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

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

2 On the systematic character of the subdivision of the Macedonian state into civic units (at least by the third century), see already F. Papazoglou, « Sur l’organisation de la Macédoine sous les Antigonides », Ancient Macedonia III (Thessaloniki 1983) 195-210, esp. 205-10.
The last point inevitably brings us to the hotly debated function of the epistates. I cannot repeat here Hatzopoulos’ long analysis or recent attempts to contest it\(^1\). I believe, however, that three key features of the office are hard to refute: 1) Epistatai were annual officials\(^4\) who existed in all Macedonian cities; 2) they were, as far as we can tell, of local origin\(^3\); 3) although they were the official liaison between city and king, they headed local institutions as well. These features allow us to consider the epistatai as civic magistrates, in the sense that they were officially part of the city and a product of local political dynamics, whether they were appointed by the city or the king or both\(^5\). In any case, the internal logic of Macedonian politics (on which see below) assured that persons who were favourable to the king would eventually be chosen, even if there was no formal intervention by the court.

The term court elite in Macedonia can only denote groups of persons «around the king»\(^7\), his chief advisors and/or those who occupy the highest echelons of hierarchy in the government and the army and have a major role in daily administrative work, whether their position is institutionally sanctioned or not. The court elite should not be equated with the sum total of central government officials or with the Macedonian nobility in general\(^6\). Inevitably, therefore, we need to focus our attention on the king’s Companions, the έταῖροι of the Temenids and the φιλοί of the Antigonids.

This institution has been exhaustively analysed\(^9\) and I wish only to draw attention to


\(^2\) Errington 2002 dedicates the greater part of his article to an attempt to prove that epistatai never figure as eponymous alone in public documents, hence their office cannot be annual; he does not, however, take into account one of the earliest such functions of the epistatai, a dedication from Beroia dating from the 4\(^{th}\) century (ΕKM I 29).

\(^3\) To the evidence adduced by Hatzopoulos 1996, I 381-82 one can now add the cases of Agasikles from Dion (SEG 48 [1998] 783; cf. BullÉpigr 2000, 453.2) and, perhaps, Plesist from Gazoros and Alketas from Morrylos, if they are indeed epistatai, as I claim towards the end of this paper.

\(^4\) The traditional view that epistatai were appointed by the king rests primarily on the authority of Polybios (see, e.g., 4.76.2; 5.26.5; 20.5.12; 23.10.8; cf. Livy 34.48.2), an author, however, who apparently knew little about Macedonian institutions (see below, n. 26). For possible evidence that epistatai were, in fact, elected, see again below, towards the end of this paper.

\(^5\) The idea of proximity (in all senses of the word) to the king is conveyed by terms such as οἱ ποιεῖν αὐτόν or άμφοτερον (references in Kallér 1954, 176, n. 3), which are not always used literally. Significantly, the phrase οἱ ποιεῖν αὐτόν έταίροι, which is standard in Arrian, carries distinct Homeric connotations (Il. 2.417; 8.537; 19.5; 24.123; Od. 11.520; cf. G. Plaumann, „Έταίροι“, RE VIII 2 (1913) 1374-80, esp. 1375; Berve 1926, I 30).

