

## THE KING AND THE LAND IN THE MACEDONIAN KINGDOM

Two recently published inscriptions afford new insights into this subject.\* They were published separately and independently within a year or two of one another. Much is now to be gained by considering them together. The first inscription, found at Philippi in 1936, published by C. Vatin in *Proc. 8th Epigr. Conf.* (Athens, 1984), 259–70, and published with a fuller commentary by L. Missitzis in *The Ancient World* 12 (1985), 3–14, records the decision by Alexander the Great on the use of lands given by his father, Philip II, and in some cases confirmed by himself.<sup>1</sup> The second inscription, found at the site of ancient Kalindoia (Toumpes Kalamotou) in 1982, was published with exemplary speed and an excellent commentary by I. P. Vokotopoulou in *Ancient Macedonia* 4 (Thessaloniki, 1986), 87–114. It records the names of the priests of Asclepius on a stele dedicated to Apollo; and in the preamble it mentions the name of Alexander, being Alexander the Great. Philippi and Kalindoia were both within the limits of the kingdom of Philip and Alexander (Str. 7 fr. 35).

I shall refer to the first inscription as A and the second inscription as B. I give the text of A as printed by L. Missitzis and the relevant part only of the text of B.

### Inscription A

[ _____ ]ρσιδ[...]	
[καὶ _____ Φιλίππ]ήσ[ιοι π]ρεσβεύσαν-	
[τες πρὸς βασιλέα Ἀλέξ[ανδ]ρον καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος	3
[τάδε διατέταχεν. Τὴν ἀργὸν ἐργάζεσθαι Φιλίπ-	
[πους... ἐστ]ιν χώρα καὶ προστελούσ[ι ...]	
[ _____ τ]ὴν ἀργὸν ὀρίσαι δὲ τὴν [ _____ ]	6
[ _____ ]ς Φιλώταν καὶ Λεονν[άτον _____ ]	
[ _____ ἐπεισβ]εβήκασιν τῆς χώρας _____ ]	
[ _____ Φιλίπ]ποις ἔδωκεν Φίλ[ιππος _____ ]	9
[ _____ ] ἐπισκέψα[σθαι _____ ]	
[ _____ ]ασιν τοῦ [ _____ ]	
[ _____ ἐ]πεισβεβήκ[ασιν _____ ]	12
[ _____ ] ἐξελεῖν [ _____ ]	
[ _____ ] πλέθρα δισχ[ίλια _____ ]	
[ _____ ] Δάτου χώρα[ _____ ]	15

\* I am most grateful to I. P. Vokotopoulou, who very kindly read and commented on the first draft of this article. The following abbreviations are used: *Anc. Mac.* = *Ancient Macedonia*, being the reports of the International Conferences held at Thessaloniki. Arr. = Arrian, *Alexandri Anabasis*. HM = N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia* 1 (Oxford, 1972); and G. T. Griffith, 2 (1979); and F. W. Walbank, 3 (1988). *Proc. 8th Epigr. Conf.* = *Πρακτικά του Η' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Ἐπιγραφικῆς* 1 (Athens, 1984).

<sup>1</sup> It was in my opinion an exact record of Alexander's arrangements, of which the original was kept in the *King's Journal*. Missitzis, p. 4, considered that it was 'a summary or epitome of the original'; but this view is hard to square with Plu. *Eum.* 2.3, where the officials were ordered to supply copies (*ἀντίγραφα*) of the original documents which had been destroyed by a fire. With regard to the nature of the *King's Journal* see my article in *Historia* 37 (1988), 129ff.



The inscription mentions gifts made by Philip (line 9 *ἔδωκεν*, line 19 *δέδο]ται*, and lines 24–5 *ἔδωκε*). The time of that giving was presumably when Philip ‘enlarged the city of Crenides with a large number of settlers and changed its name to Philippi’ (Diod. 16.8.6), i.e. in 356 or soon afterwards. For he must have regulated then not only the amount of additional territory for the enlarged city but also the rights of the Thracians whom he had defeated in coming to the help of Crenides (Steph. Byz. s.v. Philippoi).

