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Abstract

This dissertation was written as part of the MA in Classical Archaeology and the Ancient History of Macedonia at the International Hellenic University.

This study focuses on the relationship between the central government and the civic authorities in ancient Macedonia. It was a long held belief that the institution of the monarchy in Macedonia could not exist alongside a semi-independent civic government. The aim of this study is to show that there did indeed exist semi-autonomous governments in the cities, and the state of Macedonia was not a feudal monarchy but a federal state in which the central and civic governments were interdependent.

This study consists of four chapters. The first chapter focuses on the history of research regarding the relationship between the central and civic governments. The second chapter focuses on the civic institutions. The functions of the council and the assembly are briefly discussed after which a larger part of the chapter is dedicated to the offices of the epistatai and the politarchs, who were the chief civic magistrates of the cities of the kingdom. The third chapter contains a list of inscriptions pertaining to the communication between the king and the civic officials. Another part of the chapter is dedicated to discussing few of these inscriptions in detail. The final chapter includes the conclusions of the entire study and a discussion on what can be established regarding the nature of the Macedonian kingdom based on the discussion throughout the study.
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Preface

I chose this topic for my study due to my interest in learning not only about the well-known kings of Macedonia and their achievements but also the inner-workings of the kingdom that affected the daily lives of the people. I believe that it is only possible to understand the political nature of a kingdom by examining its constituent parts. I spent months researching and trying to put forth a work that is comprehensive. I do know that this study will have shortcomings, however, with considerable help from my supervisor, I was able to create a detailed study as best as I could, while also gaining an enormous amount of knowledge in the process.
Letters of Demetrios to Harpalos concerning the sanctuary of Herakle Kynagidas in Beroia .................................................................27
Letter of Philip V to Archippos concerning a land grant ........................................28
Document from Philippi concerning the settlement by Alexander III of a land dispute between the city of Philippi and the neighbouring Thracians ......................30

CIVIC DECREES ........................................................................31
Asyelia decrees for the Asklepieion of Kos ..........................................................31
The Gymnasiarchical Law of Beroia and the Ephebarchical Law of Amphipolis 34

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE NATURE OF THE MACEDONIAN STATE ..........37

THE MONARCHY AS THE NUCLEUS OF THE STATE ..................................................37
CIVIC AUTONOMY ................................................................................38
INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE CENTRAL AND CIVIC GOVERNMENTS ........39

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..................................................................................41
Chapter 1

History of research

When examining the relationship between the king and the Macedonian cities, the opinions of scholars are usually divided into two: 1) According to some scholars, the king was at the centre of the government, ruling over his subject cities which had no autonomy to make decisions without the king’s consent even on affairs that could be considered purely civic in nature. 2) The second is more constitutionalist in nature and according to it, although the king was the supreme leader of the Macedonian state and had the right to intervene in all affairs of the cities, there existed a certain amount of civic autonomy which gave the cities the right to make decisions for themselves. One of the reasons for believing in the existence of an absolute autocratic administrative system in Macedonia is over emphasis of scholarly study on Athenocentric sources which considered the monarchy to be a feudal institution that was a remnant of the heroic past. There existed the belief (which continue to exist in modern times) that it was impossible for an intricate central and civic administrative system to exist in a state that was controlled by a king. The lack of literary sources from within Macedonia is another factor responsible for this misunderstanding. Ancient sources such as Thucydides, Herodotus and Polybius wrote about Macedonia, with a central focus on the king but none of them were acquainted with the inner workings of the administrative system. Polybius not only shows a lack of knowledge of the political system of Macedonia but his works also exhibit animosity towards the kingdom especially from the latter part of the reign of Philip V.

In modern scholarship until the middle of the twentieth century, there was an overt tendency to focus only on the institution of the monarchy, either emphasising the achievements of kings such as Philip II, Alexander III and Philip V or portraying them as overlords of a feudal state.¹ From this period onwards, certain scholars began focussing on the political institutions of Macedonia, although most of them concerned the central institutions of the kingdom. In the late forties and the early fifties, Andre Aymard began studying Hellenistic Macedonia, for the first time using epigraphic evidence either coming from Macedonia or inscriptions pertaining to the kingdom but coming from other Greek cities². He produced a series of studies³ regarding the monarchy as well as the national assembly, supporting the constitutionalist nature of the kingdom⁴. A distinction was created

¹ John R. Knipfing, “German Historians and Macedonian Imperialism”, The American Historical Review, Vol. 26, No. 4 (1921), 657-671 (the article discusses the effect of the existing political system on early German scholarship dominating the field of Macedonian studies during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and shows the obsession of scholars to discuss only the aspects of the monarchy.)
² M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Federal Makedonia”, Federalism in Greek Antiquity/ edited by Hans Beck, Peter Funke, 319
by E. Bikerman between the “personal” monarchies of the east and the “national” monarchy of Macedonia\(^5\) according to which Macedonia “was a semi-constitutional national state, while the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms were personal monarchies of which the only unifying principle was the king himself”.\(^6\) This suggestion was supported by Aymard who linked the political institutions of Macedonia to the institutions of the Greek cities. Although the communis opinio regarding the nature of the Macedonian state began to change in favour of its constitutionalist character, apart from the primitive army assembly, the possibility of Macedonian cities and ethne having certain rights and playing a role in the administration of the kingdom was not taken into consideration. However systematic archaeological excavations in the region revealing several finds from Thessaloniki, Edessa, Vergina, Dion, Pella, etc.\(^7\). A kingdom once considered to be a feudal state with only the institution of the monarchy as the focal point, was revealed to have a polis culture similar to that of southern Greece, with councils and assemblies, gymnasiums, sanctuaries, etc.\(^8\). Yet there were scholars who still believed that the Macedonians did not live in cities similar to that of southern Greece because their assembly was incapable of supporting civic autonomy, and some even believed that Macedonia was divided into civic centres and adopted laws, assemblies, elected councils and magistrates only during the Roman period. In the words of J. H. Oliver, “Under the kings of Macedon, the old native communities, no matter how urban, cannot have been civic communities like Greek states, which were organized under divine sponsors of freedom. The local rulers would have been officers of the king and not magistrates of republics. In 167 B.C. when the Romans, whose international respectability depended on their role as champions of republics, forced freedom upon the local communities of Macedon, the change must have involved an order to set up republican magistrates of a certain specified type.”\(^9\) Nonetheless, with the discovery of several important inscriptions from all over the kingdom (discussed below in detail) concerning civic laws and decrees as well as royal ordinances, it can no longer be denied that Macedonia had an intricate political and administrative system on the central and civic levels.

There have been a few attempts to make a comprehensive collection of inscriptions from Macedonia, the publication of M.G. Demitsas from the 1890s being the only one covering the entire region.\(^10\) In 1972 C. F. Edson published a volume of the Inscriptiones Graecae containing inscriptions from Thessaloniki.\(^11\) P. Nigdelis recently published a series of

---


\(^7\) M.B Hatzopoulos, “Macedonian Studies”, Brill’s companion to ancient Macedon: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC–300 AD/ edited by Robin J. Lane Fox, p. 38, 39

\(^8\) M. B. Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings. I. A Historical and Epigraphic Study. II. Epigraphic Appendix (Μελετήματα 22; Athens 1996), p. 320


\(^10\) M.G. Demitsas, Ἡ Μακεδονία εν λίΟοις, φύεγγομένοις και μνημείοις σωζομένοις (Athens 1896)

monographs containing inscriptions from Thessaloniki, and also contributed to the work of Edson by publishing a supplement in the Inscriptiones Graecae series in 2017, containing material from Thessaloniki published after the latter’s volume. Epigraphes ano Makedonias published in 1985 by T. Rizakes and G. Touratsoglou, features inscriptions from Upper Macedonia. A more recent publication concerning inscriptions from lower Macedonia, Beroia in specific, is the Epigraphes kato Makedonias published by L. Gounaropoulou and M.B. Hatzopoulos in 1998. Inscriptiones Graecae 10.2.2.1 containing inscriptions from north western Macedonia and Pelagonia was published in 1999 by the Berlin academy under the direction of Fanoula Papazoglou. A second volume of the Epigraphes Kato Makedonias was published in 2015 containing inscriptions from the third district, except Beroia and Pieria.

When it comes to scholarly work concerning the relationship between the central and civic governments, the works of N. G. L. Hammond, a British scholar, are significant as they provide an insight into the general history of Macedonia as well as the several political institutions within the kingdom. Other than his most well-known three-part series on the history of Macedonia in collaboration with G.T. Griffith and F.W. Walbank, several of his articles analyse the central and civic institutions of Macedonia. The research of D. Pandermalis in Dion in the late 90s helped to dismiss the assumption that Macedonia had no religious centre by revealing its sanctuaries in particular the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus with its stadium, theatre, the porticoes, dedications and royal trophies. It also brought to light important inscriptions (the letter of Antigonos Gonatas to Agasikles and the letter of Philip V concerning the asylia of Kyzikos, discussed below) significant for the understanding of the relationship between the central and civic authorities in Macedonia. R. M. Errington is another prominent scholar in the field of Macedonian studies. His most well-known work titled The History of Macedonia includes a chapter discussing the institution of the monarchy and the administration of the cities and although his opinions tend to support

---

12 P. Nigdelis, “Μακεδονικά επιγραφικά IV (Θεσσαλονίκη)”, Τεκμήρια 11 (2012) 139-204; See also P. Nigdelis, ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΑ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΑ 3, ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΑ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΑ Συμβολή στην Πολιτική και Κοινωνική Ιστορία της Αρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης (Thessaloniki, 2006) and the second volume published in 2015
13 IG X 2, 1 s, Suppl. I. Tituli inter a. MCMLX et MMXV inventi. Edid. P. Nigdelis (Berlin, 2017), p. 317-553
16 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 7, 42
18 See N.G.L. Hammond, A History of Macedonia I, II (with G.T. Griffith) and III (with F.W. Walbank) published in 1972, 1979 and 1988 respectively
21 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 2, p. 320
the interpretation of Macedonia as an absolute monarchy, he does admit to the cities having a certain amount of autonomy in administrative matters. Several of his articles discuss the institutions and the epigraphic material of the cities of the Kingdom. M. B. Hatzopoulos has produced a monumental amount of work concerning several political institutions of Macedonia, the administration of the cities and the relationship between central and local authorities. His monograph titled Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings includes more than 70 inscriptions from all over Macedonia and due to the impressive in-depth analysis of subjects concerning the physical division of the kingdom, the diverse political institutions of the cities and their role in the kingdom’s administration and the communication between the king and the civic officials amongst many others, it has been used by various scholars in their studies concerning the political organisation of Macedonia. Other scholars who have produced important works concerning the relationship between central and civic authorities and the communication between them include C. Bradford Welles, E. Bikerman, C. Schuler, F. Papazoglou, Ch. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, P. Nigdelis and E. Voutiras.

