

Theorodokoi, Asyia, and the Macedonian Cities

Ben Raynor

An influential picture of the ancient Macedonian kingdom in twentieth-century scholarship was of a polity somehow inimical to the presence or development of the *polis* as a political or social formation. Macedonia had urban communities, but it was argued that they possessed no genuine civic life.¹ An increasing body of epigraphic evidence has overturned such a picture. Civic decrees, laws, and dedications now leave us in no doubt that, from at least the mid-fourth century B.C., the Macedonian kingdom was a land of genuine *poleis*. Cities throughout Macedonia possessed civic institutions recognisable from elsewhere in the Aegean world (magistrates, councils, etc.) which structured meaningful local political life.² Much recent work on Macedonia has focused on

¹ For a clear summary see M. B. Hatzopoulos, “L’état Macédonien antique: un nouveau visage,” *CRAI* (1997) 7–25, at 11–12. Macedonia as hostile to the *polis*: A. Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus* (Leipzig 1937) 279–280; F. Schachermeyer, *Alexander der Grosse: Ingenium und Macht* (Graz/Vienna 1949) 29; H. Bengtson, *Philipp und Alexander der Grosse* (Munich 1985) 121.

² The epigraphic evidence to date was compiled in M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings I–II* (Athens 1996); see also his “Some New Documents from the Macedonian Chancery. Problems of Form and Content,” in *ΚΕΡΜΑΤΙΑ ΦΙΛΙΑΣ. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον Ιωάννη Τουρατσόγλου* (Athens 2009) II 47–55, “The Cities,” in R. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Macedon* (Leiden/Boston 2011) 235–241, and annual commentary in *Bulletin épigraphique*. *Poleis* were present at least in Macedonia’s coastal heartland, where the kingdom was divided into civic territories. It appears that *poleis* as institutional forms did not exist in Upper Macedonia: Hatzopoulos, *Institutions I* 77–104.

further investigating the importance and antiquity of civic culture in the kingdom.³ However, this new scholarly emphasis on the *polis* as an important institutional and social form in Macedonia has not definitively determined the cities' degree of self-government. It has only made more pressing the question of how a multitude of separately constituted urban communities were successfully integrated into a state whose most recognisable feature was a powerful military monarchy.

Part of the answer must be sought in the balance between central control and local self-government that existed in the Macedonian kingdom.⁴ This problem has often been framed in terms of what level of 'autonomy' the Macedonian cities possessed.⁵ This term permits multiple uses and is difficult to define. Nor do the series of concepts associated with the modern English word 'autonomy' map easily onto the ancient Greek term *autonomia*.⁶ *Autonomia* was open to a range of readings in the ancient world depending on the context, and often derived its meaning from the state with which it was contrasted.⁷ Bickerman and Ostwald identified its general use in the clas-

³ E.g. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*; A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets et al. (eds.), *Rois, cités et nécropoles. Institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine* (Athens 2006); M. Mari, "Macedonian *poleis* and *ethnē* in the Greek Sanctuaries before the Age of Philip II," *Ancient Macedonia VII* (Thessaloniki 2007) 31–49; R. M. Errington, "The Importance of the Capture of Amphipolis for the Development of the Macedonian City," *Ancient Macedonia VII* 275–282.

⁴ By no means the only approach—the integrative role of the royal court has recently received fruitful attention: P. Paschidis, "The Interpenetration of Civic Elites and Court Elite in Macedonia," in *Rois, cités et nécropoles* 251–267; J. Ma, "Court, King, and Power in Antigonid Macedonia," in *Brill's Companion* 521–543.

⁵ E.g. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions I* 472–486.

⁶ M. H. Hansen, "The 'Autonomous City-State': Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?" in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 1995) 21–43, at 22–25.

⁷ R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek City States ca. 700–338 B.C.* (Berkeley 1976) 397; A. B. Bosworth, "Autonomia: The Use and Abuse of Political Terminology," *SIIt* 10 (1992) 122–152, at 123.

sical period as a term used to defend the self-governing status of a weaker state from the imperialist encroachments of a stronger one.⁸ But this aspect of the term's use seems to have changed by the Hellenistic period, and it became compatible with subordination to a greater power.⁹ Therefore *autonomia*, at least by the Hellenistic period, need not imply full political independence, or complete freedom from outside interference by a more powerful state, but rather self-governance in local affairs. In considering the 'autonomy' of the Macedonian cities, then, we are not considering whether or not they were completely independent of any outside influence by a greater power when making decisions.¹⁰ We are considering the degree of political self-government the cities possessed in this period. Were they free to govern their own affairs in many areas? Or were their civic institutions organs only for limited quotidian administrative functions, with decisions on any important matters of political, religious, military, diplomatic, or financial weight reserved for the king? Or did their scope for independent action lie somewhere between these two poles? And did this change over time?

Some aspects of this problem have been much discussed, such as whether or not the *dikastai* or *epistatai* attested in Macedonian cities acted as royal functionaries, or whether the cities enjoyed some freedom of action in foreign relations.¹¹ In his

⁸ E. J. Bickerman, "Autonomia: sur un passage de Thucydide (1, 144, 2)," *RIDA* III.5 (1958) 313–344; M. Ostwald, *Autonomia: its Genesis and Early History* (New York 1982).

⁹ Hansen, in *Studies* 38–43.

¹⁰ This was basically impossible within a king's sphere of influence: see J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford 1999) 160–165, for the precarious position of the Seleukid 'autonomous' cities.

¹¹ Magistrates: Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 372–429, with previous bibliography; F. Papazoglou, "Polis et souveraineté," *ζAnt* 50 (2000) 169–176; R. M. Errington, "König und Stadt im hellenistischen Makedonien: die Rolle des Epistates," *Chiron* 32 (2002) 51–63. Foreign relations: A. Giovannini, "Le statut des cités de Macédoine sous les Antigonides," *Ancient Macedonia* II (Thessaloniki 1977) 465–472; F. Papazoglou, "Sur l'organisa-

influential study of the institutional structure of the Macedonian kingdom, Miltiades Hatzopoulos, as well as delivering resounding volleys in such traditional battlegrounds, opened up a new front by turning to previously underexploited evidence: several *theorodokoi* lists from the fourth and third centuries.¹²

At some point in the Classical period, certain cities began to send out delegations of messengers known as *theoroi* to announce and invite participation in their panhellenic agonistic festivals.¹³ The *theorodokoi* lists recorded the communities visited by these *theoroi*, and the members of those communities who were appointed as responsible for receiving the *theoroi*, known as *theorodokoi*.¹⁴ Some scholars, starting with Robert, have argued that in order to make a meaningful announcement of the festival, the delegation of *theoroi* would have needed access to an authority that could guarantee recognition of the sacred truce.¹⁵ Therefore, only independent political communities were visited. Others have followed Kahrstedt in seeing the toponyms in a *theorodokoi* list as merely a record of where the *theoroi* lodged, making no assumptions about the political status of the communities.¹⁶ Consequently, *theorodokoi* lists have played

tion de la Macédoine sous les Antigonides,” *Ancient Macedonia III* (Thessaloniki 1983) 195–210, and *ZAnt* 50 (2000) 170.

¹² Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 472–486.

¹³ On *theoroi* see I. Rutherford, *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 2013).

¹⁴ P. Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese* (Göttingen 2000).

¹⁵ L. Robert, “Villes de Carie et d’Ionie dans la liste des théorodokes de Delphes,” *BCH* 70 (1946) 506–523, and “Documents d’Asie Mineure XX: Ptolémaïs de Troade,” *BCH* 106 (1982) 319–333; G. Daux, “Listes delphiques de théarodokes,” *REG* 62 (1949) 1–30. P. Perlman, “ΘΕΩΡΟΔΟΚΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ ΠΟΛΕΣΙΝ: Panhellenic *Epangelia* and Political Status,” in M. H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen 1995) 113–164, argues, in relation to Crete, that cities appointing *theorodokoi* there had at least been independent *poleis* at some point; in *Theorodokia* 30–34 she tends toward following Robert.

¹⁶ U. Kahrstedt, “Chalcidic Studies,” *AJP* 57 (1936) 416–444; J. M.

a prominent role in discussions of *polis* status and *polis* autonomy.¹⁷

In one of the earliest surviving *theorodokoi* lists, dating to 360 and originating in Epidauros, king Perdikkas III appears as sole *theorodokos* for the Macedonian kingdom; no Macedonian cities individually appointed *theorodokoi*.¹⁸ Then, in other lists from later in the fourth century, Macedonian cities begin to appear appointing *theorodokoi*.¹⁹ By the late third century, *theorodokoi* for 28 Macedonian cities were recorded in the ‘Delphi Great List’.²⁰

Hatzopoulos followed Robert in seeing the appointment of a *theorodokos* as indicative of a city’s political independence. Therefore, he argued that the Epidaurian list of 360, with Perdikkas *theorodokos* for the whole kingdom, shows that the Macedonian cities had no capacity for independent action at that time. He saw the same situation reflected in ch. 66 of the mid-fourth century *Periplous* of Pseudo-Skylax.²¹ As others had before him, he argued that Pseudo-Skylax distinguished between non-autonomous cities within the Macedonian kingdom and independent cities outside of it.²² He therefore viewed the

Cook, *The Troad* (Oxford 1973) 221, 342–343, and “Cities in and around the Troad,” *BSA* 83 (1988) 7–19. P. Gauthier, “Sur les institutions de l’Épire,” *RPhil* 53 (1979) 120–128, points out that the nature of the state must be taken into account, as in federal states the centre of authority might not be in a settlement, or could move around.