Inscription B dated the beginning of the list of priests ‘from the time when king Alexander gave to Makedones Kalindoia’ etc. (lines 5–7). As Vokotopoulou has shown (p. 97), the stele was set up most probably in 323, and the first of the priests therefore took office, if the priesthood was an annual office, as we should expect, for the Macedonian year of autumn 334 to autumn 333. Thus the reorganisation of Kalindoia and the places round Kalindoia occurred within the previous Macedonian year, that is in the winter months of the Macedonian year 335–334 between Alexander’s return from Greece and his departure for Asia.

We conclude, then, that the ruling of Alexander for Philippi and the reorganisation of Kalindoia and its neighbours were both enacted in the winter of 335–334. We may therefore use one inscription to supplement or correct the other.

## 2. What lands were involved?

In inscription A there is land ‘lying fallow’ (lines 4 and 6 *τὴν ἀργόν*). ‘Of all things [? trees, pastures, meadows etc.] which have been given to the Thracians by Philip the produce is to be enjoyed<sup>4</sup> by the Thracians, as Alexander too has enjoined’ (lines 18–21, *κα[ρ]πίζεσθαι* being tacitly contrasted with ‘possessing’). ‘Philippi is to possess the land...’ (perhaps related to the two ridges of line 22). ‘Philippi is to cultivate the land around Seiraike and Dainaros, as Philip gave (i.e. granted)’ (lines 23–5). Here I propose to restore *τὴν* before *πε[ρ]ὶ Σειραϊκὴν γῆν*, and I note that *νέμεσθαι* is tacitly contrasted with ‘possessing’.<sup>5</sup> ‘The timber (restored) on...’<sup>6</sup> is not to be sold by anyone’ (lines 25–6). ‘The marshes up to Gephyra’ are all (possessions) of Philippi’ (lines 27–8, the restorations being probable). Measurements were also given in stades and in plethra, but the lacunae in the inscription make it impossible for us to apply them.

We are not told why there was a desire for a reconsideration of land tenure in the vicinity of Philippi, but we may conjecture that it arose from the reclamation of boggy land in the reign of Philip, as reported by Theophrastus who visited this area, probably in 336 (*CP* 5, 14.5).<sup>8</sup> The reclamation was carried out in the 340s, if not earlier, because new flora had developed when Theophrastus made his visit.

In inscription B ‘king Alexander gave to Makedones Kalindoia and the places

<sup>4</sup> Missitzis, p. 11 n. 2, drew a distinction between ‘enjoying the fruits of’ and ‘to have the usufruct’, which I do not understand. Vatin, p. 269, drew the contrast between cultivating and possessing, as I do.

<sup>5</sup> For the restoration one may compare the words in inscription B *τὰ χωρία τὰ περὶ Καλίνδοια*. I take the meaning of *νέμεσθαι* to be ‘reap the fruits of’ as in LSJ s.v. *νέμω* A II 2.

<sup>6</sup> Missitzis, p. 12, restored ‘on Dysoron’ and judged the restoration ‘pretty safe’; but it is geographically very improbable, since Herodotus located that mountain to the west of the Strymon basin (5.17.2, a passage discussed in *HM* 1.193f.).

<sup>7</sup> It was probably a place name, as for instance in a Roman Itinerary (see *HM* 1.48f.); in any case we reach the crossing of a river as the limit of the marshes.

<sup>8</sup> Missitzis, p. 7, quotes the passage, which is discussed in *HM* 2.659.

around Kalindoia – Thamiskia, Kamakaia, Tripoatis' (lines 5–10). Kalindoia (neuter plural, not feminine singular) was the leading city of northern Bottike (as the territory of the Bottiaei in the Chalcidic peninsula was called). Before the accession of Philip it had been an independent city of the Bottiaeans and not a part of the Macedonian kingdom *c.* 360, and its representative as host of the sacred envoys from Epidaurus had been Pausanias, most probably the pretender to the Macedonian throne on the death of Perdiccas III in 359.<sup>9</sup> It had then been an important place. Its site has been identified beyond doubt, as Vokotopoulou has shown, by the discovery of the stele in two parts at Toumpes Kalamotou, where there is a layer of habitation remains of the fourth century B.C. Toumpes, half way between Kalamoto and Doumpia (pp. 103–4), is some thirteen kilometres south of the western end of Lake Bolbe. It is very much an inland city.

