R. Malcolm ERRINGTON

RECENT RESEARCH ON ANCIENT MACEDONIA

The researches based exclusively on the literary tradition could not describe satisfactorily the political, social, economic and administrative structures of the Macedonian state. New epigraphic evidence discovered on the territory of the Macedonian kingdom in the last decades, linked with the literary information, outlined a more concrete and a more detailed image on the organisation of ancient Macedonia. Remarkable progress has been made in examining the role of the urban centres in the history of he kingdom and also in defining the relations between monarchy and the communities structured after the poliadic model, founded either by the Macedonian kings or conquered and annexed to the kingdom. The inscriptions certify the granting of individual estates within the cities of Kasandreia and Kalindonia by the Macedonian kings, as well as the guarantee of some fiscal immunities. The most interesting case is that of the city of Amphipolis, where epigraphic documents certify the existence of a royal governor, *epistates*, probably in charge after the city was conquered by Philipp II. Besides the king's representative, structures typical to a Hellenistic *polis* are certified at Amphipolis. Urban autonomy was probably allowed in certain limits, depending on the Crown's interests and, according to some historians, every Macedonian city was supervised by an *epistates*. In the light of these new data, the relations between the Seleucid or Attalid kingdoms and the Asian cities have a precedent in Philipp II and Alexander's policy and it represents, in fact, the implementation of a pre-existent model. The epigraphic sources discovered in the last years have also contributed to clarifying some very useful details on the military organisation of Hellenistic Macedonia. Three inscriptions discovered at Amphipolis, Chalkis and Kynos contain settlements on the officers' responsibilities regarding troops, soldiers' pay and equipping the army. A regulation for recruiting soldiers was discovered in two identical copies at Amphipolis and Kassandreia. Approximately, the document was dated at the end of the 3rd century BC, but probably it describes conditions already in use. The economic status and the age conditioned the participation of the individual in various regiments of the Macedonian army, as the two epigraphic sources demonstrate.

In the last fifty years the history of ancient Macedonia has turned into one of the central areas of study in Greek History. There are various reasons for this: one of them has certainly to do with the increasing attention of historians generally towards states other than Athens, which dominates the literary tradition and has so long been almost synonymous with Greek History; another is the fact that much greater historical attention has been turned to the period generally known as "hellenistic", that is the post-

Alexander period of the Third and Second Centuries B.C., which is no longer dominated by the classical Athens-centred literary tradition, and with an attempt to reassess this so-called post-classical period as a time in which developments occurred which may not have been as innovative and spectacular and have caught the imagination of the western world as much as the city-state developments of the classical period, but which had a much longer life and in due course formed the basis for the erection of the Roman Empire in the East. These developments are intimately associated with the activities of the Macedonian dynasties which ruled the Greek world for centuries after Alexander's death and which created a symbiosis between the locally independent democratically structured city-states and over-arching territorial monarchies. This increased interest in non-Athenian and non-classical areas of Greek History has led to increased research not just in the study and the lecture room but also on the ground, and this has produced spectacular archaeological finds, such as the Royal Tombs of Verghina and the cemetery of Sindos, but also epigraphic finds from the classical and hellenistic periods have increased through systematic search and registration of finds in the area by Greek archaeologists and epigraphists to such an extent that it is now posssible to regard Macedonian History as an absolutely central, and no longer—according to the Athens-centred "classical" perspective – marginal, area of ancient studies.

The new historical approach to Macedonian studies and especially the new epigraphic finds have allowed a much more detailed and systematic study of the Macedonian State than was possible fifty, indeed, even thirty, years ago. It has proved possible to move research interest away from the study of the activities of exceptionally prominent individual kings, such as Philip II and Alexander the Great, or earlier Perdikkas II (who features in Thucydides) and later Philip V (who is Polybios's bête noir), individuals therefore who for one reason or another dominate the literary tradition, towards systematic study of the Macedonian monarchic state as a long-term governmental system. The new evidence has shown that the classic problems of the hellenistic and Roman periods, the long-term relationship between previously locally independent (or at least self-governing) city-states and the (conquering) territorial power was also a classic Macedonian problem in the Macedonian homeland; and the recognition of e.g. the Seleucid kings that the Greek-style city-state offered a local governmental structure which was in fact very suitable for organising a large territorial state under ancient conditions—and which led to their founding, or creating such cities out of previously existing communities, where no city-state had previously existed—was not just an activity of the hellenistic kings outside Macedonia

but was used by the kings in the homeland themselves on a scale never previously considered possible.

