



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

At the roots of a revolution. Land ownership, citizenship and military service in Macedonia before and after Philip II

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Manuela Mari (2019). At the roots of a revolution. Land ownership, citizenship and military service in Macedonia before and after Philip II. SWANSEA : Classical Press of Wales.

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/914884> since: 2023-02-11

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

At the roots of a revolution.

Land ownership, citizenship and military service in Macedonia before and after Philip II.¹

1. To be (or to become) *Makedones*: before and after Philip II.

One of the most effective descriptions of the acceleration impressed on the history of Macedonia by Philip II is found in an unexpected source: a fervent passage in the *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus by Justin (8.5.7 – 6.1-2).

«On his return to the kingdom [after finally defeating the Phokians], as shepherds drive their flocks sometimes into winter, sometimes into summer pastures, so he transplanted people and cities hither and thither, according to his caprice, as places appeared to him proper to be peopled or to be left desolate (*sic ille populos et urbes, ut illi vel replenda vel derelinquenda quaequae loca videbantur, ad libidinem suam transfert*). The aspect of things was everywhere wretched, like that of a country ravaged by an enemy. There was not indeed that terror of a foe, or hurrying of troops through the cities, or seizure of property and prisoners, which are seen during a hostile invasion; but there prevailed a sorrow and sadness not expressed in words, the people fearing that even their very tears would be thought signs of discontent. Their grief was augmented by the very concealment of it, sinking the deeper the less they were permitted to utter it. At one time they contemplated the sepulchres of their ancestors, at another their old household gods, at another the homes in which they had been born and in which they had families; lamenting their own fate, that they had lived to that day, and sometimes that of their children, that they were not born after it. Some people he planted on the frontiers of his kingdom to oppose his enemies; others he settled at the extremities of it. Some, whom he had taken prisoners in war, he distributed among certain cities to fill up the number of inhabitants; and thus out of various tribes and nations he formed one kingdom and people (*Alios populos in finibus ipsis hostibus opponit; alios in extremis regni terminis statuit; quosdam bello captos in supplementa urbium dividit. Atque ita ex multis gentis nationibusque unum regnum populumque constituit*)».

A ruthless policy of mass relocation of the kingdom's population, of cities refounded and repopulated, of forced synoecism, is painted here in a gloomy picture, even while its effectiveness is recognised. It was through just such a bold 'colonizing', city-building policy that Philip created the Macedonian kingdom for the first time, *unum regnum populumque*.² As in a number of other fields, Philip seemed, in these actions, capable of developing to their full extent the military, politico-institutional, and urban possibilities that had already existed in the region for a long time. In Macedonia, as in various regions of Greece, Philip appears heir to pre-existing traditions and policies, which, through minimal, but brilliant innovations, he systematised and made effective to an unprecedented degree.³

In fact, on closer inspection, the best description of Macedonia's inherent nature as a territorial state, based on the right of conquest - in short, as *doriktetos chora*, according to the formula later applied to the empire of Alexander and the Hellenistic kingdoms - can already be found in Thucydides, in a famous passage describing the territorial increase of *Makedonia*

between the archaic age and the middle decades of the fifth century; much earlier, therefore, than the time when Philip II defined the 'enlarged' boundaries of the kingdom, expelled historical enemies, and conquered the wealthy cities of Chalkidike, of the Thermaic Gulf, and of Thrace. Thucydides describes here (2.99) the extension of Macedonia on the eve of the attack of the Odrysian king Sitalces (an ally of the Athenians) in 429 BC, under the kingdom of Perdiccas II:

«[Sitalces' troops], assembling in Doberus, prepared to descend from the heights onto Lower Macedonia, where the dominions of Perdiccas lay; [2] for the Lyncestae, Elimiot, and other tribes more inland, though allies and subjects of the Macedonians, still form separate kingdoms. [3] The country on the sea coast, corresponding to present-day Macedonia, was first acquired by Alexander, the father of Perdiccas, and his ancestors, originally Temenids from Argos. This was effected by the expulsion from Pieria of the Pierians, who afterwards inhabited Phagres and other places under Mount Pangaeus, beyond the Strymon river (indeed the region lying under Pangaeus by the coast is still called the Pierian gulf), and of the Bottiaean, at present neighbours of the Chalcidians, from Bottia. [4] As for Paeonia, they conquered a narrow strip along the Axios River extending to Pella and the sea; beyond the Axios and up to the Strymon they hold the district of Mygdonia, after the expulsion of the Edonians. [5] Moreover, from the region at present called Eordia were driven the Eordians, most of whom perished, though a few of them still live round Physca, and the Almopians from Almopia. [6] These Macedonians also conquered places belonging to the other tribes, which are still theirs: Anthemus, Crestonia, Bisaltia, and a great part of the country of the true Macedonians. The whole is now called Macedonia, and at the time of the invasion of Sitalces, Perdiccas, Alexander's son, was the reigning king».⁴

The historical issues and questions raised by this Thucydidean page are too numerous to be addressed in this essay, even cursorily;⁵ but it is nevertheless the point of departure to accurately approach the subject of the following pages. Nicholas Hammond grasped how extremely important this chapter was to define what *Makedonia* and *Makedones* actually were, perhaps without drawing all the possible conclusions.⁶ As noted by the great British scholar, this remarkably dense page shows us in the first place how it is inherent for a territorial state to be constantly and naturally 'expanding': all territories gradually conquered by the Temenids and their earliest entourage (the «true Macedonians», Μακεδόνων αὐτῶν [2.99.6]) progressively become «Macedonia». Furthermore, it is well known how Thucydides, while apparently identifying different categories of *Makedones* (compare specifically the definition in § 6 with that in § 2, concerning populations of the inner regions, that were *Makedones* although ranked as «subjects»), is actually suggesting that, just as «Macedonia» was constantly expanding, one also could become a «Macedonian». As a matter of fact, he is making a distinction between the 'native' Macedonians⁷ and those who had achieved the status as the result of the Temenid kings' progressive conquests, since their land had become part of *Makedonia* and, as a consequence, they «were committed to fight alongside the *Makedones* [viz., the 'natives' and their sovereigns] and were subject to them».⁸

What we have here, *in nuce* and still in a rough form, is the nature of the 'territorial state' that Philip would transform, seventy years after Sitalces' attack, as described by Thucydides, into Europe's first military power: the two components of the state, namely the king and the

Μακεδόνες; the military service that the latter were required to perform; and the privileges derived from that requirement. Among such privileges, the right to land ownership, or the preservation of such a right, is essential. In Thucydides' passage there is a clear distinction between the populations who maintained possession of their own territories, and were therefore turned, by means of their military requirement, into Μακεδόνες; the populations that the Μακεδόνες had expelled from their own territories or exterminated almost completely; and finally those who ceded land to the Macedonians in their territories (Anthemous, Crestonia, Bisaltia).⁹ As suggested by Hammond, the latter, unlike the ξύμμαχα ... καὶ ὑπήκοα populations of 2.99.2, judging by Thucydides' omission, did not become Μακεδόνες.¹⁰ The acquisition or maintenance of land ownership was the prerequisite for gaining the full 'citizenship' in the Macedonian state and the right to participate regularly in the assemblies of the Μακεδόνες, which, as acknowledged once again by Hammond, the sources explicitly describe as assemblies of men in arms.¹¹ As indicated by other episodes of Macedonian history, at the time of Perdiccas II himself, and even earlier, under Amyntas I, the king appears to have great leeway to intervene in the conquered territories, including the possibility of donating land to individuals and entire communities.¹²

2. Citizenship, hoplite status, and land ownership in Macedonia in the age of Philip II

If the principles described were already at the centre of Thucydides' description of fifth-century Macedonia,¹³ what constitutes the qualitative leap determined by Philip II in the history of the region? An essential factor is the vast increase in the social base of the Μακεδόνες. By supplying his soldiers with at least some of the required weapons, as narrated by Diodorus,¹⁴ Philip certainly expanded the recruitment pool, providing Macedonia for the first time with a substantial and competitive infantry: the famous phalanx, about which Lucius Aemilius Paulus would say, almost two centuries later (despite having defeated it in battle), that he had never seen «anything more frightful and terrible».¹⁵ Characteristically, ancient historians (in our case Diodorus, and quite likely his sources) were mainly interested in the military side of this process; as for the economic and social implications, we can only learn something from cursory references in literary sources and from some crucial pieces of epigraphic evidence.¹⁶

Expanding the recruitment pool for the hoplites not only provided them with at least part of the required armament, but also implied an overall process (consciously supported by the central authority) of economic growth for a large part of the kingdom's population, which reached the living standards required by the hoplite class.¹⁷ It was a profound social and economic transformation which, as quantified by E.M. Anson, involved tens of thousands of people, and created a heavy infantry that did not exist beforehand, and an entire class of citizen-soldiers. While it is not possible to specify the conditions of 'dependency' previously experienced by such citizens (we lack any means of demonstrating whether the rural population included the kinds of mass serfdom comparable to those known in Thessaly and

Laconia), the overall outcome of the process certainly coincides with Anson's reconstruction.¹⁸ Using the available evidence, Anson rejects the idea that the less affluent rural population (poor peasants or transhumant shepherds) were perceived – like the helots in Sparta, or the Mariandynoi at Heraclea Pontica – as a «subject, conquered population, real or imagined»; they were «poor Macedonians themselves».¹⁹ The clarification is correct in 'ethnic' terms (or in terms of ethnic perceptions), but, on the basis of what has been discussed so far, I propose an inversion of perspective: they became *Makedones* only once the military reforms and land distributions introduced by Philip converted them into hoplites and smallholders.

