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1. Political and administrative developments

1.1. Macedonia as a Roman protectorate (168–148 BC)

A few months after defeating Perseus, the last king of Macedonia, at Pydna (168 BC) the Romans found themselves facing the crucial question of how to govern the country. The question was not a new one. It had arisen thirty years before, after their victory over Perseus’ father, Philip V, at Cynoscephalae (197 BC), when the solution adopted was to preserve the kingdom within its old historical boundaries and to have the heir to the throne, Demetrius, educated in Rome, so that Macedonia would continue to fulfil its vital role as a rampart defending southern Greece against barbarian invasion. The latest war had shown that this solution was unrealistic, and that harsher measures were required for more effective control over the land. The Romans still, however, avoided becoming directly involved in the government of the country, for they did not want to assume responsibility for its defence. They therefore, having set the amount of the annual taxation at 100 talents, or half its previous level (an unavoidable reduction given that they were abolishing some of the revenues enjoyed by the previous regime), and collected spoils and plunder worth a total of 6000 talents, opted for the solution of a Macedon politically divided and economically enfeebled.

The political fragmentation of Macedonia was achieved primarily by the creation of four self-governing “cantsons” (regiones); these, with the exception of Paonia (which, although inhabited by a single tribe, was divided under the new system), were defined on the basis of their historical boundaries. The first canton extended from the Nestus to the Strymon, with the addition of Bisaltia (which lay to the west of the Strymon) and Sintice. The second canton comprised the lands between the Strymon and the Axios, plus eastern Paonia, which lay to the north about halfway upstream along the Axios. The third canton was defined as lying west of the Axios, east of Mount Vermion and north of the Peneios river, its northern boundary being indeterminate; it also included that part of western Paonia bounded by the Axios. Finally, the fourth canton embraced (from south to north) the lands of Eordaea, Elimea, Lyncestis, Derriopus, Pelagonia and the part of western Paonia that bordered on the land of the Dardanians. Of their political organisation we know only that assemblies met, taxes were gathered and governors elected (Diodorus tells us that each canton had its own governor) in their capitals (Amphipolis, Thessaloniki, Pella and Pelagonia, respectively). Although the sources do not permit any certainty on this point, it is probable – and has been argued by a number of scholars – that the Roman senate allowed the Macedonians to set up a joint council (see Livy XLV, 32) for the overall administration of the whole of Macedonia. The question of the region’s security was resolved in an unusual manner, with the constitution of local garrisons of Macedonians quartered along the northern frontiers of the three cantons that bordered on barbarian lands (i.e. not the third).

The second element of the solution, namely the economic enfeeblement of Macedonia to prevent the emergence of strong local centres that could undermine its loyalty, was to be achieved through a number of specific measures: a) prohibiting intermarriage between inhabitants of different cantons; b) prohibiting the ownership of land or buildings in more than one canton; c) prohibiting trade in salt between regions and fixing its
price for the fourth canton; and d) suspending the operation of state (royal) monopolies, such as timber and the silver and gold mines, an exception being made only for the production of iron and copper. This last decision was influenced by the disgust of the patricians in Rome at the activities of the tax-farming syndicates in Spain \(^1\). (Text 1)

The arrangements made in 167 BC proved, however, to be inadequate from both the political and the military point of view. In 163/162, just four years after the council of Amphipolis, a Roman envoy had to be dispatched to settle an outbreak of urban unrest in Macedonia; while at some later date (just when is not known), and in circumstances that are unclear, one Damasippus massacred the council assembled at the stronghold of Phacus, near Pella, afterwards seeking refuge in the court of Ptolemy VII as a mercenary. Despite the economic recovery Macedonia was enjoying, apparently on account of Rome’s decision to re-open the royal mines (158 BC), domestic strife that literary sources describe – although without providing any detail – as civil insurrection also occurred in 151, on which occasion the Macedonians sought the intervention of Rome, asking for Scipio Aemilianus, son of Aemilius Paullus, to be sent out as arbiter. The likely cause of this instability probably owes less to the political customs of the royalist Macedonians and their inability to adapt to a republican system of government, as Polybius argues, than to the inadequate and uneven rule of the new pro-Roman political elite to whom their friends had entrusted the government of the country.

However, if from the political point of view the arrangements adopted in 167 BC satisfied at least part of Macedonian society, from the military aspect they were wholly unacceptable and mathematically certain to lead to its destruction. The military weakening of Macedonia through the provision that the new administration could maintain military garrisons in the three frontier cantons left the country an easy prey to the inveterate rapacity of the neighbouring barbarian tribes, all the more so since the abolition of the monarchy had also eliminated the trepidation that might have held them back. The military security of Macedonia was, however, necessary for the viability of any settlement in Greece. In this sense the insurrection led by Andriscus in 149 BC should be seen more as the product of external pressures, and specifically of the role of the Thracian tribes that supported him militarily, than as a national or social revolution, as has sometimes been suggested, although its sponsors and supporters certainly took advantage of the social disaffection between segments of the population, not to mention their monarchist loyalties and the anti-Roman sentiments engendered by the traumatic experience of 168. That Andriscus and his Thracian associates were relying on these factors is indicated by his proclamation of himself as king of Macedonia under the dynastic name of Philip, his claim to be the son of Perseus and his elimination of a number of wealthy Macedonians, although this last action, ideologically inconsistent with the rest of his conduct, may more likely have been dictated by a desire for booty, as would in addition be suggested by the execution of a number of his own supporters. On the other hand, it is also a fact that the Macedonians did not support him until after the summer of 149 BC, by which time he had seized control of most of Macedonia.

In this adverse conjuncture (for their legions were tied up in North Africa) the Romans decided to defuse the situation through diplomatic means, sending an embassy to sort things out; but when the forces of this adventurer out of nowhere (“αεροπετούς”) managed to occupy part of Thessaly, sterner measures became necessary. The first attempt was unsuccessful: the Roman legion that arrived in Greece under the command of the praetor Publius Juventinus was soundly defeated at the Thessaly - Macedonia border and its commanding officer was killed on the battlefield (summer 148). A few months later, however, Quintus Caecilius Metellus arrived in Macedonia with two legions and, with the help of the Pergamene navy (Attalus II) and certain tactical errors committed
by his opponent, defeated Andriscus at Pydna and carried him off in chains to Rome to march in his triumph.\(^2\) (Text 3)

This episode convinced the Roman nobilitas that the experiment of a Macedonian four-canton protectorate without military support was essentially unworkable. From that year (148) on Rome kept a regular army in Macedonia, commanded by a Roman provincial governor (usually of the rank of praetor), while the Macedonians continued to contribute to the military security of the country by maintaining the garrisons instituted by Aemilius Paullus. The sending out of governors and legions (their number depending on the military requirements of each conjuncture) is the only, albeit substantial, change effected by the Romans to the arrangements for Macedonia worked out in 167, at least in these early years of their rule. These arrangements, as well as the division of the country into four cantons, remained in force into the imperial age. The fragmentary sources we have do not tell us when Macedonia formally became a province of the Roman republic and whether Metellus instituted any further arrangements. This is why some contemporary historians speak of a military administration and not of a province, basing their interpretation on the pre-eminently military responsibilities of its governors. In any case, up to the end of the republican period Macedonia was part of the vast province of that name, whose governor ruled not only over it and southern Illyricum (which had been annexed in order to secure communications between Macedonia and Italy) but also over whatever territories in the Balkan peninsula the Roman legions would afterwards add to the empire.\(^3\)

1.2. The consolidation of Roman rule in Macedonia and its role in the surrounding region (148-46 BC)

The strongly pro-monarchist sympathies of the generation of Pydna, the repercussions on the economic and social life of the Macedonians of the virtually incessant pressure from neighbouring peoples, and the capricious arrogance too often displayed by the Roman governors in the exercise of their duties naturally fostered new uprisings whenever claimants appeared – at least in the early years of Roman rule. The number of such insurrections, however, was very small. If one excepts the first such incident, which occurred during the general turmoil of the Andriscus episode, was led by an adventurer claiming to be Alexander, the son of Perseus, and was put down by Metellus, the only serious such rising was that of another false Philip (or false Perseus), which broke out in 143. According to at least one source (Eutropius) sixteen thousand armed men took part in this affray, many of them slaves; but in the end the rebels were put down by Roman forces led by the quaestor Lucius Tremellius Scrofa. The third such incident dates from the beginning of the rule of governor Gaius Sentius (93): taking advantage of the distress caused by a sharp and unjustified rise in the price of wheat in the province, a young Macedonian called Euphantus presented himself as king and appealed to his fellow-countrymen to rise and restore the “ancestral monarchy”. His action won little response (the sources describe his supporters as adventurers) and the rising never got off the ground, all the more so since his own father denounced him as insane.\(^4\)

These episodes should not, of course, lead to the conclusion that Roman rule met with persistent and permanent resistance in Macedonia. Not only were these isolated incidents, with varying degrees of support, but – and more importantly – much of the population had early on begun to adapt to the new and incontestable political reality that had taken hold of the East after Pydna: the unchallengeable Roman hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean basin and its surrounding regions. In Macedonia, the signs of this adaptation come from divers sectors of public life. The first concerns the introduction of a new dating system, beginning on the first day of the month of Dios (October) in the
year 148: it was, in other words, associated with the crushing of the insurrection of Andriscus. This system, which replaced the earlier method of dating based on the regnal year of each monarch seems – as far as can be determined from the available data – to have been used only in Macedonia (cf. the expression kata Makedonas or hos Makedones agousin); and it remained in use until the imperial age. The fact that the Macedonians were adapting to Roman rule is also shown by the institution of games in honour of Roman officials, such as the quaestor Marcus Annius who distinguished himself in the warfare of the year 120/119 BC, and by the adoption of cults, such as that of Jupiter Liberator and of Rome. Statues in honour of Roman officials began to ornament the Forums and other public places in Macedonian cities immediately after the events of 148. The earliest example is that of the Thessalonians honouring Metellus (148-146): in the inscription on the base of the statue the inhabitants of that great city, adopting the new vocabulary of the Romanised political elite of southern Greece, describe him as ‘saviour’ (σωτήρ) and ‘benefactor’ (ἐυγέργήτης). How far this adaptation had progressed within just a few decades is evident from a passage in a letter from Sulla (80 BC), in which he tells the people of Thasos that, since during the events of the First Mithradatic War (see below) “they had resisted the enemies of Rome and sworn to sacrifice themselves, their children and their wives and to die fighting for Rome rather than repudiate the friendship of the Roman people”, the Roman Senate had granted them the privileged status of socii (allies).

One of the principal factors fostering the development of this attitude among the Macedonians was obviously the fact that the Roman administration had taken over from the monarchy the difficult and wearisome task of defending the country against raids from neighbouring tribes to the north, and thus guaranteeing their security and “freedom”. Indeed, up until the time of the first Roman civil war, which was fought on Macedonian soil, the political history of Macedonia is nothing but a long list of military engagements between the Roman governors and the various tribes of the region. The need for a good highway to enable the legions to reach Macedonia rapidly and efficiently was, in fact, the main reason for the construction, sometime before 120 BC, of the Via Egnatia: named for the governor in office at the time, this great military road (via militaris) connected the Adriatic (Dyrrachium, Apollonia) with the Propontis (Byzantium) and the Aegean.

The principal foe faced by the first provincial governors (up to 84 BC) was the Scordisci, a Celtic tribe settled initially at the junction of the Savus and Danube rivers. Their first recorded clash with the Roman legions on Macedonian soil was in 120-119 and took place in Argos, eastern Paeonia (a little way north of Stobi). Despite their initial successes, and the death on the battlefield of the provincial governor Sextus Pompeius (grandfather of Pompey), catastrophe was avoided thanks mainly to the timely and effective reaction of the quaestor Marcus Annius, who managed to defeat both the Scordisci and the mounted reinforcements sent up by their Thracian allies, the Maedi, using only the available Roman legions and the local militia, without having to call up the Macedonian reserve (Text 4). A few years later, however, in 114, the then governor of the province, Lucius Porcius Cato, grandson of Cato the Censor, suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Scordisci in Thrace, part of which was under their control; they followed up their victory by invading central Greece and plundering Delphi. Subsequent governors managed to hold them in check, the most important of these being Minucius Rufus, who governed the province for three years (109-106) and won important victories over the Scordisci, the Bessi and other allied Thracian peoples both on the borders of the province (Europus) and beyond (in Thrace).