Chapter 2

The Civic Institutions of Ancient Macedonia

Due to the lack of epigraphic and literary evidence, nothing much is known about the functioning of the cities before the reign of Philip II. The expansionist ambitions and shrewd administrative policies of Philip who recognised the autonomy of civic units, turned the cities of the kingdom into important urban centres giving them an international status in the entire Mediterranean. There are several royal and civic documents, most of them belonging to period under the Antigonids, mentioning the functioning of the council and the assembly, the legislative procedures for the adoption of laws and the several magistrates and their assistants in the cities. There are around 30 civic documents consisting of laws and decrees

25 See the works of Hatzopoulos cited throughout this study
26 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8
28 E. Bikerman, “RevPhil 12” (1938) 295-312 (as cited in Hatzopoulos “Institutions”)
32 Pantelis Nigdelis and Pavlos Anagnostoudis, “New Honorific Inscriptions from Amphipolis”, Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 57 (2017) 295–324 (contains a discussion on the politarchs); See Nigdelis, op. cit. fn. 10
33 Allamani-Souri and E. Voutiras, ‘New Documents from the Sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas at Beroia’, Επιγραφές τυς Μακεδονιας (Thessaloniki, 1996)
and 20 other official or semi-official documents dating from the fourth to the second century, coming from the cities of Thessaloniki, Pella, Beroia, Cassandreia, Amphipolis, etc.\textsuperscript{34}

A detailed functioning of the assembly is attested in the gymnasiarchical law of Beroia\textsuperscript{35} that I have discussed below. The decree is introduced to the assembly by the officials of Beroia and the citizens are given a month’s period to reflect on their decision. Forty-five days later the decree is approved by the assembly with one dissenting vote and is transmitted by the politarchs to the authorities of the gymnasium for it to be published on a stele. The document is proof of the well-established government institutions in the cities of the kingdom\textsuperscript{36} and shows that they followed a complex legislative procedure in order to introduce, approve and publish decrees. Other important inscriptions that mention the working of the council and the assembly are the decrees from the cities of Pella, Amphipolis, Cassandreia and Philippi. The decree from Pella is the only one that does not explicitly mention either the council or the assembly. However, the words “it was resolved by the city” denote that the assembly had approved the granting of asylia. The decrees from Amphipolis and Philippi mention that the theoroi presented themselves before the assembly which had then approved the decision to grant asylia. The decree from Cassandreia on the other hand does not mention the assembly but states that the decision is approved by the council. One of the reasons could be that the decrees approved by the council were often ratified by the assembly without changes and this process of ratification was not explicitly stated in the concerned documents due to which mentioning the Assembly’s decision wasn’t required. Similarly, another decree from Thessaloniki\textsuperscript{37} found at Delos and dating to a period between 240 and 230 BC, mentions only the Council. The decree is introduced by the hypepistates and the dikastai to the council and concerns the request of the city of Delos to Thessaloniki to find an appropriate place to engrave the crown and erect the statue with which they honoured a Thessalonikan citizen for his benefactions towards their city. Preceding the decree, the document includes a letter to the Council and the people of Delos which gives an account of the visit of the Delian ambassador and his speech before the assembly of Thessaloniki and mentions the following decree by which the city of Thessaloniki accepts the honours presented to their citizen.\textsuperscript{38} In this case, as in that of Cassandreia, it was the decision of the council to approve the decree and honour the request of the Delians and as the decree states, it was also the responsibility of the council to decide where the statue was to be erected.

The chief magistrates of the cities varied depending on the city and the period. In the cities of Macedonia proper the chief magistrates were the epistatai, who were responsible for convening the council and the assembly, introducing laws and decrees and were responsible for their implementation. They also acted as mediators between the king and their local community. The epistatai were assisted by other civic magistrates who were called tagoi or

\textsuperscript{34} See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 7, 239

\textsuperscript{35} EKM I 1

\textsuperscript{36} The dating of the gymnasiarchical law is controversial with scholarly opinion either dating it to the end of the Antigonid rule or the Roman period in Macedonia. Below I discuss why the law most likely belongs to the period under Antigonid rule rather than that of the Romans

\textsuperscript{37} IG XI,4 1053, IG X,2 1 1028

\textsuperscript{38} See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, p.143
archontes (the term was also used for chief civic magistrates in some cities outside Macedonia proper) in some cities and dikastai in Thessaloniki. Other civic officials mentioned in the inscriptions are strategoi, nomophylakes, archons, agoranomoi, hypepistates, exetastai and gymnasiarchi. The politarchs appear in documents dating towards the end of the Antigonid rule (the reign of Philip V and Perseus), but it is unclear whether during the monarchical period they replaced the epistates as chief magistrate or whether these officials continued to exist simultaneously until the end of the Antigonid rule.

Documents from the cities are dated by an eponymous official who is usually the priest of Asklepios, in some instances it is the epistates and some documents also feature the strategos as the eponymous official such as gymnasialarchical law of Beroia and a decree from Morrylos dating to the late third or early second century BC in which the strategos is mentioned twice as the eponymous official. Although it is assumed that the strategos was an official in charge of a district, due to the lack of information regarding this office, it is impossible to know whether they were royal or civic officials.

It is not within the scope of this study to discuss all the civic institutions in detail. Thus, I will limit the discussion to the offices of the epistatai and the politarchs. A detailed discussion on the epistatai is inevitable because they were the most important civic magistrates during the monarchical period. They were the mediators between the king and the cities and played a major role in the governance of the cities. I have discussed the office of the politarchs in detail because they succeeded the epistatai as the chief civic magistrates.

**General Discussion on the Epistates**

Of all the known Macedonian civic officials, the epistates features most prominently in the epigraphic material concerning the correspondence between the king and the cities. At the early stages of the study of administration in ancient Macedonia, the commonly accepted opinion by all scholars was that the epistates was a royal official appointed in cities by the king who required him to act according to his demands. Ancient literary sources aren’t particularly helpful in providing any information regarding the office of the epistates and in such a situation it is most reasonable to turn to the epigraphic material which fortunately provide more in depth information regarding the working of the office of the epistates.

**Were the epistatai royal overseers or civic officials?**

In order to examine the official nature of the epistates it would be necessary to examine the documents concerning the communication between the king and the epistates but before turning to epigraphy I would like to briefly introduce the general scholarly opinion on the nature of the office of the epistates. Hatzopoulos, in his detailed monograph regarding the institutions of Macedonia draws six conclusions regarding the epistatai 1) they were civic and not royal officials 2) They were present in all Macedonian poleis 3) they were citizens of

---

39 SEG 39.606
the community in which they officially served 4) they had a limited annual term of office 5) they were answerable to the king as well as to the citizens of their community 6) the method of appointment of the epistates is unknown.

N.G.L Hammond, in his article titled “Role of the Epistates in Macedonian Contexts” suggests that the role of the Macedonian epistates was quite varied. In many cases he was used as an eponymous official for the dating of documents. Hammond also suggests that even if the epistates was a locally elected civic official, his role and the nature of his office changed after the conquests of Philip II and Alexander III. He believes that the kings’ ambitions led the epistates to become a royal official who carried out the demands of the kings. According to him, as Alexander conquered new lands in Asia and created Macedonian like poleis with magistrates, councils and assemblies he began training the youth in these cities to join his army. Quoting Diodorus and Plutarch, Hammond suggests that the epistates were responsible for the recruitment and the training of these youth called epigonoi. In the scholars own words, “The epistatai were responsible for organising and overseeing the training. This took place in the Macedonian cities, where many of the teachers will have been available. As agents of the king these epistatai must have had the power to obtain accommodation and arrange maintenance for large number of Asian youths; for this training was not just for one age group, but it was an ongoing system. They were not magistrates elected by the citizens of these cities, but royal appointees with supervisory powers.” He suggests that although epistatai used to be civic officials, after the conquest of Alexander they became royal appointees responsible for the education of the Asian youth. He however confuses the epistates who is the chief civic magistrate of the cities with the epistatai who were responsible for training the youth in Hellenistic Macedonian cities in Asia and who have nothing to do with the civic officials being discussed here. As is apparent from the number of inscriptions, the epistatai continued to function as civic officials in Macedonian cities even after the conquest of Alexander. A. Giovannini supports the traditional view that the epistates was a royal official, suggesting that the king would not personally correspond with a civic magistrate. As I have discussed below, when the epistates was addressed in his official capacity, the king wasn’t just addressing him but the entire civic board. M. Errington also shares the same opinion of the epistates being a royal official as he states, “The Macedonian cities seem to have had a fairly extensive series of officials, though the most widespread remains the royal epistates, to whom a whole series of royal letters are addressed and published locally.”

Epistatai as citizens of the local community

Due to the long held belief that the epistatai were royal officials, it was quite unclear whether they were appointed from a city different to the one where they held their official office or from their local community. Considering that they were civic officials it would be logical for them to be appointed from the local community and backing this fact are several

---

40 See Hammond, op. cit. fn. 18
41 M.B Hatzopoulos, “Quaestiones macedonicae: lois, décrets et épistates dans les cités macédoniennes.” TEKMHPIA 8, 56
42 R. M. Errington, “Recent Research on Ancient Macedonia” Analele Univ. Gala¸i, s. Istorie 1 (2002), 19
inscriptions consisting the names of epistatai whose families can be traced back to their respective cities. In the asylia decree of Amphipolis, the name of the father of Xenias, the epistates is Orges which is a rare name and from all Macedonian inscriptions this name can only be found in one from Amphipolis. This suggests the family of Xenias belonged to Amphipolis and thus he was a local citizen of the community. Another document that shows that the epistatai were not foreign citizens ruling over a city on the orders of the king is the letter of Antigonus Gonatas to Agasikles, the epistates of Dion concerning the land of an individual named Noumenios. A decree dating to the middle of the third century, honouring Agasikles that was found at Larissa shows that he was a citizen of Dion. His name is also mentioned in the list of theorodokoi from Delphi where he features as the father of the theorodokos of Dion.43 Andronikos, the epistates of Thessaloniki from the diagramma concerning the sanctuary of Sarapis, can be identified as Andronikos son of Alexandros who features as an agoranomoi in an earlier dedication from Thessaloniki. This document was most probably from an earlier period in his career suggesting that Andronikos too was a citizen of the community where he officially acted as epistates.44 Another document that proves the above suggestion is a decree from Thessaloniki in which the dikastai and hypepistates refer to the city as “our city” thus proving that they were from Thessaloniki.45

I would also like to mention that epistatai were present in all cities of the kingdom. This is proven by the diagramma of Philip V to Amphipolis concerning the Stephanitai games, according to which, the gymnasiarch was required to record the details of the incoming athletes and if a city did not have a gymnasiarch, these duties were to be carried out by the epistates. Also, the fact that small cities like Alkomena, Euia and also possibly Azoros (if Damason was an epistates) had epistatai suggests that they existed even in the smallest of cities in the kingdom.

The Epistates as an eponymous official

The dating of documents was done by the insertion of the name of the epistates, name of the eponymous priest, the month and the regnal year. However, not all documents contained all these elements and they could be inserted in a varying order, except the regnal year, which if inserted always comes first. It should be noted that the cities under Antigonid rule did not have a specific pattern for dating and some of them even used the strategoi and archons as eponymous officials in order to date the documents. For example, in the asylia decrees of Kos, Pella dates its decree with the eponymous priest followed by the month, Amphipolis mentions the regnal year, the name of the epistates, the eponymous priest and the month, whereas the decrees from Cassandreia and Philippi do not contain any sort of dating. Certain documents from Argilos and Beroia are date solely by the epistates who acts as the eponymous official, similar to the eponymous priest who is an annually elected official. Coming back to the subject regarding the functioning of the epistates the sole eponymous official, this suggests that he was an annually elected official, if not he would not

44 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, p. 382
45 IG XI,4 1053, IG X,2 1 1028
be able to be used for dating purposes. The deeds of sale from Mieza\textsuperscript{46} containing two series, the first one dating to the same year and regularly featuring the names of the same epistates and the same priest, and the second series which is most likely from the following year features the name of a different epistates, thus proving their annual character.

**Duties of the epistates**

Now turning to the epigraphic evidence, as mentioned earlier, the diagramma from Thessaloniki concerning the sanctuary of Sarapis is one of the few documents in which the epistates appears as more than just an eponymous official. The line “it is not allowed to open the treasuries of the god unless the overseer (epistates) and the judges [are present], or to consume the money from the treasuries without good reason, but only [with] their consent.” gives us a glimpse of the responsibility handed to the epistates by the king. By communicating his decision to Andronikos, who was the epistates of Thessaloniki, the king makes him responsible for informing the concerned authorities of the sanctuary regarding the royal decision and for ensuring that the instructions are carried out as required. It is easy to understand how this might lead one to believe that the epistates was a royal official and not a civic one. The king rather than communicating his decision directly to the authorities of the sanctuary chooses to convey it to Andronikos who in turn sends it to the authorities of the sanctuary. The fact that the diagramma was sent to Andronikos rather than directly to the authorities of the sanctuary is used as a basis by scholars such as A. Giovannini to prove that he was not just a civic magistrate but a royal official responsible for carrying out the instructions of the king. However, as Hatzopoulos suggests, whether a royal document addresses an epistates personally or the entire civic community, when seen from a formal perspective, the content of the document is addressed to the city. Also, in no other documents coming from Macedonia do we see the king directly address any lesser civic official or the authorities of an organisation. Therefore, using the above reason to justify that the epistates was a royal official and not a civic one is unreasonable. The diagramma most likely refers to the authorities of the sanctuary through the words “Nobody is allowed to alienate any of the property of Sarapis” and “if anyone commits an act prohibited hereby”. This is understood from the fact that Andronikos instructs the sanctuary authorities to publish the diagramma in the sanctuary “so that the people in charge may know what the king decided on how things should be done.” Therefore, if we consider that Andronikos was the chief civic magistrate of Thessaloniki, then he was acting as a mediator between the king and a religious association of the city as opposed to a royal overseer. Also, the fact that the epistates is instructed to oversee the finances of the sanctuary along with the dikastai, who were also civic officials, invalidates the argument that epistatai were royal overseers who would have most likely been solely in charge of such matters. Now that it has been established that the epistatai were civic magistrates, I would like to discuss further the subject regarding the addressees of the royal documents for as we shall see, in some letters the king addresses the civic officials alone, whereas in others he addresses them along with the entire community.

