes of the participants is the inability—or perhaps it is an unwillingness—to distinguish clearly between what the man *was* at a given period of time and what he was to *become*⁸. The great were not always so, much less the powerful. And outcomes are accorded a certain inevitability unjustified when the first steps to fame are taken. Indeed, the winners of the contest for Alexander's empire were few and, for the most part, unpredictable. The failures of others did not exalt them, they merely created vacuums and opportunities that could just as easily have been misplayed as mastered. And, since the self-made man is at best an anomaly in the ancient world and at worst a fiction⁹, we must look more carefully into the origins of Lysimachos' power before delving into the unexpected decline of his immediate family.

Plutarch, in his *Life of Demetrius* (44.6), says that Lysimachos was of the same ethnicity as Demetrios Poliorketes (ὀμόφυλος), a claim that finds support in Justin 15.3.1: *inlustri quidem Macedoniae loco natus* (which Yardley translates as “born into a distinguished Macedonian family,” though this should perhaps not be taken too literally). According to Theopompos *ap. Athen.* 6.259f-260a (= *FGrH* 115 F 81) a certain Agathokles, described maliciously (and doubtless inaccurately) as a slave (*doulos*) and one of the Thessalian *penestai*, had great influence with Philip II on

⁶ For the debate concerning Eurydike as a “dynastic name” see MACURDY 1932, 24-25; HECKEL 1978b; 1981; 1983; BOSWORTH 1980, 282-283; BADIAN 1982; OGDEN 1999, 22-23; CARNEY 2019, 112-115. But the name was also appealing because of the strong Macedonian associations with Thracian Orphism and Theban Maenadism (cf. HENRICHs 1978).

⁷ For the relationship between Macedonia and Thrace in Philip's time see Griffith's opinion in HAMMOND–GRIFFITH 1979, 554-566, showing that Philip's measures there fell far short of establishing the region as Macedon's first satrapy. Up to the time of Alexander's death, Thrace was ruled by a *strategos*, and although the “satrapy lists” do not designate Thrace and Euxine region as a *strategia* this does not mean that it had suddenly been converted to a satrapy. The assignment of Lysimachos to a region directly linked with Macedon was probably part of the pattern of checks and balances established by the magnates in Babylon and at Triparadeisos (see HECKEL 2002; cf. SAITTA 1955, 62, who nevertheless regards Thrace as a satrapy after 323). Eumenes, by contrast, was given a *satrapy* that he was expected to enlarge by conquest. I do not believe that Neoptolemos, the former *archihypaspistes*, was allotted Armenia in the Babylon settlement, despite the imaginative textual emendation of Dexippos, *FGrH* 100 F8.6. He may later have received from Perdikkas the title of *strategos* but this was probably a temporary post (cf. ANSON 2004, 79 and n. 5).

⁸ The tendency to attribute our lack of knowledge of Lysimachos' early career to bias in the Alexander historians (especially Ptolemy) is simplistic (rejected by LUND 1992, 4-5, though I would discount the possibility that “Cleitarachus—admittedly pro-Ptolemaic—expunged Ptolemy's rivals even more thoroughly than Ptolemy did himself”). Nevertheless, the source question needs to be considered and is thoroughly discussed by LANDUCCI GATTINONI 1992, 11-72.

⁹ The expression “self-made,” as I use it here, refers to a man who rises from humble origins to high station (in some cases, a “rags to riches” story). I would distinguish from this the other meaning, which I applied to Ptolemy in HECKEL 2018, which implies the self-fashioning of one's own image.

account of his “flattery” (*kolakeia*)¹⁰. This man was almost certainly the father of Lysimachos, who, according to Porphyry of Tyre (*ap. Euseb. Arm. = FGrH 260 F3.8*; cf. Syncellus, *Chron.* 321), was from Krannon (“der ein Thetaler war aus *Karanon* und Alexanders waffenträger”¹¹). Philip had sent Agathokles to campaign in Perrhaibia, placing him in charge of the region, and it appears that he was given lands in Macedonia, where at least three of his sons were born. As the sons of a prominent *hetairos* Lysimachos and his brothers were brought up at the court in Pella. Hence, in Arrian’s lists of Somatophylakes (*An.* 6.28.4) and trierarchs of the Hydaspes fleet (*Ind.* 18.3), Lysimachos is described as Πελλαῖος¹². In light of the fact that Agathokles’ service under Philip appears to belong to 353 or 352 (thus LANDUCCI 1992, 75; but see Griffith’s view in HAMMOND–GRIFFITH 1979, 288), it seems prudent follow Appian (*Syr.* 64.339), who dates Lysimachos’ birth to the year 352/1. Consequently, I would now rescind my view that Lysimachos was one of the Somatophylakes inherited from Philip by Alexander in 336¹³. Justin’s claim (17.1.10) that Lysimachos was seventy-four at the time of his death, though more realistic than Ps.-Lucian’s (*Macrob.* 11) allegation that he was eighty at the time of Koroupedion (even though it purports to derive from Hieronymos of Kardia), seems to be an attempt to make Lysimachos coeval with Alexander¹⁴.