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

three of its main aspects. The first is precisely the fact that it was an institution and not merely an informal collective name. Theopompos knows the number of Philip II’s hetairoi (ca. 800) in the later part of his reign\textsuperscript{10}, and we know they wore specific insignia of their status\textsuperscript{11}, and probably married and were buried separately\textsuperscript{12}. A second important aspect is that they were personally chosen by the king, if we judge from the fact that a significant number of them were not Macedonians, already in the reign of Philip II and throughout the later history of the kingdom\textsuperscript{13}. The third aspect, intricately connected with the previous one, is that the Companions drew power, money, land and, most importantly, legitimacy from their personal relationship with the king. Hammond aptly remarked that their very name is indicative: the Companions are neither « elders » nor « councilors »\textsuperscript{14}; in other words they do not represent a tribal, hereditary nobility, nor do they emanate in a regular, institutionalised way from representational organs of the Macedonian nation. Naturally, many of them had probably already followed a more or less standard \textit{cursus} in the king’s service up to the age of 30: the offspring of Macedonian nobility served as Royal Pages\textsuperscript{15} and were
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\textsuperscript{10} Theop., \textit{FGHist} 115 F 223b.
\textsuperscript{11} For the purple \textit{χλαμύς} of the Companions as a gift of the king, see Ath., \textit{Deipn.} 12.539f-540a; Curt. 5.2.18-19; Dio. 17.77.5; Just. 12.3.8. The purple \textit{καυσία} and \textit{χλαμύς} are termed \textit{δωρέα βασιλικωτάτη παρὰ Μακεδόνος} by Plutarch (\textit{Eum}. 8.12). The connection with the Companions is not explicit (although the phrase used immediately before is indicative: \textit{τιμᾶ... λαμβανόντες ἀς οἱ φίλοι παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων}); however, the fact that the plain \textit{καυσία} was worn by Royal Pages and army officers (see Chr. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, « Aspects of Ancient Macedonian Costume », \textit{JHS} 113 [1993] 122-47, esp. 137-40) implies that the purple \textit{καυσία} was awarded to a higher stratum of Macedonian nobility, immediately below the king, who wore a \textit{καυσία} with a diadem (\textit{ibid.}, 138). On the \textit{purpurati} of the Latin sources for the later Antigonid period, see below, n. 22.
\textsuperscript{12} Marriage: Plut., \textit{Alex.} 70.3; burial: Plut., \textit{Eum.} 9.5. These privileges are attested for Alexander’s \textit{hetairoi} and for army officers respectively, hence for groups wider that the king’s Companions; we can safely assume, however, that, originally, these were privileges of the Companions (cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, I 336, n. 6).
\textsuperscript{13} Theop., \textit{FGHist} 115 F 224; cf. \textit{Isoc.} 5.19. Griffith 1979, 375, n. 1 counts roughly 30% non-Macedonian \textit{hetairoi} in the reign of Philip and estimates their actual proportion at 20%. Le Bohec 1985, 116-17 (cf. Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 234, n. 65) counts 7 non-Macedonians on a total of 20 Antigonid \textit{philoi}, i.e. 35%; given the great gaps in our knowledge of 3\textsuperscript{rd} century Macedonia, one can safely say that the analogy of foreigners among Friends did not change much in Late Classical and Hellenistic Macedonia.
\textsuperscript{14} Hammond 1979, 159.
then included in the king’s guard, members of which were chosen according to their physical abilities among the wealthy families of the kingdom, as the new regulation of army service from the reign of Philip V reveals. However, the fact that the majority of members of the court elite may have already belonged to the court does not decrease the importance of the king’s right to choose between them or to add newcomers to the list. The Companions and Friends of the king – the ruling class of Macedonia, to use Griffith’s terms, those who were given the highest military, administrative, diplomatic and advisory duties in the kingdom, were, in institutional theory, a free personal choice of the king.

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

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

---

17 Griffith 1979, 403.
18 Hatzopoulos 1996, 330-337 (where one can find the earlier bibliography) believes that membership of the king’s Council, which undoubtedly represented the highest stratum of the court elite, was more or less standardised and permanent. In conformity with the communis opinio I disagree; however, the subject of the Macedonian Council(s) is too vast to be treated here and I can only defer discussion to a detailed analysis elsewhere.
19 On the seven σωματοφύλακες, see Heckel 1992, 257-59 with earlier literature.
20 See, e.g., Arr., Anab. 5.28.5; Diod. 17.16.1; 18.2.4; Curt. 6.6.11; 6.11.39; 9.6.4; 10.6.1.
21 Mooren 1977, 17 (Ptolemies); Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 265-74 (Seleucids).
22 Le Bohec 1985, 118-19. The passage of Livy is 45.32.4, on which see Le Bohec 1985, 96-98. Purpuratus does not seem to be a literal translation, since Livy tends to use the term for any courtier of any king (cf. J. Briscoe, A Commentary on Livy. Books XXXI-XXXIII [Oxford 1973] 139-40); the juxtaposition of purpurati and amici, however, shows that he probably found two different terms on the relevant Polybian passage.
23 Polyb. 23.1.5: ... τοὺς τότε δοκοῦντας εἶναι πρῶτους φίλους τοῦ βασιλέως.
always tested against the political realities of any given situation then, as it remains to be tested against the available evidence today.

If, for example, the prosopographical link between civic elites and the court appears slim, this would allow us to conclude that the court led, so to speak, a life of its own, organised exclusively upon personal relations with the king. It would also allow us to conclude that local civic structures did not carry much weight, that they were created by the Machiavellian wisdom of the kings as arenas of not-so-high status for the not-so-prominent Macedonians. If, on the contrary, we can often identify members of local political elites with members of the court, this would mean that local civic structures (and the question of who would dominate them) did matter, both to local societies and to the kings, and that these civic institutions were not merely in theory a component of the state, but were smoothly and organically embedded in its overall power structure. It would also mean that the king, although in theory without significant institutional restraints to his powers of decision, had in practice to take under consideration the strength of these local structures and their representatives; that he was forced, if I may stretch the meaning of a well-known phrase of Kallisthenes, to rule οὐδὲ βίᾳ ἀλλὰ νόµῳ 25.