The series of deeds of sale from Amphipolis, published in the early 1990s by M.B. Hatzopoulos, provides an exceptional 'live' documentation on the important city's change of status soon after its conquest at the hands of Philip in 357 BC,²⁰ and gives concrete substance to the idea of a 'colonization' of the kingdom 'from within', as summarized by Trogus-Justin. From the chronological succession of deeds of sale established by Hatzopoulos, what emerges is that, soon after Philip's conquest, the city of Amphipolis modified its calendar, adopting Macedonian names for months; it kept some of its ruling class, since the *epistates* Sparges, who already appears in documents previous to the Macedonian conquest, remained in office for several years; and received a significant number of new inhabitants. Only after a certain time interval do people with typically Macedonian names appear in real estate transactions, as recorded in inscriptions, such as Antigonos, Nikolaos, Asandros, Antipatros. Macedonian onomastics were not previously documented at Amphipolis, once an Athenian colony, then, for a long time, an independent city, close, both linguistically and institutionally, to the cities of Chalkidike.²¹

The inscriptions reconstruct a picture of Amphipolis that can also be applied to at least one other important, and protractedly independent city, annexed firmly to the kingdom only by Philip II, namely Pydna.²² Both Amphipolis and Pydna, after enjoying a long history as autonomous *poleis* (inconstantly in the case of Pydna; continuously, starting in 424 BC, in the case of Amphipolis), were definitively integrated into the kingdom by Philip II, and their territories came together «into the national territory of the Macedonian Commonwealth».²³ In concrete terms, the annexation involved the adoption of important institutional features (starting from the calendar) and an extension of the civic body through the inclusion of Macedonian colonists: this, as stated, is indicated in Amphipolis by positive onomastic evidence; in Pydna's case evidence is not as significant, but a similar process can be hypothesised.²⁴ Settlers were given lands to be cultivated; both cities experienced a significant extension of the *chora*; both were thus placed at the centre of an area much larger than their previous territory, and acquired an (unofficial) role as 'regional capitals', as confirmed by a number of indicators.²⁵

Amongst the most interesting and most visible repercussions of the changing condition of these cities is the fact that their inhabitants could now be designated – mostly of course from outside the kingdom – not with the simple city ethnic, but with a sort of 'dual' ethnic. They

were Μακεδόνες ἐξ Ἀμφιπόλεως, or ἐκ Πύδνας.²⁶ Thus Amphipolitans and Pydnaeans – not only, evidently, those who had recently been added to the population of the two cities – were to all effects and purposes Μακεδόνες.²⁷ That, in such cases, the aim of a Macedonian king was to ensure full agricultural exploitation of a very wide *chora*, while concurrently guaranteeing the full military efficiency of strategically sensitive areas, can be clearly inferred from the two famous letters by Philip V to the Larisseans, dated 217 and 215 BC. Obviously this occurs at a much later date and outside the borders of Macedonia proper (so much so that the king in this case cannot simply impose his will but is forced to patiently negotiate with the reluctant city), but the motives put forward by Philip V would not have been very different from those considered by Philip II at the time when he decided how to arrange the new areas gradually incorporated into Macedonia.²⁸

Such considerations, and the observation that both Amphipolis and Pydna after the conquest enjoyed a considerable territorial increase to the detriment of nearby cities, which were either destroyed or re-sized (Argilos and probably other settlements in the case of Amphipolis,²⁹ Methone in that of Pydna),³⁰ lead us to correct the description of how such cities were treated in the works of eminent scholars, such as F. Hampl and G.T. Griffith, who mainly insisted – albeit with subtle differences – on the assignment of great properties to *hetairoi*, the king's high ranking 'companions'.³¹ This aspect is certainly present, but must be enriched to make room for other existing realities and thus for a phenomenon that crossed social classes.³² The first phenomenon (the assignment of portions of 'royal land' to high-ranking officers and members of the court élite) is well-known through literary sources at least since the age of Philip,³³ and largely confirmed and made more specific in epigraphic sources. The system was widely adopted in the territories of Chalkidike after the liquidation of the *koinon* and the destruction of Olynthus in 348,³⁴ and in Amphipolis too assignees of great properties are also known, both among the cavalry *hetairoi* (one of Alexander's *ilai* actually took its name from the town) and other members of the 'national' élite. As a matter of fact, some senior officers of Alexander's fleet are described by Arrian as «Macedonians from Amphipolis» although they originated from other locations, evidently because they had taken up residence and received property (of great dimensions, we can assume) in the territory of the former Athenian colony.³⁵ Furthermore, that such territory included portions of βασιλική χώρα directly available to the king for his donations has been hypothesized by Ch. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki on the basis of an epigraphic text (the letters by Philip V revoking tax benefits previously granted to the city).³⁶

However, alongside the great landowners, who benefited from the king on a personal basis, many settlers of more modest condition who moved to Amphipolis were «Macedonians» also because of their ethnic origin: the deeds of sale mentioned above, on account of the small dimensions and value of the real estate involved, well describe how the relocation of *Makedones* into the kingdom's new territories occurred across social classes. For less wealthy immigrants the new territories annexed to the kingdom – including the most peripheral ones, as again suggested by the above quoted passage by Justin – were a precious opportunity for social

advancement, the only constraints being transferral to another location and **enlistment in the military of their new district**. We do not know the exact bureaucratic *iter* presiding over such transfers, and isolated epigraphic discoveries lead us to suppose a rather broad range of specific circumstances. For example, some of the settlers who obtained land in a city other than their own might not have acquired new citizenship there, living therefore as 'metics', for reasons that to this day remain obscure. This is the case for one Korrhagos, son of Perdikkas, unquestionably Macedonian, judging from his name and patronymic, yet defined as a «metic in Greia» (in Eordaia or Elimeia, part of *Makedonia*) in a letter from Philip V to Archippos, a local or regional officer.³⁷ The letter establishes the re-allocation of a plot, belonging to Korrhagos, to a group of soldiers, who had requested it, with the intention of performing religious rituals. The property in question was of small or medium size (50 *plethra*). It did not belong to a first rank personality, and was possibly returned to the king's hands when the assignee died without heirs.³⁸ We learn less from this document than we would like to, but at least we acquire the certainty that 'national' citizenship is not *sic et simpliciter* equivalent to full 'local' citizenship everywhere in Macedonia: a Μακεδῶν ἐξ Ἀμφιπόλεως, or ἐκ Πύδνας (with reference to previous examples), did not automatically become a citizen of Greia³⁹ once given property there. Concerning this issue – and several others – the affinity between Macedonia and other *ethne* (including those not ruled by a monarchy, such as Aetolia or Boiotia) is certainly to be recognised.⁴⁰ Furthermore, despite the irregularity with which the designation 'Macedonian from *x*' alternates with the use of the local ethnic on its own (based on city or region) one must definitely reject the idea, put forward in different forms by different scholars, that two mutually exclusive levels of citizenship were in use in Macedonia, and that *Makedones* were only a small part of the kingdom's inhabitants.⁴¹

3. Land «of» and «belonging to» the Macedonians: ancient definitions of a territorial state

Many large new territories were annexed to Macedonia by Philip, especially in the first ten or twelve years of his reign, and the treatment imposed upon them was quite varied, necessarily affecting the fate of the Macedonian settlers involved. As we have seen, the reconstructed fate of Amphipolis can be extended to Pydna, considerably closer to the historical nucleus of *Makedonia*, therefore for many settlers originating from there a more comfortable and welcome destination.⁴² On the other hand, Chalkidike, subjugated a few years later, shows differing situations, and was the arena for various experiments in urban planning, the distribution of land ownership,⁴³ and probably the general condition of territories, not all directly incorporated into *Makedonia*.⁴⁴ Also in Thrace, East of the Strymon river, conditions in the different cities and their respective territories were not uniform: if, as mentioned, Amphipolis was directly annexed to *Makedonia* (preserving, in the vast territory it ruled, large portions of βασιλική χώρα destined to provide 'excellent' donations including those to the officers known to Arrian),⁴⁵ on the other hand Krenides, once a Thasian colony, underwent a veritable refoundation and was

renamed (Philippi), indicating a bond with the crown and a 'special' territorial status. In Chalkidike, such a 'special' status was granted in the first Hellenistic age to Kassandreia; as a consequence of their peculiar condition, for a certain period of time, both Philippi and Kassandreia continued to be 'extraterritorial' with respect to the kingdom, and their inhabitants are mentioned in epigraphic testimonies only by their city ethnic.⁴⁶ Nor do the cities destroyed by Philip all enjoyed the same fate, as we can well appreciate in the case of Methone and Olynthus, razed to the ground in 354 and 348 respectively: Olynthus was never rebuilt – the symbolic meaning of the city and of its destruction being too important for the fate of new *Makedonia* –, while in the Hellenistic age a new settlement occupied the former site of Methone;⁴⁷ Olynthus' territory was treated as 'royal land' (although, in this case as well, the composition of its occupants cannot be reduced exclusively to the *hetairoi* who were assigned extensive properties),⁴⁸ and later merged into the great synoecism of Kassandreia, of which Olynthus probably represented a κώμη,⁴⁹ while Methone's territory was immediately attributed to nearby Pydna, allowing, as mentioned, for its expansion and re-peopling.