Kamakai and Tripoiai figured alongside Kalindoia as independent *poleis* in a treaty of alliance which Athens contracted with some cities of 'the Bottiaeans' in 422 B.C. (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 76 = Tod, *GHI* 68, line 45, cited by Vokotopoulou, p. 99). Thamiskia may well have been the land of another polis at that time, named perhaps Thamiskos, meaning 'Foxtown'. What Alexander gave to Makedones in 335–334 were places (*χωρία*), defined territorially as 'Thamiskia' = land of ?Thamiskos, 'Kamakaia' = land of Kamakai, and 'Tripoatis' = land of Tripoiai. The thorough survey of Hellenistic remains by Vokotopoulou and her careful matching of the names with the local conditions have led her to the conclusion that the population centre of Thamiskia was some 6 kilometres distant from Kalindoia (p. 106), and that the centres of Kamakai and Tripoiai were less distant. The diameter of the whole territory given by Alexander to Makedones would then have been something like 15 kilometres. It was good land in that it had supported three and perhaps four *poleis* in 422 B.C.

If we compare the two inscriptions, we can see that they were dealing with areas of much the same order; for the bridge or the place of that name beyond the marshes was some thirteen kilometres from Philippi if the bridge was over the Xeropotamos, and twice that distance if it was over the Angites.<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Who were the recipients of the awards by Alexander?

In inscription A the recipients were 'Philippi' and 'the Thracians'. Philippi sent two embassies to Alexander, no doubt to negotiate (lines 2 and 26). There is no mention of embassies from 'the Thracians', and we may infer that they were in no position to negotiate. The difference between Philippi and the Thracians was one of status. Philippi acted as an independent Greek city. The Thracians who had endangered Crenides had been defeated by Philip and were treated then as his subjects and now as Alexander's subjects. There was also a difference between Philippi and the Thracians in regard to the land. Whereas Philippi owned its original territory and any further land given to it to possess (as in line 21 *ἔχειν τὴν χώραν* if Philippi is correctly restored there), the Thracians were allowed only to cultivate the land and gather its produce (as in lines 18–21 *καρπίζεσθαι*). Finally there was 'the land around Seiraike, and Dainaros'. These areas were not to be owned by Philippi but only to be cultivated by Philippi (line 24 *νέμεσθαι*) in accordance with a grant made by Philip (*καθάπερ ἔδωκε Φίλιππος*).

In inscription B the recipients were 'Makedones': βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔδωκε

<sup>9</sup> *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 295, cited and discussed in *HM* 2.193.

<sup>10</sup> Vatin, p. 269, prefers the Angites. A suitable place for a bridge on the Angites is at Symbole on sheet 'Serron' of the map of the Greek National Statistical Service, 1:200,000.