What is striking about Lysimachos, in addition to his relative youth in 323, is his apparent lack of a meaningful social network. In the Alexander historians, no one is specifically named as a “friend” (in the non-technical sense), nor can any direct friendship (personal or political) be inferred, even though there were others of Thessalian origin who were prominent at the court. The only exceptions are literary men or philosophers, who can be excluded because they had no impact on the man’s career and were certainly not in a position to give political support (for example, Kallisthenes and Kalanos)¹⁵. Otherwise, he appears as a member of the Somatophylakes, a role in which he is first attested in 328, but this was hardly a uniform group or noted for its camaraderie. The only family with which the sons of Agathokles appear to have had some connection is that of Antipatros the regent¹⁶. Alkimachos (if he was, in fact, Lysimachos’ brother¹⁷) is honored in Athens along with Antipatros (*Harpokration s.v. Ἀλκίμαχος = Hyper. Frag.* 19.2; cf. Justin 9.4.5). Numerous passages in the histories of the Successors mention the earlier friendships of men such as Ptolemy, Antigonos, Antipatros, Eumenes, and Nearchos, but there is not one reference

¹⁰ WESTLAKE 1935, 179, by allowing for the possibility that the alleged *penestes* and the man from Krannon may be different individuals, creates unnecessary difficulties and gives unwarranted credence to Theopompos’ character assassination.

¹¹ Orthography as in Jacoby, *FGrH* IIB 1204.

¹² As I have noted elsewhere (HECKEL 1992, 268; cf. YARDLEY–WHEATLEY–HECKEL 2011, 257), this does not mean that he was born in Pella or, as WESTLAKE 1935, 195 claims, that his father was received land there. The Lynkestian Leonnatos is also described as “Pellan” in the same two passages.

¹³ HECKEL 1978a, 228; 1982, 375; 1992, 274. I regret my stubborn defense of a theory that, in all other respects, runs counter to the evidence. See now HECKEL 2021a, n° 673.

¹⁴ App. *Syr.* 64 places his birth in the year 351.

¹⁵ Lysimachos’ connections with Onesikritos appear to belong to the age of the Successors (Plu. *Alex.* 46.5). For his association with Kallisthenes see YARDLEY–WHEATLEY–HECKEL 2011, 258–261.

¹⁶ LANDUCCI 2007, 146. See, however, GRAINGER 2019, 112: “It has been suggested that this [i.e. the marriage of Lysimachos and Nikaia] was a great enhancement of Lysimachos’ status, and so it may be, but it may also be well to recall that the groom had been *somatophylax* of both Philip and Alexander. Socially among the Macedonians, he was already remarkable.”

¹⁷ BELOCH 1927 [IV² 2], 131 warns against making the identification on limited evidence: “aber die bloße Übereinstimmung im Namen des Vaters ist dafür natürlich noch kein genügender Beweis, um so weniger, als der Name Agathokles recht häufig ist.”

to a previous relationship of Lysimachos to another officer of Alexander. The only clear indication of some kind of cooperation (possibly a sign of earlier friendship) that does not involve the dynasts themselves is the stable relationship between Antipatros' family and Lysimachos. Not once in the years from 319 to 297 do we hear of policy differences or military confrontation between Kassandros and Antipatros. Given that Lysimachos and Kassandros were of roughly the same age (HECKEL 2021a, n° 579), the two may have belonged to the same cohort of the Pages. It is tempting to see the Antipatrids as the most powerful supporters of the upstart sons of Agathokles. What Lysimachos lacked in social status he made up for with physical prowess and courage¹⁸.

Lysimachos enters the history of Alexander during the campaign in Baktria-Sogdiana, where he is mentioned on three occasions: in the context of a lion-hunt at place called Bazeira (Curt. 8.1.13-17); at the banquet in Marakanda, which ended with Alexander's killing of Kleitos (Curt. 8.1.46); and just after the attack on the fortress of Sisimithres (Curt. 8.2.35-9; his presence is corroborated by Justin's otherwise inaccurate account: 15.3.13)¹⁹. Curtius' account of the first of these makes reference to an earlier lion-hunt in Syria, which we must date to 332 or 331.

“Among these animals was a lion of unusual size which came charging forward to pounce on the king himself. Lysimachus (who subsequently gained royal power) happened to be standing next to Alexander, and had started to aim his hunting spear at the beast when the king pushed him aside, told him to get out of the way, and added that he was as capable as Lysimachus of killing a lion singlehanded. In fact, once when they were hunting in Syria, Lysimachus had on his own killed a lion of extraordinary size, though his left shoulder had been lacerated right down to the bone and he had been within an inch of his life. This was the point of Alexander's taunt to Lysimachos but his actions were, in fact, more courageous than his talk—he not only took on the animal but he dispatched it with a single stroke. I am inclined to think that it was the event I have described above that gave rise to the widespread but unsubstantiated story that Lysimachus was deliberately exposed to a lion by the king”²⁰.

In 332/1, Lysimachos was probably 19 or 20 years old and served the king as a member of the *hypaspistai basilikoi* (sometimes called *somatophylakes basilikoi*). The young men of this unit fought in the immediate vicinity of the king and through courageous or exemplary action came to his attention. They were, in turn, promoted to military commands or to membership in the seven-man Bodyguard. It was perhaps this event, where despite his age, Lysimachos showed both courage and exceptional bodily strength, that led to his—perhaps not immediate—elevation to the elite Bodyguard, a position he held by the time of the Bazeiran hunt. Members of the *hypaspistai basilikoi* are not mentioned by name except when they performed conspicuous acts, as in the

¹⁸ In this respect, he differed from Kassandros (Hegesandros, *FHG* IV Frag. 33 *ap.* Athen. 1.18a), who was slow at establishing his “manhood,” i.e. earning the right to recline at the symposium.

¹⁹ The fact that Lysimachos' involvement in these three events is reported only by Curtius Rufus is fortuitous, indicating at best the use of sources other than Ptolemy and Aristoboulos. This merely reflects the choices of the extant historians.

²⁰ Curt. 8.1.14-17 (J.C. YARDLEY tr.). On this episode see CARNEY 2002, 63-64; although I agree with the first half of her claim that in the Greek view “excellence was not simply a matter of being good but of being *better* than any one else, one man's success always meant someone else had failed” [original emphasis] I do not share the view that, as a result of the Bazeiran lion-hunt, “Lysimachus was penalized” (64).

case of Perdikkas, Attalos (son of Andromenes), and Leonnatos in the aftermath of Philip II's assassination (D.S. 16.94.4).

