

Aleksandar DONSKI

HISTORICAL MANUAL AGAINST THE GREEK ANTI-MACEDONIAN PROPAGANDA

*MANUAL FOR SUCCESSFUL OPPOSITION AGAINST THE
GREEK DENATIONALIZATION PROPAGANDA WHICH IS
STILL BEING CARRIED OUT AMONG THE MACEDONIANS
IN THE AEGEAN PART OF MACEDONIA.*



Aleksandar DONSKI

HISTORICAL MANUAL AGAINST THE GREEK ANTI-MACEDONIAN PROPAGANDA

Publisher:

Macedonian Literary Association "Grigor Prlichev"
P.O. Box 227 Rockdale NSW 2216 Australia

For the publisher:

Dushan RISTEVSKI



In collaboration with:

The Association of the Macedonians from the Aegean
part of Macedonia "Mirka Ginova" From Stip (Macedonia)

President: **Stojan DIMKOV**



This book has been published in Macedonian, English, and
Greek, and is intended for free distribution.

INTRODUCTION

Macedonians in the Aegean part of Macedonia (which belonged to Greece only after the Balkan Wars in 1912 and 1913) have always been exposed to denationalization by Greek regimes. These attempts at denationalization began even before the division of Macedonia, through the Patriarchate of Constantinople (which was practically a Greek church). Namely, at that time the Ottoman government did not allow Macedonians to open their own church, so whether they wanted to or not, they satisfied their religious needs in foreign churches (first in the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople), and then in the Bulgarian Exarchate and the Serbian Church. All these churches abused this by opening schools in Macedonia right next to their larger church buildings where the children of Macedonian believers were educated. In these schools, Macedonian children were lied to that they were "Greeks", "Bulgarians" or "Serbs". In doing so, the strongest "argument" for such denationalization was history, i.e. historical events viewed through the prism of the denationalizers.

In this brochure, we will review the fundamental and striking segments of history that Greek historiography and propaganda use for the denationalization of the Macedonians from the Aegean part of Macedonia, and at the same time, we will refute such claims with arguments.

1. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: ACCORDING TO THE WRITINGS OF ANCIENT AUTHORS, ANCIENT MACEDONIANS WERE GREEKS

Contrary to this claim, the facts show that there are nearly FIFTY ancient authors who quite clearly treated the Macedonians as a separate people in relation to the Greeks (you can see more details about all this on Aleksandar Donski History channel on You Tube). Here we will only list some of such testimonies here, but before that it is necessary to give some additional explanations.

In the English translations (but also in the originals in Latin) the people who lived in antiquity on the ethnic territory of present-day Greece are named "Greeks", although they considered themselves "Hellenes". The renaming of the Hellenes into Greeks was due to the Romans. It was they who, with a dose of mockery, began to call the Hellenes "Greeks" (based on the name of the small tribe Graeci, mentioned by Herodotus in the 5th century BC), and so this name has remained to this day as the name used by foreign nations for the people of Greece. We have a similar example during World War II (and later) when some nations mockingly called the Germans "Swabians" (based on the name of their region of Swabia). So the term Greeks (as the name of a small tribe that in antiquity lived on the territory of present-day Greece) was used by the Romans as a kind of mocking name for the Hellenes, and therefore the present-day inhabitants of our southern neighbor do not consider themselves Greeks, but Hellenes. They say: "We are not Greeks, but we are Hellenes, but others from the outside call us Greeks. And the name of our state is the Hellenic Republic, i.e. Hellas, and not Greece, as others from the outside call it." With this claim, they allude to the fact that they are descendants of the ancient

Hellenes, although it is debatable how much the present-day inhabitants of Greece have connections with the Hellenes, especially the Madjirs who settled in the Aegean part of Macedonia from Turkey in the first half of the 20th century. But this is another topic.

We give the quotes from the ancient authors as they are translated from ancient Greek into English.

With the data published here, we do not want to offend any member of the Greek people, but we only want to point out, based on relevant historical data, the senselessness of denying the basic human rights of their first neighbors, the Macedonians. First of all, during the Civil War in Greece, Greeks and Macedonians fought together on the side of the Democratic Army, but unfortunately they suffered defeat at the hands of the monarcho-fascist army, as a result of which, even today in the 21st century, Greece, together with Bulgaria, are the only two countries that deny the existence of an entire people, the Macedonians.

And now let us begin by presenting the data related to the first question, which concerns the writings of ancient authors regarding the ethnicity of the ancient Macedonians.

One of the ancient biographers of Alexander the Great of Macedonia was the ancient Greek historian **Arrian** (1st and 2nd centuries AD). Of his several testimonies about the uniqueness of the ancient Macedonians in relation to the Greeks, we will mention his description of the battle at Issus that was fought between the Macedonian army (led by Alexander) and the Persian army (led by Darius III). Arrian (chapter 8) writes:

“But as soon as Darius was certified of Alexander's approach for battle, he conveyed about 30,000 of his cavalry and with them 20,000 of his light-armed infantry across the river Pinarus, in order that he might be able to draw up the rest of his

forces with ease. Of the heavy armed infantry, he placed first the 30,000 Greek mercenaries to oppose the phalanx of the Macedonians..." (Arrian, "Anabasis", Book 2a, 8).

Here we see that on the side of the Persian army against the Macedonians, over thirty thousand Greeks fought. These Greek units were directed to fight precisely against the strongest part of the Macedonian army – the Macedonian phalanx.

Arrian says that in this battle the fiercest conflict was precisely between the Macedonians and the Greeks, and the main reason for this, among other things, was the great hatred between these two peoples. In this regard, Arrian writes:

*"There was a violent struggle. Darius' Greeks fought to thrust the Macedonian back into the water and save the day for their left wing. Already in retreat, while the Macedonians, in their turn, with Alexander's triumph plain before their eyes, were determined to equal his success... The fight was further embittered by the **old racial rivalry of Greek and Macedonian**".* (Arrian: "The Campaigns of Alexander", Translated by Aubrey De Selincourt, Penguin books, USA, 1987, p. 119, the underlining is mine).

Can one imagine a clearer and greater proof of the differences between the Macedonians and the Greeks than this one? The ancient Greek historian Arrian, using data from the works of the Macedonian historians Ptolemy and Aristobulus, wrote quite precisely that there was an "ancient racial rivalry" between the Macedonians and the Greeks. This is one of the highest degrees of intolerance and hatred that can exist between two peoples. And who, knowing such a statement, can still claim that the Macedonians and the Greeks were "the same people"? What kind of members of the same people are there, between whom there is "racial rivalry", i.e. "racial hatred"? Continuing the description of the battle of Issus, we read:

“The whole of the army with Darius was said to number about 600,000 fighting men. As Alexander advanced, he found that the ground spread out a little in breadth, and he accordingly brought up his horsemen, both those called Companions, and the Thessalians as well as the Macedonians, and posted them with himself on the right wing. The Peloponnesians and the rest of the allied force of Greeks he sent to Parmenio on the left”. (Arrian, “Anabasis”, Book 2a, 8).

Here we see that Arrian writes about the Greeks who fought in the ranks of the Macedonian army. But he also clearly distinguishes them from the Macedonians. We see that he treats the inhabitants of the Peloponnese and Thessaly as Greeks, who fought together with "the remaining allies from the ranks of the Greeks". Practically at that time, the Greeks experienced a tragic fate when they were forced to fight in the ranks of foreign armies against each other. The same thing, after more than 23 centuries, will befall the Macedonians during the Balkan and First World Wars.

Arrian also offers a clear separation of the Macedonians from the Greeks when he mentions the list of commanders of the warships (triremes) with which Alexander's army traveled through the Hydaspes River. Here he writes:

"As commanders of triremes were appointed, from the Macedonians, Hephaestion son of Amyntor, and Leonnatus son of Eunous, Lysimachus son of Agathocles... Pantauchus son of Nicolaus, of Aloris; Mylleas son of Zoilus, of Beroea; all these being Macedonians. Of Greeks, Medius son of Oxynthemis, of Larisa; Eumenes son of Hieronymus, from Cardia...". (Arrian, “Indica”, XVIII).

Elsewhere in his description of the Battle of Issus, Arrian treats the Macedonians and the Greeks as two separate peoples.

Let us also mention the ancient historian **Appian** (c. 95–165 AD). In his work “The Illyrian Wars,” he mentions the Macedonians and the Greeks as two separate peoples in several places. Writing about the attacks of the Illyrian tribes in Macedonia, Appian says:

“The Romans...made war against the Illyrians, on account of this temple robbery, as the Romans now held sway over the Greeks and the Macedonians.” (Appian, “Illyrian Wars”, 5).

The ancient author **Lucius Ampelius**, who lived in the 2nd or 3rd century, also wrote about the Macedonians as a separate people from the Greeks. Ampelius is remembered for his work “Liber Memorialis”. It is, in fact, a short general history, which begins from the earliest times and ends with the time of the Roman emperor Trajan (53 - 117 AD).

In this work, Ampelius mentions Macedonia and the Macedonians several times. In doing so, he unequivocally treats them as a separate people from the Greeks and other peoples. In the sixth chapter of the book we read:

In Asia the most famous (In the original Latin it's written “clarissimae”, which literally means “shiniest”) *nations are: Hindis, Serians, Persians, Medes, Partians, Arabs, Bitinians, Phrygians, Cappadocians, Syrians, Lycians.. In Europe the most famous* (clarissimae) *nations are: Scythians, Sarmatians, Germans, Dacians, Mysians, Thracians, **Macedonians**, Dalmatians, Panonians, Illyrians, **Greeks**, Italians, Galians and Spanians.”* (In Latin: “*In Asia clarissimae gentes: Indi, Seres, Persae, Medi, Parthi, Arabes, Bithyni, Phryges, Cappadoces, Cilices, Syri, Lycii. In Europa clarissimae gentes: Scythae, Sarmatae, Germani, Daci, Moesi, Thraces, **Macedones**, Dalmatae, Pannonii, Illyrici, **Graeci**, Itali, Galli, Spani...*” (Liber Memorialis, De orbe terrarum, VI, 3).

In the same chapter, this ancient author unequivocally writes that Olympus was a completely Macedonian mountain:

Here we will also mention an **anonymous early Christian author**, who is remembered only for his brief introductory comments on some of the Epistles of Saint Paul from the New Testament. These introductory comments are presented and elaborated in the book "The Gospel History and its transmission", published in 1906.

This anonymous author treated the ethnic origin of the people to whom Saint Paul sent his letters. Thus, for example, under the chapter entitled "To the Galatians", he writes: "The Galatians are Greeks".

Under the chapter entitled "To the Corinthians," he writes: "The Corinthians are of Achaia."

Under the chapter entitled "To the Romans," he writes: "The Romans are in the parts of Italy."

However, under the chapter titled "To the Thessalonians," he writes:

Thessalonians are Macedonians, who having accepted the word of truth persevered in the faith even in persecution from their fellow-citizens.

Under the chapter titled "To the Philippians," he writes:

Philippians are Macedonians. These having accepted the word of truth persevered in the faith, nor did they receive false apostles. (More details in: "The Gospel History and its transmission" F. C. Burkitt, Gorgias Press, 2006, ISBN: 978-1-59333-529-8).

One of the most decisive ancient Greek authors in terms of the claim that the Macedonians were not Greeks was **Demosthenes** (4th century BC). He is today considered the greatest orator among the ancient Greeks. Among other things, he is also known for his anti-Macedonianism and this segment is

very significant in his work. His "Four Philippics" (four separate written speeches against the Macedonian king Philip II) are famous.

The clearest evidence for the non-Greek origin of the Macedonians and their kings was given by Demosthenes in the Second Philippic, where, in connection with the Macedonian king Philip II, he made the following insulting statement:

And yet in regard to Philip and his conduct they feel not this, although he is not only no Greek and no way akin to Greeks, but not even a barbarian of a place honourable to mention; in fact, a vile fellow of Macedon, from which a respectable slave could not be purchased formerly.

It is known that the noun "barbarian" in antiquity mainly referred to people who spoke a language incomprehensible to the Greeks (people who "babble") with a dose of disdain for their culture. Practically, all peoples who did not speak Greek were called "barbarians" by the Greeks, while among themselves the Greeks called themselves "xenoi".

As an illustration, we will cite the writings of the author Emma Stafford, who in her book "Ancient Greece, Life, Myths and Art", regarding the meaning and etymology of this word, writes:

"The Greek language was fundamental for the Greeks to be able to define themselves as different from the barbarians, whose ba-ba-ba language they mocked." (Ema J. Stafford: "Ancient Greece, Life Myth and Art"; Great Britain, 2004, ISBN 1-84483-044-6, cited by Janko Tomov: "The Ancient History of Macedonia and the Balkans in the Works of Western Authors", Brisbane, Australia, 2005, p. 72).

The American historian Dr. Synthia Sydnor Slowikowski, here is how she explains the meaning of "barbarian":

“The term ‘barbarian’ came to be the accepted opposite of ‘Hellene’ in antiquity and had three chief meanings in authors: unintelligible, foreign non-Greek.” D-r Synthia Sydnor Slowikowski: *"Sport and Culture in the Ancient Macedonian Society*, The Pennsylvania State University, 1988 стр. 30).

Finally, ancient Greek authors themselves wrote about what they meant by the term "barbarians". The famous Athenian playwright Aristophanes (lived around 448 - 385 BC) gave clear evidence of this. In his play "The Birds" (written in 414 BC), regarding the "barbarians", Aristophanes wrote:

"I spent a lot of time with them and taught them how to speak, even though they were barbarians" .

Here it is clearly seen that the term "barbarians" for ancient Greek authors meant "people who do not speak Greek", i.e. people who are not Greeks.

After all, there is a huge number of testimonies from ancient Greek authors, in which they use the term "barbarians" for members of various Asian, African, but also European peoples, and this is quite well known. Therefore, if, for example, members of some distant Asian people were called "barbarians" only because they did not speak Greek, the essence of the use of this same term in relation to the Macedonians is exactly the same. The term "barbarians" cannot have one meaning when referring to the Macedonians, and another meaning for all other non-Greek Asian, African and European peoples.

Demosthenes was not the only Greek who determined the Macedonians as "barbarians", i.e. a people of non-Greek origin. And the ancient Greek author Thrasymachus in the 5th century BC, in his speech about the Larissaeans, called the Macedonian king Archelaus a "barbarian" in relation to the Greek Larissaeans.

Macedonians were called "barbarians" by the Greeks and

in the Lexicon "**Suda**" (written by several ancient and medieval authors) which we will write about below.

The grammarian **Hesychius** also described the Macedonians as "barbarians". In describing the meaning of the word sarisa (a long spear of the Macedonian phalanx), he wrote that it was used by "barbarian Macedonians".

Let us conclude that with his anti-Macedonian statements Demosthenes represents one of the most significant sources for the non-Greek origin of the ancient Macedonians.

The ancient philosopher, cartographer, geographer and mathematician **Dicaearchus** (4th and 3rd centuries BC), a native of Messana, also clearly testified that the Macedonians were not Greeks. In his work "Life of Greece", which was dedicated to the history and geography of the Greek territories, in the first volume Dicaearchus gave a detailed description of the geography and history of the Greeks. Regarding the borders of Greek territories, Dicaearchus wrote:

"I therefore draw the limits of Hellas at the country of Magnesians, i. e. to the Vale of Tempe. Above Tempe towards Olympus is the region of Macedonians."

He also writes that the Greek territories began from the Ambracian Gulf (located south of Epirus) and ended at the Peneus River ("Memorandum on the Ancient Boundaries of Greece"; British documents of foreign affairs, Part I, Series F, Europe 1848 - 1914, Vol. 14 "Greece, 1847 - 1914", University publications of America).

The ancient historian **Dionysius of Halicarnassus** (born around 60 BC, and died sometime after 7 AD) in his most famous work "Roman Antiquities" in the First Book (Part 3) mentions Macedonia as the "most powerful nation" in the world of that time:

“Macedonia, which until then was reputed to be the most powerful nation on land, she no longer had as rival any nation either barbarian or Greek”. ("Roman Antiquities", Book I, 3).

In the Second Book (Part 17) he clearly writes that the Macedonians deprived the Greeks (Athenians and Thebans) of their freedom, after having previously defeated them in the Battle of Chaeronea:

“And the Thebans and Athenians through the single disaster at Chaeronea were deprived by the Macedonians not only of the leadership of Greece but at the same time of the liberty they had inherited from their ancestors.” ("Roman Antiquities", Book II, 17).

The ancient geographer Dionysius Calliphon (1st century BC) regarding the borders of the ancient Greek territories, wrote:

“Ambracia is the first city in Greece... Greece is continuous from Ambracia to the Peneus.” ("Memorandum on the Ancient Borders of Greece"; British documents of foreign affairs, Part I, Series F, Europe 1848 - 1914, Vol. 14 "Greece, 1847 - 1914", University publications of America).

We see that he did not treat Macedonia (or Epirus) as a "Greek country" at all.

Dio Chrysostom is also known as Dion of Pursa. He lived in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD (from about 40 to 120 AD). In his work "Dioscuri" about the inhabitants of the island of Rhodes, Dio Chrysostom writes that he was told different information about the same subject. Here we read:

“For instance, one and the same statue, they say, is at one time a Greek, at another time a Roman, and later on, if it so happens, a Macedonian or a Persian.” (Dio Chrysostom Discourses, Vol. III, 159).