¹⁷ Summary and bibliography in M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford 2004) 103–106.

¹⁸ *IG* IV².1 94/95; Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 67–78, Ep. Cat. E.1.

¹⁹ List from Nemea: *SEG* XXXVI 331; Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 105–131, Ep. Cat. N.1. Addenda to the Epidauros list: Perlman 78–81, Ep. Cat. E. 1. Possible list from Argos: *IG* IV 617; Perlman 127–129.

²⁰ A. Plassart, “Inscriptions de Delphes, la liste des Théorodoques,” *BCH* 45 (1921) 1–85. I have not seen J. Oulhen, *Les théarodoques de Delphes* (unpublished thesis, Université de Paris X, Nanterre 1992).

²¹ G. Shipley, *Pseudo-Skylax’s Periplous: The Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World* (Exeter 2011).

²² Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473, following U. Kahrstedt, “Städte in Ma-

increasing number of Macedonian cities appointing *theorodokoi* later in the century as representing an innovation. The Macedonian cities were for the first time developing their own capacity for independent action, instead of being beholden to the king in all matters of international relations.²³ Hatzopoulos argued that this occurred as a result of Philip II's modernising reforms of the Macedonian state, as rhetorically summarised in the speech Alexander the Great makes to his troops at Opis in 324 in Arrian's *Anabasis*.²⁴ Cities and regions which had enjoyed independent civic life were absorbed into the Macedonian kingdom and reorganised as 'cells' of 'Greater Macedonia'. Hatzopoulos argued that these cities possessed a significant measure of political autonomy. This came to be the rule for all cities in Macedonia, with the fullest expression of this substantial increase in autonomy being the 28 Macedonian cities appointing *theorodokoi* for Delphi in the late third century.

The increasing number of Macedonian cities appointing *theorodokoi* shows that *something* changed between the mid-fourth and late third centuries in Macedonia. But was that change necessarily a substantial increase in civic autonomy? Below I shall reexamine the evidence underlying Hatzopoulos' model, and argue for a different interpretation of the *theorodokoi* lists.

We can quickly dispense with Alexander's speech in Arrian. Arrian has Alexander give a description of Philip II's policies as part of a speech to the troops following the Opis mutiny in August 324. This has been seen as a rhetorical summation of Philip's program of modernisation and civic development in Macedonia.²⁵ Certainly, Philip's achievements in transforming

kedonien," *Hermes* 81 (1953) 85–111; J. N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macédoniens* II.1 (Athens 1954) 592–594. See also M. Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo. Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo ellenismo* (Athens 2002) 68–69 n.5, and *Ancient Macedonia* VII 31–49.

²³ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473–476; Mari, *Ancient Macedonia* VII 38–41.

²⁴ Arr. *Anab.* 7.9.2; Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473–474.

²⁵ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473–474. J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London 1976) 58–59, and Hammond in N. G. L. Hammond

a backwater kingdom into the pre-eminent power in the Balkan peninsula are not in question. Unfortunately, this speech cannot be used as direct evidence of his policies. Bosworth has convincingly demonstrated that, while some of the arguments may originate with a speech Alexander gave at Opis, the speech as we have it is a literary construction by Arrian.²⁶ At best it can be taken as Arrian's interpretation of the kind of rhetoric he felt his audience wanted to read, or the kind of arguments he would have had Alexander make had he been Alexander's speech writer. It cannot form part of our evidence for considering the development of civic institutions and local self-government in Macedonia.

Pseudo-Skylax's *Periplus* describes the Mediterranean and Black Sea coastlines, including major landmarks and communities. Like other texts of its kind, it is arranged in the form of a coastal itinerary, and may be classified as a work of geography. Ch. 66.1–2 describes Macedonia and the Macedonians:

And past the Peneios river are the Makedones, an *ethnos*, and the gulf of Therma. The first *polis* of Macedonia is Herakleion; (then) Dion; Pydna, *polis hellenis*; Methone, *polis hellenis*, and the Haliakmon river; Aloros, *polis*, and the river Loudias; Pella, *polis*, with a royal seat (*basileion*) in it, and there is a voyage upstream to it up the Loudias; (then) the Axios river; the Echedoros river; Therme, *polis*; Aineia, *hellenis*. (transl. Shipley, adapted)

The *Periplus* is difficult to date. Shipley favours a date of ca. 338–336 for the work as a whole.²⁷ Pseudo-Skylax probably gathered information from sources of different ages, and was content not to resolve inconsistencies. The date of different sections of the *Periplus* must perhaps be judged separately.²⁸ Ch.

and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II* (Oxford 1979) 658–660, see the passage as referring to Upper Macedonia, but no such distinction is made in the text.

²⁶ A. B. Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander* (Oxford 1988) 101–113.

²⁷ Shipley, *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplus* 6–8.

²⁸ P. Flensted-Jensen and M. H. Hansen, "Pseudo-Skylax' Use of the

66 on Macedonia has generally been thought to portray the situation in the area around the late 360s.²⁹

As mentioned above (n.22), some scholars have interpreted the distinction between *polis* and *polis hellenis* in this passage as political: a *polis* was a community subject to a greater power, while a *polis hellenis* was an independent Greek city-state. On this view Pseudo-Skylax makes a distinction between those cities under the autocratic sway of the Macedonian king (*polis*) and those who control their own affairs (*polis hellenis*).

Unfortunately, as discussed by Flensted-Jensen and Hansen,³⁰ Pseudo-Skylax's use of the term *polis hellenis* is inconsistent. If the distinction between a *polis* and *polis hellenis* is a matter of autonomy, why are none of the settlements in Pseudo-Skylax 34–65, which covers the centre of the Greek world, labelled *hellenis*? It cannot be taken as given that all the cities recorded in this section enjoyed full political independence, negating the need for the additional qualifier. The relationships between urban communities in southern Greece were complex, and some communities identified as *poleis* in this section will have been in more or less formal or marked positions of subordination to other *poleis*. Flensted-Jensen and Hansen instead see *polis hellenis* as an unevenly applied ethnic criterion. In chs. 34–65, Pseudo-Skylax is covering 'Hellas proper', and all the communities are self-evidently Hellenic. In the rest of the work, Hellenic communities existed alongside non-Greek populations, so Pseudo-Skylax used *polis/polis hellenis* to distinguish between them (though not consistently). On this reading, in the Macedonian section Pseudo-Skylax makes a distinction between cities within the Macedonian kingdom (a non-Greek power in the eyes of Pseudo-Skylax or his source)

Term *Polis*," in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 1996) 137–167, at 137–138.

²⁹ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 472–473; R. Lane Fox, "The 360's," in *Brill's Companion* 257–269, arguing (267) for summer 360; contra Shipley, *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplus* 141.

³⁰ In *More Studies* 138.

and cities outside of it.³¹ Cohen's recent survey of the use of the term *polis hellenis* reached a similar conclusion for the Classical period, when authors generally used *hellenis* of either cities in Greece (as opposed to elsewhere) or Greek colonies in non-Greek territories.³² But on its own, the presence or absence of the label *hellenis* implies nothing about the political freedom of communities.

Given Pseudo-Skylax's inconsistencies, we should not press the *Periplus* for political classification. It was, after all, not a political pamphlet, but an academic geographical treatise.³³ It is not good evidence for the political status of the communities it records. Therefore, it must be left out of discussions of Macedonian civic autonomy.

The first *theorodokoi* list of interest is from the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros.³⁴ The delegation it records was in the north between spring and late summer 360. Perdikkas III appears as *theorodokos*, and his death in battle early in the archon year 360/59 provides our lower date limit.³⁵ The presence of Datos in the list provides our upper limit. Perlman has shown that Kallistratos of Aphidna, upon whose advice the

³¹ Flensted-Jensen and Hansen, in *More Studies* 151–152.

³² G. M. Cohen, "Polis Hellenis," in P. Wheatley and E. Baynham (eds.), *East and West in the World Empire of Alexander: Essays in Honour of Brian Bosworth* (Oxford 2015) 259–276. Cohen (263–264) does pick out Pseudo-Skylax 66 as an exception, along with Polybius on the cities of Asia Minor and a number of Hellenistic inscriptions, where "Greek city" seems equivalent to "autonomous city." But I do not accept this reading of Pseudo-Skylax, for the reasons laid out here.

³³ Shipley, *Pseudo-Skylax's Periplus* 13.

³⁴ *IG IV*².1 94/95; Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 67–78, Ep. Cat. E.1.