\textsuperscript{46} SEG 24.524, SEG 49.744
Such a distinction is made obvious in the Letter of Philip V to Amphipolis concerning tax exemptions granted to Ainians.\textsuperscript{47} In the first letter Philip addresses an individual whose name has not been preserved, informing him that the citizens of the Thracian city of Ainos living in Amphipolis require that the privileges and exemptions granted to them by the king and his father Antigonos Doson be published and displayed at the sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos. The second letter is addressed to an individual whose name again has not been preserved, and to the Ainians residing in Amphipolis. This letter is one of the documents granting privileges and exemptions to the Ainians, which they had requested to be published in the sanctuary.

Both these letters provide a significant insight in the communication between the royal and civic authorities in Macedonia. Firstly, as mentioned above, the first letter does not contain the name of the addressee and the letter is written in second person plural form. It could be assumed that the addressee in the letter is the entire civic body or another corporate body within the city, however, it has been concluded that the lacuna in the inscription permits only for the name of an individual to be inserted (Hatzopoulos suggests the name Adaios)\textsuperscript{48} and this individual was most likely the epistates of Amphipolis. The use of second person plural in a letter that is supposedly addressed only to the epistates suggests that the letter addressed the epistates in his official nature as the chief civic magistrate and thus the head of the civic board of authorities of the city. Therefore, the communication between the king and the epistates was not personal and through the letter the king communicated to the entire community as a whole. Secondly, on the matter of why only the epistates is addressed in the letter instead of the entire civic board or the city, we should first take into consideration the content of the letter. The king informs the epistates of the request of the resident Ainians and permits that the grants and exemptions given to them be published in the sanctuary. The content of the letter did not involve the introduction of a new civic law or the modification of an existing one and thus was a matter solely concerning the royal authorities. The epistates is addressed because being the chief civic magistrate it is his duty to carry out the instructions of the king. It is apparent that the scope of the letters determined the addressees and the king only addressed the authorities or communities that were directly concerned with issue requiring attention. As we have seen in the first letter, it is presumably only the epistates who is addressed but the second letter which contains the grant of privileges and exemptions to the Ainians, addresses the Ainians themselves and also most likely the epistates. Similarly, in another letter of Philip V to Amphipolis\textsuperscript{49} in which he reminds the Amphipolitans that the privileges granted to them during the second Macedonian war have expired and they should fulfil their regular duties, although the name of the addressee has not been preserved, it is assumed that the addressee was most likely the city of Amphipolis such as in the next two letters in which Antigonos Doson addresses an official alongside the entire ethnos of Tripolis. However, the following letters do not feature

\textsuperscript{47} SEG 27.245, SEG 33.499
\textsuperscript{48} See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, 404
\textsuperscript{49} See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, 405
an epistates but an official heading the ethnos of Tripolis, whose official title remains a matter of speculation.\textsuperscript{50}

Two of the three letters\textsuperscript{51} mentioned above are addressed to a certain Megalokles and the Tripolitans and concern the grant of civic liturgies to certain officers, cavalry men and peltasts who fought alongside Antigonos Doson in the battle of Sellasia. Tripolis was a small federation consisting of the three cities of Azoros, Pythion and Doliche. As I mentioned above, Megalokles was an official heading Tripolis and his official post remains unclear due to it not being mentioned in the letters, but it is assumed that he was a strategos, as mentioned in an inscription from Samothrace\textsuperscript{52}. The reason behind the king addressing the Tripolitans as a whole is probably related to the procedure of recruitment of soldiers to the king’s army,\textsuperscript{53} which makes it probable that the military unit granted tax exemptions was recruited from the entire civic unit of Tripolis, thus making it unnecessary for the cities or the officials of the cities within Tripolis to be addressed individually. Whereas, in another letter, Antigonos Doson addresses Megalokles as well as an official who was presumably the epistates of Azoros but before discussing this document, it is necessary to mention another letter concerning tax exemptions granted to a military unit, that is quite similar to the ones discussed above. It reads as follows:

...and to sail back from Delos as soon as possible. Furthermore, I have granted to the officers who fought under my command, as soon as they are discharged from their military duty, exemption from civil liturgies. Concerning these matters, I have written a common letter to the Botteatai, but I also decided to address you in particular. In the seventh year, on the seventeenth day of Gorpiaios.

[List containing the names of 60 men.\textsuperscript{54}]

The above is a royal letter sent by a king to the city of Beroia, granting senior officers who fought under his command, exemptions from paying taxes. Although the name of the king does not survive, based on the language and letter forms (showing features typical to the inscriptions from the second half of the third century BC) and the content of the document which mentions the demobilisation of the army after what was probably a large scale military operation, the first editors concluded that letter was written by Antigonos Doson.\textsuperscript{55} Hatzopoulos who first dated the letter to the reign of Philip V, upon seeing its similarity with the letters addressed to the Tripolitans, assigned it to Antigonos Doson.\textsuperscript{56} The letter mentions that a copy of the same letter has also been sent to the Botteatai. The reason for
addressing an entire district is again due to the fact mentioned above that the cities as well as districts were recruitment units for the king’s army.

Another reason for addressing a district or an entire community, is due to the fact that the action taken through the letters, such as the grant of privileges to those who participated in a large scale military operation, affected large communities within the kingdom. It was not enough for a civic official to publish it on a stele, but the king would have wanted the measure to gain a large amount of publicity and also be read publicly at the following session of the Assembly.\(^{57}\) Accordingly, the letter of Philip V to Dion concerning the grant of asylia to Kyzikos contains the following address: “King Philip to Eurylochos the epistates of the Diestai, to the peleiganes and to the other citizens, greetings.”\(^{58}\) The reason for addressing the ethnikon of Dion through the former’s chief civic magistrate shows that the granting of asylia was a decision to be made formally by the community as a whole. As we shall see in the discussion of the decrees concerning the asylia of Kos, apart from the decision of the king, a formal decision on the civic level had to be reached by either the council or the assembly or both. Similarly, the editors of the letter of Antigonos Doson to Beroia believe that the letter of the king displayed at the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas was accompanied by a formal civic document accepting the provisions of the letter. In their words, “Since the addressee was (beside “the Botteatai”) the city of Beroia, which had set up an inscribed copy of it in a prominent public sanctuary, it is likely that the inscription also contained an official document of the city related to the letter- probably a decree voted in compliance with its provisions.”\(^{59}\)

Until now we have observed that the addressee of a king’s letter, whether it was an individual, a city or ethnos or an entire district, depended on the scale of the people affected by the measure. It can be suggested that when it came to matters of national scope (such as grants given to army units following the demobilisation of the army after a battle), the king did not communicate with every single village or city within an ethnus. Supporting this suggestion is the next fragmentary circular letter from Alkomena in Derriopos which reads as follows "Doules to Nikolaos. I have sent you the copy of the letter which the King had written on the festival of Daisia. Take care of everything, in order that it may be accomplished in the exact manner he deems that they should. In the 8th year, on the 28th(?) of Apellaioi. Concerning the expenses for the Daisia...".\(^{60}\) The letter, sent by Doules to Nikolaos is written in third person form and informs the latter of the king’s instructions regarding the expenses for the Daisia festival. Fanoula Papazoglou who first published the inscription established that Nikolaos was the epistates of the city of Alkomena, while Doules was the strategos of the regional unit of Paonia, of which Derriopos was a part. According to her, in the late Antigonid period, although Derriopos was part of the kingdom, it was under the jurisdiction of the strategos of Paonia which was the possession of the king and was governed by a royal strategos. In her opinion, the strategos and epistates were royal officials and she raises the question as to why the letter was transmitted through two royal

\(^{57}\) See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 56, p. 54

\(^{58}\) See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 56, p. 48; SEG 48-785

\(^{59}\) See Allamani-Souri and E. Voutiras, op. cit. fn. 33, p. 20

\(^{60}\) See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, 411, 412; SEG 46-711
intermediaries rather than the king communicating directly to the city of Alkomena.\textsuperscript{61} The discussion regarding the status of Paionia does not come under the scope of this study. However, as we have already observed, when concerning civic matters, the king communicates directly either to the chief civic magistrate or the official heading the ethnos in the case of Anigonos Doson’s letters to the Tripolitans. Nowhere in the discussed documents does the king transmit his message to the chief magistrate using a higher official such as a strategos as an intermediary. Thus, suggesting that in this case the strategos was the intermediary between the king and the epistates would not be in consonance with the procedure of communication observed so far between the central and civic authorities. The king does however, use the epistates as an intermediary to convey his message either to the entire community or the authorities of a certain organisation within the civic unit. Thus Hatzopoulos’ theory seems more reasonable according to which he suggests that Doules was not the strategos of Paionia but the chief civic magistrate of Derriopos and Alkomena was not a city as suggested by Papazoglou but a village in Derrioppos, making Nikolaos the chief magistrate of this lesser unit. Another reason that Doules was not likely to be the strategos of Paionia is that from 181 BC until the fall of Perseus, an individual named Didas was the regional strategos of Paionia.\textsuperscript{62} Accordingly it can be suggested that the king’s letter was sent to Doules whose responsibility was to notify the civic officials of the smaller civic units such as Alkomena, thereby making this a transmission within a political unit. The method of communication no longer seems unusual and can be compared to the communication between Andronikos and the authorities of the sanctuary of Sarapis in the diagramma from Thessaloniki (as Hatzopoulos points out, there are many similarities between the two documents.) Referring back to my suggestion regarding the connection between the scope of the letter and its addressee, in this case as well, the instructions written by the king concerning the festival of Daisia was not meant for a particular city but probably for all cities around the kingdom. Considering the national or regional character of the measures to be taken, it would be impossible for the king to communicate with every village of the kingdom, thus communicating only with the officials of the greater civic units whose responsibility it was to inform the officials of the smaller civic units. To further support this suggestion, it would be useful to examine the third letter of Antigonos Doson to Megalokles addressed only to the latter and not including the Tripolitans as the addressees.

In the letter\textsuperscript{63} the king expresses his gratitude towards a deceased Nikarchos, a citizen of Azoros, and considering his obligation towards the latter he promises to watch over his son Asklepiades as he would a relative. This he would do by observing the behaviour of Nikarchos’ wife, the guardian of Asklepiades and he adds that the son would receive the same privileges as the father and the household would be exempted from paying taxes until he becomes an adult. The king makes Megalokles responsible for ensuring that no injustice is done to the family and adds that he has communicated the same message to Damason. There is no mention of the official position of Damason but he was most likely the epistates.

\textsuperscript{61} Fanoula Papazoglou, "Nouveau fragment d’acte de la chancellerie macédonienne", Klio 52 (1970) 313-314 (as cited in Hatzopoulos “Institutions”, 412)
\textsuperscript{62} See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, 413
\textsuperscript{63} SEG_60.585
of Azoros, similar to Nikolaos, the epistates of Alkomena. It has been suggested that Damason could have also been a financial official, considering that if he was a magistrate subordinate to Megalokles, the king wouldn’t communicate with him directly, like in the case of Doules who was responsible for communicating the king’s message to Nikolaos. This suggestion is reasonable but there is also the fact that the scope of the letter determines its addressee. As I have mentioned above, the letter from Doules to Nikolaos contained the general instructions of the king for the cities around the kingdom. However, the letter to Megalokles regarding the household of Nikarchos concerned a particular citizen of Azoros and his family, thus making it more likely that Damason was the epistates of Azoros. Another suggestion that can be made based on the inscriptions discussed above is that the epistates was not only answerable to the king but also the entire civic community in which they held office. The fact that the king addressed the community and the official civic board through the epistates shows they were answerable to the civic communities (if they were answerable only to the king, which would have been the case if they were royal officials, the communication would have been more personal in nature). Also if we consider certain inscriptions such as the letter of Philip V concerning the asylia of Kyzikos, the fact that king addresses the epistates in particular along with the civic authorities of Dion shows that a formal decision was required from the side of the entire civic community and the epistates was a mediator between them and the king, thus making him answerable to both sides.

