



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 20, 2005

2005

BOZHNHAUSEN



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 20

2005


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Gemeinsam mit:

Wolfgang Hameter und Hans Taeuber

Unter Beteiligung von:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Franziska Beutler, Sandra Hodeček, Georg Rehrenböck und Patrick Sänger

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien
maggoschitz@holzhausen.at
Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob.Barbara 8.

© 2006 by Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Wien

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar

Eigentümer und Verleger: Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien
Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien,
Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@univie.ac.at
Hersteller: Holzhausen Druck & Medien GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien
Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Alette V. B a k k e r s, Anita T. J. K o o r n, Ward C. M. W a r m o e s - k e r k e n (Leiden): Ein Gelddarlehen aus der Zeit des Kaisers Phocas (Tafel 1)	1
Loredana C a p p e l l e t t i (Wien): Le monete „lupine“ dei Lucani ...	11
Herbert H e f t n e r (Wien): Marius und der Eid auf das Ackergesetz des Saturninus. Zu Appian, <i>Bella civilia</i> I 29–31 und Plutarch, <i>Marius</i> 29 ..	23
Enver H o x h a j (Prishtina): Mythen und Erinnerungen der albanischen Nation. Illyrer, Nationsbildung und nationale Identität	47
Stefan L i n k (Paderborn), Die spartanische Kalokagathia — nur ein böser Witz? Zur Deutung von Thuk. 4, 40, 2	77
Christa M a y e r (Wien): Zum Schriftbild ephesischer Inschriften aus dem ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert (Tafeln 2–9)	87
Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): Zwei Mietverträge aus Herakleopolis (Tafeln 10–11)	101
Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): Zum Steuerekodex P.Louvre II 122	111
Federico M o r e l l i (Wien): Nochmals P.Paramone und Restaurierung. Nachträge zu P.Paramone 17	115
Jacek R z e p k a (Warszawa): <i>Koine Ekklesia</i> in Diodorus Siculus and the General Assemblies of the Macedonians	119
Patrick S ä n g e r (Wien): Die Eirenarchen im römischen und byzanti- nischen Ägypten	143
Michael P. S p e i d e l (Honolulu): The Origin of the Late Roman Army Ranks	205
Argyro B. T a t a k i (Athen): The Sea as a Factor for the Formation of Greek Personal Names	209
Kerstin B ö h m, Ekkehard W e b e r (Wien): <i>Annona epigraphica Austriaca 2005</i>	217
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XVIII (<Korr. Tyche> 522–525)	259
Buchbesprechungen	263
Géza A l f ö l d y, <i>Städte, Eliten und Gesellschaft in der Gallia Cisalpina</i> . Stuttgart 1999 (G. Dobesch: 263) — Hans-Georg B e c k, <i>Das byzantinische Jahrtausend</i> . München 1994 (G. Dobesch: 265) — Holger K o m n i c k, <i>Die Münzprägung von Nicopolis ad Mestum, Griechisches Münzwerk</i> . Berlin 2003 (K. Strobel: 268) — Thomas K r u s e, <i>Der königliche Schreiber und die Gauverwaltung. Untersuchungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Ägyptens in der Zeit von Augustus bis Philippus Arabs (20 v. Chr. – 245 n. Chr.)</i> . München, Leipzig 2002 (F. Beutler: 270) — Luigi L o r e t o, <i>Guerra e libertà nella repubblica romana. John R. Seeley e le radici intellettuali della Roman Revolution di Ronald Syme</i> . Roma 1999 (G. Dobesch: 272)	

— Ruth S t e p p e r, *Augustus et sacerdos. Untersuchungen zum römischen Kaiser als Priester*. Stuttgart 2003 (K. Strobel: 274) — Elfriede S t o r m, *Massinissa. Numidien im Aufbruch*. Stuttgart 2001 (M. Gerhold: 281) — S t r a b o n, *Geographika Bd. 2, 3 und 4. Übersetzt und eingeleitet von Stefan R a d t*. Göttingen 2003–2005 (M. Rathmann: 285) — Lothar W i e r s c h o w s k i, *Fremde in Gallien – „Gallier“ in der Fremde. Die epigraphisch bezeugte Mobilität in, von und nach Gallien vom 1. bis 3. Jh. n. Chr.* Stuttgart 2001 (G. Dobesch: 287) — Carola Z i m m e r m a n n, *Handwerkervereine im griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum*. Bonn 2002 (M. Donderer: 290)

Indices 293

Eingelangte Bücher 297

Tafeln 1–11

JACEK RZEPKA

Koine Ekklesia in Diodorus Siculus and the General Assemblies of the Macedonians

0. The problem — 1. General assemblies of Italian tribes. — 2. A few examples from Classical Greece. — 3. Meetings of Macedonians. — 4. Greek Alliances and Federal States. — 5. The epigraphic evidence — Opramoas' dossier. — 6. „*Koinon ton Makedonon*“ of the Hellenistic Age. — 7. Diodorus XVI. — 8. Summary of conclusions.

0. The problem

Greek authors talking about actions by a popular assembly of Greek *polis* regularly use the term *ekklesia* while referring to this institution. This noun is often applied to the assemblies in the states in which other designations for this institution had the official character. *Ekklesia* became, therefore, thanks to the Athenian model mainly, a generic term for „the Greek popular assembly“. Today historians, however, are fully aware that at Athens *ekklesia* had *demos* as a synonym¹, so in documentary evidence as in literary works. Ancient authors sometimes retain the wording of decrees they quote, but translating the documentary style of decrees into a language comprehensible to a broader circle of readers is more common. The question how ancient Greek authors rendered state's working, decree-passing procedures and names of acting assemblies was analysed for the *polis*-states, yet for other forms of political organisation in Greece there is no specific study².

The most notable exception is the Macedonian assembly that is also the most important scholarly problem among better researched non-*polis*, assemblies. This privi-

All three-figure dates in this paper are B.C., unless otherwise indicated. Translations of Greek authors are usually LCL ones, for Polyaeus I follow E. L. Wheeler and P. Krentz. For Justin I used the translation by J. C. Yardley. There was a need, however, to standardise *termini technici* variously rendered by the original translators.

¹ M. H. Hansen, *Demos, Ecclesia and Dikasterion in Classical Athens*, GRBS 19 (1978) 127–46, shows that the term *demos*, although far wider, can be synonymous to narrower *ekklesia* and that both depict — quite technically as well — the Athenian assembly.