*Μακεδόσι*. Thus the whole complex consisting of the important city Kalindoia and the places now associated with it – which we may call the lands of three towns – passed into some form of Macedonian ownership. Who were these ‘Makedones’? One view is that they were individual Macedonians. This view was advanced by Vokotopoulou, who aptly cited the statement of Plutarch, that before embarking on his ship for Asia Alexander ‘enquired into the circumstances of his Companions and allotted to one a field (ἀγρός),<sup>11</sup> to another a village (κώμη) and to another the revenue of a lodging-place (συνοικία) or of a harbour’ (Plu. *Alex.* 15.3). But there are two difficulties if this interpretation is given to the inscription. The scale of the gift is entirely different from that of gifts to individuals mentioned by Plutarch, and the concentration of all the gifts, if they are to individuals, in one large, rich area is not paralleled by the gifts to individuals in the Macedonian kingdom which are known (*SIG* 332 given by Philip II and Cassander, and *Arch. Eph.* 1934/35, 117ff., republished in *AJA* 42 (1938), 246, given to other later beneficiaries by Philip V). There is a passage in Diodorus 16.34.5 which may be taken to support the view of Vokotopoulou. When Philip captured Methone, an independent Greek city, the Greeks were allowed to depart with one garment, the buildings were razed and Philip ‘distributed the land to the Macedonians’ (τὴν δὲ χώραν διένειμε τοῖς Μακεδόσιν). But the verb διανέμω implies a distribution as G. T. Griffith wrote ‘viritim’ and ‘a distribution not in large estates to a handful of Companions but to a large number of ordinary Macedonians’.<sup>12</sup> This is certainly correct; for it was from Methone that the Athenians had recently sent an expeditionary force to Aegeae, the old capital, and it was essential that as many soldiers as possible should be settled at this strategic point. The second difficulty is that the connection between a number of gifts to individuals and the setting up of a list of priests is a riddle. And if we take the case of settlers at Methone as an analogy, it is to be noted that there is no record of any ‘Makedon from Methone’ and that the razing of the buildings meant that Methone ceased to exist as a city. There would not be a list of priests there.

The view which I propose is that the recipients were Makedones in a general sense. It is clear from a number of inscriptions and literary citations that *Μακεδόνες* without a definite article was used in a political context for the Macedonian people. For example in inscriptions we have ἡγεμόν]ες Μακεδ[όνο]ν Περδίκκας... (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 89), *Μακεδόσιν ἐκ Χαλκιδέων* (Tod, *GHI* no. 111), Ἀ[μ]ύντα[s] Π[ερ]δίκ[κ]α *[Μ]ακεδόνων βασιλεύ[s]* (*IG* VII 3055) and *Μακεδόνες* (contributing money in 325; *Mélanges G. Daux*, p. 22 and p. 24).<sup>13</sup> And in literary passages we have, for example, βασιλεὺς *Μακεδόνων* (Hdt. 9.44.1), *Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς* (Thuc. 1.57.2), *Μακεδόνων... Μακεδόνες* (Paus. 10.8.2), ὅσα ἔτη *Μακεδόσι* (Arr. 1.27.4), *ξυμμακίας τῆς πρὸς Μακεδόνας γενομένης* (ibid. 3.24.5), εἰς *Μακεδόνας* (3.26.2) and ἐν *Μακεδόσι* (3.27.2). If this is the meaning of *Μακεδόσι* in the phrase of our inscription βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔδωκε *Μακεδόσι*,<sup>14</sup> then we have an immediate explanation for the size of the gift and for the setting up of a list of priests which started from the beginning of a new era; for that winter of 335–334 saw the birth of a πόλις *Μακεδόνων* established on the site of Kalindoia and owning the lands also of three other (hitherto Bottiaean) towns.

<sup>11</sup> Or ‘an estate’. See Ph. M. Petsas on the meaning in *Ancient Macedonian Studies in honor of Charles F. Edson* (ed. H. J. Dell, Thessaloniki, 1981), p. 297.

<sup>12</sup> In *Greece and Rome* 12 (1965), 136 and *HM* 2.361f.

<sup>13</sup> See my discussion in *CQ* 30 (1980), 462.

<sup>14</sup> It is to be noted that the inscription gives the definite article with ‘the Thracians’ in lines 18 and 19.

#### 4. What was the aim of Alexander in each case?

In inscription A Alexander was careful to conserve the allocations made by Philip (lines 18–19 and 23–4). His purpose was probably the same as that of Philip, for whom, to quote the words of G. T. Griffith, ‘Philippi would become (among other things) a kind of showplace, politically, the Greek city which was “free in a way that suited” him’.<sup>15</sup> To that end Alexander received two embassies from Philippi as a free Greek city in this winter of 335–334. On the other hand, the Thracians were subject to direct rule and Alexander laid down what lands they were to cultivate. His aim was to strike a proper balance between the Greeks of Philippi and his Thracian subjects. We see him taking similar steps a year later in regulating the affairs of Priene, a free Greek city, and of the persons of Naulochum and its surroundings who were not Prienians but were his own subjects (Tod, *GHI* 185, Prienians being ‘autonomous and free’ and those who were not Prienians having to live in villages and pay taxes to Alexander). Macedonians did not come into the picture in either case except for the adjudicators, Philotas and Leonnatus. Indeed the citizens of Philippi were ‘Philippeis’ (e.g. in *SIG* 267 A, after 347/6) or ‘Philippesioi’ if correctly restored in inscription A, line 2.<sup>16</sup> There is no mention at this time of ‘Macedones from Philippi’.