Based on the inscriptions discussed so far, we can discern certain duties of the epistates: 1. To have the authorities of the sanctuary public the king’s diagramma and to oversee the opening and usage of the sanctuary’s treasuries (Thessaloniki) to restore funds taken from the sanctuary (Beroia) 2. Being informed of grants and privileges and to publish the king’s decrees (Beroia and Amphipolis) 3. To protect a citizen’s property or household (Dion and Azoros) 4. To register incoming athletes in cities that did not have gymnasiarchs (Amphipolis) 5. Arbitrations (Beroia and Dion) 6. To inform officials of smaller civic units of the king’s instructions (Alkomena) 7. To propose the king’s decree in the assembly so that the city could make a formal decision (Dion)

---
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The Politarchs

Research on Politarchs

The politarchs being an important civic institution in ancient Macedonia under Roman rule and also most likely during the Antigonid period has made it an extensive subject of study for many scholars. E.D Burton, whose research was first published in 1898, was the first scholar who attempted to collect all inscriptions related to the politarchs. However, the inscription which were available to Burton during that period was fairly limited and a more updated and in depth study was taken up by Greek scholars, S. Pelekides and D. Kanatsoulis. G. Schuler’s article published in 1960, titled the “Macedonian Politarchs”, containing a list of 32 inscriptions mentioning politarchs, provides a thorough examination of the office and the functions of the politarchs in Macedonia. M.B. Hatzopoulos, who provides a list of 50 inscriptions from Macedonia mentioning politarchs, in several of his works expresses his views on the functions of the politarchs, especially in pre Roman Macedonia. P. Nigdelis and P. Anagnostoudis discuss the politarchate in Macedonia in their article on the honorary inscriptions from Amphipolis featuring four inscriptions, all of which mention the politarchs. P. Gauthier and Hatzopoulos in their article concerning the Gymnasiarchical law of Beroia, discuss the reasons why they believe that the politarchs existed before the Romans took control of Macedonia. Other prominent scholars who have made an important contribution to the understanding of the politarchate are Holleaux, one of the first scholars to argue in favour of the existence of politarchs under the Antigonids, F. Papazoglou, who discusses the roles of civic officials and administration of Macedonian cities in her article Polis et souveraineté, and Voutiras who provides an alternative theory regarding the dating of the Gymnasiarchical law of Beroia (discussed below).

Which cities had the Politarchs

Schuler gives a list of Macedonian cities from where inscriptions have attested to the existence of politarchs: Amphipolis, Parthicopolis, Lete, Thessaloniki, Gortynna, Beroea, Edessa, Derriopus, Stuberra, Heraclea Lynci, the community of the Battynaeans in Orestis, and Lyke in Dassaretis. However, out of all these cities only Amphipolis, Beroia and Thessaloniki are relevant to this study because the inscriptions mentioning the politarchs from these cities are the only ones that possibly date back to the period under Antigonid rule (as we shall see below, this is a debatable topic; the other inscriptions mentioning the politarchs have a definite dating to the period under the Romans).

The problem of dating

77 See Schuler, op. cit. fn. 29, 90-100
78 P. Nigdelis and P. Anagnostoudis, "New Honorific Inscriptions from Amphipolis", Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 57 (2017) 295–324
80 See Schuler, op. cit. fn. 29, p. 90
Scholars are divided on whether the institution of the politarchs in Macedonia was constituted during the period under the monarchy, most likely by either Philip V or Perseus, or it was introduced by the Romans, either immediately after the conquest of Macedonia in 167 BC or after Macedonia became a Roman province in 148 BC. The argument that the politarchate was a Roman invention is based on the fact that the majority of documents mentioning the politarchs date to the period after Macedonia was made a Roman province. There are three inscriptions mentioning the politarchs that could possibly date to the last years of the Antigonid rule: 1) the dedications of Perseus and of the People of Amphipolis to Artemis Tauropolos, 2) the gymnasiarchical law of Beroia and 3) the dedication to Dionysos from Thessaloniki.

The Gymnasiarchical law of Beroia mentions the politarchs in line 42 and at the end of law where they are responsible for transmitting the decree to the authorities of the Gymnasium. It does not have a regnal date and is dated by the eponymous strategos and the name of the month. It is impossible to be certain about which period this inscription dates to without a regnal year, the lack of which has caused many to conclude that is belonged to a period after 167 BC. Firstly, it should be noted that the lack of a regnal year does not make it impossible for the document to be dated to the Antigonid rule since there did not exist a standard dating system during this period. Secondly, the observation of the Gymnasiarchical law makes its military character quite apparent. The training of the youth in the gymnasium was more than likely for the purpose of preparing the youth to enrol in the king’s army. The Gymnasiarchical law was therefore a decree issued by the king rather than the authorities of Rome.

A. Giovannini believes that the Gymnasiarchical law was adopted independently by the city of Beroia as part of a general regulation created by the authorities in Rome in 167. According to him, the law was adopted on the initiative of the city which would not be possible if it were still under the monarchy due to the lack of independence of the cities during that period. He concludes that the law was adopted in 167 while still retaining most features of the Gymnasiarchical law of the monarchical period. However, stating that the cities under the Macedonian monarchy did not have any independence would be a misunderstanding, for as we have seen above, although the cities were under the control of the central authorities, they did have a certain amount of administrative, legislative and judicial independence. We should also take into consideration a theory put forward by Hatzopoulos according to which he claims that Kallippos son of Hippostratos, one of the rogators of the Gymnasiarchical law, was affiliated to an affluent family whose members were important officers of the king’s army and thus would have been deported to Rome in 167 after the defeat of Perseus.

The copy of the ephebarchical law of Amphipolis which also prominently features the politarchs, and is very similar in content to the Gymnasiarchical law, proves that the original
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decree, to which it is almost identical, also belongs to the monarchical period. As mentioned above, it is also possible that the ephebarchical law and the Gymnasiarchical law were created by the same authority. Another document that could be dated to the monarchical period is the dedication to Artemis Tauropolos from Perseus and the people of Amphipolis represented by two politarchs. First published by Koukouli-Chrysanthaki who dated it to the reign of Perseus between 179-171 BC, this document has also been subject to debate due to the fact that the second dedication appears to be less deeply engraved than the first. E. Voutiras put forward a theory according to which after the defeat of Macedonia in 167, the new authorities of the city tried to supersede the dedication of Perseus by stuccoing it and inscribing below it the dedication that mentions the politarchs. This theory however is not accepted by the majority of scholars because firstly there is no trace of stucco on the royal dedication. Secondly, the space between the royal and the civic dedication is even suggesting that they were they were inscribed sequentially and were meant to be seen simultaneously. Schuler leans more towards the possibility of the politarchate being created by the Roman. However, he does not completely reject the possibility of it being an office created by the Macedonian monarchs that was later modified by the Romans. Another reason for Hatzopoulos suggesting that the politarchs were pre-Roman magistrates is that from the above mentioned inscriptions of Thessaloniki and Amphipolis, it is evident that they had only two magistrates. However, during the Roman period, big cities like Amphipolis, Beroia and Thessaloniki had a board of five politarchs. This change could indicate that the cities had only two politarchs during the Antigonid rule and the number was increased under the Romans.

**Official duties of the Politarchs**

During the Roman period, it is evident that the politarchs were annual officials who acted as chief magistrates of the cities. Depending on the city their duties included acting as representatives of their respective cities, convening the assembly, proposing decrees and ensuring that their instructions are carried out, convening the council, and formulating decrees and having them inscribed. However, due to lack of epigraphic evidence, their official duties during the period under the monarchy remains unclear. The politarchs are mentioned twice in the Gymnasiarchical law of Beroia, the first is in the 42\textsuperscript{nd} line of the text, according to Hatzopoulos as chief magistrates and are assisted in their duties by the exetastai who appear to be responsible for “receiving and examining the accounts of incumbent and outgoing magistrates and as exercising a preventive control over the legality of propositions of decrees and laws.” The second mention of the politarchs is at the end of the text where as I mentioned above, they were responsible for transmitting the decree to the authorities of the gymnasium. Schuler on the other hand, while preferring to date the document to a period between 167-150 BC, does accept the possibility of the document dating to an earlier period. However, according to his opinion, even if the politarchs existed during the monarchical period, they did not become the chief magistrates of the cities until

---
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under the Roman rule. However, according to Hatzopoulos, the politarchs were the rogatores, who he suggests were responsible for convening the assembly in order to propose the gymnasiarchical law. This would mean the politarchs had already begun to act as the chief civic magistrates of the cities, replacing the epistatai. According to him, “The documents from late Antigonid Beroia and Amphipolis, which are confirmed by some closely parallel texts from the Roman period, also indicate that the politarchs were exclusively responsible for convening and presiding the sessions of the Assembly and of the Council.”

The ephebarchical law of Amphipolis mentions the politarchs several times and gives us a better understanding of the duties of the politarchs. To be specific, the politarchs are mentioned in three articles of the decree. First is the article “On the contests held every month for the ephebes” according to which the politarchs along with the paidonomos, gymnasiarch and the ephebarch, judge the monthly contest held for the ephebes. Second is the article “On competitors” which states that in the annual competition for the ephebes, the ephebarch gives the names of the three winners to the politarchs. Third is the article “Fines to the teachers” which states that in case the ephebarch fines and removes a teacher from his post, he should inform the politarchs or he shall be held accountable. Judging from the duties of the politarchs mentioned in the document, it can be assumed that they were the chief magistrates of the city. Considering that the original copy of the ephebarchical law was composed during the period of the gymnasiarchical law and by the same authorities, it is probable that the politarchs were already the chief magistrates of Amphipolis during the later years of the Antigonid rule. Nevertheless, this can only be an assumption due to lack of any information regarding the legislative procedure of the adoption of the law in the city. It is also possible that during the monarchical period, the office of the politarchs was also military in character. This is suggested by the fact that Timonides and Mestylos, the politarchs of Amphipolis, dedicated a monument to Artemis Tauropolos after repelling the Thracians.

Chapter 3
Communication between the central and civic authorities

Over the past century many important laws and decrees concerning military, religious and financial affairs have been discovered. The two main forms of communication between the central and civic authorities that have been attested in Macedonia are diagrammata and royal letters. As I have discussed below, a diagramma can be compared to a circular that the king sends to the officials of the cities, communicating his instructions and demanding that a certain action be taken. The kings also used letters to do the same but compared to the diagramma, a letter is rather informal in nature. In total, there have been found around 20
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royal letters and nine diagrammata\textsuperscript{91} but before I further discuss these two forms of communication it would be helpful to compile a list of inscriptions that deepen our understanding of the relationship between the central and civic governments in Macedonia. I have done so by chronologically segregating the inscriptions based on the subject they concern: religious, financial, military and arbitrations. The final four inscriptions (the gymnasialarchical and ephebarchical laws and the asylia decrees concerning Kos) cannot be included in the list of diagrammata or letters since they were not written by the king and conveyed to the civic officials. Thus, I have segregated them under the title ‘other inscriptions’ because they are relevant for our understanding of the intervention of the central authorities in civic affairs and amount of autonomy held by cities in administrative matters.

Content of the documents

Documents concerning financial affairs

1. A letter by Antigonos Gonatas to Agasikles who was also most likely the epistates of Dion concerning an estate called “Mysia” owned by a certain Noumenios was discovered in 1995 and published by D. Pandermalis in 1999\textsuperscript{92}. The letter which the king requests Agasikles to publish before the sanctuary of Zeus, prevented the sons of Noumenios from carrying out any transactions on the estate without the permission of their father. A copy of the same letter was discovered at Apollonia in 1969 and was published in Horos in 2000\textsuperscript{93}

2. Letter of Demetrios II concerning the transfer of vineyards to the crown after the death of their heirless owner, was discovered at Pythion in 1998 and published by A. Tziafalas in 2000\textsuperscript{94}

3. Two letters of Antigonos Doson to Megalokles and the Tripolitans, dating to 222 BC, concerning tax exemptions granted to infantry officers, hetairoi and peltsats, who fought in the battle of Sellasia, discovered in the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios at Pythion in 1997\textsuperscript{95}

4. Another letter of Antigonos Doson to Megalokles, dating to 222 BC, concerning the household of a certain deceased Nikarchos, granting the latter’s son the same privileges that were given to him and exempting the household from paying taxes until the boy is an adult. The inscription was discovered in 1997 near the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{91} See Hatzopoulos, \textit{op. cit.} fn. 56, p. 50
\textsuperscript{92} D. Pandermalis, \textit{Διον}, Athens 1999, p. 53 (as cited in Hatzopoulos 2009, 48); SEG 48-783
\textsuperscript{93} A. G. Zannis, “"Une deuxième copie de la lettre d'Antigone Gonatas concernant la terre octroyée à Nouménios”, \textit{ΗΟΡΟΣ} (2000-2003) p. 14-16
\textsuperscript{94} See Hatzopoulos, \textit{op. cit.} fn. 56, p. 50
\textsuperscript{95} SEG 60.586
\textsuperscript{96} SEG 60.585
5. A fragmentary letter of Antigonus Doson dating back to 222 BC to the city of Beroia concerning tax exemptions granted to infantry officers. The 1.17 m high stele that originally stood in the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas, was discovered at Beroia in 1980 and published by V. Allamani-Souri and E. Voutiras in 1996.