² The problem remained untouched in P. J. Rhodes, D. M. Lewis, *The Decrees of Greek States*, Oxford 1997. For ways of rendering decrees in Greek historiography, see a model study by J. K. Davies, *Documents and „Documents“ in fourth-century Historiography*, in: P. Carlier (ed.), *Le IV^e siècle av. J.-C. Approches historiographiques*, Nancy 1996, 29–39. See also J. Rzepka, *Ethnos, Koinon, Sympoliteia and Greek Federal States*, in: T. Derda, J. Urbanik, M. Wecowski (eds.), *Εὐεργεσίας χάριτι. Studies in honour of E. Wipszycka*, B. Bravo (JJP Suppl. 1), Warszawa 2002, 225–247.

leged situation of the Macedonian assembly does surprise, since it is the central problem in the discussion on the constitutional (or non-constitutional) character of the Macedonian monarchy³. One has analysed this institution at work, this approach had to be connected with investigating the terminology. Much, therefore, was said about *ekkleisia*, *plethos* or *plethe*, *stratos* or *populus*, *contio*, *vulgus*, *exercitus*⁴. However, the term *koinē ekkleisia* that is repeatedly applied to meetings of the Macedonians by Diodorus of Sicily remains almost unnoticed by modern students⁵. The attempts at explanation were restricted to the concrete events, and no scholar scrutinised the term in the internal context of Diodorus in order to work out the difference (if any) between normal *ekkleisiai* and *koinē ekkleisia*.

Importance of Diodorus for the meaning of this cliché is obvious, since about a half its Classical literary attestations are from his *œuvre*. Let us, therefore, survey the

³ There exists the immense literature on the Macedonian state; the epoch-marking books are ones by N. G. L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State. The Origins, Institutions and History*, Oxford 1989, E. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus*, Princeton 1990, R. M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens*, München 1986, of later 1980s, as well as a slightly later M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 2 vols., Athens 1996. To sketch briefly their positions, Hammond and Hatzopoulos are „constitutionalists“, whereas Borza and Errington display far-going scepticism about the rule of law in ancient Macedonia. It is equally impossible to think about the Macedonian state without recalling dispersed studies by André Aymard (conveniently reunited in A. Aymard, *Études d'histoire ancienne*, Paris 1967, 73–177) in the spirit of the moderate constitutionalism.

⁴ The studies quoted in the previous note are fundamental in this respect, too. Yet, the most systematical presentation of the constitutionalist interpretation of Macedonian history is a study by F. Granier, *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung*, München 1931. In his search for the Indo-Germanic warrior assembly in Macedon, Granier almost overlooked the problem that is the terminology of the assembly. One can adduce here a statement that is representative for Granier (p. 25–26) insisting that in almost each case, when οἱ Μακεδόνες appear in sources, the assembly, though lacking its name, was involved: „Der Ausdruck Μακεδόνες — oft mit dem bestimmten Artikel — steht gewöhnlich für die Heeresversammlung, die keinen besonderen Namen gehabt zu haben scheint“. This seems an unjustified oversimplification, which, however, made Granier's line of argument easier. To complete his Indo-Germanic interpretation Granier denied also that there could be assemblies of people in Macedonia. Another illustration of his method could be a rejection of Curtius Rufus VI 8, 25 (the well-known passage on the assembly of army at war and the assembly of people in peacetime): „Denn wir wissen mit Sicherheit, dass in Makedonien auch in Frieden nur eine Heeresversammlung, niemals aber eine Volksversammlung gegeben hat“ (p. 52). Far more methodical and careful is an analysis by P. Briant, *Antigone le Borgne. Les débuts de sa carrière et les problèmes de l'assemblée macédonienne*, Paris 1973, 279–345. A great merit of Briant is paying more attention to the fact of confusion of the terms indicating the people of Macedon — *to plethos* or *vulgus* and the army — *ho stratos* or *exercitus*. After Briant, the scholars talk about the assembly of people rather than that of army.

⁵ A notable exception is Briant, *Antigone* (s. n. 5), 257 n. 6 and 297, for whom an adjective κοινός stresses complex structure of the assemblies: (297) „Au surplus, l'expression de Diodore, *koinē ecclesia* ne fait pas obligatoirement référence à une AP [Briant's abbreviation for People's Assembly]; l'adjectif *koinē* est employé en effet lorsque l'assemblée est formée de plusieurs éléments, soit de soldat et de civils, soit de plusieurs corps de troupes“. However, such an easy answer seems to me rather unsatisfactory.

use of the wording *koine ekklesia* in Diodorus in comparison with other ancient writers. It seems convenient to start with the earliest interventions of *koine ekklesia* in history, and then introduce relevant passages in Diodorus and later actions by „general assemblies“. Our examination will leave a problem of the rights of the assembly aside, but — expectantly — shall throw some light on the ancient Greek understanding of the Macedonian state.

We should start from recalling that the term *koine ekklesia* is not very often in the Greek literature except Christian writers, for whom it signifies the *Church*⁶. In surviving epigraphic evidence the term appears only in Roman Lycia (and there in the so-called Opramoas *dossier* only)⁷. Very few other authors using the wording under discussion are Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarchus, Polyaeus and Proclus.

In the surviving parts of *Bibliotheca Historica* the phrase *koine ekklesia* recurs twelve times. As far as the internal chronology within *Bibliotheca* concerns, all but three occurrences were concentrated in two groupings. Four attestations of this wording as label for the Macedonian assembly are included in the Books 18 and 19, both based on Hieronymus of Cardia. There is also a mention of Acarnanian *koine ekklesia* in the Book 19. Another concentration of occurrences we can meet also in the Book 16 containing four examples connected with the history of fourth-century Sicily (Diod. 16, 10, 3; 16, 18, 3; 16, 68, 5; 16, 78, 2). The Sicilian episodes are interesting from our point of view, too — for the clarity of the argument I will come back to them later in this study.

1. General assemblies of Italian tribes

Thus, Diodorus, contemporary, Dionysius of Halicarnassus uses this cliché to describe the assembly of the Etruscans in 480.

Dion. Hal. 9, 1, 2: συνήχθη γὰρ εἰς κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸ ἔθνος, καὶ πολλὰ Οὐιεντανῶν δεθόντων συνάρασθαι σφίσι τοῦ κατὰ Ῥωμαίων πολέμου, τέλος ἐξήνεγκεν ἐξεῖναι τοῖς βουλομένοις Τυρρηνῶν μετέχειν τῆς στρατείας.

