

The interpenetration of civic elites and court elite in Macedonia

Paschalis Paschidis

Some decades ago, the very notion of a civic elite in Macedonia would probably be frowned upon, or would require a lengthy preliminary discussion about Macedonian civic institutions based on insubstantial evidence. New sources, principally epigraphic, and recent research carried out by M. B. Hatzopoulos and others¹ on the subject, however, allows me to give here only a brief – and, inevitably, misleadingly simple – overview of what these institutions were. After a process which begun under Philip II, the Macedonian kingdom seems to have been systematically and probably exhaustively (with the important exception of royal land), subdivided into local civic units, be they *poleis*, sympolities, or ‘regions’ of ethnic origin². By the Antigonid period, when we have sufficient evidence for these civic units, they seem to possess all the institutional apparel of a southern Greek *polis* : an internationally acknowledged identity, annual elected archons, a local priest as eponymous, a council, an assembly, local legislation and courts, distinct finances etc. As constitutive parts of the Macedonian State, however, Macedonian cities had two differences of seminal importance in comparison with their southern counterparts : 1) they had no autonomy in many important matters which were perceived to belong to the jurisdiction of the central government, and 2) their chief magistrates were accountable not only to the civic unit itself but also to the Head of State, the king.

¹ See Hatzopoulos 1996, I 125-209 ; 361-460 ; 464-86, with earlier literature, and Hatzopoulos 2003. I would like to acknowledge here my debt to his work and to our long ‘Macedonian’ discussions, as well as to the work of another scholar with whom I have had the pleasure to work with for some time now, Argyro Tataki, whose thorough prosopographical and onomastic studies on Macedonia have proved an indispensable tool for my ventures into the moving sand of Macedonian prosopography. [In what follows, all dates are B.C. unless otherwise stated].

² On the systematic character of the subdivision of the Macedonian state into civic units (at least by the third century), see already F. Papazoglou, « Sur l’organisation de la Macédoine sous les Antigonides », *Ancient Macedonia III* (Thessaloniki 1983) 195-210, esp. 205-10.

The last point inevitably brings us to the hotly debated function of the *epistates*. I cannot repeat here Hatzopoulos' long analysis or recent attempts to contest it³. I believe, however, that three key features of the office are hard to refute : 1) *Epistatai* were annual officials⁴ who existed in all Macedonian cities ; 2) they were, as far as we can tell, of local origin⁵ ; 3) although they were the official liaison between city and king, they headed local institutions as well. These features allow us to consider the *epistatai* as civic magistrates, in the sense that they were officially part of the city and a product of local political dynamics, whether they were appointed by the city or the king or both⁶. In any case, the internal logic of Macedonian politics (on which see below) assured that persons who were favourable to the king would eventually be chosen, even if there was no formal intervention by the court.

The term court elite in Macedonia can only denote groups of persons « around the king »⁷, his chief advisors and/or those who occupy the highest echelons of hierarchy in the government and the army and have a major role in daily administrative work, whether their position is institutionally sanctioned or not. The court elite should not be equated with the sum total of central government officials or with the Macedonian nobility in general⁸. Inevitably, therefore, we need to focus our attention on the king's Companions, the ἑταῖροι of the Temenids and the φίλοι of the Antigonids.

This institution has been exhaustively analysed⁹ and I wish only to draw attention to

³ See Hatzopoulos 1996, I 371-429 with earlier literature ; N. G. L. Hammond, « The roles of the *epistates* in Macedonian contexts », *ABSA* 94 (1999) 369-375 ; F. Papazoglou, « Polis et souveraineté », *ŽAnt* 50 (2000) 169-76, esp. 172-76 ; Errington 2002.

⁴ Errington 2002 dedicates the greater part of his article to an attempt to prove that *epistatai* never figure as eponymous alone in public documents, hence their office cannot be annual ; he does not, however, take into account one of the earliest such functions of the *epistatai*, a dedication from Beroia dating from the 4th century (*EKM* I 29).

⁵ To the evidence adduced by Hatzopoulos 1996, I 381-82 one can now add the cases of Agasikles from Dion (*SEG* 48 [1998] 783 ; cf. *BullEpigr* 2000, 453.2) and, perhaps, Plestis from Gazoros and Alketas from Morrylos, if they are indeed *epistatai*, as I claim towards the end of this paper.

⁶ The traditional view that *epistatai* were appointed by the king rests primarily on the authority of Polybios (see, e.g., 4.76.2 ; 5.26.5 ; 20.5.12 ; 23.10.8 ; cf. Livy 34.48.2), an author, however, who apparently knew little about Macedonian institutions (see below, n. 26). For possible evidence that *epistatai* were, in fact, elected, see again below, towards the end of this paper.

⁷ The idea of proximity (in all senses of the word) to the king is conveyed by terms such as οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν or ἄμφ' αὐτόν (references in Kallérís 1954, 176, n. 3), which are not always used literally. Significantly, the phrase οἱ ἄμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι, which is standard in Arrian, carries distinct Homeric connotations (*Il.* 2.417 ; 8.537 ; 19.5 ; 24.123 ; *Od.* 11.520) ; cf. G. Plaumann, « ἑταῖροι », *RE* VIII 2 (1913) 1374-80, esp. 1375 ; Berve 1926, I 30.

⁸ Livy seems to understand the distinction between court elite and central government officials when he describes the *principes Macedonum* who were deported to Italy in 167 (45.32.3-6) : they did not only include the *regis amici*, the *purpurati* and the army commanders (the court elite *par excellence*), but even commanders of forts and anyone who had been appointed in *aliquis ministeriis regis*, in other words practically all officials of the central government.

⁹ For the ἑταῖροι, see e.g. F. Carrata Thomes, *Il problema degli eteri nella monarchia di Alessandro Magno* (« Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Torino » 7.4 ; Turin 1955) ; G. S. Stagakis, « Observations on the ἑταῖροι of Alexander the Great », *Ancient Macedonia* I (Thessaloniki 1970) 86-102 ; Hammond 1979, 158-60 ; Griffith 1979, 395-404 ; Hatzopoulos 1996, I 334-36 ; Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 291-307. The bibliography on the Hellenistic *philoi* is even richer : for general treatments see Chr. Habicht, « Die herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenistischen Monarchien », *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 45 (1958) 1-16 (still a fundamental article) ; Mooren 1977, 38-50 ; G. Herman, « The 'Friends' of the Early Hellenistic Rulers : Servants or Officials? », *Talanta* 12-13 (1980-81) 103-49 ; G. Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gessellschaft. Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* (« *Hermes Einzelschriften* » 62 ; Stuttgart 1993) 22-32 ; K. Buraselis, « Des Königs *Philoi* und des Kaisers *Amici* » in : K. Buraselis (ed.), *Ενότητα και ενόητες της αρχαιότητας. Ανακοινώσεις από*

three of its main aspects. The first is precisely the fact that it was an institution and not merely an informal collective name. Theopompos knows the number of Philip II's *hetairoi* (ca. 800) in the later part of his reign¹⁰, and we know they wore specific insignia of their status¹¹, and probably married and were buried separately¹². A second important aspect is that they were personally chosen by the king, if we judge from the fact that a significant number of them were not Macedonians, already in the reign of Philip II and throughout the later history of the kingdom¹³. The third aspect, intricately connected with the previous one, is that the Companions drew power, money, land and, most importantly, legitimacy from their personal relationship with the king. Hammond aptly remarked that their very name is indicative: the Companions are neither « elders » nor « councilors »¹⁴; in other words they do not represent a tribal, hereditary nobility, nor do they emanate in a regular, institutionalised way from representative organs of the Macedonian nation. Naturally, many of them had probably already followed a more or less standard *cursus* in the king's service up to the age of 30: the offspring of Macedonian nobility served as Royal Pages¹⁵ and were

ένα Συμπόσιο στους Δελφούς, 5-8.4.1992 (Athens 1994) 19-33; Savalli-Lestrade 1998, especially x-xiv and 251-81; L. Mooren, « Kings and Courtiers. Political Decision-Making in the Hellenistic States », in: W. Schuller (ed.), *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum* (Darmstadt 1998) 123-33; B. Meißner, « Was es für die Griechen hieß, Freund eines Königs zu sein », *AKG* 82 (2000) 1-36. Most studies on specific Hellenistic kingdoms also treat the subject of the *philoï*. For the prosopographical material, see Berve 1926 II for the age of Alexander (and the Successors), now to be consulted along with Heckel 1992 and Tataki 1998; Le Bohec 1985 for Antigonid Macedonia; Billows 1990, appendix 3 for Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios Poliorketes; H. Lund, *Lysimachus. A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship* (London, New York 1992) 178-83, F. Landucci Gattinoni, *Lisimaco di Tracia. Un sovrano nella prospettiva del primo ellenismo* (Milan 1992) 245-59 and C. Franco, *Il regno di Lisimaco. Strutture amministrative e rapporti con le città* (« Studi ellenistici » 6; Pisa 1993) 183-205 for the kingdom of Lysimachos; Savalli-Lestrade 1998 for all kingdoms of Asia (on the Attalids in particular see also R.E. Allen, *The Attalid kingdom. A Constitutional History* [Oxford 1983] 133-35; I. Savalli-Lestrade, « Citoyens et courtisans. Le cas des *philoï* des Attalides », *Chiron* 26 [1996] 149-81); L. Mooren, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt. Introduction and Prosopography* (« Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 37.78 »; Brussels 1975) and Mooren 1977 on the Ptolemaic kingdom.