In inscription B, as I understand it, the aim of Alexander was to create a Macedonian city. There were many antecedents within the Macedonian realm. An unnamed city, known only through excavation, was planted at Manastir by the Iron Gates of the Axios in the reign of Archelaus (see *HM* 1.174, summarising reports in *Arch. Iugo*. 5 (1964) and *Starinar* 12 (1961)). A Greek city, Oesyme, was converted into a city of Macedonians, *πόλις Μακεδόνων* (Scymn. 656ff.) and was renamed Emathia, probably in 354 B.C. (see *HM* 2.363f.). The Macedonians of Balla were transplanted to Pythion in Perrhaebia (*FGrHist* 774 (Theagenes) F 3; *BCH* 2 (1897), 112) probably when Philip II annexed Perrhaebia (F. Hampl, *Der König der Makedonen* 37 n. 3 and *HM* 2.656). The Macedonian city Philippoupolis in Parorbelia is usually attributed to Philip II (Str. 7 fr. 36 and *HM* 1.199). That Philip did create a number of Macedonian cities within his kingdom by moving Macedonians was clearly stated by Justin. 8.5.7: ‘on returning (from Phocis) to his kingdom he transferred peoples and cities at his own desire... just as shepherds move their flocks now to winter and now to summer pastures’ (‘reversus in regnum... populos et urbes... ad libidinem suam transfert’).<sup>17</sup> Now we see Alexander applying the same policy in northern Bottike.

As a *πόλις Μακεδόνων* Kalindoia, if that continued to be its name, had the lands of three villages attached to it. Similar attachments are found with other Macedonian cities. Thus in Pieria Dium ‘has a village nearby, Pimpleia’ (Str. 7 fr. 17). In Deuriopus Alalcomenae, a city (Str. 327), has a village called Alcomena (*Spomenik* 98 (1948), no. 58; cf. *HM* 1.89). In the Strymon basin ‘Gazorus and its associated villages took a decision’ (*Bull. Epigr.* in *REG* 97 (1984), 453 *ἔδοξε Γαζ[ωρίους] κα[ὶ] ταῖς συ[γκ]ουρούσαις κώμαις*). And in the vicinity of Beroea in Emathia a number of villages were mentioned as a *χωρίον* or a *κώμη* in the manumission inscriptions

<sup>15</sup> *HM* 2.361. Philippi was still a Greek city in 242 (see F. Papazoglou in *Anc. Mac.* 3.203).

<sup>16</sup> Variants of the name are given by Missitzis, pp. 6f.

<sup>17</sup> See *HM* 2.661. A. B. Bosworth in *CQ* 23 (1973), 250 held that Philip planted new cities only in Thrace, but that is not the meaning of Justin at 8.5.7, who was writing of the kingdom itself and moved on to its frontiers at 8.6.1. Bosworth argued also that there was a lack of cities in Upper Macedonia; but he relied on the *argumentum ex silentio*, which is invalid in a country so little explored archaeologically. J. R. Ellis in *Makedonika* 9 (1969), 9–17 had a better understanding of Just. 8.5.7.

which were published by Ph. M. Petsas (*Anc. Mac.* 3 (1983), 238ff. and *Proc. 8th Epigr. Conf.* [Athens, 1984], 305f.).