Three factors, then, will account for Lysimachos' position as one of the *megistoi* after Alexander's death: his position as Somatophylax, his apparent connections with the house of Antipatros, and his own martial prowess. Justin (15.3.15) says that he was "assigned the fiercest tribes on the assumption that he was the bravest of them all" (*ferocissimae gentes quasi omnium fortissimo adsignatae sunt*). This probably reflects later propaganda more than contemporary thinking, but there is no denying the man's courage, which was proven at Sangala, where he was among the wounded. His difficulties in Thrace, where he suffered notable setbacks, may be a tribute to the Thracians themselves, but may suggest that he was a better warrior than a tactician²¹. Two other Somatophylaxes who were leading figures in the early years of the Successors, Aristonous and Peithon, are also mainly absent from the Alexander historians. Their prominence may be due to their socio-political networks and their relationship with Perdikkas, who was the most powerful of the leaders in Babylon.

Lund believes that the *strategia* of Thrace was converted to a satrapy in 323, though there is no explicit evidence for this. Nevertheless, she maintains that Lysimachos remained "subordinate to Antipatros the *strategos* of Europe"²². One thing is clear: the relationship between Lysimachos and the Antipatrids, reinforced no later than 320/19 by the marriage of Lysimachos and Nikaia²³, was cordial and mutually supportive. Lysimachos' position must have changed at some point, since it is hard to imagine that he could have declared himself *basileus* in 305, alongside Kassandros, if he had still been playing a subordinate role²⁴. It seems most likely that, when Kassandros won Lysimachos' support in his struggle against Polyperchon, the two were prepared to view each other as equals. Certainly, Diodorus (20.106.2-3) supports the view of longstanding cooperation:

²¹ Despite the claims of Aelian, *VH* 12.16 and 14.47a. Photius' summary of Arrian's *Events after Alexander* (*Succ.* 1.10) wrongly reports that Lysimachos was killed in his first battle with Seuthes: Λυσίμαχος δὲ Σεύθη τῷ Θρακί πολέμῳ ... ἀνῆρέθη.

²² LUND 54. On p. 53 she speaks of "the newly created satrapy of Thrace" (cf. SAIITA 1955, 63). In the extant accounts of the settlement at Triparadeisos, Lysimachos and Thrace are omitted entirely, though perhaps because these recorded only the redistribution of power in Asia. FOL-MAZAROV 1977, 152-153 for the tenuous nature of Macedonian control in Thrace; cf. PELEKIDIS 1994, 112. On the other hand, as ARCHIBALD 2010, 340-341 notes the sizeable contingent of Thracian troops in Alexander's armies suggests, at least, a strong level of cooperation. The fact that in the lead-up to the Peace of the Dynasts in 311, Prepelaos spoke for both Kassandros and Lysimachos is also indicative of the relationship, though not an explicit statement of subordination. GRAINGER 2019, 172 notes: "The western part of the empire was divided between the three principals, with Kassander as '*strategos* in Europe', Antigonos as the '*strategos* in Asia', and Lysimachos to rule Thrace, *but apparently without such a grandiose title*" [emphasis added]. SEIBERT 1967, 93 believes that Antipatros "konnte ... wohl nur mit Einwilligung des Lysimachos 321 ungehindert nach Kleinasien übersetzen und beim Rückzug, als seine Truppen meuterten, bei dem thrakischen Strategen Schutz suchen." But, if we accept (as Seibert does) that Lysimachos was *strategos*, Lysimachos' "Einwilligung" was surely expected and a hostile stance against Antipatros would have been tantamount to rebellion.

²³ For the date of this marriage see SEIBERT 1967, 16 and n. 16. But COHEN 1973 makes a good case for the lifetime of Antipatros; OGDEN 1999, 57; DMITRIEV 2007, 136. SAIITA 1955, 72 dates the marriage of Lysimachos to an Odrysian princess to c. 310/09, which would make it unlikely that Agathokles was the son of this woman (*contra* DROYSEN 1836, 635), since he must have married Lysandra in 294. CARNEY 2013, 35 dates the marriage to the Odrysian princess to roughly the same time as that to Arsinoë.

²⁴ SAIITA 1955, 74 sees this a sign of the increase of Lysimachos' power, but he and Kassandros continued to work in tandem.

“Cassander was alarmed and summoned Lysimachus from Thrace to take concerted action in regard to their highest interests; for it was his invariable custom when facing the most alarming situations to call on Lysimachus for assistance, both because of his personal character and because his kingdom lay next to Macedonia”²⁵.

This bond was strengthened after Ipsos by the marriage of Lysimachos’ daughter Eurydike to Kassandros’ second son Antipatros.