From this testimony we also see that the inhabitants of Rhodes themselves in antiquity distinguished between Greek and Macedonian cultural values.

In the "Fourth Dialogue Dedicated to the Kingdom" Dio Chrysostom describes a fictional dialogue between Alexander the Great of Macedon and Diogenes. In this dialogue Alexander asked Diogenes:

"And what enemy have I still left," said he, "if I capture those peoples I have mentioned?"

Then follows Diogenes' answer:

"The most difficult of all to conquer," he answered, "one who does not speak Persian or Median as Darius does, I presume, but Macedonian and Greek."

Here too we see a clear distinction between the Macedonian and Greek languages, spoken by two neighboring but different peoples.

Let us also mention the ancient biographer of Alexander the Great of Macedonia, known as **Diodorus of Sicily**, who lived in the 1st century BC. He also gave several testimonies in favor of the truth that the ancient Macedonians were not Greeks at all.

One of them is found in the 17th book and refers to the cooperation of the Greeks with Persia in the period after the battle of Gaugamela (Arbela). In this regard, Diodorus writes:

"In this year (about 330 BC) word was brought to Greece about the battle near Arbela (Gaugamela), and many of the cities became alarmed at the growth of Macedonian power and decided that they should strike for their freedom while the Persian cause was still alive. They expected that Darius would help them and send them much money so that they could gather great armies of mercenaries, while Alexander would not be able to divide his forces. If, on the other hand, they watched idly while

the Persians were utterly defeated, the Greeks would be isolated and never again be able to think of recovering their freedom... The Lacedaemonians (Spartans) thought that the time had come to undertake a war and issued an appeal to the Greeks to unite in defence of their freedom". (Diodorus Siculus, Book 17, 62.1, 62.2, 62.3 and 62.6).

This is another direct ancient testimony that shows that the Greeks of that time felt occupied by the Macedonians, which is why they felt great hatred towards them. The Greeks were even ready to unite with their centuries-old enemies, the Persians, just to get rid of the Macedonian occupation. And this even in the time after the Battle of Gaugamela, after which the Persian army was definitely broken.

Diodorus also writes about the wounding of Alexander the Great of Macedonia when it was not known whether he would survive. When the Greeks, who were left to live in the Central Asian regions of Bactria and Sogdiana, heard about this, thinking that Alexander was dead, they rebelled against the Macedonians, wanting to return to their homeland. About this Diodorus (17.99.5 - 17.99.6) writes:

"For many days the king lay helpless under his treatment,¹ and the Greeks who had been settled in Bactria and Sogdiana, who had long borne unhappily their sojourn among peoples of another race and now received word that the king had died of his wounds, revolted against the Macedonians. They formed a band of three thousand men and underwent great hardship on their homeward route. Later they were massacred by the Macedonians after Alexander's death."

The Roman historian **Eutropius** (4th century) writes about the letter that the Macedonian king Philip V sent to the Carthaginian king Hannibal in which he offered him an alliance against the Romans, and in return asked him for help in

Macedonia's fight against the unbridled hostility of the Greeks against the Macedonians.

“About this time also Philip, king of Macedonia, sent ambassadors to him (Hannibal), offering him assistance against the Romans, on condition that, when he had subdued them, he, in turn, should receive assistance from Hannibal against the Greeks.” (Eutropius, “Breviarium historiae Romanae”, 12).

And here we see clear evidence that the Macedonians even in the time of Philip V considered the Greeks a different, hostile people.

Aemilius Sura was a Roman historian, about whom little is known. He is assumed to have lived in the 2nd century BC. An authentic quote from his historical work is transmitted by the later Roman historian Marcus Velleius Paterculus. In his First Book of the History of Rome (paragraph 6) Marcus Velleius Paterculus writes:

Aemilius Sura says in his book on the chronology of Rome: The Assyrians were the first of all races to hold world power, then the Medes, and after them the Persians, and then the Macedonians. Then through the defeat of Kings Philip and Antiochus, of Macedonian origin, following closely upon the overthrow of Carthage, the world power passed to the Roman people.” (Marcus Velleius Paterculus, “Roman History”, I, 6).

From this authentic excerpt, we see that the Roman historian Aemilius Sura also clearly treated the Macedonians as a separate people who once ruled the world.

We will also mention the Roman historian **Eutropius**, who lived in the 4th century AD. This ancient author also quite clearly treated the Macedonians as a separate people in relation to the Greeks. In the Third Book of his work "Breviarium historiae Romanae" he writes about the war between Carthage (Hannibal) and Rome. He also mentions the Macedonian king Philip V, who

offered Hannibal an alliance against the Romans, and in return asked him to help him against the rebellious Greeks. Here we read:

“About this time also Philip, king of Macedonia, sent ambassadors to him (Hannibal), offering him assistance against the Romans, on condition that, when he had subdued them, he, in turn, should receive assistance from Hannibal against the Greeks.” (Eutropius, “Breviarium historiae Romanae”, 12).

It is clear that Philip the Fifth also considered the Greeks as a different people in relation to his Macedonians. After all, a good part of the Greek territories in his time were subordinated to the Macedonians.

With this testimony, Eutropius is included in the list of ancient authors who considered the ancient Macedonians as a separate people in relation to the ancient Greeks.

The church historian **Eusebius of Caesarea** (3rd and 4th centuries) also mentions the Macedonians and the Greeks separately. In his book “Evidences of the Gospel” (third book, chapter 7), mentioning the peoples that fell under Roman rule, Eusebius of Caesarea writes:

“Since that day the Jewish people have become subject to the Romans, the Syrians likewise, the Cappadocians and Macedonians, the Bithynians and Greeks, and in a word all the other nations who are under Roman rule.” (Eusebius of Caesarea: “Demonstratio Evangelica”, Tr.W.J .Ferrar, 1920, Book 3, Chap VII).

The famous Athenian orator **Aeschines** (4th century BC) also did not consider the Macedonians to be Greeks. In his speech “On the Embassy” he mentions the peoples who made up the pan-Greek cultural organization known as the Amphictyonic Council. Aeschines lists the tribes that made up this Council. They were: *“The Thessalians, Boeotians, Dorians,*

Ionians, Perrhaebi, Magnetes, Dolopiand, Locrians, Oetaeans, Phtiotians, Malians, and Phocians". (Aeshines, "On the Embassy", 2.116)

Not only are the Macedonians not mentioned here as members of this Greek Council, but so are the tribes living in Epirus.

The borders of the then Greek world (in which Macedonia is not mentioned) were also described by the ancient historian **Ephorus**, who lived in the fourth century BC. Ephorus' works are not preserved in the original, but we know about them from the transmitted works of other later authors. One of them was Strabo. Quoting Ephorus, who described the then borders of the Greek world, he writes:

"Ephorus says that, if one begins with the western parts, Acarnania is the beginning of Greece; for, he adds, Acarnania is the first to border on the tribes of the Epeirotes. But just as Ephorus, using the seacoast as his measuring-line, begins with Acarnania (for he decides in favor of the sea as a kind of guide in his description of places, because otherwise he might have represented parts that border on the land of the Macedonians and the Thessalians as the beginning), so it is proper that I too, following the natural character of the regions, should make the sea my counselor."

And further:

"Thus Greece consists of two very large bodies of land, the part inside the Isthmus, and the part outside, which extends through Pylae as far as the outlet of the Peneius (this latter is the Thessalian part of Greece)."

And here the border of the Greek territories is so clearly described that no comment is needed.

The Macedonians were also mentioned as a separate people from the Greeks by the ancient Greek orator **Isocrates**,

who was a contemporary of Philip II of Macedon. Addressing Philip II, Isocrates, among other things, pointed out the benefits that the Macedonians and the Greeks would receive if his rule succeeded. Among other things, he said:

“I say that you ought to be the benefactor of the Hellenes, the king of Macedonia, and the ruler over as many barbarians as possible. If you succeed in this, all will be grateful to you, the Hellenes by reason of advantages enjoyed, the Macedonians, if you govern them like a king and not like a despot, and the rest of mankind, if they are freed by you from barbarian sway and gain the protection of Hellas.” (“Philippus”, 154).

In the same work “Philippus”, Isocrates wrote about this Macedonian king:

“...his rule was one of quite a different character from the rest; for he alone among the Hellenes claimed to rule over a people not of kindred race... ” (“Philippus”, 105 -108).

So Isocrates clearly called the Macedonians a people who were a “non-kin race” in relation to the Greeks

And the most famous ancient Jewish historian Josephus (1st century AD) also treated the Macedonians as a different people from the Greeks.

In his book “Flavius Josephus against Apion” Flavius mentions the Macedonians as inhabitants of the Egyptian city of Alexandria. In the second part (6), he writes that: *“The Greeks and the Macedonians possessed the city...”*.

Josephus also writes about the Macedonians as the dominant inhabitants of Alexandria at that time in other places in his works.

Flavius also mentions a speech by the Judean king Agrippa (first century AD) in which Agrippa persuaded the Jews not to rebel against the Romans, because the Roman Empire was very strong and they would fight in vain. To dissuade them

from the intention of raising an uprising against the Romans, he mentioned that other nations were also under Roman rule, but still, none of them dared to fight against this strong empire. Among the listed nations, he separately mentioned the Macedonians and the Greeks:

“What confidence is it that raises you up to oppose the Romans? Perhaps it will be said, it is hard to endure slavery. Yes; but how much harder is this for the Greeks... It is the same with the Macedonians, who have more just reason to claim their liberty than you have.” (Josephus Flavius, “War of the Jews”, II, 16,4).

So here too, the Macedonians are clearly distinguished as a separate people in relation to the Greeks.

Let us also mention the ancient historian **Justin** (whose exact date of life is not known, but it is believed to have been the 2nd, 3rd or 4th century). His most famous work was "Historiarum Philippicarum Libri XLIV". Writing about the rise of Philip II of Macedon to power and the threats that loomed over the Greeks and Asia, Justin states:

“...The name of the Macedonians, previously mean and obscure, rose into notice; and Philip, who had been kept three years as a hostage at Thebes, and had been imbued with the virtues of Epaminondas and Pelopidas, imposed the power of Macedonia, like a yoke of bondage, upon the necks of Greece and Asia.” (Justin, 6,9).

And this excerpt does not need any further comment.

Justin mentions the Macedonians separately from the Greeks when he says:

“The rising power of the Romans would swallow up the ancient empire of the Greeks and Macedonians.”(Justin, 30, 4).

The Macedonians are clearly distinguished as a separate people in relation to the Greeks in the Biography of Alexander the

Great of Macedonia, written by the Latin historian **Quintus Curtius Rufus**. There is no information about the life of this historian, but it is believed that he lived in the 1st century AD.

Quintus Curtius Rufus wrote quite clearly that the ancient Macedonians and Greeks communicated with each other through - translators!

The incident is known when the trial of the Macedonian Philotas, who was preparing a plot to kill Alexander the Great, took place. The plot was discovered and Philotas was publicly questioned personally by Alexander.

Quintus Curtius Rufus, describing this In one case, he clearly wrote that the Macedonians spoke a separate language. He even quotes a statement by Alexander the Great himself, in which, addressing the Macedonians in the first person plural, he mentions (quote): "*the mother tongue and our language*". Alexander addressed Philotas with the words:

"Now the Macedonians will judge you. I ask you: will you address them in your mother language?"

Philotas answered in the negative, explaining that, in addition to Macedonians, there were also members of other nations present. To this, Alexander said to the Macedonians present:

"Look, do you see? Did Philotas come so far that he would detest the mother tongue?... But let him speak as he pleases, and you remember that he has become equally alienated from our customs and our language." (Quintus Curtius Rufus, "De Rebus Gestis Alexandri Macedonis, VI, 10).

But Philotas did not remain indifferent to these accusations, and in his response, he said:

"I am accused of refusing to speak my native language and of being disgusted by the customs of the Macedonians. So, in this way, I threaten the kingdom, which I despise? But, even

earlier, that native language was abandoned in communication with other peoples, and so both the victors and the vanquished had to learn a foreign, foreign language."

However, Alexander's general Bolon intervened in the accusations against Philotas, who, among other things, accused Philotas of (quote): "...*although he was a Macedonian, he was not ashamed, through **an interpreter**, to listen to people who spoke his native language.*"

And this incident is so clear in relation to the existence of the special Macedonian language that no comment is needed. Also, from this description we see that some of the Macedonians, for practical reasons (greater opportunity for communication with other peoples, etc.), also used the Koine language, although among themselves they continued to speak their native Macedonian language.

We also see that during Philotas' trial, Alexander reprimanded him for not wanting the Macedonians to address him in their "native language".

Philotas, in turn, accused Alexander of introducing the Koine language, saying that the Macedonian language had long been neglected, so that now both the victors (Macedonians) and the vanquished (Greeks, Persians and other peoples who fell under Macedonian rule) should learn this new language.

Bolon intervened in this, accusing Philotas of communicating with the Macedonians through interpreters, even though he was a Macedonian, while in power. This is an extremely important testimony and proof that at that time most Macedonians did not know the Koine language at all, so when they wanted to address someone, they did so through interpreters. Philotas, although he knew the Macedonian language, did not want to listen to the Macedonians in their own

language, but insisted that their words be translated to him in the Koine language.

Quintus Curtius Rufus also mentions the Macedonians and the Greeks separately in other places as separate peoples. Regarding the subjugation of the Asian tribe of Arachos and his stay in their country, Rufus writes:

“There (Alexander, p.m.) united the army that was under the command of Parmenion. There were six thousand Macedonians, two hundred nobles and five thousand Greeks with six hundred cavalry...” (cited work, p. 292).

Македонците и Грците како два посебни народи, ги спомнал и **Св. Климент Александриски**, кој живеел во II и III век. Во книгата „Предупредување до Грците“ (Петто поглавие: „Мислењето на филозофите во врска со Бог“) Климент Александриски ги критикува паганските верувања на некои од тогашните народи. Тој ги спомнува народите што го обожавале огнот и притоа одделно ги спомнува Македонците од Грците. Овде читаме:

...Many of the inhabitants of Asia, worshipped fire; and besides them, the Macedonians, as Diogenes relates in the first book of his Persica... They have not supposed stocks and stones to be images of the gods, like the Greeks; nor ibises and ichneumons, like the Egyptians; but fire and water, as philosophers.”)

And for the ancient Gallic historian **Cornelius Nepos** (1st century AD) there was no doubt that the Macedonians and the Greeks were two separate peoples. His only surviving work is the “Excellentium Imperatorum Vitae”, which was published during the reign of Emperor Theodosius I (347 - 395 AD). When writing about the stay of the Greek Eumenes among the Macedonians, Cornelius Nepos writes that he was a foreigner in Macedonia. Here we read:

“Eumenes was a native of Cardia... As he happened to live, however, in the days in which the Macedonians flourished, it was a great disadvantage to him residing among them, that he was of a foreign country. Nor was anything wanting to him but a noble descent; for, though he was of a family of distinction in his native city, the Macedonians were nevertheless dissatisfied that he should ever be preferred to them. They were obliged to submit, however, for he excelled them all in caution, vigilance, endurance, and acuteness and activity of intellect.” Cornelius Nepos, “Lives of Eminent Commanders”, XVIII, 1).

In chapter 21 (under the title “On the Kings”) Nepos makes it even more clear that the Macedonians were not Greeks at all. He previously lists the names of the most famous Greek military commanders (generals): Timoleon of Corinth, Phocion of Athens, Eumenes of Cardia, Agesilaus of Sparta, Pelopidas of Thebes, Epaminondas of Thebes, Datamus of Caria, Timothy of Athens, Cabrias of Athens, Iphicrates of Athens, Dion of Syracuse, Conon of Athens, Thrasybulus of Athens, Alcibiades of Athens, Lysander of Sparta, Cimon of Athens, Pausanias of Sparta, Aristides of Athens, Themistocles of Athens and Militadas of Athens. Then he writes about all of them:

“These were almost all the generals of Greece that seemed worthy of record, except kings, for we would not treat of them, because the actions of them all are narrated separately...” (Cornelius Nepos, “Lives of Eminent Commanders”, XXI, 1).

We see that not a single Macedonian is mentioned in the list of names of Greek generals! But not only that. In continuation, Cornelius Nepos separately mentions the most prominent figures from the ranks of the Macedonians, those (as he himself writes) *“of the nation of the Macedonians”*. In the same 21st chapter (2) Nepos writes:

“Of the nation of the Macedonians, two kings far excelled the rest in renown for their achievements; Philip, the son of Amyntas, and Alexander the Great. One of these was cut off by a disease at Babylon; Philip was killed by Pausanias, near the theater at Aegae, when he was going to see the games.”

Let us also mention Cohen, who was one of the most trusted generals of Alexander the Great of Macedonia. The year of his birth is unknown, but it is believed that he died in 326 BC. He accompanied Alexander during the campaign in Asia, and in the autumn of 334 BC he returned to Macedonia together with other soldiers and officers who had been given a rest, after which he joined the Macedonian army (in Gordium in Asia Minor). That was in the spring of 333 BC. In written sources, Cohen was remembered for his speech that he delivered before Alexander, which was largely preserved by the ancient Greek historian Arrian in his “Biography of Alexander” that we have already mentioned. From the point of view of our topic, it is interesting that in his speech, Cohen also made an unambiguous distinction between the Macedonians and the Greeks. Addressing the emperor, Cohen said:

“For thou thyself seest how many Macedonians and Greeks started with thee, and how few of us have been left...” (Arrian, “Anabasis” Book V, 27).