6. Letters of Philip V to Amphipolis, dating to 218 BC, concerning tax exemptions granted to Ainians staying in the city. The document consists of two letters, the first informing an individual of the Ainians’ request to publish at the sanctuary the benefactions they received from the king as well as his father and the second letter is one of the documents granting these benefactions.

7. A letter of Philip V to Amphipolis reminding them of the expiry of privileges granted to them in the year of 198/7 BC and that from then onwards they were required to fulfil their normal obligations.

8. Dating to 181 BC is the letter of Philip V to Archippos, the epistates of either Greia or Euia, concerning the grant of land to a military unit. The inscription consists of the letter of Philip to Archippos along with the copy of a petition sent to the former by the military unit. It was found in 1931 near Kozane and published by Ch. I. Makaronas.

Inscriptions concerning religious affairs

1. Three letters of the crown prince Demetrios to Harpalos, the epistates of Beroia, concerning the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas dating to 248/7 BC. The inscription found in Beroia was first published by A.M. Woodward in 1911/12 and restored by J. M. R. Cormack and C. F. Edson.

2. Dating to 187 BC is the royal diagramma of Philip V along with the opening letter of Andronikos, the epistates of Thessaloniki, concerning the property of the sanctuary of Sarapis in Thessaloniki, first published by S. Pelekides in 1934.

3. A diagramma of Philip V sent to Amphipolis in 182/3 BC, concerning the participation of athletes in the stephanitai games. The diagramma, as we will discuss below, does not concern only Amphipolis but all the Macedonian cities.

---

97 Allamani-Souri and E. Voutiras, 'New Documents from the Sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas at Beroia', Επιγραφες της Μακεδονίας (Thessaloniki, 1996) 13; EKM I 4
98 SEG 27.245, SEG 33.499
99 See Hatzopoulos “Institutions”, Epigraphic Appendix No. 14
100 Ch. Makaronas, "Επιστολή τοῦ βασιλείου τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης, Ἐφεμερις (1934-1935) 117-27 (as cited in Welles “Diagramma”, 245); ΕΑΜ 87
103 S. Pelekides, Από την πολιτεία και την κοινωνία τής αρχαίας Θεσσαλονίκης (Thessalonike 1934) 5-23 (as cited in Hatzopoulos “Institutions”, 378); IG X,2 1 3
104 SEG 43.369
4. Letter of Philip V to Dion concerning the granting of asylia to Kyzikos dating to 180 BC, discovered in 1997 and published by D. Pandermelis in 1999.105

5. The fragmentary circular letter from Alkomena concerning the general instructions given by the king, regarding the festival of Daisia. The letter is sent by a certain Doules to Nikolaos (their official status has been discussed in the chapter concerning the epistates) the former acting as a mediator and informing the latter of the king’s instructions. The inscription was first published in 1970 by Fanoula Papazoglou who dates it to 215 BC, during the reign of Philip V.106 The dating has since then been disputed, G. Daux being the first to suggest dating it to 174/3 BC, during the reign of Perseus.107

Inscriptions concerning arbitrations

1. An inscription (possibly a diagramma) of Philip II from an unknown place in Mygdonia, dating to a period between 357 and 350 BC, concerns the settlement of a boundary dispute between several Mygdonian cities and was published by D. Lazarides in 1990.108

2. Letter of Demetrios Poliorcetes dating back to 291 BC, to a certain Ladamas who was most likely the epistates of Dion. The letter concerns a boundary settlement between Pherai and the newly established city of Demetrias, which the king requests Ladamas to display on a stele before the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios. The letter hasn’t been published yet but a translation of it is available in one of Hatzopoulos’ studies.109

3. An inscription discovered in Philippi in 1936110, concerning the settlement of a dispute between the city of Philippi and the neighbouring Thracians, by Alexander III. The document dating back to 330 BC is neither a diagramma nor a royal letter but a report of an ambassador of Philippi relating the decision of the king regarding the dispute. It was published in 1936 by C. Vatin and republished with a more thorough commentary by L. Missitzis in 1985.111

Inscriptions concerning military matters

105 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 56, p. 48; SEG 48-785
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107 G. Daux, "En marge des 'Mélanges Klaffenbacil"; Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, Volume 95, livraison 1, 1971. pp. 274, 275; IG X 2.2 347
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1. A complete copy of Philip V's military diagramma concerning garrison duty was discovered at Chalkis and first published by S. B. Kougeas in 1934. A fragmentary copy of the same diagram was discovered at Kynos and it was published by Hatzopoulos in his monograph on the Antigonid army. Another fragmentary inscription concerning military matters from Amphipolis, dating to 200 BC, is believed to be part of the same military diagramma.

2. Two fragmentary inscriptions dating to the reign of Philip V, concerning the regulations of recruitment to the Macedonian army were found at Drama in 1956 and Nea Potidaia at an unknown date. These inscriptions were first published by P. Nigdelis and K. Sismanides in 1999 and republished in 2001 by M. B. Hatzopoulos who believes them to be a part of the general military code of Philip V, mentioned above.

Other inscriptions

1. The Gymnasiarchical law was first discovered in 1949 in the modern city of Beroia and was studied by B.G. Kallipolitis and Ch. Makaronas the ephorates of Beroia and Thessaloniki respectively. However, it was first published only in 1973 by British scholar J.M.R. Cormack and since then has become a subject for research by various scholars. The inscription consists of 217 lines engraved on two sides of a stele 1.75m high (the dating of the inscription is a subject of debate).

2. The decrees of Pella, Philippi, Amphipolis and Cassandria dating to 243 BC, concerning the granting of asylum to the city of Kos. Similar to the Gymnasiarchical law of Beroea, these decrees are also civic in nature but influence of the central government becomes apparent by the fact that three of the four decrees state the will of the king.

3. The ephebarchical law of Amphipolis is similar to the gymnasiarchical law and probably dates back to the reign of Philip V (as discussed below, there is also an inscription containing the ephebarchical law dating to the Roman period. However, the finding of an older inscription with similar content suggests that the one from the Roman period was a copy of the older law).
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Diagramma: The diagrammata along with the royal letters were the most common form of communication between the royal and civic authorities. The diagramma concerning military affairs such as those found in Chalkis, Kynos and Amphipolis, did not mention any measures to be taken by the civic authorities and only included regulations regarding the army. The civic diagrammata on the other hand, although they were not different in form from the military diagrammata, mentioned certain measures to be taken by the civic authorities. For example, the diagramma of Philip V to Amphipolis stated that the Gymnasiarch was responsible for registering the incoming athletes participating in the Stephanitai games and if a city didn’t have a gymnasiarch, the mentioned duties were to be carried out by the epistates. Also, the diagramma concerning the sanctuary of Sarapis needed to be transferred by the epistates to the authorities of the sanctuary and be published by them. Nonetheless, both the types of diagrammata came into effect as soon as they were written by the royal authorities. Another common feature of the diagramma is that they were never dated and neither did they mention the sender nor the recipient, making them impersonal in nature.

Royal Letters: Letters were more personal in nature compared to the diagrammata due to the fact that they always mention the addressee and the sender. The addresses of the letters could either be an individual, usually the chief civic magistrate (or the head of an ethnos as in the case of Megalokles), a small community of people such as the resident Ainaians of Amphipolis, the residents of a city such as the Diestai or a larger district such as the Botteatai and the Tripolitans. As I have discussed earlier, this distinction between addressee of the letters is based on scale of the people affected by the measure that’s required to be taken and the necessary action that’s required by the concerned authorities. That is why the letter concerning the asylia of Kyzikos is addressed to the epistates as well as the Diestai (because a formal decision had to be taken by the entire community) and the letter concerning the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas was addressed to Harpalos (because acting as arbitrator in a dispute was the sole authority of the king). Even if a particular official was addressed in the letter, it was always in his official capacity and thus the communication between the king and the civic authorities was never personal.

In the previous chapter concerning the civic officials, I discussed the following documents while focussing on the communication between the king and the civic officials and communities: 1) The diagramma from Thessaloniki corning the sanctuary of Sarapis, 2) The letters of Philip V to Amphipolis and the Ainians 3) The letters of Antigonos Doson to Megalokles and the Tripolitans 4) The letter of Antigonos Doson to Beroia 5) The letter of Philip V to Dion concerning the asylia of Kyzikos 6) The letter of Doules to Nikolaos from Alkomena. I also discussed the gymnasiarchical and ephebarchical laws in relation to the dating of the office of the Politarchs. In the inscriptions that I discuss below, I will further analyse the communication between the central and civic authorities, while also focussing on the king’s right as head of state, to intervene in civic affairs. Accordingly, I have chosen to discuss two diagrammata, two royal letters and a document that prove that the king had the final say in religious and financial matters and those concerning boundary disputes. The civic
laws and decrees I discuss after that are neither in the form of diagrammata or letters but they show an influence of the king on civic affairs.

Diagrammata

The diagramma of Philip V concerning the sanctuary of Sarapis

From Andronikos. The ruling {diagramma} about the property of Sarapis, which I have sent to you, was sent to me by the king; have it inscribed on a stone stele and put it up in the sanctuary, so that the people in charge may know what the king decided on how things should be done. In the thirty-fifth year, on the 15th day of the month of Daisios.

Ruling {diagramma} issued by king Philippos. Nobody is allowed to alienate any of the property of Sarapis, by any means, or to mortgage anything of the other votive offerings or to propose any decree about these. And if anyone commits an act prohibited hereby, he [shall be] guilty and the punishment shall be as in the case of theft and the alienated property shall be restored to the sanctuary, having been exacted from the property of the offender. Similarly, it is not allowed to open the treasuries of the god unless the overseer {epistates} and the judges [are present], or to consume the money from the treasuries without good reason, but only [with] their consent. Otherwise, [anyone who acts] in this way shall be liable to [the] same punishment.

The above document was discovered in 1917 at the sanctuary of Sarapis in Thessaloniki. It has since become one of the most important documents to highlight the interconnection between the central and local government in Macedonia, considering it is one of the only three documents that provides us with details regarding the duties of the epistates (in other documents the epistates usually appears only as an eponymous official). The document begins with an opening letter from a certain official named Andronikos to whom Philip V had sent the diagramma regarding the finances of the sanctuary of Sarapis in Thessaloniki. The recipient of the letter is not mentioned by Andronikos who instructs them to publish the diagramma in front of the sanctuary. The diagramma contains instructions regarding the proper use of the sanctuary’s property and finances and the penalty for those who defy the mentioned instructions. The king makes the epistates and judges responsible for the sanctuary’s finances and without their permission the treasuries can neither be opened nor the money used.

Although the aim of the diagramma is straightforward, that is to prohibit the unlawful use of the sanctuary’s property, the entire document however raises several questions such as what was the official position of Andronikos, who is the addressee of the covering letter, and what prompted the king to issue the above, amongst many others.

S. Pelekides, who first published the diagramma along with the covering letter, believed that the document was addressed to the priests of the Sarapeion from Pella by Andronikos who

---
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was the epitropos of the king. However, this argument would make one wonder why the king would choose to communicate through an official at Pella, rather than communicating directly with the officials of the city and the sanctuary. Considering that the epistates is one of the officials made responsible for the sanctuary’s finances, the procedure of communicating his decision to the sanctuary through a royal official at Pella is incomprehensible.