Before I proceed to the prosopographical evidence, I need to make a preliminary remark. First of all, since inscriptions and literary sources unfortunately do not include footnotes with cross-references, any identification of ancient individuals attested in both kinds of sources is inherently uncertain. A Nikanor (without a patronymic) attested as a city official in an epigraphic text need not be the court official Nikanor (without patronymic or ethnic) mentioned in a literary source for the same period; he may well be, but it would be imprudent to assert this in the absence of supporting evidence. Some peculiarities of the sources for Classical and Hellenistic Macedonia make our task even more difficult. The onomastic habits of Macedonian society, with its pronounced aristocratic nature, lead to repeated occurrences of some names within the leading families of the cities and the kingdom, precisely the target group of our investigation, thus making possible identifications less certain. More importantly, our sources are very unevenly concentrated. Prosopographical evidence about Macedonian cities comes almost exclusively from inscriptions, whose number becomes significant only for the reign of the last two Antigonids. Conversely, prosopographical evidence about the Macedonian court comes almost exclusively from literary sources. For the reigns of Philip and Perseus, the only epigraphically rich period, our information comes mainly from Polybios, who has no first-hand knowledge of (nor sympathy for) Macedonian institutions 26. These problems taken into account, the attestations of interpenetration

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

26 It is often asserted (see, e.g., Walbank 1957, 33-34 and id., Polybius [Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1972] 75 ; Pédech 1964, 360-64) that Polybios drew information on Macedonia by Macedonian exiles in Rome; in fact he says so himself in one particular instance (29.8.10). However, even in that instance his resulting judgement on Perseus is clearly hostile, as it is hostile – in fact, malevolent – on practically all aspects of the character, skills
between civic elites and court elite can be safely assumed to be a mere fraction of actual cases. I would even go so far as to suggest that precisely the fact that some identifications seem possible and probable is a positive indication of how widespread the phenomenon must have been in reality.

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

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

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

28 The only relevant piece of evidence is the army regulation of Philip V, which stipulates that neither the epistatai nor officers of the central army command have a right to enroll someone in a city’s body of citizens, i.e. in its polis, without a written authorization by the king (SEG 49 [1999] 855 A, L. 22-26). The assumption that ultimate authority on naturalization lay with the king is also based on analogy with the award of proxeny, which probably lay within the jurisdiction of the king and, perhaps, the Assembly (Hatzopoulos 1996, 1 367-69 and 2003, 136) and the award of asylia, for which Macedonian cities were obliged to follow – or felt it safer to mention – the king’s wish (see Hatzopoulos 1996, 1 365-67; II n° 36, 41, 47, 58 and Rigsby 1996, n° 23-27, with the texts and bibliography on the often studied decrees for the asylia of the sanctuary of Asklepios at Kos).

29 Oddly, even Hammond 1979, 647-48 acknowledged this, although it is not in accordance with his theory of a specific Macedonian citizenship as a privilege of the political elite – a theory now rightfully abandoned (see Hatzopoulos 1996, 1 167-68 and BullEpigr 2000, 440 with bibliography). Incidentally, this means that even if all grantees of individual Macedonian citizenship received it from the king, some sort of formal acknowledgement
Some of the grantees may never have left the court and probably followed the vicissitudes of Hellenistic high politics; this seems to be the case of Alexander’s admiral Nearchos of Crete30, or of Erigyios and Laomedon of Mytilene31, all three citizens of Amphipolis. We should not, however, forget that for these prominent ‘new’ Macedonians there was always the possibility of ‘retiring’ in the city and playing a part in local politics; this may have actually happened in the case of Kallimedon, the Athenian pro-macedonian politician who received at least the rights of enktesis and epigamia in Beroia32, and whose family line we can perhaps follow in Hellenistic Beroia, as Tataki has cautiously suggested33.

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

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

32 According to a dubious source (Aischines, Ep. 12.8), Hegemon (PAA 480795; LGPN II s.v. Ηγήµων n° 4) and Kallimedon (PAA 558185; LGPN II s.v. Καλλιµέδων n° 7) received donations at and with from Pella and Beroia respectively by Philip II. It is not clear whether they simply received the rights of enktesis and epigamia or the citizenship of the respective cities as well.
35 See Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 20 and 22 with M. B. Hatzopoulos, Une donation du roi lysimaque («Méletrimata» 5; Athens 1988) 48–49; 53-54 and 1996, I 205 and 435. I must point out that in neither donation is it explicitly attested that either of the recipients had become, are, or will become citizens of Kassandreia or that their lands belong to the civic territory; this is merely deduced by the fact that the inscriptions were erected in Kassandreia and dated by a local priest. In any case, Kassandreia—a new creation with a vast chor ally precisely in the area where the majority of estates donated by the kings to individuals were located—was hardly a typical case.
36 Lillon 33 (Welles, RC 10–13).
other two sides. Therefore, even if the procedure existed in Macedonia and was instigated by the kings – both assumptions remain uncertain –, it is hardly necessary to assume that the kings consciously used it as a tool of implantation of civic leaders.