Diodorus' passage about the fate of Methone (16.34.5) deserves some further consideration and a complete quotation:

«The inhabitants of Methone for some time held out, but later, being overpowered, they were forced to hand the city over to the king, on the term that the citizens should leave Methone with a single garment each. Philip razed the city to the ground and distributed its territory among the Macedonians (ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος τὴν μὲν πόλιν κατέσκαψε, τὴν δὲ χώραν διένειμε τοῖς Μακεδόσιν)».

Reference here is made to land distribution «among the Macedonians», a *viritim* distribution, in small lots, according to Griffith: Hammond confirmed this interpretation of Diodorus' passage (διένειμε τοῖς Μακεδόσιν),⁵⁰ offering a different reading (in terms of legal practice) of a very similar expression found in an important epigraphic text describing the destiny, under Alexander the Great, of some areas once belonging to the Bottiaeans. The inscription consists in a list of people who had served in the city of Kalindoia as eponymous priests of Asclepius and Apollo «since King Alexander assigned to the Macedonians ([ἀφ' οἷ] βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔδωκε Μακεδόσι) Kalindoia and the nearby districts of Thamiskia, Kamakaia, Tripoatis»: ⁵¹ the four nearby villages were intended to form a single entity, according to a common custom in Macedonia (in a word, one may speak of synoecisms, acknowledging however that the phenomenon – which **was applied** in the afore-mentioned foundation of Kassandreia in the early Hellenistic age – has diverse and interesting connotations).⁵² In Hammond's (and later Hatzopoulos') view, these towns with their respective territories were assigned as a whole to the Macedonian *koinon*, whereby Kalindoia and its associated areas were transformed into a new type of city, a πόλις Μακεδόνων.⁵³ I am under the impression that the two situations (the treatment of Methone's territory and Kalindoia's 'synoecism') are in fact more similar than the two distinguished scholars surmised. In concrete terms, assigning a territory «to the Macedonians» meant opening it to the establishment of settlers who were (or would become)

Makedones, and this occurred both in Kalindoia and in Methone (which had become part of Pydna's territory), as well as in Amphipolis, Pydna, and in some areas of Chalkidike, as previously discussed. On the other hand, in my opinion, Hammond over-estimated the specific juridical impact of the expression *πόλις Μακεδόνων*, which occurs in some literary sources. If we exclude very particular cases, for which the 'special statute' is well indicated by a series of clues, it is impossible to claim that within the realm of Philip and his successors there could be cities that were *πόλεις Μακεδόνων* and others that were not (once more I am thinking of Philippi and, for a more limited time, of Kassandreia). In literary sources (especially of later geographers and lexicographers) the designation *πόλις Μακεδόνων* cannot be unduly loaded with a specific and distinctive legal value, but can only point to the annexation of those sites to the territory owned and controlled by *Makedones*.⁵⁴

Moreover, it is quite unlikely that the Kalindoia inscription can prove the existence and the juridical-financial competence of the *koinon* of the *Makedones* (or, in Hatzopoulos' modernizing terms, of a «Macedonian Commonwealth»), enjoying its own property, its own territory and an autonomous economic and fiscal capacity with respect to the king.⁵⁵ To cite the cautious warning given by Michele Faraguna: «it is one thing (...) to say that the land subject to donation was transferred to the Macedonians, in view of the foundation» (or re-foundation by synoecism) «of a *polis* (that is, an instrument of local government within a policy of colonization and therefore of consolidation of military conquest) (...), and another thing to say that that land was transferred to an administration distinct and separate from the king's authority under the authority of the assembly of Macedonians».⁵⁶ The lack of the article in the Kalindoia inscription (*Μακεδόσι*) in comparison to Diodorus' passage on Methone (*τοῖς Μακεδόσιν*) does not sufficiently indicate, in my opinion, an actual difference in circumstances and, in the first case, does not indeed establish the *Makedones* «in a general sense» as recipients of the king's concession of land.⁵⁷

I would like to add a passing remark regarding the nature of *χώρα Μακεδόνων*. Its existence – as suggested, in the Kalindoia text, by the phrase relating to Alexander's land concessions «to the Macedonians» – is officially confirmed by another epigraphic text. The expression appears during the reign of Antigonos Gonatas, in one of the decrees of Macedonian cities (specifically that of Pella), granting *asylia* to the Asclepius sanctuary in Cos. However, it is precisely the text from Kalindoia, in addition to Diodorus' passage on the fate of Methone, that demonstrates well how even the «land of the Macedonians» ultimately originated as *doriktetos chora*, granted to them by the king (who was under no obligation to do so).⁵⁸ In concrete terms, this always led in the end to a *viritim* grant of land allotments to individual assignees, authorized and promoted by the central power, through intermediate steps of which we currently have no knowledge.⁵⁹

In the Pella decree for the *Asklepieion* of Cos, the context in which the expression is used (recalling the traditional good relations between the inhabitants of Cos and the Macedonians, and the benevolence of the former «towards King Antigonos, the Pellaeans and the rest of the

territory» [or «country»] «of the Macedonians»)⁶⁰ and comparison with the parallel decrees of the other Macedonian cities clearly show that *χώρα Μακεδόνων* is simply equivalent to *Μακεδονία*, or better still, in the most common Greek use, to the 'national' ethnic *Μακεδόνες*: in the other decrees reference is made to «the Macedonians», or to «the other Macedonians», or, in the case of Philippi (a famous and significant exception), to «the other Greeks and Macedonians».⁶¹ If so many clues confirm, as mentioned, that Philippi enjoyed a 'special statute' and was not *sic et simpliciter* part of Macedonia, the problem remains of distinguishing, in terms of actual treatment and relationship with the central authority, a *χώρα Μακεδόνων* from a *χώρα βασιλική*.⁶² What is certainly of lasting and exceptional interest is the use of the expression *χώρα Μακεδόνων* in an official document: is it perhaps the clearest known example of how Macedonians perceived their state as being 'territorial'.

4. Macedonian 'colonization' and Hellenistic legacy.

In this context, I will only touch upon a highly delicate issue, the relationship between the Macedonian tradition of 'internal colonization' within the kingdom, as reconstructed so far for the time periods up to and including the reign of Philip II, and the subsequent 'colonial' policy practised by Alexander in Egypt and Asia and inherited by the Hellenistic kingdoms. A few years ago, Thomas Figueira proposed that the term *klerouchos* with its related vocabulary moved from the Athenian Empire to the Hellenistic kingdoms (where they are attested in particular in Ptolemaic Egypt) thanks to the decisive mediation of Philip II. Figueira thus suggested that already in fourth-century Macedonia the term may have designated, as it did later in Egypt, a land assignee required to perform military service, thus – both in terms of rights and of duties – fully joining the ranks of the *Makedones*.

A close and thorough lexical examination of the direction suggested by Figueira, to complement the interesting clues provided by the scholar himself, is certainly desirable. In any case, his intuition of the basic affinity between the two processes can be considered more than reasonable: in the present essay, the legal and political procedures in Macedonia have been reconstructed along the same lines.⁶³ Both the experience of Attic cleruchies (and *apoikiai*), and the distributions of land 'from above', which in Macedonia tied the king to a relatively small circle of *hetairoi*, and to the *Makedones* as a whole, could take on different forms and cut through social classes. Significantly, neither situation can be reduced to a single scheme; and one must include in both instances the large properties assigned to absentee landlords, as well as the small farms allocated to settlers who could thus achieve hoplite status.⁶⁴ Therefore, while Figueira's definition of the nature of *κληροῦχος*, as the term was interpreted by Philip II and his successors (a land recipient required to perform military service), refers mostly to the low and mid-ranking *Makedones* mentioned earlier, in connection to the 'new territories' gradually annexed to the kingdom, the fact remains that the only attestation known so far of the lexicon of

cleruchy in Macedonia proper is, on the contrary, linked to a large donation of property, assigned in Chalkidike by Philip II and confirmed by Cassander.⁶⁵ That one can speak in both contexts of κληροί and therefore, evidently, of κληροῦχοι (as strange as it might seem for us to define as such, for example, Alexander's navarch Nearchus, one of the «Macedonians from Amphipolis» of Arrian's list, cited above) is confirmed by Richard A. Billows' conclusions on land distribution by the Macedonians in Asia.⁶⁶