After explaining the need for the army to return to rest, Cohen said to Alexander: “...other Macedonians and Greeks will follow thee...”.

We believe that these words also require no comment.

And for one of the most famous ancient Greek geographers (who was also a traveler and historian) **Pausanias** (2nd century), there was no doubt that the ancient Macedonians were not Greeks at all. In his work "The Description of Greece", written in ten books, he includes a description of all the then

areas in which the ancient Greeks lived, namely: Attica (Athens), Corinth, Laconia, Messenia, Elis, Achaia, Arcadia, Boeotia, Phocia and Locris. After such historical statistics, the question arises: if Macedonia in antiquity was a "Greek country", why then did Pausanias (as one of the most famous ancient authors, who, moreover, himself stayed in Macedonia), not mention it as such in his capital work consisting of descriptions of the then Greek countries?

Furthermore, describing Piraeus in Athens, Pausanias stated that there were portraits of meritorious Athenians and gods there. Among them was a portrait of a certain Leosthenes, who was famous among the Greeks for having successfully fought against the enemies of the Greeks, the Macedonians. Here we read:

"Here is a portrait of Leosthenes and of his sons, painted by Arcesilaus. This Leosthenes at the head of the Athenians and the united Greeks defeated the Macedonians in Boeotia and again outside Thermopylae forced them into Lamia over against Oeta, and shut them up there." (Pausanias, "Description of Greece", 1,1,3).

Pausanias clearly distinguishes the Macedonians from the Greeks in his Seventh Book. Here we read:

"When Philip, the son of Demetrius, reached man's estate, and Antigonus without reluctance handed over the sovereignty of the Macedonians, he struck fear into the hearts of all the Greeks." (Pausanias, "Description of Greece", 7,7,5).

Pausanias also mentioned the names of the Greek tribes that belonged to the Amphictyonic Council, which is known to have been an all-Greek organization. They were: Ionians, Dolopians, Thessalians, Aenians, Magnesians, Maleans, Phthiotes, Dorians, Phocians, Locrians ("British documents of

foreign affairs", Part I, Series F, Europe 1848 - 1914, Vol. 14 "Greece, 1847 - 1914", University publications of America).

And here not only are the Macedonians not treated as "Greeks", but Pausanias did not even consider the Epirotes as a "Greek people" (there are other ancient testimonies about the non-Greek character of the Epirotes, which we will not dwell on here, in the interest of space).

Let us also mention the famous ancient historian **Plutarch**. In his biography of the Roman general Aemilius Paulus, which Plutarch wrote in 75 AD, regarding the events surrounding the war of Philip V against the Romans, he clearly recorded that the Greeks at that time were under the yoke of the Macedonians, from which they had been freed by the Romans:

*"This was the time, in public matters, when the Romans were engaged in war with Perseus, king of the Macedonians, and great complaints were made of their commanders... They that not long since had vanquished king Philip in Thessaly, and **freed the Greeks from the Macedonian yoke**...not being aware that Philip after his defeat had greatly improved both the strength and discipline of the Macedonian army."* ("Aemilius Paulus" by Plutarch, translated by John Dryden, emphasis added).

The war between Rome and Macedonia is also described by **Polybius** (3rd and 2nd centuries BC). In his description of the battle of Cynoscephalae, in which the Macedonians suffered a heavy defeat at the hands of the Romans, Polybius writes that many Greeks did not believe that the Macedonians had been defeated:

"...Many Greeks on the actual occasions when the Macedonians suffered defeat considered the event as almost incredible, and many will still continue to wonder why and how the phalanx comes to be conquered by troops armed in the Roman fashion."(Polybius, "Histories", XVIII, I, 32).

In the 4th or 3rd century BC, a manuscript entitled "Periplus" appeared, which loosely translates to a kind of maritime travelogue. Although there is no evidence for the identity of the author of this work, some believe that it was a certain Scylax, who lived as early as the 6th century BC and was a navigator and explorer in the service of Persia. The only information about Scylax is given by Herodotus. In the absence of authentic data about the author of the work "Periplus", the designation "**Pseudo-Scylax**" has been accepted in science. In this work, as in the others mentioned, the borders of Greek territories in antiquity are described, as stated:

"From Ambracia Greece is continuous (along the coast) as far as the river Peneus." (Memorandum on the Ancient Boundaries of Greece", British documents of foreign affairs, Part I, Series F, Europe 1848 - 1914, Vol. 14 "Greece, 1847 – 1914", University publications of America).

So we see that for this author, too, the Greek territories in antiquity were unambiguously located only around the Peloponnese (south of Olympus). This automatically means that not only Macedonia and the Macedonians, but also Epirus and the Epirotes were not treated as Greek.

Pseudo-Skymnus is the nickname of another unknown author who wrote a work dedicated to geography. It was first thought that it was the work of the geographer Skymnus of Chios (who lived in the 2nd century BC), but it was later proven that Skymnus was not the author of that work because it featured characters from the period after his time. This work also clearly indicates that the northern border of the ancient Greek territories was located in the area between the Ambracian Gulf and the Pena River ("Memorandum on the Ancient Boundaries of Greece", British documents of foreign affairs, Part I, Series F,

Europe 1848 - 1914, Vol. 14 "Greece, 1847 - 1914", University publications of America).

The early Christian historian **Sozomenus**, who lived from the end of the 4th to the middle of the 5th century, also wrote about the ancient Macedonians. Regarding the Christianization of the Balkan peoples, which took place during the time of Emperor Constantine the Great (306-337), Sozomenus wrote:

"...The Christians of the West, the Greeks, the Macedonians, and the Illyrians, met for worship in safety through the protection of Constantine, who was then at the head of the Roman Empire". (Sozomenus, "Eccl. History", Book II, Chap. II).

We see that here too he very decisively mentioned the Macedonians and the Greeks as two separate peoples, together with the Illyrians.

Let us also mention the most famous ancient geographer **Strabo** (who lived from the 1st century BC to the 1st century AD). In the Eighth Book (1) of his work "Geography" Strabo gives a description of the then Greek ethno-cultural territories. Here too he does not include Macedonia in them at all and clearly presents it as a separate ethno-cultural entity. Here we read:

"I now shall give an account of the remainder of the geography of Greece... After the Epeirotes and the Illyrians, then, come the following peoples of the Greeks: the Acarnanians, the Aetolians, and the Ozolian Locrians; and, next, the Phocians and Boeotians; and opposite these, across the arm of the sea, is the Peloponnesus... And after Macedonia, the Thessalians (extending as far as the Malians) and the countries of the rest of the peoples outside the Isthmus, as also of those inside."

Strabo continues by writing that formerly there were many tribes in Greece, but that only those who spoke the "*four Greek dialects*" were Greek, and he gives in detail the names and history of these tribes (Ionians, Dorians, Aeolians, Athenians and

Arcadians). Of course, there is no mention of the Macedonians among them.

The ancient author **Theopompus** (4th century BC) wrote similarly. Specifically, Theopompus mentioned the peoples who made up the Greek Amphictyonic Council (for which we also presented data). In the list of these peoples (Ionians, Dorians, Achaeans, Phocians and others) neither the Macedonians nor the peoples who lived in Epirus are mentioned at all, which means that, according to Theopompus (but also according to other ancient Greek authors that we have cited), neither Epirus in antiquity was Greek territory, let alone Macedonia ("Memorandum on the Ancient Borders of Greece"; British documents of foreign affairs, Part I, Series F, Europe 1848 - 1914, Vol. 14 "Greece, 1847 - 1914", University publications of America).

The Roman historian **Titus Livius** is one of the few ancient historians whom modern Greek historiography and propaganda, and pro-Greek-minded authors, refer to in order to "prove" the alleged "Greek ethnicity" of the ancient Macedonians. But the facts speak of something completely different. Let's see what it is about.

In an excerpt from his work "History of Rome" (book 31, chapter 29) Titus Livius wrote that the Aetolians, Acarnians and Macedonians were "people of the same language" (in Latin: "esuide linguae homines"). Since the Aetolians and Acarnians were "Greeks" (peoples who lived on the territory of present-day Greece), this means that the Macedonians were also "Greeks". Well, let's respond to these remarks.

Titus Livius lived from 59 BC to 14 AD. He (as a Roman) wrote this sentence, writing about the negotiations between the Balkan peoples and Rome that took place during the Roman invasion of the Balkans (2nd century BC). This means that he

was writing about an event that took place almost a century and a half before his birth. There are two possible explanations for his claim.

The first explanation is suggested by Livius himself, who explains that in his time the Macedonians were to some extent Hellenized (meaning that they were not Hellenes, but only that some of them accepted parts of Hellenic culture, just as the Greeks accepted segments of Macedonian culture - which is quite normal between two neighboring peoples.

However, despite this, Livius quite clearly distinguishes the Macedonians from the Greeks. In the same (31 book, 44), writing about the hatred of the Athenian Greeks towards the Macedonians from the time of Philip V and about their desire, with the help of Rome, to get rid of the Macedonians, Livius writes:

*“... The people of Athens and their allies, their armies and fleets, should so often curse and execrate Philip, his children and his kingdom, his military and naval forces, and the whole **race and name of the Macedonians.**”*

This testimony of Livius has far greater weight than the testimony about the similarity of language between the Macedonians, Acarnania and Aetolia, because here he points to ethnic (“racial”) differences between the Macedonians and the Greeks, unlike language which can be a changeable category.

We cite the second explanation only as a hypothesis that needs to be further investigated in order to refute or confirm it. Namely, Acarnania and Aetolia bordered Epirus.

There are controversial opinions about the ethnic origin of the Acarnians.

Strabo considered them a "Greek tribe", but Aeschines, Theopompus and Pausanias do not mention them as Hellenes in

the Amphictyonic Council, which was a community of Greek tribes at the time.

Thucydides seems to be the most correct writer on the ethnic origin of the Acarnians. He claims that the Acarnians (specifically from the city of Argos) were a mixture of Hellenes and "barbarians" (people who did not speak Greek).

There are also opinions according to which the Acarnians had Thracian origin. For example, the author Cornelius Nepos wrote about the mother of Themistocles that she was Acarnian, and Plutarch in his Biography of Themistocles explains that she was Thracian. (G. Sotiroff: "The Language of Constantine the Great"; *Elementa nova pro historia Macedono-Bulgarica*; Regina, Lynn Publishing Co., Saskatchewan, Canada, 1986 p. 20).

If other data are found on the kinship between the Acharnians and the Thracians (such as the Bulgarian historian Sotirov writes that there are), then here is an answer to why Livy claimed that the Macedonians and the Acharnians spoke a similar language - neither one nor the other were Greeks.

The same is the case with the Aetolians. There are ancient testimonies about them according to which they were also people who spoke a different language from the Greeks.

The historian Thucydides (5th and 4th centuries BC) also wrote about the borders in which the Greeks (Hellenes) migrated and lived. In his famous work "The Peloponnesian War", he writes:

"For instance, it is evident that the country now called Hellas had in ancient times no settled population; on the contrary, migrations were of frequent occurrence... The richest soils were always most subject to this change of masters; such as the district now called Thessaly, Boeotia, most of the Peloponnese,

Arcadia excepted, and the most fertile parts of the rest of Hellas.” (“History of the Peloponnesian War”, Book 1).

We see that according to Thucydides, the Macedonians were not treated as part of the “Greek world”.

Tatian the Assyrian was born in Assyria (a territory in present-day Iraq) around 120 AD. He was an early Christian writer and theologian who left behind several valuable works. One of his most famous works is “Address to the Greeks,” in which he criticizes ancient Greek authors for undeservedly attributing merits to the Greeks that objectively did not belong to them. He lists which segments of science and art the Greeks took over from other peoples and later presented them as “their own.” Tatian also criticizes pagan mythology in favor of Christianity. Below is a part of this work:

“THE GREEKS CLAIM, WITHOUT REASON, THE INVENTION OF THE ARTS. BE not, O Greeks, so very hostilely disposed towards the Barbarians, nor look with ill will on their opinions. For which of your institutions has not been derived from the Barbarians? The most eminent of the Telmessians invented the art of divining by dreams; the Carians, that of prognosticating by the stars; the Phrygians and the most ancient Isaurians, augury by the flight of birds; the Cyprians, the art of inspecting victims. To the Babylonians you owe astronomy; to the Persians, magic; to the Egyptians, geometry; to the Phœnicians, instruction by alphabetic writing. Cease, then, to miscall these imitations inventions of your own. Orpheus, again, taught you poetry and song; from him, too, you learned the mysteries. The Tuscans taught you the plastic art; from the annals of the Egyptians you learned to write history; you acquired the art of playing the flute from Marsyas and Olympus, - these two rustic Phrygians constructed the harmony of the shepherd’s pipe. The Tyrrhenians invented the trumpet; the Cyclopes, the smith’s art; and a woman

who was formerly a queen of the Persians, as Hellanicus tells us, the method of joining together epistolary tablets: her name was Atossa. Wherefore lay aside this conceit, and be not ever boasting of your elegance of diction; for, while you applaud yourselves, your own people will of course side with you. But it becomes a man of sense to wait for the testimony of others, and it becomes men to be of one accord also in the pronunciation of their language. But, as matters stand, to you alone it has happened not to speak alike even in common intercourse; for the way of speaking among the Dorians is not the same as that of the inhabitants of Attica, nor do the Æolians speak like the Ionians. And, since such a discrepancy exists where it ought not to be, I am at a loss whom to call a Greek. And, what is strangest of all, you hold in honour expressions not of native growth, and by the intermixture of barbaric words have made your language a medley... You have, too, contrived the art of rhetoric to serve injustice and slander, selling the free power of your speech for hire, and often representing the same thing at one time as right, at another time as not good. The poetic art, again, you employ to describe battles, and the amours of the gods, and the corruption of the soul.”

Here we see clearly that when he mentions Greek dialects, this early Christian writer does not mention the Macedonian language as a “Greek dialect” at all.

The philosopher and orator **Trasymachus** is also known as Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, after his place of origin. He was born around 459 and died in 400 BC. Only fragments of his works have survived, transmitted by other authors. One of them was Clement of Alexandria, who lived in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. In his work “Stromathis” (6), Clement of Alexandria quotes an excerpt from a speech by Thrasymachus known as “On the

Larissaeans". In this speech, Thrasymachus, mentioning the Macedonian king Archelaus (reigned from 413 to 399 BC), wrote: "*Shall we be slaves to Archelaus - Greeks to a Barbarian?*".

Thrasymachus made this statement after the increased tendencies of Macedonia (specifically Archelaus) to influence Athenian possessions during the Peloponnesian War.

We have already mentioned that the term "barbarian" in antiquity meant a person who did not speak Greek, so it is clear that Thrasymachus did not consider the ancient Macedonians to be Greeks either.

Thucydides is an ancient Greek historian, whose best known work is "The Peloponnesian War". He was born in Athens around 460 BC and died around 395 BC. He participated as a commander in the Athenian army in the Peloponnesian War, which was the largest war in the Balkans in the 5th century BC and was fought between Sparta and Athens.

From the aspect of the topic we are considering, it is undeniable that for this famous historian, the Macedonians were a separate people in relation to the Greeks. Writing about the borders in which the Hellenes (ancient Greeks) lived, Thucydides writes:

"For instance, it is evident that the country now called Hellas had in ancient times no settled population; on the contrary, migrations were of frequent occurrence... The richest soils were always most subject to this change of masters; such as the district now called Thessaly, Boeotia, most of the Peloponnesians, Arcadia excepted, and the most fertile parts of the rest of Hellas." ("The History of the Peloponnesian War", Book 1).

We see that Macedonia is not even mentioned in the description of the "Hellenic countries".

In the same (First Book) Thucydides calls the Macedonians "barbarians", i.e. people who did not speak Greek

(Hellenic). Describing the Athenian army in a battle in the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides writes that it consisted of "Hellenes" and "barbarians" (non-Greeks who fought on the side of the Athenians). In doing so, he lists which nations provided their armies to help the Athenians. Here we read:

"Of Hellenes he had in his army Ambraciots, Leucadians, Anactorians, and the thousand Peloponnesians whom he brought with him, - of Barbarians a thousand Chaonians, who, having no king, were led by Photyus and Nicanor... With the Chaonians came the Thesprotians, who, like them, have no king. A Molossian and Atintanian force was led by Sabylinthus, the guardian of Tharypas the king, who was still a minor; the Paravaeans were led by their king Oroedus, and were accompanied by a thousand Orestians placed at the disposal of Oroedus by their king Antiochus. Perdiccas also, unknown to the Athenians, sent a thousand Macedonians, who arrived too late."
"The Peloponnesian War", Book 1).

Let us also mention the historian **Herodian**, who lived in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. In his most famous historical work (devoted to the history of Rome), this author also very clearly treated the Macedonians as a separate people in relation to the Greeks. Thus, for example, in the First Book (chapter 3) Herodian mentions the Macedonian dynasty of the Ptolemies who ruled Egypt. In doing so, he writes about King Ptolemy:

"Ptolemy, too, contrary to the laws of the Macedonians and Greeks, went so far as to marry his own sister." (Herodian: "History of the Roman Empire", 1961, Book 1, Chapter 3).