In other cases where the attestation of the individual at court precedes his attestation in civic institutions, we have, again, no reason to suspect a conscious royal initiative for his involvement with local politics. Aphthonetos, for example, a Royal Page of Philip II, may well be Αφθόνητος Πιθοδώρου ἐξ Ἀλλάντης, theorodokos for the Nemean games in 321-317; however, the fact that he is first attested at court does not mean that his prominence in Allante was due to his affiliation with the king. As a Royal Page, he was a son of a πρῶτος τῶν Μακεδόνων, hence undoubtedly belonged to one of the leading families of Allante anyway.

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

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

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

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

40 SEG 35 (1988) 662 ; Gérard Lucas kindly informed me with information on its date. —[—]inos son of Bouplagos, mentioned in a dedication from the same city which dates from the first half of the 3rd century (ArchÉph [1924] 149 n. 392), could be a descendant. The only bearer of the extremely rare name Bouplagos outside Python that I know of is also a Macedonian attested in Thessaly : Bouplagos son of Menneias, attested in Phthiotic Thebes (IG IX 2, 174).

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

42 On certain and probable members of the Elimeian royal house bearing this name, see Tataki 1998, 194-95, n. 5-8. Outside Elimeia, the name is relatively rare in Macedonia (Beroia : EKM I 142, 1st cent. BC. – 1st cent. AD ; Olynthos : SEG 38 (1986) 641, soon after 348 ; Amphipolis : SEG 41 (1991) 564, probably during the reign of Alexander); another Macedonian bearing that name (TAM V 2, 1190) is of unknown origin.
person bearing this illustrious name is a Derdas in the army of Alexander, friend of the king and diplomat. He may be no other than Derdas of Python who returned to his homeland and died there soon after the expedition. Even if we accept this tentative identification, however, it is not necessary to assume that the family owes its status to Alexander’s veteran and his return home; if the family had any relation to the old Elimeian royal house, the position of Derdas at court was the result and not the cause of the family’s prestige.

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

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

The archetypical example of the ‘upward’ movement from city to court is the well-known family of Harpaloi from Beroia. Harpalos (I, perhaps son of a Polemaios), was epistates of Beroia in 248; his son Polemaios (II) is named first in the catalogue of Beroian officers in

44 Curt. 7.6.12; 8.1.7.
45 Berve 1926, II 131 n° 250 had already suggested that the diplomat Derdas belonged to the Elimeian royal family and his assumption is tacitly accepted by Tataki 1998, 195 n° 9, who lists him under Elimeia.
48 J. R. Ellis, « The Unification of Macedonia » in: M. B. Hatzopoulos, L. D. Loukopoulou (eds), Philip of Macedon (Athens 1980) 36-46, is still a clear and insightful narrative of this process; for the prosopographical evidence and further literature, see the references in Tataki 1998, 193-214.
49 In Alexander’s army, infantry contingents from Upper Macedonian districts were sometimes commanded by officers originating from these districts (for the evidence and bibliography, see Tataki 1998, 213 n° 6 [Polyperchon from Tymphaia]; 196 n° 13 [Koinos from Elimeia]; 206-7 n° 12 and 204 n° 2 [Perdikkas and Alketas from Orestis]). This certainly testifies to the respect they were expected to command from their countrymen, but it would be rash to generalise since this was not a firm rule even in Alexander’s army (cf. Berve 1926, 114-15; Griffith 1979, 427).
50 Only one public document emanating from a civic entity of pre-Roman Upper Macedonia has survived, in a lamentable state of preservation (Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 63, from early Hellenistic Tymphaia).
51 EKM 13.
223; his grandson Harpalos (II) son of Polemaios (II) was *hieromnemon* of Perseus at Delphi in 1783 and ambassador of the king to Rome in 1724. We can follow the family line even after the Roman conquest, when Harpalos (III, perhaps son of a Polemaios III) is honoured by the city, towards the end of the 2nd century55. In the decree in his honour, family pride is evident in the cautious but very conscious reference to the honourand’s ancestors, their sense of civic duty and their high position in the army, in other words their belonging to the elite of the city and to the elite of the kingdom56.