Many clues – beginning with the fascinating chapter in Thucydides' *History* quoted above in full – indicate that the systematic practice of territorial assignments to *Makedones* and the transfers of population, including those on a massive scale, were, so to speak, part of Macedonia's DNA, long before Philip II. However, as we have seen, it was during his reign, and thanks to his dazzling conquests, especially in the early years (from his rise to power, with the ensuing military reform, up to the liquidation of the Chalkidic *koinon* in 348) that the process acquired an inconceivable dimension and a systematic quality. The fact that only then did Macedonia incorporate in its territories areas that had been systematically subject to Athenian 'imperial colonization' (*in primis* Amphipolis and Potidaea), can also explain the impressive lexical transfer grasped by Figueira, the most striking effects of which can be noticed in the Hellenistic appendage of the Macedonian experience, particularly in Egypt. The lexical transfer was made viable thanks to the dilution of the term «cleruchy», which is documented in literary sources from the the fourth century BC onwards (unless the latter is due, as in many other cases, to a structural elasticity and fluidity of the Greek institutional lexicon, which is likely to be misunderstood if forced into excessively narrow confines).⁶⁷ However, apart from the obvious differences between the 'imperial colonization' of a *polis* (fifth- and fourth-century Athens) and the systematic expansion of a territorial state (fourth-century and Hellenistic Macedonia), the two experiences overlapped in many ways and could be described in the same terms. Just like the «Athenians of Myrina» (in Lemnos), the «Macedonians of Amphipolis» or «of Pydna» were citizens *optimo jure* whose residence was determined by the acquisition of landed property far from their original residence or place of birth.⁶⁸ Furthermore, both in the case of the Attic cleruchies and in that of the territories gradually annexed to Macedonia we must also acknowledge a socially high-ranking presence, obviously *optimo iure* in terms of 'citizenship', but not bound by residency.⁶⁹

An interesting point, finally, is the interpretation offered by Billows regarding 'Macedonian' colonies or settlements (or the settlers who defined themselves as Μακεδόνες) in the Hellenistic kingdoms. Using some excellent arguments, Billows scaled down both the numbers of Macedonians *stricto sensu* who moved from their own land into new territories after the conquests of Alexander, and the duration of the phenomenon in time,⁷⁰ arriving at the conclusion that «many of these colonists and settlers were 'Macedonians' only in the sense that they received their allotments of land in return for their own and their descendants' military service in units armed and trained as Macedonian-style phalangites».⁷¹

As per the teachings of Nicholas Hammond, to draw a clean-cut line through the history and, most importantly, through the institutions of Macedonia, separating what happened before and after Alexander, is a serious error (certainly encouraged by scholars' excessive specialisation on increasingly narrow chronological ambits).⁷² If this is the case, then the best evidence for the accuracy of Billows' reading of the nature of Macedonian colonization outside of Macedonia derives, paradoxically, from the Thucydidean chapter we started with: as occurred at the time of the great expansion of the kingdom under Alexander I and his successors, described by the historian of the Peloponnesian War, in the new age inaugurated by the conquests of Alexander the Great, albeit in an incomparably broader scenario, one could become Macedonian. *Makedones* and *Makedonia* were flexible and potentially ever-expanding notions: inclusion amongst the *Makedones* hinged upon landed property and military service, central to the definition of identity among the members *optimo jure* of every ancient society. As suggested by the Cos decrees, *Makedonia*, *Makedones* and χώρα Μακεδόνων were, to a certain extent, one and the same.

Manuela Mari

University of Cassino and of Southern Latium

m.mari@unicas.it

Works cited

- Anson, E.M.
2008 'Philip II and the Transformation of Macedonia: A Reappraisal', in T. Howe and J. Reames (eds.), *Macedonian Legacies. Studies in Ancient Macedonian History and Culture in Honor of Eugene N. Borza*, Claremont, 17-30.
- Asouchidou, S. and Nigdelis, P.
2011 'Torone after 348 BC: New Epigraphic Evidence', *MediterrArch* 24, 1-8.
- Bagnall, R.S.
1984 'The Origins of Ptolemaic Cleruchs', *BASP* 21, 7-20.
- Berve, H.
1926 *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, München.
- Bessios, M. and Pappa, M.
1996 *Pydna*, Athens.
- Billows, R.A.
1995 *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden-New York-Köln.
- Boffo, L.
2001 'Lo statuto di terre, insediamenti e persone nell'Anatolia ellenistica', *Dike* 4, 233-255.
- Bonias, Z. and Perreault, J.-Y.
1998 'Άργυλος, ή αρχαιότερη Έλληνική άποικία στην Θρακική περιοχή του Στρυμόνα' in A.N. Balkas (ed.), *Άνδρος και Χαλκιδική, Πρακτικά Συμποσίου Άνδρος, 23 Αύγουστου 1997*, Andros, 173-196.
- Bucciantini, V.
2015 *Studio su Nearco di Creta. Dalla descrizione geografica alla narrazione storica*, Alessandria.
- Chaniotis, A.
2011 'The Impact of War on the Economy of the Hellenistic *Poleis*: Demand Creation, Short-Term Influences, Long-Term Impacts', in Z.H. Archibald, J.K. Davies and V. Gabrielsen (eds.), *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*, Oxford, 122-141.
- Collart, P.
1937 *Philippe, ville de Macédoine, depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine*, Paris.
- Criscuolo, L.
2011 'La formula εν πατριοῖς nelle iscrizioni di Cassandrea', *Chiron* 41, 461-485.
- Culasso Gastaldi, E.
2013 'Composizione e mobilità sociale di una cleruchia: l'esempio di Lemnos e non solo', in A. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *ΑΞΩΝ. Studies in honour of Ronald Stroud*, Athens, 599-637.
- Ellis, J.R.
1969 'Population-Transplants by Philip II', *Makedonika* 9, 9-17.
- Errington, R.M.
1980 review of Hammond and Griffith 1979, *CR* 30, 78-80.

1998 'Neue epigraphische Belege für Makedonien zur Zeit Alexanders des Grossen', in W. Will (ed.), *Alexander der Grosse. Eine Welteroberung und ihr Hintergrund*, Vorträge des Internationalen Bonner Alexanderkolloquiums, 19.-21.12.1996, Bonn, 77-90.

Fournier, J. (ed.)

2016 *Philippe, de la préhistoire à Byzance. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire*, Athènes.

2007 'The Importance of the Capture of Amphipolis for the Development of the Macedonian City', in *Ancient Macedonia*, VII, Thessaloniki, 275-282.

Fantasia, U.

2003 *Tucidide. La guerra del Peloponneso. Libro II*, Pisa.

Faraguna, M.

1998 'Aspetti amministrativi e finanziari della monarchia macedone tra IV e III secolo a.C.', *Athenaeum* 86, 349-395.

2006 'L'economia della Macedonia ellenistica: un bilancio', in *Approches de l'économie hellénistique*, Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, 6-7 mai 2004, Paris, 121-146.

forthcoming 'Documenti sul regime fondiario nella Macedonia ellenistica: un bilancio', in P. Paschidis and M. Kalaitzi (eds.), Proceedings of the conference *Βόρειο-Ελληνικά. Histoires du monde des ethnè, Colloque international en l'honneur de M.B. Hatzopoulos*, Athènes, 20-21 février 2015.

Feyel, M.

1942 *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au III^e siècle avant notre ère*, Paris.

Figueira, Th.J.

1991 *Athens and Aigina in the Age of Imperial Colonization*, Baltimore-London.

2008 'Colonisation in the Classical Period', in G.R. Tsetschladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, II, Leiden-Boston 2008, 427-523.

Fischer-Bovet, Chr.

2011 'Counting the Greeks in Egypt. Immigration in the first century of Ptolemaic rule', in C. Holleran and A. Pudsey (eds.), *Demography and the Graeco-Roman World. New Insights and Approaches*, Cambridge, 135-154.

Gabbert, J.

1988 'The language of citizenship in Antigonid Macedonia', *AHB* 2, 10-11.

Game, J.

2008 *Actes de vente dans le monde grec. Témoignages épigraphiques des ventes immobilières*, Lyon.

Hammond, N.G.L.

1988 'The King and the Land in the Macedonian Kingdom', *CQ* 38, 382-391.

1989 *The Macedonian State. Origins, Institutions, and History*, Oxford.

2000 'The Continuity of Macedonian Institutions and the Macedonian Kingdoms of the Hellenistic Era', *Historia* 49, 141-160.

Hammond, N.G.L. and Griffith, G.T.

1979 *A History of Macedonia*, II, Oxford.

Hampl, F.

1934 *Der König der Makedonen*, diss. Leipzig.

Hansen, M.H.

2004 'Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity', in M.H. Hansen and Th. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 58-69.

Hatzopoulos, M.B.

1988 *Actes de vente de la Chalcidique centrale*, Athènes.

1991 *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis*, Athènes.

1996 *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, Athens.

2001 *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciennes et documents nouveaux*, Athènes.

2003 'Herodotus (8.137-8), the manumissions from Leukopetra, and the topography of the middle Haliakmon Valley', in P. Derow and R. Parker (eds.), *Herodotus and his World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forest*, Oxford, 203-218.

2007 'Perception of the Self and the Other: the Case of Macedonia', in *Ancient Macedonia*, VII, Thessaloniki, 51-66.

2015a 'L'organisation de la guerre macédonienne: Philippe II et Alexandre', in Ph. Contamine, J. Jouanna and M. Zink (eds.), *Colloque La Grèce et la guerre. Actes*, Paris, 105-120.

2015b 'Federal Makedonia', in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 319-340.