„For that nation had been convened in a general assembly and at the urgent solicitation of Veientes for aid in their war against the Romans, had passed a decree that any of the Tyrrhenians, who so desired might take part in the campaign“.

Let us notice that Dionysius, while presenting *the nation* (of Etruscans) *gathered in general assembly* (συνήχθη γὰρ εἰς κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸ ἔθνος) follows a picture well attested for Greek federal states. In Aetolian dedicatory inscriptions we can find a striking differentiation between a decree-passing action of *koinon* (i.e. the *assembly*) and *virtue and deeds towards ethnos* (i.e. the nation), which were motives of honorary decrees (IG IX 1² 56, 9: Αἰτωλῶν τὸ κοινὸν ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐεργεσίας τᾶς εἰς τὸ ἔθνος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας, similarly in IG IX 1² 183, 3–5: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐεργεσίας τᾶς ποτὶ τὸ ἔθνος). A similar contrasting use of *koinon* and *ethnos* is attested in documents of the Achaean

⁶ Cf. LSJ s.v. ἐκκλησία II 2; given the existence of TLG on CD-ROM, I believe it is unnecessary to quote dozens of attestations of this meaning.

⁷ See below.

Confederacy (Syll.³ 702: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν εὐνοίας ἔνεκεν τῶς εἰς τὸ ἔθνος καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλλαντας)⁸. Thus, it is noteworthy that Dionysius wrote here about *koine ekklesia* of the ethnos. As it will be shown later, the same pattern was exploited by Diodorus on the assembly of the Acarnanian Confederacy (Diod. 19, 67, 4) and by Proclus on the Aetolians (*In Platonis rem publicam commentarii*, vol. II p. 115 [Kroll]).

Dionysius's passage is one of the two cases when the term was in a non-Greek context. A man under scrutiny, Diodorus, too, attributed this name to non-Greek people. In an enigmatic passage he refers to an assembly debate concerning a defection of Capua and Campania from Rome during the Second Punic War:

Diod. 26, 10, 1 (Const. Exc. de sententiis 286): "Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Καπύην προτεθείσης βουλῆς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κοινῇ τί πρακτέον εἴη περὶ τῆς ἀποστάσεως, ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ Καπυηνοὶ γνώμην ἀποφύνασθαι τῷ προσαγορευμένῳ Παγκύλῳ Πάυκῳ.

„When the question of secession was brought at a general assembly at Capua, and the course of action to be taken was being debated, the Capuans allowed a certain Pancylus Paucus to express his opinion“.

This piece of evidence of *koine ekklesia* at Capua or Campania cannot, however, be easily compared with any other information about the work and the name of assembly, which was an Oscan-language institution. Titus Livius in his detailed account of secession (23, 1–10) gives no comparable elements. On the other hand, Capua was the capital of the Campanian League, and this very wording can reflect the federal character of the assembly⁹.

⁸ For the Aetolian and Achaean usage see Rzepka, *Ethnos, Koinon, Sympoliteia and Greek Federal States* (s. n. 2), 231. Scholars hesitate whether the Etruscan League was rather *Bundesstaat* than a *Staatenbund*, see e.g. L. Aigner-Foresti; she previously spoke for a *Bundesstaat* (L. Aigner-Foresti, *La Lega Etrusca*, in: L. Aigner-Foresti (ed.), *Federazioni e federalismo nell' Europa antica*, Milano 1994, 327–350, esp. 329–337), and more recently sees in Etruria a *Staatenbund* rather (L. Aigner-Foresti, *Föderalismus im antiken Italien bis 89 v.Chr.*, in: P. Siewert, L. Aigner-Foresti, *Föderalismus in der griechischen und römischen Antike*, Stuttgart 2005, 96).

⁹ Diodorus himself was well aware of existence of the Campanian League. He also provides us with the date of its constitution, and the wording witnesses his understanding of federal phenomenon (12, 31, 1 under 438/7: κατὰ μὲν τὴν Ἰταλίαν τὸ ἔθνος τῶν Καμπανῶν συνέστη, καὶ ταύτης ἔτυχε τῆς προσηγορίας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ πλησίον κειμένου πεδίου — „in Italy the nation of the Campanians was constituted, and received this name due to the fertility of nearby plains“. — Let us note that Capua was herself oligarchy, policies were usually made by *meddices*, and Pacuvius Calatius' democratic upheaval of 217 as portrayed in Livy (23, 2–4) conforms too easily with the general scheme of pro-Roman oligarchs or aristocrats and anti-Roman democrats. Cf. J. Heurgon, *Recherches sur l'histoire, la religion et la civilisation de Capoue preromaine des origines à la deuxième guerre punique*, Paris 1942, 85–88, as well as A. J. Toynbee, *Legacy of Hannibal. The Hannibalic War's Effects on Roman Life* vol. 1: *Rome and her Neighbours before Hannibal's Entry*, Oxford 1965, 214.

2. A few examples from Classical Greece

With the identical wording Plutarch records the Plataean meeting of the Greeks allied against Persia in 479, i.e. of the Hellenic Alliance.

Plut. Arist. 21, 1–2: Ἐκ τούτου γενομένης ἐκκλησίας κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἔγραψεν Ἀριστείδης ψήφισμα συνιέναι μὲν εἰς Πλαταιάς καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος προβούλους καὶ θεωρούς, ἄγεσθαι δὲ πενταετηρικὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ἐλευθερίων, εἶναι δὲ σύνταξιν Ἑλληνικὴν μυρίας μὲν ἀσπίδας, χιλίους δ' ἵππους, ναῦς δ' ἑκατὸν ἐπὶ τὸν πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους πόλεμον, Πλαταιεῖς δ' ἀσύλους καὶ ἱεροὺς ἀφίεσθαι τῷ θεῷ θύοντας ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

„After this, there was a general assembly of the Hellenes, at which Aristides proposed a decree to the effect that deputies and delegates from all Hellas convene at Plataea every year, and that every fourth year festival games of deliverance be celebrated — the Eleutheria; also that a confederate Hellenic force be levied, consisting of ten thousand shield, one thousand horse, and one hundred ships, to prosecute the war against the Barbarians; also that the Plataeans be set apart as inviolable and consecrate, that they might sacrifice to Zeus the Deliverer in behalf of Hellas“¹⁰.