¹⁰ Theop., *FGrHist* 115 F 225b.

¹¹ For the purple *χλαμύς* of the Companions as a gift of the king, see Ath., *Deipn.* 12.539f-540a; Curt. 5.2.18-19; Diod. 17.77.5; Just. 12.3.8. The purple *καυσία* and *χλαμύς* are termed *δωρεὰ βασιλικωτάτη παρὰ Μακεδόσι* by Plutarch (*Eum.* 8.12). The connection with the Companions is not explicit (although the phrase used immediately before is indicative: *τιμὰς... λαμβάνοντες ἄς οἱ φίλοι παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων*); however, the fact that the plain *kausia* was worn by Royal Pages and army officers (see Chr. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, « Aspects of Ancient Macedonian Costume », *JHS* 113 [1993] 122-47, esp. 137-40) implies that the purple *kausia* was awarded to a higher stratum of Macedonian nobility, immediately below the king, who wore a *kausia* with a diadem (*ibid.*, 138). On the *purpurati* of the Latin sources for the later Antigonid period, see below, n. 22.

¹² Marriage: Plut., *Alex.* 70.3; burial: Plut., *Eum.* 9.5. These privileges are attested for Alexander's *hetairoi* and for army officers respectively, hence for groups wider than the king's Companions; we can safely assume, however, that, originally, these were privileges of the Companions (cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, I 336, n. 6).

¹³ Theop., *FGrHist* 115 F 224; cf. Isoc. 5.19. Griffith 1979, 375, n. 1 counts roughly 30% non-Macedonian *hetairoi* in the reign of Philip and estimates their actual proportion at 20%. Le Bohec 1985, 116-17 (cf. Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 234, n. 65) counts 7 non-Macedonians on a total of 20 Antigonid *philoï*, i.e. 35%; given the great gaps in our knowledge of 3rd century Macedonia, one can safely say that the analogy of foreigners among Friends did not change much in Late Classical and Hellenistic Macedonia.

¹⁴ Hammond 1979, 159.

¹⁵ On the βασιλικοὶ παῖδες, see N. G. L. Hammond, « Royal Pages, Personal Pages, and Boys Trained in the Macedonian Manner during the Period of the Temenid Monarchy », *Historia* 39 (1990) 261-90 (reprinted in N. G. L. Hammond, *Collected Studies II* [Amsterdam 1993] 149-78), with the sources and earlier literature; Heckel 1992, 237-44; Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 294-98.

then included in the king's guard, members of which were chosen according to their physical abilities among the wealthy families of the kingdom, as the new regulation of army service from the reign of Philip V reveals¹⁶. However, the fact that the majority of members of the court elite may have already belonged to the court does not decrease the importance of the king's right to choose between them or to add newcomers to the list. The Companions and Friends of the king – the ruling class of Macedonia, to use Griffith's terms –¹⁷, those who were given the highest military, administrative, diplomatic and advisory duties in the kingdom, were, *in institutional theory*, a free personal choice of the king¹⁸.

Already during the Asian expedition, an inner circle within the Companions is attested. It is formed by the king's Seven Bodyguards (an institution which did not survive the end of the Temenids)¹⁹ and other Companions selected by Alexander as his chief advisors and members of his Council and described as ἀξιολογώτατοι, πρεσβύτατοι or *principes*, i.e. πρώτοι, of the Companions²⁰. This selection, however, was not constrained by any sort of official court titlature. As all researches on the *philoi* of Hellenistic kings show, there was no system of honorific court titles before the very end of the 3rd century²¹. In Macedonia itself we can, at best, trace the beginnings of a formal differentiation within Friends to the last years of Philip V's reign, if we accept Sylvie Le Bohec's analysis of terms such as πρώτος φίλος and τιμώμενος φίλος and take Livy's differentiation between the *purpurati* and the *amici* at face value²². It is clear, however, that even then no attachment of specific titles to specific offices is observable. In fact, the description of two of Philip V's friends as « then considered to be First Friends of the king »²³ seems to show that even this inner hierarchy of Friends was not fixed, and that all the above terms reflect a king's particular bond with the particular Friends at that particular time. In other words, the freedom of the king to choose his Companions extends even to the narrowest circles of the court elite. The Macedonian court appears to be a fluid rather than an elaborate structure, its only constant point of reference – its centre of political gravity – being the king.

From ancient authors to modern scholarship, this institutionally sanctioned freedom of the king is usually considered as automatically depriving any other power structure in Macedonia of its essence²⁴. However, this explanatory model needs to take into account growing evidence that such structures existed in Macedonia and were crystallised in functioning institutions. Their existence suggests that the theoretical freedom of the king was

¹⁶ SEG 49 (1999) 722, L. 18-19 and 855 B, L. 5-8 ; see Hatzopoulos 2001, 56-59, 104-105.

¹⁷ Griffith 1979, 403.

¹⁸ Hatzopoulos 1996, I 330-337 (where one can find the earlier bibliography) believes that membership of the king's Council, which undoubtedly represented the highest stratum of the court elite, was more or less standardised and permanent. In conformity with the *communis opinio* I disagree ; however, the subject of the Macedonian Council(s) is too vast to be treated here and I can only defer discussion to a detailed analysis elsewhere.

¹⁹ On the seven σωματοφύλακες, see Heckel 1992, 257-59 with earlier literature.

²⁰ See, e.g., Arr., *Anab.* 5.28.5 ; Diod. 17.16.1 ; 18.2.4 ; Curt. 6.6.11 ; 6.11.39 ; 9.6.4 ; 10.6.1.

²¹ Mooren 1977, 17 (Ptolemies) ; Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 265-74 (Seleucids).

²² Le Bohec 1985, 118-19. The passage of Livy is 45.32.4, on which see Le Bohec 1985, 96-98. *Purpuratus* does not seem to be a literal translation, since Livy tends to use the term for any courtier of any king (cf. J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy. Books XXXI-XXXIII* [Oxford 1973] 139-40) ; the juxtaposition of *purpurati* and *amici*, however, shows that he probably found two different terms on the relevant Polybian passage.

²³ Polyb. 23.1.5 : ... τοὺς τότε δοκοῦντας εἶναι πρώτους φίλους τοῦ βασιλέως.

²⁴ For a brief overview of modern views on the Macedonian state, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, « L'état macédonien antique : un nouveau visage », CRAI (1997) 7-25, esp. 7-14.

always tested against the political realities of any given situation then, as it remains to be tested against the available evidence today.

If, for example, the prosopographical link between civic elites and the court appears slim, this would allow us to conclude that the court led, so to speak, a life of its own, organised exclusively upon personal relations with the king. It would also allow us to conclude that local civic structures did not carry much weight, that they were created by the Machiavellian wisdom of the kings as arenas of not-so-high status for the not-so-prominent Macedonians. If, on the contrary, we can often identify members of local political elites with members of the court, this would mean that local civic structures (and the question of who would dominate them) did matter, both to local societies and to the kings, and that these civic institutions were not merely in theory a component of the state, but were smoothly and organically embedded in its overall power structure. It would also mean that the king, although in theory without significant institutional restraints to his powers of decision, had in practice to take under consideration the strength of these local structures and their representatives ; that he was forced, if I may stretch the meaning of a well-known phrase of Kallisthenes, to rule οὐδὲ βίᾳ ἀλλὰ νόμῳ²⁵.