The period of relative peace and stability that followed came to an end for Macedonia when events on the international scene stirred up the Scordisci and the Thracian
these were (first) the Social War in Italy (91-89 BC) and (secondly and more importantly) the First Mithradatic War (88-85). The man called upon to deal with the general rebellion of barbarian tribes (omnium barbarorum defectio, in Cicero’s phrase) was the governor, Gaius Sentius Saturninus, who remained in the province from 93 to 87 BC. For three years, starting in 91 BC, Macedonia suffered a series of raids by Thracian tribes, who penetrated into the interior of the province but were driven back by the Romans thanks to their military superiority and the collaboration of its population and their allies the Denteletae. In a new invasion in 88 BC, kindled by their ally and protector Mithradates VI Eupator, king of Pontus, the Thracians drove through Macedonia to Epirus and the Temple of Jupiter at Dodone, where they were repulsed by Sentius. One year later (87 BC) the Roman legions, under strength and exhausted but still putting up a strong resistance in Eastern Macedonia with the support of the local population, fell back towards Thessaly, abandoning Macedonia to Ariarathes, the son of Mithradates, who annexed it to his kingdom as a satrapy. Roman rule over the region was restored in 86 BC, when Sulla re-occupied Macedonia and began to use it as a base for small-scale military operations against neighbouring tribes (Dardanians, Sinti, Maedi), with the object of pillage as well as training for his troops. Meanwhile, as Sulla was pressing forward into Asia (summer 85), Skordisci, Maedi and Dardanians were once again attacking Macedonia and Greece, reaching Delphi and looting its treasury yet again in the autumn of that year. They were eventually turned back in 84 BC by governor Lucius Scipio Asiagenus, who finally pushed the Skordisci right back to the Danube region.

Over the following decade (70-60 BC) the governors of Macedonia used the province as a base for launching military operations to bring under control the unruly tribes inhabiting the Balkan Peninsula, the most important of these being the Dardanians, the Thracian Bessi and the tribes that had settled in Moesia, e.g. the Bastarnae. During this same period Rome, by then engaged in the Third Mithradatic War (74-66), also brought under its control the great Greek maritime cities of the western shore of the Black Sea previously under the protection of the king of Pontus (Apollonia, Mesembria, Dionysopolis, Kallatis, Tomi, Istrus, Parthenopolis and Bizone). Thus, under Gaius Scribonius Curio (governor 75-72) the Romans, having defeated the Dardanians and occupied a large part of Moesia, for the first time penetrated as far as the Danube; his successor, Marcus Terentius Varro Lucullus (72-71), brother of the famous general Lucius Licinius Lucullus, crushed the Bessi among the crags of Mount Haemus, where they had their hidden strongholds, completed the subjugation of Thrace and Moesia and brought under Roman control the afore-mentioned Greek cities on the western shore of the Black Sea. Rome did not long, however, enjoy the fruits of these military successes, for the incompetence and rapacity of the next governor, Gaius Antonius Hybrida (62-60 BC), resulted in an uprising by the Bastarnae (summoned to the assistance of the Greek cities of Pontus, in revolt against the heavy burden of exactions imposed by Antonius) which ended in his defeat: the northern territories of the province were thus once again pushed back south of Mount Haemus. Despite the military successes against the Bessi of the next governor, Gaius Octavius (60–59 BC), father of Augustus, Rome would not begin to regain control over the lost territories until after Augustus came to power. Two years after Octavius’ governorship, and because of the weakness of the notorious (from the infamous invective of Cicero) governor Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (57–55 BC), Macedonia was plundered not only by such traditionally hostile tribes as the Bessi and the Dardanians but also by former allies, like the Denteletae, with the result that fear and insecurity reigned. Similar conditions, but of greater intensity and longer duration, prevailed again some years later, when the so-called Roman revolution entered its final phase and the Republic’s greatest generals clashed in the last of its civil wars: Pompey against Caesar, the so-called liberators, Brutus and Cassius, against Antony and
Octavian, and, finally, Antony against Octavian. For the most important battles of these wars were fought on Macedonian soil, with all obvious consequences for the economic and social life of the Macedonians 5.

1.3. The period of the Roman Civil Wars (48-31 BC).

In the spring of 49 BC Macedonia was at the centre of developments as the first great civil war between Pompey and Caesar unfolded. With Caesar having won control of Italy and thus secured his position in the West, Pompey, at the head of the aristocratic (government) party (optimates) and followed by both consuls and two hundred senators, set up his government-in-exile in Thessaloniki, the seat of the provincial governor, and, while waiting for his opponent to follow him, exercised his troops (nine legions) on the plains of Berea (Text 5). Early in the following year (48 BC) Caesar led seven legions through southern Illyricum, occupying successively the cities of Oricus, Apollonia, Byllis and Amyntia, with reinforcements from Italy (four more legions) following soon afterwards. While the movement of Pompey’s army westward into the region of Dyrrachium temporarily relieved Macedonia of the burden of military requisitions, the arrival (spring 48) of two new legions plus auxiliary forces under the command of Quintus Metellus Scipio, former governor of the province of Syria and Pompey’s father-in-law, led to an outbreak of hostilities in Upper Macedonia between Pompey and Caesar’s seconds-in-command Cassius Longinus and Domitius Calvinus. Cities and villages were looted and burnt by soldiers from both sides. After Caesar’s decisive victory at Pharsalus (August, 48 BC), however, the country began to recover from the economic prostration it had suffered as a result of the activities and requirements of the opposing legions and the conscription of its own men.

Five years after these events Macedonia once again found itself caught up in the maelstrom of the second round of Rome’s civil wars. Unfortunately for the province, its governor at that time was one of Caesar’s assassins and the chief promoter of the conspiracy to kill him, Gaius Cassius Longinus. In 43 BC he raised two legions of Macedonian soldiers, which he trained in the Roman manner for the purposes of a brief campaign against the Bessi. These forces, together with those gathered in Asia Minor and Syria by the other “liberator”, Marcus Junius Brutus, met the Caesarian army led by Mark Antony and Octavian in the autumn of 42 BC at Philippi. The victory of the Caesarians heralded the final phase of Macedonia’s history in the republican age. During this period Macedonia found itself under the rule of Mark Antony until the naval battle of Actium (September, 31 BC). As expected, and as happened in so many Greek cities, it had to furnish men and pay part of the cost for Mark Antony’s campaign against the Parthians and his fateful battle with Octavian (afterwards Caesar Augustus) at Actium. Accommodating themselves to the new political situation, as had the inhabitants of other eastern provinces, the Macedonians adopted the year 31 BC as the beginning of a new system of chronology in their public and private documents: that of the Augustan years (the name being derived from the official title of the emperor) 6.

1.4. The imperial age (30 BC – AD 284)

In the first years of Augustus’ rule Macedonia, as the northernmost province in the eastern part of the Empire, continued to serve as a base for military operations to secure Thrace and Moesia and to protect the Roman provinces and their allies throughout this region. Right from the beginning of this new period, the first imperial governor, Marcus Licinius Crassus (30-28 BC), resumed the campaigns against the Dacians, the Bastarnae, the Thracians, the Getae and the Moesians, winning major victories and generally pacifying the region. Smaller scale campaigns continued for the next two decades,
chiefly against the Bessi (who played an important role in the dynastic quarrels in Thrace). Administratively, following the reforms of the year 27 BC historical Macedonia formed, together with part of southern Illyricum, the main core of a small (compared to the republican age) province under the administration of the Roman senate. By 10 BC, however, the province had ceased to play the role of a Roman military bastion in the Balkans, since the legions that had been garrisoned on Macedonian soil were placed under the command of the imperial legate (legatus Augusti pro praetore) who ruled the military district (and later province) of Moesia. This change affected not only the duties of the governor of the province but also the life of its people, since save for a few cohorts the region was relieved of the presence of major military units and its inhabitants of the tax burden entailed by their maintenance.

This reform, however, had no direct benefits for the Macedonians, such as, for example, deliverance from the consequences of the misadministration of the province that had until then been concealed under the cloak of military necessity. Thus, in AD 15, at the request of the inhabitants of both provinces, the Emperor Tiberius made Macedonia and Achaea a joint imperial province under the control of the imperial legate who was the governor of Moesia. This administrative change, which lasted until AD 44, when the Emperor Claudius restored the province of Macedonia to its former status as a senatorial province within its 27 BC boundaries, was probably implemented to permit a more effective and a more efficient use of military resources in the defence of the two provinces.

From the beginning of the imperial period and until the early part of the third century of the Christian era, Macedonia – like the rest of the East – enjoyed the benefits of the so-called ‘Roman Peace’ (Pax Romana), all the more so since it was no longer a frontier province, the boundary of the Roman state having been pushed northwards towards the Danube. Its cities and villages began to recover from the crushing consequences of the successive civil wars, while economic and social stability was gradually restored to the country, especially from the reign of Trajan on. The invasion of mainland Greece by the Costoboci during Marcus Aurelius’ war against the Marcomanni in AD 170-171 was no more than a parenthesis with no serious effect on the situation. The quiet life of the small province that under Antoninus Pius expanded its borders with the addition of Thessaly was only rarely disturbed by imperial visits, such as those of Hadrian and Septimus Severus. The importance of Macedonia, however, and particularly of those of its cities that, like Heraclea Lyncestis and Thessaloniki, were located on major land and sea routes increased in the beginning of the 3rd century with the opening of the front against the Persians.

The peace of the province was shattered again in about the middle of the 3rd century when, because of the numerous Gothic raids, Macedonia was obliged to accept military units on its soil; for these, on some occasions at least, became involved in the dynastic disputes that characterised the so-called period of the military emperors (AD 235–284) and proclaimed their commanders emperor. These commanders were Titus Julius Priscus, who ruled as Emperor for a few months in 250, and Valens, who was called Thessalonicus, perhaps because he was proclaimed in Thessaloniki or because he made that city the centre of his activity, and who was Emperor in the first months of 261. Additionally, in at least one instance the outcome of a struggle for the imperial throne – between Philip the Arabian (244-249) and Decius (249-251) – was decided in favour of the latter in a decisive battle fought near Beroea in September 249. Conditions remained unstable for many more years, on account of the Goths who had settled along the north coast of the Black Sea in the early years of the century and had been troubling the Roman administration of the frontier provinces, particularly those of Dacia and Moesia, since before 250. Now, in the latter half of the 3rd century, the Goths were ex-
tending their raids deeper into Roman territory and attacking more southerly parts of the Empire.

The first Gothic incursion into the province of Macedonia occurred in AD 253, and included a siege of Thessaloniki, whose inhabitants put up a vigorous and very effective resistance. These raids were repeated a few years later, with greater intensity. In one of them (268) a horde 320,000 strong and including other barbarian tribes (Sarmatians, Getae, Gepids and Peucini) attacked Moesia and, encountering insurmountable resistance, divided into two parts. One of these overwhelmed Thrace, while the other took ship for the Bosporus and from there into the Aegean. The invaders sailed along the Macedonian coast and, having dropped anchor in the Singitic Gulf, besieged Cassandra and Thessaloniki. It seemed as though the two great cities would succumb, especially when first group of Goths, who had come down through Thrace, joined the besiegers. But the advance of the Roman Emperor Claudius southwards through Panonia alarmed the Goths, who, afraid that the Romans would cut off their retreat towards their Danubian homelands, lifted the siege and moved off to the north, laying waste to Pelagonia as they went. The two armies met at Naissus (Nis), where the Goths were utterly destroyed (their losses were calculated at some 50,000). That was the last Gothic invasion of the Balkan countries, as they were subsequently incorporated into the Roman army.

Some years later (AD 297) Diocletian’s reforms turned Macedonia once more into a small region confined to its historical territory (that is, without southern Illyria and Thessaly) and belonging to the great province of Moesia, one of the twelve created by that emperor across the Empire.

2. The population of Macedonia and its demographic changes

2.1. The population of Macedonia before the Roman occupation

It was natural that the population of a region with the geopolitical position and the history of Macedonia would lack the racial homogeneity of the lands of southern Greece. The presence of non-Greek populations in Macedonia before and after the Roman conquest is attested in a very few instances by ancient writers. Thus, Hecataeus tells us that, on the Thermaic Gulf, Chalastra was inhabited by Thracians and Therme had a mixed population (Greek and Thracian); while Polybius speaks of Thracians settling in the coastal cities of the kingdom in 183 BC and the consequent movement of their Macedonian inhabitants into parts of Paeonia. Livy (based on Polybius) tells us that when Macedonia was occupied there were in Bottiaia “a large number of Galatians and Illyrians, hard-working peasants”: colonists, that is, who had been transplanted there by Philip V to renew the population of the area (or, according to another view, prisoners of war from the campaigns conducted against these peoples by the Macedonian kings, perhaps working royal estates).

Information about the composition of the Macedonian population is also provided by inscriptions from the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, chiefly through the names mentioned in them. Inscriptions from Upper Macedonia, for example, contain Thracian names (historical and otherwise), such as Bithys (the name of the mythical ancestor of the Thracians), Cotys (the name of a dynast), Rhoemetalces, Douliis, Dentis, Torkos, and Illyrian names, such as Epicados, Pleuratos and Breucos. These names appear as personal names or as patronyms in combination with a Greek name or both. The use of names of historical figures in the framework of the same family (statistically a small sample) may indicate the existence of a local historical consciousness, which would
have been tolerated by the Roman administration. The same holds true for the use of the names of Paeonian kings, such as Patraos and Audoleon, in inscriptions in regions belonging to the kingdom of Paeonia, which had been Hellenised in the 5th century BC. The use of names that according to some were Thracian and according to others belonged to the so-called pre-Hellenic substratum that was subjugated by the Macedonians as they expanded their kingdom towards the east, names like Alys, Manta and Nano, are found in inscriptions not only from Upper Macedonia but also from Lower Macedonia, including Mygdonia, Bisaltia and Edonis. In all these cases, however, it can be said with certainty that from the social point of view their bearers had been assimilated into the Hellenic environment in which they lived, notwithstanding the fact these kinds of names are in a minority compared to the Greek names commemorated in the inscriptions 10.