³⁵ M. B. Hatzopoulos, "The Oleveni Inscription and the Dates of Philip II's Reign," in W. L. Adams and E. N. Borza (eds.), *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Washington 1982) 21–42. Hatzopoulos' date is to be preferred to that of N. G. L. Hammond, "The Regnal Years of Philip and Alexander," *GRBS* 33 (1992) 355–378, who argues for spring 359. Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 69, cautiously takes the entire archon year 360/59 as the lower limit.

town was founded by Thasos, cannot have arrived in the area until November/December 361. This makes spring 360 the earliest date for Damos' foundation.³⁶

The section recording the journey of the *theoroi* through Macedonia (b.7–10) reads as follows, recording the communities and the names of their *theorodokoi*:

Πύδνα· Δαμάτριος
 Μεθώνα· Πολύφαντος
 Μακεδονία· Περδίκκας
 Αΐνεα· Εὔβουλος

Perdikkas III here acts as sole representative of his kingdom in relationships with the *theoroi*. Pydna, Methone, and Aineia, cities outside of his kingdom, appoint their own *theorodokoi*.

The next list that concerns us is for the panhellenic games of Zeus at Nemea. The section for Macedonia (col. ii.10–17)

³⁶ Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 69–70. K. Rigsby, “The Foundation of Damos,” *Historia* 56 (2007) 111–113, has highlighted that this is a very tight chronology. He also suggests that Epidauros would not send out *theoroi* as early as 360 for the Asklepieia of spring 358. Therefore, he proposes that Damos was not founded but only augmented around this time, opening up the whole of Perdikkas' reign for the appearance of Damos in this list—Rigsby suggests ca. 363. I am not convinced. The clearest reading of the sources is that Damos was a new foundation, with the possible exception of Hdt. 9.75 which probably refers to a region not a city where the Athenian Sophanes died fighting in the 460s. As to sending *theoroi* early, the Epidaurians were rebranding their festival as panhellenic, and may well have sent out multiple theoric delegations over an extended period of time in order to guarantee large turnouts: Perlman 72. Errington and Lane Fox have argued that Pydna and Methone, which appear outside of Perdikkas' Macedonian kingdom in the Epidaurian list, were not taken by Timotheos until his second expedition in the archon year 360/59: R. M. Errington, *A History of Macedonia* (Berkeley/Oxford 1990) 37; Lane Fox, in *Brill's Companion* 266–267. This would make Rigsby's earlier date for the list untenable, and give a potentially even later *terminus post quem* for the list than Damos' foundation. There are, however, proponents of a higher chronology of 364/3 for these cities' capture: Hammond and Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* II 186; M. B. Hatzopoulos and P. Paschidis, “Makedonia,” in Hansen and Nielsen, *Inventory* 794–809, at 806.

includes a number of *theorodokoi* from cities of the now greatly expanded kingdom:³⁷

ἐμ Μακεδονίαι
 ἐν Ἀμφιπόλι
 Πέρσας Νικολάου
 ἐν Λήτηι
 Μένανδρος Λυσάνδρου
 ἐξ Ἀλάντης
 Ἀφθόνητος Πυθοδώρου
vacat
 Ἀριστόνους

Here we have Amphipolis, Lete, and Allante appointing *theorodokoi*. Then there is one Aristonous recorded under a *vacat* without patronymic. This requires explanation, and two solutions have been advanced. The first, that he was a second *theorodokos* of Allante, is unsatisfactory.³⁸ The format of the inscription indicates that the *vacat* should be filled by another city or community. Why leave the uninscribed line at all if Aristonous was a second *theorodokos* of Allante? The second, that Aristonous was a *theorodokos* from Pella, is probably correct.³⁹ Amphipolis-Lete-Allante-Pella makes a reasonable east-to-west itinerary across central Macedonia.⁴⁰ We know of only one Aristonous who was famous enough to be recorded without patronymic, who happens also to be attested with the ethnic Pellaios: the son of Peisaios and a bodyguard of Alexander.⁴¹ Aristonous' presence

³⁷ SEG XXXVI 331; Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 105–131, Ep. Cat. N.1.

³⁸ Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 129, Pros. Cat. 49.

³⁹ H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich 1926) II 69, no. 133; Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 475; W. Heckel, *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great* (Oxford 2006) 50.

⁴⁰ L. Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Les Milliaires de la Voie Egnatienne entre Héraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique* (Athens 1985) 58–59 n.6.

⁴¹ When names on their own, lacking any further identifying information, are used in proxeny decrees, it is often because the individual in question is sufficiently famous, at least in the decree's context, to render further identification redundant. For discussion and examples see D. Knoepfler, *Décrets*

allows us to date the Nemean embassy to between Alexander's death in Babylon in June 323, where Curtius gives Aristonous a small role in the succession debate, and Aristonous' death in Macedonia in 316, by which point he had become a trusted and prominent member of the faction of Olympias and Polyperchon.⁴² We will return to the *vacat* below.

Before continuing with the *theorodokoi* lists, a brief aside. In a decree of Eretria of the late fourth century, an Aristonous is made *proxenos kai euergetēs* for being a "good man with regard to the *demos* of the Eretrians and saying and doing what was advantageous to the *demos*."⁴³ This Aristonous' patronymic and ethnic were left deliberately blank on the stone twice, in lines 2–3 and 7–8.⁴⁴ This individual has been convincingly identified as the same Aristonous as in the Nemean *theorodokoi* list, on similar grounds: dating, and the fame required of an individual to be left on an inscription without patronymic or ethnic.⁴⁵ As

érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté (Lausanne 2001) 185–190 and 279–284; W. Mack, *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford 2015) 53 n.104. For Aristonous see also A. B. Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad: A Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia* (Athens 1998) 150 no. 20. See Arr. *Anab.* 6.28.4 for 'Pellaios'. Aristonous is also attested with the ethnic 'Eordaios', Arr. *Ind.* 18.5; see Hammond and Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II* 680. I find the suggestion of R. Lane Fox, "Philip's and Alexander's Macedon," in Lane Fox, *Brill's Companion* 367–391, at 371, following Berve, most probable: Aristonous was a nobleman of Eordaia given land near Pella as part of Philip II's policies to engender loyalty among the Upper Macedonian nobility.

⁴² Olympias put him in charge of the remaining field forces in 316 (Diod. 19.35.4), he defended Amphipolis against Kassandros' forces (19.50.3), and was executed after the surrender of the city (19.51.1).

⁴³ *IG XII.9* 221; Knoepfler, *Décrets* 185–195.

⁴⁴ Knoepfler, *Décrets* 187, could find no traces on the stone that information had first been inscribed then later removed.

⁴⁵ Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad* 150 no. 20; Knoepfler, *Décrets* 188–189. S. G. Miller, "The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games," *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 147–163, at 158–159, noted the attraction of connecting Aristonous the bodyguard, the Aristonous of the Nemean list, and the Aristonous of the Eretrian decree, but preferred to leave the question open.

with the Nemean list, I will return to the *vacats* in this decree below. For now, it suffices to say that Aristonous being made *proxenos* by Eretria does not preclude him from having acted as *theorodokos* for Nemea in Pella. His service in the faction of Polyperchon and Olympias, doubtless as a prominent and high-ranking figure, could have provided the opportunity to do some favours for the Eretrians. Perhaps he served as an army commander at some point during the fighting between Polyperchon and Kassandros in mainland Greece between 318 and 316, helped the Eretrians somehow in the course of his duties, and returned to Macedonia afterward.⁴⁶ However, we need not necessarily believe that Aristonous in fact did anything for the Eretrians, or went anywhere near their city. The Eretrians may instead have been using a familiar, formulaic, and flattering form of honourific decree to establish good relations with an influential Macedonian, and thereby with his faction.⁴⁷ If Knoepfler is correct to identify other individuals recorded without ethnic who were granted *proxenia* by Greek cities as mobile high-ranking royal officials or courtiers, then this use of *proxenia* was not uncommon.⁴⁸ The additional title of *euergetēs* in the Eretrian decree perhaps makes this latter interpretation less probable, however. Either way, there is nothing about the Eretrian decree that prevents us interpreting Aristonous in the Nemean list as a *theorodokos* for Pella.

To return to the *theorodokoi* lists, near-contemporary addenda to the Epidaurian list of 360 record more *theorodokoi*.⁴⁹ *Theoro-*

⁴⁶ For these campaigns see Diod. 18.55–58, 64–66, 68–75; N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia III* (Oxford 1988) 130–139.

⁴⁷ Knoepfler, *Décrets* 189.

⁴⁸ Knoepfler, *Décrets* 280–284. Cities also awarded *proxenia* as a privileged and respected status to individuals whom they could not expect to perform or to have performed any useful service for them, in the interests of establishing good relationships with important people and communities: Mack, *Proxeny* 24–25.

⁴⁹ Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 78–81, Ep. Cat. E.1.

dokoi for three more cities of the Macedonian kingdom were added to the side of the initially inscribed text: Pythion, Kassandreia, and Ainos.⁵⁰ Though the addenda are difficult to date, the presence of Kassandreia gives a *terminus post quem* for Perlman's Mason A (who inscribed the names of the Macedonian cities) of that city's foundation in 316 (Diod. 19.52.2).