Before I proceed to the prosopographical evidence, I need to make a preliminary remark. First of all, since inscriptions and literary sources unfortunately do not include footnotes with cross-references, any identification of ancient individuals attested in both kinds of sources is inherently uncertain. A Nikanor (without a patronymic) attested as a city official in an epigraphic text need not be the court official Nikanor (without patronymic or ethnic) mentioned in a literary source for the same period ; he may well be, but it would be imprudent to assert this in the absence of supporting evidence. Some peculiarities of the sources for Classical and Hellenistic Macedonia make our task even more difficult. The onomastic habits of Macedonian society, with its pronounced aristocratic nature, lead to repeated occurrences of some names within the leading families of the cities and the kingdom, precisely the target group of our investigation, thus making possible identifications less certain. More importantly, our sources are very unevenly concentrated. Prosopographical evidence about Macedonian cities comes almost exclusively from inscriptions, whose number becomes significant only for the reign of the last two Antigonids. Conversely, prosopographical evidence about the Macedonian court comes almost exclusively from literary sources. For the reigns of Philip and Perseus, the only epigraphically rich period, our information comes mainly from Polybios, who has no first-hand knowledge of (nor sympathy for) Macedonian institutions²⁶. These problems taken into account, the attestations of interpenetration

²⁵ Arr., *Anab.* 4.11.6. Cf. L. Mooren, « The nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy », in : E. Van't Dack, P. Van Dessel, W. Van Gucht (eds), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven - 24-26 May 1982* (« *Studia Hellenistica* » 27 ; Leuven 1983), 205-40, esp. 219-24, who acutely points out that the exact meaning of νόμος here (written law, custom or something in between ; in other words, restraints of an institutional, moral, or political nature) is of secondary importance ; what really matters is that at least one trend in Macedonian political mentality recognised that the king was subject to a set of restraints more or less understood – if not agreed upon – by the body politic.

²⁶ It is often asserted (see, e.g., Walbank 1957, 33-34 and *id.*, *Polybios* [Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1972] 75 ; Pédech 1964, 360-64) that Polybios drew information on Macedonia by Macedonian exiles in Rome ; in fact he says so himself in one particular instance (29.8.10). However, even in that instance his resulting judgement on Perseus is clearly hostile, as it is hostile – in fact, malevolent – on practically all aspects of the character, skills

between civic elites and court elite can be safely assumed to be a mere fraction of actual cases. I would even go so far as to suggest that precisely the fact that *some* identifications seem possible and probable is a positive indication of how widespread the phenomenon must have been in reality.

One could postulate two scenarios for the movement of a prominent Macedonian up and down the ladder connecting civic structures and the court. The 'downward' scenario covers cases where someone already attested as an influential member of the court is then attested as being involved in local politics ; the 'upward' scenario covers the opposite cases, where a city official or his descendants are later attested at court.

Let me begin with the 'downward' scenario, where one would legitimately suspect a royal intervention in city politics. There are two ways through which a king could « implant » city leaders, to use the famous phrase Polybios uses to describe the relation of Antigonos Gonatas with Greek cities²⁷. One is outright appointment ; however, if we do not *a priori* accept that *epistatai* were appointed by the kings, I know of no such case in Macedonia proper. Another, more indirect way would be naturalization. We know very little about naturalization in Macedonia, but there are reasons to assume that it was a privilege of the king²⁸. This is confirmed by prosopography : the few certain and probable cases of naturalized Macedonians that we know of concern foreign friends and advisors of the king – the king being Philip II in all cases. The grant of Macedonian citizenship apparently implied citizenship in a Macedonian city as well ; one could not become a Macedonian without becoming a citizen of one of its cities²⁹.

and policies of the last two Antigonids after the estrangement of his hero Aratos from Philip V (cf. Pédech 1964, 223-25). The fact that this hostility is invariably expressed in moral terms allows serious doubts as to whether Polybios drew any information other than court gossip and factual details of diplomatic procedure from his Macedonian informants. Is it an accident that in the surviving sections of his book VI (of which no substantial part is lost ; cf. Walbank 1957, 635), a book full of remarks on the constitution of various states (see esp. 6.43-56), Macedonia does not figure even once? In a work which sets out to explore « by what means and under what system of polity the Romans... have succeeded in subjecting nearly the whole inhabited world... » (1.1.5), the author offers us a detailed comparison between the constitution of Rome and one of its great adversaries, Carthage (6.51-56), but not a word about the constitution of its other great adversary, Macedonia. Even the infamous μεταβολή of Philip V is described in terms of a change in character and not in institutional terms (cf. F. W. Walbank, « Polybios and Macedonia », *Ancient Macedonia I* [Thessaloniki 1970] 290-307, esp. 303-4 and E. Lévy, « La tyrannie et son vocabulaire chez Polybe », *Ktèma* 21 [1996] 43-54, esp. 47-48), as one would expect of an author who believed in the inevitable *institutional* μεταβολή of monarchy into tyranny (6.4.7-8).

²⁷ Polyb. 2.41.10 : πλείστους γὰρ δὴ μονάρχους οὗτος ἐμφυτεύσαι δοκεῖ τοῖς Ἑλλησι. He describes in similar terms Philip V's policy in Thrace (22.13.5 : τοῦ Φιλίππου πάλαι τοὺς ἀυλικοὺς ἐγκαθεικότος εἰς τὰς πόλεις ταύτας καὶ συνήθεις πεποιηκότος τοὺς ἐγχωρίους ταῖς τοῦτων παρεπιδημίαις).

²⁸ The only relevant piece of evidence is the army regulation of Philip V, which stipulates that neither the *epistatai* nor officers of the central army command have a right to enroll someone in a city's πολίτευμα, i.e. in its body of citizens, without a written authorization by the king (*SEG* 49 [1999] 855 A, L. 22-26). The assumption that ultimate authority on naturalization lay with the king is also based on analogy with the award of proxeny, which probably lay within the jurisdiction of the king and, perhaps, the Assembly (Hatzopoulos 1996, I 367-69 and 2003, 136) and the award of *asylia*, for which Macedonian cities were obliged to follow – or felt it safer to mention – the king's wish (see Hatzopoulos 1996, I 365-67 ; II n^{os} 36, 41, 47, 58 and Rigsby 1996, n^{os} 23-27, with the texts and bibliography on the often studied decrees for the *asylia* of the sanctuary of Asklepios at Kos).

²⁹ Oddly, even Hammond 1979, 647-48 acknowledged this, although it is not in accordance with his theory of a specific Macedonian citizenship as a privilege of the political elite – a theory now rightfully abandoned (see Hatzopoulos 1996, I 167-68 and *BullEpigr* 2000, 440 with bibliography). Incidentally, this means that even if all grantees of individual Macedonian citizenship received it from the king, some sort of formal acknowledgement

Some of the grantees may never have left the court and probably followed the vicissitudes of Hellenistic high politics; this seems to be the case of Alexander's admiral Nearchos of Crete³⁰, or of Erigyios and Laomedon of Mytilene³¹, all three citizens of Amphipolis. We should not, however, forget that for these prominent 'new' Macedonians there was always the possibility of 'retiring' in the city and playing a part in local politics; this may have actually happened in the case of Kallimedon, the Athenian pro-macedonian politician who received at least the rights of *enktesis* and *epigamia* in Beroia³², and whose family line we can perhaps follow in Hellenistic Beroia, as Tataki has cautiously suggested³³.

Certainly more frequent than the individual naturalization of non-Macedonians was what we can term collective, and sometimes intra-Macedonian, naturalization. The long series of conquests by Philip II, the extensive colonisation of these New Lands with Macedonians and population transplants carried out mainly by Philip II but also by subsequent kings transformed Macedonia, especially east of the Axios³⁴. Whatever the motives in each particular case, however, these were collective measures, which, at best, ensured loyalty of groups within the city towards the king, usually during the incorporation of a city into the power structure of Macedonia proper; they were not *viritim* appointments of local leaders.

Although the evidence is not unambiguous, it has been assumed that even individual recipients of donations of royal land eventually received the citizenship of the nearest city³⁵; evidently, these already powerful individuals would have a pronounced position in city politics. This sort of naturalization, however, need not constitute a royal intervention in local political structures. If the model of the well-known case of Aristodikides of Assos³⁶ was followed, all three sides benefited equally from the procedure: the grantees by securing possession of the donation; the cities by augmenting civic land and by enrolling an important individual with ties to the court; the king by mutually balancing the power of the

by the city was necessary. Although it is dangerous to draw conclusions from the relation of Macedonian kings with non-Macedonian cities, the process followed may well have been the one often used for the naturalization of Macedonians in Athens, where the king asked for the grant to be bestowed, and the city voted on it, either expressly mentioning the king's wish (Osborne 1981, D 35 [Syll.³ 315; IG II² 387]; the request here is Polyperchon's, not the king's) or simply alluding to it (Osborne 1981, D 45 [IG II² 486]; SEG 36 [1986] 164), or even passing it over in silence (as in the case of the philosopher Zenon [Diog. Laert. 7.10-12, 15]).

³⁰ J. Papastavru, *Amphipolis. Geschichte und Prosopographie* (« Klio Beiheft » 37; Leipzig 1936) 97-137 n° 61; Heckel 1992, 228-33; Tataki 1998, 57 n° 93.

³¹ Heckel 1992, 209-12; Tataki 1998, 51 n° 50 and 55 n° 75.