When this marriage occurred and who arranged it, we cannot be certain. The earliest date for the birth of Antipatros the Younger is 315/14, which means that he was about sixteen or seventeen when his father and his brother, Philip IV, died within months of each other²⁶. We are told that, after the latter’s death there was a joint kingship of the younger sons, Antipatros and Alexander, nominally, at least, under the guidance of their mother, Thessalonike²⁷. Thus the official version, perhaps invented to discredit Antipatros —as if matricide in itself was not a sufficient source of opprobrium. But we do not know why such a joint-kingship should have been in the interests of the Macedonian state. Earlier Macedonian history had taught that two inept kings were just as bad, if not worse, than one. Furthermore, Antipatros was both on the verge of manhood and mentally competent. Brothers could also prove less collegial than others who shared office²⁸. Although it is possible that Thessalonike negotiated the marriages of her boys to Eurydike and Lysandra respectively, it seems more likely that Kassandros, whose own wasting illness and the frailty of his heir Philip must have been a cause of concern, arranged at least for Antipatros to marry the daughter of his trusted friend Lysimachos. This may have been a reaction to the matrimonial arrangements of the other “kings” after Ipsos, but it is more likely that Kassandros hoped to secure the throne against his enemies, Pyrrhos and Demetrios, and that he regarded Lysimachos as the protector of his kingdom²⁹. How and when the marriage of Alexander V and Lysandra came about is more difficult to ascertain, but, if we assume that both brothers were married at the same time, we create a complicated and virtually inexplicable nexus of matrimonial relationships that could be regarded as contradictory in its aims, especially in the case of the Ptolemaic brides.

In the period immediately after Ipsos Ptolemy gave daughters of both Eurydike and Berenike (in the latter case, one or two stepdaughters) to various potentates: Antigone and Theoxene, both apparently daughters of Berenike and her first husband Philip, to Pyrrhos and Agathokles of Syracuse; Eurydike’s daughters, Lysandra and Ptolemais, to Alexander V and Demetrios respectively; and, even though he had given Arsinoë (II)

²⁵ Κάσανδρος ... καταπλαγείς Λυσίμαχον ἐκ τῆς Θράκης μετεπέμψατο πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὅλων κοινοπραγίαν. ἀεὶ γὰρ εἰώθει τοῦτον κατὰ τοὺς μεγίστους φόβους εἰς τὴν βοήθειαν προσλαμβάνεσθαι διὰ τε τὴν τάνδρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ διὰ τὸ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ ὅμορον εἶναι τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ.

²⁶ HECKEL 2021a, n° 904. For his death Justin 16.1.1; Porphyr. Tyr. *FGrH* 260 F3.5; OIKONOMIDES 1989. Kassandros married Thessalonike not long after she was captured at Pydna in 316 (cf. Justin 14.6.13; D.S. 19.35.5), certainly by 315, when the other Successors accused him of marrying her against her will (D.S. 19.52.1, 61.2; cf. Paus. 8.7.7; Justin 14.6.13; Porphyr. Tyr. *FGrH* 60 F3.4).

²⁷ CARNEY 2000, 157 rightly notes that Thessalonike was not regent. *Contra* BELOCH 1925 [IV² 1], 215; cf. WORTHINGTON 2016, 176, on no good evidence, although in n.72 he does state that “her status as guardian or regent is controversial.”

²⁸ For the mother’s support of the younger son, one could point to the famous case of Parysatis and the younger Kyros, though this did not, of course, involve joint kingship.

²⁹ Cf. Justin 17.2.15 for a similar relationship between Pyrrhos and Ptolemy Keraunos. Hammond’s (HAMMOND 1988) suggestion that this refers not to Keraunos but to Philadelphos involves convoluted reasoning and is both unconvincing and unnecessary.

to Lysimachos, Ptolemy later arranged for his heir Ptolemy (Philadelphos) to marry another Arsinoë (I), the daughter of Eurydike's sister, Nikaia. Perhaps, he was more interested in forging connections that might pay dividends in the future than in pursuing some specific, immediate policy. Despite the eventual supremacy of Berenike at the Ptolemaic court—and this appears not to have manifested itself until c.285—Soter used his daughters as political pawns without consideration of their maternity. How these daughters viewed each other is another matter, although we run the risk of seeing friction or animosity where it may not have existed. And, even if it did exist on a personal level, this has no bearing on the political calculations. The Successors were forging bonds with Ptolemy, not his wives or concubines. If we assume, as I think we must, that the dynastic fates (i.e. the rights of succession) of the kingdoms of Egypt and Thrace had not yet been determined, we may postulate a different chain of events that nevertheless culminated in the fall of the house of Lysimachos and altered the course of Ptolemaic history. In the swirl of this political and dynastic chaos the vortex was Macedon.

In 287, Lysimachos murdered his son-in-law Antipatros, having previously imprisoned his own daughter Eurydike, who had been pushing her husband's claim to the Macedonian throne too vigorously. Thereafter, for a short time at least, the two dowager queens of Macedon resided in Lysimacheia, one as the wife of Lysimachos' heir, the other languishing in prison. The sudden supremacy of Lysandra was thus, in some ways, paradoxical. Married to the weaker of the two claimants to the Macedonian throne, she was soon widowed and shunted off to Thrace to be remarried. This new marriage left her in a stronger position, seemingly destined to become queen of Thrace. Hence, despite the fact that Arsinoë was firmly entrenched at Lysimachos' court and already the mother of one or more potential heirs, Lysandra—who is generally depicted as the victim of her stepsister's intrigues—was more likely to be feared than despised³⁰. And, in the campaign against Demetrios in Asia Minor, Lysandra's husband enhanced his reputation, apparently solidifying his position as heir to the kingdom. Lysimachos' decision to remove Antipatros and Eurydike from the dynastic equation would seem to have complicated rather than simplified the situation. Hence, we need to look more closely at the events of 297-287.

At the beginning of this period, Pyrrhos, with the help of his “father-in-law” Ptolemy, was restored to his rightful kingdom of Epeiros, though this involved sharing the throne with Neoptolemos II. Since Neoptolemos had been elevated to the kingship by the pro-Kassandros party (and doubtless with the support of the Macedonian king), it is likely that Pyrrhos did not return to his homeland until after Kassandros' death³¹. Soon after his return—before the death of his Ptolemaic bride, Antigone³²—Pyrrhos

³⁰ DROYSEN 1836, 635 comments on Arsinoë's relationship with Lysandra: “sollte sie selbst dann dieser Stiefschwester Lysandra, die sie im väterlichen Hause schon verachtet, den Rang abtreten...” [emphasis added]. Similarly, CARNEY 2013, 41 remarks: “If Arsinoë and Lysandra knew each other as children, as seems likely, they would have known each other as enemies, probably early on channeling the rivalry of their mothers and brothers.”