The *koine ekklesia* of 479 was to have been replaced by the Greek council (*to Hellenikon synhedrion*), undoubtedly consisting of *deputies and delegates from all Hellas* mentioned in Plut. Arist. 21, 2) gathering in Plataea down to Plutarch's times (Plut. Arist. 19, 8: καὶ νῦν ἔτι τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς ἀθροίζεται συνέδριον — „and at the present time, the Hellenic council assembles in Plataea“). However, nothing suggests that for Plutarch the *koine ekklesia* of the Greeks at Plataea in 479 was a kind of council. On the one hand, such an equation would not surprise, for in Plutarch's times representative bodies replaced popular assemblies in the Rome-sponsored Greek leagues¹¹. On the other hand, a distinction between *koine ekklesia* and deputies (*probouloi*) and delegates (*theoroi*) in the passage could suggest that Plutarch wanted to underscore the different character of the original event and later anniversary reunions. Of course, the authenticity of event is not beyond a doubt — no trace of regular meetings and the pan-Hellenic festival in fifth-century Plataea is known, a foundation of the feast of *Eleutheria* in the form known to Plutarch must have been remarkably later, probably should be dated in the Hellenistic Age¹². Lack of con-

¹⁰ A. E. Raubitschek, *The Covenant of Plataea*, TAPA 91 (1960) 178–183, and R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford 1972, 507–508 (Appendix 10B: *The Covenant of Plataea*), P. Siewert, *Der Eid von Plataiai*, München 1972, passim are principal speakers for the authenticity of the event.

¹¹ J. A. O. Larsen, *Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism*, CP 40 (1945) 65–97, cf. M. Sartre, *L'Orient romain*, Paris 1991, 113–6. There is the first-century A.D. epigraphic evidence of this „common council of the Hellenes who congregate at Plataea“ (τὸ κοινὸν συνέδριον τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν εἰς Πλαταιὰς συνιόντων in IG VII 2509).

¹² L. Robert, *Ἀριστοῦ Ἑλλήνων*, REA 31 (1929) 13–20. Contra Raubitschek, *The Covenant of Plataea* (s. n. 10), 183 arguing for the unbroken celebration of Eleutheria in the 5th century and, by this, confusing separate items: that of the covenant itself, that of the decree passed by the Greeks, and that of its putting into practice. Authenticity of Greek

tinity between 479 and the fourth century¹³ as well as entirely different character of reunions in 479 and later ones (in 479 the allied, and armed, Greeks were present in Plataea in a great number; the *Eleutheria* feast was attended by relatively fewer participants) need not imply that the account of the general assembly in 479 is a scholarly invention. The isolation of the expression in Plutarch's *œuvre* can suggest, on the one hand, that its wording was a verbatim repetition of his source. On the other hand, if the decree of *koine ekklesia* of the Greeks as presented by Plutarch was a later fabrication, the invention would have been contemporary to the re-founding of Plataea and reflected the usage of the fourth century.

Unfortunately enough, we do not know the proper historical context of Polyaeus on the *stratagem* of Iphicrates, whose soldiers, in all likelihood mercenaries, *eo ipso* foreigners to each other, men collected from various communities, asked for summoning (in fact, they had summoned) a general assembly in demand for money. The story most likely refers to the Egyptian campaign in 373. One should note that *ekklesia* once having been summoned was packed (*plethousa*) as in a democratic city. It is also noteworthy that the soldiers were the only able to dissolve this tumultuous gathering.

Polyaen. 3, 9, 59 Ἴφικράτης ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων τῶν στρατιωτῶν θορυβούντων καὶ κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν αἰτουμένων ἄνδρας ἐμπείρους τῆς Περσίδος γλώττης στολὰς Περσικὰς ἐνδυσσάμενους προσέταξε πληθούσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιφανῆναι καὶ παρελθόντας ἀγγέλλειν βαρβαριστὶ „πλησίον οἱ τὰ χρήματα κομίζοντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ προεπέμφθημεν τοῦτο σημανοῦντες“. ταῦτα μηνύσαντες, οἱ στρατιῶται διέλυσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

„Iphicrates was short of money. When the soldiers, in an uproar, demanded a general assembly, he dressed men acquainted with the Persian language in Persian clothing, and commanded them to appear before the packed assembly and, upon arriving, report in the barbarian manner, 'The men bringing money are near, and we were sent ahead to tell you this'. At this disclosure the soldiers dissolved the assembly“.

Of course, it was irregular meeting of a rather random group of people, but its nature and the sequence of events bring to mind other tumultuous assemblies of other troops, for instance mutiny against Antipater in Triparadeisus (Diod. 18, 39, 4) analysed below. A little can be said about actual Polyaeus, source from which he, directly or not, had drawn the story. There are more related stories of Iphicrates, shortage of money in Polyaeus (3, 9, 30 and 35)¹⁴, and a common source can be assumed for all of them. Thus, Polyaeus is likely to have drawn this stratagem from an earlier collection of this kind. At this point it cannot be answered whether Polyaeus himself

koine ekklesia in 479 need not prove that the decree we have was actually passed in the form we have.

¹³ The *polis* of Plataea was finally re-founded by Philip II after the battle of Chaeronea in 338, and this event forms the *terminus post quem* of the first *Eleutheria*.

¹⁴ Cf. D. Whitehead, *Polyaeus on Iphicrates*, CQ 53 (2003) 613–616. Whitehead's refusal to accept the authenticity of another stratagem on Ἴφικράτης ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων (Polyaen. 3, 9, 30) need not cast doubts on the dependability of the stratagem including a mention of *koine ekklesia*.

minted the phrase ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων to introduce a few entries or borrowed it from his sources. Yet, the wording *koine ekklesia* was, no doubt, repeated after a fourth-century source. Since it matters what source it is, we shall come back to this question having collected more fourth-century material¹⁵.

The oldest event alluded to by Diodorus as *koine ekklesia* is a debate of the Spartan assembly about the question of maritime *hegemonia* in 475/4.

Diod. 11, 50, 2–3: συναχθείσης δὲ τῆς γερουσίας ἐβουλευόντο περὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὑπὲρ τῆς κατὰ θάλατταν ἡγεμονίας. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐκκλησίας συναχθείσης, οἱ μὲν νεώτεροι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ πολλοὶ φιλοτίμως εἶχον ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, νομίζοντες, ἔαν αὐτὴν περιποιήσωνται, χρημάτων τε πολλῶν εὐπορήσειν καὶ καθόλου τὴν Σπάρτην μείζονα ποιήσεσθαι καὶ δυνατωτέραν, τούς τε τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οἴκους πολλὴν ἐπίδοσιν λήψεσθαι πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν.