In the Third Book (chapter 2) Herodian is even more decisive in emphasizing the uniqueness of the Macedonians in relation to the Greeks. Here he criticizes the Greeks for constantly quarreling among themselves, being jealous of one another, and seeking to destroy anyone among them who succeeded in life. For

this reason, he says that the Greeks as a people had failed, and so, destroyed by their greed and malice, they became easy prey for the Macedonians, and later for the Romans. Here we read:

“This is an ancient failing of the Greeks; the constant organizing of factions against each other and their eagerness to bring about the downfall of those who seem superior to them have ruined Greece. Their ancient quarrels and internal feuds had made them easy prey to the Macedonians and slaves to the Romans, and this curse of jealousy and envy has been handed down to the flourishing Greek cities of our own day.”

Finally, as a figure from antiquity who quite clearly separated the Macedonians from the Greeks as two separate peoples, we will mention the most famous Macedonian king **Alexander the Great of Macedonia** (356 - 323 BC).

Today, excerpts from his letters and speeches have been preserved, published by the ancient Greek historian Arrian, who took these materials from the historical work dedicated to Alexander, written by Alexander's general (and according to some sources, his half-brother) Ptolemy. This historical work is preserved today only in fragments transmitted by several other ancient historians.

Arrian reports the speech (taken from the lost work of Ptolemy) that Alexander the Great of Macedon delivered to his officers when they, at the request of the soldiers, decided not to follow him further in the final conquest of India and, exhausted, wished to return to their homes. When Alexander realized what was happening, he called his officers to a meeting and addressed them with the words:

“O Macedonians and Greek allies, seeing that you no longer follow me into dangerous enterprises with a resolution equal to that which formerly animated you, I have collected you together into the same spot, so that I may either persuade you to march forward

with me, or may be persuaded by you to re-turn... But, O Macedonians and Grecian allies, stand firm! ... But what great or glorious deed could we have performed, if, sitting at ease in Macedonia, we had thought it sufficient to preserve our own country without any labour, simply repelling the attacks of the nations on our frontiers, the Thracians, Illyrians, and Triballians, or even those Greeks who were unfriendly to our interests?" (Arrian, "Anabasis", Chap. XXV-XXVI).

In this speech of Alexander, preserved from the lost history of Ptolemy, it is unequivocally seen that the most famous Macedonian king himself made a clear distinction between the Macedonians and the Greeks as two separate peoples. Here he not only addresses them separately as "*Macedonians and Greek allies*", but also decisively explains that the Macedonians in Macedonia could be threatened by their neighbors: Illyrians, Thracians, Triballians and - Greeks!

*

There are many more ancient and later testimonies about the ethno-cultural distinctiveness of the Macedonians in relation to the Greeks. For more details on this topic, we invite you to visit the You Tube channel "Aleksandar Donski History Channel" and watch all forty episodes of the documentary series "The Ancient Macedonians were not Greeks", which features quotes from nearly fifty ancient authors who in their works clearly distinguished the Macedonians and the Greeks as two separate peoples.

2. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: THE LANGUAGE OF THE ANCIENT MACEDONIANS WAS A DIALECT OF GREEK

Today's Greek historiography and the pro-Greek-oriented authors abroad claim that the language of the ancient Macedonians was a dialect of Greek, i.e. that the Macedonians and the Greeks may have been two different peoples, but they had the same origin and therefore their languages were similar. We have already cited testimonies from dozens of ancient authors (among whom the ancient Greeks dominate) who quite clearly treated the Macedonians and the Greeks as two separate peoples. Such testimonies also exist regarding the uniqueness of their languages.

One of these pieces of evidence is a fragment of a papyrus, which is believed to be part of a lost work entitled "History of the Ancestors" by the ancient Greek historian Arrian (who lived from about 92 to 175 AD). In this papyrus (PSI XII.1284), an episode from Macedonian history is mentioned in which the uniqueness of the Macedonian language is clearly emphasized. Here we read that the secretary of Philip and Alexander the Great of Macedon, named Eumenes (quote): "*...sent a man called Xennias, who spoke Macedonian...*" to negotiate with the Macedonian army of Neoptolemus. This event occurred around 321 BC.

The ancient Greek historian Plutarch (who lived from 45 to 120 AD) also gave irrefutable evidence of the uniqueness of the language of the ancient Macedonians.

In his biography of Eumenes, describing Eumenes' appearance before the Macedonian soldiers, Plutarch wrote: "*...On the first sight of the general of their heart, **the troops saluted him in the Macedonian language**, clanked their arms, and with loud shouts challenged the enemy to advance,*

thinking themselves invincible while he was at their head."). The translation of Plutarch was made by John Langhorne, in collaboration with his brother William. John lived in the 18th century, was a famous English poet. This translation appeared in 1770, a fact that sufficiently testifies to impartiality, since this manuscript was printed over half a century before the emergence of the Greek state, in the 19th century).

Plutarch also mentions the Macedonian language in his biography of Marc Antony. It is known that after the death of Alexander the Great of Macedonia, his empire disintegrated, and its parts were left to be ruled by his top military leaders. For example, his military leader, childhood friend (and according to some sources, half-brother) Ptolemy I remained to rule Egypt and some surrounding countries. He founded the Ptolemaic dynasty, which continued to rule Egypt after his death. The most famous descendant of this Macedonian dynasty is the famous Egyptian queen Cleopatra VII. In his Biography of Marc Antony, Plutarch devotes more space to the character of Cleopatra. In doing so, he indirectly mentions that her native language was Macedonian. Plutarch writes:

"It was a pleasure merely to hear the sound of her voice, with which, like an instrument of many strings, she could pass from one language to another; so that there were few of the barbarian nations that she answered by an interpreter; to most of them she spoke herself, as to the Ethiopians, Troglodytes, Hebrews, Arabians, Syrians, Medes, Parthians, and many others, whose language she had learnt; which was all the more surprising, because most of the kings her predecessors scarcely gave themselves the trouble to acquire the Egyptian tongue, and several of them quite abandoned the Macedonian." The translator of Plutarch into English, John Dryden, lived from 1631 to 1700.

This very important testimony from Plutarch says that the native language of the Ptolemies was precisely the Macedonian language. We see that, according to Plutarch, some of them (probably for political reasons) neglected the Macedonian language in favor of the common language Koine, which we will write about later. However, Plutarch does not write anything like that about Cleopatra, which means that she retained her native Macedonian language.

There are other testimonies from Plutarch regarding the peculiarity of the Macedonian language. Somewhere around 75 AD, based on older works, Plutarch wrote a biography of Alexander the Great of Macedon. In this biography (chapter 53), describing an argument between Alexander the Great and one of his friends, Plutarch wrote:

“For breaking from them, he (Alexander) called out aloud to his guards in the Macedonian language, which was a certain sign of some great disturbance in him...” (Plutarch, Parallel Lives, Alexander).

This testimony actually refers to the event when Alexander thought that his life was in danger from his friend Cleitus, with whom he had a drunken argument. At one point, Alexander thought that Cleitus wanted to attack him, so he called his bodyguards (squires) to protect him. Plutarch clearly writes that he called them in Macedonian.

To explain the meaning of this testimony from Plutarch, it is necessary to first point out a few moments. It is known that the official language in the Macedonian Empire (and in the army) during the Macedonian domination was the Koine language. It was a mixed language, created mainly from elements of Greek dialects, although the Koine language contained words from both the Macedonian language and other languages. Alexander introduced this language for practical reasons. He was probably

aware of the likelihood that he would encounter problems and resistance if he tried to forcefully impose the unknown Macedonian language on the various peoples of his empire.

So, Koine was a kind of mixed (common) language, which was later forced by the Macedonian dynasties as a universal language in the countries they ruled, solely for the sake of easier communication between different peoples (whose members in large part had previous knowledge of Greek dialects through maritime and land trade and other types of communication, so it was easier for them to communicate in that language than in the unknown Macedonian language.

Today, scholars are inclined to believe that the Koine language was actually a kind of Esperanto at that time. As an illustration of this, we will mention the writings of Dr. Charles Francis Potter, who insists on the fact that the Koine language was not a "pure" Greek language, but that it was a kind of Esperanto - a mixture of several languages of that time. In this regard, Dr. Potter, in his book "The Lost Years of Jesus Revealed" (1958 and 1962) wrote that the Koine language was a mixture of different languages and that it arose as a result of Alexander the Great's conquests of the then known world. He writes that Koine was a common or universal language of that time, a kind of Esperanto, which was used in conversation, commerce and writing for centuries before and after the first century AD.

Even more decisive is the Serbian church historian Veselinović, who, regarding the character of the Koine language, as early as 1908, in his book "Lessons from the Holy Scriptures - Law Books of the Old Testament" wrote:

"The Koine language should be distinguished from the old classical Greek language. It was created in the time of Alexander the Great as a common language for all peoples in the

Macedonian Empire. It was also called: common or Alexandrian dialect, because it mainly developed in Alexandria. The Holy Scriptures were translated into that language in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus...".

From this, the conclusion can be drawn that Alexander, with his military leaders and army (which, although dominated by Macedonians, also included a large number of Greeks, Thracians, Jews, and members of other peoples), officially communicated in the Koine language.

At the moment when Alexander thought that his life was in danger, he instinctively spoke in his native language, the language he learned first in life and knew best, which was the Macedonian language. Such a reaction of his is in line with human psychology. His instinctive and instant reaction in his native Macedonian language occurred at a critical moment when he practically had no time to think about how to compose a sentence to call for help in the foreign language Koine, and at the same time he knew that his bodyguards were also Macedonians.

Macedonians used the Koine language not only as a language for communication with other peoples, but also in its written form, and it was in this language that ancient Macedonian authors wrote. However, the use of a separate written language does not necessarily have anything to do with the ethnic origin of the people who write in that language. Even today we have members of numerous peoples who write in a language that does not correspond to their ethnic origin. For example, millions of Irish, Scots, Welsh, and Africans today write exclusively in English, but this does not mean that they are all "ethnic English." There are many such examples. After all, in ancient times, two written languages were mainly used in Europe: Koine and Latin, but this does not mean that only two peoples lived in Europe at that time.

The Latin historian Quintus Curtius Rufus (whom we wrote about) also wrote that the ancient Macedonians spoke a separate Macedonian language. Describing the incident during the trial of the Macedonian Philotas, he wrote that the Macedonians and Greeks at that time communicated through translators.

We will also highlight other testimonies regarding the uniqueness of the language of the ancient Macedonians.

On an inscription in Macedonia from 212 AD, the girl Nike was recorded as belonging to a family that “*spoke Macedonian.*”

The distinct Macedonian language (not a dialect) is also mentioned by the famous Roman philosopher Seneca (born in 4 BC and died in 65 AD). In his work “*De consolatione ad Helviam*” (7.1), Seneca writes about the legacy left by Alexander the Great in Asia. In this regard, it is written:

“Why do we today find Greek cities in the very heart of the lands of the barbarians? Whence the Macedonian language among the Indians and Persians?”

This testimony refers to the well-known fact that Alexander the Great of Macedonia left a certain number of Macedonians and Greeks in some of the lands he conquered, who remained to live there. Even today there are people from those regions who consider themselves descendants of the army of Alexander the Great.

We have already cited indirect narrative ancient testimonies about the uniqueness of the language of the ancient Macedonians, which refer to the Greeks calling the Macedonians “barbarians”, which at that time meant “people who do not speak Greek”.

Macedonians were called “barbarians” by the Greeks and in the Lexicon “Suda” (written by several ancient and medieval authors). This Lexicon, in addition to tens of thousands of words,

also contains numerous excerpts from texts by ancient, mostly Greek, authors.

In the interpretation of the word "kausia" (a type of Macedonian hat) in "Suda", the unknown ancient Greek author writes that it was "*a type of barbarian head covering*". Due to the fact that it is known that this hat was created and mostly practiced by the Macedonians, it is clear that this ancient Greek author also considered the Macedonians to be "barbarians".

Let us also mention the testimony of Thucydides (5th century BC), who in his work "The Peloponnesian War" (second book) wrote about the members of the Macedonian tribe Orestes (who lived near the present-day city of Kostur) that they were "barbarians".

The grammarian Hesychius also described the Macedonians as "barbarians". In describing the meaning of the word "sarisa" (a long spear of the Macedonian phalanx), he wrote that it was used by "*barbarian Macedonians*".

Otherwise, Hesychius is considered to have lived in the 5th century in Alexandria and most likely had Greek ethnic origin. He was mainly engaged in collecting words from ancient languages and dialects, which seemed interesting to him. Over time, he created a huge lexicon in which about 51,000 words are represented. In the great "Catholic Encyclopedia" assumptions are made that the basis of this Lexicon was actually some older lexicon, which contained words from ancient languages and which was created in the first century after Christ, and Hesychius only supplemented it. ("The Catholic Encyclopedia", Volume VII Copyright © 1910 by Robert Appleton Company Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by K. Knight,; Hesychius).

This lexicon is mostly composed of words from various dialects of the then language of the Greeks (Hellenic), but there is a whole chapter entitled "Words of the Peoples" and in this

chapter we find a certain number of words from other languages: Persian, Thracian, Egyptian, Indian and others. Under a separate title in this chapter, words from the language of the ancient Macedonians are also included.

In accordance with this, in the world-famous encyclopedia “Columbia” (The Columbia Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition. Copyright © 2001 Columbia University Press, title: Hesychius of Alexandria) the truth is quite correctly presented according to which, the Lexicon of Hesychius offers data for, albeit quite small, reconstruction of some lost languages, among which the language of the ancient Macedonians is particularly emphasized. Here we read:

“Hesychius of Alexandria, fl. 5th cent. Alexandrian grammarian. Hesychius is known as the compiler of an invaluable lexicon, a glossary of unusual words and expressions occurring in Greek writings. The material is drawn from special languages (e.g., medical), from older poets, and from various dialects and languages. It is the source of virtually all the material now available on certain vanished languages, such as ancient Macedonian.”

It is interesting to mention that the contents of Hesychius's Lexicon have not yet been fully presented to the world public.

3. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: ALL INSCRIPTIONS FOUND ON THE TERRITORY OF ANCIENT MACEDONIA WERE WRITTEN IN GREEK

At first glance, this claim really seems like a convincing argument in favor of the Greek views regarding the origin of the ancient Macedonians. But this is not the case at all, and to confirm our position we will point to several notorious facts.

First of all, it is a fact that there is not a single inscription in the Greek language on the territory of the whole of Macedonia, dating from the 5th century BC, i.e. from the time before the first serious contacts between the Macedonians and the Hellenic culture. We know that old inscriptions in Greek dialects have been found much earlier than the 5th century BC on the territory of present-day Greece, but such inscriptions in Macedonia - there are none! As proof of this, we will mention several testimonies of Greek archaeologists.

The Greek professor Petsas, in his article entitled “A Little Pig Traveler”, writes that not a single Greek inscription from the older antique period has been found in Macedonia. (For more details on this article, see: Hristo Andonovski: “Southern Macedonia from Ancient to Modern Macedonians”, Skopje, 1995, p. 19).

The same is written by the famous Greek archaeologist Andronikos, who says:

“I am very unhappy that I have not found any inscription from the fifth century in Vergina”. (Hristo Andonovski, op. cit.).

This fact is even acknowledged on the official website of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Greece (at least at the time we were doing this research). Regarding the oldest known inscriptions in Greek in Macedonia, it was written there:

“So far, the oldest ancient written examples in Macedonia are the inscriptions on vases dating from the second half of the sixth century BC. These inscriptions were mainly brought by colonists from the southern part of Greece, who settled on the coast of Macedonia, and especially in Halkidiki.”

As a further explanation of this quote, we will mention that indeed a certain number of Greek colonists had settled on the coast of Macedonia, who existed there in colonies. Here we will deviate a little from the topic, to mention a fact that is not very popularized in Greek historiography today. Namely, during the time of Philip II, it is known that the borders of Macedonia expanded. One of the first measures that Philip II took in this direction was the annexation of the Athenian colonies on the territory of Macedonia, i.e. their joining to the mother state. Philip II forcibly entered these cities from where he expelled the Greek colonists to return to the territory of present-day Greece, and those who resisted, he liquidated or sold into slavery. This is quite well known in historiography. Just as an illustration, we will cite an excerpt from the book of the contemporary historian Arthur Vaygal, who describes the behavior of Philip II of Macedon towards the Greek colonies on Macedonian land:

“In 349 BC, Philip again set out with his army to Chalkidiki, on the eastern side of the Gulf of Thessalonica, where he continued his policy of suppressing the rebellions of the Greek settlements. He called on Olynthus, the capital of these colonies, to finally surrender... But, securing help from Athens, this city closed its gates to the Macedonians and resisted until 348 or 347 BC, when it was razed to the ground and the citizens were sold into slavery.” (Arthur Vaygal, “Alexander the Great”, translated into Macedonian, Skopje, 1992, p. 64).

And further:

“The fall of Olynthus was a great shock to the Athenians, who sent considerable aid in men and supplies to the unfortunate colonists, but let us understand that Philip had no desire to be at war with Athens and was now fully prepared for a peace treaty with them, since there were no other Athenian or Greek colonies on his immediate coasts. He only wanted, as he said, to cleanse his native coast of these foreign inhabitants, who had no right to the Macedonian land.”