2015-16 'Σύντροφος: Un terme technique Macédonien', *Tekmeria* 13, 57-70.

Hatzopoulos, M.B., Knoepfler, D. and V. Marigo-Papadopoulos V.,

1990 'Deux sites pour Méthone de Macédoine', *BCH* 114, 639-668.

Hatzopoulos, M.B. and Paschidis, P.

2004 'Makedonia', in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 794-809.

Heckel, W.

1985 'The "Boyhood Friends" of Alexander the Great', *Emerita* 53, 285-289.

1992, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire*, London-New York.

2006 *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire*, Oxford.

Herzog, R. and Klaffenbach, G.

1952 *Asylieurkunden aus Kos*, Berlin.

Kahrstedt, U.

1953 U. Kahrstedt, 'Städte in Makedonien', *Hermes* 81, 85-111.

Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, Ch.

1996 'Fragments of Inscriptions of Philip V from Amphipolis', in *Inscriptions of Macedonia*. Third International Symposium on Macedonia, Thessaloniki, 8-12 December 1993, Thessaloniki, 40-71.

2011 'Amphipolis', in R.J. Lane Fox (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, Leiden-Boston, 409-436.

Landucci, F.

2014 'Filippo II e le *Storie Filippiche*: un protagonista storico e storiografico', in C. Bearzot and F. Landucci (eds.), *Studi sull'epitome di Giustino. I. Dagli Assiri a Filippo II di Macedonia*, Milano 2014, 233-260.

Lazaridi, K.

2015 'Ο ἐφηβαρχικός νόμος τῆς Ἀμφιπόλεως', *AE*, 1-48.

Liampi, K.

2005 *Argilos. A Historical and Numismatic Study*, Athens.

Makaronas, Ch.I.

1934-35 'Επιστολή τοῦ βασιλέως Φιλίππου τοῦ Ε' ', *AE*, 117-127.

Marchand, F.

2010 'The Philippeis of IG VII 2433', in R.W.V. Catling, F. Marchand and M. Sasanow (eds.), *Onomatologos. Studies in Greek Personal Names presented to Elaine Matthews*, Oxford, 332-343.

Marchiandi, D.

2008 'Riflessioni in merito allo statuto giuridico di Lemno nel V secolo a.C. La ragnatela bibliografica e l'evidenza archeologica: un dialogo possibile?', *ASAIA* 86, 11-40.

Mari, M.

1999 'Potere centrale e poteri locali nella Macedonia dei re: realtà istituzionali e immagine letteraria', *MediterrAnt* 2, 627-649.

2002 *Al di là dell'Olimpo. Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo ellenismo*, Atene.

2008a 'L'ascesa della Macedonia e Filippo II', in A. Barbero (ed.), *Storia d'Europa e del Mediterraneo. Il mondo antico*, II, *La Grecia*, ed. by M. Giangiulio, IV, *Grecia e Mediterraneo dall'Età delle guerre persiane all'Ellenismo*, Roma, 433-461.

2008b 'Un modello statale possibile per la Grecia del nord: il 'secolo breve' del *koinon* calcidico (432-348 a.C.)', in M. Lombardo and F. Frisone (eds.), *Forme sovrappoleiche e interpoleiche di organizzazione nel mondo greco antico*, Galatina, 388-405.

2010 'Atene, l'impero e le *apoikiai*. Riflessioni sulla breve vita di Anfipoli 'ateniese'', *ASAIA* 88, 391-413.

2014 "'Un luogo calcato da molti piedi". La valle dello Strimone prima di Anfipoli', *Historikà* 4, 53-114.

2016 'La porta del paradiso. Anfipoli e l'economia dell'impero ateniese', in S. Sanchirico and F. Pignataro (eds.), *Ploutos & Polis. Aspetti del rapporto tra economia e politica nel mondo greco*, Atti dell'Incontro Internazionale di Studi, Roma, Academia Belgica, 20-22 maggio 2013, Roma, 249-269.

forthcoming 'Macedonian cities under the kings: standardization or variety? A view from Amphipolis', in P. Paschidis and M. Kalaitzi (eds.), *Proceedings of the conference Βόρειο-Ελλαδικά. Histoires du monde des ethnē, Colloque international en l'honneur de M.B. Hatzopoulos*, Athènes, 20-21 février 2015.

Mari, M. and Thornton, J.

2016 'Città greche tra conservazione e modelli rivoluzionari. Megalopoli, Larisa e i re macedoni nel III secolo a.C.', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi ellenistici* 30, 139-195.

Mehl, A.

1980-81 'Δοξίκτητος χώρα. Kritische Bemerkungen zum «Speererwerb» in Politik und Völkerrecht der hellenistische Epoche', *AncSoc* 11-12, 173-212.

Montgomery, H.

1985 'The economic revolution of Philip II – myth or reality?', *SymbOsl* 60, 37-47.

Moretti, L.

1967-76 *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, Firenze.

Musti, D.

1966 'Lo stato dei Seleucidi. Dinastia, popoli, città da Seleuco I ad Antioco III', *SCO* 15, 61-197.

1977 'Il regno ellenistico', in R. Bianchi Bandinelli (ed.), *Storia e civiltà dei Greci*, VII, *La società ellenistica. Quadro politico*, Milano, 231-316.

Oetjen, R.

2010 'Antigonid Cleruchs in Thessaly and Greece: Philip V and Larisa', in G. Reger, F.X. Ryan and Th.F. Winters (eds.), *Studies in Greek Epigraphy and History in Honor of Stephen V. Tracy*, Bordeaux, 237-254.

Papazoglou, F.

1983 'Sur l'organisation de la Macédoine des Antigonides', in *Ancient Macedonia*, III, Thessaloniki, 195-210.

1988 *Les villes de Macédoine a l'époque romaine*, Athènes-Paris.

1997 *Laoi et paroikoi. Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique*, Beograd.

1998 'Politički i socijalni sadržaj imena Μακεδών, Μακεδόνες u predhelenističkoj i helenističkoj Makedoniji', *ŽA* 48, 25-41.

Robinson, D.M. et al.

1929-52 *Excavations at Olynthus*, Baltimore.

Rzepka, J.

2005 'Koine Ekklesia in Diodorus Siculus and the General Assemblies of the Macedonians', *Tyche* 20, 119-142.

Scharrer, U.

2006 'Die Einwanderungen griechischer und makedonischer Bevölkerungsgruppen in den hellenistischen Osten', in E. Olshausen and H. Sonnabend (eds.), *"Troianer sind wir gewesen" – Migrationen in der antiken Welt*, Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geo-graphie des Altertums 8, 2002, Stuttgart, 336-363.

Schmitt, H.H.

1969 *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*. III. *Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.*, München.

Segre, M.

1944-45 *Tituli Calymnii*, *ASAA*, n.s. 6-7.

Stroud, R.S.

2010a *Introduction*, in A. Magnetto, D. Erdas and C. Carusi (eds.), *Nuove ricerche sulla legge granaria ateniese del 374/3 a.C.*, Pisa, 11-25.

2010b 'Future Research on the Athenian Grain Tax Law', in A. Magnetto, D. Erdas and C. Carusi (eds.), *Nuove ricerche sulla legge granaria ateniese del 374/3 a.C.*, Pisa, 235-242.

Tataki, A.B.

1998 *Macedonians Abroad. A Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia*, Athens.

Themelis, P.

2000 'Μεταλλοτεχνία Μακεδονική', in *Μύρτος. Μνήμη Ιουλίας Βοκοτοπούλου*, Thessaloniki, 495-517.

Tziafalias, A. and Helly, B.

2010 'Inscriptions de la Tripolis de Perrhébie. Lettres royales de Démétrios et Antigone Dôsôn', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi ellenistici* 24, 71-125.

Vokotopoulou, I.P.

1986 'Η επιγραφή των Καλινδοίων', in *Ancient Macedonia*, IV, Thessaloniki, 87-114.

Walbank, F.W.

1940 *Philip V of Macedon*, Cambridge.

Welles, C.B.

1938 'New Texts from the Chancery of Philip V of Macedonia and the Problem of the "Diagramma"', *AJA* 42, 245-260.

Zahrnt, M.

1971 *Olynth und die Chalkidier. Untersuchungen zur Staatenbildung auf der Chalkidischen Halbinsel im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, München.

¹ I hope that an essay on the economic and social consequences of Philip II's reign on Macedonian (and world) history will contribute in an adequate way to the general scope of this volume and will pay at the same time due homage to one of the greatest scholars of ancient economies and societies. This article is offered to John K. Davies with deepest admiration and devoted friendship.

² According to Landucci 2014, 237, Philip's reforms are described by Justin «in extremely negative terms»; positive elements, however, emerge from his gloomy picture (see Ellis 1969, with the translation of the passage I have given above [13]; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 179-180), and we also have to take into account that some *topoi* are present. The fact that the population of the cities of the kingdom was enlarged through the transplantation of «war prisoners», for example, is not to be taken literally.

³ See Mari 2008a, more particularly 448-450.

⁴ The passage here quoted is followed by Thucydides' famous remark on Macedonian military weakness and lack of roads and infrastructure, and on the improvements due to the short reign of Archelaus at the end of the fifth century (2.100.1-2).