This research activity has manifested itself in a large number of major and minor articles in scientific journals, but also in major book publications, of which in particular the massive three-volume *"History of Macedonia"* begun by Nicholas Hammond in 1972 and continued in cooperation with Guy Griffith (vol. II, 1979) and Frank Walbank (vol. III, 1988), despite being in the meanwhile in part overtaken by new discoveries, broke new ground and provided a first detailed attempt to address all questions, both political and structural, raised by the known ancient sources on the Macedonian monarchy from the prehistoric period to the end of the monarchy in 167. My own *Geschichte Makedoniens* (1986, engl. 1990) was an attempt to produce in one volume a concise survey of the whole of Macedonian History during the period of monarchic independence (also in part overtaken by new discoveries); Eugene Borza's *In the Shadow of Olympus* (1990) restricts itself to the classical period; but Miltiades Hatzopoulos's large work *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (2 vols. 1996) exploits all the new material, for the collection of which he himself in a large series of preliminary publications was largely responsible, shows that it is now posssible to present a well-founded systematic large-scale discussion of the nature of the Macedonian State, which a generation ago would have been quite imposssible. Hatzopoulos has also generously provided future researchers with an invaluable instrument of research in the collection in the second volume of his book of the texts of all known epigraphic documents relating to the period of the monarchy—a collection which ironically provides other researchers with a comfortable way of disagreeing with some of his own interpretations. But in the meanwhile even this extensive collection is no longer complete, as a result of even more recent spectacular epigraphic finds from Macedonia.

If we look at the areas which have received the greatest attention in the last generation we shall above all have to look at the political and administrative structures. Whereas previous generations, stimulated in particular by the idea, propagated above all by Theodor Mommsen for Rome, that a Greek state like Macedonia must have had some kind of legal constitutional structure (Staatsrecht), whereas as far as could be seen in Macedonia from the written sources the King and his Companions (later called his "friends", *Philoi*) were the only continually visible constitutional factors, efforts were made to invent a constitution for the Macedonians by postulating that the army meeting as a popular assembly had certain

constitutional rights including the right to elect a new king.[1]. This idea was extrapolated from a few incidents in times of particular crisis in which the literary sources attest that the army did indeed have an important say in influencing certain decisions. But since the main evidence came from the highly unusual situation in Babylon at the time of the death of Alexander the Great in 323 and a few other similar situations concerning individual diadochoi, it has proved possible to show that the idea of a regular constitutional assembly of the Macedonian army is a chimaera and that indeed the picture generally drawn by the sources from other periods, that the king and his chosen counsellors (his "Friends") were normally able to govern the centralized functions of the state without further controlling instances from any representatives of the army or the people is basically correct, and in this respect the regimes established by Seleukos in Asia and Ptolemy in Egypt were not fundamentally different in principle from the conditions which they had known at home in Macedonia: reports of riots and other expressions of momentary dissatisfaction are not a good basis on which to build a constitutional theory. It is therefore hardly surprising that the great advance in our knowledge of how the state operated internally has provided no further evidence for any kind of regular activity of an assembly of the Macedonian army or people.[2]

It is, however, particularly in the area of internal administration that new epigraphic evidence has made itself most felt and has made the greatest contribution. Firstly there is the area of new settlement in the new territories acquired by Philip II and Alexander the Great on and over the original frontiers of the Macedonian kingdom towards the East, especially in the Chalkidike. We have long known from a literary source (Justin 8.5.7-6.2) that Philip founded new fortified settlements on the frontiers also in mountainous Upper Macedonia from the forties onwards and transplanted populations in order to give these new cities an adequate population. What their status, their relationship as communities to the central government, was, however, once they were founded, we do not know. Some new evidence from the new territories in Lower Macedonia has however made a contribution to our knowledge in this area. We have known for a long time from an earlier discovered document from the area of later Kassandreia in the Chalkidike

---

[1] See e.g. R.M.Errington, "The Historiographical Origins of Macedonian 'Staatsrecht'", *Archaia Makedonia* III, 89-101. The interpretation was first formulated by P.Granier, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung*, München 1931, but since then has been especially favored by many scholars with a legalistic inclination, and is still not abandoned by Nicholas Hammond and Miltiades Hatzopoulos.