In practice, Philip II treated the Greek colonies on Macedonian land as occupiers.

This means that the oldest inscriptions in Greek in Macedonia were actually inscriptions on vases brought by these Greek colonists, who lived only on the coast of Macedonia, and not inland. We continue with the topic of inscriptions.

On the same website of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Greece, under the heading “Tombstone Inscriptions”, it was written:

“The oldest tombstone inscriptions on stone, which have been preserved in Macedonia, belong to the fourth century BC.”

And here we clearly see that before the closer contacts of the Macedonians with Greek culture, i.e. before the 4th century BC, there are no attested inscriptions in Greek in Macedonia, such as there were in parts of present-day Greece.

The American CD “Grollier” encyclopedia (Electronic publish, Mindscape, Inc. 1995, Novato CA 94945) also says something similar. Here, the ancient Greek language is not even mentioned as a spoken language in Macedonia. The title “Greek language” precisely lists the areas where the ancient Greek spoken language was in use in antiquity, and Macedonia is not mentioned at all. Here we read:

“The ancient Greek language was a spoken language in Greece, on Crete, in parts of the eastern Mediterranean and in

western and northern Anatolia, in Sicily and southern Italy, on the northern coast of the Black Sea and partly on the North African and French coasts”.

So, Macedonia is not mentioned at all as an area where the ancient Greek language was spoken. The remark that the author, when mentioning present-day Greece, automatically included Aegean Macedonia in it does not hold, because we see that here Crete is also mentioned separately from Greece, although it is today an integral part of it. By the way, the author of this text is Margaret Alexiu, who here refers to a large number of works by eminent foreign and Greek authors (whose longer list is provided at the end of the text).

In connection with what has been stated so far, the question arises: How is it possible that Macedonia has always been a country with Greek culture, if no inscriptions in Greek have been found in it from the time when it existed without closer and more widespread cultural ties with the Hellenes, and at the same time such inscriptions have been found throughout present-day Greece? How is it possible that Macedonia has always been a "Greek country", when it is known that in Macedonia at that time the Greek language was not even spoken at all (especially not among the broad masses of the people)? Indeed, Greek historiography cannot provide an answer to these questions before the world public.

But let us assume that the ancient Macedonian language did not exist in its written form and that the first written language in which the ancient Macedonians communicated was Greek. This does not mean at all that the ancient Macedonians were Greeks. Namely, in the classical period, only the Greeks and the Romans are known to have had their own written language. So, does this mean that all the peoples who used their script and language were Romans or Greeks? If we look at it that way, it

turns out that in all of antiquity there were only two peoples, and it is frivolous to even think about it. Even the Turko-Mongol Bulgarians, after their arrival from Asia to the Balkans in the 7th century, wrote in the Greek script, which, for more than a century and a half, was the official script in the First Bulgarian Khanate/Empire. So, were they Greeks too? And what about the other peoples of that time: the Illyrians, the Thracians and others, who also wrote in Greek? Well, even the Romans until the 2nd century BC wrote their chronicles in ancient Greek dialects. So, were they also Greeks until the 2nd century BC, and then, suddenly, became Romans? And today we have a large number of such examples in the world. In some African countries, the official written language is English, of course, this does not mean that the inhabitants of these countries are English. The same is true of the millions of immigrants in English-speaking countries. A large part of them (especially the second and third generations) can read and write only in English, which does not mean that they are ethnic English.

So, the use of the ancient Greek written language by the ancient Macedonians (which, in fact, did not exist at all before the 5th century BC) does not constitute any proof that the ancient Macedonians were Greeks. Moreover, the ancient Greek script is not authentically Greek at all, but is known to be only an adapted variant of the Phoenician script. Even later, when some Macedonians adopted the spoken Greek language, this does not mean that they were Greeks. Let us recall the fact that even today there are numerous peoples in the world who speak other languages. For example, Brazilians speak Portuguese; a good part of the inhabitants of Latin America speak Spanish (although they are not Spaniards); while the Irish, Scots and Welsh speak English, although they are not English. There are many more such examples.

4. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: ALL PERSONAL NAMES OF THE ANCIENT MACEDONIANS WERE GREEK AND ENDED WITH THE GREEK SUFFIX "OS".

It is true that in the records of ancient Greek authors, a large part of the names of ancient Macedonians ended in the suffix "os", but this does not mean at all that those names were "Greek". And not only that. The question is whether such records of Macedonian names at all corresponded to their original pronunciation. The true pronunciation of personal names, but also of other words from the language of ancient Macedonians, cannot be determined with certainty precisely because of the fact that they have mostly reached our time through their Greek transcription, and it is known that ancient Greek authors artificially Greekized personal names (and other words) from other peoples in their records. Below we will list a number of such examples.

It is known that one of the wives of Alexander the Great was called Roxana. That name has reached our time and is generally accepted today, not only in our country, but also in most of the world's science. However, for the uninitiated, it will seem surprising if we say that the name Roxana is only a bad Greek transcription of the real name of this Bactrian princess, which in the original was approximately Rushanak. So, Rushanak, the Greeks presented her as Roxana (of course, in accordance with their own linguistic norms).

Even more conclusive evidence of the uncertainty of the Greek transcription is provided by Herodotus. Writing about the geography of the land of the Scythians, he gives the original Scythian name of one of their rivers, and at the same time gives its Greek transcription. Herodotus writes:

“This river the Scythians call Porata, and the Greeks PiretuS”. (The emphasis on the letter “s”, everywhere in the text is mine, p. m.).

This is certainly the most decisive evidence from which we see that the Greek ending “s” (which also ends some of the ancient Macedonian personal names and other types of words written by Greek authors) was added by Greek authors themselves in the transcription of almost all foreign names they encountered in the world of that time.

This is the case with the other wife of Alexander the Great. In the Greek historian Diodorus of Sicily, her name is recorded as Statira, and in some Greek sources this same name is recorded as StatiraS.

Arrian, however, also mentions her real Persian name, which was Barsina, with the remark that (quote): *“Barsina was usually called Statira”*.

An even more drastic example of this is the name of the Egyptian pharaoh Khufu. Herodotus records this pharaoh's name as Cheops, and he is still known by this name today, although it is certain that if he had had the opportunity to hear the name Cheops at the time, he would not have understood it at all, let alone thought that it could be his name. In the world-famous CD encyclopedia Encarta, in the subtitle for Cheops we read:

“Khufu, in Greek Cheops, Egyptian pharaoh (about 2638 - 2613 BC)”.

The same was true of the name of the Egyptian pharaoh Psamtik. Greek authors also changed (Greekized) his name. In the same encyclopedia Encarta (cited work, title: Psamtik I) it is written:

“Psamtik I, in Greek, Psamtik I, king of Egypt (reigned 664-610 BC)”.

However, Herodotus made the greatest linguistic mistakes when the Egyptian pharaoh Snefru (Khufu's father) was baptized as Rampsinitus (!?), and the same fate befell Khufu's son, who was called Rejedef, and Herodotus wrote him down as Mykerinus (of course with the obligatory Greek ending "s").

The ancient Greek historian Arrian calls the Central Asian river Amu-Darya as Oxus, and gives two completely different names for the Syr-Darya: Jaxartes and Tanais (!?).

The same is true of the Chenab River, which Arrian called Akesine. Furthermore, the Pir-Sar River is written down as Aornos, the Jhelum River as Hydaspes. The Ravi River is written down as Hydraotes, and the Beas River as Hyphasis.

In the Lexicon "Suda", ancient Greek authors also changed the name of the Drava River, which is recorded here as Drao ("Suda", delta 1501).

In several Greek historians, the Phoenician city, known to us under the name Tyre, is recorded as Tiros, although its original name, i.e. the name used by the people who lived in it, was approximately Dzore.

There are many more such examples.

All serious researchers of the ancient period are aware of this practice. For example, the French historian Lamartine in his work "Ve d' Alexander le Grand" (Paris, 1859, p. 54), will write in this regard:

"The Greeks distorted even the names of the rulers and military leaders with whom they fought. They gave everything a Hellenic appearance, even in India and Persia..."

Even more decisive in pointing out this truth is the famous Serbian historian Z. Petkovic. In his work: "Macedonia of the Ancient World", on p. 1, we read:

"The ancient Greek historians, who mostly serve as a source for the history of Macedonia, had the habit of changing

the geographical names and personal names of other peoples and adjusting them according to the Greek way of pronunciation, which is why today it is difficult to find the true names of those altered toponyms and names”.

But let us return to the personal names of the ancient Macedonians, which remained written with the Greek ending “s”. How do we know that they reached our time Hellenized? What if they were originally written and pronounced with the Greek ending “s”? The answer to these questions is very simple. Namely, it is true that we do not really know the original pronunciation of these names, but we do know that the Greeks in their records changed (Greekized) the personal names of literally all the peoples they came into contact with!

Thus, for example, almost all Persian personal names that we encounter in the works of ancient Greek authors end in “s” (although it is known that the Persians were not Greeks at all). We will provide a longer list of such Hellenized Persian personal names, taken from the works of Herodotus, Arrian, Diodorus Siculus and other authors. These names are: AbuleuteS, ArsameS, ArsiteS, AzaneS, AriomarduS, ArtifuS, AtibieS, ArtakaeS, AntixiS, AntibeluS, Azemi-lkuS, AmestriS, AnisuS, Artochmes, Achaemenus, Atize, Artaictes, Artine, AriandeS, ArchaeumneS, ArmamithraS, AspatineS, ArbazuS, AmorgeS, AriarmeneS, ArtabanuS, ArtaicteS, AutophradateS, AriabigneS, ArizuS, AvstaneS, ArbupaleS, AbuliteS, ArtaxerxeS, AtropateS, AriobarzaneS, ArtoniS, AutobareS, ArtiboleS, BagistaneS, BarxaeS, BessuS, BubakeS, BubareS, BarzenteS, GergiS, GorguS, GobriaS, DamastimuS, DariusS, DaurisS, DripetiS, DatameS, DotuS, ZopiruS, IntapherneS, ItamatreS, CambyseS, CandaluS, CyruS, XerxeS, KerasmiS, KersiS, CleophiS, CybernicuS, MazeuS, MaxameS, MegadosteS, MavaceS, MedateS, MyrsuS, MitrobuzaneS, MitrobeuS, MitrobateS,

MithrineS, MausoluS, MasiteS, MassageS, MardonteS, MegasidruS, MitrausteS, NabarneS, NiphateS, OxatreS, OrxineS, OxiarteS, OxodateS, OkondobateS, OronteS, OtaneS, Omares, Oebares, Oarizus, Ochus, Orontobates, PatizeiS, PrexaspeS, ParmuS, PatyrampheS, PixodaruS, PettineS, PigreS, ParistaS, ProexeS, RosakeS, RheomitreS, SabakeS, Sisamnes, SisineS, Sisimakes, SisineS, Sisingambris, SicaS, SeldomuS, SpitrobateS, SpitridatheS, SyromitreS, SatibarzaneS, StatiraS, Smerdis, SynesiS, TasiakeS, TomagoraS, TiteusS, ThespeS, ThiridateS, TabaluS, TimnesS, TimonaxS, TimondaS, Tritan-techmeS, TigraneS, TetramnestuS, PharnakeS, PhrasaostreS, FradasmeneS, FerendateS, PharnabazuS, FrataferneS, HystaspeS, HydrieuS, HydarneS, HegisistratuS, HostaspeS, ChoreneS and others.

The same fate befell the toponyms that were part of the Persian state and which also remained Greekized to this day with the ending “s”. Some of them are: the cities: DamascuS, AnchialuS, ThapsakuS, MiriandroS, TarsuS, PriapuS, MinduS, OpiS, MaluS, MagarsuS, MaratuS, TelmisuS, MiliaS, CyzicuS, KinduS, LampaxuS, HekatontapuluS, SabiktaS, XanthuS, KyropoliS, AsoenduS, HelmisuS, PhaseliS, CaspatiruS, BibluS, MinduS, KaunuS, IsuS, TiroS, KalipoliS, SestoS, SardeS and others; then, the rock of AornuS, the rivers: GranicuS, BumoduS, SangariuS, CydnuS, TigriS, PyramuS, HermuS, ChoeS, EuphrateS, StiboetiS, AraxeS, AornoS, JakarteS, TanaiS, CaicuS, ChoaspeS, PinaruS, PhasiS, OxuS, AceS, ThapsacuS, HaluS, ArabiuS, PractiuS; lake SerboniS; the mountains of CassiuS, TauruS, the island near Arabia, Tilus, and others.

But this is not the case only with Persian names and titles. This fate has befallen other peoples as well. Thus, for example, by Diodorus OF SICILY, the name of the queen of the Amazons is recorded as ThalestriS, and the name of an Egyptian as DanauS.

Herodotus, on the other hand, mentions the Egyptian rulers: Psammetichus, Moeri, Sesostri, Rampsinitho, Cheops, Mykerinus, Amasis and Apries, as well as Apries' daughter, named Niteti.

Here are also the names of several more Egyptians, mentioned by Herodotus and Arrian: Amyrtheus, Pausiri, Doloaspi, Petisi and others.

The Egyptian cities in Herodotus were also written with the ending "s" (Memphis, Sai, Thebes, Oasiss, Heliopolis, Canopus and others), and such is the case with Lake Moeri (in Arrian: Mareotis) and with the island of Prosopiti.

Even the name of the only Arabian river mentioned by Herodotus was recorded as Koru, and the name of an Arabian city by Arrian was recorded as Heropoli. The names of the only Libyans mentioned by Herodotus were recorded as Inaru and Tanura. Herodotus wrote the Libyan cape as Solei, and a Libyan river was recorded as Kinip.

And the Phrygian personal names in the aforementioned Greek narrative sources remained recorded with the ending "s": Adrastus, Gordius, Mida, Pelop, etc., and the name of the Ethiopian king remained recorded as Sabaku.

The name of the Assyrian princess remained recorded as Nitokri, and the name of her son as Labinetus. The Assyrian king who built the city of Anchiaulus is recorded as Sardanapalus, and he was the son of Anakindaraxes.

The same story is told with the Scythian names recorded by Herodotus. He first emphasizes that the Scythians were a separate people, saying (quote): "*The Scythians... are the youngest of all peoples.*" He also mentions that they had their own language, citing several of their words, along with their Greek transcription. However, he also wrote down the personal names of individuals from this separate people in Greek:

TargitauS, BorystheneS, LeipossaiS, ArpoksauS, KolaksaiS, AriapiteS, ScyllasS, OctamasadaS, AriantaS, TeresS, IdantirsuS and others, and the same is true of the names of the Scythian rivers GeruS, LycuS, OaruS, TiarantuS, AraruS, NapariS, PiretuS, OrdesuS and HirgiS. He wrote down the name of a Scythian lake as PaluS MaeotiS, the name of a region as: ExampeusS, while the tributaries of the largest Scythian rivers he wrote down as: ThiraS, HipaniS, BorystheneS, PanticapaeS and HippacyruS.

Otherwise, Herodotus also mentions the names of the Scythian gods, whom he also presents with Greek names. Arrian also mentions the Scythian commander Sathrakes, as well as the river Politymetus.

Herodotus also mentions a distant Western European river called Eridanus, where he strongly emphasizes that this was the Greek name of that river, and he also mentions two northern rivers: CarpiS and AlpiS. Arrian also mentions three Central Asian rivers: EparduS, AriuS and EtymandruS.

Illyrian names in Greek sources also remained written with the ending “s”. Some of them are: BardiliS, PineS, GraboS, PleuratoS and others, and the names of Illyrian toponyms were also Greekized, such as: EpidamnoS, DenusoS, LisoS, AngruS and others.

The same is the case with Thracian personal names. And the majority of them were recorded by ancient authors with the Greek ending “s”. Some of them are: MukakentoS, EptaikentoS, RodopiS, DaoS, PatoumaS, OloruS, PatoumasoS, KreteuS, KarsiS, TereS, SitalkeS and others. The Thracian rivers in Herodotus are recorded as AtriS, NoeS and ArtaneS, and here is the area of SalmudesuS. Arrian also mentions the Thracian mountain HemuS, the river HebruS and the city of KalatisS.

And the names of the Tribali suffered the same fate. For example, the Greek historian Arrian mentions the tribal river LiginusS, then the tribal city of KalatiS, as well as the name of the king of the Tribali, SirmuS.

Even the Indian personal names in the Greek sources were Greekized. Some of them are: PharnasatreS, TaxileS, MophiS, EmbisaruS, SasibisareS, PoruS, SpitakeS, MeroeS, Sopeite, Artabat, Phegeus, Xandrane, Misikanu, Porticanus, DandamiS, SandrakotuS, SambuS, KalanuS, Cofeus, AssageteS, and the names of the Indian rivers remained recorded as: InduS, GangeS, AkesineS, HydaspesS, HydraotesS and HyphasiS. The names of two Indian cities are recorded as SalmuS and OrobatiS, and of two mountains as MeruS and ParapamiS (Hindu-Kush, which Arrian also calls the Indian CaspianS).