³¹ Plu. *Pyrrh.* 5.1; Paus. 1.11.5; cf. Paus. 1.6.8. Cf. Walbank's view in HAMMOND–WALBANK 1979, 213. Plutarch's story of how Berenike was taken with Pyrrhos' charm may contain an element of truth, but both the marriage to Antigone and the restoration to Epeiros were clearly political. The Molossians were prepared to bring Pyrrhos in as a counterbalance to Neoptolemos, who had, in the years 302-297 made himself unpopular. The death of Kassandros appears to have opened the door for Pyrrhos' return, but he may also have feared that Neoptolemos might seek political support elsewhere (5.3: δεισας, μη προς τινα των άλλων βασιλέων ο Νεοπτόλεμος τράπηται).

³² HECKEL 2021a, n° 114. Plu. *Pyrrh.* 5.13 shows that Antigone was still alive at the time. The date and cause of her death are uncertain. She may have died giving birth to Pyrrhos' daughter Olympias. The only dating criterion we have is Plutarch's claim that Pyrrhos did not take his other wives, including

eliminated Neoptolemos on what may have been a trumped up change of conspiracy. At this time, Lysimachos was preoccupied with his campaigns against the Getic king, Dromichaïtes³³. The Macedonians, for their part, did nothing, either because they were powerless to intervene or re-evaluating their foreign policy. Kassandros' hatred of Aiakides and his son, Pyrrhos, is well documented³⁴, but his widow, Thessalonike, is somewhat of an enigma. We hear nothing about her involvement in the affairs of state during her husband's lifetime, and in general she comes across as an (apparently) unwilling pawn in the power struggles of the last two decades of the fourth century, a valuable commodity (on account of her pedigree) rather than a forceful personality. But she may have been schooled in the arts of intrigue and the powers that could be exercised behind the scenes by Olympias, who seems to have taken on the role of raising her after her mother's death³⁵. How the joint-kingship of Antipatros and Alexander came about, or if it was even an arrangement sanctioned by the Macedonian assembly, is unclear. F. W. Walbank recounts the course of events as follows:

“No record has survived of the constitutional procedures which led to the accession of Philip IV and that of his brothers; but the Macedonian Assembly no doubt gave formal approval to the obvious dynastic heir or heirs in each case. Antipater cannot have been more than sixteen; and Cassander's widow Thessalonice, though we are not told that she was officially appointed his guardian, seems to have exercised considerable influence over both sons. The queen preferred the younger boy, Alexander, and insisted that Antipater should share the kingship with him. As the half-sister of Alexander the Great and a daughter of Philip II, she evidently commanded sufficient prestige to have her way, though it was by no means obviously in the interest of the state. A boy king was bad enough. Two boy kings ruling together could only compound the dangers. However, this joint monarchy lasted from Philip IV's death in autumn 297 until the spring of 294. The division of the kingship was an indication of weakness and a recipe for intervention”³⁶.

This amounts to nothing more than an educated guess, based on some of what the sources tell us and much that they do not. In fact, the final sentence ought to be reworded to read: “The division of the kingship was a recipe for weakness and an indication of intervention.” Plutarch says that the death of Philip IV was followed by strife between the younger brothers, a clear indication that a division of power had not

Lanassa and Birkenna, until after Antigone's death (9.1: γυναῖκας δὲ πραγμάτων ἔνεκα καὶ δυνάμεως πλείονας ἔγημε μετὰ τὴν Ἀντιγόνης τελευτήν). For the identity of Neoptolemos II and the events in the Molossian kingdom see HECKEL 2021b.

³³ For Lysimachos' campaigns against Dromichaïtes see DELEV 2015, 55; cf. DELEV 2000.

³⁴ Plu. *Pyrrh.* 3.2; Paus. 1.11.4-5. He is said to have offered the Illyrian king Glaukias 200 talents if he surrendered the child (Plu. *Pyrrh.* 3.5; Justin 17.3.20) but was rebuffed.

³⁵ CARNEY 2000, 156: “It is difficult to imagine where else Thessalonike could have grown up than in the household of Olympias, unless possibly that of her half sister, Cleopatra. Thessalonike most likely followed her stepmother to seclusion in Molossia and returned to Macedonia with her.” For her life see HECKEL 2021a, n° 1122. Thessalonike must have been familiar with Aiakides, Olympias' nephew and ally, and Deidameia, who had only recently died. But we must be careful not to read too much into the charges made by Antigonos that Kassandros had married her against her will. At any rate, Thessalonike's actions were personal rather than political, and, although the blame for her death falls squarely on Antipatros' shoulders, there were probably many powerful Macedonians who were not unhappy to be rid of her.

³⁶ Walbank in HAMMOND–WALBANK 1979, 210-211. Nor is it certain that the sharing of power came about in 297.

been arranged at the time of Philip's death³⁷. On the basis of seniority, Antipatros had every reason to expect to succeed his shortlived brother, and the ensuing strife shows that his rights were challenged by the faction of the dowager queen³⁸. This challenge to Antipatros' authority may not have come until 295/4, when Antipatros was approaching the age of majority; its impact was immediate and, for Thessalonike, disastrous. Beloch summarizes events as follows:

“Die Herrschaft hätte dem älteren, Antipatros, gebührt; die Königin-Mutter Thessalonike aber, die den jüngeren Alexandros, begünstigte, setzte es durch, daß das Reich geteilt wurde, so daß der Osten Antipatros zufiel, während Alexandros den Westen mit Thessalien erhielt” [emphasis added]³⁹.