[2] See R.M.Errington, "The Nature of the Macedonian State under the Monarchy", *Chiron* 8, 1978, 77ff.

that pieces of land were granted by the kings to individuals in the newly conquered territories, without these being in any way attached to a city: a document shows that when Kassander founded the city of Kassandreia, on the site of old Potideia, a private man, Perdikkas son of Koinos, petitioned him for confirmation of his private possession of pieces of land given him by Philip and Alexander, and he was also to be tax-free (he was granted *ateleia*) for moveable goods, even when his estates were attached administratively to the new city territory.[3] A new inscription from the same area gives us an indication of how large such estates might have been: Lysimachus, when king of Macedonia, granted one Limnaios several estates: one of 1200 *plethra* (ca. 120 hectares) of land with trees on it, a second estate also with trees of 360 *plethra* (ca. 36 hectares), and a third piece of 900 *plethra* of trees (ca. 90 hectares) and 20 *plethra* (ca. 2 hectares) of vineyard. In his case, the document does not grant him freedom of taxes, but since it was found in the territory of Kassandreia it does show that despite the foundation of the city and its responsibility for the organisation of its territory the king of the moment had no scruple about giving grants of land within its territory, which suggests that Kassander must have retained some of the city territory as royal land when the city was founded in 315, and that Lysimachos was merely exercising his rights on some if it.[4]

A new inscription from Kalindoia, south of lake Bolbe, sheds light on land tenure in Eastern Macedonia. It is a list of priests of Asklepios and Apollo, set up by one of them and beginning "at the time when King Alexander granted Macedonians Kalindoia and the places around Kalindoia, Thamiskia, Kamakaia, Tripoatis."[5] There is no mention here of the new foundation of a city, only the grant of land to a group of Macedonians as individuals, who are not here named as individuals, since this would not have been necessary for the document. We know from a passage of Diodorus Siculus (16.34.5) that a similar distribution of land had happened with the territory of Methone after it was taken by Philip II in the 350s. There is no evidence in this inscription that a new city was being founded by Alexander, but that land was given to a larger group of individual Macedonians on the territory of the former independent city Kalindoia, just as happened at Potidaia, seems clear. There has also been published in recent years a text found in the French excavations at Philippi in 1936. It belongs to the time of Alexander the Great, and although the text is extremely fragmentary, which

---

[3] Dittenberger, *Sylloge*[3] 332 = Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no.20.

[4] M.Hatzopoulos, *Une donation du roi Lysimache. Meletemata* 5,1988, 17f.=*SEG* 38, 1988, 619= Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* 22.

[5] *SEG* 36, 1986 626= Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* 62.

makes it difficult to locate to a precise context, it is clear from it that as late as the early years of Alexander's reign certain questions concerning the status of pieces of the territory of the city remained unresolved and that the city authorities themselves were unable to resolve them without referring the matter in dispute back to the king or his representative, whose decision was final and was then published for all to see in the inscription which we now possess.[6] A third inscription from the southeastern Chalkidike, apparently from the time of Philip II, shows this time the regulation of boundaries in a context which is unfortunately incomplete and in detail unrestorable, but which would fit well enough into the general context of a redefinition and redistribution of territories in the Chalkidike after the fall of Olynthos and in general in Eastern Macedonia under Philip II, which we know from the other documents and from the literary sources took place at the time.[7]