„(2) And when a meeting of the gerousia was convened, they considered making war upon the Athenians for the sake of regaining the command of the sea. (3) Likewise, when the general assembly was convened, the younger men and the majority of the others were eager to recover the leadership, believing that, if they could secure it, they would enjoy great wealth, Sparta in general would be made greater and more powerful, and the estates of its private citizens would receive a great increase of prosperity“.

There are uncertainties about Diodorus' version: whether authenticity of a fact or its date is doubtful¹⁶. Diodorus' passage (11, 50) is the first passage in *Historical Library* dealing with affairs of mainland Greece, after two chapters devoted exclusively to the history of Western Greeks and before other two¹⁷. Of course, it need not mean that Diodorus drew here from his usual, though fiercely discussed, Western Greek source, presumably being the same which he follows in naming a few assemblies *general (koine ekklesia)* in his Book 16. Yet, it makes this idea very likely¹⁸.

However, for our analysis, the literary picture itself is sufficient. As seems, two institutions of the Spartan state are opposed here, and the wording *koine ekklesia* was intended (whether by Diodorus or by his source) to underscore exclusiveness of the *gerousia*.

3. Meetings of Macedonians

Macedonian *koine ekklesia* appears in Diodorus four times. All the evidence touches on the era of Diadochi:

¹⁵ M. T. Schettino, *Introduzione a Polieno*, Firenze 1999, 173–7, divides the 63 Iphicrates' stratagems in Polyaeus III 9 into three groups: 1) eulogistic, moralistic stories taken from Ephorus mainly, 2) stories firmly datable, which we equally often owe to Theopompus, 3) episodes of the internal history of Athens. Schettino, however, sees no criteria which make possible ascribing this passage to Ephorus or Theopompus.

¹⁶ See hesitating Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (s. n. 10), 40: „If there was such a debate it was probably in 478 or 477, but the credentials are not very good“.

¹⁷ T. S. Brown, *Timaeus, and Diodorus, Eleventh Book*, AJP 73 (1952) 337–335, 342.

¹⁸ Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (s. n. 10), 40.

I. Diod. 18, 39, 4 refers to mutiny at the Triparadeisus „Conference“, with the following words: *ταραχῆς δὲ μεγάλης οὔσης ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσι καὶ κοινῆς ἐκκλησίας συναχθείσης ὁ μὲν Ἀντίπατρος διαλεχθεὶς τοῖς πλήθεσι τὴν μὲν ταραχὴν κατέπαυσε, τὴν δ' Εὐρυδικὴν καταπληξάμενος ἔπεισε τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν* („There was great disorder in the army; but a *general assembly* was called together, and Antipater put an end to the tumult by addressing the crowd, and by thoroughly frightening Eurydice he persuaded her to keep quiet“)¹⁹. Antipater used the assembled Macedonians to authorize his new division of satrapies (18, 39, 5–7), but earlier his life was in danger during an uncontrolled gathering of soldiers (Diod. 18, 39, 1–4; Arr. *Succ.* 1, 32–33; Polyæn. *Strat.* 4, 6, 4). It is noteworthy that Diodorus refers to *koine ekklesia* whereas Arrian records the army (*ho stratos* or *he stratia*) and the crowd (*ta plethe*), Polyænus — the crowd as well (in the singular *to plethos*). Admittedly, Antipater, according to Diodorus, too, addressed the crowd (*διαλεχθεὶς τοῖς πλήθεσι*), whereas earlier „*troubles*“, divided the Army. Polyænus stresses also that the Macedonians (*hoi Makedones*) willing to lynch Antipater were militants²⁰.

II. Diod. 19, 15, 1 accounts a reunion of Eumenes and satraps Peucestas and Antigonus before the decisive campaign against Antigonus Monophthalmus: *Ἐπεὶ δὲ παρεγενήθησαν εἰς τὴν Σουσιανὴν πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Εὐμενῆ, συνήγαγον ἐκκλησίαν κοινήν, ἐν ἣ πολλὴν συνέβη γενέσθαι φιλοτιμίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡγεμονίας* („When the satraps had come into Susiane and had joined Eumenes, they called together a *general assembly* in which there was found to be a good deal of rivalry for the chief command“).

There is a notable opposition of *koine ekklesia* in (Diod. 19, 15, 1) and a council, proceeding each day *like that of some city ruling itself on democratic principles* in a further part of that relation (Diod. 19, 15, 4: *πάντων δὲ διασημαινομένων τὸ ῥηθὲν ὡς συμφέρον εἰρημένον συνήγε καθ' ἡμέραν συνέδριον οἷόν τινος δημοκρατουμένης πόλεως*). I will return to this intriguing passage in a later part of the present study.

III. Diod. 19, 51, 1–2 is especially important for the students of prerogatives exercised by the Macedonian assembly, since describes a trial of Queen Olympias before

¹⁹ This case of mutiny has the immense literature, see remarks by Briant, *Antigone* (s. n. 4), 274–279, there also a bibliography of precedent studies.

²⁰ Polyæn. 4, 6, 2 writes on Antipater's salvation from the Macedonians (thrice in the chapter), just to close with a remark that he escaped „the stones of the soldiers“: *Ἀντίγονος Ἀντίπατρον κινδυνεύοντα βληθῆναι ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων ἔσωσε. τοῦ στρατοπέδου μέσος ἦν ποταμὸς ὄξυς τὸ ῥεῦμα γέφυραν ἔχων· ἔνθεν οἱ Μακεδόνες ἐσκήνουν· ἐκεῖθεν Ἀντίγονος ἔχων ἰπέας ὁμοφρονούντας. οἱ μὲν μετὰ πολλοῦ θορύβου καὶ μεγάλης βοῆς ἦτον χρήματα βαλεῖν ἀπειλοῦντες, εἰ μὴ λάβοιεν· Ἀντίπατρος δὲ μὴ ἔχων δοῦναι ἦν ἐν ἀμηχάνῳ. Ἀντίγονος ἔφη πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄλλ' ἐγὼ γέ σοι δώσω καιρὸν ἀφόδου'. ταῦτα εἰπὼν, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πανοπλίᾳ διαδραμῶν τὴν γέφυραν, μέσας τεμῶν τὰς φάλαγγας ἐκάστω προσῆει εὐκίως δημηγορήσοντι. οἱ Μακεδόνες ὡς ἀνδρὶ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἐξεχώρουν καὶ παρίεσαν καὶ πάντες εἶποντο ἀκουσόμενοι [ὦν] προλέγειν μέλλει. ἐπεὶ δὲ περιέστη τὸ πλήθος, μακρὰ ἐδημηγόρησεν ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ Ἀντίπατρον, ἐπαγγελλόμενος, παρακαλῶν, διαλλάσσειν. ἐν δὲ τῷ καιρῷ τῆς μακρᾶς δημηγορίας Ἀντίπατρος μετὰ τῶν ἰπέων τὴν γέφυραν παρελθὼν ἐξέφυγε τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν λίθους.*