B. Welles agrees with the fact that Andronikos was the epistates of Thessaloniki. According to him “If Andronikos was in such close relations with the city that he could address it through an informal “hypomnema,” he cannot have been some personage at the royal court at Pella, a dioecetes or some other; he must have been the epistates in the city’. He however believes the epistates to be the crown agent of the king and not a local magistrate. He further suggests that the diagramma was addressed to “a civic community” or the “executive magistrates” of Thessaloniki and was aimed at transferring the control of the sanctuary’s finances from the city officials to the crown agents, the epistates and the judges. The question regarding whether the epistates was a crown agent as Welles has suggested, or a civic magistrate, is particularly important while discussing the above document because it can determine the aim of the diagramma and also demonstrate how instructions by the central authorities were implemented into civic affairs. I have however discussed in the previous chapter why the epistates was more likely to be the chief magistrate who was an essential part of the civic administrative body rather than an official sent by the king. Thus it is more likely that although the king maintained overall control over the sanctuaries in Macedonia and had the final say regarding their affairs, this diagramma was not an attempt to transfer the sanctuary’s finances to the crown. Instead, its purpose was to make a clear distinction between civic and religious finances and prevent the inappropriate use of the money in the sanctuary’s treasury. Since the epistates was in charge of the administration of civic affairs, the king communicates his instructions to the former who in turn conveys it to the interested party. As we shall see in other documents discussed below, this procedure of communication was fairly common between the king and the civic officials of the cities.

Regarding the question of who the covering letter was addressed to, as Hatzopoulos suggests, we need to take into consideration the fact that the addressees of the letter are instructed by Andronikos to publish it before the sanctuary ‘so that the people in charge may know what the king decided on how things should be done’. Also, since Andronikos is a civic magistrate who is responsible for transmitting the king’s message to the concerned authorities, it is unreasonable to suggest that the addressee was the civic body. Thus it is most likely that the addressees of Andronikos’ letter are the priests supervising the affairs of the sanctuary and as per the king’s diagramma they are not permitted to open the sanctuary’s treasury without the consent of the epistates and the dikastai. The above
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diagramma when examined carefully can tell us a lot regarding the relationship between the central and civic authorities.

The document being a diagramma, required no legislative procedure to be approved at the civic level, thus granting the king complete control over the final decision regarding the concerned matter. At first glance this procedure seems to be completely autocratic with no room for civic autonomy. However, considering the fact that the king makes the civic magistrates and not a royal officer responsible for carrying out his instructions and overseeing the opening of the sanctuary’s treasuries, the civic magistrates appear to have a certain amount of autonomy to work in their capacity. Also to take into consideration is the fact that the king’s intervention most likely came as a final resort to either already settle a dispute that had already taken place at the given sanctuary or to prevent it from happening. It could therefore be suggested that the king usually only intervened in civic affairs in order to settle disputes that the civic officials could not settle by themselves, or when his intervention was specifically asked for. Interpreting the above document in a way that portrays that monarchy to have complete control over the city’s affairs, leaving no room for civic self-governance, would be misinterpreting the relationship between the king and the civic administrative body.

Diagramma of Philip V concerning the participation of athletes in the stephanitai games

"To those in charge. Let the following text be inserted into the gymnasiarchical law. In the 39th year, on the 7th of Panemos. And let the gymnasiarchs of the cities of Macedonia register in the city where they disembark for the first time the athletes who arrive in order to take part in the games, interrogating them for which event they arrive, and let them transmit the document to the priest and to the gymnasiarch appointed for the games having a crown as a prize. If there are no gymnasiarchs, let these provisions be carried out by the epistatai". 124

The above diagramma concerning the participation of athletes in the stephanitai games is sent by Philip V to the officials of Amphipolis. The diagramma that is to be inserted into the gymnasiarchical law of the city contains instructions for the gymnasiarch regarding registering the athletes arriving in the cities to participate in the stephanitai games and it mentions that if a city does not have a gymnasiarch, the instructions should be carried out by the epistates. This is one of the few inscriptions that has a general scope and although the diagramma is meant to be inserted into the gymnasiarchical law of Amphipolis, the given instructions take all the cities of Macedonia into consideration. The general scope of the above document and the amendments of the king to the city’s gymnasiarchical law bring to mind the gymnasiarchical law of Beroia which as I have discussed below, also seemed to concern all the cities of the kingdom but with the intervention of the central authorities being rather subtle. Another fact to be taken into consideration is the communication between the king and the authorities of the cities regarding civic affairs. In all the documents we have discussed so far, whether they are related to religious affairs, grants of land or
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participation in contests, the king always communicates with the civic authorities of the city and never with lower civic officials or organs. So is the case with this document in which the king addresses the civic authorities as “to those in charge”. This shows that only the civic authorities were authorised to administer civic affairs. Also, as I have mentioned before, the central and civic authorities followed a standard procedure in the communicating and execution of the king’s instructions and as we see, this procedure is followed in all situations.

Royal Letters

Letters of Demetrios to Harpalos concerning the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas in Beroea.

"When Antigonos was king for the 36th year the kynegoi Chartas son of Nikanor and Attylos son of Nikanor having petitioned Demetrios, the following letters were issued:

Demetrios to Harpalos, greetings. The priests of Herakles state that some of the god’s revenues have been assigned to the city. See to that they are restored to the god. Farewell.

Demetrios to Harpalos, greetings. It seems that the manumitted slaves used to consecrate phialai to the sanctuary. Since there have accumulated more than are needed for the god, let them consecrate, instead of phialai, skypnoi and horns. Farewell.

Demetrios to Harpalos, greetings. Let the priests of Herakles be exempt of exactly the same taxes as the priests of Asklepios. Farewell. In the 36th year, on the 15th of Dystros”.

The first royal Macedonian document to be published, it has raised several questions and debates over the years. However, due to the subject of this study, the focus shall be limited to what the above document conveys regarding the relationship between the central and the local authorities. Dating back to 248/247 BC, the document contains three letters sent by Demetrios, acting as regent in place of his father Antigonos Gonatas, to an official named Harpalos regarding the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas in Beroea. While discussing the diagramma of Philip V regarding the sanctuary of Sarapis, we established that Andronikos was the epistates responsible for the proper execution of the king’s instructions. Due to the similarity in nature of the document with the letters of Demetrios, we can assume that in this case Harpalos was the epistates of Beroea. He was responsible for the civic affairs of the city, thus the king as we see in the letters, communicates his decision to him regarding the appropriation of sanctuary funds, manumission of slaves from the sanctuary and the payment of taxes by the priests.

In the case of Andronikos it is probable that the misuse of the sanctuary money had not yet taken place and the aim of the king’s diagramma was to prevent such an occurrence in the future. It is also possible that the misappropriation had taken place in another city due to which the king issued the diagramma. In this case however, as can be seen in the first letter, the sanctuary’s funds were taken to be used for the city and Harpalos is ordered by the king
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to restore the funds. What is evident in the first letter of Demetrios, as was in the diagramma from Thessaloniki, is the king’s right to intervene in the affairs of the city in order to solve a dispute. Here the dispute is clearly between the civic authorities and the authorities of the sanctuary, the latter asking for the king’s intervention so as to have the funds restored to the sanctuary. Again, the king’s intervention should not be considered as him exercising control over civic affairs but rather as utilising his right as head of state to solve a dispute between the civic body and a religious organisation in one of the cities.

What makes this scenario different from the one discussed previously is the method of communication between the central authorities and the civic magistrates. Although we do not know how the king communicated with Andronikos, sending a diagramma along with his instructions to be published at the sanctuary, exhibits a formality that one would expect is required when the central authority communicates with the civic officials. In this situation, it is not only the fact that the king sends personal letters to the chief civic magistrate to solve the affairs concerning a religious organisation, that makes the method of communication seem informal but also the content of the letters. The sentences of Demetrios seem abrupt and commanding and the absence of his order to publish and display the instructions given to Harpalos gives the impression that carrying out the final decision given by the central authorities required no formal procedure. This was probably true, especially in certain situations such as the settlement of disputes.

Another document that supports this suggestion is the letter of Philip V concerning a land grant.

**Letter of Philip V to Archippos concerning a land grant**

"King Philip to Archippos, greetings. I have sent you the copy of the hypomnema submitted to me by Nikanor the tetrarches and his men. I concede therefore to them the arable land of Korrhagos son of Perdikkas, one of the metics in Greia, which according to them has a surface of 50 plethra, as long as they perform the sacrifices in the month of Apellaios. You, after transcribing my letter, display it before the epistasion. In the 42nd year, on the (----) of Audnaios. Hypomnema to king Philip from Nikanor son of Philotas, tetrarches, Theoxenos son of Kleitinos, hypaspistes, Bilos son of Nikanor, lochagos, and the Euiestai serving in the first lochosr. Alexandras son of Proitos, Antigonos son of Alexandras, Nikanor son of Armennas, (----) machos son of Krateuas, (----) son of Antigonos, Anti-..."126

The above text consists of a letter written by Philip V to an official named Archippos, informing him about his favourable decision concerning a petition submitted to him by a group of soldiers. According to it he grants the petitioners, Nikanor and his men, 50 plethra of land belonging to a certain metic Korrhagos. The king further instructs Archippos to transcribe the letter and display it before the epistasion. The text raises several questions such as who was Archippos, in which city was the land belonging to Korrhagos located, what was the military status of Nikanor and his men (were they retired soldiers, were they a contingent of the army stationed in the region) etc. However, as mentioned earlier, taking the subject of this study into consideration, I would limit the focus to what the letter
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indicates regarding the relationship between the central and the local authorities. In order to do so, it would be necessary to examine the method of communication between the petitioners and the king and that of the king with Archippos but first and foremost, the identity of Archippos should be taken into consideration. The letter does not mention his official status and most editors of the text take it for granted that he was the royal governor of Greia. According to Welles, “As the editor correctly infers, Archippos was, then, himself presumably an epistates, a royal "overseer" or resident stationed in a city to safeguard the king's interests.”

Errington further suggests that the land granted to the petitioners is royal land and Archippos was in charge of its administration. However, as Hatzopoulos rightly suggests, it is not plausible to take for granted that Archippos was a royal official with no evidence regarding his official duties. His suggestion that Archippos was not the royal governor considering that the king could not employ his officials in every district of Macedonia seems the most reasonable compared to the arguments of other scholars. Citing his words, “It is remarkable that neither Makaronas nor Welles ever stopped to think how the king could spare dignitaries "of his immediate circle" to man every year not only a hundred or so Macedonian cities, but also each of the several scores of hamlets of the five Macedonian cantons (Eordaia, Elemia, Lynkos, Orestis, Tymphaia-Parauaia) west of the Bermion range.”

Another reason for assuming that Archippos was a civic official and not a royal governor lies in the method of communication of the petitioners with the king. If Archippos was indeed a royal official stationed at the city where the king's instructions were to be carried out (Greia as per most scholars or Euia as Hatzopoulos suggests), it suggests a strict hierarchical order of the central rule throughout Macedonia. It can therefore be assumed that Nikanor and his men would have been required to send their hypomnema to the king through the royal official stationed in their region. However, in this case, the hypomnema is sent directly to the king who is also informed by the petitioners regarding the dimensions of the land. Whether or not the petitioners had a private audience with the king is hard to say but there is no evidence suggesting that Archippos played a role in communicating the hypomnema to the king.

The king then conveys his reply to Archippos through a simple letter along with the hypomnema of the petitioners attached, and is instructed to publish it before the epistasion. The fact that the dossier is to be erected before the epistasion indicates that Archippos was the epistates, thus, if we assume that he was the chief civic magistrate, then the method of communication of the royal instruction is in keeping with other documents such as the diagramma sent by Philip V to Andronikos regarding the sanctuary of Sarapis. Based on this assumption it can be said that king sends his reply to Archippos because being the chief magistrate, he is responsible for the city's administration and for ensuring that the king's instructions are carried out without any problems. Although the process of communication between the king and the civic officials is yet again quite simple, unlike the previous
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document, it exhibits a formal course of action, with the king attaching the hypomnema of the petitioners to the letter he sends Archippos and then having both transcribed and displayed before the epistasion. There was a standard method of communication: the king (crown prince in the case of Demetrios) would communicate his decision to the chief civic magistrate who in turn would be responsible for carrying out his instructions and transmitting the decision to the concerned authorities.

Another matter to be taken into consideration is that the king does not send an official from the court to measure the land. Suggested by the words “which according to them has a surface of 50 plethra”, the land is measured by Nikanor and his men who only have to inform the king regarding its dimensions. Although this has nothing to do with the civic officials of the city, it shows that groups and organisations in the cities, the entire civic community on the whole, had the right to function semi-independently.