Far more numerous and with a decidedly clearer cultural awareness was the Thracian element in eastern Macedonia, although it, too, with the passage of time assimilated to the culturally stronger Greek and Roman environments in which it lived, after the founding of the colony of Philippi 11.

2.2. The Roman presence in Macedonia during the republican age

A new element, this time of Italian origin, was injected into the multiracial society of the Macedonian kingdom some decades after the Roman conquest, but with a certain time lag compared to the rest of the East, since the settlement and active integration of Italian merchants, businessmen (particularly bankers) and – more rarely – farmers in the cities of southern Greece, the islands of the Aegean and Asia Minor dates from the early years of the 2nd century BC. Their presence is attested by various Latin or Greek names and phrases, such as Italici, negotiatores, consistentes / Romani, etc.

With regard to Macedonia, while until recently it was believed that the first Roman settlers arrived after the Mithradatic Wars, new finds prove that this must have occurred much earlier, and certainly no later than the final decades of the 2nd century BC: a brief dedicatory inscription from the Mygdonian city of Apollonia, for example, tells us that in the year 106/105 BC, that is, just 42 years after the Andriscus episode, a Roman named M. Lucilius Marcus, called Demetrius, dedicated a gymnasium to Zeus Soter, Hermes and Heracles. What exactly this dedication referred to is not known. However, whether it was the construction of a new gymnasium or the repair of an existing one (the hostilities that marked the governorship of Minucius Rufus make the latter interpretation more likely), the fact remains of particular interest in respect of the history of the Italian communities in the region. The dedication in itself, and also the fact that Lucilius had adopted a Greek name by which he was known in the society of this Macedonian city, show that he and probably others of his compatriots who used the gymnasium must have been living in Apollonia for many years before 106 BC. Inscriptions from the nearby town of Kalindoia that may date from the 2nd half of the 2nd century BC reinforce the probability of the existence of Italian settlers in the region at least in the final decades of that century. The dedicatory inscription from Apollonia also shows that the constant barbarian raids attested in that period did not seem to have discouraged Italian businessmen or farmers from settling in Macedonia, perhaps because they did not all have such serious consequences as our sources would have us believe. Similar early settlements of Italian immigrants are attested in an inscription from 90 BC in the free city of Amphipolis.

The conclusion to which this evidence leads is reinforced by certain more general reflections. It would indeed be curious if, despite the instability prevailing in the region, some adventurous Italians had not wanted to take advantage of the opportunities offered
by the new economic conditions in Macedonia after the abolition of the monarchy, with new opportunities for investment in the former royal lands and forests, the estates of the exiled nobility and the mines. At the same time, the repeated military operations and campaigns – of whatever extent – obviously offered important opportunities for enrichment from the trade in slaves, the spoils of war. The exercise of these types of activity in Macedonia by Italian speculators is confirmed by the famous stele (late 1st c. BC?) commemorating the slave trader Aulus Caprilius Timotheos that was found in Amphipolis, the important city linking Thrace with the Aegean via the river Strymon.

Regardless, however, of the rate at which Italians settled in Macedonia and when the first such settlements began, the sources show that by the middle of the 1st century BC there were already communities of Italians in the bigger cities and the ports, some of whom were veterans of the legions that had served in the province. Examples include the communities established in Beroea, attested in an inscription on the base of a statue erected in honour of the proconsul Calpurnius Piso (57-55 BC), and in Amphipolis, whose members were called to arms by Pompey shortly after the Battle of Pharsalus (August, 48 BC). There must also have been an Italian community in Pella, the ancient capital of Macedonia and capital of the third Roman canton, by the end of the 2nd or the beginning of the 1st century BC, judging by a statue dedicated to Mercury by one Aulus Fictorius Gaius, called Alexander (a member of the same family seems to have occupied in 25-24 BC the office of chief magistrate – duumvir – of the Roman colony). The numerous inscriptions dating from the period between the republican and the imperial periods and showing that the Italians in Macedonia and other parts of the East formed associations of Roman citizens (conventus civium Romanorum) with a particular form of organisation attest to the existence of Italian communities in other Macedonian cities as well, certainly in Thessaloniki, Acanthus, Edessa, Styberra and Idomene and probably Heraclea Lyncestis and Stobi. These Roman associations continued to exist, throughout the east, until the end of the 1st century of the Christian era, by which time their members had become fully assimilated into the society of their new homes.

With regard to the origin of these Italian immigrants, the sources provide very little definite information. Funerary inscriptions from Pella, Amphipolis and the region of Cassandra, for example, cite places like Rome, Heraclea in Lucania and Tarentum as the place of origin of certain specific individuals. In most cases, however, determining place of origin is an extremely difficult task, and one that more often than not yields no definite conclusions. The method used is to study the gens names (gentilicia) borne by the Italian settlers (e.g. Caprilius, Fictorius) and whether and to what part of the Italian peninsula they are indigenous. Research has shown that some at least of the 560 or so gens names attested exclusively in inscriptions from various Macedonian cities are indigenous to parts of Latium, Campania and Lucania and even areas of northern Italy (e.g. Aquileia). The geographical distribution of the gens names found in the east also indicates that families belonging to the same gens settled at simultaneously or moved with time to various cities not only in Macedonia but also in other areas of coastal Thrace and western Asia Minor, and particularly cities lying on the great military road of the Via Egnatia or major ports on the sea routes linking Italy with Asia Minor. Characteristic examples are the gens of the Agelilei, members of which settled in Thessaloniki, Thasos and Ephesus, and of the Erennii, whom we find in Dyrrachium, Pella, Dion, Thessaloniki, Europus and later Philippi. Of course, the settlement of Italian emigrants was not effected with the intervention of the state, as was the case with the colonists (see below), nor did they always come directly from the cities and districts of the Italian peninsula. Thus, when in the middle of the 1st century BC the Italian traders on Delos, the largest free commercial port in the eastern Mediterranean, left the island on account of (primarily) the Mithradatic wars, some of them settled in Mace-
donia, chiefly in the great port of Thessaloniki (others resettled in major cities in western Asia Minor, such as Ephesus, Smyrna and Cyzicus). The number of Romans in Macedonia increased significantly in the second half of the 1st c. BC, with the founding of four colonies – Philippi, Cassandria, Dion and Pella – and, in Upper Macedonia, the municipium (autonomous community) of Stobi. Another Roman city (colony or municipium) is attested from epigraphs in the years of the Antonines, on the site of the ancient Greek Mygdonian city of Apollonia. The conditions in which these colonies were founded cannot be determined with any certainty, nor can the exact date of their founding. The earliest colonies were those of Dion and Cassandria, which must have been founded by Quintus Hortensius Hortalus in the year 43 or 42 by order of Brutus (Hortensius had been appointed provincial governor by him early in 44 BC and after the assassination of Caesar attached himself to his nephew Brutus and fought with him against Mark Antony; the opinion that the colonies had been founded in 44 BC by Caesar stems from the fact that he had been Caesar’s proconsul). Philippi was colonised by veterans of Mark Antony’s army immediately after the Battle of Philippi in 42 BC. As for Pella, the colony there was most probably founded after 30 BC. Philippi, Cassandria and Dion were “refounded” after the Battle of Actium by order of Caesar Augustus. That new colonists arrived in the country at the time of this “refounding” is attested by Augustus himself in his Res Gestae, where he cites Macedonia as one of the regions in which he settled his veterans (Text 6), by the appellation of parens (that is, father of the colony) ascribed to him by the inhabitants of Dion in an inscription in his honour, and by the use of the official titles Julia Augusta on the coins of these colonies.

The founding of colonies was certainly connected with the demographic problem caused by the wide-scale conscription of Macedonia’s male population, from the first Mithradatic war to the end of the Roman civil wars, and with the constant warfare in the region, which made it of the most urgent necessity to revitalize the province’s economic and social life. But such major events were not, nor could be, caused by a single factor, however considerable. Situated in key positions on the Via Egnatia and the land route between northern and southern Greece, these Roman centres permitted control not only of Macedonia but also of all of the channels of communication leading from the West to the East, rendered all the more essential since the northern Balkan region was still outside the Roman Empire. These colonies could also, and to some extent did, serve as reserves of manpower for the military operations that led to the conquest of Thrace.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the colonies founded in Macedonia were exclusively military in character. Dio Cassius, for example, tells us that the inhabitants of Dyrrachium and Philippi were supporters of Mark Antony who were deported by Augustus from their homes in Italy to the colonies in Macedonia. Prosopographical studies, moreover, show that Italians already settled in Macedonian cities entered substantially into the formation of their elites, while in some of the colonies an important role was played by their manumitted slaves.

The number of colonists who settled in the colonies of Macedonia is unknown, since the inscriptions do not provide sufficient evidence. The only colony for which there is a satisfactory body of evidence is Philippi, where certain statistics enable us to form a general impression of the size of the various population groups in that colony: out of a total of 1480 individuals whose legal position we are able to determine on the basis of their onomastic type, the Roman citizens, including freedmen, numbered 1032, or 70%, while non-citizens – or peregrini – numbered 428 (29%); this latter group included the former inhabitants of the colony, mainly of Greek and Thracian descent. The names of the Roman citizens indicate origins from various regions, including Calabria,
Samnium and Campania (southern Italy), Latium and Etruria (central Italy) and Aquileia (northern Italy)

Colonial settlement did not stop in 30 BC, however, but continued after the Augustan “refounding” in at least some of them, as indicated by the case of Philippi, which after the creation of the province of Thrace (AD 46) was reinforced by veterans of the military campaigns that secured the new province.

2.3. Immigration into Macedonia during the imperial age

The influx of Roman citizens continued during the imperial period, particularly into such major urban centres as Thessaloniki and Heraclea Lyncestis, and the colonies of Dion and Philippi. The incomers, however, were no longer first or second generation Romans living in the East: study of their gens names shows that in this period it is very risky to speak of a “Roman” immigration, since as a rule the bearers of these names, especially when they appear in the 2nd and 3rd century, are Hellenised descendants of earlier Italian immigrants or descendants of freedmen. This was also a period when the whole migratory horizon altered: as far as we can determine, more immigrants were coming from the large cities of coastal west and northwest Asia Minor (Bithynia, the Troad, Ephesus, Smyrna, etc.) and fewer from the cities and regions of Italy or southern Greece.

The substantial influx of settlers from Asia Minor maybe deduced not only from the number of individuals whose ethnic names attest such an origin but also from their collective expression in private associations where they are referred to summarily as ‘Asians’. Such associations, claiming the protection of the god Dionysus, are known from inscriptions dating from the 2nd and 3rd centuries to have existed in Thessaloniki, Lete and Philippi, as well as in other regions and important cities in the neighbouring province of Thrace. The fragmentary data we have at our disposal do not permit us, however, to estimate the volume of migration into Macedonia or to establish the conditions in which it occurred. The fact that some of these incomers from Asia Minor were craftsmen specialising in textiles and purple dye has permitted some scholars to suppose that they may have been artisans and merchants taking advantage of opportunities in the economically underdeveloped Macedonia of the period immediately following the civil wars.

Another foreign population group with a strong collective organisation was that of the Jews. For the Roman administration, however, they were not an ethnic but a social group: that is, the Jewish communities were seen as private aggregations of individuals, simple religious associations. On the basis of our knowledge to date, there were Jewish communities in four of Macedonia’s major urban centres, namely Philippi, Thessaloniki, Beroea and Stobi (which is the only community of whose synagogue relics have been saved). Precisely when the first Jews settled in Macedonia remains unknown, although some have argued that there had been Jews living in Macedonia since the middle of the 2nd century BC. The first definite information, however, comes from the author of the Acts of the Apostles, who names certain places (Philippi, Thessaloniki and Beroea) in whose synagogues St Paul preached on his first visit to Macedonia in AD 50.

These communities continued to exist at least until the 4th century, the most important being that of Thessaloniki, which may have increased in size and acquired more than one synagogue. Later inscriptive material from Beroea allows us to probe more closely into the organisation of that city’s Jewish community, which was governed by an elected council of elders, as was the case with several pagan associations. Despite their incorporation into local society, as is indicated by, for example, the use of Greek
on their funerary monuments and the existence of communal graveyards shared with the other inhabitants of the cities, the Jews were never fully assimilated into their new environment. Their funerary monuments, which are our chief source of information about them, clearly express their religious identity, sometimes with depictions of religious symbols, sometimes stating the institutional role of the synagogue in their life and sometimes simply using the ethnic appellative ‘Jew’.