⁵ A synthetic presentation, a thorough discussion, and a large bibliography can be found in Fantasia 2003, 589-594.

⁶ Hammond 1989, 49-53 (and see also 63-65).

⁷ These 'native' Macedonians were located by Herodotus at the feet of Mount Bermion (8.138.3, on which see Hatzopoulos 2003 and Mari 2008a, 434-437).

⁸ This is the free (but very effective) translation of Thuc. 2.99.2 by Hammond 1989, 51. The Greek text reads as follows: τῶν γὰρ Μακεδόνων εἰσὶ καὶ Λυγκησταὶ καὶ Ἑλιμιῶται καὶ ἄλλα ἔθνη ἐπάνωθεν, ἃ ζύμμαχα μὲν ἐστί τοῦτοις καὶ ὑπήκοα, βασιλείας δ' ἔχει καθ' αὐτά.

⁹ Thuc. 2.99.6: ἐκράτησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν οἱ Μακεδόνες οὗτοι, ἃ καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἔχουσι, τὸν τε Ἀνθεμοῦντα καὶ Κρηστωνίαν καὶ Βισαλτίαν καὶ Μακεδόνων αὐτῶν πολλήν.

¹⁰ Hammond 1989, 52-53.

¹¹ Hammond 1989, 62-63, with references. On the other hand, Hammond interpreted the condition of the *Makedones* as an 'elite citizenship' granted by the king to a small part of his subjects only and suggested that most inhabitants of Macedonia enjoyed only a local (that is, civic or ethnic) citizenship (Hammond and Griffith 1979, 163-164, 647, 651-652; see also Papazoglou 1998): this thesis has been rightly challenged by Errington 1980; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 167-168; Id., *Bull. ép.* 2000, 440. On the combination of local and 'national' ethnics in Macedonia see below.

¹² See the excellent analysis by Faraguna 1998, 368-368, with references.

¹³ Thuc. 2.99 apparently indicates several stages of Macedonian expansion, without giving precise chronological references. The conquest of the 'New Lands' east of the Axios River can be dated to the period following Xerxes' invasion: cf. Mari 2008a, 437-438, and 2014, 76-78 and n. 74, with bibliography.

¹⁴ D.S. 16.3.1, when describing Philip's earliest reforms: «having arranged in the best possible way the formation of his soldiers and equipped the men suitably with weapons of war (τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ὅπλοις δεόντως κοσμήσας), he constantly held military processions and competitive drills». On the financial support of the state to the equipment of Macedonian infantrymen and horsemen see Hatzopoulos 2001, 41-49 and Lazaridi 2015, 23-24, with references. On the 'centralised' character of weapons production in Macedonia see Themelis 2000.

¹⁵ Polyb. 29.17.1. Several passages in Diodorus Siculus and the figures there cited give a clear idea of the enormous increase of Macedonian forces, both of infantry and cavalry, during Philip's reign: see Hatzopoulos 2015a, 108-109, with references.

¹⁶ Diodorus stresses the economic basis of Macedonian growth when narrating the consequences of the foundation of Philippi and of the control established upon the mining area nearby (16.8.6-7). Significantly, however, the consequences he is thinking of are merely the enrollment of mercenaries and bribery (see again Hatzopoulos 2015a, 110-111).

¹⁷ See Hammond and Griffith 1979, 352-362, 705-713; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 268-271, and 2015a: Philip not only provided his soldiers with a part of their equipment, but he also made it less expensive in general terms. The inscriptions recording the military code of Philip V clearly show that the army under the Antigonid kings (and probably already under Philip II) was enlisted on a strict census system. According to this system, the Macedonians of modest means were enrolled as infantrymen on a non-permanent basis: cf. Hatzopoulos 2001, 89, 103-107 and the copies of the *diagramma* on military service from Drama and Kassandreia, *ibid.*, epigraphic appendix, 2 I and 2 II. In Greek cities, still in the Hellenistic age, the citizens were expected to pay for their military equipment, and those of humble condition were enrolled only in exceptional circumstances, at the expense of the *polis* or with the financial support of wealthy benefactors (see Chaniotis 2011, 129-130).

¹⁸ Anson 2008, like Billows 1995, 9-23, insists on the backwardness of Macedonia before Philip's reign, on the basis of rhetorical passages such as Arr., *An.* 7.9.1-5 (Alexander's speech during the revolt at Opis). While Billows explicitly admits the existence of Macedonian 'rural serfs', akin to the Thessalian *penestai*, Anson (rightly in my view) has rather in mind smallholders or former landowners suffering a heavy impoverishment, akin to the Athenian *hektemoroi* of Solon's age. The documentation available from Macedonia proper does not attest so far either rural serfdom or the dependent indigenous *laoi* which are well attested in Hellenistic Egypt and Asia Minor (cf. Papazoglou 1997, 2, 118, 124-125 and n. 284, with further bibliography, and Hatzopoulos 2015b; on slavery in Macedonia see also Papazoglou 1998).

¹⁹ Anson 2008, 20.

²⁰ Hatzopoulos 1991; see more recently Game 2008, nrs. 1-12. In both collections the first deed of sale is actually from Argilos (Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 192, 389-390); a new deed of sale is to be added to the Amphipolis series (cf. n. 21 below). A deed of sale from Torone, in the Chalkidic peninsula of Sithonia, is also to be dated immediately after the Macedonian conquest and gives interesting hints on local institutions (Asouchidou and Nigdelis 2011), while the deeds of sale from central Chalkidike published by Hatzopoulos 1988 can be dated to the years immediately before the annexation to the kingdom (72-74, 80; cf. Id. 1996, I, 196, 388-389; Game 2008, 45, and nrs. 13-38bis).

²¹ On these topics see, along with the commentary on each document by Hatzopoulos 1991, Id. 1996, I, 163-165, 181-184, 188-189, 201-205, 382, 388-391; Errington 2007, 279-280; Mari forthcoming. A new deed of sale mentioning the *epistates* Sparges and, at the same time, a payment in *alexandreis* was the object of a presentation by P.M. Nigdelis and P. Anagnostoudis at the 8th Symposium on *Ancient Macedonia*, held at Thessaloniki in November 2017. In the discussion that followed, Nigdelis suggested to downdate the entire series of Sparges' documents to the age of Alexander or the early Hellenistic period, while M.B. Hatzopoulos admitted the possible existence of two homonymous *epistatai* (grandfather and grandson?) and defended the original chronology he had proposed for the already known documents. I will discuss the implications of the new document elsewhere.

²² The debate on the origins of Pydna (a colony of southern Greeks or a Macedonian city *ab origine*?) is apparently now settled in favour of the latter hypothesis, on archaeological grounds: see Bessios and Pappa 1996, 5.

²³ Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 180.

²⁴ See again Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 180-181; for archaeological data from Amphipolis see Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 2011, 420-422, stressing in particular the appearance of 'Macedonian tombs' in local necropoleis. The onomastic material from Pydna (available from the second half of the fourth century) is less significant than that from Amphipolis. The fate of both cities following the Macedonian conquest is depicted in gloomy terms by Demosth. 1.5, whose view should probably not be taken literally; Griffith drew from this passage the conclusion that Macedonian colonists were settled also in Pydna (Hammond and Griffith 1979, 356-357).

²⁵ In the sanctuary of Athena at Pydna 'national' documents were displayed (*IG II² 329* = Schmitt 1969, nr. 403, l. 13), and the city annexed the territory of Methone to its own (Hammond and Griffith 1979, 356-357, and see below, n. 30). As for Amphipolis, a whole *ile* of Alexander's horsemen was named after the city, which was apparently at the centre of a large recruitment area (Arr., *Ann.* 1.2.5); the role of Amphipolis as 'regional capital' is further indicated by the relevance at the sanctuary of Artemis *Tauropolos*, by the high number of royal letters and *diagrammata* found in the archaeological area, and (in the last phase of the Antigonid period) by some numismatic clues (Kahrstedt 1953, 107-108; Hammond and Griffith 1979, 351-352; Mari forthcoming).

²⁶ See, respectively, *SIG³ 268* = *FD III, 4, 391*, a Delphic honorary decree for Euainetos, «Macedonian from Amphipolis», third quarter of the fourth c. (on which see Mari 2002, 297); and Segre 1944-45, 58, nr. 25, an honorary decree by the city of Kalymnos for Aristagoras, «Macedonian from Pydna», third century BC. Several other cases of

such a double designation are known from Macedonian cities, and it is impossible to establish why in other instances only the civic ethnic is employed (see, after Gabbert 1988, the collection of data in Tataki 1998). As a matter of fact, this omission of the 'national' ethnic occurs not only within Macedonia, where of course the designation *Makedon* could be regarded as superfluous (Errington 1980, 79; Hatzopoulos and Paschidis 2004, 795), but also in documents from abroad.

²⁷ Anson 2008, 20 rightly insists upon the absolute equality of rights between 'old' and 'new' citizens in the cities that Philip conquered and/or refounded. Welles 1938, 248 implicitly suggested that a local citizenship (and ethnic) was incompatible with the status of *Makedon*, but this cannot be accepted on strictly legal terms (see below, n. 40).