Therefore, the following Macedonian cities were independently appointing *theorodokoi* for panhellenic festivals by the end of the fourth century: Amphipolis, Lete, Allante, Pythion, Kassandreia, and Ainos, with the probable addition of Pella as the city for which Aristonous was *theorodokos*. Other cities recorded in a roughly contemporary inscription from Argos, which records money contributions from Thessaly and Macedonia, should perhaps also be added.⁵¹ This fragmentary list dates to ca. 316–293, as determined by the presence of both Kassandreia, founded in 316, and Pagasai, absorbed into Demetrias upon the latter city's foundation by Demetrios Poliorketes shortly after 294.⁵² The cities of Macedonia in the list are Aigai, probably Beroia, Edessa, Allante, Europos, Kassandreia, and Philippi. The itinerary order of the list suggests that it records a delegation of *theoroi*. Therefore this may well record more Macedonian cities establishing relationships with a Greek

⁵⁰ An example of an Upper Macedonian *ethnos* providing a *theorodokos* appears in these addenda: 'Euordaia' is recorded here alongside the cities (spelling with an epsilon otherwise unattested: Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 127 n.117). After Philip II, the Upper Macedonian territories were organised with institutions of local government based around federations of villages rather than around large urban centres: Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 77–104. These organs of local government could have seen to the appointment of a *theorodokos* as proficiently as the council or assembly of a *polis*. There is no need to invent a city of Eordaia: see N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia* I (Oxford 1972) 109, and Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 92–94, contra F. Papazoglou, *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine* (BCH Suppl. 16 [1988]) 166–169, and Perlman 127 n.117.

⁵¹ IG IV 617; Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 127–129.

⁵² Plut. *Dem.* 53.3; Hammond and Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III 222–223.

sanctuary.

Finally, the so called ‘Great List’ of Delphi for the festivals of Pythia and Soteria, dating to ca. 220–210.⁵³ The section for Thessaly and Macedonia starts at column iii.10, and 28 settlements in the Macedonian kingdom appointed one or more *theorodokoi*.

Are these lists evidence of the Macedonian cities developing increasing political autonomy, as Hatzopoulos argued? The underlying assumption here is that one can infer the political status of a community from its appointment of a *theorodokos*. As noted above, this has been a matter of debate, with some scholars arguing that *theoroi* only visited independent political communities, while others see the lists as merely records of where the *theoroi* lodged. As Rutherford has pointed out, both of these positions have problems.⁵⁴ Oulhen noted that some communities listed sequentially in the Delphi list are so far apart that, were these simply lists of lodging places, one would expect other places listed in between.⁵⁵ Therefore it is possible the *theoroi* visited places where *theorodokoi* were not appointed. On the other hand, some lists include communities which certainly did not enjoy full political independence, such as the Boiotian cities which were subject to Thebes recorded in the Epidaurian list (see below).

Had we not already decided that Pseudo-Skylax uses *polis hellenis* too inconsistently to safely read the term as identifying an autonomous city, ch. 66 of the *Periplus* might offer some support for seeing the appointment of *theorodokoi* as politically significant. Pseudo-Skylax calls each of Pydna, Methone, and Aincia *hellenis*, and these three cities appoint *theorodokoi* for Epidaurus in 360. Pseudo-Skylax’s mere *poleis* in the area do not: instead Perdikkas represents the whole Macedonian kingdom. If one reads *polis/polis hellenis* as a distinction between non-

⁵³ For the date see Rutherford, *State Pilgrims* 73–74.

⁵⁴ Rutherford, *State Pilgrims* 86–88.

⁵⁵ Oulhen, *Les théarodoques* 523, cited in Rutherford, *State Pilgrims* 87.

autonomous and autonomous cities, and dates ch. 66 as roughly contemporary to the Epidaurian list, this implies that the *theoroi* from Epidauros only visited independent communities. However, as argued above, Pseudo-Skylax's use of the term *polis hellenis* cannot be viewed in this way.

Hansen and Nielsen have noted that the majority of the toponyms recorded in *theorodokoi* lists are attested elsewhere as *poleis*, as opposed to *komai* or some other form of settlement.⁵⁶ This makes sense: *theoroi* would have wanted to make efficient use of their time and resources, and this would entail announcing mainly in the larger urban settlements of an area. Not every city of import in a region appears in the *theorodokoi* lists, perhaps because this lay beyond the reach of resources available to individual delegations. If important cities could miss out on visits from *theoroi*, we should be wary of reading too much into the appearance of a city in a *theorodokoi* list.

Hansen has also shown that several cities in the Epidaurian *theorodokoi* list of 360 were effective dependencies of Thebes at the time.⁵⁷ Therefore a *polis* which lost its political independence did not necessarily lose the right to receive *theoroi*. *Mutatis mutandis*, one cannot infer that a city appearing for the first time in *theorodokoi* lists has acquired greater autonomy.

These observations make it possible to harmonise certain aspects of the opposing positions on *theorodokoi*. It is surely correct that one cannot make political inferences about communities from *theorodokoi* lists. Beyond the arguments stated above, it is not clear that *theoroi* made a meaningful announcement/*epangelia* at each stop, especially if the delegation was operating in a federal state where many state functions were concentrated in one individual or body. But Robert's observations on the general importance of communities recorded in *theorodokoi* lists have been verified by Hansen's findings. The

⁵⁶ Hansen and Nielsen, *Inventory* 105.

⁵⁷ M. H. Hansen, "Were the Boiotian *Poleis* Deprived of their *Autonomia* during the First and Second Boiotian Federations? A Reply," in Hansen and Raaflaub, *More Studies* 127–136.

fact that they are usually attested elsewhere as *poleis* can be explained by the *theoroi* needing to make best use of their time and resources by generally visiting larger communities.

Therefore, the existence of relationships surrounding international festivals does not indicate autonomy for those communities involved, nor did the existence of these relationships constitute any challenge to a greater political authority. Thus we cannot draw any conclusions about the relative political independence of cities based on their appearance in *theorodokoi* lists. This leaves the argument for an increase in Macedonian civic autonomy very shaken.

How then do we explain the difference between the Epidaurian list of 360, with Perdikkas as sole representative of the kingdom, and the Delphi ‘Great List’ with its 28 Macedonian cities? What historical process does this change reveal, if not the increasing political freedoms of these cities? Before attempting to answer this question, I would stress the difficulty in making such a comparison between a list from the mid-fourth century and a list from the end of the third century. It is not a simple matter to contrast the Epidaurian and Delphian lists. It is true that Perdikkas acted as sole *theorodokos* for his kingdom in 360. In this respect he seems to stand out from other *theorodokoi* in the region, who represent individual cities. But we should in fact see a near equivalence between Perdikkas and the other *theorodokoi* who appear in this part of the list.

As explored by Lane Fox, in 360 the Macedonian kingdom was neither large nor powerful.⁵⁸ Athenian territorial gains around the Thermaic Gulf threatened Perdikkas’ territory. An inscription from nearby Dikaia suggests that Perdikkas wielded limited judicial authority with regard to certain foreigners in his kingdom. He appears as witness to oaths taken by the Dikaians, and agrees to execute any Dikaian whom he finds in his kingdom in breach of the oaths “if he is so able.” The Dikaians are also granted the ability to arrest such offenders within the terri-

⁵⁸ Lane Fox, in *Brill’s Companion* 266–269.

tory of Perdikkas.⁵⁹ The free rein given to Dikaian citizens who encounter a Dikaian oath breaker within Macedonia paints a weak picture of Perdikkas' personal authority in his kingdom. Other threats included Timotheos, again operating in the north, and two potential royal usurpers lingering around Macedonia's borders. Though the Chalkidian League in the east was relatively quiet and may have remained neutral during the succession crisis which followed Perdikkas' death,⁶⁰ it remained a potential threat. The Upper Macedonian cantons to the west remained independent. All in all, the Argead kingdom at this time was small and weak.

I therefore suggest that the *theoroi* officially visited only one place in Perdikkas' Macedonia: the royal capital of Pella. It is useful to think of things from the perspective of the *theoroi*. In such a small kingdom, the time and resources of the delegation were best spent visiting the royal capital, which would have stood out as the best place to make their announcement and seek recognition of the truce. In visiting Pella, the *theoroi* would have done their job. They had announced the festival at the most suitable place in the political unit they were visiting, namely Macedonia. Visiting any of the other (much smaller and much less prestigious) urban centres in the small Macedonian kingdom, of which there were not many, was superfluous. Perdikkas was effectively acting as *theorodokos* for Pella, though he was represented on the list as *theorodokos* for a kingdom to honour him and to reflect the difference between the political organisation of his kingdom and that of his city neighbours.⁶¹ We cannot read much into the absence of any other

⁵⁹ E. Voutiras and K. Sismanides, "Δικαιοπολιτών συναλλαγαι. Μια νέα επιγραφή από τη Δίκαια, αποικία της Ερετρίας," *Ancient Macedonia* VII 253–274 [*SEG* LVII 576; *BE* 2008, 263 and 339]. Now also B. Gray, "Justice or Harmony? Reconciliation after *Stasis* in Dikaia and the Fourth-century BC Polis," *REA* 115 (2013) 369–401.

⁶⁰ S. Psoma, *Olynthe et les Chalcidiens de Thrace* (Stuttgart 2001) 241.