the *Macedones*²¹: προετρέψατο (Cassander) δὲ καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους τῶν ἀνηρημένων ὑπ' Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐν κοινῇ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐκκλησίᾳ κατηγορεῖν τῆς προειρημένης γυναικός. ὧν ποιησάντων τὸ προσταχθὲν καὶ τῆς μὲν Ὀλυμπιάδος οὔτε παρούσης οὔτε ἐχούσης τοὺς ἀπολογησομένους οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες κατεγίνωσκον αὐτῆς θάνατον κτλ.

„He also urged the relatives of those whom Olympias had slain to accuse the afore-said woman *in the general assembly of the Macedonians*. They did as he had ordered; and, although Olympias was not present and had none to speak in her defence, the Macedonians condemned her to death“.

Pausanias is less precise when alludes to the same episode (1, 25, 6: Ἀντιπάτρου δὲ ἀποθανόντος Ὀλυμπιάς διαβῆσα ἐξ Ἠπείρου χρόνον μὲν τινα ἤρξεν ἀποκτείνασα Ἀριδαῖον, οὐ πολλῶν δὲ ὕστερον ἐκπολιορκηθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κασσάνδρου παρεδόθη τῷ πλήθει. — „On the death of Antipater, Olympias, came from Epirus, killed Arridaeus, and for a time occupied the throne, but shortly afterwards was besieged by Cassander, taken, and delivered up to the crowd“).

There is a Latin account of the same event by Pompeius Trogus/Justin (14, 6, 6: *sed Cassander ad contionem vocato populo etc. — but Cassander summoned people to the assembly*). The sentences following Diodorus, description of the assembly that condemned Olympias are also of interest here; we can assume that Diodorus summarised Olympias' answer to the condemnation. Our attention should be attracted by Olympias' wish to be judged *by all the Macedonians*, or Cassander's fear of Olympias recollecting deeds of Philip and Alexander *toward the whole nation*, Diod. 19, 51, 3–4: τῆς δὲ Ὀλυμπιάδος οὐ φαμένης φεύξεσθαι, τούναντίον δ' ἐτοίμης οὔσης ἐν πᾶσι Μακεδόσι κριθῆναι ὁ Κάσανδρος φοβηθεὶς μήποτε τὸ πλῆθος ἀκοῦον τῆς βασιλίσσης ἀπολογουμένης καὶ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Φιλίππου πρὸς ἅπαν ἔθνος εὐεργεσιῶν ἀναμνησκόμενον μετανοήσῃ κτλ.

„As Olympias, however, refused to flee but on the contrary was ready to be judged *before all the Macedonians*, Cassander, fearing that *the crowd* might change its mind if it is heard the queen defend herself and was reminded of all benefits conferred on the entire nation by Alexander and Philip, etc.“.

Friedrich Granier understood that *all the Macedonians* had been equal to *koine ekklesia*²², but Pierre Briant wants to see in *all the Macedonians* the assembly of people confronted with *the general assembly* of soldiers²³. Another passage in Diodorus, that on Antigonus, response to the trial of Olympias (see below) weakens the assumption of Briant. It seems reasonable to follow Karl-Julius Beloch who argued that Olympias had tried to appeal to „the real representation of the Macedonian people“, i.e. to the Macedonians in Asia as well²⁴.

²¹ Granier, *Makedonische Heeresversammlung* (s. n. 4), 90; Briant, *Antigone* (s. n. 4), 297–299.

²² Granier, *Makedonische Heeresversammlung* (s. n. 4), 90.

²³ Briant, *Antigone* (s. n. 4), 298–299.

²⁴ K. J. Beloch, *GG IV* 1², 109, n. 1.

IV. Diod. 19, 61, 1–3 with an undoubted indication of decree-passing role of the assembly (it does not matter here whether this role was more than facade or not) refers to Antigonos, reaction to Cassander's punishment of Olympias and contains a decree of the Macedonians:

1. Ἀντίγονος δὲ παραγενομένου πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πολυπέρχοντος πρὸς μὲν τοῦτον συνέθετο φιλίαν, αὐτὸς δὲ συναγαγὼν τῶν τε στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῶν παρεπιδημούντων κοινήν ἐκκλησίαν κατηγορήσε Κασάνδρου, προφερόμενος τήν τε Ὀλυμπιάδος ἀναίρεσιν καὶ τὰ συμβάντα περὶ Ῥωξάνην καὶ τὸν βασιλέα. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἔλεγεν ὡς Θεσσαλονίκην μὲν βιασάμενος ἔγημεν, φανερώς δὲ ἐξειδιάζεται τὴν Μακεδόνων βασιλείαν, 2. ἔτι δὲ ὡς Ὀλυθίους ὄντας πολεμιωτάτους Μακεδόνων κατόκισεν εἰς τὴν ὁμώνυμον ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν καὶ Θήβας ἀνέστησε τὰς ὑπὸ Μακεδόνων κατασκαφείσας. 3. συναγνακτούντων δὲ τῶν ὄχλων ἔγραψε δόγμα καθ' ὃ τὸν Κάσανδρον ἐψηφίσαστο πολέμιον εἶναι, ἐὰν μὴ τὰς τε πόλεις καθέλῃ καὶ τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὴν μητέρα τὴν Ῥωξάνην προαγαγὼν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς ἀποδῶ τοῖς Μακεδόσι καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἐὰν μὴ πειθαρχῇ τῷ καθεσταμένῳ στρατηγῷ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας παρελιηφότι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν Ἀντιγόνῳ. εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἑλληνας ἅπαντας ἐλευθέρους, ἀφρουρήτους, αὐτονόμους. ἐπιψηφισαμένων δὲ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τὰ ῥηθέντα διαπέστειλε πανταχῇ τοὺς κομιοῦντας τὸ δόγμα κτλ.