²⁸ *IG IX 2*, 517 = *Syll.*³ 543. See Mari and Thornton 2016; in that essay (159-160 and n. 83, 174-175 n. 140, 186 n. 181) the Φιλίππεις included in a list of names from Thebes, in Boiotia (*IG VII 2433*), are tentatively interpreted as 'royal colonists' from Macedonia, following Feyel 1942, 285-297, but their origin from Euromos-Philippi in Caria has been convincingly demonstrated by Marchand 2010, 338.

²⁹ Argilos apparently ceased to exist as an autonomous *polis* after the Macedonian conquest. Its territory was annexed by Amphipolis, and Argilos survived only as a *kome*, receiving, as Amphipolis, a good number of new settlers, as indicated by the presence of Macedonian names in funerary inscriptions: see Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 192-193 and n. 9, 389-390; Liampi 2005, 45, 69-73, 87-90, 95; archaeological data in Bonias and Perreault 1998, 185.

³⁰ On Philip's conquest and destruction of Methone see Demosth. 9.26 and D.S. 16.34.5. The latter explicitly mentions the distribution of its large territory «among the Macedonians». Here, too, the onomastic material points in the same direction (Hatzopoulos, *Bull. ép.* 1991, 385). While the pre-existing urban centre ceased to exist, a new settlement was founded nearby, which never reached the status of an autonomous *polis* (Hammond and Griffith 1979, 357, 361-362; Papazoglou 1988, 105-106; Hatzopoulos, Knoepfler and Marigo-Papadopoulos 1990; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 180-181).

³¹ See Hampl 1934, 22 ff., especially with reference to Amphipolis (but Aesch. 2.27 and [Demosth.] 7.28 do not support in a decisive way his thesis of large confiscation and redistribution of lands among the *hetairoi*). Griffith, more cautiously, limited the effects of the confiscation to the pro-Athenian Amphipolitans who were exiled after 357, but he too suggested that the enlargement of the territories of Amphipolis and Pydna primarily benefited the *hetairoi* (Alexander's 'Amphipolitan' *ile* [above, n. 25] consisted of no less than 200 horsemen: Hammond and Griffith 1979, 352-362; see also Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1996, 59).

³² The latter is the position of Anson 2008, 21-23 and Hatzopoulos 2015a: both scholars stress, along with other hints at the relatively low condition of some recipients of allotments of land, Alexander's grants of tax exemption to the relatives of the soldiers who died during the Asian campaign (Arr., *An.* 1.16.5; 7.10.4; the first passage, which explicitly mentions τῶν ... κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἀτέλειαν, is particularly meaningful).

³³ Theop., *FGrHist* 115 F 225b, *ap.* Athen. 6.77.260 D-261 A; Demosth. 19.145-146; Plut., *Al.* 15.2-3.

³⁴ Among the sources quoted in n. 33, Demosthenes deals in particular with the distribution of lots of land in the former territory of Olynthus among the Greek friends of Philip; two important inscriptions add information on the grants of land by Cassander and Lysimachus: see Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nrs. 20 and 22, and the remarks of the same scholar *ibid.*, I, 195-199, 209-213. On Philip's treatment of Chalkidike see also Hammond and Griffith 1979, 365-376 and Montgomery 1985, 40.

³⁵ See Arr., *Ind.* 18.4 and 18.10, with a few more details on Nearchus (= *FGrHist* 133 T 7: τὸ γένος μὲν Κοῦης ... ὄκει δὲ ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει τῇ ἐπὶ Στυμόνι). As for the other two officers, Laomedon came from Mytilene and Androstenes from Thasos. For biographical details see Berve 1926, II, nrs. 80, 464, 544; Heckel 1985; Id. 1992, 190-195, 210-215; Id. 2006, 29, 119, 146, 171-173; Bucciantini 2015, 9-28. On the general problems raised by the list of *Makedones* given by Arrian see also Hammond and Griffith 1979, 353 and Hatzopoulos 2007, 61-62.

³⁶ *SEG* 46 (1996), 716; cf. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1996, 57: the interpretation of the text, however, as far as this crucial aspect is concerned, is highly questionable (see below, n. 62).

³⁷ Makaronas 1934-35; Welles 1938, 246-249; Moretti 1967-76, II, nr. 110; Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nr. 17 (and cf. I, 95-101, 381, 386-387, 419, 457); Id. 2001, *ep. app.*, nr. 6; *EAM* I 87.

³⁸ Moretti 1967-76, II, 99 suggested two possible explanations of the devolution of Korrhagos' land to the crown: 1. the land had been only temporarily allotted to him and the king remained the actual owner of it; 2. Korrhagos died leaving no heir belonging to «una determinata e precisa categoria di parenti» (legally specified kin). While Moretti preferred the first explanation, the second one is now supported by documents which clearly attest the devolution of properties to the crown in similar cases in Hellenistic Macedonia: see in particular Demetrius II's letter dealing with the vineyards of Pausanias, from Pythion (Tziafalias and Helly 2010, 85-93).

³⁹ Or of the wider district (Eordaia or Elimeia) to which Greia belonged, as convincingly suggested by Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 95-101.

⁴⁰ See Walbank 1940, 7-8 and, more recently, Rzepka 2005, 136: in the Aetolian parallel cases the terms employed are κατοικέοντες or πολιτεύοντες, while Korrhagos is described as one τῶν ἐν Γρήναι μετοίκων (l. 5); a comparison with Boiotia was suggested by Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 168. The precise legal meaning of the term μέτοικος in our text remains obscure (Musti 1977, 255), but we cannot draw from this case the general conclusion that the local citizenship (which Korrhagos had not enjoyed or requested) was incompatible with the status of *Makedon*, as suggested by Welles 1938, 248. Hatzopoulos, on the contrary, insists on the 'quasi-federal' character of the Macedonian state and on the fact that the 'national' citizenship automatically implied the rights of *enktesis* and *epigamia* in the whole of the kingdom (1996, I, 487-496; 2015b). Moreover, a man who performed military service automatically received, along with the local citizenship, the status of *Makedon*, as is clearly shown by Philip V's military code: see again Hatzopoulos 2001, 91-98 (and above, n. 17), and 2015-16, 68.

⁴¹ See references in notes 11, 26 and 27.

⁴² Pydna and its territory, however, from the central power's point of view, was an area no less difficult to control and guard militarily than that of Amphipolis. As we have seen, Pompeius Trogus-Justin insists on the 'forced' character of the population transfer (cf. Ellis 1969); the same can be said of the colonial settlements fostered by Alexander in the new territories in Asia (cf. Billows 1995, 157-159, and Scharrer 2006, with references).

⁴³ The existence of large estates is well known (see above, n. 33), but, to quote just one example, the Macedonian colonists who moved to Stageira after its refoundation (during the reign of Alexander at the latest), were definitely of a humbler condition. A funerary inscription from Olynthus mentions some Μακεδόνες, possibly «the inhabitants of the north-western quarter [of the town], where colonists from the Old Kingdom had apparently come to join the surviving, probably pre-Macedonian Olynthians»; their condition was probably similar to that of the Macedonians of Stageira, whose presence is revealed by the onomastic material (Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 197-198, with references).

⁴⁴ See Hammond and Griffith 1979, 365-376; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 189-196. In Hatzopoulos' view, Philip in general terms chose to annex the territories lying closer to the kingdom's borders and to give the other ones (including a large part of the Chalkidike) the status of 'royal land'. Torone kept the status of *polis* for some time, but received typically Macedonian institutions, such as the eponymous priest of Asclepius: see Asouchidou and Nigdelis 2011.

⁴⁵ Apart from abstract legal definitions, however, the king kept extensive powers of intervention in any case: see my remarks on the lands attributed «to the Macedonians» in Kalindoia, below, and Faraguna 1998, 353-354, 387.

⁴⁶ On the 'special status' of Philippi and Kassandreia see Mari forthcoming, with references and bibliography. On the openly 'non-Macedonian' character of Kassandreia in Cassander's intentions, clearly suggested by D.S. 19.52.2-3 and 61.1-2, see Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 164, 199-200. On Crenides' refoundation as Philippi see Collart 1937, 133-160 and now the papers by P. Hamon, M.B. Hatzopoulos, O. Picard, S.E. Psoma in Fournier 2016; the transplantation of a huge number of new settlers is explicitly testified by D.S. 16.8.6.

⁴⁷ On the archaeological evidence from Methone see Hatzopoulos, Knoepfler and Marigo-Papadopoulos 1990. On Olynthus see Robinson in Robinson et al. 1929-52, volumes II, XI and XII. On the symbolic value of the physical destruction of Olynthus see Mari 2008b, 392-393, 398-399.

⁴⁸ See above, notes 33 and 43.

⁴⁹ Such a conclusion is suggested by the long survival of the civic ethnic after the destruction of Olynthus (Kahrstedt 1953, 106; Zahrt 1971, 112-119; Hansen 2004, 63-64 and n. 65).

⁵⁰ Hammond and Griffith 1979, 357, 361-362; Hammond 1988, 386 («the verb διανέμω implies a distribution [...] 'viritim' and 'a distribution not in large estates to a handful of Companions but to a large number of ordinary Macedonians'»).

⁵¹ Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nr. 62, lines 4-10.