The evidence for such a division—which would indeed have been advantageous to the younger brother—is ambiguous at best and should thus be treated with caution⁴⁰. Justin 16.1.2 speaks of *divisio inter fratres regni*, but this could simply mean a sharing of power rather than a partitioning of territory. Similarly, Plut. *Pyrrh.* 6.5 shows only that Pyrrhos, after annexing portions of Macedonian lands to his own kingdom, took territory from Antipatros and gave it to Alexander, but he nowhere says that this came of the eastern part of realm⁴¹. If there was, indeed, a territorial division along the lines that some scholars suggest, this clearly overturned the Macedonian “rules” of succession and completely undermined Antipatros' authority, to say nothing of the power of the kingdom. There is, however, no doubt that Antipatros murdered his mother because she favored Alexander, working either to strengthen his position or perhaps even to make him the sole ruler of the kingdom. Antipatros, married to Lysimachos' daughter, threatened not only Alexander but the dowager queen as well. The chain of events that led to her murder is not clearly stated, but several points deserve to be raised.

First, there is no good reason to believe that a joint-kingship was either desired by the Macedonians or required for the stability of the kingdom. At sixteen or seventeen, Antipatros was nearing the age of majority and Kassandros' *hetairoi* (or, at least, the bulk of them) would no doubt have been available to serve him, advising him on policy

³⁷ Plu. *Demetr.* 36.1: ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτοῦ τῶν παίδων Φίλιππος οὐ πολὺν χρόνον βασιλεύσας Μακεδόνων ἀπέθανεν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ δύο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐστασίαζεν.

³⁸ BELOCH 1925 [IV² 1], 222, adding in n. 2: “Die Grenze der beiden Anteile bildete wahrscheinlich der Axios.” Beloch's addition of Thessaly to Alexander's portion is doubtless speculation based on Thessalonike's regional origin. Later (IV² 1.231 n.2), when discussing the partitioning of Macedonia between Pyrrhos and Lysimachos, Beloch notes: “Über die Abgrenzung der beiderseitigen Anteile sind wir nicht unterrichtet.” This is true of the division of territory (if it occurred) between Antipatros and Alexander as well, but Beloch concludes with the circular argument: “Am nächsten liegt die Annahme, daß Lysimachos den Anteil des Antipatros, Pyrrhos den des Alexandros erhalten hat.”

³⁹ Plu. *Pyrrh.* 6.4-5: ἐπελθὼν ὁ Πύρρος ἤτησε μισθὸν τῆς συμμαχίας τὴν τε Στυμφαίαν καὶ τὴν Παραυαίαν τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ τῶν ἐπικτήτων ἐθνῶν Ἀμβρακίαν, Ἀκαρνανίαν, Ἀμφιλοχίαν. Προεμένου δὲ τοῦ νεανίσκου, ταῦτα μὲν αὐτὸς εἶχε φρουραῖς καταλαβὼν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κτώμενος ἐκείνω, περιέκοπτε τὸν Ἀντίπατρον. Note that Walbank in HAMMOND–WALBANK 1979, 215 n. 6 interprets this as follows: “The words τὰ λοιπὰ mean ‘the rest of Macedonia’ or ‘the rest of what was now Antipater's kingdom’.” [My emphasis.]

⁴⁰ I see no firm evidence for the geographical partitioning of Macedonia. If the division of power had involved partitioning of the kingdom, it is difficult to understand what the sources mean when they say that Thessalonike was favoring the younger brother. ERRINGTON 1978, 126 comments on the struggle for the kingship: “The open question was, which of the two boys would succeed; and the mother of the boys was thought to have played a decisive role....” This hardly suggests a contest between two sons who had already divided the kingdom on a territorial basis.

⁴¹ Plu. *Pyrrh.* 6.5:

and knowing that they could call upon Lysimachos in time of need⁴². Just as there was no need of a joint-kingship, there was also no good reason for marrying Alexander to a daughter of Ptolemy in 297 or soon afterward; for this too would have had a destabilizing effect, in effect enshrining dyarchy and, possibly, a geographic division of the state⁴³. Hence, the marriage may have been part of a scheme to place Alexander on the throne, instigated by Thessalonike herself. It also brought Alexander into closer alliance with Pyrrhos, who was married to Ptolemy's stepdaughter; and it is not surprising that Alexander called, first and foremost, on Pyrrhos, when Antipatros murdered his mother and drove out Alexander with relatively little opposition from his Macedonian subjects. The marriage Alexander and Lysandra —or, to put it another way, the pro-Ptolemaic alliance— must have played no small part in Antipatros' murder of his mother and the expulsion of Alexander from the kingdom⁴⁴. Pyrrhos, for his part, could use his alliance with Alexander and their bond as sons-in-law of Ptolemy as an excuse to intervene in Macedonian affairs, in the process of which he extorted territorial concessions⁴⁵. For Lysandra herself the marriage was a short one, possibly not even consummated, even though Pyrrhos had succeeded in chasing Antipatros to the court of his father-in-law in Lysimacheia. Pyrrhos, having gained what he wanted, left the matter to be resolved through diplomacy.