„1. Antigonos, after Polyperchon's son Alexander had come to him, made a pact of friendship with him, and then, *calling a general assembly of the soldiers and of the co-followers*²⁵, laid charges against Cassander, bringing forward the murder of Olympias and the treatment of Roxane and the king. Moreover, he said that Cassander had married Thessalonice by force, and was clearly trying to establish his own claim to the Macedonian throne; 2. and also that, although the Olynthians were very bitter enemies of the Macedonians, Cassander had re-established them in a city called by his own name and had rebuilt Thebes, which had been razed by the Macedonians. 3. When the crowd showed that it shared his wrath, he introduced a decree according to the terms of which it was voted that Cassander was to be an enemy unless he destroyed these cities again, released the king and his mother Roxane from imprisonment and restored them to the Macedonians, and, in general, yielded obedience to Antigonos the duly established general who had succeeded to the guardianship of the throne. It was also stated that all the Greeks were free, not subject to foreign garrisons, and autonomous. When

²⁵ Aristophanes of Byzantium defines *parepidemos* as a traveling foreigner (*xenos*, see: *Lexica Graeca Minora*, ed. L. Latte, H. Erbse, Hildesheim 1965, 279 and fr. 38 Nauck = *Nomina aetatum*, fr. Paris. 16). The contrast between the unequivocal *stratiotai* and the discussed *parepidemountes* in Diodorus proves that the latter were civilians. Most of them, however, must have been „camp-followers“. Thus: R. H. Simpson, *Antigonos One-eyed and the Greeks*, *Historia* 8 (1959) 389; P. Briant, *Antigone* (s. n. 4), 300 („dans le baggage“). N. G. L. Hammond, *Some Passages in Arrian concerning Alexander*, CQ 30 (1980) 464 translates them as „the residents there“ and understands them as the Macedonians residing near Tyre. R. Engel, *Untersuchungen zum Machtaufstieg des Antigonos I. Monophtalmos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der frühen Diadochenzeit*, Kallmünz 1976, 121 n. 273 assumes that Antigonos summoned all his troops and „anwesenden Fremden“ that would have been delegates of Polyperchon.

the soldiers²⁶ had voted in favour of these messages, Antigonus sent men in every direction to carry the decree, etc.“.

The extensive quotation may appear superfluous, but this assembly is especially important for our aims. It is usually understood that an assembly was *general* for the reason that it was a composite of soldiers and „others in the camp“ (*parepidemiountes*). Its structure would have been complex, therefore. I believe that this passage comprises a clear indication that Antigonus seeking a legitimate response against Cassander tried to reproduce *the Macedonian state* in Asia. To achieve that, he needed not an assembly of warriors of wartime, but a more perfect, larger assembly of militants and other Macedonians (hence, the presence of co-travellers — *parepidemiountes* was emphasised by Diodorus). This again, together with a description of the decisions passed by this very assembly as *the decrees by the Macedonians with Antigonus* (Diod. 19, 62, 1: τὰ δεδογμένα τοῖς μετ’ Ἀντιγόνου Μακεδόσι) shows that the usual form of the assembly were covenants of the Macedonians, not of soldiers (although the soldiers formed the majority — Diod. 19, 61, 3: ἐπιψηφισαμένων δὲ τῶν στρατιωτῶν reveals this reality).

The frequent recurrence of *koine ekklesia* in Diodorus, narrative of the Successors can suggest that he, while choosing this wording, was influenced by his source (definitely Hieronymus of Cardia²⁷). On the other hand, other authors drawing on the same source, referring to the same events use the different wording (as Arrian in *History of the Diadochi*). Most likely, they were more independent from the usage of the source.

In other books of his *Historical Library*, basing not on Hieronymus, naturally, Diodorus names the Macedonian assembly as simply as possible *ekklesia* (16, 3, 1; 16, 4, 3; 17, 109, 2). He also attributes to the Macedonian assemblies plainly unofficial names, for instance *ta plethe* (the crowd) in 16, 3, 3; 17, 2, 2. Of course, these names ascribed to the Macedonian assembly we can find in other authors (Arrian²⁸;

²⁶ The assembly at Tyre was therefore dominated by the soldiers. On the other hand, K. Rosen, *Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia (323–302 B.C.)*, Ant. Class. 10 (1967) 41–94, though stressing that it was not „a mere military assembly“ (on 78–79), argues for a „quite informal“ participation of *parepidemiountes* in the assembly. However, one can ask why Antigonus convened both: soldiers and *parepidemiountes*. Most likely, an involvement of the latter was useful in attempts to present the assembly as lawful and legally binding all the Macedonians, since consisting of all Macedonians, not only the soldiers.

²⁷ There is the general consensus that Diodorus’ narrative of the Diadochi heavily depends on Hieronymus: T. S. Brown, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, AHR 52 (1947) 684–696, 692; R. H. Simpson, *Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus*, AJP 80 (1959) 370–379; R. Drews, *Diodorus and His Sources*, AJP 83 (1962) 384; Rosen, *Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia* (s. n. 26), 41–93; J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford 1981, *passim*; I. Merker, *Diodorus and Hieronymus of Cardia*, AHB 2 (1988) 90–93 (with a good argument for direct use of Hieronymus in Diodorus). A problem remains whether Diodorus used another source (other sources) combined with Hieronymus. A good presentation of *status quaestionis* may be found in J. Seibert, *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen* (Erträge der Forschung 185), Darmstadt 1983, 2–9 and 27–36.

²⁸ For instance, in Arr. An. III 27 (a trial of Amyntas) both *plethos* and *ekklesia* are inserted interchangeably as synonyms.

Plutarch, *Alexander* 47, 3 [probably]). It was probably need for *variatio stylus* that made a historian (Diodorus or already Hieronymus) to coin a mixture as *to koinon Makedonon plethos* that was used to describe an assembly convened by Perdiccas in order to cancel Alexander's last plans (Diod. 18, 4, 3²⁹: ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξει διὰ τῆς ἰδίας γνώμης καθαιρεῖν τι τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου δόξης ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μακεδόνων πλῆθος ἀνήνεγκε τὴν περὶ τούτων βουλήν. — „To avoid impression that he cancelled something from Alexander's decisions by the calculation of his own, he (Perdiccas) entrusted the judgment on this to the general assembly³⁰ of Macedonians“). No doubt, *koinon plethos* cannot refer simply to common people, commoners (most likely, such an eccentric assumption led Ernst Badian to translate *to koinon Makedonon plethos* as „the infantry“³¹. Nothing, but the context indicates that it was an assembly of the army³². Thus, *koinon plethos* had undoubtedly been another literary description of the Macedonian assembly, a variant of *koine ekklesia*. It would be interesting to say what the actual name of this institution of the Macedonian state was, and why it was rendered so often with an adjective κοινός.