⁵² Cf. Hammond 1988, 388; Mari 2008b, 400. In Macedonia the coalescence of separate settlements into one unit covers a wide range of possibilities (true synoicism; coexistence of many villages within the territory of a major centre; royal foundations; *sympoliteiai*): cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 51-75, 109-122, with archaeological and epigraphic references. In Chalkidike, more particularly, this is a recurrent feature of urban life: see Mari 2008b.

⁵³ Hammond 1988, against Vokotopoulou 1986, 97, who in this case too thought of distribution of large estates to the *hetairoi* (see literary references in n. 33). According to Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 195, Kalindoia and the other villages mentioned in the inscription «were made the object of an outright donation to the Macedonian Commonwealth, were opened up for colonisation, and were refounded as a Macedonian city».

⁵⁴ Alexander, when assigned the three villages to Kalindoia, turned it into a 'Macedonian city' (Hammond 1988, 387, and cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 195). Since the time of Philip II, such a process usually affected the cities conquered by the Macedonians; its typical features were the introduction of the Macedonian calendar and of the *epistates* and/or the priest of Asclepius as eponymous officers. To the examples mentioned, one may add the cases

of the former Thasian *emporion* of Oisyme, which the Macedonians refounded and renamed Emathia (Steph. Byz., s.v. Οἰσύμη; Ps. Skymn., 656-658); of Philippopolis in Parorbelia, probably founded by Philip II (Strabo 7, fr. 36); and of Pythion in Perrhaibia, where Archelaus (?) relocated the inhabitants of Balla, in Pieria (Steph. Byz., s.v. Βάλλα = Theagenes, *FGrHist* 774 F 3).

⁵⁵ Hammond 1988, in part. 389; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 195, 261-264, 431-442. Both scholars frequently stressed the autonomous existence of the *koinon* of the Macedonians in juridical, political and economic terms: cautious reservations were on the contrary expressed by Faraguna 1998, 387-395, and 2006, and by Mari 1999, 643-645.

⁵⁶ Faraguna 1998, 389 (my translation from the original Italian text).

⁵⁷ Hammond 1988, 386: while the parallels of this 'official' use of the term Μακεδόνες without the article are convincing (see below in my essay, on χώρα Μακεδόνων, and Papazoglou 1983 and 1998, on βασιλεὺς ὁ δεῖνα καὶ Μακεδόνες, especially in epigraphic documents), we should be careful not to overrate the available data (see above, on πόλις Μακεδόνων). Errington, rightly in my view, challenged the idea of a juridical difference in the treatment of Methone and Kalindoia (1998, 79-82), which is now reaffirmed by Faraguna forthcoming.

⁵⁸ On the general question see Mehl 1980-81; Boffo 2001, with further bibliography.

⁵⁹ It is likely that requests for land assignments (that went hand in hand with joining the hoplite rank of *Makedones*) were directly processed by the central power, but it is also generally accepted that the level of bureaucratic development in Macedonia, even in the age of Antigonos, was less extended – and in any case is less well known – than in other Hellenistic kingdoms (cf. Faraguna 1998 and 2006): no firm conclusion is therefore possible on this specific point. Hatzopoulos apparently suggested the idea that the 'direct grant' of the lands to the *Makedones* encouraged and simplified the transfer of individuals and groups (1996, I, 195, 261-264, 431-442), but it is impossible to have a clearer idea of each phase of the process.

⁶⁰ Herzog and Klaffenbach 1952, 18-19, nr. 7 = Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nr. 58, lines 3-6. It is interesting, among other things, that the recipients of *oikeiotes* and those of *eunoia* do not exactly coincide (τὴν τε οἰκειότητα ... τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν Κώϊοις πρὸς Μακεδόνας καὶ τὴν εὐνοϊαν ... ἦν ἔχουσα τυγχάνει ἢ πόλις ἢ Κώϊων πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα | Ἀντίγονον καὶ πρὸς Πελλαίους καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν χώραν τὴν Μακεδόνων).

⁶¹ Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nr. 36 (Philippi), lines 6-8, 12-13; nr. 41 (Amphipolis), lines 6-8, 12-13; nr. 47 (Kassandreia), lines 5-7, 12-14. In the decree from Pella the sentence referring to *eunoia* at lines 4-6 (cf. n. 60) is repeated in a slightly different form at l. 12 (πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἀντίγονον καὶ πρὸς Μακεδόνας), thus confirming that *Makedones* and *chora Makedonôn* are employed as synonyms. Unlike Philippi, Kassandreia seems now fully incorporated into *Makedonia* (cf. Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 158-165, 199-204).

⁶² Faraguna 1998, although accepting the legal distinction of status, rightly stresses the fact that the king strongly interfered in the treatment of the χώρα Μακεδόνων and of the territories of individual cities; a good example is provided by Alexander's settlement of the *chora* of Philippi (Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nr. 6). The same scholar also reaffirms that the juridical concept of χώρα (or γῆ) βασιλική definitely existed in Macedonia, although it is never testified in epigraphic documents (Faraguna forthcoming). In the fragmentary text of Philip V's letters to Amphipolis, whose contents probably were «matters connected with the transfer, leasing, and cultivation of land in the χώρα» of the city, Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 1996, 57 restored almost entirely a reference to 'royal land' at lines 11-12 of fr. 1 ([--]αἶαι τοῦ | [βασιλέως]) but the reading is uncertain and linguistically implausible.

⁶³ Figueira 1991, 46-48, and 2008, 486-490. In Ptolemaic Egypt, the *kleroi* were directly granted by the king to the soldiers as a form of remuneration for military service (Criscuolo 2011, 476). Among the non-Attic occurrences of the vocabulary of cleruchy considered by Figueira, a passage in Polybius on the reforms by the Spartan king Cleomenes III is particularly interesting (4.81.2: τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς κληρουχίας καὶ τῶν ἀναδασμῶν), as the king's policy was possibly perceived as a 'revolutionary' version of the land policy of the Macedonian kings from Philip II onwards (cf. Mari and Thornton 2016).

⁶⁴ On the wide range of social classes variously affected by the Athenian 'colonial' experiences (cleruchies and *apoikiai*) see Figueira 1991, 57-70, 176, 180-181; Id. 2008, 438, 440-442, 458-459; Stroud 2010a, 21, and 2010b; Culasso Gastaldi 2013; Mari 2016.

⁶⁵ Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nr. 20: two portions of arable land were granted by Philip to Polemokrates and later to Polemokrates' son, Koinos; later, the same grant is confirmed to Koinos' son, Perdikkas. The meaning of ἐμ πατρικοῖς when referred to a royal grant of properties (not only in this text: see also *ibid.*, nr. 22, and Tziafalias and Helly 2010, 72-84) caused a lively debate among scholars, on which see Criscuolo 2011, with a rich bibliography. On the large dimension of the estates given to Polemokrates, Koinos and Perdikkas, who were undoubtedly members of the Macedonian élite, see again Criscuolo 2011, 464-465 and n. 9.

⁶⁶ Billows 1995, 9-23, 111-137, 146-178. Billows insisted, and rightly so, on the Macedonian origin of practices known in Hellenistic kingdoms, albeit without insisting on lexical aspects (with some interesting exceptions: see

his remarks on the widespread use of a non-specific term like *κάτοικοι*, 148 and n. 9; and on the fact that in documents from Asia Minor the term *κλήροι* can designate both the allotments granted to smallholders, and the fractions of larger estates assigned to royal *philoï* and members of the elite, 120-121, 160-166). Some scholars, therefore, use the term *κληροῦχοι* even with reference to pre-Hellenistic and Antigonid Macedonia: see for example Oetjen 2010; Criscuolo 2011, 462, 467, 477-481.

⁶⁷ See the cautious remarks, on the status of Lemnos and Amphipolis in the Athenian empire, by Marchiandi 2008 and Mari 2010 respectively.

⁶⁸ On the status of the cleruchs (in Lemnos and elsewhere) as Athenian full citizens, belonging to the Attic tribes, see Marchiandi 2008; on this specific point, the condition of the *apoikoi* was definitely different (Mari 2010).

⁶⁹ On Athenian cleruchies see the bibliography quoted in notes 64 and 67. As far as Macedonia is concerned, moreover, at least since the age of Philip II the kings used to bestow large estates on their Greek friends, who did not become *Makedones* as a consequence of such gifts (above, notes 33 and 35).

⁷⁰ On the basis of the figures available and of a comparison with the Ottoman period, Billows concluded that Macedonia experienced a significant population growth thanks to Philip's reforms and land policy; according to the same scholar, the dimensions of Macedonian migration to the new territories conquered by Alexander were overestimated by previous studies (1995, 6-7, 148-160, 183-212, and cf. Scharer 2006, with a rich bibliography). See more particularly, on Macedonian migration to Ptolemaic Egypt, the estimates by Bagnall 1984 and Fischer-Bovet 2011.

⁷¹ Billows 1995, 208 (and cf. also 155-157); cf., on Ptolemaic Egypt, again Bagnall 1984 and Fischer-Bovet 2011, 141 (the latter scholar, however, interprets the noun *Makedones* «as a marker of origin in the third century»); for a non-ethnic interpretation of all references to 'Macedonians' in Seleucid Syria see also Musti 1966, 111-138, and 1977, 296-307.

⁷² Hammond 2000, 141.