According to this Greek practice of the time, it turns out that peoples with completely different cultures, ethnic origins (and even races!), such as: Persians, Egyptians, Illyrians, Arabs, Libyans, Thracians, Ethiopians, Scythians, Indians, Macedonians and others, had identical (Greek) endings to their personal names (!?). Of course, this is frivolous to even think about. But, despite all these facts, today's Greek historiography and propaganda uses the Greekized written ancient Macedonian personal names (as well as other words, toponyms, etc.) as "proof" that the ancient Macedonians were Greeks (since, after all, the ending of some of them was Greek). But if that is the case, then today's Greek propagandists should claim that the Thracians, Illyrians, Ethiopians, Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, Libyans, Indians, Italians and other peoples of that time were also Greeks, because personal names (but also toponyms and other words) in ancient Greek sources remained written with the ending "s" ("os" or "is"). However, Greek historians are silent

about this information, and use it only when the ancient Macedonians are in question. Here is another proof of their bias..

This conclusion is supported by the fact that not all the names that the ancient Macedonians bore were recorded by ancient Greek authors. Some of these names have been discovered on tombstones and other inscriptions, which means that they were written down by the Macedonians themselves. A good portion of these authentic personal names do not end in the Greek suffix "s" at all, and some of them are even more associated with names derived from a language close to modern Macedonian than with names with Greek roots. Some of these personal names are: Adaya, Ania, Giga, Dada, Dania, Damon, Dita, Dule, Zaika, Zaimina, Lasten, Lika, Mama, Mamina, Manta, Milo, Moma, Momo, Nana, Pita, Plator, Rumi, Sita, Skrita, Stasanor, Tato, Tate, Tataia, Filina and others.

In any case, if we compare most of the ancient Macedonian personal names found in literature (regardless of their origin) with the ones used by Macedonians today (specifically presented in the book: "Dictionary of Personal Names among Macedonians" by Ljubica Stankovska, Skopje, 1992), we will find numerous similarities. Some of these names are even completely identical to today's Macedonian names. Others, however, have been modified as female names or as surnames. For example, the ancient Macedonian male name Aleksandar is today found both as a female name Aleksandra, and as a family surname - Aleksandrovi. Some of these names, however, have undergone minor modifications, but not only have their roots remained the same, but the largest number of vowels have also been retained with a slightly changed order.

Because of all this, the question arises: from whom did today's Macedonians receive these numerous personal names,

to what extent do today's Macedonians supposedly have no connection with the ancient Macedonians?

5. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: THE NAME OF THE GREATEST MACEDONIAN KING (AND OF ALL OTHER ANCIENT MACEDONIANS WITH SUCH A NAME) WAS ALEXANDROS, NOT ALEXANDER

When it comes to the pronunciation of the name of the most famous Macedonian king Alexander the Great of Macedonia, it is true that all ancient Hellenic authors who wrote about him wrote his name as "Alexandros", but we have previously proven that ancient Greek (Hellenic) authors artificially Greekized all the names of foreign peoples they encountered. In addition, all the preserved writings by these authors in which the name of this king is mentioned were written centuries after his death. None of them was his contemporary to confirm what his real name was. For example, one of Alexander's biographers, named Diodorus of Sicily, lived almost three centuries after Alexander's death, and Plutarch wrote his biography of Alexander almost four centuries after Alexander's death, while Arrian wrote about Alexander over four centuries after his death. The same or similar is true of other ancient authors. However, there are preserved writings about Alexander that were written while he was still alive and they still exist today! These are the Babylonian astronomical records written in cuneiform. In some of them, the name of this Macedonian king is clearly written as ALEXANDER, and not as ALEXANDROS!.

During the Babylonian Empire, but also later, the most important temple for the Babylonians and Chaldeans (who were a separate people under Babylonian rule that over time adopted

Babylonian culture and religion) was the temple of Esaglia. It was actually a complex of temples dedicated to the Babylonian god Marduk. In this temple, for years, the priests kept an Astronomical Diary in which celestial phenomena were registered. Other data from everyday life were occasionally recorded in this Diary (weather conditions, the level of the Euphrates River, food prices, but also political events). The British Museum in London today keeps some of the daily records from the Astronomical Diary of the Chaldeans, among which Alexander the Great of Macedonia is mentioned.

In the tablet written in the fifth year of the reign of the Persian king Darius III, not only is Alexander's name mentioned, but from the preserved (although rather damaged) fragments one can sense interesting data written authentically during his very entry into Babylon.

In the tablet written in the twelfth year of Alexander's reign from the first to the end of the sixth month we read:

“In the twelfth year of King Alexander in the first month, the moon became visible through the clouds. From the setting of the sun to the setting of the moon there were clouds and I did not observe. On the night of the first the clouds passed through the sky. It was very cloudy and rain poured down. On the night of the second the moon was one and a half cubits to Jupiter and one cubit below Venus...”

Here the name of the Macedonian king is written as “A-lek-sa-an-dar”, and this is evidently at the time when he returned to Babylon, shortly before he died in that city. This is actually indisputable evidence that his name in the original was ALEXANDAR, and not ALEXANDROS, as later ancient Greek authors artificially Greekized it, just as they Greekized the names of dozens of other members of different peoples, artificially adding the Greek suffix “s” (“os”).

Some modern historians also believe that the real Macedonian name of the most famous Macedonian king was "Alexander" (as it is written in the authentic Babylonian cuneiform text written at the time when he lived), and not "Alexandros". For example, the Dutch historian Jonah Lendering (known for his book on Alexander the Great) in his review of the book "Alexander the Great. Historical Sources in Translation by Waldemar Heckel, John Yardley (2004) writes:

"We must not rule out the possibility that the name Alexander was a Macedonian name by which the conqueror of Asia was known among his compatriots".

6. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: THE ANCIENT MACEDONIANS WORSHIPPED THE GREEK GODS, WHICH MEANS THAT THEY WERE GREEKS

To respond to this view, we will first emphasize that the so-called "ancient Greek mythology and religion" was for the most part not Greek at all. Namely, until the 18th century it was considered that this religion, i.e. mythology, was autochthonous Greek, but then data were disclosed that the Greeks largely took over their religion from the Phoenicians (and from other Indo-European peoples of the time). To show that this is known to the world public today, we will attach a quote from the popular American Grolier CD encyclopedia (CD Grolier electronic publishing, inc. Mindscape, Inc. 1995, Novato, CA 94945), where it is quite clearly claimed that most elements of Greek religion and mythology were borrowed from other different cultures. In this regard, in the chapter "Mythology", in the subtitle "Greek Mythology" we read:

“Greek mythology contains mythological elements from different cultures and histories”.

But what is it that is borrowed from other religions? The answer is: most of the Greek deities were not Greek at all. For example, regarding the origin of the supreme god Zeus, this encyclopedia writes:

“The Indo-European cultural element is represented in deities such as Zeus... Zeus is the most prominent deity of Greek mythology. He is clearly of Indo-European origin and is a celestial deity related to and symbolized by the sky and sky phenomena”. (CD Grolier electronic publishing, inc. Mindscape, Inc. 1995, Novato, CA 94945, "Greek Mythology").

So, we see that the most famous “Greek god” Zeus is not Greek at all. Or rather, as much as he is Greek, he is also Macedonian, and as much he belongs to all the peoples who worshipped him at that time.

The same is true of the god Poseidon. Regarding him, in the same place, we read:

“Poseidon was originally an Indo-European deity and an elder brother to Zeus”. (CD Grolier electronic publishing).

As for the “Greek” Apollo, few people know that he is an Asian deity, imported from Siberia, where he existed in connection with Asian tribal shamanic cults. Here is what this encyclopedia says about this “Greek” deity:

“Apollo originated in Siberia and the ecstatic powers attached to his cult were derived from the tribal shamanism of that area rather than from the Dionysian cult at Delphi.”

Let us also mention the god Dionysus. He was a Brygian deity, but was first celebrated by the Macedonians, and only then by the Greeks.

In the aforementioned CD Grolier encyclopedia, in connection with the celebration of Dionysus by the Macedonians,

it is written that Dionysus in the Balkans was first celebrated by the Macedonians (although his Brygian origin is also mentioned). Here we read:

“Dionysus was not an Indo-European deity, but was probably of Brygian origin, whose cult first flourished in Macedonia, and then in Thessaly and Boeotia.”

It is known that in the ethnogenesis of the ancient Macedonians, the old Balkan people of the Brygians played a significant role, so of course that is where the presence of this god among the Macedonians comes from.

A large number of characters from this mythology also came from Thrace, from the Illyrian lands, from Africa and from Asia, which means that they also did not have Greek origin.

Even the “Father of History” Herodotus writes that most of the Greek deities were not Greek at all. Regarding the origin of the Greek deities, Herodotus writes in his “History”:

“The gods, with whose names they profess themselves unacquainted, the Greeks received, I believe, from the Pelasgi, except Neptune. Of him they got their knowledge from the Libyans.”

Who were the Pelasgi from whom (according to Herodotus) the Greeks took the gods?

The ethnic origin of the Pelasgi is not established. Herodotus (who was their contemporary) is decisive in claiming that they were not Greeks and that they spoke a language incomprehensible to the Greeks. Herodotus also writes about the hostilities between the Pelasgi and the Greeks. He also writes that the Pelasgi also lived in Macedonia, in the area of Crestonia. Regarding this, Herodotus writes:

“The Pelasgi, on the other hand, were, as I think, a barbarian race...”

Herodotus is even more decisive about the Pelasgians from the Macedonian region of Crestonia:

“For it is a certain fact that the people of Creston speak a language unlike any of their neighbours...”

Taking these facts into account, the claim that the ancient Macedonians were “Greeks” because they prayed to the “Greek gods” (!?) is completely nullified. These deities (of Indo-European and Asian origin) belonged equally to the ancient Greeks and the ancient Macedonians, but also to other Balkan peoples.

To explain this better, we will make a comparison with Christianity. Today, hundreds of millions of Christians belonging to various nations pray and believe in Jesus, although he was formally born as a member of the Aramaean people. No one today claims that all those who believe in Jesus are “ethnic Aramaeans”. But this is exactly the situation in modern Greek historiography in relation to the ancient Macedonians. This historiography absurdly claims that since the Macedonians believed in Zeus, Apollo, Poseidon... it means that they were "ethnic Greeks", although the Thracians, Illyrians, Pelasgians and other Balkan peoples also believed in these gods and although most of these gods did not have Greek origin at all.

But even in the celebration of the common gods there was a pronounced difference in the way they were celebrated. To clarify this, we will cite a modern example. Let's take the Catholic religion. Today, almost every Catholic holiday is associated with certain national customs, i.e. with a certain "way" of its celebration (of course, in addition to the universal general-Catholic rites). It is precisely in the specificity of these customs that peoples differ. For example, there is a noticeable difference in the customs and rituals during Christmas among the Poles and the Czechs (and certainly the same is true of the folk customs and rituals associated with other holidays, and among all other

Catholic peoples). So, in this case, we have Poles and Czechs (who believe in the same God), but they have a different way of celebrating that God (in terms of folk customs and rituals).

It was the same with the Macedonians and the Greeks. Both of them celebrated Zeus, but in quite different ways.

One of the world's most famous researchers of ancient Macedonia, Dr. Eugene Borza, writes in this regard that the Macedonians revered many deities that the Greeks also revered, but the manner of such veneration was also significantly different. For example, from the period of the Argives (Macedonian dynasty) nothing has yet been discovered that would resemble Greek temples, which are the main public religious monuments in Greece. (Eugene Borza: "In The Shadows of Olympus - The Emergence of Macedon", ISBN 0-691-05549-1).

Also, the Macedonians often used their own Macedonian names for these common Indo-European gods. Later, the same practice was adopted by the Romans, who gave their own names to the common Indo-European and Balkan gods, although their characteristics remained the same. For example, Zeus among the Romans became Jupiter, Hera became Juno, Artemis became Diana, and so on. So, does the fact that the Romans adopted almost all the so-called Greek gods mean that the Romans were Greeks?

But were there original Macedonian gods? The answer to this question is affirmative. Unfortunately, under the influence of Greek propaganda, in a good part of world historiography, even some of the purely Macedonian gods are treated as "Greek".

The original ancient Macedonian goddesses were the famous Muses! Their cult was first witnessed in the Macedonian region of Pieria, and from there they were accepted by the Greeks. In the aforementioned CD Grolier Encyclopedia under the title "Muses", we read:

“The muses... Sometimes called the Pierides, after their early home, Pieria, in Macedonia, frequented the fountain of Aganippe on Mount Helicon”.

So the muses also originate from the beliefs of the Macedonians who, let us recall, according to the Greeks of that time, spoke an incomprehensible Macedonian language for them and who were therefore called barbarians.

The religious corpus of the ancient Macedonians also included the gods Kaviri. Herodotus believes that the cult of the Kaviri was brought by the Pelasgians, who at that time also lived in Macedonia and who (according to Herodotus) also spoke a language incomprehensible to the Greeks.

Another important cult for the Macedonians is the cult of the legendary mythical singer Orpheus, who, according to beliefs, was born in Macedonia. In fact, the minimal knowledge of mythology shows that Orpheus was the son of the muse Calliope, whose Macedonian origin we have already mentioned. Orpheus was not only born in Macedonia, but he was also buried in our country. His grave was located at the foot of Mount Olympus in southern Macedonia, and his tombstone was inscribed with verses by a Macedonian poet.

As an ancient Macedonian god, we should also mention the god of healing, Daron.

Another ancient Macedonian deity, which was not present among the Greeks, was the goddess Ma. In Macedonia, several examples of finds with representations of this goddess have been witnessed, while such finds in Greece - there are none! The goddess Ma is considered to be of old Macedonian-Brygian origin and among the Macedonians, she had her own Macedonian specificities, which were not present among other peoples (although every people had a deity with a similar role as the Primal Mother).

Heracles was also celebrated in Macedonia as a special Macedonian god, and such was the case with the goddess Zeirena (who had separate Macedonian epithets), and in her content she resembled the Greek Aphrodite.

Both the Macedonian god of war (which the Greeks referred to as "Macedonian Ares"), as well as the Macedonian goddesses, who had an analogy in the Greek nymphs and graces, also had their own separate Macedonian names and were celebrated by the Macedonians with those names.

In the following, we will also review the origin of the authors who created the so-called "Greek mythology", as well as the origin of some other characters from this mythology.

The so-called "ancient Greek gods", along with all other mythological characters, are the product of the works of several ancient authors who created them. In the following, we will briefly review the origin of these authors.

It is well known in science that this mythology first appeared in written sources in three works (which were published with a relatively small time difference). These works are considered fundamental for this mythology. In this regard, we will quote an excerpt from the famous encyclopedia "Microsoft Encarta" in which we read about the first written manifestations related to this mythology:

"Greek mythology... mainly contains various stories and legends about various deities. Greek mythology reached its full development in the 700s BC. Three classical collections of myths: "Theogony" by the poet Hesiod, as well as "The Iliad" and "The Odyssey" by the poet Homer, appeared at this time." (Microsoft Encarta, USA, 1998, "Greek mythology").

So the first three fundamental works of the so-called "Greek mythology" are: "Theogony" by Hesiod, as well as "The Iliad" and

"The Odyssey" which are considered to have been written by Homer.

Regarding the work "Theogony" by Hesiod, in Encarta we read:

"Theogony depicts the origin of the world, which occurred from chaos, then the birth of the gods, as well as a description of their experiences". (Encarta, cit. work, title: "Hesiod").

So we see that Hesiod is the first author who systematically presented the key events of this mythology. But what is interesting for us is that Hesiod in his work "Theogony" never once mentions Greeks, nor any other word derived from this ethnonym (Greek, Greek, etc.). We recall that Hesiod lived approximately in the 8th century BC.

The same is true of the other two fundamental works of the so-called "Greek mythology", namely the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey". And in them, not a single word is mentioned, the ethnonym "Greeks"! Because of this, the question arises: what is this "Greek mythology", when in its first and fundamental works neither Greeks nor any other word derived from this ethnonym (Greek, Greek, etc.) is mentioned?

But that is not all. If we make an overview of the ethnic origin of the most significant ancient and medieval authors (creators) of this mythology, we will obtain even more surprising data in support of its non-Greek character.

The world-renowned researcher and expert on this mythology, Carlos Parada, has carried out detailed analyses of all known ancient and medieval works in which myths from the so-called "Greek mythology" are represented. Carlos Parada is the author of a large number of scientific papers dedicated to this mythology, in which all the characters and events in it are listed. He has processed this mythology so meticulously that he even made an overview of its most important authors (practically - its

creators) in which he calculated which author contributed how many lines of his works to the creation of this mythology.

Based on this, Carlos Parada also calculated which (ancient or medieval) author participated in what percentage in the creation of the works, which are fully or partially dedicated to characters and contents of this mythology. Some of Carlos Parada's papers are published in his book "Genealogical Guide to the Greek Mythology" (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, Vol. 107, Coronet Books; ISBN: 9170810621, Philadelphia, USA, 1993). These papers have also been published on CD, and are also available on the Internet..

Referring to the meticulous research of this world-famous contemporary expert on the so-called "Greek mythology", the following results are noted.

The most common author whose works were dedicated to characters and events from this mythology is the ancient writer Apollodorus. Carlos Parada calculated that of the total known literary opus of the so-called "Greek mythology", Apollodorus contributes 2389 lines or about 19%.

He is followed by the ancient authors Pausanias and Hyginus. In the total known literary opus of this mythology, Pausanias contributes a total of 1318 lines (about 12%), while the ancient author Hyginus contributes a total of 1259 lines (from his two works: "Fabulae" and "Poetica Astronomica"), which in percentage terms also amounts to about 12%.