From Eastern Macedonia we have a series of new private documents which shed light on a variety of subjects, not least the way in which the kings handled the older cities.[8] Amphipolis was a special case in point, since it had a long history as an Athenian colony of the Fifth Century, and subsequent precarious independence, and which only became Macedonian after an intensive struggle with the Amphipolitans themselves, a struggle which also involved and offended Athenian interests in the region. Now one of the most remarkable long-term cultural developments in Macedonian history is the gradual socio-political acculturation of the Macedonian monarchic state in the direction of the world of the Greek poleis, and the associated creation of a cultural symbiosis, which was not merely an expression of Macedonian military superiority but included mutual borrowings and adaptations. Particularly impressive in this connection is the way in which city-state (*polis*) life spread in these years throughout the areas conquered by the Macedonians, where Greek-style self-governing cities had up to then not been known; these *poleis* served as administrative centres and infrastructural organisational units for the enormous territories which the new Macedonian states occupied in Asia. The paradox is well-known, though rarely spelled out, since it is more often formulated in terms of ethnicity than of governmental structures: monarchically ruled Macedonians, who for the most part did not themselves live in self-governing poleis, were mainly responsible for a movement which made the self-governing Greek-style *polis* the characteristic form of socio-political life at grass-roots level throughout the Eastern Mediterranean area; these *poleis*, whether founded or just patronised

---

[6] *SEG* 34, 1984, 664=Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no.6.
[7] *SEG* 40, 1990, 542=Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no.4.
[8] On this see my contribution to *Archaia Makedonia* VII (forthcoming).

by the Macedonian kings, provided a fundamental political structure, founded on an integrated social organisation which was also a locally-based loyalty system, which in principle survived *mutatis mutandis* until around the time of the Arab conquest. The symbiotic nature of the relationship between the monarchic-authoritarian superstructure and the city-based participatory urban infrastructure has puzzled generations of systematic historians interested above all in the legal-constitutional basis of the relationship between hellenistic city and territorial monarch. But most such investigations have begun too late, starting with the world established by Alexander and the Diadochi and then taking it as a fixed unit called something like "the hellenistic city", and they have also been mainly looking in the wrong place (particularly in Asia Minor and the Seleucid and Attalid kingdoms) to be able to come to terms with the functional nature of the relationship in its historical dimension. The conquerors and city-constructors in the East were above all Macedonians, and it is becoming increasingly clear that Alexander and his successors who set up the hellenistic city-state system in the newly conquered territories in Asia were not creating something essentially new (except, of course, for the huge dimensions and the gigantic geographical range of the development), but were in fact merely exporting and further developing a system which had already served well at home in Macedonia itself, and in particular had been developed and practiced by Philip II.

If we wish to understand the mentality of the relationship between hellenistic cities and their hellenistic territorial (Macedonian) monarchs—which seems to me in the last resort to be far more important in a fundamentally flexible and dynamic system than the question of the legal or constitutional basis of the relationship—then we have indeed to turn to the Macedonian homeland for an explanation. As a result of the new information it is now possible to look for the roots of the hellenistic system not in Alexanders's treatment of the Greeks of Asia but in Philip's and Alexander's treatment of his own new Macedonian territories. The ideas I shall sketch here, whether right or wrong, could not even have been formulated thirty years ago. That is a clear indication of the advance in studies on Ancient Macedonia in this generation.

I want to approach one single problem in rather more detail and offer a sketch of a possible development pattern. It is easy enough to talk in a general way about the results of expansion and conquest, but such activities always bring with them some pretty basic questions on the ground, which require solution if the territorial expansion or conquest is to last and be more than a mere trivial episode. In this respect the ancient world was no different from the modern. Without the basic willingness of the ruled to be ruled and to

see advantages outweighing disadvantages, no governmental system, however brutal, can survive for very long.

Now the details of the politico-social organisation of the earliest Macedonian expansion into lower Macedonia are for us still not capable of reconstruction in detail. It is only when we come to the time of Philip II that the information basis widens sufficiently to allow even an approach to this problem with some level of confidence. With the capture of Amphipolis we have for the first time the case of the integration of a major independent Greek city into the Macedonian state in historical times; and recent finds seem to show some aspects of how this was managed.