³² According to a dubious source ([Aischines], *Ep.* 12.8), Hegemon (PAA 480795; LGPN II s.v. Ἡγήμων n° 4) and Kallimedon (PAA 558185; LGPN II s.v. Καλλιμέδων n° 7) received donations at and wives from Pella and Beroia respectively by Philip II. It is not clear whether they simply received the rights of *enktesis* and *epigamia* or the citizenship of the respective cities as well.

³³ Tataki 1999, 1119-20.

³⁴ See e.g. Griffith 1979, 348-82; Hatzopoulos 1996, I 171-209.

³⁵ See Hatzopoulos 1996, II n°s 20 and 22 with M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Une donation du roi Lysimaque* (« Μελετήματα » 5; Athens 1988) 48-49; 53-54 and 1996, I 205 and 435. I must point out that in neither donation is it explicitly attested that either of the recipients had become, are, or will become citizens of Kassandrea or that their lands belong to the civic territory; this is merely deduced by the fact that the inscriptions were erected in Kassandrea and dated by a local priest. In any case, Kassandrea – a new creation with a vast *chora* precisely in the area where the majority of estates donated by the kings to individuals were located – was hardly a typical case.

³⁶ *I.Ilion* 33 (Welles, RC 10-13).

other two sides³⁷. Therefore, even if the procedure existed in Macedonia and was instigated by the kings – both assumptions remain uncertain –, it is hardly necessary to assume that the kings consciously used it as a tool of implantation of civic leaders.

In other cases where the attestation of the individual at court precedes his attestation in civic institutions, we have, again, no reason to suspect a conscious royal initiative for his involvement with local politics. Aphthonetos, for example, a Royal Page of Philip II, may well be Ἀφθόνητος Πυθοδώρου ἐξ Ἀλλάντης, *theorodokos* for the Nemean games in 321-317³⁸; however, the fact that he is first attested at court does not mean that his prominence in Allante was due to his affiliation with the king. As a Royal Page, he was a son of a πρῶτος τῶν Μακεδόνων³⁹, hence undoubtedly belonged to one of the leading families of Allante anyway.

Another interesting – but equally uncertain – case is the *theorodokos* for Epidauros at Pythion soon after 316, Bouplagos⁴⁰, who is probably related to Derdas son of Bouplagos, attested in a late 4th – early 3rd century epitaph from Pythion⁴¹. Since Pythion had been incorporated into Elimeia and colonised by Macedonians⁴², it is not surprising that we find there a name like Derdas, so typical of the old royal house of Elimeia⁴³. The last prominent

³⁷ Cf. K. M. T. Atkinson, « The Seleucids and the Greek Cities of Western Asia Minor », *Antichthon* 2 (1968) 32-57, esp. 35-37, 56-57; J. T. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford 1999) 168. The commonly held view that the transformation of donated royal land into civic land was an obligation rather than a privilege for the grantee (see F. Papazoglou, Laoi et paroikoi. *Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique* [« Centre d'études épigraphiques et numismatiques de la Faculté de philosophie de l'Université de Belgrade, Etudes d'histoire ancienne » 1; Beograd 1997] 34-35, n. 73, with earlier bibliography) is, in my view, contradicted by the very wording of the Aristodikides letters (L. 44-45 : ἔᾶσαι αὐτὸν προσενέγκασθαι πρὸς ἣν ἄμ βούληται πόλιν [cf. also L. 19-21 and 70-72], where the verb ἔᾶσαι clearly refers to the whole procedure, as Wörrle and others point out [for references see Papazoglou, *ibid.*], and not merely to the choice of city, as Papazoglou and others would have it).

³⁸ Ael., *VH* 14.48 and *SEG* 36 (1986) 331 B 22 respectively (on the date of the second document I follow the reasoning of D. Knoepfler, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* [« Eretria » XI, Lausanne 2001] 189-90, readjusting his proposed date [320-316] according to the 'high' chronology of this period, which I consider more likely). S. G. Miller, (« The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games », *Hesperia* 57 [1988] 147-63), the first editor of the Nemea list of *theorodokoi*, thought of this identification but considered it unlikely. Heckel 1992, 289 and Tataki 1998, 44 n° 2 and 276 n° 334 do not even mention the possibility, while Mari 2002, 311 n° 84 considers it « evidentementee arrischiato » to identify the two. This is perhaps overcautiousness : the name is common in the Greek world in general (88 entries in the published volumes of *LGP*N), but I know of only one other certain Macedonian example (*SEG* 24 [1969] 576) of a much later date ; bearers of that name in Perrhaibia (four entries in *LGP*N IIIB ; add now *ArchDelt* 52 [1997] *Chron.* 524 n° 27) need not, of course, be of Macedonian origin.

³⁹ Cf. Ael., *VH* 14.48 ; Arr., *Anab.* 4.13.1 ; Curt. 5.1.42 ; 8.6.2 ; Livy 45.6.7.

⁴⁰ *IG* IV² 1, 94 II (Perlman 2000, 177-79, n° E 1 and 78-79 for the date), L. 39. Ekphantos (L. 40) is the second *theorodokos* from Pythion.

⁴¹ *SEG* 35 (1985) 662 ; Gérard Lucas kindly provided me with information on its date. [---]inos son of Bouplagos, mentioned in a dedication from the same city which dates from the first half of the 3rd century (*ArchEph* [1924] 149 n° 392), could be a descendant. The only bearer of the extremely rare name Bouplagos outside Pythion that I know of is also a Macedonian attested in Thessaly : Bouplagos son of Menneias, attested in Phthiotic Thebes (*IG* IX 2, 174).

⁴² The date of the incorporation of the Perrhaibic Tripolis into Macedonia is contested ; G. Lucas (*Les cités antiques de la haute vallée du Titarèse. Etude de topographie et de géographie historique* [« Collection de la Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen » 27, « Série épigraphique et historique » 4 ; Lyon 1997] 211-19, with the sources, earlier literature and detailed discussion), opts for the reign of Amyntas III.

⁴³ On certain and probable members of the Elimeian royal house bearing this name, see Tataki 1998, 194-95, n°s 5-8. Outside Elimeia, the name is relatively rare in Macedonia (Beroia : *EKM* I 142, 1st cent. BC. – 1st cent. AD ; Olynthos : *SEG* 38 [1988] 641, soon after 348 ; Amphipolis : *SEG* 41 [1991] 564, probably during the reign of Alexander) ; another Macedonian bearing that name (*TAM* V 2, 1190) is of unknown origin.

person bearing this illustrious name is a Derdas in the army of Alexander, friend of the king and diplomat⁴⁴. He may be no other than Derdas of Pythion who returned to his homeland and died there soon after the expedition. Even if we accept this tentative identification, however, it is not necessary to assume that the family owes its status to Alexander's veteran and his return home; if the family had any relation to the old Elimeian royal house⁴⁵, the position of Derdas at court was the result and not the cause of the family's prestige.

A subcategory of the 'downward' scenario involves cases during the conquest of a city or region by the king. When a city official before the conquest remains in place in its immediate aftermath, we can safely assume that he does so with the king's consent, and that the reason for this consent is probably his collaboration during the take-over. For example, Sparges was the *epistates* of Amphipolis before and after the city's conquest by Philip II⁴⁶, and Timandros, *theorodokos* of Epidauros at Datos in the beginning of Philip II's reign, became a prominent citizen of Philippi after Philip's conquests in the area⁴⁷. Although interference of the king in city politics is certain in the case of Sparges and possible in the case of Timandros, we have no reason to suspect that either of them played any part at court. They were simply members of local elites whose status was temporarily confirmed by the conqueror.

In the 'upward' scenario, we should again begin with the subcategory of 'promotion after conquest'. As is well known, this was the method employed by Philip after the annexation of Upper Macedonia. Members of upper Macedonian royal houses were attached to the court, married into the royal family and occupied high offices in Alexander's army⁴⁸. Unfortunately, we have no evidence as to their quite possible involvement in the political life of their homelands⁴⁹; this is understandable, given that we have almost no evidence on local institutions in Upper Macedonia before the Roman conquest⁵⁰.

The archetypical example of the 'upward' movement from city to court is the well-known family of Harpaloi from Beroia. Harpalos (I, perhaps son of a Polemaios), was *epistates* of Beroia in 248⁵¹; his son Polemaios (II) is named first in the catalogue of Beroian officers in

⁴⁴ Curt. 7.6.12; 8.1.7.

⁴⁵ Berve 1926, II 131 n° 250 had already suggested that the diplomat Derdas belonged to the Elimeian royal family and his assumption is tacitly accepted by Tataki 1998, 195 n° 9, who lists him under Elimeia.

⁴⁶ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n°s 84-88; cf. I 391 and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis* (« Μελετήματα » 14; Athens 1991) 24-28, 74-77.