3. The administration of Roman Macedonia

3.1. The provincial administration

3.1.1. The mechanism of administration

After 148 BC Macedonia was governed by a Roman official, usually a former general (praetor), who was sent out by the Roman senate for one year and who carried with him political and military authority (imperium). The provincial governors, who in reality were amateurs and who governed with no professional training, were assisted in the performance of their duties by a small council (consilium), which was appointed by the senate in consultation with them. The most important members of this staff were the legate (legatus), a sort of deputy governor with professional (administrative and military) experience who could replace the governor in the performance of his duties, and the quaestor, who was in charge of the treasury. Other members of the council included his aides (comites, cohors amicorum), that is, persons of confidence, frequently relatives, probably not more than ten in number, who served primarily as advisors. Finally, the government apparatus included a small number of salaried public servants brought from Rome by the proconsul (known as apparitores), clerks and scribes, lictors, messengers, heralds, augurs, and a number of household slaves (cooks, mule-drivers, grooms, etc.).

In about 10 BC the military authority of the governors of Macedonia, who were by this time always called proconsuls, was limited to command over a small number of soldiers attached to his person (officium), whom he used as clerks and as his own personal guard. This was due to the fact that the imperial frontier had shifted north and there were no longer any Roman legions in the province of Macedonia. Of course, the proconsul’s staff continued to include legates and quaestors, as well as his own personal slaves or freedmen.

There are some administrative discontinuities during the imperial period, that did not occur under the republic. These were due for the most part to personal interventions on the part of certain Roman emperors, including Tiberius and Trajan, who wanted to control the government of the senatorial provinces, of which Macedonia was one, sometimes directly through trusted officials (legati pro praetore Augusti) and sometimes sending envoys with special missions who in essence limited the authority of the military governors. By the time of the Severans, and even more so from the middle of the 3rd century on, the governors being sent out in the place of the proconsuls were procurators or even simple equestrian prefects, who assumed the administration of the province and the military forces stationed there because of the threat of Gothic raids. These imperial interventions were extended during the reign of Trajan over the financial administration of the cities through the office of special imperial envoys (curatores rei publicae).
A special government apparatus directly under the emperor’s control was instituted in the imperial age by the public finances sector to handle the administration of the imperial estates and the direct taxes collected for Rome from the Roman citizens of Macedonia, namely inheritance tax and the tax levied on the manumission of slaves. These services were staffed by experienced members of what was known as the “Emperor’s family” (familia Caesaris), who were slaves or freedmen and who, as far as we know, worked under equestrian procurators (procuratores). The sources, finally, also mention imperial procurators with other than financial responsibilities.

3.1.2. The responsibilities of the provincial administration

Under the republic provincial administrations had two main responsibilities: one was to assure military security and peaceful conditions and the other was to collect the taxes and duties payable to Rome. Achievement of the first object meant maintaining the legions sent out to Macedonia each year, as well as the local reserve forces that were garrisoned along the frontier. This was a costly charge, and the burden of their upkeep fell, in the first instance largely and in the second entirely, upon the cities. The inhabitants of the provinces were required, among other things, to provide the legions with grain at a price fixed by the senate; and it is interesting that in the inscription from Lete (mentioned above) its inhabitants praised the quaestor of the province, Marcus Annius, for having dealt with the enemy without burdening the cities with the costs associated with the mobilisation of the Macedonian reserves. In order to do this the Roman governors frequently resorted to extensive conscription, particularly in the period following the Mithradatic wars, the most striking example being Brutus’ raising of two whole legions. It is these military responsibilities and duties of the provincial governors of Macedonia that emerge primarily from the available literary and inscriptional sources, and these do indeed to a considerable extent reflect the reality of their situation. They also, of course, had other, non-military, duties, such as the administration of justice, but our information in this regard is minimal.

The second major sector of Roman provincial administration was the management of public revenues. As early as 167 BC the Romans had imposed upon the “free” cities of Macedonia a tax of 100 talents. The sources do not say exactly what this tax represented (nor even if it continued to be exacted), but some historians, based on information from the imperial age, assume that its primary constituents were a land tax (tributum soli) and a poll tax (tributum capitis). Government revenues also included the customs duties (portoria) levied on both imported and exported goods.

As was the case in other provinces of the Empire, these revenues were collected through the mechanism of tax collectors known as publicans (publicani). Tax contracts were sold to the highest bidder, often a company representing Roman business interests, whose agents collected the sums required, usually through illegal methods and generally demanding far more than the lawful amount of tax, as often as not with the tacit assent of the provincial authorities. The details of this mechanism, such as for example how the total provincial tax burden was divided up among the cities, we do not know; but the preservation of the four canton system until the imperial age suggests that these also served as tax districts. Nor do we know how the vast royal estates (farms, forests, gold and silver mines), which had become Roman public land (ager publicus), were exploited, whether that is they were leased directly to the publicans or to a number of tenants (local or foreign), as was the case during the period of the monarchy. The system of tax farmers, which was the object of constant dispute between Rome’s various political factions, was finally abolished by Augustus, when the collection of direct taxes
was assigned to government-appointed officials or minor civil servants (usually slaves or freedmen) under the superintendence and control of the imperial procurators.

The exclusively civic responsibilities of the provincial governors during the Principate were not limited to the dispensation of justice through the system of judicial districts (conventus), which seems to have existed in Macedonia as well, but were far more extensive. Governors settled, by decisions that often took the form of edicts, a variety of matters that had to do with, for example, relations between cities (boundary disputes), the maintenance of major public roads and the manumission of slaves in local sanctuaries. The most striking feature of this period, however, is the intervention of the Roman administration in matters of local self-government, in a manner moreover that has led many historians to the conclusion that the cities could do nothing without the governor’s prior approval. This view may of course be exaggerated, to the extent that it does not correspond to any sort of legal requirement; but it does describe the “constitutional” reality of the cities where, by reason of the ennoblement of their societies, the system had become ostensibly democratic, with the result that its institutions were frequently unable to resolve even the most minor problems of everyday life. Characteristic of this situation was the case of an edict lately published from Beroea (late 1st – mid 2nd c.): its citizens, being unable to agree on which idle public funds they should use to finance the city’s gymnasium (which had had to close its doors), asked the proconsul to step in and resolve the problem 17.

Other similar interventions initiated by the cities through the dispatch of envoys to the emperor are also attested; these concern individual cities as well as the provincial assembly (koinon) of the Macedonians. The most eloquent such example has come to our knowledge through a letter written by Antoninus Pius to an unidentified Macedonian city in the eastern part of the province (Paricopolis?), in which the Emperor suggests various ways to improve the city’s finances, such as levying a poll tax on the free inhabitants of the city without political rights, raising the number of councillors to eighty and increasing the sum they paid upon assuming their duties, etc. (Text 9).

The direct and indirect Roman taxation levied during the republican period continued in the imperial age as well, but the burden on the cities became very much lighter. One reason for this was that they were no longer required to help maintain the Roman legions garrisoned in the province; their only similar obligation was a contribution (financial) to the operation of the cursus publicus, the imperial postal service that provided for the transportation of public officials, army units, public goods and government orders. The primary reason for this change, however, was the improvement in the exercise of public administration on the part of the provincial governors and procurators compared to their republican predecessors, on account of the long experience of public administration that had been amassed in the meantime, the new and fairer way in which taxes were collected and most of all the political stability that characterised the new political regime.

3.2. Government of the cities

Immediately after the Roman conquest the cities of Macedonia were integrated into the Roman Empire as tributary cities (civitates stipendiariae), with the exception of Amphipolis, Skotousa and Thessaloniki (in AD 42), which were recognised as free (civitates liberae). The difference between these two categories was one of privileges: the free cities were exempt, for example, from the ordinary taxation of the tributary cities, their courts of justice enjoyed a privileged status (they could hear cases in which one of the parties was a Roman citizen), and in general they constituted a part of the province over which the provincial governor had no authority. However, in times of war
these distinctions lapsed, particularly in respect of financial matters, and all the cities were treated alike by the provincial administration, as is evident from, for example, Cicero’s famous attack on the governor of Macedonia, Lucius Calpurnius Piso.

Despite the interventions of the Roman administration, the cities of Macedonia continued after the Roman conquest to be governed by the institutions they had had under the monarchy. Each city had its own collective political organs, the ecclesia tou demou (the citizen body meeting in assembly) and the boule (council), its archons (magistrates), its laws (locally applicable) and its own mechanism for the dispensation of justice for specific punishable offences, on condition of course that the parties were not Roman citizens, whose actions were judged by the provincial governor. The power to levy fines for the desecration of tombs, for example, belonged to the cities. The cities also had their own sources of income from real and other property (which, particularly in the years after the 2nd c. AD, when the region became more prosperous, was increased by gifts and bequests from its citizens). In general, Rome was unwilling to make radical changes and thus did not touch the existing institutions, but endeavoured, as elsewhere, to govern Macedonia through well-disposed persons whose political careers it fostered.

From the institutional point of view the Macedonian cities resembled those of southern Greece, and may be said to have been democratic. This assessment is based primarily on the evidence of inscriptions documenting the existence of collective democratic institutions, namely the ecclesia and the boule, as well as a large number of archons. For historical reasons, however, democracy in Macedonia had never functioned otherwise than as a timocracy, and it remained that way until the end of antiquity. The exclusion of descendants of manual labourers from the gymnasium in Beroea (the gymnasiasarch law, probably dating from the time of the monarchy) and the fixing of property criteria (minimum property requirement of 3000 drachmae in land or cattle) for the admission of youths to the ephebeia (final cycle of education) in Amphipolis (ephebarch law 23/22 BC) make it very likely that the right to vote and to be elected had already been subject to similar restrictions before the Roman conquest, which continued to be preserved afterwards. The institutional constraints upon the functioning of democracy in Macedonia from the republican age onwards also reflect the exclusive prerogative of the politarchai, the all-powerful body of civic magistrates which existed in all Macedonian cities, to submit proposals to the boule and the ecclesia for their consideration (according to some scholars, this restriction is also held to have existed under the monarchy, since the institution of civic magistrates was introduced into the Macedonian cities during that period). The progressive ennoblement of society in the Macedonian cities caused by social changes and reinforced by the legal distinctions between its citizens that were introduced by Rome from the late 1st century BC on (between Roman citizens and others initially, between honestiores and humiliores later), in conjunction with the functional aspect of public office (exercise of which entailed considerable private expenditure), eventually resulted in the total devitalisation of the ecclesia: this institution thereafter gradually dwindled into a body that merely rubber-stamped the proposals of the politically all-powerful boule and the magistrates, that is, the members of the local aristocracy. This lack of correspondence between society and the formally democratic regime was recognised by the Roman administration, as may be deduced from the afore-mentioned edict from Beroea where the proconsul felt the need to stress in his preamble that his proposed solution had the approval of the boule and the “first citizens” of Beroea, that is, the upper stratum of the local aristocracy.

About the composition and operation of the collective civic authorities in the Macedonian cities we know very little. The ecclesia was the assembly of all male citizens, and it met whenever it was convened by the politarchai, never of its own will. Debates
in the ecclesia presupposed the existence of a previously agreed draft (probouleuma), which was prepared by the boule and introduced for debate and voting by the politarchai. In exceptional cases, particularly concerning the awarding of honours to eminent Roman officials or local citizens, the ecclesia worked conjointly with the assemblies of the Italian communities for as long as these formed autonomous associations with a legal status.

Unlike the ecclesia, the boule played a fairly broad role. In addition to its initiatory legislative powers, the sources record a wide range of activities associated with the public life of the cities that were under its direct superintendence. These administrative functions included the education of the ephes, the athletic training of the young men, the use and management of public resources (derived as a rule from donations and bequests), the organisation of games, the awarding of honours to distinguished members of the community or to foreigners, and the representation of the city through embassies to the Roman central (imperial) and provincial administration. In regard to its composition, the boule was as a rule a fairly numerous body, whose members belonged, as has been shown by prosopographic studies, to the local aristocracy. The political importance and authority of the boule are indicated not only by its power to legislate alone in certain matters at least (particularly connected with the distribution of honours) but also from the fact that citizens sought the distinction of the title of bouleutes, even if only honorary (super legitimum numerum). This was true even in the latter part of the 3rd century, by which time membership of this council had become a lifetime post (precisely when this significant change, which so radically altered the institution of a one-year term of office, occurred in the cities of Macedonia we do not know). The general institutional tendency is evident, furthermore, in the appearance during the imperial age in the city of Thessaloniki of a gerousia, an aristocratic institution that acted in an advisory capacity thanks to the authority and prestige conferred upon its elderly members by their wealth and experience.