They are followed by Homer, whose works constitute about 8% of the entire known literary opus of the so-called "Greek mythology" (of course, if he really existed as the only author).

In fact these authors with their works participate with about over 50% of the entire known literary opus dedicated to the so-called "Greek mythology".

They are followed by: Ovid with a total of 632 lines (about 6%); Nonnus with a total of 570 lines (about 5%); Hesiod with 493 lines (about 4.6%); Diodorus of Sicily with 484 lines (about 4.4%) and Virgil, who participates with 466 lines (about 4%).

The remaining authors participate with a much smaller percentage.

Having stated these figures, let us take a look at the ethnic origin of the most represented authors, i.e. creators of the largest part of the so-called "Greek mythology" literary opus known to date.

We said that the most represented author (with 19%) is Apollodorus. He lived in the second century in Alexandria. His ethnic origin is unknown. However, there is data on the approximate ethnic composition of Alexandria from the end of the first century AD (which means only a few decades before the appearance of Apollodorus). At that time, the most dominant inhabitants in Alexandria were: Egyptians, Macedonians (who founded this Egyptian city and who were its first inhabitants), Greeks, Jews and Romans.

The most famous ancient Jewish historian Josephus Flavius (who lived in the first century AD) writes about the Macedonians as inhabitants of Alexandria at that time. When writing about the settlement of Jews in Alexandria by the Macedonian ruler Ptolemy I, Flavius writes that this ruler: "...*gave the Jews in Alexandria the same privileges as the Macedonians themselves had*" (Josephus Flavius, "Jewish Antiquities, XI, 12,1).

In his book "Flavius Josephus Against Apion" Flavius also writes about the Macedonians as inhabitants of Alexandria. In the second part (6), he writes that: "*The Greeks and Macedonians possessed the city*", and in the continuation he accuses the Egyptians of having, due to racial hatred towards the Jews, won the Macedonians and Greeks to turn against the Jews who lived

in Alexandria. Flavius also mentions a speech by the Judean king Agrippa (first century AD) in which the Macedonians are also quite clearly mentioned as the dominant inhabitants of Alexandria, but also as inhabitants of several other areas in Egypt (Flavius Josephus, Wars of the Jews, II, 16.4). In this speech, speaking about the conditions in the city of Alexandria during the Roman occupation, Agrippa said:

“In Alexandria... two legions (Roman, p.m.) are stationed, which oversee the more distant parts of Egypt, as well as those parts which are more populated by respectable Macedonians”.

So, for almost 400 years after the founding of Alexandria, Macedonians continued to be residents of this city to a significant extent.

As for Apollodorus, he could have been Macedonian, he could have been Greek, but he could also have been Jewish, or even Egyptian or Roman.

The fact that Apollodorus wrote in the Koine language (a mixed language created from several Greek dialects, but also from elements from other languages), absolutely does not mean that Apollodorus was Greek. This language was then written by the majority of the few literate people from many nations of the world, because at that time the Koine language and the Latin language were the only two known written languages in that area, which were in wider use. Even the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius wrote in the Koine language, so no one today claims that he was "Greek" (and let's not go any further, that even Nicolaus Copernicus wrote in Latin, so it is known that he was not Latin; here are also today's Nigerians who write in English, but are not English, and countless such examples). So, the conclusion remains that the ethnic origin of Apollodorus is unknown, but the fact is that he did not originate from the territory of present-day Greece.

Second, according to the representation in the so-called "Greek mythology" (which accounts for 12%) in the so-called literary opus known so far, is Pausanias. It can be said with more than certainty that he was not Greek. He was born in the region of Lydia (which was located in present-day Turkey). It is known that a separate people, the Lydians, lived in Lydia, who spoke their own Lydian language. This language, along with the Hittite, Lycian, Palaian and Luwian languages, belonged to the group of "Anatolian languages". After Lydia was conquered by Alexander the Great of Macedon, i.e. in the period that followed, elements of Balkan culture were also observed, but there is no data on the mass emigration of the Lydians from Lydia, from whose gene Pausanias probably also came. So, this author of the so-called "Greek mythology" not only did not originate from the territory of present-day Greece, but more than certainly was not even an ethnic Greek.

Third author according to the representation in the works of the so-called "Greek mythology" is Hyginus. In the world-famous Encyclopedia Britannica, regarding the origin of this author, we read:

"Hyginus worked in the first century after Christ. He was a Latin author and scholar who, according to Suetonius (Suetonius, De Grammaticis, 20), was appointed by Augustus as the chief supervisor of the Palatine Library."

So even the third most represented author in the entire known literary opus of the works of the so-called "Greek mythology" was not Greek, nor did he originate from Greek territories, and he did not even write in the Koine language, but in Latin.

With 8% representation in the contents of the so-called "Greek mythology" comes Homer. Nothing is known about his ethnic origin and there is practically no information about his life

(biography, mention of him by contemporaries, representation of his character, etc.). Therefore, today, opinions in world science are divided as to whether he even existed as a person or perhaps his works were written by multiple authors.

In antiquity and the Middle Ages, it was mainly believed that Homer was a single person and that he was the author of the works signed with his name. However, in 1795, the author F.A. Wolf published a book entitled "The Homeric Problem" (Prolegomena at Homerum). In this book, Wolf disputed Homer's authorship, which opened a debate in the scientific community that continues to this day.

There are mainly two groups of scientists regarding this problem. The first group believes that Homer existed as a person and that he was the author of the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey", while the second group believes that there are multiple authors behind his works.

The final form of the "Iliad" and "Odyssey", as we know it today, is believed to have been created in Alexandria and Athens, where between 300 and 100 BC meetings were held by the scholars of the time at which the original texts of Homer were "restored" (edited). This practically means that it is not known for sure what the original language in which these works were written was.

All this means that Homer cannot be said to have been a "Greek". Not only because the ethnonym "Greeks" did not exist in his time, but also because it is not even known whether he existed as a person at all. Those who believe in his existence believe that he came from Asia Minor.

The next author according to the extent to which he participated in the opus of the so-called "Greek mythology" is Ovid. We said about him that he participated with 6%. Regarding his ethnic origin, in the Encarta encyclopedia, we read:

“Ovid (43 BC - about 17 AD) was a Roman poet.”

So Ovid was not Greek either, but a Roman, who wrote his works in Latin.

Nonnus follows with 5% and Virgil with 4% participation in the so-called “Greek mythology” literary opus known so far. Nonnus was an Egyptian who lived in the 5th century AD (Encyclopedia Britannica, title Nonnus), and Virgil is well known to have been a Roman poet, born in a village in present-day northern Italy, near Mantua. He lived from 70 to 19 BC.

Of the authors of the so-called “Greek mythology” who were not Greeks and who did not originate from ethnic Greek territories, we will also mention the Latin authors Statius, Antonius Liberalis and Valerius Flaccus. Statius with his works contributed about 2.6% of the total known literary opus of the so-called “Greek mythology”, and Antonius Liberalis and Valerius Flaccus with 2%. All three were Latin authors.

Let us also mention Apollonius of Rhodes, who contributed 1.8% of the known literary opus of the so-called “Greek mythology”. It is known that he lived in the 3rd century BC and was born in Alexandria.

Authors who participated in the creation of the so-called “Greek mythology”, who were of non-Greek or unknown ethnic origin, were: Apuleius Lucius, a Roman writer and philosopher, who lived in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD and was born in the territory of present-day Algeria; Callimachus, who lived in the 3rd century BC in Alexandria, and came from Libya; Cicero, who lived in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC and was a famous Roman writer and orator; Claudius Aelian, who lived in the 2nd and 3rd centuries and was a Roman rhetorician; Propertius Sextus, who lived in the 1st century BC and was a Roman poet, born in Assisi; Athenaeus of Naucratis, who came from Egypt, and others.

Here are also the later Byzantine authors: Coluthus, Constantinus Prophirogenitus, Stephen Byzantium, John Tzetzes and others.

And what can be concluded from this entire review? The authors who created over 80% of the literary works, partially or completely devoted to the characters and events of the so-called "Greek mythology", were either not Greeks or were people of unknown ethnic origin. This is yet another argument in favor of the unjustification of the use of the term "Greek mythology." At least, from the point of view of the ethnic origin of its creators, this mythology cannot be "Greek". What is this "Greek mythology" when it is known that the vast majority of its creators were not Greeks, and a large part of its characters were taken from other peoples.

7. GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY CLAIMS: TODAY'S INHABITANTS IN THE AEGEAN PART OF MACEDONIA ARE SLAVOPHONESIANS OR POSSIBLY SLAVS WHO HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ANCIENT MACEDONIANS

Regarding the ethnic origin of today's Macedonians, you will hear in many places that it is "purely Slavic", that Macedonians speak "Slavic" and that they have no connection with the ancient Macedonians, etc. Contrary to this theory, recent research indicates that the ancient Macedonians have the most significant share in the ethno-cultural profile of today's Macedonians.

To briefly explain all this, we need to recall a few moments. First of all, the ancient peoples did not disappear from the face of the earth and did not evaporate into thin air (except perhaps a few drastic cases of their mass emigration, etc.). The ancient

peoples mostly introduced their blood and culture into the more modern ethnicities that appeared on their territory. This is accepted today by almost all historiographies in the world and there is no reason for Macedonia and the Macedonians to be an exception. According to this logic, it is precisely the ancient Macedonians who are the ancient ancestors of the present-day Macedonian nation.

Secondly, the advocates and supporters of the pan-Slavic theory (according to which, today's Macedonians are "pure Slavs" originating from "behind the Carpathians") will have to give a convincing answer to a simple question: why do today's Macedonians, according to some basic anthropological characteristics, differ markedly from the majority of members of the other Slavic peoples? The Byzantine medieval historian Procopius (who was a contemporary of the ancient Slavs) quite clearly described them as a people whose members were (quote): "*tall and very strong*". He also claimed that the ancient Slavs were all "*blond*", emphasizing that there was not a single one of them who had a different hair color, except blond! It is clear that the majority of today's Macedonians almost do not fit into this description of the basic anthropological features of the ancient Slavs. Therefore, the question arises: how is it possible that the "blood ancestors" of today's Macedonians were all blond people and, for the most part, "tall and strong", and their present-day "descendants" have almost completely opposite characteristics to them? Such a case does not exist in history. Let's take, for example, the Swedes. It is known that the basic anthropological features of their blood ancestors (the Vikings) are the same as the anthropological features of today's Swedes. Can a modern Swedish historian describe the Vikings as "short, dark-skinned people with dark hair?" Moreover, the insistence that today's

Macedonians are "pure Slavs" smacks less of racism ("pure peoples", "pure origin", etc.).

In addition to this, we will mention one more point. The adherents of the pan-Slavic theory of the origin of the Macedonian nation everywhere point to medieval documents in which it is written about the "immigration of the Slavs to Macedonia" in the 6th century. But there are also such serious medieval documents and testimonies in which the emigration of a significant number of Slavs from Macedonia is clearly described, and that in the 7th century! Such a mass emigration of the Slavs from Macedonia was undertaken by the Byzantine emperor Justinian II (reigned: 685-695 and 705-711). The Patriarch of Constantinople Nicephorus (806-815) in his chronological notes (chapter 34) described this quite clearly. Here we read:

"Justinian II attacked the Sclauinians. He reached the city of Thessalonica and drew out many of the Sclauinian tribesmen there, some with force, some with appeal, and relocated them to the land called Opsicius." (Opsicius is a Byzantine theme in Asia Minor, p.m.).

But what was the approximate number of the Slavs who were deported from Macedonia to Asia Minor? The Byzantine historian Theophanes (late 8th and early 9th centuries) gives us an approximate answer to this question. Writing about the Arab-Byzantine war of 692, Theophanes writes that from the ranks of the Slavs who had been deported to Asia Minor, the Byzantine emperor Justinian II managed to recruit as many as thirty thousand soldiers for the needs of this war. Here we read:

"In that year, Justinian II chose 30,000 recruits from the Sclauinians that he had relocated (to Asia Minor), and by arming them he made them a substantial army". (The document is taken

from: “Selected Readings for the History of the Macedonian People”, Skopje, 1951, p. 25).

If we take into account the fact that there was no compact majority of Slavs in Asia Minor before the relocation carried out by Justinian II, then it can be said with certainty that those thirty thousand Slavic soldiers were recruited precisely from the ranks of those Slavs that Justinian II relocated from Macedonia to Asia Minor.

From this data it can be seen that the number of Slavs who relocated from Macedonia to Asia Minor was perhaps several hundred thousand people, since as many as thirty thousand of them were capable of fighting with weapons in hand. This means that the number of “Transcarpathian Slavs” who remained to live in Macedonia was considerably reduced.

Therefore, it seems right that the French academic Georges Cerbelaud Salagnac in 1992, in his book entitled “The Ethnic Origins of the Europeans” (“Les origines ethniques des Europeens” Editions Perrin, 1992, Paris, France) claims that today’s Macedonians are to a large extent descendants of the ancient Macedonians. He writes that the Slavs did indeed appear in the Balkans in the 6th century, but that they, as an unorganized tribe, could not become the dominant inhabitants of Macedonia, which is why they quickly merged into the ancient Macedonians, who were then a cultural and civilized people.

When writing about this topic, we should also take folklore into account. In Macedonian folklore, i.e. in the historical memory of the Macedonian people, there is not a single work that mentions the alleged “Transcarpathian life” of our people (some Transcarpathian toponym, hydronym or any other segment). This information also deserves attention because the folklore of a people draws its roots from the ethnic past of that people.

On the other hand, there are a large number of cultural elements (customs, rituals, folk beliefs, folklore motifs, etc.) that have remained since the ancient Macedonians among Macedonians in the 19th and 20th centuries. We will briefly mention some of them. For example, Herodotus writes that at festivities in ancient Macedonia, men sat separately from women. This custom was also recorded by the scribes of Macedonian folk tales from the 19th century, specifically by Verković, Šapkarev and the Miladinovci brothers, and has even survived to this day in some areas of Macedonia. The custom of breaking bread during wedding customs also remained from the ancient Macedonians, which was mentioned by the biographer of Alexander the Great of Macedonia, Quintus Curtius Rufus. This same custom remained among the Macedonians in the 19th century, and even today. The treatment of the male belt from the folk costume as a symbol of masculinity was also retained from the ancient Macedonians. This belief among the ancient Macedonians was described by Aristotle, and the same belief was recorded in the 19th century by the folklorist Verković in his description of the wedding customs of southwestern Macedonia. And giving a ring to the heir (before a woman dies) is a custom recorded among the ancient Macedonians that has survived to this day. Cutting hair during great mourning is also an ancient Macedonian custom that has survived to this day among the Macedonians. This custom was first described by the ancient philosopher Socrates in connection with the Macedonian king Archelaus, and later Alexander the Great of Macedonia cut off a lock of his hair as a sign of mourning for the death of his friend. Even today in Macedonia, some women cut their long hair as a sign of mourning for some great tragedy in their family. Even the ancient Macedonian custom of choosing a king (which took place through a mass gathering of the army and election by

acclamation) remained among the Macedonians of the 19th century as a custom for choosing a village elder. This custom is described in detail by the Bosnian folklorist Stefan Verković in his descriptions of customs in southwestern Macedonia from the 19th century. Verković writes that the village elder was even given a scepter as a sign of respect (just as it was with the kings in ancient Macedonia). Another ancient Macedonian custom is the marking of a circle around the settlement for protection from evil. This custom is also recorded as a custom among the Macedonians from the 19th century again by Stefan Verković. Ancient Macedonian elements are also noted among the Macedonians during the celebration of the spring holidays of Lazarus, George's Day, Rusa Sreda and Pročka (Day of forgiveness). The decoration of young girls during these holidays is a pure ancient Macedonian custom.

Ancient Macedonian elements are also registered in today's Macedonian customs, which are performed to call for rain. The belief in the magical power of the snake has also remained from the ancient Macedonians; then several funeral customs (such as covering the face of the deceased before being buried) and others.

It is also significant that in Macedonian folklore there are numerous Macedonian folk works (songs, stories, legends, traditions, etc.) dedicated to some of the ancient Macedonian rulers or public figures. For example, in the 19th and 20th centuries old songs and stories dedicated to Alexander the Great of Macedonia, Philip II of Macedonia, Perseus and others were written down. There are also certain folklore elements (especially in the stories), which undoubtedly have their roots in the time of ancient Macedonia. Such are: the motif with the lion (which really lived in the time of ancient Macedonia and is precisely why it is most represented in Macedonian folk tales, but also in heraldry);

the motif of the lynx in tales; the motif of the philosopher in tales; the motif with the three brothers (taken from Herodotus' story about the origin of the Macedonian state); the cult of water and many others.

Macedonian folklore also contains a significant number of elements from ancient mythology, which was also practiced by the ancient Macedonians. Numerous motifs from this mythology are also present in Macedonian folk tales and other types of folklore works, which is certainly another proof of the significant ancient origin of today's Macedonians. Some of these motifs are: the motif of fairies (magical women with similar properties to the ancient maenads and ancient erinyes), the motif of gilding and silvering by touch (which is found in Macedonian stories, and is taken from the ancient story of King Midas), the motif of the personification of the sun, the motif of the sun rising and setting on the opposite side, the motif of the personification of the celestial bodies, the motif of the creation of man from mud, the motif of the dragon (taken from the ancient creature lamia), the motif of the dragon, the motif of belief in fate, the motif of the personification of happiness, the motif of a god disguised as an old man, the image of the winged horse, the motif of metamorphoses, the motif of Heracles, the motif of the underworld and many others, which we have only briefly mentioned here, and their detailed elaboration can be found in the book "The Ancient Macedonian Heritage in Today's Macedonian Culture". "Nation - Part One Folklore Elements" by the author of this text, as well as on the YouTube channel Aleksandar Donski history chanel.