The reason I termed the example of the Harpaloi archetypical is because Polemaios (II) embodies the crucial link in the progression from civic elite to the court: the army. One cannot overemphasize the importance of war and army duty in all levels of political life in Macedonia. The army reforms of Philip II and Alexander III57 multiplied the number of Macedonians who gained money and status from their participation in war, strengthened both the civic and the national identities and thus created the fertile ground from which the possibility for political action grew, for a segment of Macedonian society significantly larger than the few hundred nobles of the archaic past58. The king fought and lived among his countrymen during the almost incessant campaigns which he led and this presented singular opportunities for the most able of the Macedonians. If the king at war was in a position to admire the skills of an enemy officer like Philopoimen, to the point of asking him to join him59, one can expect that promotion κατ’ ἀρετὴν 60 was not uncommon in the

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

53 *Syll.* 636.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Harpaloi were not the only family from Beroia represented both in local institutions and – later – at the court of Philip V and Perseus. Pantau[chos] (I) son of [Balak]ros (I) was the eponymous priest of Beroia some year during the second half of the 3rd century62; his grandson Pantauchos (II) son of Balakros (II) was one of the πρῶτοι φίλοι of Perseus and one of the most influential figures in the last years of the kingdom63; Balakros (III), son of Pantauchos (II), was sent to Genthios of Illyria as a hostage in 16864. Antanor son of Neoptolemos, one of the Delphic theorodokoi at Beroia in the 210’s could be identified or (more probably) related to Antenor, envoy of Perseus66. This Antenor collaborated in 168 with a certain Kallippos67, who may well be Kallippos son of Hippostratos, politarch of Beroia in the reign of Perseus68; the father and uncle of the politarch are included in the catalogue of Beroian officers of Antigonos Doson69. Meidon son of Me[idon], a Beroian officer in 223 is probably the father of Midon (as his name is attested in the literary sources), another First Friend of Perseus70. These cases, to which one could add some less probable ones, attest to the surprisingly high representation of Beroians in the Late Antigonid court. This has been attributed, probably correctly, to the possible family connection of the Antigonids with

62 EKM I 16. Tataki (1988, n° 1011 and p. 423 ; 1998, 395 n° 6 ; 1999, 1116-17) tentatively identifies Pantauchos (I) as a grandson of the general of Demetrios Poliorctetes who bore the same name (Plut., Demetr. 41 and Pyrrh. 7). This is certainly possible, but the name figures among the Hellenistic elites of other cities of the kingdom as well (Aloros : Arr., Ind. 18.6 ; Thessalonike : IG X 2, 1, 2), thus decreasing the credibility of the identification.
63 Polyb. 27.8.5-6 ; 29.3.3-5, 4.1 ; Livy 42.39.7 ; 44.23.2-4, 27.9-11, 30.14, 35.2, 45.2 and 7.
64 Polyb. 29.4.6.
66 Polyb. 27.4.3-4 and 10, 14.1 ; Livy 44.28.1, 8 and 15, 29.3 ; 45.10.1, 31.14 ; cf. Tataki 1988, 70-71 and 422 ; 1998, 75 n° 10. Another Antenor (son of Sosimenes) of Beroia in 223 (EKM I 4, L. 12-13).
67 Livy 44.28.1 : Callippus.
68 EKM I 1, L. 5. On the possibility of identification, see Hatzopoulos 1996, I 138. The fact that the envoy of Perseus is a praefectus classis poses no problem, since it does not imply that Beroia had to procure a naval contingent; whatever the original Greek term was, a praefectus classis was obviously a high officer, personally chosen by the king irrespectively of the regional origin of the contingent. The common name Kallippos is rather rare in Macedonia (SEG 24 [1969] 583 [Amphipolis, probably shortly before the Macedonian conquest] ; IG X 2, 2, 324 [Derriopos, 50/1 A.D.]).
69 EKM I 4, L. 11-12. Hippostratos and Timokles, sons of Kallippos, recorded second and third in the catalogue of officers of the first speira, were probably tetrarchai alongside Polemaicos son of Harpalos (cf. above, n. 52).
70 EKM I 14, L. 24.
71 Polyb. 27.8.5 ; 29.15.2 ; Plut., Aem. 16.2 ; Livy 42.58.7 ; 44.32.9, 45.2 and 7 (cf. Tataki 1998, 80 n° 37).
72 It would be tempting, for example, to link Glaucias (no ethnic), bodyguard and envoy of Perseus (Polyb. 28.8.9 ; Livy 43.20.3) along with Adaios from Beroia (Polyb. 28.8 ; Livy 43.19.13, cf. 43.20.2-4), to another important Beroian family, counting among its members three sons of a Glaucias, all of them eponymous priests of the third quarter of the 3rd century (EKM I 16 ; 45 ; 46), and Glaucias son of Eubiotos, officer in the catalogue of 223 (EKM I 4, L. 25) ; the name Glaucias, however, is very common in Macedonia.
Beroia\(^{73}\). However, the reason we can identify most of these Beroian Friends of Philip V and Perseus with local officials is precisely that Beroia is the only city of the kingdom from which we have sufficient Hellenistic epigraphic material to compare against the literary sources.