⁴⁷ Timandros of Datos: *IG IV² 1*, 94 I b (Perlman 2000, 177-79, n° E 1), L. 32; Timandros of Philippi: *Syll.³ 267A*. On the identification, see Griffith 1979, 359; Hatzopoulos 1996, I 188, n. 1; Perlman 2000, 279, n° 291; Pilhofer 2000, 766 and 812; Mari 2002, 297 and 315. Tataki 1998, 99, Datos n° 1 and 167 n° 33 prefers to identify Timandros of Philippi with Timandros of Pella, a military commander in Alexander's army (Arr., *Anab.* 1.22.4).

⁴⁸ J. R. Ellis, « The Unification of Macedonia » in: M. B. Hatzopoulos, L. D. Loukopoulou (eds), *Philip of Macedon* (Athens 1980) 36-46, is still a clear and insightful narrative of this process; for the prosopographical evidence and further literature, see the references in Tataki 1998, 193-214.

⁴⁹ In Alexander's army, infantry contingents from Upper Macedonian districts were sometimes commanded by officers originating from these districts (for the evidence and bibliography, see Tataki 1998, 213 n° 6 [Polyperchon from Tymphaia]; 196 n° 13 [Koinos from Elimeia]; 206-7 n° 12 and 204 n° 2 [Perdikkas and Alketas from Orestis]). This certainly testifies to the respect they were expected to command from their countrymen, but it would be rash to generalise since this was not a firm rule even in Alexander's army (cf. Berve 1926, 114-15; Griffith 1979, 427).

⁵⁰ Only one public document emanating from a civic entity of pre-Roman Upper Macedonia has survived, in a lamentable state of preservation (Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 63, from early Hellenistic Tymphaia).

⁵¹ *EKM I 3*.

223⁵²; his grandson Harpalos (II) son of Polemaios (II) was *hieromnemon* of Perseus at Delphi in 178⁵³ and ambassador of the king to Rome in 172⁵⁴. We can follow the family line even after the Roman conquest, when Harpalos (III, perhaps son of a Polemaios III) is honoured by the city, towards the end of the 2nd century⁵⁵. In the decree in his honour, family pride is evident in the cautious but very conscious reference to the honourand's ancestors, their sense of civic duty and their high position in the army, in other words their belonging to the elite of the city and to the elite of the kingdom⁵⁶.

The reason I termed the example of the Harpaloi archetypical is because Polemaios (II) embodies the crucial link in the progression from civic elite to the court: the army. One cannot overemphasize the importance of war and army duty in all levels of political life in Macedonia. The army reforms of Philip II and Alexander III⁵⁷ multiplied the number of Macedonians who gained money and status from their participation in war, strengthened both the civic and the national identities and thus created the fertile ground from which the possibility for political action grew, for a segment of Macedonian society significantly larger than the few hundred nobles of the archaic past⁵⁸. The king fought and lived among his countrymen during the almost incessant campaigns which he led and this presented singular opportunities for the most able of the Macedonians. If the king at war was in a position to admire the skills of an enemy officer like Philopoimen, to the point of asking him to join him⁵⁹, one can expect that promotion κατ' ἀρετήν⁶⁰ was not uncommon in the

⁵² EKM I 4, L. 11. Polemaios was probably one of the nine Beroian *tetrarchai*, the higher officers designated on a local level, since his name is the first in the catalogue of officers of the first *speira* (on the nature of the catalogue, see Hatzopoulos 1996, I 453-57).

⁵³ *Syll.*³ 636.

⁵⁴ Livy 42.13; Diod. 29.34.1; App., *Mac.* 11.3.

⁵⁵ EKM I 2. We can perhaps follow the family line even later: Harpalos son of Harpalos from Beroia, responsible for the erection of a monument in 44 B.C. (EKM I 60, L. 3) could belong to the same family, proud of the names of its past illustrious members. On the contrary, I see no reason to accept the tentative suggestion by Hatzopoulos (1996, I 417) that Limnaios, son of Harpalos (no ethnic), the grantee of a donation by Lysimachos in Chalkidike (Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 22) was the uncle of Harpalos (I): Limnaios and Harpalos are fairly common names all over Macedonia.

⁵⁶ EKM I 2, L. 5-7: ... ἀνανεωσάμενος τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν | προγόνων δόξαν, εἰ καὶ ἡ [τ]ύχη διὰ τοὺς | καιροὺς αὐτῶν ἦττων ἦν...; L. 12-15: ... ἐννοηθεῖς δὲ τὰς τῶν πάππων | στρατηγίας καὶ δαπάνας ὅσα τε τῆς πόλεως | ἐκείνοι καὶ πρὸς κόσμον καὶ πρὸς φυλακὴν | ἀνέστησαν... I see no reason why the reference to the στρατηγίαί of Harpalos' ancestors (L. 13) should imply that Harpalos (II) was *strategos* of Bottia (i.e. the head officer of one of the four Macedonian districts), as Hatzopoulos 1996, I 258 suggests. I think the reference is to army offices in general, a reminder – inevitably discreet given the realities of Roman dominance – that the family did not only serve the city but also the national army and, therefore, the king. For a different approach, focusing exclusively on civic pride, cf. I. Savalli-Lestrade, « Remarques sur les élites dans les poleis hellénistiques », in: M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, L. Lamoine (eds), *Les élites et leur facettes. Les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain* (« Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome » 309, « collection ERGA » 3; Rome, Clermont-Ferrand 2003) 51-64, esp. 63-64.

⁵⁷ Griffith 1979, 405-49 is still indispensable; on the political impact of these reforms, see also Hatzopoulos 1996, I 267-71. A. Noguera, « L'armée macédonienne avant Philippe II », *Ancient Macedonia VII* (in print; cf. his paper in this volume), would date some of these reforms before Philip.

⁵⁸ R. A. Billows, *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism* (« Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition » 22; Leiden, New York, Cologne 1995) 17 argues, with justified exaggeration, that « the Macedonian state and nation was in large degree the creation of the Macedonian army invented and trained by Philip, with all the consequences which flow from such an origin ».

⁵⁹ Polyb. 2.68.2; Plut., *Phil.* 6.13-7.2; Paus. 8.49.6-7; *Suda*, s.v. Φιλοποίμην.

⁶⁰ Arr., *Anab.* 3.16.11; cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, I 444-50.

Macedonian army, whether ἀρετή meant military valour and commanding skills or merely a talent in public relations. In this respect, the fact that army officers below the degree of *σπειράρχης* were probably appointed on a city level⁶¹, could become a crucial factor in local politics, in the sense that such an appointment could promote the careers of ambitious individuals.

The Harpaloi were not the only family from Beroia represented both in local institutions and – later – at the court of Philip V and Perseus. Pantau[chos] (I) son of [Balak]ros (I) was the eponymous priest of Beroia some year during the second half of the 3rd century⁶²; his grandson Pantauchos (II) son of Balakros (II) was one of the *πρῶτοι φίλοι* of Perseus and one of the most influential figures in the last years of the kingdom⁶³; Balakros (III), son of Pantauchos (II), was sent to Genthios of Illyria as a hostage in 168⁶⁴. Antanor son of Neoptolemos, one of the Delphic *theorodokoi* at Beroia in the 210's⁶⁵ could be identified or (more probably) related to Antenor, envoy of Perseus⁶⁶. This Antenor collaborated in 168 with a certain Kallippos⁶⁷, who may well be Kallippos son of Hippostratos, politarch of Beroia in the reign of Perseus⁶⁸; the father and uncle of the politarch are included in the catalogue of Beroian officers of Antigonos Doson⁶⁹. Meidon son of Me[idon], a Beroian officer in 223⁷⁰, is probably the father of Midon (as his name is attested in the literary sources), another First Friend of Perseus⁷¹. These cases, to which one could add some less probable ones⁷², attest to the surprisingly high representation of Beroians in the Late Antigonid court. This has been attributed, probably correctly, to the possible family connection of the Antigonids with

⁶¹ See Hatzopoulos 1996, I 453-60.

⁶² EKM I 16. Tataki (1988, n° 1011 and p. 423; 1998, 395 n° 6; 1999, 1116-17) tentatively identifies Pantauchos (I) as a grandson of the general of Demetrios Poliorketes who bore the same name (Plut., *Demetr.* 41 and *Pyrrh.* 7). This is certainly possible, but the name figures among the Hellenistic elites of other cities of the kingdom as well (Aloros: Arr., *Ind.* 18.6; Thessalonike: *IG X 2*, 1, 2), thus decreasing the credibility of the identification.

⁶³ Polyb. 27.8.5-6, 11; 29.3.3-5, 4.1; Livy 42.39.7; 44.23.2-4, 27.9-11, 30.14, 35.2, 45.2 and 7.

⁶⁴ Polyb. 29.4.6.