Turning now to the various public offices in the Macedonian cities, the general image given by the sources is one of uniformity, since the civic magistracies in almost all these cities included the offices of politarchai, grammateus, agoranomoi, tamiai, gymnasiarch, ephebarch and mnemones (a kind of public notaries), and possibly others as well. We know, for example, that some cities instituted additional offices, such as those of stones (corn-buyer) and eirenarches (police magistrate), either to meet a specific and extraordinary need (e.g. purchasing grain) or to provide a permanent and general service (policing the countryside). The sources also attest to other extraordinary offices, such as that of architect, chief medical officer (archiatrus), and the like, as well as offices connected with religious functions and the administration of the treasuries of the local temples and sanctuaries (procurators). Officers and magistrates were elected, by the ecclesia (assembly), for a single year.

Two of these offices warrant more particular mention: those of politarch and gymnasiarch. The office of politarch, as we have seen, was the most important in the Macedonian cities, and its importance resided not only in the determinant role its holder played in the preparation of and voting on collective decisions, but also in all the other competences attached to it, thanks to which the civic magistrate was involved in virtually every aspect of the city’s public life. That the importance and the sphere of responsibility of this initially two-member body expanded over time may be deduced from the facts that its membership was increased to five and that in Thessaloniki (as we know from the Acts of the Apostles) it had judicial powers (like the judges of the monarchy): it was to these “rulers of the city” that St Paul’s friend Jason and his companion were taken by the Jews, who received the complaints laid against them. The office of gymnasiarch also acquired increased importance over time, since the generosity of its
holders supplemented the meagre sums available for the purchase of the olive oil that was a rare commodity in Macedonia but was essential to both athletic exercise and to bathing (in the imperial age the gymnasias served more as bath-houses than for their original purpose). Indeed, this office assured the smooth functioning, year round, of a city’s social life and the health of its male population.

The institutions of the cities of Macedonia, however, like those of other Greek cities, did not – nor would such a thing have been possible – remain static in the wake of the Roman conquest. The appearance of officials such as the chief priest of the local imperial cult (archiereus) is in itself sufficient confirmation of this. Roman influence is also responsible for the introduction of the summa honoraria, the amount that candidates for office had to pay in order to assume their functions. It is, however, beyond doubt that the imposition of this custom was due to the fact that it coincided with what had been customary in the Greek cities since the middle of the Hellenistic period, where in the name of euergetism, the benefaction that was the creed and ideology of the local aristocracies, public office was synonymous with the assumption of expenses for a variety of reasons. This ennoblement of the citizen body, which was influenced by changes in society, is reflected in such realities as the aggregation of public offices simultaneously in the person of a single individual, the repeated exercise of the same office by the same persons, and the appearance of women and minors among the city authorities.

3.3. The local assemblies (koina) in Upper Macedonia

The evolution of the civic institutions of Upper Macedonia was, historically, somewhat different to that of the remainder of Macedonia. These differences were due to the lower rate of urbanisation of this mountainous area, which meant that the old tribal groups – the Eordaeoi, the Elimiotai, the Lyncsteis, and the Orestai – preserved their ancient system of organisation based on assemblies, a local confederation of cities and villages, independent of tribes and clans. The autonomy of these assemblies perhaps also explains the fact that the writers of the republican period often refer to Upper Macedonia as “free” (Pliny, however, only applies this term to the Orestai). Recognising this local particularity, the Romans accepted these assemblies as an intermediate mechanism for communication between the provincial administration and its constituent small cities and villages. This option was imposed rather than adopted, given the low degree of urbanisation and the small size of the urban centres in this region.

The constitution of the local assemblies in Upper Macedonia is still a matter of dispute among historians. One view holds that each koinon represented a single city, which was its administrative and political centre, and no other settlements larger than a village. Recent inscriptional finds, however, have shown that in certain assemblies some of what were initially believed to be villages were in fact small cities comprising a small urban core surrounded by a cluster of rural hamlets. The politeia of the Lycaeoi cited in inscriptions, for example, which grew up around Agios Achilleios on the smaller of the Prespe Lakes, was centred on Lyce, which in more recently discovered inscriptions is described as a city (polis). The koinon of the Orestai (roughly corresponding to the present-day prefecture of Kastoria) thus included the cities of Argos Orestikon, administrative and political centre of the Koinon, and Celetrum (present-day Kastoria), plus the politeiai of the Lycaeoi, the Oblostaeoi and the Battynaeoi, and possibly other politeiai and villages as well (for the position of these entities, see below). The other assemblies in Upper Macedonia (those of the Eordaeoi, the Elimiotai, the Lyncsteis and the Derriopes) must have been organised in a similar way (the sources do not permit a clear picture of the organisation of Pelagonia).
From the point of view of institutions, these local koina had a boule (council) and a primary assembly (ecclesia tou demou), and they elected archons where necessary (to provide oil for festivals, for example, the koinon of Lyncestis elected a gymnasiarch, a magistrate in charge of athletics for the whole tribe). The collective civic organs also elected ambassadors to represent them and their affairs before the provincial governor. This is clear from inscriptions such as the famous one from the Battynaeoi, expressing the displeasure of the inhabitants of the town and all the Orestai with a group of powerful people who are described as ‘provincials’ (επαρχιακοί) and who had misappropriated communal public land. Finally, much of the work of the Koinon was concerned with the cult of the Emperor 19.

Despite the progressive urbanisation that took place during the imperial age, the predominant form of organisation in Upper Macedonia remained, for historical, geographical and economic reasons, the village. The increase in the number of villages, particularly towards the end of the republican age, was at least in part attributable to the population decline consequent upon the aftermath of destruction that followed the Roman civil wars.

Extant inscriptions preserve the names of some Upper Macedonian villages through the presence of people from those places in other regions. Examples include the names of Kolobaissa in Pelagonia, Bistyrros in Elimae, Krannea in Eordaia. In some, rarer, instances, the name of the village is coupled with the phrase ‘koinon of the such-and-such’ (e.g. koinon of the Neapolitans): in this form of designation villagers are identified by the name of their village plus that of the local koinon to which the village belongs. Thus, for example, an act of manumission from Leucopetra (district of Beroea) describes the manumittor as a Bistyrrian inhabiting Elimae (‘Βιστύριως κατοικών εν Ελιμαία’). This type of designation, stating the koinon to which the village belongs, is understandable where it is necessary to specify as precisely as possible the geographical origin of the individual (e.g. in legal documents, such as an act of manumission); but its significance goes far beyond that, to the point where it raises the problem of the possible administrative dependence of the villages upon their koina. This is a question that, for lack of information, cannot be answered, especially since the history of the villages of this region is different in each instance (there might, for example, be villages that came from cities that were directly subject to the koinon and others that belonged to cities and formed with them the type of politeia within the koinon mentioned above) 20.

Very little is known about the organisation of the villages in Upper Macedonia. An inscription from neighbouring Lychnidos mentions the office of komarches, or village headman, the highest local official judging by what we know from other Greek regions. The inhabitants of the villages could decide upon minor matters of everyday life, chiefly the awarding of honours, through assemblies that must had to be called by the headman. One interesting case is that of the village of Alcomenai (of the koinon of the Derriopes), which is mentioned in an inscription as having four tribes. The most probable explanation is that this represents the institutional survival of a once flourishing city (described by Strabo), which had dwindled into a mere village without ever recovering.

A central role in the life of certain villages at least seems to have been played by a temple or sanctuary, the divinity worshipped there being the patron and protector of the village. The temple often filled the role of the village archive, and in this sense the priest must have had clerical duties. Each village had its own sovereign territory, which was demarcated in relation to that of contiguous political entities (villages or cities). Extant inscriptions from the age of Trajan and Hadrian attest to the settlement, by the Roman authorities, of boundary disputes between neighbouring communities, as in the case of the villages of Geneatae and Deb[jaei in Pelagonia 21.
3.4. The administration of the Roman colonies

The Roman colonies in Macedonia, like the other Roman colonies of the Empire, were governed, on the model of Rome, through an assembly of the people (populus, plebs), a local council (ordo decurionum, decuriones) and magistrates (magistrati). The first step was their initial organisation by a “founder”, who bore the title legatus coloniae deductorum or simply deductor coloniae (we know the names of two deductores: Q. Paccius Rufus, founder of Philippi and Q. Hortensius, founder of Cassandria or of Dion). He was the one who appointed, on the basis of wealth and rank, the archons and the members of the council. Thus, for example, he selected the two chief magistrates of the colony (duoviri iure dicundo) from among the colonists who had served as chilarchs or centurions, and the other officers and councillors from among those who had held public office (the decuriones in many Roman colonies during the Empire had to have a fortune of 100,000 sesterces). The citizens of the colony received allotments of public land, depending on their office and political position: for example, a councillor might receive up to 100 jugera (1 jugerum = 25 hectares).

The most important civic organ of the colony, the body that essentially governed it, was the curia / boule, or council, which corresponded to the Roman senate. It was an aristocratic body, with a maximum of one hundred members who were elected for life, and renewed from among those who had completed the cursus honorum, the entire sequence of public offices (this rule was abandoned after the 2nd century AD). New members were elected either by the assembly or by the curia / boule upon the recommendation of two magistrates elected for a five-year term, the duoviri quinquenales, the equivalent of the censors in Rome.

In the colonial hierarchy, the most important office was that of chief magistrate (duovir). This was an office equivalent to that of consul in Rome, and its responsibilities were judicial. The lowest office, the bottom rung of the political ladder, was that of ae-dilis: there were two of these, and they had a wide range of responsibilities, including: a) public order and policing duties in relation to the market, and more specifically assuring the regularity of the grain supply, as well as maintaining the roads and public buildings; b) financial duties, in relation to the tenants of public lands or the assignment of compulsory public services; and c) ceremonial duties, in relation to the celebration of the games. The remaining political office was that of quaestor, the city treasurer. In addition to these there were also a number of minor civil offices, such as those of eirenarch, or police magistrate, and priestly offices, particularly those associated with the cult of the emperor. The senior magistrates had a large staffs of clerical and other assistants.

The right to vote and to be elected to these bodies and offices was enjoyed by those colonists (coloni) or inhabitants of the colony who had been given grants of land when it was founded (these allotments came either from confiscated lands or from appropriation of sections of the ager publicus, or public land). Colonists had full political rights, which they could hand down to their descendants. The citizens of the colonies, with the exception of those of Pella, had the same fiscal status as the inhabitants of Italy (jus Italicum), and were thus exempt from the tributum capitis and the tributum soli, probably because many of them had been landowners in Italy before coming to Macedonia.

The population of the colonies also included the non-Romans who were settled there before their foundation (paroikoi / incolae), that is, foreigners and, primarily, the original Greek and, in the case of Philippi, Thracian inhabitants of the place, who, although entitled to own land, had no political rights and thus lived as “strangers in their own country”. These inhabitants paid taxes to the colony both for privately owned land
and for the public land (subcessiva concessa) they leased from it. Within the territory of the colonies there were also villages (vici), inhabited for the most by local populations (at Philippi a large number of these were of Thracian origin, but in some cases the village populations were mixed, in the sense that they also included colonists with full political rights). The inhabitants of the villages (vicani) retained a degree of administrative autonomy: they took their own decisions on matters of local concern, they had their own property and they enjoyed civic rights; but they were dependent on the colony, in the sense that on the legal and political level they were inferior to the colonists. In some instances the colonies could have small dependent communities outside their territorium, in the form of a civitas adtributa. These tributary communities, although enjoying local autonomy, were required to pay a collective tax to the colony upon which they were dependent, as was probably the case with Neapolis and Tripolis in relation to Philippi.

Very little information has come down to us regarding the relations between the colonists and the local inhabitants. Although there were ways in which the more dynamic elements of the local population could rise socially and become integrated into the colonial elite through acquisition of the rights of Roman citizenship, the colonial aristocracy remained rather conservative towards the prospect of the incorporation into their ranks of prosperous locals. This situation changed after AD 212, when Caracalla’s edict granting Roman citizenship to all free citizens of the Empire made citizens of virtually all the inhabitants of the colony.

3.5. The koinon of the Macedonians

Alongside their local government authorities, the Macedonians of the imperial age also had a collective institution, the Koinon of the Macedonians.

After a brief hiatus immediately following the Roman Conquest, the institution of provincial assemblies, that is, the federated states that had secured the protection of their member cities against the designs of the great kingdoms of the Hellenistic period, now resumed their operation, but with a new content. The provincial assemblies were now federal organs whose members expressed themselves as a single body on, principally, the religious and social level, that is, through games and festivals, and less on the political level, where they served primarily as channels of communication between their aristocracies and the regional Roman administration. These basic features were preserved in the imperial age with one main difference: the focus of their religious and social life was now the cult of the Roman emperors and the festivals that accompanied it.