To understand this \textit{a contrario} one can compare the cases of the two other major cities of Late Antigonid Macedonia, Pella and Thessalonike. There are only three inscriptions mentioning city officials or \textit{theorodokoi} from Hellenistic Pella. The Delphic \textit{theorodokoi} of the 210's (Apollonides, Diphilos and Chares)\(^{74}\) should be termed as ‘otherwise unattested’, although the names Apollonides and Diphilos are attested among leading Macedonians of the late fourth century\(^{75}\). Despite his very common name, it is certainly not inconceivable that the eponymous priest of Pella in the \textit{asylia} decree for Kos in 242, Asklepiodoros\(^{76}\), is a descendant of the homonymous Pellaian trierarch of the Indian fleet\(^{77}\). It is equally tempting to identify the \textit{epistates} of the city and addressee of a recently published letter of Philip V, whose name begins with Πολεµ[---]\(^{78}\), to Polemokrates (no ethnic), a Friend of Perseus\(^{79}\). Again, I must stress that none of these identifications is secure, especially since names like Apollonides and Asklepiodoros are so common. They are possible but imprudent to make in the absence of supporting evidence, and I would hardly mention them had our epigraphic material been richer; but it is not. Depending on whether one sees the glass half-full or half-empty, one can either say that the Pellaian civic elite has no certain connection to the court – perhaps a surprising assertion for the city which was the normal seat of the court – or that all attested members of the civic elite of Pella could be connected, personally or through family links, to individuals of significant ‘national’ status.

In Thessalonike, Hellenistic epigraphic evidence is minimal, compared to the rich Roman material. It is therefore not surprising that there is no certain identification between epigraphically attested magistrates and members of the court attested in literary sources\(^{80}\). The only certain case from Thessalonike is also the only case where an ancient author takes the trouble to inform us about the prominence of a courtier at his homeland. Herodikos, \textit{princeps Thessalonicensium} according to Livy, was murdered by Philip V before 182\(^{81}\). Whether he participated in the court conspiracy of 183, as Walbank assumed, or was murdered

\(^{74}\) Plassart 1921, 17, col. III, L. 61 (on the date, see the bibliography above, n. 65).
\(^{75}\) Tataki 1998, 257 n° 239-40 and 312 n° 82 respectively.
\(^{76}\) Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 58 (Rigsby 1996, n° 23).
\(^{77}\) \textit{Arr.}, \textit{Ind.} 18.3 ; for other possible sources, see Tataki 1998, 152 n° 26.
\(^{78}\) \textit{SEG} 48 (1998) 818.
\(^{79}\) Polyb. 29.8.7 ; on the possibility of identification, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, « Epigraphie et philologie : récentes découvertes épigraphiques et gloses macédoniennes d’Hésychius », \textit{CRAI} (1998) 1189-1218, esp. 1190 ; in \textit{BullÉpigr} 1999, 345 he had suggested that the name of the epistates was Polemon and that he was a descendant of Polemon of Pella, officer in the Asian expedition (\textit{Arr.}, \textit{Anab.} 3.5.3).
\(^{80}\) There is one probable case : Antimachos, politarch of Thessalonike not long before 168 (Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 72) could perhaps be identified either to Antimachos, commander of Demetrias in 169, or, more probably, to Antimachos, cavalry commander in Perseus’ army in 171 (both without ethnic; references in Tataki 1998, 248). Oddly, the very common name Antimachos (229 entries in the published volumes of \textit{LGPN}) is very rare in Macedonia ; I know of only two other certain occurrences (J. M. R. Cormack, « Inscriptions from Pella, Edessa and Beroea », \textit{ArchP} 22 [1973] 203-4 n° 1, late 4\textsuperscript{th} century and \textit{EKM} I 134, L. 14, late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century ; cf. Tataki 1998, 473, with three more – but doubtful – occurrences).
\(^{81}\) Livy 40.4.
earlier, as the text of Livy suggests82, it is obvious that Herodikos had to be prominent at court to be considered a threat to the king. This is the only secure attestation of a member of a civic elite who is simultaneously influential at court. His case is a useful reminder that the movement from civic elite to the court did not imply a breaking of bonds with the homeland. It is true that the immediate entourage of the king was expected to be often « around the king », but constant proximity was hardly a prerequisite83 and, in any case, family links assured that a civic official promoted to the court retained power at home84.