⁶⁵ Plassart 1921, 17, col. III, L. 56; on the date, see Hatzopoulos, *BullEpigr* 1994, 432, with earlier literature, and J. Oulhen, « Chronologie des décrets de la cité de Delphes: l'exemple du groupe K », *Τόποι* 8 (1998) 215-30, esp. 224.

⁶⁶ Polyb. 27.4.3-4 and 10, 14.1; Livy 44.28.1, 8 and 15, 29.3; 45.10.1, 31.14; cf. Tataki 1988, 70-71 and 422; 1998, 75 n° 10. Another Antenor (son of Sosimenes) of Beroia is attested in the catalogue of officers for 223 (EKM I 4, L. 12-13).

⁶⁷ Livy 44.28.1: *Callippus*.

⁶⁸ EKM I 1, L. 5. On the possibility of identification, see Hatzopoulos 1996, I 138. The fact that the envoy of Perseus is a *praefectus classis* poses no problem, since it does not imply that Beroia had to procure a naval contingent; whatever the original Greek term was, a *praefectus classis* was obviously a high officer, personally chosen by the king irrespectively of the regional origin of the contingent. The common name Kallippos is rather rare in Macedonia (*SEG* 24 [1969] 583 [Amphipolis, probably shortly before the Macedonian conquest]; *IG X 2*, 2, 324 [Derriopos, 50/1 A.D.]).

⁶⁹ EKM I 4, L. 11-12. Hippostratos and Timokles, sons of Kallippos, recorded second and third in the catalogue of officers of the first *speira*, were probably *tetrarchai* alongside Polemaios son of Harpalos (cf. above, n. 52).

⁷⁰ EKM I 4, L. 24.

⁷¹ Polyb. 27.8.5; 29.15.2; Plut., *Aem.* 16.2; Livy 42.58.7; 44.32.9, 45.2 and 7 (cf. Tataki 1998, 80 n° 37).

⁷² It would be tempting, for example, to link Glaukias (no ethnic), bodyguard and envoy of Perseus (Polyb. 28.8.9; Livy 43.20.3) along with Adaios from Beroia (Polyb. 28.8; Livy 43.19.13, cf. 43.20.2-4), to another important Beroian family, counting among its members three sons of a Glaukias, all of them eponymous priests of the third quarter of the 3rd century (EKM I 16; 45; 46), and Glaukias son of Eubiotos, officer in the catalogue of 223 (EKM I 4, L. 25); the name Glaukias, however, is very common in Macedonia.

Beroia⁷³. However, the reason we can identify most of these Beroian Friends of Philip V and Perseus with local officials is precisely that Beroia is the only city of the kingdom from which we have sufficient Hellenistic epigraphic material to compare against the literary sources.

To understand this *a contrario* one can compare the cases of the two other major cities of Late Antigonid Macedonia, Pella and Thessalonike. There are only three inscriptions mentioning city officials or *theorodokoi* from Hellenistic Pella. The Delphic *theorodokoi* of the 210's (Apollonides, Diphilos and Chares)⁷⁴ should be termed as 'otherwise unattested', although the names Apollonides and Diphilos are attested among leading Macedonians of the late fourth century⁷⁵. Despite his very common name, it is certainly not inconceivable that the eponymous priest of Pella in the *asylia* decree for Kos in 242, Asklepiodoros⁷⁶, is a descendant of the homonymous Pellaian trierarch of the Indian fleet⁷⁷. It is equally tempting to identify the *epistates* of the city and addressee of a recently published letter of Philip V, whose name begins with Πολεμ[---]⁷⁸, to Polemokrates (no ethnic), a Friend of Perseus⁷⁹. Again, I must stress that none of these identifications is secure, especially since names like Apollonides and Asklepiodoros are so common. They are possible but imprudent to make in the absence of supporting evidence, and I would hardly mention them had our epigraphic material been richer; but it is not. Depending on whether one sees the glass half-full or half-empty, one can either say that the Pellaian civic elite has *no* certain connection to the court – perhaps a surprising assertion for the city which was the normal seat of the court – or that *all* attested members of the civic elite of Pella *could* be connected, personally or through family links, to individuals of significant 'national' status.

In Thessalonike, Hellenistic epigraphic evidence is minimal, compared to the rich Roman material. It is therefore not surprising that there is no certain identification between epigraphically attested magistrates and members of the court attested in literary sources⁸⁰. The only certain case from Thessalonike is also the only case where an ancient author takes the trouble to inform us about the prominence of a courtier at his homeland. Herodikos, *princeps Thessalonicensium* according to Livy, was murdered by Philip V before 182⁸¹. Whether he participated in the court conspiracy of 183, as Walbank assumed, or was murdered

⁷³ See C. F. Edson, « The Antigonids, Heracles and Beroia », *HSCP* 45 (1934) 213-46; Tatakis 1988, 45, 420, 433; *contra* Billows 1990, 18, n. 8.

⁷⁴ Plassart 1921, 17, col. III, L. 61 (on the date, see the bibliography above, n. 65).

⁷⁵ Tatakis 1998, 257 n^{os} 239-40 and 312 n^o 82 respectively.

⁷⁶ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n^o 58 (Rigsby 1996, n^o 23).

⁷⁷ Arr., *Ind.* 18.3; for other possible sources, see Tatakis 1998, 152 n^o 26.

⁷⁸ SEG 48 (1998) 818.

⁷⁹ Polyb. 29.8.7; on the possibility of identification, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, « Epigraphie et philologie : récentes découvertes épigraphiques et gloses macédoniennes d'Hésychius », *CRAI* (1998) 1189-1218, esp. 1190; in *BullEpigr* 1999, 345 he had suggested that the name of the *epistates* was Polemon and that he was a descendant of Polemon of Pella, officer in the Asian expedition (Arr., *Anab.* 3.5.3).

⁸⁰ There is one probable case: Antimachos, politarch of Thessalonike not long before 168 (Hatzopoulos 1996, II n^o 72) could perhaps be identified either to Antimachos, commander of Demetrias in 169, or, more probably, to Antimachos, cavalry commander in Perseus' army in 171 (both without ethnic; references in Tatakis 1998, 248). Oddly, the very common name Antimachos (229 entries in the published volumes of *LGP*) is very rare in Macedonia; I know of only two other certain occurrences (J. M. R. Cormack, « Inscriptions from Pella, Edessa and Beroea », *ArchPF* 22 [1973] 203-4 n^o 1, late 4th century and *EKM* I 134, L. 14, late 2nd century; cf. Tatakis 1998, 473, with three more – but doubtful – occurrences).

⁸¹ Livy 40.4.

earlier, as the text of Livy suggests⁸², it is obvious that Herodikos had to be prominent at court to be considered a threat to the king. This is the only secure attestation of a member of a civic elite who is *simultaneously* influential at court. His case is a useful reminder that the movement from civic elite to the court did not imply a breaking of bonds with the homeland. It is true that the immediate entourage of the king was expected to be often « around the king », but *constant* proximity was hardly a prerequisite⁸³ and, in any case, family links assured that a civic official promoted to the court retained power at home⁸⁴.

My final example concerns someone who did not necessarily manage to attract the attention of the king ; its chief interest lies in the modalities of his attempt. The well-known decree of Gazoros in honour of Plestis⁸⁵, has been often studied principally as a source for civic organisation in Eastern Macedonia, a subject which need not concern us here⁸⁶. Plestis was a citizen of Gazoros, as is obvious from the disclosure formula.⁸⁷ His main benefaction, described in detail in the lost part of the decree and summarily repeated in L. 9-14, was that he took measures to preserve the safety of the *chora* of Gazoros, thus allowing citizens to continue to perform their duties⁸⁸. Veligianni asserted that Plestis was a royal official⁸⁹. Her first argument is that Plestis acted « in a manner worthy of the king and the citizens »⁹⁰ which clearly shows that Plestis was accountable to the king ; her second argument is based on the embassy the city decides to send to the king in order to inform him about the honours awarded to Plestis⁹¹, a fact which, she claims, shows that Plestis was not part of the civic structure of Gazoros ; finally, she claims that the πρόνοια that Plestis displayed (Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀξίως τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν προνοήσατο τῆς χώρας τοῦ διασωθῆ[να]...) ⁹² is a term often used for higher authorities, especially royal officials. I believe none of these arguments prove that Plestis was a royal official ; on the contrary, there are good reasons to suggest that he was a civic magistrate, most probably the *epistates* of Gazoros⁹³.

⁸² For the connection with the conspiracy of 183, see F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (Cambridge 1940) 244-45 ; Livy, however, clearly says that the murder took place *multis ante annis* before 182 (40.4.2).

⁸³ Cf. Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 355-59. Even Le Bohec, who believes that Friends are expected to be in the presence of the king (1985, 96, 99-100), has to admit (120-21) that this was not the case when the Friends were on some mission abroad.