⁶¹ Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 81, on the addenda to the Epidaurian list of *theorodokoi* from 360: *theorodokoi* were not always erased upon their death or

cities of Macedonia in the Epidaurian list as, unlike in later years after Philip II's expansion of the kingdom, a visit to the royal capital sufficed in 360. Therefore, while the contrast between Perdikkas as lone *theorodokos* for a kingdom in the fourth century and the many *theorodokoi* for the Macedonian cities in the third appears stark, on closer inspection the position of Perdikkas in 360 makes such simple comparisons misleading: a single visit to the royal capital would never again be enough. The difference becomes one of the scale of the kingdom and of Perdikkas' representation, rather than of institutional development.

This interpretation suggests an explanation for the *vacat* above Aristonous the bodyguard in the Nemean list of ca. 323–316. As noted above, Aristonous was probably acting as *theorodokos* for Pella. Why was the space for Pella left blank? I believe the *vacat* is best seen in the context of the previous appearance of Perdikkas as sole *theorodokos* for the kingdom in the Epidaurian list, of which the compilers of the Nemean list would have been aware. This one man who had represented the entire kingdom had resided in Pella in a much smaller Macedonia. Now the Nemean delegation was also tasked with recording a *theorodokos* in Pella. But how to record him? Did Aristonous represent Pella alone? Or did the man appointed as *theorodokos* in Pella, the political and symbolic centre of the kingdom, represent the entire kingdom and not just Pella? After all, at least one previous *theorodokos* in Pella had wielded this kind of authority. I submit that it is this confusion that is reflected in the *vacat*.

There are, of course, other perfectly plausible explanations. *Vacats* are common in inscriptions, and this may be a simple case of human error. If this explanation is sound, however, it is potentially enlightening. By ca. 323–316, Macedonian cities had begun to appear in the *theorodokoi* lists. The monarchy in

replacement, indicating that the primary function of these lists was to honour the sanctuary and the *theorodokos*.

the wake of Alexander's death was very weak, and the future of both the royal house and the entire Macedonian empire was increasingly uncertain. Yet outsiders were possibly still confused over whether or not a *theorodokos* in Pella acted as representative for the whole kingdom. If there had been any significant change in the autonomy of the Macedonian cities, even in the sphere of religious relations, it was perhaps perceived by outsiders as only having gone so far. This could also explain why there are no more cities recorded after Pella for this delegation. After announcing the festival at Pella, royal seat and the most important settlement of the Macedonian heartland, the *theoroi* may have decided that their work in Macedonia was done.⁶²

A similar pattern may perhaps be seen from the roughly contemporary addenda to the *theorodokoi* list of Epidauros. The new entries were inscribed in an apparently haphazard manner, squeezed onto the stone where they could be at clear temporal intervals.⁶³ This could simply reflect the fact that the inscribed lists were updated somewhat irregularly or haphazardly. But it could also reflect the slow and uneven speed at which the institution of the *theorodokia* came to be used in the various cities of Macedonia. This may have been partially because of the kind of confusion over the remaining centralisation of power in Macedonia that we may see reflected in Aristonous' *vacat* in the Nemean list.

The *vacat* may, however, have had less to do with Nemean perceptions of continuing centralisation of power in Macedonia than with Aristonous himself. During this period, generals and functionaries were travelling the Mediterranean in the service of kings, dynasts, and their own ambitions. The loyalties and fortunes of all those involved in high politics could be subject to rapid and frequent change. It may have been unclear to the

⁶² Also, a desire to cut short their trip may have been felt keenly by the members of this delegation. Macedonia ca. 323–316 was not a safe place to wander around: Hammond and Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III 95–144.

⁶³ Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 78–81.

communities of mainland Greece in what capacity powerful individuals were acting at any given time. Perhaps the compilers of the Nemean list could not be sure, because of Aristonous' position and prestige, whether it would be appropriate to record him as *theorodokos* specifically for Pella, or whether his authority in this arena extended further in some way than the community in which he received the *theoroi*. Therefore the effect would be the same as my previous explanation, but with the confusion stemming from Aristonous' stature rather than Pella's perceived importance.

The details of the Eretrian decree for Aristonous might provide some support for such an explanation. Twice in this text gaps were left following his name where one expects his patronymic and ethnic. Knoepfler suggested that Aristonous' details were unknown at the time the decree was inscribed, and the engraver left the option of completing these later, after the information had been obtained. This is certainly possible, but it can be explained in other ways. In general in proxeny decrees, the city ethnic of the *proxenos* was included as a crucial element in signalling the establishment of a relationship between the community voting the decree and that of the *proxenos*. In the absence of a city ethnic, the *proxenos* was often a prominent individual attached to a royal court, theoretically serving the same function of representing the granting community's interests, but in a different political context.⁶⁴ I have suggested, following Knoepfler, that the Eretrian decree may be an example of this latter kind, with the Eretrians granting Aristonous the statuses of *proxenos kai euergetēs* in order to establish good relations with Polyperchon's Macedonian faction. In the other examples discussed by Knoepfler, however, space was not left on the stone after the names of the *proxenoi*: their ethnics were simply absent. Perhaps the Eretrians left space for this information purposefully because they were un-

⁶⁴ Knoepfler, *Décrets* 280–284; Mack, *Proxeny* 51–58. Regional ethnics could appear instead of city ethnics.

sure whether the standard form of a proxeny decree, with the grantee's city ethnic, would be the right way of expressing the relationship they hoped to establish with Aristonous and his faction. Including the city ethnic (presumably *Pellaïos*) might have made the relationship they hoped to establish with this highly placed Macedonian seem too limited and parochial. On the other hand, it was the standard form for proxeny decrees. Torn between these considerations, the decision was tabled for a later date and the engravers were instructed to go ahead but to leave space for biographical details just in case. Aristonous' death in 316 then rendered the debate moot.

Therefore the Eretrian decree and the Nemean list may have recorded Aristonous without the expected accompanying details for similar reasons: his position and power, like those of other powerful individuals in this period of rapid political change, made it difficult for Greek communities to fit him into familiar modes of interstate relations.⁶⁵ It has to be said that we

⁶⁵ Knoepfler's interpretation of the circumstances of Aristonous' appointment at Nemea (*Décrets* 190) goes some way to suggesting a third alternative to explain the *vacat* in the Nemean list. He suggests that Aristonous was appointed *theorodokos* for Nemea during Polyperchon's campaigns in the Peloponnese 318–316, where he could have been present with the army, perhaps during the Nemean games of 317. Therefore his presence in the list would not reflect his having actually received *theoroi* in Macedonia, but would instead be an honourific appointment. This could explain the *vacat*: Aristonous does not appear here as *theorodokos* for a particular community because he had not been one. Instead he now occupied some poorly defined position as *theorodokos* for Nemea in Macedonia as a whole. This is certainly possible: as discussed above, one might expect anomalous situations like this to emerge as Greek communities felt out ways to interact with the powerful kings, generals, and courtiers of the period after Alexander. Perlman, *Theorodokia* 30, notes that the *theorodokia* could be included in a package of other honours, and it is no great step from there to the *theorodokia* being presented on its own as a purely honourific title (not unlike some unusual grants of *proxenia*: see n.48 above). However, overall I am not convinced by Knoepfler, since I follow Perlman, *Theorodokia* 34, in seeing the lists of *theorodokoi* as generally being inscribed to record actual trips by *theoroi*. I think that, in order to appear in this list, Aristonous must have seen to the reception of *theoroi* during a real visit of theirs to a real community.

know little about Aristonous' exact movements or influence in this period. Perhaps his role in the contest between Polyperchon and Kassandros for leadership in Macedonia and the Greek mainland made his position particularly ambiguous. I must confess, however, that I have no good explanation for the absence of Aristonous' patronymic in either inscription.

Both the possible explanations advanced here for the *vacat* in the Nemean list, then, suggest that communities could feel uncertain engaging with Macedonia or Macedonians in the political world after Alexander's conquests. One emphasises potential confusion over the status of the Macedonian cities, while the other emphasises potential confusion over the status of powerful men like Aristonous. It seems probable to me that the Nemean *theoroi* would have felt some combination of both these confusions upon encountering Aristonous in Pella. Both interpretations, of course, assume that the *vacat* in the Nemean list has significance. It could just as easily have been a result of human error.

In spite of some uncertainties, the above considerations make it increasingly difficult to see the *theorodokoi* lists as straightforwardly reflecting an increase in the autonomy of the Macedonian cities. What, then, do they show us? I believe that these lists have been misinterpreted. The relationships they record existed as part of exchanges between cities throughout the early Hellenistic world.⁶⁶ These activities represent what may be broadly termed "social relations" between cities.⁶⁷ They occurred in a different political sphere from the activities which most concerned the central authorities, the extraction of income and the waging of war. Therefore, an increase in the number of Macedonian cities taking part in such exchanges is not reflective of increased freedom of action for the cities in

⁶⁶ Rutherford, *State Pilgrims* 87–88.

⁶⁷ Giovannini, *Ancient Macedonia* II 465–472, and "Greek Cities and Greek Commonwealth," in A. Bulloch et al. (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1993) 265–286; Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 30–34.

areas which had previously been the sole purview of the central authorities. The central authorities of a kingdom had little to nothing to do with these relationships. Rather, they reflect the development of alternative avenues of expression for the civic energies of these communities in directions which did not bring them into conflict with the interests of the central authorities.