It appears, then, that Alexander created in northern Bottike the typical complex of a Macedonian city with Kalindoia as the centre and with the lands of three associated villages (lines 7–10). It is of interest that when Cassander created the new Macedonian city called Cassandreia in 316 B.C., he brought into it various cities and ‘in addition not a few of the nearby places’ (Diod. 19.52.2 τῶν σύνεγγυς χωρίων οὐκ ὀλίγα), and gave to it a large area of good land. Similarly the new Macedonian city Demetrias had within its territories the villages which had previously been Greek cities (F. Stählin, E. Meyer and A. Heidner, *Pagasai und Demetrias* (Berlin–Leipzig, 1934), 94f.).

The presence of a strong Macedonian city at Toumpes Kalamotou served several purposes. It was well placed to control the Bottiaeans of central Chalcidice. Like Apollonia Mygdonica,<sup>18</sup> it could safeguard the main route from the Axios valley to the Strymon valley, the later Via Egnatia. Since the land was very fertile, the Macedonian city of Kalindoia was likely to become prosperous. As Vokotopoulou has demonstrated, the names Kalindoia (for the rolling of a horse) and Tripoatis (triple pasture) refer to the fact that the land near Lake Bolbe was excellent country for breeding horses. The settlement here was too late, of course, to have contributed men to the Companion Cavalry in the Balkan campaign of Alexander;<sup>19</sup> but no doubt it provided cavalrymen later on.

## 5. What was the juridical position of Philip and Alexander in their territorial arrangements?

In inscription A it is clear that Crenides–Philippi as a free Greek city owned its own territory, whether possessed before the arrival of Philip or added subsequently by him and by Alexander. This ownership is shown by the verb ἔχειν in line 21 and by the phrase εἶναι πάντα Φιλίππων in lines 27–8, the restoration being probable. Other land was allotted to Philippi and to the Thracians for cultivation only<sup>20</sup> (line 4 ἐργάζεσθαι; line 19 καρπίζεισθαι; line 24 νέμεσθαι). We may assume that this other land was owned by Philip and then by Alexander, since they granted the use of it (lines 18–19 δέδοται and lines 24–5 ἔδωκε Φίλιππος). Later, in 334, we find Alexander making the same point in Asia, where the Prieniens were to be ‘autonomous and free, possessing their land and houses ... and their territory (χώραν)’ and the non-Prieniens were to live in villages and pay taxes to Alexander (Tod, *GHI* 185). It was with reference to the non-Prieniens around Nauchochum that Alexander stated ‘I observe that the land is mine’ (line 12 χώραν γινώσκω ἐμὴν εἶναι).

In inscription B Alexander owned the land and was thus able to ‘give it to

<sup>18</sup> For the site of this city see Vokotopoulou, p. 105. It is by Nea Apollonia, near the middle of Lake Bolbe’s southern shore, and not at Toumpes Kalamotou, as was supposed by Ch. Makaronas in *Anc. Mac.* 2 (1973), 189f., writing before the discovery of inscription B.

<sup>19</sup> The squadron of Companion Cavalry ‘from Bottiaea’ was in action in spring 335 (Arr. 1.2.5). Whether that squadron came from the coastal plain of Lower Macedonia known as ‘Bottiaea’ or from the land of the Bottiaeans called ‘Bottike’, has been much discussed. G. T. Griffith in *HM* 2.368 favoured the former, and A. B. Bosworth in *A Historical Commentary on Arrian’s History of Alexander* 1 (Oxford, 1980), 59 favoured the latter. Inscription B tends to suggest that the large-scale presence of Macedonian settlers in Bottike is to be dated after spring 335 and that the view of Griffith is therefore more likely to be correct. See also E. Oberhammer in *RE* 3 (1899), col. 795.

<sup>20</sup> The word προστελοῦσι in line 5 indicates that some payment was made by the Philippians, presumably to Alexander.