From the period immediately following the conquest of the city a series of private documents is preserved which give us some information about the internal affairs of Amphipolis. They are a series of dated records of land transactions, and their interest for us lies in the formulaic listing of the dating mechanism, for they all mention an *epistates*, mostly together with, but two without the annual Priest of Asklepios; they usually also bear a calendar date, whereby two calendars are discernable, one being the Macedonian, the other can only be that of pre-Macedonian Amphipolis, which is otherwise not known. It seems to me that the earliest group of texts probably all belong precisely to the transitional phase immediately after the fall of Amphipolis to Philip, and it is perhaps no accident that in these years Amphipolitans were particularly careful to register land transactions with a publication on stone: there may well have been a lot of them going on! The most important thing for us is the naming of the official called the *epistates*, who outside of Macedonia is always somebody set into a function by some higher authority, and I see no reason to think this was not the case in Macedonia also. It seems clear that developments took place in the structure of Amphipolis at this time which lasted throughout the hellenistic period, as far as we can tell.

The *epistates* together with the annual eponymous magistrate, the Priest of Asklepios, remain a characteristic part of Amphipolitan city life throughout the period, and both seem new. Particularly important is the case of the *epistates* Spargeus, who is named in six of the documents, five times with four different annual Priests of Asklepios and once alone, without an Asklepios Priest at all.[9] He was therefore in office for at least 4+x years,

---

[9] The texts are conveniently published in M.Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis. Meletemata* 14, Athens 1991 and in Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions: Actes de vente* II (without priest); *Epigraphic Appendix* 84 (=*Actes de vente* III), 85 (*Actes de vente* IV), 86 (*Actes de vente* V), 87 (*Actes de vente* VI), 88 (*Actes de vente* VII).

therefore was not an annual official, which the priest of Asklepios was, at least in its function of representing the eponymous official.

From these observations and assumptions we can, I think, trace the following changes in Amphipolis as a result of the Macedonian conquest:

Phase 1: Sparges remained continuously in office as representative of the king for 4+x years, throughout the whole of the transition period. He was, however, not the first *epistates,* since one Kallipos is also mentioned without a Priest of Asklepios, and must therefore have served before him.

Phase 2: The Priest of Asklepios was chosen to become the eponymous official. This was either a new post or an existing office was heightened in status.

Phase 3: The Macedonian calendar was introduced, presumably with the appropriate annual religious observances which were associated with the calendar, while Sparge(u)s was still in office.[10]

Phase 4: At some time before the mid-Third Century (though the event may well be much earlier than the first accidental piece of evidence) there seems to have been a change in the character of the assembly which passed decrees representing the city: while Amphipolis was free, this body was, not unnaturally for an Athenian colony, the *Demos*,[11] whereas in the Third Century it was the *Polis*.[12] The change must mean something, and since we know that the Macedonians even in Athens after the conquest of Athens after the Lamian War severely restricted the franchise in the democracy, it would hardly be surprising if this had already been practiced in Amphipolis, since like the Athenians in 322 it was the basis-democratically organised Amphipolitans who had resisted the Macedonians under Philip and been conquered by him.

Whether or not this latter change was immediate (it seems at least plausible, but there are other occasions, particularly during the wars of the successors, which could be envisaged), Amphipolis was clearly fully integrated into the Macedonian State, while at the same time it retained a certain level of self-government in local affairs. There is no need to think that the royal *epistates* must always have been a stranger. There was much to be said for employing a local person in such function, as the case of e.g. Demetrius of Phaleron in Athens during the Macedonian occupation under Kassandros suggests, which may not have been merely a special treatment of Athens but a regular Macedonian way of treating subordinate or subject communities. Thereafter Amphipolis remained Macedonian, but also

---

[10] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no. 86 (cf. no. 84).
[11] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no. 40.
[12] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no. 41.