Our knowledge of the history of the Macedonian assembly is, unfortunately, riddled with gaps. While we know that Macedonia had had a form of federal organisation since the reign of Antigonus III Doson, after the Roman conquest there is no evidence of a Macedonian assembly before the reign of Claudius, while some historians date it no earlier than the reign of Augustus. If for historical reasons a revival of the Hellenistic assembly after 148 BC appears unlikely, nonetheless the division into four cantons (which was, with some modifications, based on the administrative divisions of the monarchical period) was retained in the new koinon of the imperial age. This koinon continued to exist until AD 424, as we know from a rescript (written answer to a legal inquiry or petition) of the Emperor Theodosius II, which is preserved in the Theodosian Code; but it is obvious that after the adoption of Christianity it must have shed its religious character and developed into a civil administrative body, like the provincial assemblies of the post-Diocletian era.
Given its title, the Koinon of the Macedonians, and the absence of representatives or officers from the Illyrian part of the province, it is more probable that the koinon embraced only the cities and regions of Macedonia proper, with the exception of the Roman colonies. The seat of the assembly, where the representatives of the Macedonian cities and the officers of the koinon met, was Beroea. Here every October games were held in honour of the Roman Emperor; these included both Greek games (sacred and universal), with a programme of contests in athletics and music, as well as gladiatorial combats and venationes (staged hunts with wild animals). The focus of these events was the province-wide cult of the Emperor. This was also the reason why the city had been granted the exclusive right for all of Macedonia to build a temple to serve the imperial cult (and was thus granted the title of neokoros, or ‘custodian’) and to be called a metropolis, a privilege accompanied by both prestige and material benefits that fed an unending rivalry with the other major city in the province, Thessaloniki.

As was the case with almost all the provincial assemblies of the imperial period, the principal duties of the koinon of the Macedonians were concerned with the cult of the Emperor. This is evident, among other things, from the titles of archiereus and agonothetes of the Assembly of the Macedonians borne by its president (in the late 2nd and the 3rd century AD the title of Macedoniarch was adopted, perhaps by analogy with the corresponding titles borne by the officials of other provincial assemblies, such as Asiarch, Bithyniarch, Thracarch, etc.). Although the koinon had no political organisation it was not detached from the affairs of the province. Inscriptions in honour of Roman and Macedonian officials suggest that if nothing else it played a part in the province’s fiscal affairs: it is not unlikely that it helped the provincial administration fix the level of taxation and was responsible for seeing that the receipts were paid promptly into the Roman treasury. Otherwise, apart from the minting of coins and the sending of diplomatic (and other) deputations to the emperors and proconsuls, its authority does not appear to have extended into other administrative areas.

The information we have about its organisation is sporadic and very limited. We do not know, for example, how many members it had, or how they were elected. The representatives elected to the assembly did not live permanently in the city where it met, but gathered there each time it was convened, probably on the occasion of the festivals or some other public business. Extant inscriptions confirm that the assembly voted honours for benefactors of the province, magistrates of the koinon and the member cities and representatives of the provincial administration, and allowed a monument to be erected in the meeting-place of the assembly or in the recipient’s birthplace.

Through the assembly the koinon elected its magistrates. These included, in addition to the chief priest (archiereus), who usually also served as agonothetes, the hierophant. Like the members of the assembly, they were elected for one year, the only exception being the ad hoc office of gymnasiarch, who in any case was elected by Beroea. The need for distinction increasingly demanded by the members of the local aristocracies led in certain exceptional instances to the presidency of the assembly being a position held for life (διά βίου). The exercise of this office, as is clear from certain invitations to games in the 3rd century, entailed vast expenditures, among other things for the organisation of gladiatorial combats and venationes, which only the very wealthiest Macedonians could afford. This is confirmed by prosopographic studies, which show that those who served on the assembly, not only as president but also as delegate, were consistently the most prominent Macedonians of their day, and always Roman citizens. In reality, the Koinon was the institutional framework within which the Macedonian aristocrats could act on a supra-local level and thus aspire to make a name for themselves as a first step to acquiring equestrian or senatorial rank for themselves and their
children: in other words, it was a sort of springboard for social advancement within the society of the Roman Empire.  

4. Economic and social developments

4.1. Economic developments in the republican period

The impact on the lives of Macedonia’s cities of the barbarian raids and, even more so, the Roman civil wars, is recorded, first and foremost, in its archaeological ruins. Although the picture we have is incomplete, excavations have shown that in certain regions urban life contracted substantially, while some cities disappeared entirely. In Eordaea, for example, the ancient city near Petra was laid waste; in Bottiaea, the ancient Macedonian capital of Pella was impoverished and reduced; Philippi shrank to a mere village.

This urban diminishment is also attested in literary sources, one characteristic example occurring in the Geography of Strabo (late 1st BC / early 1st c. AD) who, in speaking of the region of Upper Macedonia, observes (7, 327) that, while during the age of the Macedonian kingdom it was a place with cities, urban life had by then wasted away to the point where the principal type of settlement was the village. Dion Chrysostom (33, 27), rhetorician and philosopher from the Bithynian city of Prusa (late 1st / early 2nd c. AD), wrote of Pella that “no one passing by Pella today would see any trace of it, save only for the many broken shards marking its place”. If observations of this type – particularly in the case of Dion – contain a degree of exaggeration, due largely to the latent comparison with the glorious past, still, the picture of economic decline, at least in the later republican years, can scarcely be challenged.

The periodic economic difficulties that faced the cities of Macedonia, in some cases even the most important of them, are also revealed by decrees honouring eminent citizens, such as that voted in honour of the Beroean chief priest of the city’s divine patrons, Harpalus (late 2nd / early 1st c. BC), which speaks of the city’s “diminished fortunes” (ἡ καθαρὰ τύχη) in comparison with the past, or that honouring the gymnasiarch of Amphipolis who in 105-104 BC, that is, one or two years after the operations conducted by Minucius Rufus against the Skordisci, himself supplied the necessary funds for the athletic training of the young men of Amphipolis because the city was unable to furnish, as was its duty, the sum required.

4.2. Economic developments in the imperial period

No more than a quick glance at the archaeological finds and the inscriptions from the early imperial period (particularly from the reign of Trajan onwards) is needed to see that the general economic conditions prevailing in Macedonia at that time had improved immensely. For evidence of this turn of affairs we need look no further than the ambitious building programmes carried out in important cities like Philippi, Beroea and Thessaloniki right through the early decades of the 3rd century. These programmes included the construction, repair and/or expansion of large public buildings in their agora or other public places, financed from the public treasury and/or by prominent citizens. The general trend is also indicated by the important increase in the number of donations and bequests from wealthy citizens to their birthplaces on several occasions. These favourable economic conditions are further reflected in the large number of costly festivals that continued to be organised, or were organised for the first time, by cities of all sizes in celebration of a variety of events.
Despite the improvement in the general economic conditions and the increasing urbanisation that took place during the imperial age, the economy of Macedonia remained essentially agrarian. The crucial question of the relationship between large and small landholdings, whether in other words the latter were gradually swallowed up by the former, is for lack of data a difficult one to answer. Recent finds reinforce the image of a period in which wealthy citizens owned vast landed estates (see following section), but we know nothing about their organisation or even what types of properties these were, whether, that is, they were large agricultural estates (latifundia) like those we know of, under a variety of names (tractus, saltus, etc.), from other regions of the Empire. Also unclear is the office of “χωρικός από χωριαρχών”, a title borne by a prominent citizen of Thessaloniki in 240 AD and which, according to some historians, could be an indication of the existence of this type of large landholding. The pre-eminently agricultural character of the economy of Macedonia is also evident from the fact that, as we learn from an inscription from Gazoros, in the years of the Antonines the government pressed for an intensification of agricultural production via the distribution – on favourable terms – of fallow public lands to the citizens, regardless of their social position. Also unknown is the extent of the imperial estates, which were managed by imperial freedmen or slaves for the Emperor and were subject to the imperial procurator. These estates were lands given by or confiscated from Roman citizens or remnants of the ager publicus after the foundation of the colonies.

In the mountainous regions of Upper Macedonia forestry represented a major source of wealth, as is clear from the famous petition of the Battynaeoi, where the inhabitants of the region (koinon of the Orestae) asked the provincial governor to protect them from powerful foreign provincials (επαρχικοί) who were encroaching upon their forests and meadows. The sources have nothing to say about livestock-raising or about the probable development of a woollen industry, while Strabo tells us only that fishing was well-developed in the Prespes district.

With regard to mineral wealth, one of the most important sources of revenue for the Macedonian kings, archaeologists have shown that mines were operating in various regions, including Chalcidice, Pangaion, Philippi, Odomantice, Dysoron (Crestonia district) and the region of Stobi. These belonged to the Emperor, as one might reasonably infer from what happened elsewhere, and from a reference in the Theodosian Code (386 AD) to procurators of the mines (procuratores metallorum intra Macedoniam). An inscription found near the western boundary of Philippi suggests, however, that they were exploited at least in part by contractors (conductores) representing the interests of wealthy local families.

For other sectors of the economy, such as trade, we have written information to supplement the archaeological finds. Graves and destruction strata in the cities yield imported luxury products such as pottery and glass vessels, which were intended for a prosperous public and came from the workshops of Italy and Asia Minor. To these may be added such sumptuous grave monuments as the Attic sarcophagi. The written sources also confirm the existence of mercantile occupations, such as vendors of drugs and perfumes and slave-traders. As for the artisanal trades, these do not seem to have gone beyond the satisfaction of local demand. We do, however, know that the manufacturers of purple garments employed skilled workers from Asia Minor, and specifically from the region of Thyatira, which had a long tradition in this trade.

While we do not have the quantitative and numerical data that would allow us to assess these economic conditions comparatively, nonetheless, indicative comparisons of expenditures incurred by prominent Macedonian citizens with the corresponding sums laid out by, for example, wealthy Asians on the organisation of similar festivals leave the impression that the wealthy Macedonians were far less so than their counterparts in
large and more modest cities in the province of Asia. This finding presumably applies to the level of development of the country’s economy as well.

4.3. The new aristocracy and euergetism

Throughout the period 167-31 BC the cities of Macedonia were faced with both demographic and social upheavals, the result of general instability and often adverse economic developments, as well as of the great losses of manpower ensuing successively from the wars of Perseus and Andricus, the displacement of the monarchist aristocracy ordered by Rome in 167 BC (Text 2), the elimination of opponents first by Andricus and later by Mithradates, not to mention the barbarian raids and the Roman civil wars. It is, however, very difficult to estimate the extent of these upheavals and their impact on the social fabric of the cities, since the contemporary sources are exceptionally sparing of detail. The picture of the social changes in the period following the middle of the 1st century BC is somewhat clearer. By this time as many of the old bourgeois families of the ancien regime as had survived the turmoil began gradually to constitute, together with the more powerful of the families of incomers (chiefly but not exclusively with the Italians), the new urban aristocracy that would monopolise political and social power in the cities. As we move towards the end of antiquity the relations between these two elements become wholly indissoluble as the incomers became incorporated into the life of the cities, primarily through intermarriage. The activities, the economic profile and the ideology of the new elite will be discussed below. At this point, however, a word is necessary about a theory that has recently been formulated with regard to social developments in certain regions of Macedonia, and specifically in the cities of Beroea and the Mygdonian city of Kalindoia.

This view holds that a comparative study of the names that occur in these cities between the republican and the imperial periods reveals a statistically significant increase in the number of pro-Hellenic names and a corresponding fall in the number of Macedonian, a development that would have to be explained as a sign of the social ascension of those segments of the population of Macedonia that before the Roman conquest had been absent from our sources as constituting a lower social stratum. To the degree that the names it studies are those of young men (epheboi), this attractive theory does certainly contribute to signalling parallel social developments with regard to the constitution of the elite in the cities under review (their appearance should be attributed to intermarriages between members of the local societies with different social origins). It should not, however, lead to an overestimation of the phenomenon, since in most instances the social position of the bearers of these names is not remarkable (the inscriptions cited are generally on simple grave markers or votive offerings). On the other hand, the presence of such names shows that in the imperial age even the lower social strata were well enough off to afford decent funerary monuments and to make votive offerings.

The first feature of the new Macedonian urban aristocracy concerns their economic profile. Although the integration into their ranks of the Italian immigrants, who tended to devote themselves to commerce, is in itself enough to show that the sources of wealth of this new aristocracy must have been multiple and varied, nonetheless the land and its exploitation continued to be the solid foundation of their economic power. They were, in other words, landowners, whose estates in many cases must have been extensive. This conclusion is validated by, for example, the appearance of a fair number of managers (stewards or agents) in inscriptions from regions like Philippi, Thessaloniki, Mygdonia, Beroea, Pella and Heraclea Lyncestis, or the ease with which prominent citizens supplied their cities with grain at below market price. In any case, there were also
supplementary sources of wealth, such as livestock-raising in Upper Macedonia, fishing on the Prespes region and shipping investments in, primarily, the great port of Thessaloniki. These wealthy Macedonians may also have amassed fortunes from the lease of the state mines and forests, as we have already seen.