Makedones'.<sup>21</sup> Thus the property of the king and the property of Makedones were distinct and discrete. Until recently this might have seemed surprising.<sup>22</sup> But in *CQ* 30 (1980), 461ff. I showed from the firsthand evidence of inscriptions and from literary sources that 'the king as the executive authority and the Makedones as the continuing entity "year after year" (cf. Arr. 1.27.4) make up the Macedonian state', and that each of them had their own finances. Official reference to the Macedonian state was made often to one or other part, which stood for the whole. It is interesting that Pausanias often named both parts in mentioning the Macedonian state: for example, in chronological order, *Φιλίππῳ σύμμαχοι... καὶ Μακεδόσιν* (4.28.2), *Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Μακεδόνων ἔφοδον* (9.6.6), *Ἀντιπάτρου καὶ Μακεδόνων* (10.3.3), and *πολεμῶν Ἀριδαίῳ καὶ Μακεδόσιν* (1.11.3). In *Anc. Mac.* 3 (1983), 195–210 F. Papazoglou published the paper she had read at the Conference of 1977 'sur l'organisation de la Macédoine des Antigonides', in which she showed these two parts of the Macedonian state in operation but only from the reign of Antigonos Gonatas in the third century B.C.<sup>23</sup> Her arguments are incontrovertible.

The ownership by Philip and Alexander of lands surrounding the territory of Philippi and the ownership by Alexander of lands formerly possessed by Bottiaeans can be explained only on the basis that the Macedonian kings acquired lands by conquest as their own possession. It was in fact 'spear-won land' *γῆ δορίκτητος*. We can thus understand the claim of Alexander to personal possession of Asia, as he threw his spear into the soil of Asia and 'declared his acceptance of Asia, won by the spear, at the hands of the gods' (Diod. 17.17.2 *παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀπεφαίνετο τὴν Ἀσίαν δέχεσθαι δορίκτητον*); and his repetition of the claim in his letter to Darius in 332 B.C. 'I possess the land as the gods gave it to me' (Arr. 2.14.7).<sup>24</sup> So too after the end of the Temenid house the generals claimed their realms 'as it were won by the spear' (Diod. 19.105.4 *ὥσανεὶ τινα βασιλείαν δορίκτητον*).<sup>25</sup>

What the king chose to do with the spear-won land was solely his concern. When Archelaus captured Pydna, an independent Greek city, he removed it to a site four kilometres inland (Diod. 13.49.2). When Philip captured Potidaea, he sent the Athenian garrison home, sold the inhabitants as slaves and gave the city with its buildings and lands to Olynthus (Diod. 16.8.5). Both Philip and Alexander gave some parcels of land to deserving Companions, or conferred lands on free Greek cities such as Philippi and Priene, or granted lands to be possessed by new cities as in inscription B, or permitted the use of the land to the subject peoples who paid a tax to the king

<sup>21</sup> The word *δίδωμι* is used constantly in inscriptions recording gifts of land (for example, thrice in inscription A, and in *SIG* 332), which were called *δωρεαί* in literary sources (e.g. in Diod. 20.28.2).

<sup>22</sup> It has often been held either that there was no Assembly of Makedones, or that, if there was, its performance was 'largely a formality' (G. Cawkwell, *Philip of Macedon* [London, 1978], 28). An extreme form of that view has been expressed by R. M. Errington in *Chiron* 8 (1978), 131 'Macedonia had no formal or regular assembly of people or army with rights acquired by tradition and acknowledged by the nobles and the king' and in his book *Geschichte Makedoniens* (Munich, 1986), 197 'dem Volk ein formales politisches Organ vorenthalten war'.

<sup>23</sup> For this later period inscriptions provide examples of King and Makedones: for example together in *Inscr. Cret.* 2 no. 20 *πρὸς Ἀντίγονον καὶ Μακεδόνας*, Antigonos being probably Gonatas (as in Paus. 1.7.3 *ἐπ' Ἀντίγονον καὶ Μακεδόνας*), and as separate entities in *SIG* 575 *τὸ κοινὸν Μακεδόνων βασιλέα Φίλιππον*, being Philip V. Papazoglou and I were unaware of each other's views, because I did not attend the Conference in 1977 and she delivered her paper for publication before my article appeared in *CQ* in 1980.

<sup>24</sup> This claim is discussed by me in *Antichthon* 20 (1986), 75f.