⁸⁴ Another interesting point about Herodikos is that one of his daughters was married to Poris, *longe principis gentis Aenianum* (Livy 40.4.4). This is one of the few attestations of a phenomenon which must also have been fairly common : family links between individuals who were at the same time *principes* of their cities and leading Macedonians. These links must have constituted an important 'horizontal' bond between members of the Macedonian aristocracy, a bond intersecting the 'vertical' connection between court elite and civic elites.

⁸⁵ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 39 (Pilhofer 2000, 532-37 n° 543/G480, with full bibliography, to which add J. R. Harrison, « Benefaction Ideology and Christian Responsibility for Widows » in : S.R. Llewelyn [ed.], *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 8 [Macquarie, Cambridge 1998] 106-16).

⁸⁶ See Veligianni 1983 and 1995 ; Hatzopoulos 1996, I 51-75, with earlier bibliography ; A. Chaniotis *ad SEG* 45 (1995) 763 ; Pilhofer 2000, 532-37 n° 543/G480.

⁸⁷ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 39, L. 22-25 : ...ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ὀρώντες τὴν γεγενημένην εὐεργεσίαν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν πρόνοιαν ἔχωσιν τοῦ διασωθῆναι τοὺς ἰδίους πολίτας.

⁸⁸ On the meaning of λητουργία (L. 12) see Hatzopoulos 1996, I 437-39.

⁸⁹ Veligianni 1983, 109.

⁹⁰ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 39, L. 9-10 : ἀξίως τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν.

⁹¹ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 39, L. 16-19.

⁹² Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 39, L. 9-11.

⁹³ Hatzopoulos 1996, I 74 and 258 believes he was either an *epistates* or the governor of the first *meris*. The Macedonian parallels which we shall examine presently make the first choice much likelier.

First of all, *paraprasis*, the minor benefaction of Plestis described in L. 1-9, clearly points to a civic milieu, as J. and L. Robert and Ph. Gauthier noted⁹⁴. Secondly, the fact that Plestis was accountable to the king is certainly not incompatible with the office of *epistates* or with the civic nature of that office⁹⁵. Thirdly, embassies of Macedonian cities to their king for a variety of reasons are often attested, as Hatzopoulos pointed out⁹⁶; the embassy of Gazoros proves nothing as to the function of Plestis as it does not prove Veligianni's now abandoned theory that the king in question was Ptolemy II. Finally, and most importantly, *pronoia* is not only used in relation with external powers, as even Veligianni concedes⁹⁷. In fact, the second time it appears in our text, it clearly concerns intra-civic *euergesia*: ...ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ὀρῶντες τὴν γεγενημένην εὐεργεσίαν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν πρόνοιαν ἔχωσιν τοῦ | διασώζειν τοὺς ἰδίους πολίτας (L. 22-25). There are two Macedonian inscriptions which present striking analogies with the wording and the context of the Gazoros decree; in both cases *pronoia* describes the concern of the chief civic official for the safety of the city⁹⁸. The anonymous politarch of Anthemous around 40 BC προενοήθη | τῶν τε τῆς πόλεως πραγμάτων καὶ | τῆς τῶν παροικούντων ξένων ἀσφαλίᾳς⁹⁹; Alketas of Morrylos, who ἠρέθη | εἰς μεγίστας ἀ[ρ]χὰς παρὰ τῶν πολ[ε]ιτῶν, performed a number of benefactions, including the financial contribution to (if not also the supervision of) the building of walls in 206/5, χάριν τοῦ προ[ο]θηθῆναι τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας, and was honoured [ἐπὶ τε τῆ προ]νοίᾳ καὶ τῆ | πρὸς τοὺς π[ο]λείτας [εὐ]νοίᾳ¹⁰⁰.

Incidentally, the highest office of the city to which Alketas was *elected* was obviously linked to his benefactions for the safety of the city « in the 17th year »¹⁰¹, as is evident by the city's decision to celebrate the date of his election every year¹⁰² and by the use of ἐπιδεξάμενος¹⁰³, a word typically used in honorific decrees for the voluntary assumption of expenses linked with magistratures and liturgies¹⁰⁴. I fail to see how such a « highest » office, corresponding to the office of the politarch of Anthemous and whose responsibilities included the city's safety, can be any other than the office of *epistates*¹⁰⁵; if this is correct, it would prove that, at least at late-third-century Morrylos, *epistatai* were elected.

⁹⁴ *BullEpigr* 1984, 259 and Ph. Gauthier, « Nouvelles récoltes et grain nouveau : à propos d'une inscription de Gazōros », *BCH* 111 (1987) 413-18, esp. 418, n. 30. Gauthier does not openly contest Veligianni's claim that Plestis was a royal official; he simply points out that the *paraprasis* was certainly not carried out on the king's orders.

⁹⁵ See above, in the beginning of this paper.

⁹⁶ Hatzopoulos 1996, I 54-55.

⁹⁷ To limit myself to an example of *pronoia* displayed by civic officials which is roughly contemporary to the Gazoros decree, see, e.g., *IG* II² 1304 (*Syll.*³ 547), L. 15.

⁹⁸ For more examples of *pronoia* in inscriptions from Macedonia but in different contexts, see *Syll.*³ 700, L. 8-9 (where *pronoia* is displayed by a Roman *quaestor*), *IG* X 2, 1, 4 and *EKM* I 7 AB, L. 70; 106, L. 10 (where *pronoia* is again displayed by civic officials).

⁹⁹ *SEG* 42 (1992) 558, L. 8-11.

¹⁰⁰ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 54.

¹⁰¹ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 54, L. 6.

¹⁰² Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 54, L. 18-22.

¹⁰³ Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 54, L. 6-7 : ἐπιδεξάμε[ν]ος τιςίσαι τὴν πόλιν μόνος.

¹⁰⁴ Among many examples, see e.g. *IG* XII 9, 234, L. 14, 25 and 36; for an example from Macedonia, see *SEG* 35 (1985) 744, where the honouree, ἐπιδεξάμενος αὐθαίρετον ἱερατείαν (L. 9-10), performed a number of sacrifices ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου (L. 17).

¹⁰⁵ The decree refers to the election of Alketas in 206/5, hence before the introduction of the politarchs as chief magistrates of Macedonian cities, which must postdate 183 (cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 16).

But let me get back to Plestis. If Plestis is indeed a civic official, presumably the *epistates* of Gazoros, it is certainly significant that in the city's decision the embassy to the king is mentioned *before* the erection of the stele and the award of a crown to the honourand. This obviously reflects the honourand's priorities. From his point of view, the most important outcome of the whole affair was not that he was honoured at his relatively obscure hometown ; it was the chance he had to inform the king of his abilities as an administrator, of his actions and their local results and of his popularity among his fellow-citizens. The decree was, in a sense, Plestis' *carte de visite* to the court. It clearly portrays the double vision of civic officials, not only accountable « both to the king and to their fellow-citizens », to repeat the decree's wording, but obviously aspiring to political gain in both arenas, the court and the city – in order of significance and not chronology.

The picture of Macedonian politics that seems to come out from such an approach of the – admittedly scanty – evidence is more diversified than the traditional 'autocratic' description of the Macedonian state allows. The kings may have created and continued to supervise the legislative and administrative framework within which civic institutions functioned ; there is, however, no observable tendency on their part to interfere with civic elites on the level of individual appointments of magistrates, at least once the city was fully integrated into the state. Conversely, in practically all cases where a prosopographical connection between court and city elite is possible or probable, the attested movement is from the city to the court and not vice versa. This seems to show that a local office, be it an army command or an administrative position, was a worthy political goal for leading local families not only on its own merit but also as a stepping stone to the field of real power, the court elite. To return to our original question, this, in its turn, inevitably means that local civic structures were not devoid of importance and political essence on a 'national' level.

This semi-autonomy of local political life allowed by the kings was certainly not due to any sort of republican sensibilities on their part. One can suggest two reasons why they apparently did not « implant » city leaders. First of all, they did not need to. As I claimed earlier, admittance to the court elite, with everything that this admittance signified – power, a part in decision-making, status, money, land – was regulated not so much by binding aristocratic or bureaucratic sets of rules as by the personal choices of the king. Thus, the overall political structure became strongly centripetal : elite members on all three levels of the state (the city, the *ethnos*, the court) had a very selfish personal interest to show εὔνοια and προθυμία to the king, to use the words of Polybios¹⁰⁶. A second reason is that the conditional autonomy of local institutions provided the king with a pool of human resource, from which he could choose competent administrators, high officers, advisors and diplomatic envoys. This was a crucial parameter : without these men, experienced in war and politics, any Greek state, traditionally averse to large bureaucracies, would be paralysed. The ἰσηγορία and παρησία of Macedonians towards their kings, attested even by hostile authors who elsewhere deplore the tyrannical character of Macedonian kingship¹⁰⁷, should perhaps be understood not only as obsolete remnants of the archaic self-image of Macedonian nobles as free men of essentially equal rights with the king, but also as the more 'modern' outcome of the self-esteem

¹⁰⁶ Polyb. 7.11.6.