Just how wealthy the members of the Macedonian aristocracy could become is indicated by certain characteristic inscriptions. Thus, in the year AD 1, thirty years after the end of the civil wars, the inhabitants of the Mygdonian city of Kalindoia honoured a young fellow-citizen as a multiple benefactor of the city during his term of office as the priest of the local imperial cult. His name was Apollonios, son of Apollonios and Stratto and grandson of Kertimas. These names (Greek and Macedonian) in themselves show that Apollonios belonged to an old Macedonian family that had survived the upheavals of the republican era. The honorary decree tells us that during his term of office, which lasted for one year, Apollonios had every month offered a sacrifice to Zeus and to the divine protector Augustus, followed by a public banquet for all the citizens of Kalindoia. In the official celebration offered by the city in honour of these two gods he had himself ornamented the procession with all manner of spectacles, had organised lavish games, had assumed the cost of the sacrifices offered by the city, sacrificing oxen, had repeatedly entertained the entire citizen body at banquets, and had erected a statue of Augustus, actions for which his fellow-citizens honoured him and his parents with the exceptional right to statues erected in the most important part of the agora, the cost of which was in the end borne by Apollonios himself (Text 7).

Even more impressive is the image of wealth that emerges, a century later (circa 98), from another inscription, recording the honours paid by a tribe from Beroea to one of its citizens. The citizen in question was the chief priest for life (archiereus dia biou) of the Koinon of the Macedonians Quintus Popilius Pytho, an important figure with a prestige that went beyond the boundaries of the city, if we judge from the fact that he successfully conducted a diplomatic mission to the Emperor asking that Beroea be allowed to retain the exclusive privilege of custodianship (neokoria) of the imperial cult (see the chapter on administration, Koinon of the Macedonians). This inscription enumerates divers benefactions similar to those performed by Apollonios, but for the far more numerous spectators of the games and festivals of the koinon, and including banquets, distributions of money and food, organisation of athletic games and even gladiatorial combats and venationes, for which he imported exotic animals. He also, apparently, and this is what is truly astonishing, performed public services that must have entailed the outlay of huge sums of money, including repairing roads, supplying grain at below the market price, and paying the poll tax due to the Roman treasury on behalf of the cities in the Koinon (it is possible, for the brevity of the inscription makes it impossible to determine, that Popilius, as the official responsible to the Roman authorities, paid out of his own purse the part of the total tax that for whatever reason had not been collected and not the entire poll tax owed by the cities of the koinon for their thousands of inhabitants) (Text 8). Popilius Pytho was, we know, a member of an Italian family that had settled in Beroea a hundred years before.

The cases of Apollonios and Popilius Pytho were certainly not isolated instances. Hundreds of inscriptions from all the cities and many of the villages of Macedonia show that their life in all its manifestations was bound up with the wealth of the members of their upper classes. Wealthy citizens supplied the market with grain in years when the harvests were poor, provided basic foodstuffs at low prices, contributed to the cost of building or repairing fountains and even aqueducts to assure their city’s water supply, organised free distributions of meat and other foodstuffs on various occasions, particularly during festivals. They also had a care for the quality of life in their communities, making repeated donations to ensure or improve the operation of the gymnasia and the
baths (public exercise, health and leisure facilities), enriched the public libraries and enlivened daily routine with athletic, drama and music competitions as well as the gladiatorial contests and *venationes* that represented the new aesthetic of the spectacle that had been introduced by the Italian immigrants. In a fair number of cases, including the games organised by the *Koinon* at Beroea or the pan-provincial games held at Thessaloniki, these games contributed as much to the local economy as to the entertainment of the people, since they were essentially festivals that attracted thousands of people from other cities in Macedonia and neighbouring regions.

Part of the expenditures incumbent upon the members of the upper classes had to do with relations between the cities and the Roman authorities. The local communities, and therefore chiefly their wealthier members, were responsible for maintaining the *cursus publicus* (ensuring food, shelter and transport for groups or individuals who were entitled to make use of this imperial postal service) and for travel expenses of delegations to the provincial governor and the Emperor in Rome. However, the area in which these prominent citizens spent most lavishly was the construction and maintenance of public buildings of every sort – fountains, aqueducts, odeums, theatres, basilicas, baths, gymnasia, etc. Through these works, some of which took years to complete, they provided necessary public facilities and amenities as well as embellishing their cities, particularly when it came to ambitious or extensive complexes. In the case of the rival cities of Beroea and Thessaloniki, such benefactions were inspired by the desire to secure the precedence of position among the cities of province, with all the economic benefits that accrued to their inhabitants from such a distinction.

This type of behaviour on the part of members of the upper classes was, of course, not unique to Macedonia: in reality it was an expression of the institution of *euergetism*, the system of moral duties and legal obligations that emerged in the Greek city-states early in the Hellenistic period and required the local aristocracies to assume, at their own expense, most of the financial burden of running them. The obvious counter-consideration was the political supremacy of these aristocracies, as we have already seen. The image of the public benefactor that emerges from the inscriptions is, of course, an idealised one, due to the laudatory nature of these texts, since not infrequently political and social power was used – and sometimes abused – for personal profit. These sources are also misleading in another way, and that is with regard to the extent to which the cities themselves contributed to their own running costs: this is downplayed or ignored in honorific inscriptions precisely because of their laudatory nature. In any event, *euergetism* must be considered the preponderant reality of the social and political life of the cities of Macedonia (including the colonies), as it was throughout the Empire.

The ambitions of these urban upper classes were not always confined to the narrow boundaries of their own city. The most prominent of them aspired to a place in the imperial aristocracy through the mechanisms available to them for climbing the social ladder. The basic precondition for achieving this ambition was to secure the rights of Roman citizenship, which entailed a set of legal obligations and privileges. By the time the Emperor Caracalla issued his edict granting Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire (*Constitutio Antoniniana*, AD 212), the members of the upper social classes in Macedonia’s cities appear to have virtually universally acquired Roman civic rights. This explains the fact that more Roman citizens (60% of the total of known cases from the province, excepting the colonies) came from the familiar cities of Lower Macedonia, especially Thessaloniki and Beroea, while in Upper Macedonia with its limited urbanisation the proportion was just 27%. The large number of Roman citizens from Thessaloniki and Beroea specifically is not surprising, given the procedure for acquiring Roman citizenship: this involved submitting an application, complete with all the pre-
scribed supporting documents, to the appropriate imperial office, together with a letter of recommendation from the provincial governor. Logically, distinguished citizens of Thessaloniki and Beroea were better placed to set the mechanism in motion, their cities being respectively the seats of the provincial government and the Assembly of the Macedonians.

Backed by their Roman citizenship and their great wealth, a fair number of Macedonians succeeded in gaining admission to the Roman equestrian class, and took up administrative positions in various parts of the Empire. A much smaller number (both absolutely and in comparison with other larger and economically more developed provinces, such as Asia and Achaea) succeeded in achieving Roman senatorial rank. With regard to the Macedonian senators, we know that initially they came from the colonies and specifically from Philippi and the municipium of Stobi, while it was not until the 3rd century that descendants of some of the most prominent families in Thessaloniki managed to scale the ranks of the Empire’s highest social order.

4.4. The other social orders

In contrast to the dominant urban social order, members of the other classes in the cities appear only incidentally in the written sources. Thus, for example, although slaves constituted the bulk of the population of Macedonia, since farming and stock-raising relied on a slave-owning system of production, they are very rarely mentioned. Characteristically, however, some slaves, profiting from the improvement in living standards and the prosperity enjoyed by the province in the imperial age, succeeded, thanks to the important positions entrusted to them by their masters, in amassing enough money to make votive offerings in the temples and to acquire their freedom. From a number of acts of manumission that have been found in various rural sanctuaries in central and western Macedonia, and chiefly in Leucopetra (near Beroea), we know that slavery continued to exist in Macedonia until the beginning of the 4th century AD. Most of the freedmen we know about, however, were former slaves of Roman citizens. With their freedom they acquired political rights and entered the middle class, chiefly in the cities (plebs urbana).

The composition of the middle class was extremely varied. The funerary inscriptions, it is true, rarely commemorate labourers, artisans, small traders or actors – more often veterans of the Roman army. Relatively few Macedonians served in the Roman army, and they appear on the rolls primarily in the period of the civil wars and the first decades of the empire. Most of these soldiers came from the colonies and the poor regions of Upper Macedonia, and they served in legions and, chiefly, in the cohorts of the Praetorian Guard. This army service gave the inhabitants of Macedonia Roman political rights.

A closer look at some aspects of the social life of the middle and lower classes in some regions at least is offered by the associations. We know of around eighty of these in Macedonia, the overwhelming majority of which date from the imperial age, and particularly the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The activity of most of these (more than 80%) was centred in cities like Thessaloniki, Philippi and Beroea. Some of these societies were professional associations, such as those of the purple-dyers of Thessaloniki and the money-changers of Philippi, but their number was limited. Most of the Macedonian societies represented themselves as cult associations, in the sense that they were organised around the cult of their patron divinity (chiefly Dionysus, Heracles, Silvanus and some few others), even when their membership included practitioners of similar or different trades. In major urban centres, such as for example Thessaloniki, the growth of this
phenomenon was fuelled by massive immigration, with the result that at least some of these societies were founded by foreigners.

The activities of these associations, whose membership generally numbered a few dozen only, were multiple: they satisfied their members’ needs in respect of social life, with dinners and festive events associated with the cult of their patron god; metaphysical anxieties, based on a collective perception of the existence of an afterlife, especially in some of the Dionysian bands; and practical problems, providing mutual assistance through the solidarity that developed among the members and addressing specific problems such as defraying the cost of a decent funeral and burial (the phenomenon intensified during the economically difficult years of the 2nd half of the 3rd century). These associations, despite their egalitarian organisation, had a hierarchy of offices similar to that of the cities.

The popularity of these new alternative forms of collective organisation should be attributed first of all to the gradual loss of role and importance of the city’s institutions as a result of the progressive depoliticisation of the city-state, particularly through the system of euergetism. The societies offered their members the possibility of self-determination through these more familiar and more cohesive collectivities, a sense of superiority in relation to the indeterminate social whole, and an opportunity for social display and advancement through the assumption of official duties, insofar as they had the means to do so. Those who used the societies as a channel for social advancement were very often people of humble origins who had succeeded in substantially improving their economic position (cf. the large number of freedmen in the society of followers of Silvanus at Philippi). The fact that in Macedonia the common bond in the formation of these associations was in the main a cult and not, for example, a trade, even in purely urban areas, should be seen as an indication of the significance of religion for the common man of the ancient world as a basic element of his identity, and also of the pre-eminently agrarian character of that province’s economy.
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**Texts**

**Text 1: The arrangements of Aemilius Paullus and the Senate for Macedonia after the Battle of Pydna. The Congress of Amphipolis (Livy, Ab urbe condita, XLV).**

First of all it was resolved that the Macedonians and Illyrians should be free peoples, so that it might be clear to all the world that the arms of Rome did not carry slavery to the free, but on the contrary freedom to the enslaved; and also that amongst those nations which enjoyed liberty, the security and permanence of their liberty rested under the protection of Rome, whilst on the other hand those who lived under the rule of kings might be led to believe that their kings were all the more just and merciful through the respect they felt for Rome, and if ever their sovereigns began war, the issue of the war would bring victory to Rome and liberty to the people. It was also resolved to abolish all contracts for working the mines of Macedonia, which afforded a considerable revenue, and also all leases of the royal domains; these could not be carried on without the tax-farmer, and wherever the tax-farmer flourished either the law lost its authority or the subjects their liberty. Nor were the Macedonians able to work them themselves, for where those in charge found plunder ready to their hand there were never lacking causes for quarrels and riots. The national council was suppressed, lest some unprincipled flatterer of the mob should turn the safe and reasonable liberty which had been granted into a dangerous and fatal licence. Macedonia was to be divided into four cantons, each to have its own council, and the tribute to Rome was to be half what they had been accustomed to pay to the king. The same regulations were made in the case of Illyria. The other measures were left to the generals and commissioners, as they would be dealing with matters on the spot and would be able to make more definite arrangements (18).
Aemilius gave notice for the councils of ten from all the cities to assemble at Amphipolis and to bring with them all archives and documents wherever they were deposited, and all the money due to the royal treasury. When the day arrived he advanced to the tribunal, where he took his seat with the ten commissioners, surrounded by a vast concourse of Macedonians. Though they were accustomed to the display of royal power, this novel assertion of authority filled them with fear; the tribunal, the clearing of the approach to it through the mass of people, the herald, the apparitor, all these were strange to their eyes and ears and might even have appalled allies of Rome, to say nothing of a vanquished enemy. After the herald had called for silence Paullus, speaking in Latin, explained the arrangements decided upon by the senate and by himself in concert with the ten commissioners; Cnaeus Octavius, who was also present, translated the address into Greek. First of all it was laid down that the Macedonians were to be a free people, possessing their cities and fields as before, enjoying their own laws and customs and electing their annual magistrates. They were to pay to Rome half the tribute which they had been paying to the king. Secondly, Macedonia was to be broken up into four separate cantons. The first would embrace the district between the Strymon and the Nessus, and in addition, beyond the Nessus to the east, the forts, towns and villages which Perseus had held, with the exception of Aenus, Maronea and Abdera, and beyond the Strymon to the west the whole of Bisaltia together with Heraclea, which district the natives call Sintice. The second canton would be bounded on the east by the Strymon, exclusive of Sintice, Heraclea and Bisaltia; and on the west by the Axius, including the Paeonians, who dwelt to the east of the Axius. The third division would be the district enclosed between the Axius on the east and the Peneus on the west; the Bora range shuts it in on the north. This canton was increased by the addition of the part of Paeonia which extends westwards beyond the Axius; Edessa and Beroea were assigned to this division. The fourth canton lay on the other side of the Bora range, bordering Illyria on the one side and Epirus on the other.