Amphipolitan, as descriptions of Amphipolitans from outside Macedonia make clear: the simple ethnic *Amphipolítes* outnumbers by far the doubtless strictly correct *Makedòn ex Amphipóleos* in the collection of Macedonians abroad by Argyro Tataki.[13] Settlers were, of course, also brought in from other places to boost the numbers of loyal citizens, and a short generation later the city was able to raise a named cavalry unit for Alexander's army.[14]

But this is not the main point I wish to make here. It is rather that the clearly successful integration of the independent city Amphipolis into the Macedonian state seems to have created a precedent and provided a model for further development and for application in other places. It was, certainly, not a model which Philip thought to apply everywhere in the conquest phase, as his treatment of Methone and the Chalkidian cities shows, where no new city was founded, but land distributed to individuals; Amphipolis was in many ways a special case, not just a well-established major city with a substantial economic basis, but a strategically situated city which needed to be preserved and dominated at all costs in order to control the Strymon crossing and thereby secure easy access to the Pangaion area. The lasting success of the Amphipolis model in Macedonia will also help explain why the office of *epistates* seems to have become increasingly widespread in Macedonia as a result of the enormous level of urbanisation which took place under and after Philip II, so that Hatzopoulos can maintain with some plausibility that every Macedonian polis must have had an *epistates*.[15]

But perhaps more important in the long run is that the Amphipolis solution provides us with the "mental model" for the relationship between Macedonian kings—outside Macedonia as well, of course—and Greek (or Greek-style) cities which they governed or founded. The differing expectations between kings and cities, particularly those old *poleis* which themselves had a history of what they liked to call greatness – that is, imperialism and domination of others—led certainly to a century of regionally varying tensions, but in the last resort also to a coming-to-terms with the changed political reality. In Macedonia itself the success of the Amphipolitan model also led to new city foundations with a closer approximation to the original than was possible outside Macedonia, but also to a gradually improving status of existing urban or pre-urban communities, which seem to have achieved *polis*-status with local self-governing rights (together with international i.e. pan-hellenic—recognition of this, as for

---

[13] A.Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad. Meletemata* 26. Athens 1998, 45-63.
[14] Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.2.5.
[15] Implied in Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions* I, 424ff.

instance the Delphic *Thearodokoi* List shows)[16] in ever-increasing numbers from the Fourth Century onwards. As the differences between the structure of the way of life of the Macedonian urban communities and those of the rest of the Greek world diminished, that is as more and more Macedonians came to live in locally self-governing cities, even under the doubtless basically benevolent patronal eye of a royal *epistates*, while at the same time the majority of non-Macedonian poleis came to terms with the existence of powerful territorial monarchies and worked out a *modus vivendi* with them, so did the Macedonians achieve a cultural and social integration into the Greek cultural *koine*. The beginning of this important process, I would suggest, is first traceable in Philip II's treatment of Amphipolis.

It would be surprising if, given the spread of city-state culture in hellenistic Macedonia, we did not equally have a spread of epigraphic culture there, since the hellenistic period is the time when the city states of Greece produced in general more public inscriptions than at any other previous time in their history. Macedonia is indeed no exception, and we now have a series of decrees from the cities which demonstrate that a large number of them enjoyed a limited ability to run their own affairs and to pass and set up decrees which were called *psephismata* voted by local assemblies of some kind, the most sophisticated having differing functions as on the Athenian model with functionally separate meetings called *boule* and *ekklesia* representing the *demos* (or *polis*).We do not know anything about how these meetings were organised, who was allowed to participate and the criteria for appointment to the council, which varied widely within the Greek world, but the formal adaptation of the city structure to pan-hellenic norms is increasingly clear and the evidence increasingly widespread. We know that, for instance four Macedonian cities, Philippoi, Amphipolis, Pella and Kassandreia, recognised the *asylia* of Kos in 243,[17] and that several cities passed decrees honouring those who had helped them, whether individuals or groups. This is evidence for participation in the international Greek cultural scene, since these cities both received and/or sent envoys abroad in their own affairs. The Macedonian cities seem to have had a fairly extensive series of officials, though the most widespread remains the royal *epistates,* to whom a whole series of royal letters are addressed and published locally. But as in other Greek cities, we have evidence for eponymous officials, in Macedonia very often, as in Amphipolis, priests of one kind or another—it is not always possible to know exactly what their function was beyond being a dating

---

[16] A.Plassart, *BCH* 45, 1921, 1ff.
[17] Most convenient texts in Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* nos. 36, 41,47, 58.

mechanism—but also financial officials (*tamiai*) and market supervisors with various names (*agoranomoi*, or in one case in Amphipolis *emporiou epimeletai*), secretaries (*grammateis*) as well as groups named merely *archontes*.