John Ma studied such interactions among Hellenistic *poleis* in the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean when he examined the utility of the concept of “peer polity interaction” for the study of the Hellenistic world.⁶⁸ He argued for a series of interactions which built multiple and overlapping networks of association between groups of *poleis* of roughly equal standing. Hellenistic city-states developed many ways of establishing and maintaining relationships with one another, including interstate arbitration, seeking from other cities judges to settle local court cases, recognising the inviolability (*asylia*) of cities and sanctuaries, expressing ancestral kinship (*syngeneia*), developing proxeny networks, offering material help, and indeed sending and receiving *theoroi* to announce major festivals.⁶⁹ These kinds of interactions developed in the wake of the conquests of Alexander, when the new political realities of the world around them forced cities to look for new ways to interact. As the high politics of war and armies became an increasingly murderous high stakes game, individual cities created networks among themselves which

⁶⁸ J. Ma, “Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age,” *PastPres* 180 (2003) 9–39. Peer polity interaction: C. Renfrew and J. F. Cherry (eds.), *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change* (Cambridge 1986).

⁶⁹ Arbitration: S. L. Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.* (Berkeley 1996). Foreign judges: L. Robert, “Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque,” in E. von Caemmerer (ed.), *Xenion: Festschrift für Pan J. Zepos I* (Athens 1973) 765–782; C. V. Crowther, “Iasos in the Second Century BC III: Foreign Judges from Priene,” *BICS* 40 (1995) 91–138. *Asylia*: K. J. Rigsby, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1996). *Syngeneia*: O. Curtry, *Les Parentés légendaires entre cités grecques* (Geneva 1995); C. P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1999). Proxeny networks: Mack, *Proxeny*. Material help: Giovannini, in *Images and Ideologies* 276–277; Ma, *PastPres* 180 (2003), esp. 9–12.

allowed for the meaningful expression of civic identity and energy without exposing themselves to the dangers of the world of kings and leagues. This is not to say that Hellenistic cities did not raise armies and fight among one another. There is abundant evidence that they did just that.⁷⁰ But like other interactions between cities, it was on a different scale and in a different sphere to the actions of the hegemonic states and kings.

It is in this light that we should interpret the increase in the number of Macedonian cities establishing links with panhellenic sanctuaries in the early Hellenistic period. This increase, instead of necessarily indicating the increasing independence of the Macedonian cities, rather demonstrates their integration into a wider world of Greek urban communities. This world, towards the end of the fourth century and moving into the third, was developing the new networks of interaction discussed above. The Macedonian cities were part of this trend, as shown by the *theorodokoi* lists.⁷¹ Such transactions between cities hon-

⁷⁰ J. Ma, "Fighting *Poleis* of the Hellenistic World," in H. van Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* (London 2000) 337–376.

⁷¹ We can safely take the limited evidence of the *theorodokoi* lists as indicative of a more regular phenomenon, that of regular and meaningful contact between Hellenistic cities mediated by delegations of *theoroi*. Rutherford, *State Pilgrims*, has comprehensively discussed the multiple and overlapping roles of *theoroi* in building relationships between cities. Though he recognises the drawback that a 'network approach' to these relationships can obscure hierarchies between participants in these religious exchanges (9), he rightly throughout sees it as useful to envisage the resultant web of relationships as a network (6–9, 11, 37, 81, 88, esp. 281–303, including the important observation that the participants in particular festival networks could vary significantly over time). On the *theorodokoi* lists Rutherford concludes (87–88) "the system of announcers and *theorodokoi* seems to some extent designed to perpetuate the impression of a wide network of independent city-states, in which each city, great or small, is independently linked to the sanctuary by a symmetrical relationship in which the sending of festival delegates from city to sanctuary reciprocates the earlier journey that the announcer *theoroi* had made in the opposite direction. Increasingly in the age of leagues and kingdoms, the real condition of cities is one of dependence on larger units, but such festival networks seem to create an illusion of an 'imagined com-

oured the communities involved, and formed matrices of trans-Aegean religious and civic interaction. None of this interfered with the chief preoccupations of the king of Macedon, as they had nothing to do with ‘power politics’, so such interactions were free to develop among the cities of Macedonia without prompting royal intervention or concern.

There is a specifically Macedonian set of processes to take into account. Whereas in 360 Perdikkas had been able to represent all Macedonia as an adult king ruling over a small kingdom, the territory ruled by Macedonians was huge upon the death of Alexander in 323. Had the *theoroi* of the Nemean games travelling in Macedonia ca. 323–316 wanted the king to act as *theorodokos* for the entire kingdom, it would have been impossible. The king or kings during this time (Alexander III, Philip III, Alexander IV) were either far to the east, dead, unborn, mentally incapacitated, or an infant, or some combination of the above.⁷² How could the cities of the Macedonian kingdom continue to engage in the cycle of panhellenic festival participation except by the development of a system that allowed some latitude on the part of the cities themselves? Such a state of affairs probably evolved during the reign of Alexander and his long periods of campaigning far from the Greek mainland. The key difference in this model compared to Hatzopou-

— munity’ of small and self-sufficient polities united by their participation in the festival.” Festival announcement was a necessary practicality for regular festivals (71–82): therefore the *theorodokoi* lists do not completely record one-off exchanges but incompletely record regular delegations in both directions. It is probable, as with any epigraphic evidence that has come down to us, that we have available only a small portion of the documentation such delegations produced. While Rutherford is perhaps too sceptical of the real significance of the communities created by such inter-city exchanges, I follow him in considering the *theorodokoi* lists as the evidentiary residue of one way in which cities in the Hellenistic period built relationships with each other. They may therefore be placed alongside the other evidence for inter-city relationships discussed above. In aggregate, this evidence allows us to securely posit multiple networks of inter-city exchanges, though some will doubtless have been weaker or more irregularly activated than others.

⁷² Hammond and Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III 95–144.

los' is a matter of motivation. The increasing participation of the Macedonian cities in the international religious life of the Greek Aegean was not an intended result of Philip II encouraging urban development and civic autonomy.⁷³ Rather, it was an inevitable but unintended result of his expansion of Macedonia and the absenteeism of his immediate successors.

This process must have quickened during the chaotic period of Macedonian history following the death of Kassandros in 297. Rapid changes in leadership, a weakening of the national monarchy as an institution, and the increasing territorial fragmentation of Macedonia proper will all have increased local agency.⁷⁴ But in order for civic life to continue in the cities of Macedonia in this chaotic period, as it evidently did, processes whereby cities could act as local social and institutional foci for the non-military population of Macedonia had to develop.

This was probably not an entirely smooth process. As noted above, the *theorodokoi* list from Nemea and the addenda to the Epidaurian lists seem to show some caution on the part of communities sending *theoroi* when beginning to engage with individual Macedonian cities. They were possibly unsure to what extent any central authority would consider the establishment of these links appropriate. The Delphi 'Great List' attests to the eventual full development of the institution of the *theorodokia* as a means by which Macedonian cities could participate in the international religious life of the Greek *poleis* without presenting a challenge to king and court.

There is an additional consideration to bear in mind with the *theorodokoi* lists. Many of the Macedonian cities which appear at one time or another in the lists were conquered by Philip II, or were only sporadically a part of Macedonia before that.⁷⁵ It is unlikely that any Macedonian king would have intervened to

⁷³ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473–486.

⁷⁴ Hammond and Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III 210–258.

⁷⁵ Hammond and Griffith, *A History of Macedonia* II 203–379; Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*; M. B. Hatzopoulos and P. Paschidis, in *Inventory* 794–809.

prevent conquered cities receiving *theoroi*: delegations of festival announcers moving freely through his area of influence represented no challenge to his authority whatsoever. Over time, there would have been a homogenising effect, with the older cities of the kingdom adopting the same methods of relating to the wider world as the cities of the ‘New Lands’. This could have been a side effect of the drive toward greater administrative uniformity within the Macedonian kingdom noted by Hatzopoulos.⁷⁶ This also makes sense from the perspective of the cities sending *theoroi*. What city would have stopped sending *theoroi* to communities to which they had already sent them, or ceased to seek out new worthy places to send *theoroi*? More invited communities led to more participating delegations, which led to more sacrifices and greater glorification of the sanctuaries’ gods. The extra money derived could be fed into monumental building programmes and sending delegations to even more cities, in a continued effort to outdo other sanctuaries.⁷⁷ The gradually extending appearance of Macedonian cities in the *theorodokoi* lists need not reflect anything more than the increasing activity of *theoroi*. It does not need to reflect the political status of these cities in relation to king and court.

Ultimately the apparent contrast between the mid-fourth century Epidaurian *theorodokoi* list and the increasing visibility of Macedonian cities in later lists does not show an increase in the political autonomy of those cities. Rather, it reflects the changing circumstances of the intervening years. Macedonia had gone from a small, weak kingdom on the edge of an Aegean ringed by independent *poleis*, to a major player in a world now dominated by the power of kings. In the mid-fourth century, the king could act as *theorodokos* for all of Macedonia. But the enlargement of the kingdom necessitated the decentralisation of certain religious relationships so that Macedonian *poleis* could continue to participate in the international religious

⁷⁶ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 129–165.