Lysimachos, whose attentions were fixed on Dromichaites and the Getai, could do little at the time except propose a truce between the brothers —Alexander could be eliminated later, now that he had lost his mother's support and was tainted by the surrender of Macedonian territory; Antipatros was firmly in his power— which he asked Pyrrhos to broker with a promise of 300 talents, to be paid by Antipatros⁴⁶. Despite this move, the arrival of Demetrios Poliorketes all but put an end to Kassandros' dynasty. Whether he had, in fact, been summoned by Alexander initially is debatable: the invitation, along with the allegation that Alexander had plotted to murder Demetrios, may well have been invented by Hieronymos in order to put his master in a good light. The same writer was probably responsible for the observation that the Macedonians hated Antipatros for the murder of his mother and Kassandros for his

⁴² There is no evidence that Antipatros' murder of his mother resulted in civil war in Macedonia. The action was doubtless regarded as the king's rightful defense of his authority. If anything, the struggle for power involved the magnates who had taken sides with one son or another for their own political gain. ERRINGTON 1978, 126 points out that Alexander would not have needed to summon outside aid unless the Macedonians themselves had accepted Antipatros' action as in the best interests of the state.

⁴³ Dyarchy, when it occurred (twice) among the Molossians (Paus. 1.11.3; Plu. *Pyrrh.* 5.3), did not, as far as I can see, result in territorial division. REUSS 1881, 161 ("Ihm [*sc.* Alketas] folgten seine Söhne Neoptolemos und Arybbas, welche anfangs die Regierung gemeinsam führten, dann aber eine Theilung des väterlichen Reiches vornahmen") suggests a sharing of *power* followed by a division of *territory*.

⁴⁴ CARNEY 2018, 33 notes that Justin 16.1.3 claims that there was no *fraus* on Thessalonike's part (*nullum maternae fraudis vestigium fuit*): "This suggests that Thessalonike was murdered not because she favoured one son to the exclusion of the other, but rather because she refused to favour one son to the exclusion of the other." But Justin 16.1.2 says: *causa parricidii fuit, quod ... [sc. Thessalonice] propensior fuisse pro Alexandro videbatur*. We must conclude that she lent her support to Alexander openly and not fraudulently behind the scenes. The older brother clearly had reason to believe his mother was an obstacle to his kingship.

⁴⁵ Territorial concessions: Plu. *Pyrrh.* 6.4-5. Pyrrhos may have been far more restrained if Thessalonike had still been alive.

⁴⁶ Details in Plu. *Pyrrh.* 6.6-9, where Lysimachos arranges a peace (εἰρήνη), but there is no talk of territorial division. A truce between the two brothers would have been much easier to bring about if it did not division of territory. Lysimachos' aim was doubtless to achieve some stability in Macedonia until he himself was free to set affairs in order. This scheme was, of course, preempted by the arrival of Demetrios.

“crimes” against the family of Alexander the Great; that they respected the elder Antipatros and welcomed the husband of his daughter Phila as their new king⁴⁷.

The story of Demetrios’ annexation of Macedonia need not detain us. What matters here is that, upon his departure for Asia, Lysimachos seized the kingdom and ruled it as his own, making no effort to reinstate Antipatros and Eurydike⁴⁸. The latter was imprisoned for promoting her husband’s claims too vigorously and the husband himself was soon eliminated by the man he regarded as his protector. Since we hear nothing further about Eurydike, we may assume that she was executed (perhaps along with her husband), died of illness, or forced to live out her life in obscurity and isolation. The last seems least likely since, for as long as she lived, she offered a potential husband a claim to the Macedonian throne. In this regard, the fact that Ptolemy Keraunos, after murdering Seleukos, did not choose Eurydike as his bride rather than Arsinoë, strongly suggests that she was no longer alive. Her disappearance must, however, have increased the political capital of Lysandra, already the wife of the designated heir to Thrace.

Under these circumstances, the dynastic strife of the mid-to-late 280s that has come to be obscured by stories of Arsinoë’s treachery and Lysimachos’ apparent dotage⁴⁹, takes on a new perspective. And it answers the question posed by Dmitriev: “if Lysimachus and Arsinoe were married ca. 300, why did Arsinoe suddenly succeed in bringing Lysimachus over to her side only in the mid-280s?”⁵⁰. Whether Macedonia and Thrace were intended to become a single kingdom in unclear⁵¹, but the future of the Macedonian throne must have been a bone of contention at Lysimachos’ court. Possibly, Agathokles pressed his wife’s claims to Macedon just as Eurydike had earlier demanded the reinstatement of her husband⁵². Or, perhaps, Lysimachos planned to award Macedonia to the sons of Arsinoë in an attempt to avert a power struggle in Thrace⁵³. In either case, the succession question put father and son at loggerheads and, after the matter led to Agathokles’ imprisonment and murder, the remainder of the affair was played out as a struggle between the (briefly) triumphant queen of Thrace and the dowager queen of Macedon, with the latter kingdom as its prize. However, it was that these events unfolded, there seems to be very little evidence —beyond the expected hostile portrayal of the queen by her enemies— for the depiction of Arsinoë as an ambitious and scheming second wife, intent upon stealing power from a befuddled old man and his rightful heirs.

⁴⁷ Plu. *Demetr.* 37. Cf. Justin 16.1.10-17.

⁴⁸ CARNEY 2000, 160: “We do not know why Eurydice maintained her loyalty to her husband at a time when it was expedient to abandon it. She may have seen more power for herself in a possible resurgence of her husband’s claim to Macedonian rule than in supporting her father. She may have been fonder of her husband than her father.”

⁴⁹ CARNEY 2013, 31 aptly speaks of “gold-digging sex kittens and doddering, indulgent old fools.”

⁵⁰ DMITRIEV 2007, 144.

⁵¹ In 281/0, when Seleukos and Ptolemy Keraunos were proclaimed, in succession, in Lysimacheia, they were not recognized as kings of Macedon but rather of Thrace. And, indeed, Keraunos’ sole aim in marrying Arsinoë was the acquisition of the other kingdom. For full discussion see Heckel 2022.