It is also clear from two quite extraordinary *polis* inscriptions, one from Amphipolis and the other from Beroia, that many of the cities, at least in the later hellenistic period, had their own gymnasia and trained their young men as *epheboi*. A now famous text from Beroia, the *Gymnasiarchikos Nomos*, first published in 1975, and dating from the period immediately following the abolition of the monarchy, but in principle reflecting a situation which was in itself much older, offers uniquely detailed information about the way the gymnasium was run, the role of the gymnasiarch and his helpers, the extent of the financial responsibility of the city authorities, the detailed rules about the operation of the gymnasium festival the *Hermaia* including the *Lampas* (torch race through the city) and a range of other detailed arrangements (including fines for keeping discipline).[18] For the Macedonian state the text is fascinating for showing the extent to which the city authorities were involved in the educational activities of the gymnasium, just like in other non-Macedonian cities, but also because the text also draws attention to the fact that many other Macedonian cities had gymnasia, and with these regulations Beroia was just drawing equal to others in drawing up detailed regulations for the use and administration of its gymnasium. So we can conclude that also in this educational area at least the larger Macedonian cities had been able to equip themselves with a modern gymnasial infrastructure and the associated educational activities associated with this. A later text from Amphipolis which calls itself an *Ephebarchikos Nomos*, but which is unfortunately not wholly published, would serve to confirm this conclusion, since it seems to be the republication of much older rules going back to the period of the kings.[19]

It would, however, be surprising in a monarchic state such as Macedonia if Royal ordinances did not dominate the epigraphic picture. A large number of the documents which illustrate the activities of the cities also illustrate the activities of the royal administration. The decrees of the Macedonian cities for the *asylia* of Kos, for instance, all make reference to the fact that their decision is in conformity to the policy of king Antigonos (Gonatas)—a quite unnecessary assertion, if they were wholly free to do what

---

[18] Text and extensive commentary in Ph.Gauthier-M.B.Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia. Meletemata* 16, 1993. Also in Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no. 60.

[19] Cf. *SEG* 35, 1985, 705; Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no. 42.

they wished.[20] A letter of Demetrios II to an official Harpalos (perhaps the *epistates*) in Beroia is concerned with details of the financial affairs of the cult of Herakles Kynagidas in the city;[21] and the same sort of attention to cult finances is shown by a letter of Philip V to his official Andronikos responsible for Thessaloniki (perhaps also an *epistates*) concerning the finances of the Egyptian cults in the city half a century later.[22] We have already seen that the kings distributed land to individuals without consultation of the city authorities; a royal letter now in the Museum of Kozane shows Philip V writing to one Archippos (perhaps also an *epistates*) concerning the possession of certain pieces of land and their use by military settlers as late as 181.[23] Nothing much seems to have changed in this respect over the centuries of the monarchy: the king remained interested and concerned with the details of land distribution within the kingdom. From Macedonia there remains still no evidence that the local city authorities might have been involved in such matters.

Macedonia remained until the end of the monarchy a strong military power, as it had been since the time of Philip II. Some recent discoveries enable us to assess this development much more clearly than was previously the case. Since the 1930s two documents have become known concerning aspects of the military organisation of Macedonia at the time of Philip V, one from Amphipolis, the other from Chalkis. The Amphipolis document is a royal *diagramma* and concerns in particular the responsibilities of military officials for the pay of the soldiers and their equipment. It is unfortunately badly damaged, so that large sections of it are only partly intelligible, but it is clear that there were general disciplinary regulations for the army in order to provide for efficiency; and the level of military bureaucracy which is evidenced by the text is remarkable.[24] From Chalkis, a Macedonian garrison town in southern Greece, a text was found at about the same time as the Amphipolis text which provides in great detail regulations for the running of the garrison, including rules for keeping stores and fixing the various responsibilities of the royal officials responsible for the garrison for its efficient running. Until recently these texts stood alone as unique isolated examples of the Macedonian royal bureaucracy in action, but it was difficult to know whether we had to do with a reform under Philip V or merely with a greater readiness to make such things public at his time—that is, an increase

---

[20] See on this A.Giovannini, "Le statut des cités de Macédoine sous les Antigonides", *Archaia Makedonia II*, 1977, 465-472.