⁷⁷ Perlman, *City and Sanctuary* 18–34.

life of the Aegean world. This process was part of the development of inter-city relationships which were conducted outside of the world of high politics. Therefore, *theorodokoi* can tell us little about the internal institutional history of the Macedonian kingdom.

If we have to stop using the *theorodokoi* lists in this manner, can other sources tell us about the relationship between city and king in Macedonia in this period? For the final part of this article, I turn to another important group of documents which regularly appears in discussions of this problem: the *asylia* decrees from Kos.

In 242 the city of Kos sent out ambassadors across the Greek world to ask a large number of communities to participate in their festival and to recognise the inviolability of their sanctuary of Asklepios. This effort is known to us from the large archive recording the ambassadors' achievements.⁷⁸ This archive includes decrees of Pella, Kassandria, Amphipolis, and Philippoi.⁷⁹ The decrees of Pella and Amphipolis record motions passed in Gorpiaios, and the Amphipolitan decree dates from the 41st year of Antigonos Gonatas: the embassy from Kos was in Macedonia around August 242. The decrees from Kassandria, Amphipolis, and Philippoi said that they were recognising the inviolability of the Asklepieion in accordance with the wishes of King Antigonos.

These decrees have featured prominently in discussions of Macedonian civic autonomy. Heuss saw them as further evidence of the exercise of significant freedom of action by these cities.⁸⁰ Hatzopoulos took the reference to the king's will to indicate that the Macedonian cities had no say in foreign policy at all, and he was followed by Papazoglou.⁸¹ Underlying these views is the interpretation of a grant of *asylia* as a major de-

⁷⁸ *Asylia* nos. 8–52; *IG XII.4* 208–245.

⁷⁹ *Asylia* nos. 23, 25–27; *IG XII.4* 220–221.

⁸⁰ Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher* 280–282.

⁸¹ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 365–366; Papazoglou, *ζAnt* 50 (2000) 170.

cision of foreign policy. Giovannini, however, saw these as symbolic gestures, without any major significance for the autonomy of the Macedonian cities.⁸² These decrees have therefore been seen as evidence for substantial civic autonomy in Macedonia, as evidence of a lack of autonomy with regard to foreign relations, or as nothing to do with autonomy. They merit reconsideration in light of the new perspective on the *theorodokoi* lists outlined above.

Rigsby has collected and analysed the evidence for *asylia* decrees. He rightly rejects the notion that these grants were genuine attempts to combat inter-state warfare or increased levels of piracy.⁸³ There is no evidence for the deployment of military aid as a result of a recognition of inviolability.⁸⁴ Besides, many communities and individuals recognised the inviolability of sanctuaries and cities which were well beyond either their spheres of interest or the realistic extent of reactive military action. This is particularly true for the cities in Macedonia, where the king retained full control over the kingdom's army. Nor, as Rigsby points out, can any of these grants be interpreted as an attempt to protect sanctuaries because traditional religious scruples had been eroded and temples had become the target of violence.⁸⁵ If this were the case, would those granting or seeking a recognition of *asylia* really expect those committing such violence to respect a new assertion of principles of sacred space?⁸⁶

Instead, Rigsby convincingly argues that these decrees were

⁸² Giovannini, *Ancient Macedonia* II 469.

⁸³ Rigsby, *Asylia* 16–17; contra H. Seyrig, “Notes on Syrian Coins,” *NMM* 119 (1950) 20–21.

⁸⁴ The decrees from Crete recognising Teian inviolability did promise to provide some military aid, but there was no oath and no evidence that this was ever called upon; Rigsby, *Asylia* 16.

⁸⁵ P. Ducrey, *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique*² (Paris 1999) 308–309.

⁸⁶ P. Gauthier, *Symbola: Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques* (Nancy 1972) 228–229; Rigsby, *Asylia* 15–17.

designed to bestow honour upon the city or sanctuary being granted the inviolability.⁸⁷ As two of the inscriptions granting *asylia* to the Asklepieion at Kos recognise, the embassies from Kos were asking for nothing more than a stated recognition of a principle that had long been recognised.⁸⁸ Reiterating a commonly accepted state of affairs represented no inconvenience for the city recognising inviolability. Even in those cases where the gesture was extended to a city, the lack of any expectation of concrete aid imposed no burdens upon the grantor. A public declaration of piety via a recognition of *asylia* could do no harm. As for the community or sanctuary that had its inviolability recognised, the resources expended were more than justified by extending and publicly displaying the extent of their network of contacts throughout the Greek world.

The *asylia* decrees from the Macedonian cities should therefore be seen as another kind of inter-city exchange. These were symbolic, honourific exchanges which allowed for the expression of civic agency without treading on the toes of the kings. Therefore, as Giovannini recognised, they cannot directly tell us about the political autonomy of the Macedonian cities. It is worth noting, however, that the exchanges represented by the *asylia* decrees are different in kind from those represented by the *theorodokoi* lists. *Theorodokoi* lists are the surviving evidence for regular delegations of *theoroi* in both directions between inviting and invited cities. *Asylia* decrees are the surviving evidence for one-off delegations. However, the effort made to undertake and display the results of these delegations makes clear the importance attached to displaying an extensive diplomatic reach by the communities that sought recognition of *asylia*. The resultant large archives of responses, as well as adding honour to the god and the city, represented an imagined network of contacts more permanent and wide-reaching than the actual relationships produced by delegations seeking recognitions of *asylia*.

⁸⁷ Rigsby, *Asylia* 22–29.

⁸⁸ *Asylia* nos. 18, 23.

The fact that kings also recognised *asylia* inevitably led to interaction between cities recognising inviolability and the kings under whose sway those cities fell.⁸⁹ We have such interaction in the *asylia* decrees for Kos from Macedonia. These decrees show how, at least in a context where royal interests were not materially affected, the relationship between king and city in Macedonia could be portrayed as cooperative and harmonious.

The decrees from Kassandreia, Amphipolis, and Philippi all state that, in recognising the inviolability of the Asklepieion, the enacting bodies are acting in accordance with the previously established wishes of King Antigonos. The decree from Pella, on the other hand, does not. The Pella decree does recognise “inviolability for the temple as for other temples” (ὑπάρχειν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν τῷ ἱερῷ καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἱεροῖς, 12–13). Giovannini and Hatzopoulos suggest that this refers to an existing central regulation recognising the inviolability of all sanctuaries.⁹⁰ It is possible that such a regulation could exist, but there is nothing in the wording of the Pella decree to suggest it. “As for other temples” would be a peculiarly vague way to refer to a specific edict from the central authorities. The lack of reference to royal wishes must still be accounted for. Papazoglou suggested that Pella, as the royal capital, necessarily complied with royal wishes, implying that a further reference to the royal will was therefore unnecessary.⁹¹ This requires us to believe, however, that a civic decree which makes no mention at all of the king in fact conceals a situation of complete royal control. I am not convinced that this is a good solution.

Rigsby’s suggestion is the most probable: the *theoroi* had also requested that Antigonos recognise the *asylia* of the Asklepieion, but they had not yet obtained his answer by the time Pella gave its response.⁹² The decrees in response to the

⁸⁹ Kings recognising *asylia*: *Asylia* nos. 7–13, 68–72, 135, 164, 185.

⁹⁰ Giovannini, *Ancient Macedonia* II 469, specifying a royal regulation; Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 365.

⁹¹ Papazoglou, *ζAnt* 50 (2000) 170.

⁹² Rigsby, *Asylia* 134–135.

different embassies of the Koans were not always recorded in strict cartographic order. But the arrangement Kassandria – Amphipolis – Philippi on the stele with these three decrees is a sensible itinerary for a delegation travelling west to east across the kingdom. The logical place for Pella in this sequence is before Kassandria. Antigonos may well not have been present in the royal capital at the time. Aratos' capture of Korinth in 243, and the resultant diplomatic realignments between Macedonia, the Aitolian League, and Epeiros, provide plenty of scope for Antigonos' absence from Pella.⁹³ The fact that the Koans were present in Pella sometime during Gorpaios and then in Amphipolis by the 19th day of that month attests to the speed with which the embassy moved through Macedonia. They may well have been unwilling to wait for Antigonos' decision before making their request of Pella and moving on.

The decree at Pella says that “it was resolved by the city” that the inviolability of the Asklepieion be recognised. This was a decision of a civic deliberative body.⁹⁴ The fact that the city felt able to recognise this inviolability without knowing the king's thoughts shows that this was an action within the city's capabilities. This was, after all, just a reiteration of a status quo, one which the citizens of Pella were happy enough to make but which they perhaps saw as redundant. Rigsby interprets the reference to inviolability for other temples as an expression of surprise: of course the Asklepieion is inviolable, for all temples are.⁹⁵ This was not regarded as controversial in any way.

The Pella decree therefore makes it clear that a Macedonian city could at this time recognise *asylia* independently. It is reasonable to assume that the citizen bodies of Kassandria, Amphipolis, and Philippi likewise could have decided to

⁹³ Hammond and Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III 308–312.