⁵² SAIITA 1955, 87 considers the marriage of Lysandra to Agathokles a blow to the ambitions of Demetrios, but does not specify how this is so. Perhaps, since Lysimachos had given Antipatros’ share of Macedonia to the Besieger, that left the question of western Macedonia undetermined.

⁵³ It is perhaps significant that Ptolemy son of Lysimachos and his followers made no attempt to defend Lysimacheia against either Seleukos or Ptolemy Keraunos, but that the victorious Keraunos was forced to suppress the party that favored Arsinoë’s son in Macedonia (i.e. Kassandreia and Pella).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANSON, E. M. (2004): *Eumenes. A Greek among Macedonians*, Leiden.
- ARCHIBALD, Z. (2010): “Macedonia and Thrace”, in J. ROISMAN – I. WORTHINGTON (eds.): *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford: 326-341.
- BADIAN, E. (1982): “Eurydice”, in L. ADAMS – E. N. BORZA (eds.): *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage*. Washington, DC: 99-110.
- BELOCH, K. J. (1925): *Griechische Geschichte. 4.1 Die Griechische Weltherrschaft*, Berlin–Leipzig.
- (1927): *Griechische Geschichte. 4.2 Die Griechische Weltherrschaft*, Berlin–Leipzig.
- CARNEY, E. D. (2000): *Women and Monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman.
- (2002): “Hunting and the Macedonian elite: sharing the rivalry of the chase”, in D. OGDEN (ed.): *The Hellenistic World. New Perspectives*, London: 59-80.
- (2013): *Arsinoe of Egypt and Macedon. A Royal Life*, Oxford.
- (2018): “Royal Women as Succession Advocates”, in T. HOWE – F. POWNALL (eds.): *Ancient Macedonians in the Greek and Roman Sources. From History to Historiography*, Swansea: 29-40.
- COHEN, G. M. (1973): “The Marriage of Lysimachus and Nicaea”, *Historia* 22: 354-356.
- DELEV, P. (2000): “Lysimachus, the Getae and Archaeology”, *CQ* 50: 384-401.
- (2015): “Thrace from Kotys I to Koroupedion (360-281 BCE)”, in J. VALEVA – E. NANKOV – D. GRANINGER (eds.): *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Oxford: 48-58.
- DMITRIEV, S. 2007: “The Last Marriage and the Death of Lysimachus”, *GRBS* 47: 135-149.
- ERRINGTON, R. M. (1978): “The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy”, *Chiron* 8: 77-133.
- FOL, A.; MAZAROV, I. (1977): *Thrace and the Thracians*, London.
- GRAINGER, J. D. (2019): *Antipater’s Dynasty. Alexander the Great’s Regent and his Successors*, Philadelphia.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1988): “Which Ptolemy gave Troops and Stood as Protector of Pyrrhus’ Kingdom?”, *Historia* 37: 405-413.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L.; GRIFFITH, G. T. (1979): *A History of Macedonia. Vol. 2*, Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L.; WALBANK, F. W. (1988): *A History of Macedonia. Vol. 3*, Oxford.
- HECKEL, W. (1978a): “The Somatophylakes of Alexander the Great: Some Thoughts”, *Historia* 27: 224-228.
- (1978b): “Kleopatra or Eurydike?”, *Phoenix* 33: 155-158.
- (1982): “The Early Career of Lysimachos”, *Klio* 64: 373-781.
- (1992): *The Marshals of Alexander’s Empire*, London–New York.
- (2002): “The Politics of Distrust: Alexander and his Successors”, in D. OGDEN (ed.): *The Hellenistic World. New Perspectives*, London: 81-95.

- (2016): *Alexander's Marshals. A Study of the Makedonian Aristocracy and the Politics of Military Leadership*, London.
- (2021a): *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander and his Successors. From Chaironeia to Ipsos (338–301 BC)*, London.
- (2021b): “The Limits of Brotherly Love: Neoptolemus II and Molossian Dynastic History”, in M. D’AGOSTINI – E. M. ANSON – F. POWNALL (eds.): *Affective Relations and Personal Bonds in Hellenistic Antiquity. Studies in honor of Elizabeth D. Carney*, Oxford–New York: 63-77.
- (2022): “Storm Clouds over Three Hellenistic Courts: the life and death of Ptolemy Ceraunus”, in F. POWNALL – S. ASIRVATHAM – S. MÜLLER (eds.): *The Courts of Philip II and Alexander the Great: Monarchy and Power in Ancient Macedonia*, Berlin–Boston: 33-45.
- HENRICH, A. (1978): “Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina”, *HSCP* 82: 121-160.
- OGDEN, D. (1999): *Polygamy, Prostitutes and Death. The Hellenistic Dynasties*, London.
- PALAGIA, O. (2000): “Hephaestion’s pyre and the royal hunt of Alexander”, in A. B. BOSWORTH – E. BAYNHAM (eds.): *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*, Oxford: 167-205.
- PELEKIDIS, C. (1994): “The Greeks in Thrace”, in G. SELIMIS (ed.): *Thrace*, Athens: 98-114.
- REUSS, F. (1881): “König Arybbas von Epeiros”, *RhM* 36: 161-174.
- SAITTA, G. (1955): “Lisimaco di Tracia”, *Kokalos* 1: 62-154.
- SEIBERT, J. (1967): *Historische Beiträge zu den dynastischen Verbindungen in hellenistischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden.
- WORTHINGTON, I. (2016): *Ptolemy. King and Pharaoh of Egypt*, Oxford.
- YARDLEY, J. C.; WHEATLEY, P.; HECKEL, W. (1997): *Justin. Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus. II. The Successors to Alexander the Great*, Oxford.