[21] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no.8.

[22] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no.15.

[23] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no.17.

[24] Hatzopoulos, Epigraphic Appendix to *Macedonian Institutions* no. 12.

in the epigraphic habit. This question will remain problematic, but recent finds seems to suggest the latter, since the text from Chalkis was not unique. A second copy of the text has been found from another garrisoned place, Kynos in central Greece, and the text is identical with that from Chalkis.[25] The bureaucracy under Philip V therefore issued, or at least insisted on publication on stone, the detailed regulations for garrisons, which we must now assume were general for the whole of the areas garrisoned by the Macedonians outside of Macedonia itself. It is not very likely that the garrison at Chalkis, which had existed long before Philip V, had had no written instructions before his time.

The most spectacular new find, again in two separate copies of the same basic text, one from Kassandreia, the other from Amphipolis, is a regulation regarding the details of recruitment to the Macedonian army, again dating probably from the end of the Third or beginning of the Second Century, the reign of Philip V, but at least in some respects representing earlier conditions.[26] The details are astonishing and make these newly discovered documents, despite their incompleteness, the most detailed rules on recruitment we have for any army in antiquity. The first editors were so impressed with the details that they thought it must be emergency regulations issued before the battle of Kynoskephalae in 198, when we know from Livy that exceptional efforts were made to recruit all Macedonians capable of serving. But the double publication on stone alone makes it clear that we have here a long-term structural regulation. The basic unit of recruitment was the "fire-unit" (*pyrokausis*) a new word, and these were established with a significant amount of bureaucracy, being recruited, it seems, by the *epistatai* of the cities, for those who lived in city areas. There was also centrally kept lists (*diagraphai)* run by a royal official (*ho epi tas diagraphas*) registering the *pyrokauseis* and their members. As far as the distribution of the troops into individual units was concerned, we have here new evidence for a social selection, the poorest men being brigaded into the phalanx infantry. The special units, the royal agema, the peltasts or the hypaspistai were selected according to social criteria from the better-off. Age also played a role. The agema was recruited from older men, with a cut-off point at 45, except for particularly fit individuals, whereas the peltasts were not older than 35. The rules also show great respect for maintaining family structures: in a household where a father and son lived and the son was over 20, the father

---

[25] Texts in M.B.Hatzopoulos, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux. Meletemata* 30. Athens 2001, 151ff.

[26] Editio princeps by P.Nigdelis and K.Sismanides, *Ancient Macedonia* 6, Thessaloniki 1999, 807-822; new edition by Hatzopoulos, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne* (as n. 26) 153f.

over 50, the son was to be recruited; and the father was a kind of emergency reserve (*boethos*); where the son was under 20 and the father 50 or under 50, the father was to be recruited as long as he was physically fit to serve, and the son belonged to the emergency reserve, but if the father were over fifty and the son more than 15 the son was to serve, and such fathers who were over 55 belonged to the reserve unless they were ex-officers or guardsmen (*hegemones, hetairoi),* in which case if they were physically fit they were to join the reserve. In households where a son was under 15 the call-up of the father depended on whether the son was physically strong enough to run the farm: if so, the father was to be recruited. There are also detailed regulations for the recruitment of cavalry horses, but these are less well preserved in the text.

I hope I have shown in this paper that a great deal of new material from Ancient Macedonia has been discovered in the last generation, and that this material allows in some cases extraordinarily detailed information about how the state was organised. In particular the level of bureaucracy involved in all these areas is surprising, and it does mean that when we talk about the development of administration in the hellenistic kingdoms the Macedonian homeland, where the hellenistic world began, can no longer be regarded an having made only a minor contribution to this. The Macedonian state in the Third Century was well organised, with both central and local officials existing with defined responsibilities, and a certain amount of local administration being delegated to the city authorities. This gradually improving knowledge of the efficiency of the state apparatus gives us a good idea of how Macedonia could continue to dominate Greek affairs for some 200 years and how the Macedonian army was capable of offering the Romans such a significant challenge.

Marburg