The following documents as I have mentioned earlier are neither diagrammata or letters but decrees and laws relevant in analysing the relationship between central and civic authorities.

Document from Philippi concerning the settlement by Alexander III of a land dispute between the city of Philippi and the neighbouring Thracians

An embassy was sent to Alexander from Philippi in order to seek his intervention in the ongoing dispute of the latter with the neighbouring Thracians over the use of royal land. As I have mentioned, the document being discussed here is not directly written by the king but it is a report of an ambassador, stating the decisions of the king. According to the inscription, the king would send two royal delegates, “Philotas and Leonnatus” to define a boundary. It also mentions the grants of land and rights to use royal land given to the Thracians and to the city of Philippi by Philip II, which Alexander had decided were to be followed. Based on the document, I’m able to draw two conclusions regarding the relationship between the king and the cities.

Firstly, the document shows that the king had the sole authority to preside over disputes between communities and his decisions had to be accepted by the civic units. However, since the inscription does not mention the role of the civic authorities in the entire procedure of communicating with the king and having the dispute settled, it is impossible to know how king’s decision was implemented at the civic level. Secondly, as Hatzopoulos has noticed, when concerning the settlement of land disputes, the same procedure was followed from the reign of Alexander III to that of Philip V: 1) The cities would first send an embassy to the king to plead their cause 2) The king would then appoint arbitrators in order to measure the land and redefine the boundaries. This consistency supports my suggestion that although the communication between the king and the cities was simple (without the need for royal officials as mediators), every measure to be taken required a standard procedure that was followed by both the central and civic authorities.

Civic Decrees

Asylia decree for the Asklepieion of Kos

Pella

*Of Pella. When Asklepiodoros was priest, in the month of Gorpiaios. Whereas the architheoros Aristolochos son of Zmendron and the theoros Makareus son of Aratos, arriving from Kos, renewed the familiar ties which exist between the Koans and the Macedonians and gave an account of the goodwill of the city of Kos towards King Antigonos and the Pellaians and the rest of the land of the Macedonians and announced the Asklepieia celebrated in their city and the contests due to take place at the festival and also the truce and demanded that the sanctuary of Asklepios at Kos be inviolable, it was resolved by the city that the announcement of the Asklepieia by the Koans and the truce be accepted and that they be praised for the honours which they pay to the gods and for their goodwill towards King Antigonos and the Macedonians; that inviolability be granted to the sanctuary as to the other sanctuaries; that the treasurers give to the theoroi the same presents of hospitality which are given to others announcing contests having crowns as prizes and that a theorodokos of the Koans be elected, Hipp... son of... was elected.*

Pella is the first of the four cities to pass a decree regarding the inviolability of the sanctuary of Kos. It praises the Koans for their devotion towards the Gods and their goodwill towards Antigonos Gonatas and the Macedonians. It further recognises the inviolability of the sanctuary, instructs the treasurers to provide the theoroi with presents and orders for a theorodokos to be elected from amongst the Pellaians. It is to be noted that the decree from Pella is the only one that doesn’t mention the will of the king while granting inviolability to the sanctuary. It is usually assumed that the theoroi probably reached Pella before the city’s assembly could have an audience with the king. Bengtson on the other hand concludes that Pella along with Amphipolis fail to cite the will of the king and he takes this as an indication that these two cities had more autonomy compared to Cassandreia and Philippi. He also suggests that since the decree didn’t mention the assembly and the council, these institutions didn’t exist in the city. However, we shall see in the decree discussed immediately below that Amphipolis does mention the king’s will. Also, although the decree does not explicitly mention the institutions, use of words such as “it was resolved by the city” and the mention of the election of theorodokoi refer to a civic institution such as an assembly (the request for asylia would have also been put forward before the assembly).

Amphipolis

*Of Amphipolis. When Antigonos was king for the forty-first year, Xenias son of Orges epistates, Lysimachos priest; decrees of the 19th of Gorpiaios. Whereas Aristolochos son of Zmendron sent out as architheoros by the city of Kos and Makareus son of Aratos along with him as theoros presented themselves before the Assembly and renewed the familiar ties which exist between the Koans and the Macedonians and pointed out the goodwill of their*
city towards King Antigonus and the Macedonians and announced the Asklepieia celebrated in their city and the truce and demanded that the sanctuary of Asklepios at Kos be inviolable, let it be resolved by the city of Amphipolis that the announcement of the Asklepieia and the truce be accepted and that they be praised for the honours which they bestow to the gods and for their goodwill towards King Antigonus and the Macedonians; that the sanctuary be inviolable, as it is also the wish of King Antigonus; that the magistrates give to the theoroi a present of hospitality such as is given to those who announce the Pythia; that Dionysios son of Epigenes be the theorodokos of the sacred embassy of the Koans. It was adopted by a unanimous vote.¹³⁴

The decree of Amphipolis unlike that of Pella mentions that the theoroi presented themselves before the assembly. While the other three decrees instruct the treasurer to provide the theoroi with presents, the Amphipolitan decree addresses the same to the epistates. According to Rigsby, the mention of the royal date and the name of the epistates indicates that Amphipolis was less autonomous compared to the other cities. “Its preface contrasts with the other Macedonian decrees for Cos in such a way as to suggest that this city was more subordinate to the king than were the others, which cite only civic institutions: first a royal date and a royal overseer, ...and the bureaucratic docket dating the decree to 19 Gorpiaios (late August).”¹³⁵ As can be seen, one of the reasons behind Rigsby’s conclusion regarding Amphipolis comes from his belief that the epistates was a royal overseer. However, as we have seen, the epistates was a civic official and not a royal overseer as some believe. Moreover, the use of the royal date alone cannot suggest the degree of autonomy of the city. Rigsby’s conclusion is made even less plausible when considering that Amphipolis is not the only city that mentions the will of the king while recognising the sanctuary’s inviolability.

Cassandreia

Of Kassandreia. The strategoi and the nomophylakes proposed: Whereas theoroi have arrived from the city of Kos announcing the Asklepieia and the contests which take place there and the truce and give an account of the goodwill of their city towards King Antigonus and the city of Kassandreia and all the other Macedonians and demand that their sanctuary of Asklepios be inviolable, with good fortune, let it be resolved by the Council that the announcement of the Asklepieia be accepted and also the contests and the truce and that the sanctuary of Asklepios be inviolable according to the wish of the King; that the city of Kos be praised, because it takes care to perform its duties towards the gods fairly and gloriously and keeps its goodwill towards King Antigonus and our city and all the Macedonians; that the treasurer give to the visitors the present of hospitality which is prescribed by the law; that they be invited to the archegeteion; that the relevant expenses be disbursed by the treasurer. These made the

---

¹³⁴ See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 8, p. 140; IG XII 4.1, 220
announcements: Aristolochos son of Zmendron architheoros, Makareus son of Aratos theoros. The sacrifice shall take place in eight months.\textsuperscript{136}

The decree from Cassandreia is introduced by the strategoi and the nomophylakes and doesn’t mention the assembly but only the council. Rigsby believes that the theoroi, continuing with their travels, had no time to wait for the meeting of the next assembly and thus contented themselves with the vote of the council.\textsuperscript{137} Another possibility for the lack of mention of the assembly, as I have mentioned in the previous chapter, is that the decrees of the council were often ratified by the assembly without making changes and also without mentioning the process of this ratification in the concerned texts. Thus the mention of the assembly wasn’t necessary in the decree.

Philippi

"Of Philippi; on sacred matters; concerning the sacred embassy from Kos. Proposition of the Assembly. Whereas the city of Kos, in conformity to tradition and to the oracle, [has founded] the sanctuary of Asklepios and has sent out Aristolochos son of Zmendron as architheoros and along with him Makareus son of Aratos as theoros to announce the sacrifice to Asklepios and the truce, who presenting themselves before the Assembly pointed out and renewed the familiar ties which exist between the city of Kos and the city of Philippi and King Antigonos and the other Greeks and Macedonians and demanded that the sanctuary be inviolable, with Good Fortune, let it be resolved by the Assembly that the city accept the announcement of the Asklepieia of Kos and the truce, such as the theoroi announce them; that the city of Kos be praised for the honours which they bestow on the gods and for their goodwill towards King Antigonos and the city of Philippi and the other Greeks and Macedonians; that inviolability be granted to the sanctuary of Asklepios at Kos, as is also the wish of King Antigonos, that the treasurer pay out to the theoroi on behalf of the city as a present of hospitality a sum equal to that which the law prescribes should be given to those announcing the Pythia; that the archon invite the theoroi to the prytaneion to partake of the sacrifices on behalf of the city; that the treasurer give the archon for each one of them the sum prescribed by the law; that, in order that they be conveyed safely to Neapolis, the strategoi send along with them the mercenary soldiers who are in the service of the city; that theorodokos of the sacred embassy from Kos be Herakleodoros son of Aristion, who welcomed the sacred embassy.\textsuperscript{138}

The decree from Philippi is introduced by the assembly and mentions the goodwill of the Koans not only towards the king, the city and the Macedonians but also refers to “other Greeks”. The decree mentions the archon who is responsible for inviting the theoroi to take part in the sacrifices on behalf of the city. It also mentions the strategoi who are responsible for sending along with the theoroi, the mercenary soldiers of the city so that they reach Neapolis safely. The decrees from the cities concerning granting of asylia to the Asklepieia of Kos are important documents that point out a specific characteristic of the relationship between the central and local authorities. As I have already mentioned while discussing the

\textsuperscript{136} See Hatzopoulos, \textit{op. cit.} fn. 8, p. 143, 144; IG XII 4.1, 220
\textsuperscript{137} See Rigsby, \textit{op. cit.} fn. 135, p. 136
\textsuperscript{138} See Hatzopoulos, \textit{op. cit.} fn. 8, p. 146, 147; SEG 12.373, ll. 35-55
letter of Philip concerning the asylia of Kyzikos, granting of asylia required a decision from the central as well as the local authorities. On the civic level the decision was to be taken and approved by the council and the assembly as was done by the four cities. The fact that these cities were consulted regarding granting of asylia and that they could make their own decision through a formal legislative procedure shows that they had a considerable amount of civic autonomy. The king being the central authority was consulted before the cities and the decision to mention his will was probably due to the fact that in matters that required the decision of both the king and the cities, the civic authorities felt the need to express that their decision is in accordance with that of the king. What is apparent from these decrees is that the decision of the central as well as the civic authorities was equally authoritative in form. This suggests that neither did the central administration have complete control over the civic units and nor were the latter completely autonomous, rather they were both interdependent on each other.

The Gymnasiarchical Law of Beroia and the Ephebarchical Law of Amphipolis

The Gymnasiarchical law from Beroia is one of the few documents found in Macedonia that paints an elaborate picture of the working of the gymnasium. It is a meticulous document relating to the civic life of a Macedonian city and its dating, a matter that has been subject to years of debate, is very important when considering what this document can tell us regarding the relationship between the central and local authorities. The opinions on the dating of this document are divided into two, some believing that it dates back to the pre Roman era, under the kings and others dating it to the period after 167 BC, under Roman rule. The matter regarding the dating of this document has been discussed more in detail in the following chapter in the section regarding the politarchs, where I have suggested that it dates to the period under the Antigonid rule and is not a Roman invention.

Another document similar to the gymnasiarchical law is the ephebarchical law of Amphipolis. Dating back to 24/3 BC, this inscription describes the duties of the ephebarch and his assistants, the etiquette and training of the ephebes, the contests held each month and the rewards for the victors and the fines that can be imposed by the ephebarch on the ephebes due to any misconduct on their part. Although this document dates to the Augustan period under Roman rule, Hatzopoulos believes that it is a copy of an older document dating back to the period under Antigonid rule. This theory should be attributed to the finding of an ephebarchical law engraved on a stele, identical to the one mentioned above but dating back to the first quarter of the second c. BC. Hatzopoulos states several characteristics of the ephebarchical law dating to 24/3 BC that prove they are a copy of an older document: there is no mention of the procedure of the adoption of the law or the election of the ephebarch, the use of monetary units such as minae that didn’t exist during that period and the intensity of training that was similar to the training in gymnasiats during Antigonid rule in order to prepare the youth to join the Macedonian army. What makes this finding more interesting is that the original ephebarchical law is inscribed on a

139 M.B. Hatzopoulos, Comprendre la loi ephebarchique d’Amphipolis, Τεκμήρια 13 (2015-2016) 147
140 M.B Hatzopoulos (2016), ΝΕΟΤΗΣ ΓΕΓΥΜΝΑΣΜΕΝΗ. Macedonian Lawgiver Kings and the Young (David Lewis Lecture in Ancient History, Oxford 2016), Athens, 31
stele that consists on the other side a royal diagramma concerning service in the field army. The fact that a royal military diagramma and civic decree regarding the training at the gymnasion were inscribed on the same stele can reveal important elements of the relationship between the central and civic authorities but I would first like to address the subject of what the content of these two laws reveals regarding this relationship.