Aemilius then designated the capital cities where the councils were to be held in the different cantons; Amphipolis was fixed for the first, Thessaloniki for the second, Pella for the third, and Pelagonia for the fourth. There the councils for each canton were to be summoned, the tribute deposited, and the annual magistrates elected. His next announcement was that all intermarriage between the inhabitants of the different cantons was forbidden, as also the possession of land or houses in more than one canton. The gold and silver mines were not allowed to be worked, but permission was given in the case of the iron and copper mines. Those working the mines would have to pay one half of the royalty which they had paid to the king. The use of imported salt was also forbidden. The Dardanians were laying claim to Paeonia on the ground that it once belonged to them, and they had a common frontier; the consul told them in reply that he was granting political liberty to all who had been under the rule of Perseus. As he had refused them Paeonia he granted them the right to purchase salt and ordered the third canton to carry its salt to Stobi, fixing, at the same time, the price at which it was to be sold. He forbade the Macedonians either to cut timber for ship-building themselves or to allow others to do so. He gave permission to those cantons whose frontiers were contiguous to those of the barbarians to maintain armed forces on their borders (29). The congress of the Macedonians which had been interrupted by these proceedings was again convened. First of all the status of Macedonia was defined. Senators, who were known as "synedri," were to be elected to form a council for the administration of government.... The laws which Aemilius gave to the Macedonians had been so carefully and considerately drawn up that he might be thought to be giving them not to vanquished enemies but to allies who had rendered good service, and not even after a long practical experience - the only safe guide in legislative reform - have they been found to need amendment. (32).
**Text 2. The deportation of the royal aristocracy (Livy, Ab urbe condita, XLV)**

...Then a list was read out of the names of those Macedonian leaders who it was decided were to go in advance to Italy with all their children over fifteen years of age. At first glance this seemed a cruel measure, but it soon became apparent to the Macedonians that it was done to protect their liberties. The names on the list were those of the friends and court nobles of the king, the generals of his armies, the commanders of his ships and garrisons accustomed to servile submission towards him and dictatorial insolence towards others. Some were exceedingly wealthy; others whose fortunes did not equal theirs lived quite as extravagantly; their table and dress were on a regal scale; they had no idea of citizenship, and were incapable of submission to law or to a liberty equal for all. Every one, therefore, who had been employed in the king's service, even those who had been sent as envoys, were ordered to leave Macedonia and proceed to Italy, and whoever refused obedience was threatened with death... (32).

**Text 3: The Rebellion of Andriscus (Diodorus, Polybius).**

Andriscus heard that Teres, the king of the Thracians, had married a daughter of the Macedonian king Philip V. This was enough to send him haring off to Thrace... and he reached Teres, who received him with honour and gave him one hundred soldiers and a diadem. Teres presented him to other (Thracian) rulers from whom he received another hundred soldiers. Then he went on to the king of the Thracians ..... whom he persuaded to take part in the expedition he was planning and to place him on the throne of Macedonia, arguing that the kingdom of the Macedonians belonged to him by right of inheritance. ... After being initially defeated by the Macedonians the false Philip fled into Thrace. In the end, however, he seized control of the cities of Macedonia. (Diodorus 32, 15, 5-7).

In the beginning people seemed to give little weight to the talk about the false Philip; what had happened was that there had appeared in Macedonia someone claiming to be Philip, indifferent to the opinions of the Macedonians and the Romans and with no reasonable basis for this action, since the real Philip was known to have died at the age of about eighteen two years before his father Perseus in the town of Alba, in Italy. After about three or four months, however, when Andriscus had made a name for himself, having defeated the Macedonians in battle beyond the river Strymon in Odomantice, some began to speak of him, but others were still dubious. Finally, not long afterwards, when the news arrived that he had defeated the Macedonians on this side of the Strymon and that he had become the master of Macedonia and the Thessalians began to send letters and ambassadors to the Achaean leaders begging them to come to their aid and saying that they were in great danger, then the matter appeared wonderful indeed and at the same time very curious. For there was no probability nor was it tenable that this should have an auspicious outcome. (Polybius 36, 10, 1-7).

**Text 4: Votive decree of Lete, 119 BC, honouring the quaestor of the province Marcus Annius (Syll. 3, 700).**

Decree of the 20th of the month of Panemos (= June) of the 29th year, proposed by the civic magistrates, on the basis of the draft edict approved by the council: Marcus Annius, son of Publius, a good and virtuous man, who was sent out by the Roman people as quaestor for the province of Macedonia, did incessantly throughout his term of office perform his duties to the benefit of all the Macedonians and did further did have a care to the particular interests of our city, displaying exceptional zeal and enthusiasm. Moreover in the recent crisis, when the nation of the Celts did assemble and take to the field with a great military force in the region of Argos and the soldiers lost courage, because it happened that the governor Sextus Pompeius was killed in the pitched battle he was fighting against them (the Celts), he did take the field against them with the forces he had under his command: he
routed the adversary, gathered up the bodies of the dead soldiers, killed many of the enemy, captured large numbers of horses and weapons, and, providing for the safety of the soldiers garrisoned in the region, took them into his own camp. A few days later, when even more Celtic horsemen had assembled and had been joined by Tipas, the leader of the Maedi, with another great force, Annius stood against the barbarian attack with only the soldiers he had in his camp, that is, without calling up reserves from the Macedonians, for he did not want to burden the cities with their pay and preferred to leave the people to their (agricultural) occupations. He, without avoiding any danger or hardship, drew up his soldiers in battle array, defeated the enemy in battle with the divine providence of the gods, killed many of them in hand-to-hand combat, took others prisoner and captured a large number of horses and weapons. Acting with such gallantry Annius brought matters under his control and in this way sought to hand over to his successors a Macedonia with its population intact and in a peaceful and prosperous condition, actions that were worthy of his homeland, his ancestors, his fame, his courage and of the responsibilities assigned to him. For these reasons the council and the people of Lete have resolved to commend Marcus Annius, son of Publius, quaestor of the Romans, and to crown him with a wreath of olive and to institute in his honour an equestrian contest in the month of Daisios (= May), when the games in honour of the other benefactors are held. They have also resolved to elect a deputation whose members shall go to him and, having greeted him on behalf of the city and offered our congratulations for that he and his men are in good health, shall hand him this decree and shall pray him to be pleased to accept the esteem of our people and always to do good to our city. (They did also resolve that) the decree and the (honorable) wreath should be carved on a stone column to be placed in the most formal position in the agora, and that the civic magistrates and the quaestor of the city should see to the erection of this column. This was ratified by vote taken on the 20th day of Panemos (= June) of the 29th year, and Aidaos son of Aidaos, Lyson son of Philota and Amyntas son of Dieos were elected to form the deputation.

Text 5. Pompey in Macedonia (Dio Cassius, Plutarch).

The next year the Romans had two sets of rulers..... Those in Thessaloniki (contrary to what occurred in Rome) did not hold elections, although there were assembled there, as some say, about two hundred senators and the consuls and they had instituted a district of Thessaloniki public Roman soil for the official rites, so that it would appear that everything had been done in due form and that thus both the people, through them, and Rome were there .... (Dio Cassius, 51, 43).

In the meanwhile Pompey had assembled a large military force .... His cavalry was mixed and in need of training; he worked them at Beroea, not taking his ease, but training with them as if he were in the flower of his youth. And those who saw him thus despite his fifty-eight years contending with the foot soldiers in full battle gear and then on horseback drawing his sword at full gallop without disturbing his steed and finally replacing it in its sheath without difficulty drew great courage from it .... He continued to receive visits from kings of nations and dynasts and sufficient distinguished Romans to furnish a complete senate (Plutarch, Pompey 64).

Text 6. The founding of the Roman colonies (Dio Cassius, Augustus).

He (Augustus) also obliged those living in Italy who had sided with Antony to leave the country, granting their cities and fields to his soldiers; as for the exiles, he allowed most of them to settle in Dyrrachium and Philippi, and promised the rest that he would compensate them for their land .... (Dio Cassius 51, 4, 67).


Decree of the year 148 (= AD 1): proposed by the politarchai to the people, following the preliminary decision by the council and the convention of the assembly of the people. Apollonios son of Apollonios and grandson of Kertimas was a good and virtuous man and worthy of every honour, for, having voluntarily assumed the office of priest of Jupiter and of Rome and of Caesar Augustus, the son of God, he displayed such great magnanimity and a generosity worthy of the virtue of his ancestors and his own, that he would allow no one to surpass him in expenditures concerning the gods and the fatherland. Specifically he offered from his own purse all year the monthly sacrifices performed in honour of Jupiter and Caesar Augustus, distributing costly honours to the gods and holding banquets and offering sumptuous feasts to the citizens at public dinners, corporately and (separately) in triclinia. He also during the (annual) festival made the procession varied and spectacular and organised lavish games in honour of Jupiter and Caesar Augustus, worthy of the gods and of Rome, providing not only for the needs of the banquet but also for the spectacles and the recreation and entertainment of the spirit, to the benefaction of the citizens. He also at his own request privately supplied the sacrifices to Jupiter and to Caesar Augustus and to the other benefactors of the city that are celebrated during the (annual) civic festival, at his own expense sacrificing oxen and throughout the duration of the festival receiving each and every citizen in his dining rooms and made splendid largesse to all the tribes, so that they could fare sumptuously, wherever they wished, by his grace. In brief, and disregarding all expense, he paid from his own purse for a statue of Caesar to be made and dedicated it as an eternal reminder of the benefits of the Augustus to mankind, thus offering an ornament to the fatherland and to the god due grace and honour. For the above reasons the council and the people have resolved to commend the splendour of his spirit and his benefactions to the fatherland and to crown him with a crown of leaves and to erect a stone statue of him and of his father Apollonios and of his mother Stretto, one for each. (It is further resolved) that these statues and the decree shall be set up in the most formal position in the agora that he shall prefer as agonothetes, so that the other citizens seeing them may desire the recognition of the city and make benefactions to the fatherland. With the approval of this resolution Apollonios accepted the honours and the recognition of the nation, but discharged the city of the burden of the expenditure. Voted on 14 Daisios (= May).

Text 8. The action of a chief priest of the imperial cult (EKM I, 117).

The Peukasteke honours the benefactor Quintus Popilius Pytho, chief priest for life of the imperial cult and agonothetes for the Koinon of the Macedonians, for that he succeeded in his embassy to the Emperor Nerva that (our city) Beroea should continue alone to enjoy the privilege of serving the cult of the Augusti and to bear the title of metropolis (of Macedonia); for that he also during his priesthood paid the poll tax due from the province and at his own cost repaired the roads; further, for that he proclaimed and organised games equivalent to the Actian Games for the prize of one talent, drama and music competitions and athletics, combats and venationes with animals of every kind, domestic and exotic, and also gladiatorial combats; for that in addition when times were difficult he sold grain cheaply or below the (market) price, and that throughout his priesthood he received the inhabitants of the province, at every assembly (of the Koinon) distributing food or money to all; (finally) for that during his service as gymnasiarch he always placed himself at the disposal of the whole community and was affable in private with his fellow-citizens. This monument was erected by Dioscurides son of Alexander

Text 9. Letter from Antoninus Pius to a city in Eastern Macedonia (IGBulg IV, 2263)

….. the foreigners …. for their land, when you the citizens pay so much for […] and the slaves and silver plate that are not intended for your use. If in respect of
this matter I should learn that something is being done that you should know about, I will inform you. I give my consent to your levying a tax of one denarius on each free inhabitant of your city (who is not a citizen, however) who is of an age to be subject to this tax, that it may serve as revenue for your needs. Let the number of your councillors be eighty and let each one give five hundred Attic drachmas, so that on the one hand the size of your council may increase the prestige of your city and on the other the monies thus paid may constitute additional revenues. The foreigners who have acquired property in your land shall be subject to the jurisdiction of your magistrates for cases up to two hundred and fifty denarii either as plaintiffs or as defendants. The envoys were Demas son of Paramonus and Crispus son of Toscus, whose travelling expenses will be paid, unless they promised to pay them themselves. May you prosper. Written and filed when the civic magistrates were Valerius Pyrrhus and his associates in the year 189 (= AD 158).
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