My final example concerns someone who did not necessarily manage to attract the attention of the king; its chief interest lies in the modalities of his attempt. The well-known decree of Gazoros in honour of Plesia85, has been often studied principally as a source for civic organisation in Eastern Macedonia, a subject which need not concern us here86. Plesia was a citizen of Gazoros, as is obvious from the disclosure formula.87 His main benefaction, described in detail in the lost part of the decree and summarily repeated in L. 9-14, was that he took measures to preserve the safety of the chorae of Gazoros, thus allowing citizens to continue to perform their duties88. Veligianni asserted that Plesia was a royal official89. Her first argument is that Plesia acted « in a manner worthy of the king and the citizens »90 which clearly shows that Plesia was accountable to the king; her second argument is based on the embassy the city decides to send to the king in order to inform him about the honours awarded to Plesia91, a fact which, she claims, shows that Plesia was not part of the civic structure of Gazoros; finally, she claims that the πρόνοια that Plesia displayed (Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀξίως τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν πρόνοιαν τῆς χώρας τοῦ διασωθῆ[νά]...)92 is a term often used for higher authorities, especially royal officials. I believe none of these arguments prove that Plesia was a royal official; on the contrary, there are good reasons to suggest that he was a civic magistrate, most probably the epistates of Gazoros93.

82 For the connection with the conspiracy of 183, see F. W. Walbank, Philip V of Macedon (Cambridge 1940) 244-45; Livy, however, clearly says that the murder took place multis ante annis before 182 (40.4.2).
83 Cf. Savalli-Lestrade 1998, 355-59. Even Le Bohec, who believes that Friends are expected to be in the presence of the king (1985, 96, 99-100), has to admit (120-21) that this was not the case when the Friends were on some mission abroad.
84 Another interesting point about Herodikos is that one of his daughters was married to Poris, longe principi gentis Aenianum (Livy 40.4.4). This is one of the few attestations of a phenomenon which must also have been fairly common: family links between individuals who were at the same time princes of their cities and leading Macedonians. These links must have constituted an important ‘horizontal’ bond between members of the Macedonian aristocracy, a bond intersecting the ‘vertical’ connection between court elite and civic elites.
87 Hatzopoulos 1996, II no 39, L. 22-25 : ...καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ὀρώντες τὴν γεγενηµένην εὔεργείαν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν πρόνοιαν ἔχωσιν τοῦ διασώζειν τοὺς ἴδιους πολίτας.
93 Hatzopoulos 1996, I 74 and 258 believes he was either an epistates or the governor of the first meris. The Macedonian parallels which we shall examine presently make the first choice much likelier.
First of all, *paraprasis*, the minor benefaction of Plestis described in L. 1-9, clearly points to a civic milieu, as J. and L. Robert and Ph. Gauthier noted. Secondly, the fact that Plestis was accountable to the king is certainly not incompatible with the office of *epistates* or with the civic nature of that office. Thirdly, embassies of Macedonian cities to their king for a variety of reasons are often attested, as Hatzopoulos pointed out; the embassy of Gazōros proves nothing as to the function of Plestis as it does not prove Veligianni’s now abandoned theory that the king in question was Ptolemy II. Finally, and most importantly, *pronoia* is not only used in relation with external powers, as even Veligianni concedes. In fact, the second time it appears in our text, it clearly concerns intra-civic *eurgesia*: ...ικα και οἱ λιοιποὶ ὀρφότες τὴν γεγενημένην ἑυρεγείαν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν πρόνοιαν ἔχωσιν τού ..., διασώζειν τοὺς ἰδίους πολίτας (L. 22-25). There are two Macedonian inscriptions which present striking analogies with the wording and the context of the Gazōros decree; in both cases *pronoia* describes the concern of the chief civic official for the safety of the city. The anonymous politarch of Anthemous around 40 BC proposed that tōν τε τῆς πόλεως πραγμάτων καὶ | τῆς τῶν παροικούντων ἔξων δικαίως 98; Alketas of Morrylos, ὥς ἤρεθ(θ) | eἰς μεγίστας ἀρχάς παρὰ τῶν πολείων, performed a number of benefactions, including the financial contribution to (if not also the supervision of) the building of walls in 206/5, χάριν τοῦ προ(θ)νοηθήναι τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας, and was honoured | ἐπί τῇ προνοίᾳ καὶ τῇ | πρὸς τοὺς πολείτας [ἐυ]νοίᾳ.

Incidentally, the highest office of the city to which Alketas was elected was obviously linked to his benefactions for the safety of the city « in the 17th year » 99, as is evident by the city’s decision to celebrate the date of his election every year 100 and by the use of επιδεξάμενος 101, a word typically used in honorific decrees for the voluntary assumption of expenses linked with magistrates and liturgies 102. I fail to see how such a « highest » office, corresponding to the office of the politarch of Anthemous and whose responsibilities included the city’s safety, can be any other than the office of *epistates* 103; if this is correct, it would prove that, at least at late-third-century Morrylos, *epistatai* were elected.