⁹⁴ Papazoglou, *Ancient Macedonia* III 204; Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 139–141; contra H. Bengston, “Randbemerkungen zu den koischen Asylurkunden,” *Historia* 3 (1955) 456–463.

⁹⁵ Rigsby, *Asylia* 135.

recognise the inviolability of the Asklepieion independently. The fact that the decision accorded with the wishes of the king, as recognised in the decrees, does not detract from the cities' ability to make this decision independently. The language of the inscriptions makes it clear in each case that this is a decision made by the community.⁹⁶ Nor does the reference to the decision of the king imply that the cities were making this decision on royal orders. At both Amphipolis and Philippi, the recognition of inviolability by the city is simply equated to the previous decision of the king, *καθάπερ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος προαιρεῖται*.⁹⁷ At Kassandreia, the language is similar, *κατὰ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως βούλησιν*.⁹⁸ These cities may have been ordered by the king to recognise the inviolability of the Koan Asklepieion. If Rigsby is correct in the attribution to Antigonos Gonatas of an anonymous royal response to Kos, then Gonatas did undertake to instruct his subjects to recognise the inviolability.⁹⁹ We know that other kings ordered or promised to order their subject cities to recognise *asylia* or grant other requests made by cities and sanctuaries, such as Seleukos II with Smyrna, or Attalos I and Antiochos III with Magnesia.¹⁰⁰ But the possibility of a royal order does not detract from the ability of the Macedonian cities to make this decision independently, and in none of the recorded royal recognitions of *asylia* did the kings simply answer for their cities. In the decrees from Kassandreia, Amphipolis, and Philippi, their recognition of Koan *asylia* is not represented as a response to royal orders, but as a civic decision which accorded with the king's wishes. It is worth stressing that this is not a minor difference: the devil is in the details when it comes to the careful diplomatic manoeuvring

⁹⁶ *Asylia* nos. 23.9 ἔδοξε τῆι πόλει (Pella), 25.8 δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι (Kassandreia), 26.10 δεδόχθαι τῆι πόλει (Amphipolis), 27.9 δεδόχθαι τῆι ἐκκλησίαι (Philippi).

⁹⁷ *Asylia* nos. 26.14, 27.14–15.

⁹⁸ *Asylia* no. 25.10.

⁹⁹ *Asylia* no. 10.

¹⁰⁰ *Asylia* nos. 7, 68, 69.

that made up the day-to-day relationships between the constituent elements of a Hellenistic kingdom. The fact that these cities portrayed this independence of action implies that this was not an area they thought likely to bring them into conflict with the king.

Why do the decrees from Kassandreia, Amphipolis, and Philippi make mention of the king's decision at all? Perhaps the Koan embassy cited the response of Antigonos at these three cities and asked that it be included in the decree. The repetition of the king's recognition of inviolability, in multiple inscriptions to be displayed in Kos, would have highlighted the goodwill of this powerful individual and emphasised the honour thereby gained for the Asklepieion.

But what is the significance of the reference to the king's decision for the city-king relationship? One must consider the benefit to both the Macedonian cities and to Antigonos in portraying their decisions in this way. The structural stability of a Hellenistic kingdom depended upon the establishment of good relationships between the central authorities (king and court) and local communities. Such relationships were performative and constantly renegotiated.¹⁰¹ The unity of policy between king and city expressed in these recognitions of inviolability represents one example of how this process could work. The cities were able to pass decrees on this matter and thereby present themselves as independently operating political entities possessing agency and identity. Upon the declaration of a central royal response to the Koan embassy, the inclusion of a nod to the royal position in subsequent civic decrees referenced and enhanced the authority of the king. But it also displayed that authority as operating sympathetically with regard to the cities of the kingdom. King and city were shown to agree, and the king's decision in this matter was shown to not be binding upon the cities. All of this was done in a diplomatic context in which

¹⁰¹ For this at work in the Seleukid kingdom see Ma, *Antiochus III* 179–242.

material commitment between the Koans, the cities of Macedonia, and King Antigonos could not occur. This made it the perfect arena for such an expression of unity since matters of material, financial, or military weight were not at issue. It was through such presentations of decision-making in the Macedonian kingdom that the compact between king and city could be expressed and renegotiated by both parties. The *asylia* decrees are evidence not for confrontation or control, but for one way in which the relationship between king and city could be defined and portrayed as a partnership.¹⁰²

¹⁰² I have here restricted myself to discussing the *asylia* decrees for Kos, since they originate in cities within Macedonia proper. Other circumstances may have prevailed for cities outside Macedonia under the subjection of the Macedonian king. That said, the *asylia* decrees for Chalcis and Eretria (*Asylia* nos. 97 and 98) in response to Magnesia's request in 208 show strong commonalities with the decrees for Kos. These two communities were under Macedonian rule. The decree of Chalcis first summarises a letter from Philip V saying the Chalcidians would do well to receive the delegation from Magnesia favourably, as he had previously done. The Chalcidians then do so. As Rigsby notes, the deference to the king's wishes is more explicit here than in the decrees for Kos. Perhaps Philip's regular use of Chalcis as a major military base made it especially politic for the Chalcidians to put accordance with the king's recommendations front and centre. But I disagree with Rigsby on the strength of the contrast. Philip's recommendation is not couched as a direct order, and the decision to recognise *asylia* is a decision of the civic body. The Chalcidians make clear they are agreeing with the king, but in their own right, and republicalise the king's decision to the benefit of all parties. The decree of Eretria makes no mention of the king's wishes at all: Rigsby suggests, as with Pella, we are dealing with a lack of knowledge of the king's wishes. Knoepfler, *Décrets* 359–365, rejects Rigsby's explanation and sees here a genuine difference in status between Chalcis and Eretria, with Eretria being independent of the king. But as we have discussed here *asylia* decrees are not good evidence for the political status of cities. Whatever the precise status of either Euboian city, in both decrees the same basic dynamic is at work as in the decrees for Kos. These were decisions cities could make on their own, though there could be benefits to showing that the decisions of king and city matched. There is no reason cities outside of Macedonia but under its control should be less concerned than cities within Macedonia itself to portray their relationship with the king as harmonious.

In the world of the Hellenistic kingdoms, the *poleis* of the Aegean world developed networks of peer interaction which did not infringe upon the political and military preoccupations of the kings. Religious exchanges, of the kind represented by *theorodokoi* lists and *asylia* decrees, were the perfect arena for such activity. Macedonian cities participated in such networks, as shown by the increasing number of cities in Macedonia developing ties with foreign cities and sanctuaries from the latter part of the fourth century. They were an important way in which Macedonian cities came to represent themselves more and more as equal peers of cities outside of the kingdom. Macedonia should in future be included in considerations of networks of interaction in the Hellenistic Aegean which were not dictated by the political boundaries of the large confederated or monarchic states.

This view means largely abandoning the *theorodokoi* lists and *asylia* decrees as evidence for the question of Macedonian civic autonomy. Given that inter-city relationships took place outside of the world of kings, there was no question of their existence representing greater political freedom from the central authorities. They simply represented no challenge to the king's authority within his kingdom. More evidence may emerge to shed light on the extent of local self-government in Classical and Hellenistic Macedonia. The most we can say now is that the Macedonian cities developed the capacity for independent action in certain kinds of honourific and symbolic exchanges with other *poleis*. The *asylia* decrees also show that such exchanges, where appropriate, could be used to express the unity of the Macedonian kingdom by representing the relationship between city and king as cooperative. This does not amount to a strong case for local political self-government in Macedonia.

This model for the relationship between king and city might conceal the potential for conflict. The *asylia* decrees show that this relationship could be presented as harmonious in the mid-third century, but tracing precisely how this balance was reached is beyond our current abilities. However, much of the credit for establishing or re-establishing this cooperative tone

must surely go to Antigonos Gonatas. The reconstitution of the Macedonian monarchy as the strong central national authority after the chaos of the Gallic invasions must have included the establishment of the non-confrontational balance between king and city which we see fully developed later in the century. It may have been a return to a status quo established by the Antipatrid dynasty before the territorial fragmentation of Macedonia. It nevertheless remains noteworthy that Antigonos and his successors could establish such a relationship with the cities of their kingdom after the years of chaos. In a study of the reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II, Lane Fox, in commenting on the foundation of Antigoneia the Sandy, remarked that “Cassandreia’s incorporation and this nearby foundation were Antigonos’ main contributions to the structure of the Macedonian kingdom.”¹⁰³ Perhaps we may also add the successful encouragement of a more collaborative compact between king and city.¹⁰⁴

February, 2016

Darwin College, Cambridge
bdr25@cam.ac.uk

¹⁰³ R. Lane Fox, “‘Glorious Servitude...’: The Reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II,” in *Brill’s Companion* 495–519, at 502.

¹⁰⁴ I would like to thank Aneurin Ellis-Evans, Peter Thonemann, Selene Psoma, Robin Lane Fox, Matt Hosty, Kent Rigsby, and the reviewers for *GRBS* for their very helpful comments on this material: it has been greatly improved by their critique and suggestions. All remaining errors are my own.