<sup>25</sup> The source of Diodorus here was Hieronymus, a dependable contemporary historian. On 'spear-won' land see A. Mehl in *Anc. Soc.* 11/12 (1980–1), 173f.



for the privilege (Tod, *GHI* 185, 8ff.). We do not know whether this prerogative of the king dated from the beginning of the Temenid house or only later. The ability of the king to move 'peoples and cities' (Just. 8.5.7 'populos et urbes') at his own pleasure (ibid., 'ad libidinem suam') was evidently employed at Kalindoia. A similar case was the movement of the population of Balla, a Macedonian city of Lower Macedonia, to Pythion in Perrhaebia, probably in the reign of Philip (*FGrHist* 774 (Theagenes) F 3).<sup>26</sup> Similarly in Asia Alexander made use of this ability in directing Macedonians to settle in his new cities there.

## 6. How was the king described?

It is convincingly argued by Missitzis (his p. 4) that the fragmentary line 1 marked the start of the document. The restoration in lines 2–3 *π]ρεσβεύσαν[τες πρὸς βασιλέα 'Αλε]ξαν[δ]ρον* is almost certain, because *Μακεδόνα* would be inappropriate within Macedonia and the patronymic *Φιλίππου* would come after *'Αλέξανδρον*. Both Vatin and Missitzis made that restoration. That the title should be used at the beginning of a document was normal (e.g. in Tod, *GHI* 185 [Priene in 334]; 192 [Chios in 332]; *SIG* 332, grants by Cassander), and that it should not be used thereafter in the document was also usual (as in 192 line 8). The absence of the title with Philip in lines 9, 19 and 25 is paralleled in *SIG* 332, line 10 *καθάπερ καὶ Φίλιππος ἔδωκεν*. In inscription B the initial and only reference to Alexander has the introductory *βασιλεύς*. This in itself makes the restoration at the start of inscription A likely.

The particular interest of our inscriptions is that they were set up within Macedonia some eighteen months after the accession of Alexander. They show that the title 'king' was used within Macedonia not only by the Philippians in an inscription set up at Philippi and reporting Alexander's decisions, but also by the Macedones settled in Kalindoia in naming the era which began with his gift. It is clear that the title *basileus* was acceptable and customary within Macedonia, though not necessarily mandatory.<sup>27</sup> The list of priests was dedicated by one of them to Apollo. It is clear that they were important persons in the new city. The dating of a document by a priest's name was common in Macedonia (e.g. in *SIG* 332).

We are fortunate to have three inscriptions, dating within the short period between winter 335 and summer 334, which report the distribution of lands and persons by Alexander. The inscriptions show conclusively that Alexander owned the land near Philippi previously possessed by Thracians, the land in northern Bottike previously possessed by Bottiaeans, and land near Priene in the vicinity of Naulochum. In *HM* 1.156 I argued, as others have done, that the king owned all 'spear-won' land. These inscriptions prove that this was so within the enlarged Macedonian kingdom of the reigns of Philip and Alexander; and Alexander proceeded with the same principle from the moment he landed in Asia. As regards the subject peoples Philip and Alexander must have removed some Thracians from lands given to Philippi or to be cultivated by Philippi, and they allowed other Thracians to cultivate land owned by the king. The displaced Thracians were probably planted on the land of another city. The bulk of the Bottiaeans of Kalindoia, Thamiskos (?), Kamakai and Tripoiai must have been displaced; and they too are likely to have been planted elsewhere in the

<sup>26</sup> For this transplantation see *HM* 2.656.

<sup>27</sup> This inscription ends the long controversy over the use of the title *basileus*; for it goes against the view of G. T. Griffith in *HM* 2.387, summarising the conclusion of R. M. Errington in *JHS* 94 (1974), 20–37, that 'the Macedonian kings did not call themselves *basileus* or expect to be called this by their people'.

kingdom by Alexander, following the policy of Philip (as expressed in Just. 8.5.7). At Naulochum in Asia Alexander directed the non-Prienians to move to villages and pay tribute. For Alexander exercised in Asia the right which Philip had exercised in Europe of moving subject peoples at his will to this site or to that.

*Clare College, Cambridge*

N. G. L. HAMMOND