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

95 See above, in the beginning of this paper.

96 Hatzopoulos 1996, I 54-55.

97 To limit myself to an example of πρόνοια displayed by civic officials which is roughly contemporary to the Gazōros decree, see, e.g., IG II2 1304 (Syll.7 547), L. 15.

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


100 Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 54.


103 Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 54, L. 6-7 : επιδεξάμενος τοῦ τὴν πόλιν μόνος.

104 Among many examples, see e.g. IG XII 9, 234, L. 14, 25 and 36 ; for an example from Macedonia, see SEG 35 (1985) 744, where the honournand, ἐπιδεξάμενος ἀθανάτου ἱεροτείου (L. 9-10), performed a number of sacrifices εἰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ (L. 17).

105 The decree refers to the election of Alketas in 206/5, hence before the introduction of the politarchs as chief magistrates of Macedonian cities, which must postdate 183 (cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, II n° 16).
But let me get back to Plestis. If Plestis is indeed a civic official, presumably the epistates of Gazoros, it is certainly significant that in the city’s decision the embassy to the king is mentioned before the erection of the stele and the award of a crown to the honourand. This obviously reflects the honourand’s priorities. From his point of view, the most important outcome of the whole affair was not that he was honoured at his relatively obscure hometown; it was the chance he had to inform the king of his abilities as an administrator, of his actions and their local results and of his popularity among his fellow-citizens. The decree was, in a sense, Plestis’ carte de visite to the court. It clearly portrays the double vision of civic officials, not only accountable « both to the king and to their fellow-citizens », to repeat the decree’s wording, but obviously aspiring to political gain in both arenas, the court and the city – in order of significance and not chronology.

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

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

106 Polyb. 7.11.6.
107 Contrast for example Polyb. 5.27.6 with 36.17.13.
developed by citizens who were not foreign to decision-making, in war, in administration and in politics.

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

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

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

Ἀλληλοδιείσδυση τῶν ἡγεσιῶν τῶν πόλεων καὶ τῆς αὐλῆς στὴ Μακεδονία

Ἡ παράλληλη προσωπογραφικὴ µελέτη τῶν ἀξιωµατούχων τῶν µακεδονικῶν πόλεων καὶ ἕκεινων τῆς µακεδονικῆς αὐλῆς ἐπιτρέπει ὅρισµένες ἐπισηµάνσεις σχετικὰ µὲ τὴν τοπικὴ πολιτικὴ στὴν Μακεδονία. Μολονότι ὁ ἀριθµὸς τῶν ἐπιφανῶν Μακεδόνων ποὺ ἀνήκουν, ταυτόχρονα ἢ διαδοχικά, καὶ στὶς δύο ὁµάδες εἶναι –HELL, µάλλον, φαίνεται νὰ εἶναι– µικρός, διαπιστώνουµε πῶς στὴν συντριπτικὴ πλειονότητα τῶν περιπτώσεων ἡ κίνηση εἶναι ἀπὸ τὴν πόλη πρὸς τὴν αὐλή καὶ ὅχι ἀντίστροφα: ἀξιωµατούχοι τῶν πόλεων (HELL οἱ ἀπόγονοι τους) «προάγονται» συχνὰ στὴν αὐλή, ἐνῶ, ἀντίθετα, ὁ διορισµὸς ἀπὸ τὸν βασιλεὺς ἐπιφανῶν αὐ- λικῶν ἢ ἀξιωµατούχων τῶν πόλεων δὲν µαρτυρεῖται. Ἡ διαπίστωση αὐτὴ ἐπιτρέπει νὰ συµπεράνουµε πῶς ἡ κατάληψη ἐνὸς τοπικοῦ ἀξιώµατος θεωρεῖται ἀξιόλογος πολιτικὸς στόχος γιὰ τὶς ἱσχυρὲς οἰκογένειες τῶν πόλεων, ὅχι µόνο ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ ἄλλα καὶ ὡς ἐφαλ- τήριο γιὰ τὸ πεδίο τῆς πραγµατικῆς πολιτικῆς ἱσχύος, τὴν αὐλή, καὶ πῶς, κατὰ συνέπεια, οἱ θεσµοὶ τῶν µακεδονικῶν πόλεων δὲν στεροῦνται πολιτικῆς σηµασίας, ἀσχέτως τοῦ βαθµοῦ αὐτονοµίας τους ἀπὸ τὴν βασιλικὴ ἱσχύ.