Ancient Macedonian ethnic identification among the Macedonians from the recent past

To all that has been stated so far, let us add the fact that despite all the anti-Macedonian propaganda that in the past used all means to convince Macedonians that they were something else and not Macedonians, the ancient Macedonian ethnic origin was massively articulated by many Macedonians, mainly in the 19th and 20th centuries. This has been discussed in particular detail by academician Blaže Ristovski (in his works: *Portraits and Processes I*, Skopje, 1989 and *Macedonia and the Macedonian Nation*, Skopje, 1995), so in the following we will use quotes from his research on such phenomena, supplemented by my additional research in this direction. It is particularly important that the feeling of the ancient Macedonian ethnicity of the Macedonians of the 19th and 20th centuries was also testified to by foreign figures who were living in Macedonia at the time. Here we will only briefly recall some of these testimonies.

Testimony that the memory of Alexander the Great remained among the Macedonians in the first half of the 19th century was given by the German travel writer Johann Mayer. During his visit to Macedonia in 1814, he wrote that the people of that region still kept the memory of Alexander the Great.

Let us also mention the statement of a currently unknown teacher from Ohrid from 1845. When asked to declare his nationality, he literally said that he was "a pure Macedonian, like Philip and Alexander the Great and Aristotle the philosopher".

The priest Dimitrija from Kriva Palanka also wrote in 1848 that he felt himself a descendant of the ancient Macedonians, while the newspaper "Tsarigradski vesnik" in the issue of 03. 03.1860, in an article by an unsigned author, wrote that the descendants of the ancient Macedonians still live in Macedonia.

The famous Bosnian folklorist Stefan Verković, who stayed in Macedonia in the 19th century (where he recorded folk tales), also wrote that the Macedonians from southwestern Macedonia (who mostly belonged to the Pulivakovci clan) considered themselves descendants of the ancient Macedonians. Writing about their national consciousness (somewhere in the sixties of the 19th century), Verković wrote:

"There is a tradition among the Pulivakovci clan that they are pure Macedonians and descendants of Alexander the Great. The people living in the vicinity of Pazar are proud of the old capital, i.e. the city of Pella (the former capital of ancient Macedonia), of which only one tower and one rock, five arshins high, remain."

The famous Macedonian teacher, writer and revolutionary Ivan Shumkov from Krusevo also considered himself a direct descendant of the ancient Macedonians, and it is also recorded that a certain Paunchev from Thessaloniki, in a conversation with a Bulgarian teacher, introduced himself as: *"a pure Macedonian, like Philip and Alexander the Great were"*.

The Bulgarian national figure Petko Slavejkov came to Macedonia in the 19th century to convince the Macedonians that they were "Bulgarians". However, he was surprised when many of them answered him that they felt themselves to be descendants of the ancient Macedonians. Slavejkov mentioned this realization in his text "The Macedonian Question", published on 18.01.1871.

The ancient Macedonian ethnic origin was also accepted as their ethnic origin by the leaders of the Macedonian Kresna Uprising raised in 1878 against the Turkish Empire. For example, in the Constitution of the Macedonian Insurgent Committee of 1878, which organized and raised this uprising, the insurgents are called: *"Macedonian army of Alexander the Great"*.

The famous Macedonian writer and revolutionary Gorgjiya Pulevski also believed that the Macedonians also had an ancient Macedonian ethnic origin and emphasized this repeatedly.

The Manifesto of the illegal Provisional Government of Macedonia, published in April 1881, stated that the Macedonians of the 19th century were descendants of the ancient Macedonians. In this Manifesto, the governments of other countries were requested to "*restore ancient Macedonia*".

In an article published in the newspaper "Macedonia", which was then published in Ruse (Bulgaria) in 1888, by an author who signed himself only with the initials K.G., it is written:

"Our homeland Macedonia has a history of its past, which shows its power, greatness, as well as its political subjugation under the rule of the then powerful Turkish Empire.... Today, every Macedonian, when mentioning Alexander the Great, says: We had Tsar Alexander the Great. With those words, he recalls the brilliant period and greatness of the Macedonian state. Alexander the Great stands before the face of every Macedonian as a national pride!"

The sense of ethnic belonging to the ancient Macedonians was also present among the Macedonians of the turbulent beginning of the 20th century. For example, the leader of the Gorno-Dzhumaj Uprising, Colonel Atanas Yankov (a colonel in the Bulgarian army, a Macedonian from the village of Zagorichani), which was raised against Turkish rule in 1902, unwaveringly considered himself a descendant of the ancient Macedonians. Before the very beginning of this uprising, he addressed the following proclamation to the rebels:

"Macedonians! Remember the world conqueror, the world glory of Macedonia – the great Alexander the Great of Macedonia! Remember the brave Tsar Samuil, the Macedonian giant, the wonderful King Marko who was a pan-Slavic glory –

that Macedonian blood flowed in all of them. They now watch over us from the heights of heaven and bless our begun work. Let us show ourselves as their worthy descendants!"

It is little known that the ancient Macedonian ethnic consciousness among Macedonians came to the fore even during the period of the great Ilinden Uprising, against the strong influence of Bulgarian propaganda which, in its schools opened in Macedonia, convinced Macedonians that they were "Bulgarians".

For example, the president of the short-lived Macedonian Krusevo Republic (which was founded on the liberated Macedonian territory by the rebels) Nikola Karev declared himself a Macedonian and a direct descendant of the ancient Macedonians. Proof of this is the interview with Nikola Karev, published in the Greek newspaper "Acropolis" on 08.05.1903 in which he answered affirmatively to the question whether he considered himself a direct successor of Alexander the Great.

In September 1903, in New York and Philadelphia in the USA, in support of the Ilinden Uprising, a Macedonian Committee was formed, which addressed an Appeal to the American public asking for help for the uprising. In this Appeal, the Ilinden insurgents are everywhere called Macedonians and as descendants of those Macedonians to whom Saint Paul preached Christianity. Here we read:

"What Paul saw in the spirit, in the human vision of Macedonia that called him to help this country, we now have all of this before us. It was high time that an uprising was raised in Macedonia as a result of the pain and poverty... For the time being, we are not interested in the rights and injustices of the Macedonians, but we must not be indifferent and not help those human beings, fellow Christians, their wives and children who are dying by the hundreds, and even more. Thousands will die if

Christian Europe and Christian America do not save them." (T. L. Porecki: "The Truth about Macedonia through Documentation", Belgrade, 1992, p. 68).

The author Petar Zagorov, at the height of the Ilinden Uprising in September 1903, published the poem "There" in the newspaper "Autonomous Macedonia", in which, among other things, he called the people of Ilinden "*descendants of Alexander the Great.*" Poems praising the glory of the ancient Macedonians were also published after the Ilinden Uprising.

The Macedonian national figure Dr. Trifun Grekov was also considered a direct descendant of the ancient Macedonians. During the years 1922 and 1924 he published several articles dedicated to the ancient Macedonians and especially to Alexander the Great in the newspaper "Macedonia" in Sofia and in the newspaper "Macedonian Knowledge" in Vienna.

A document emphasizing the ancient Macedonian origin of modern Macedonians was also found in the archive of Vancho Mihajlov's VMRO from 1932 (although this Macedonian organization was under the influence of Bulgarian propaganda). An association of the MPO organization (a kind of successor to Vancho Mihajlov's VMRO) in the city of Lorain (USA), formed in March 1924, bore the name "Alexander the Great" and had its own flag on which the name and image of this glorious king of ours were depicted.

The fact that the ancient Macedonians were not Greeks at all, but a separate ethnic group with their own culture and civilization, which "surpassed the Hellenic", was also written by Macedonian authors Vasil Ivanovski Bistrishki (in 1934) and Angel Dinev (in 1938).

Between the two world wars, the cult of Alexander the Great of Macedonia was quite developed in Prilep, as evidenced

by the Macedonian national figure of that time, Dimche Adzimitreski.

During this period, the youth of Ohrid was also embraced by the cult of Alexander. The poet Goce Miteski testified that the intellectual youth of this region during the Second World War was delighted with their ancestor Alexander the Great. In 1942, Miteski himself wrote a poem about Alexander.

After World War II, the cult of Alexander the Great and the glory of ancient Macedonia became even stronger in the ranks of illegal anti-Yugoslav Macedonian organizations in Macedonia and abroad, as well as among the wider layers of the Macedonian diaspora. Slowly but surely, based on solid evidence, this process is finally unstopably advancing among today's generations of Macedonians in Macedonia, not only among the common people, but also among the institutions.

*

Finally, let us say that it is a fact that in the past, some Macedonians declared themselves as: Bulgarians, Serbs or Greeks (in accordance with the propaganda they were exposed to). However, the declaration of the 19th century Macedonians as descendants of the ancient Macedonians has incomparably greater weight than the declaration of the Macedonians as: Greeks, Serbs or Bulgarians. I will also answer why I claim this.

The biggest reason for the Macedonians to declare themselves as Greeks, Bulgarians or Serbs (especially in the 19th century) was the large amounts of money that Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria spent on their propaganda activities in Macedonia (opening schools next to churches in which they used religion to denationalize Macedonian children, printing newspapers and books, etc.). But who convinced the Macedonians of that time to declare themselves as descendants of the ancient Macedonians? Of course, no one! And not only did

no one from the outside persuade them to declare themselves as descendants of the ancient Macedonians, but foreign propaganda tried with all its might to stifle such a declaration, while convincing them that the Macedonians belonged to their people. Moreover, the numerous historical evidence of the centuries-old national uniqueness of the Macedonians was hidden in the Bulgarian, Greek and Serbian churches and schools. Therefore, such a declaration, which was not only not encouraged, but was even hindered by foreign chauvinists, has far greater weight. Such a declaration did not arise as a result of any foreign propaganda, but rather the Macedonians inherited it from their ancestors, the ancient Macedonians, and therein lies its primordial power.

Anthropological Evidence of the Connection Between the Ancient and the Present-day Macedonians

The strongest evidence of the connection between the present-day Macedonian nation and the ancient Macedonians has recently been provided by genetics.

Here we will mention one piece of information provided by a Greek scientist! The Greek scientist Puglianos (otherwise a member of DAG) after the civil war in Greece, along with many of the Macedonians and Greeks, left for the USSR. In the fifties in Taschkent and Chirchik this scholar performed comparative anthropological studies between the Macedonians there (former DAG fighters) and the Macedonians (whose data he obtained from the archives in the USSR). The results of those studies were sensational. Puglianos proved that the anthropology of the ancient Macedonians was strikingly identical to the anthropology of the Macedonians who had temporarily resided in the USSR. It

may seem paradoxical today, but the Greek government of that time gladly accepted these findings. The logic at the time among them was that if today's Macedonians had identical anthropological traits with the ancient Macedonians (who, according to them, were "Greeks"), the present-day Macedonians are also "descendants of Greeks". (For more details on this: Hristo Andonovski: "Southern Macedonia from Ancient to Present Macedonians", Skopje, 1995).

As far as genetic research is concerned, in 2000 a group of Spanish geneticists (in collaboration with their Macedonian counterparts) conducted genetic research on modern Macedonians, proving that Macedonians were one of the oldest nations in Europe.

The Department of Immunology and Molecular Biology, H. 12 de Octubre, at the "Universidad Complutense", from Madrid, Spain, and the Tissue Typing Laboratory of the Institute of Blood Transfusion, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia, conducted the first genetic research on Macedonians and compared them to other Mediterranean populations. Ten researchers (A. Arnaiz-Villena, K. Dimitroski, A. Pacho, J. Moscoso, E. Gomez-Casado, C. Silvera-Redondo, P. Varela, M. Blagoevska, V. Zdravkovska, and J. Martinez-Laso) were involved in the research, whose aim was "to determine the relative contributions of Macedonians and Greeks to the present-day genetic pool of Mediterranean peoples", and for that "purpose, both HLA (Human Leucocyte Antigens) class I and class II DNA typing have been studied in Macedonians for the first time".

The study "*HLA genes in Macedonians and the sub-Saharan origin of the Greeks*" is presented in the Danish medical journal "*Tissue Antigens*", February 2001, volume 57, issue 2, p. 118-127. Everyone who visits the website www.blackwellmunksgaard.com/tissueantigens (the link can also

be found through www.historyofmacedonia.org) can read the following abstract:

*“HLA alleles have been determined in individuals from the Republic of Macedonia by DNA typing and sequencing. HLA-A, -B, -DR, -DQ allele frequencies and extended haplotypes have been for the first time determined and the results compared to those of other Mediterraneans, particularly with their neighbouring Greeks. Genetic distances, neighbour-joining dendrograms and correspondence analysis have been performed. The following conclusions have been reached: 1) Macedonians belong to the "older" Mediterranean substratum, like Iberians (including Basques), North Africans, Italians, French, Cretans, Jews, Lebanese, Turks (Anatolians), Armenians and Iranians; 2) Macedonians are not related with geographically close Greeks, who do not belong to the "older" Mediterranean substratum; 3) Greeks are found to have a substantial relatedness to sub-Saharan (Ethiopian) people, which separate them from other Mediterranean groups. Both Greeks and Ethiopians share quasi-specific DRB1 alleles, such as *0305, *0307, *0411, *0413, *0416, *0417, *0420, *1110, *1112, *1304 and *1310. Genetic distances are closer between Greeks and Ethiopian/sub-Saharan groups than to any other Mediterranean group and finally Greeks cluster with Ethiopians/sub-Saharans in both neighbour joining dendrograms and correspondence analyses. The time period when these relationships might have occurred was ancient but uncertain and might be related to the displacement of Egyptian-Ethiopian people living in pharaonic Egypt.”*

The study used the following samples for their calculations: 172 unrelated ethnic Macedonians from Skopje; 98 Moroccans; 98 Berbers; 94 Moroccan Jews; 176 Spaniards; 80 Basques; 228 Portuguese; 179 French; 102 Algerians; 91

Sardinians; 284 Italians; 80 Ashkenazi Jews; 80 non-Ashkenazi Jews; 135 Cretans; 85 Greeks from the Aegean; 95 Greeks from Attica; 101 Greeks from Cyprus; 59 Lebanese from Niha el Shouff; 93 Lebanese from Kafar Zubian; 100 Iranians; 228 Turks; 105 Armenians; 101 Egyptians from Siwa; 83 Oromo; 98 Amhara; 38 Fulani; 39 Rimaibe; 42 Mossi; 77 San (Bushmen); 192 Senegalese; and 86 South African Blacks.

The results of the study suggest a number of interesting conclusions. First of all, it shows that the "*Macedonians are related to other Mediterraneans and do not show a close relationship with Greeks*"; however, the Macedonians have a close relationship to the Cretans. "*This*", the researchers conclude, "*supports the theory that the Macedonians are one of the most ancient peoples existing in the Balkans, probably long before (the) arrival of the Mycaenian Greeks about 2000 B.C.*"

The researchers were surprised to find out that "*the reason why the Greeks did not show a close relatedness with all the other Mediterraneans analyzed*", was because the Greeks had a "*genetic relationship with the sub-Saharan ethnic groups now residing in Ethiopia, Sudan and West Africa (Burkina-Fasso)*".

Indeed, before this fact even the gods are silent. Some historians believe that the Pelasgians were creators of the culture of Mycenae. (Pelasgians were an ancient people who lived in Macedonia). This possibility is also mentioned in the encyclopedia "Encarta" (title *Crete and Pelasgians*).

The results of this study were announced in several Macedonian printed media sources, such as "*Utrinski Vesnik*", edition of 08.03.02, "*Makedonsko Sonce*" and others. We obtained the article as posted in the "Macedonian Herald" of the "United Macedonians" organization from Toronto, Canada (November-December 2001 issue).

Finally, we will mention the results of the DNA analysis regarding the ethnic origin of today's Macedonians conducted at the Swiss Institute of Genetics "Igenea". According to this information, the average present-day ethnic Macedonian carries most of the blood and genes from the ancient Macedonians, which is an irrefutable proof that today's Macedonians are for the most part descendants of the ancient Macedonians. The results of this research were published for a long time on the institute's official website, but were later removed under pressure from Greek chauvinists (although Macedonian activists have retained copies of the Igenea website from the time that this was published)



Short biography of the author Aleksandar Donski

Aleksandar DONSKI is born in Shtip. He comes from an artistic family. He is the author of about thirty books, dozens of radio and TV documentaries and hundreds of articles in the field of Macedonian history, folklore, religion, travelogue and literature

for which he has received a number of awards and recognitions. A small part of his works related to history can be seen on YouTube on his Aleksandar Donski history channel.

<https://www.youtube.com/@aleksandardonskihistorycha314>

For the publication of this book, the author expresses gratitude to: Trajche T. Trajkoski from Perth, Gordana Dimovska from Melbourne, and Macedon Publishers and Translators – Sydney.