When first examined, the Gymnasiarchical law appears to be purely civic in nature. It is introduced to the assembly on the 19th of Apellaios by the gymnasiarch, Zopyros son of Amyntas and the rogatores Asklepiades son of Heras and Kallippos son of Hippostratos. What is more impressive is the seemingly democratic procedure of the adoption of the law, there being a decision making period of forty-five before the law is approved and adopted on the first of Peritios with one dissenting vote. The fact that a single citizen decided to disapprove the law and go against the majority and that his decision was recorded in the introduction of the law, emphasises the democratic functioning of the civic administrative system in Beroea during this period. However, Hatzopoulos and Gauthier in their study of the law noticed a curious series of wordings throughout the document that might suggest a subtle either intervention or influence from the central authorities. As they point out, words used in the articles of the law such as “no one may anoint himself in the same city”, “he may challenge the decision within ten days and be judged by the appropriate tribunal”, “he may lodge a lodge a complaint and be tried before the appropriate magistrates” and “suits about this shall be decided before the appropriate tribunal” are too imprecise for a decree referring to a specific city. The vague reference to the city’s civic units make one wonder why the law doesn’t explicitly mention the city’s magistrates and judicial component. Hatzopoulos suggests this is due to the negligence on the part of the individuals who proposed the law since they most likely reproduced the decree based on a royal diagramma without bothering to change the content to fit a civic decree. Curiously, even the text of the ephebarchical law, the original copy of which as has been mentioned dates to the monarchical period, exhibits similar imprecise wordings. “Where it is customary for the ephebes to anoint themselves separately”, “where it is customary for the ephebes to anoint themselves with the men”, “the track and field events customary to their city” and “the processions customary in each city” are phrases that seem peculiar when used in a decree referring to a specific city.

It has already been mentioned that the original ephebarchical law dated back to the period under Antigonid rule, also, due to its similarity with the content of the gymanssiarchical law (especially a spelling mistake, see Hatzopoulos ΝΕΟΤΗΣ ΓΕΓΥΜΝΑΣΜΕΝΗ) it is evident that they were based on the content of probably a diagramma created by the same authority. Hatzopoulos’ theory of the imprecise wordings of the Gymnasiarchical law being based on a royal diagramma due to the negligence of those who proposed it is quite logical but how can one explain the same occurrence in the ephebarchical law. Unlike the Gymnasiarchical law, the ephebarchical law does not mention the legislative procedure for the adoption of the law but it would not be sensible to suggest that the imprecise wordings

141 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 113, p. 20, 32
142 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 113, p. 32,33
143 See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 140
of the latter could be because the officials of Amphipolis were also negligent. A likely possibility could be that there existed a royal regulation throughout the kingdom regarding the training at the gymnasium of the cities. As we know, the training at the gymnasium was to prepare the youth to join the army of the king and therefore it would not be unreasonable to suggest that the central authorities had the right to regulate their education. This is emphasised even more by the fact that the ephebarchical law was published on the same stele containing a royal diagramma concerning service in the field army, thus showing the relationship between training at the gymnasium and recruitment to the king’s army. Taking the above into consideration, it is my opinion that the officials of Beroia and Amphipolis proposed the decrees based on a necessary royal regulation concerning the education of the youth throughout the cities of the kingdom and the imprecision of wordings was deliberate rather than negligent. As for the legislative procedure, it is likely that since the gymnasium was a civic unit, any civic decree concerning it was required to be passed through the assembly. Despite the fact that the assembly allowed a decision making period of one month in order to adopt the law and that there was one dissenting vote that made the process seem democratic, we should keep in mind that there was only a single citizen who disapproved the decree. The introduction of the decree does however show that there existed a complex civic administration in Beroia and it is likely that the civic officials had the right to propose decrees and adopt laws without the interference of the central authorities on matters that were strictly civic in nature. Yet when it came to matters that were related to the central administration of the kingdom such as the education of the youth in order to join the field army, the officials either had to accept royal instructions in the form of diagrammata or as is most likely in this case, propose their own decrees but based on the regulations of the central authorities which were probably in the form of royal letters. Due to their similarity, it is possible that a similar procedure of adoption of the law was also carried out in Amphipolis.

Conclusions regarding the nature of the Macedonian state

The subject of this study has been the relationship between the king and the civic authorities. This final chapter includes the conclusions and a discussion on what this relationship tells us about the structure of the Macedonian state. Based on the discussion in the study I have drawn three broad conclusions regarding the structure of the kingdom: 1) The king was the highest authority in the kingdom and had command over military, religious and financial affairs of the kingdom 2) The civic units had their own functioning governments and officials, and had a fair amount of autonomy to make decisions 3) The central and civic governments were interdependent on each other, creating a complex political system throughout the kingdom.

The monarchy as the nucleus of the state

As far as the nature of the Macedonia state is concerned, whether a scholar supports the authoritarian view or the constitutionalist, there is no denying that the king was the centre
of the state. It is clear that in matters that concerned military affairs, the king was the sole authority (whether such decisions were made solely by the king or alongside other central authorities is another subject of discussion that is not included within the scope of this study) and civic officials could neither create new laws nor modify existing ones. As is known from the fragments of military diagrammata found in Chalkis, Kynos, Amphipolis, Drama and Nea Potidea\(^{144}\), the entire state of Macedonia had a general regulation concerning the recruitment and organisation of the army, created by the central authorities and followed by all the cities and districts. The king’s role as the head of the state is also apparent in religious and financial matters and those concerning arbitrations. For example, when we consider the diagramma concerning the sanctuary of Sarapis or the letters of Demetrios concerning the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas, the king was consulted due to his position as the religious head of the kingdom and also his authority to act as arbitrator in disputes between civic authorities and those of another organisation. Also, from the letter of Doules to Nikolaos we observe that the king sent out general instructions regarding the festival of Daisia which were to be followed by all the civic units of the kingdom. Similarly, the king had the right to grant privileges to military units, communities and individuals and in cases which did not affect entire communities or did not involve amendments to the existing civic laws, the king’s instructions required only to be published by the chief magistrate and required no approval by the council or the assembly. This is apparent from the decision of Antigonos Gonatas to safeguard the estate of Noumenios, the privileges granted to the household of the deceased Nikarchos by Antigonos Doson, the grant of land by Philip V to Nikanor and his men and the privileges he granted to the Ainians. The king was also the most important authority to be consulted in matters concerning foreign affairs, as is seen from the inscriptions concerning the granting of asylia (Kos and Kyzikos). Although the cities had the autonomy to formally make a decision regarding granting of asylia, the decrees concerning Kos show that they also considered it necessary to mention the will of the king (except Pella which being the capital of the kingdom, could have done so verbally.)

An anomaly that can be noticed regarding the institution of the monarchy in Macedonia is its accessibility to the common people around the kingdom. In a conventional monarchy, the king only communicates with the elite of his court and uses royal messengers as mediators to communicate with the civic officials. The Macedonian kings on the other hand not only directly communicated with the authorities of the cities but could also be directly approached by communities, organisations and individuals throughout the kingdom. Also, in certain cases the king himself wrote letters concerning the property and households of certain individuals such as the above mentioned letters of Antigonos Gonatas concerning the estate of Noumenios and the letter of Antigonos Doson to Megalokles concerning the household of the deceased Nikarchos (a copy of which he also sent to another official named Damason).

**Civic autonomy**

The cities of the Macedonian kingdom although not completely autonomous (understandably so since they were constituent parts of a kingdom), were each governed by

\(^{144}\) See Hatzopoulos, op. cit. fn. 53, p. 827
their own civic government which had the right to formally make decisions on behalf of the entire community. The amount of autonomy possessed by the cities of the Macedonian kingdom has always been a subject of discussion with several scholars downplaying the role of the civic government in the administration of the cities. The most common argument put forward is that even if the cities had their own governments they were completely dependent on the king. For example, as A. Giovannini says, “they had no sovereignty of their own, they enjoyed only a limited autonomy depending totally on the will of the central government...” 145 However important inscriptions146 from the reign of Philip II onwards mention the council and the assembly of the cities taking part in the legislative procedure to formally approve decrees and laws. Not only did the cities have a council and an assembly but also a board of civic officials such as the epistates, nomophylakes, archons, dikastai, agoranomoi, politarchs, gymansiarchs, polemarchoi, tagoi, etc. Until the reign of Philip V, the epistatai were, as we saw, the chief civic magistrates of the cities and unlike the commonly held belief, they were not royal officials appointed by the king but annually elected civic officials. As we have seen, the epistatai were present in all Macedonian cities147 and they were necessary for the proper functioning of the state since they acted as mediators between the central and civic governments. Not only were they answerable to the king but also to the communities where they held office, of which they were also citizens. The politarchs began replacing the epistatai as chief civic magistrates presumably during the reign of Philip V and it is likely that the two offices continued to exist alongside each other until the Roman conquest of Macedonia, when the office of the epistates completely ceased to exist.

The absence of royal officials appointed by the king for the purpose of governing the cities suggests that civic governments were responsible for governing the affairs of the cities, depending on the central authorities in matters that could not be solved solely on the civic level, such as arbitrations between organisations or communities. It is unlikely that the civic governments were dependent on the will of the king for matters that were strictly civic in nature, such as the appointment of the epistates. Although there isn’t any information regarding the election procedure of these officials, the fact that they were civic officials who also belonged to the same community suggests that they were appointed by the civic government without the interference of the central government. Also, as I have mentioned elsewhere in the study, the fact that the king did not find the need to send out royal officers to measure the land in Greia but accepted the measurements sent to him by the military unit in Euia suggests that communities and organisations throughout the kingdom had a considerable amount of independence.

**Interdependence of the central and civic governments**

Based on the discussion throughout this study, what can be said about the overall internal political structure of the Macedonian kingdom is that it possessed a complex administrative

---

146 See p. 5 for a brief discussion on the functions of the assembly and council and p. 31 for a discussion of the asylia decrees which mention the assembly and council
147 See p. 8
system on both the central and civic levels. However, neither the central nor the civic governments functioned independently but were interdependent on each other. This interdependence is strongly reflected in all the inscriptions that have been discovered that belonged to the various cities of the kingdom. For example, since the decisions of the king and the cities were equally authoritative in form, Philip V's decision to grant asylia also required to be formally approved by the community of Dion. Sometimes this interdependence was more apparent, such as in the above situation and at other times it was rather subtle such as in the case of the gymnasiarchical law of Beroia. Although the law seemed to be strictly civic in nature, being formulated and approved at the civic level through a thoroughly democratic procedure, it is possible that it was based on a general law that was formulated by the central authorities and pertained to all the cities of the kingdom that had a gymnasium. If so, this could be an example of how the central and civic governments worked together to formulate and implement laws, maintaining an interdependent administrative system that was necessary for sustaining order throughout the kingdom.

Along with this interdependence what can also be noticed about the internal political organisation of the Macedonian state is its well-structured administrative system. This is most apparent from the communication between the king and the civic authorities. Firstly, the king only communicated with the chief civic magistrate and never the lesser civic officials or the authorities of another organisation within a civic unit. This procedure was followed despite the fact that in many situations the king was directly contacted by military units or religious authorities (Nikanor and his men or the priests of the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas who communicated with the crown prince Demetrios or the Ainians who put forth their request before Philip V). Communicating the king’s message either within the civic unit or with lesser civic units (letter of Doules to Nikolaos) and carrying out his instructions were the responsibility of the chief civic magistrate. Also, as we have seen, the civic authorities were always addressed in their official nature and never personally. Macedonia was thus a well organised kingdom with a political administration far more complex than a feudal monarchy in which the kings will was forced upon his subjects throughout the kingdom. It could be considered a federal state in which several semi-autonomous civic units coexisted to form a unitary state headed by the king. The relationship between the king and the civic governments was not that of a monarch and his subjects but that of political interdependency that was required to govern the entire kingdom.
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