¹⁰⁷ Contrast for example Polyb. 5.27.6 with 36.17.13.

developed by citizens who were not foreign to decision-making, in war, in administration and in politics.

The system apparently worked : in the Antigonid period, precisely the period from which we have evidence about civic institutions, we hear of no significant local rebellions, so frequent in the 5th and early 4th centuries. This hardly means that civic elites always blindly complied with the king's wishes. Any institution, whatever the motives and origins of its creation, soon takes up a life of its own. It is no accident that the kingdom really collapsed not so much as a direct outcome of the Roman victory at Pydna, but when some members of the court elite, followed by the civic elites of Beroia, Thessalonike, Pella and then the rest of the Macedonian cities surrendered to the Romans¹⁰⁸. A Hellenistic king, like Demetrios Poliorketes after Ipsos, could well be a king without a kingdom and still maintain some vestiges of power ; a Macedonian king, as the same Demetrios Poliorketes bitterly discovered, was powerless without the Macedonians.

Abbreviations

- Berve 1926 = H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (2 vols., Munich 1926).
- Billows 1990 = R. A. Billows, *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (« Hellenistic Culture and Society » 4 ; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1990).
- EKM I = L. Gounaropoulou, M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Ἐπιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας, μεταξύ τοῦ Βερμίου ὄρους καὶ τοῦ Ἀξιοῦ ποταμοῦ. Τεύχος Α΄ : Ἐπιγραφές Βεροίας* (Athens 1998).
- Errington 2002 = R. M. Errington, « König und Stadt im hellenistischen Makedonien : die Rolle des Epistates », *Chiron* 32 (2002) 51-63.
- Griffith 1979 = G. T. Griffith, in : N. G. L. Hammond, G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II. 550-336 B.C.* (Oxford 1979).
- Hammond 1979 = N. G. L. Hammond, in : N. G. L. Hammond, G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II. 550-336 B.C.* (Oxford 1979).
- Hatzopoulos 1996 = M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings. I. A Historical and Epigraphic Study. II. Epigraphic Appendix* (« Μελετήματα » 22 ; Athens 1996).
- Hatzopoulos 2001 = M. B. Hatzopoulos, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux* (« Μελετήματα » 30 ; Athens 2001).
- Hatzopoulos 2003 = M. B. Hatzopoulos, « Cités en Macédoine » in : M. Reddé et al. (eds), *La naissance de la ville dans l'Antiquité* (Paris 2003) 127-40.
- Heckel 1992 = W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London, New York 1992).
- Kalléris 1954, 1976 = J. N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macédoniens. Etude linguistique et historique* (« Collection de l'Institut Français d'Athènes » 81 ; Athens 1954 [vol. I] and 1976 [vol. II]).
- Le Bohec 1985 = S. Le Bohec, « Les philoi des rois antigonides », *REG* 98 (1985) 93-124.
- Mari 2002 = M. Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo. Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo Ellenismo* (« Μελετήματα » 34 ; Athens 2002).
- Mooren 1977 = L. Mooren, *La hiérarchie de cour ptolémaïque. Contribution à l'étude des institutions et des classes dirigeantes à l'époque hellénistique* (« Studia Hellenistica » 23 ; Louvain 1977).
- Osborne 1981-1983 = M. J. Osborne, *Naturalization in Athens* (« Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren » 43.98, [Brussels 1981 (vol. 1)], 44.101 [Brussels 1982 (vol. 2)], 45.109 [Brussels 1983 (vols. 3-4)]).
- Pédech 1964 = P. Pédech, *La méthode historique de Polybe* (Paris 1964).

¹⁰⁸ Livy 44.45.2-5 ; cf. 45.1.9.

- Perlman 2000 = P. J. Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese* (« Hypomnemata » 121 ; Göttingen 2000).
- Pilhofer 2000 = P. Pilhofer, *Philippi II. Katalog der Inschriften von Philippi* (« Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament » 119 ; Tübingen 2000).
- Plassart 1921 = A. Plassart, « Inscriptions de Delphes. La liste des théorodokes », *BCH* 45 (1921) 1-85.
- Rigsby 1996 = K. J. Rigsby, *Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (« Hellenistic Culture and Society » 22 ; Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1996).
- Savalli-Lestrade 1998 = I. Savalli-Lestrade, *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique* (« Hautes études du monde gréco-romain » 25 ; Geneva 1998).
- Tataki 1988 = A. B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea : Prosopography and Society* (« Μελετήματα » 8 ; Athens 1988).
- Tataki 1998 = A. B. Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad. A Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia* (« Μελετήματα » 26 ; Athens 1998).
- Tataki 1999 = A. B. Tataki, « New Elements for the Society of Beroea », in: *Ancient Macedonia VI* (Thessaloniki 1999) 1115-25.
- Veligianni 1983 = C. Veligianni, « Ein hellenistisches Ehrendekret aus Gazoros (Ostmakedonien) », *ZPE* 51 (1983) 105-14.
- Veligianni 1995 = C. Veligianni, « Gazoros und sein Umland. Polis und Komai », *Klio* 77 (1995) 139-48.
- Walbank 1957, 1967, 1979 = F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vols. I-III (Oxford 1957, 1967, 1979).

ABSTRACT – ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

L'interpénétration des élites civiques et des élites de cour en Macédoine

L'étude prosopographique des magistrats des cités macédoniennes par rapport aux fonctionnaires de la cour permet quelques constatations sur la vie politique locale en Macédoine. Malgré le nombre apparemment (et trompeusement ?) limité des notables Macédoniens qui appartiennent aux deux groupes simultanément ou successivement, le mouvement semble presque toujours avoir lieu de la cité à la cour et non vice versa. Ainsi, des magistrats civiques ou leur descendants sont souvent « promus » à la cour ; par contre, la désignation par le roi d'un courtisan comme magistrat civique n'est pas attestée. Cette constatation nous permet de conclure qu'un ministère civique était un but méritoire pour les familles locales tant en soi que comme tremplin pour le champ du pouvoir politique par excellence, la cour royale ; par conséquent, les institutions civiques en Macédoine n'étaient pas dépourvues d'importance politique, quelle que fût l'autonomie de la cité vis-à-vis du roi.

Ἀλληλοδιείσδυση τῶν ἡγεσιῶν τῶν πόλεων καὶ τῆς αὐλῆς στὴ Μακεδονία

Ἡ παράλληλη προσωπογραφικὴ μελέτη τῶν ἀξιωματούχων τῶν μακεδονικῶν πόλεων καὶ ἐκείνων τῆς μακεδονικῆς αὐλῆς ἐπιτρέπει ὀρισμένες ἐπισημάνσεις σχετικὰ μὲ τὴν τοπικὴ πολιτικὴ στὴν Μακεδονία. Μολονότι ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἐπιφανῶν Μακεδόνων ποὺ ἀνήκουν, ταυτόχρονα ἢ διαδοχικά, καὶ στὶς δύο ὁμάδες εἶναι –ἢ, μᾶλλον, φαίνεται νὰ εἶναι– μικρός, διαπιστώνουμε πὼς στὴν συντριπτικὴ πλειονότητα τῶν περιπτώσεων ἡ κίνηση εἶναι ἀπὸ τὴν πόλη πρὸς τὴν αὐλὴ καὶ ὄχι ἀντίστροφα: ἀξιωματοῦχοι τῶν πόλεων (ἢ οἱ ἀπόγονοί τους) «προάγονται» συχνὰ στὴν αὐλὴ, ἐνῶ, ἀντίθετα, ὁ διορισμὸς ἀπὸ τὸν βασιλέα ἐπιφανῶν αὐλικῶν ὡς ἀξιωματούχων τῶν πόλεων δὲν μαρτυρεῖται. Ἡ διαπίστωση αὕτη ἐπιτρέπει νὰ συμπεράνουμε πὼς ἡ κατάληψη ἐνὸς τοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος θεωρεῖτο ἀξιόλογος πολιτικὸς στόχος γιὰ τὶς ἰσχυρὲς οἰκογένειες τῶν πόλεων, ὄχι μόνον ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἐφαλτήριο γιὰ τὸ πεδίο τῆς πραγματικῆς πολιτικῆς ἰσχύος, τὴν αὐλὴ, καὶ πὼς, κατὰ συνέπεια, οἱ θεσμοὶ τῶν μακεδονικῶν πόλεων δὲν στεροῦνταν πολιτικῆς σημασίας, ἀσχέτως τοῦ βαθμοῦ αὐτονομίας τους ἀπὸ τὴν βασιλικὴ ἰσχύ.