On the other hand, this variety of names shows that ancient authors described Macedonian assemblies ignoring their formal side. Shall it mean that all meetings of the Macedonians, about which we are informed, were informal occasions? Inscriptions with decrees of the Macedonian assembly would have solved this enigma. Unfortunately, we have no epigraphic data referring to any decree-passing (or related) activity of the Macedonians at the *ekklesia*. So, what modern historians have at their disposal?

4. Greek Alliances and Federal States

First, let us recollect some comparative material. The Sicilian evidence of *koine ekklesia*, the richest in Diodorus, is far from being unequivocal. Diodorus twice uses the term for less than regular meetings of people of various origin and political status³³.

Again, the nature of *koine ekklesia* at Delphi organised by the Phocians during the Sacred War (in 353/2) cannot be very helpful in our investigation. Since also the Phocian allies participated in the gathering, this was not the assembly of a state (the Phocian Confederacy), but of a symmarchy (Diod. 16, 32, 2 οἱ δὲ Φωκεῖς ἀπολυθέντες τοῦ πολέμου κατὰ τὸ παρὸν ἐπανήλθον εἰς Δελφοὺς καὶ συνελθόντες μετὰ τῶν συμμάχων εἰς κοινήν ἐκκλησίαν ἐβουλευόντο περὶ τοῦ πολέμου — „the Phocians, now freed from the war, for the present returned to Delphi and there meeting with their allies in a general assembly deliberated on the war“).

²⁹ Let us note that Rosen, *Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia* (s. n. 26), 49–52 tries to disprove that Diodorus 18, 4 is borrowed from Hieronymus. It is, however, rather unconvincing.

³⁰ Literally: crowd. It is, however, to resign from philological precision in order to present things as they were. Cf. Hammond, *Some Passages in Arrian* (s. n. 25), 464.

³¹ E. Badian, *A King's Notebooks*, HSCP 72 (1968) 183–204, 183 n. 3.

³² Thus, e.g. E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique I*²² (below as *HPMH*), Nancy 1979, 26. Briant, *Antigone* (s. n. 4), 257 n. 6 argues that it was an assembly of the army, of all its parts, hence an adjective *koinos* (criticising a Badian's view which I rejected, too; see the precedent note).

³³ Diod. 16, 10, 3; 16, 78, 2.

More relevant in our context seems Diodorus' reference to the *koine ekklesia* of Acarnanians. This assembly was summoned on the initiative of Cassander in the year 316. No doubt Diodorus owed his knowledge of this event to Hieronymus of Cardia, this time already a courtier of Antigonos Monophthalmus. As Diodorus states, Cassander „gathered Acarnanians to a joint assembly“ (συναγαγὼν δὲ Ἀκαρνανὰς εἰς κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν). In the existing literary evidence there is also a noun τὸ κοινόν attested as a name for the Acarnanian federal authorities. Xenophon in *Hellenica* (4, 6, 4) writes that „Agesilaos have sent to Stratos to the koinon of the Acarnanians“ (πέμψας εἰς Στράτον πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων). Fortunately, we have a few inscriptions with data concerning the Acarnanian assembly. In these inscriptions the decree-passing body is usually labelled τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων („the community of the Acarnanians“). The formula ἔδοξε τῷ κοινῷ is given by a few Hellenistic inscriptions of the Acarnanian Confederacy (IG IX 1² nos. 208; 209 1.19; 583 1.53; 588). In one text (IG IX 1² 209, 10) a more detailed enactment formula of probouleitic type was inserted δεδόχθαι τῷ βουλῷ καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων — „it was resolved by the council and the koinon of the Acarnanians“³⁴. Undoubtedly, an institution listed alongside the council as τὸ κοινόν the full citizen body of the Acarnanians must be understood as the assembly.

There is also a mention of the *koine ekklesia* of the Aetolians (Proclus, *In Platonis rem publicam commentarii*, vol. II p. 115 [Kroll]). It was already noticed that in the Aetolian usage the term „τὸ κοινόν“ denotes the assembly³⁵. Thus Proclus, although alludes to a miraculous event that was a resurrection of an Aetolian leader Polycritus³⁶, confirms that there was a practice to render τὸ κοινόν of the inscriptions as

³⁴ Another name for the Acarnanian assembly thrice attested in inscriptions: is *chilioi* („The Thousands“): IG IX² 207; IvMagn. 31 (= IG IX² 582), P. Funke, H.-J. Gehrke, L. Kolonas, *Ein neues Proxenedekret des Akarnanischen Bundes*, *Klio* 75 (1993) 131–144; cf. H. Swoboda, *Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse* (Epigraphische Untersuchungen), Leipzig 1890, 31; Rhodes, Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States* (s. n. 2), 160–62 and Rzepka, *Ethnos, Koinon, Sympoliteia and Greek Federal States* (s. n. 2), 227; cf. J. Tréheux, *Koinon*, *REA* 89 (1987) 39–46.

³⁵ Rzepka, *Ethnos, Koinon, Sympoliteia and Greek Federal States* (s. n. 2), *passim*.

³⁶ Ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ Ναυμαχίος ὁ Ἠπειρώτης, ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων πάππων γεγονώς, Πολύκριτον Αἰτωλῶν ἐπιφανέστατον Αἰτωλῶν καὶ Αἰτωλαρχίας τυχόντα καὶ ἀποθανεῖν καὶ ἀναβῖῶναι μηνὶ μετὰ τὸν θάνατον ἐνάτῳ, καὶ ἀφικέσθαι εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κοινὴν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν καὶ συμβουλευσαὶ τὰ ἄριστα περὶ ὧν ἐβουλευόντο· καὶ τούτων εἶναι μάρτυρας Ἰέρωνα τὸν Ἐφέσιον καὶ ἄλλους ἱστορικοὺς Ἀντιγόνῳ τε τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ ἄλλοις ἐαυτῶν φίλοις ἀποῦσι τὰ συμβάντα γράψαντας. — „And Naumachius of Epirus, a contemporary of our grandfathers, recounts that Polycritus an Aetolian, being the most distinguished of Aetolians and having achieved the leadership in Aetolia (Aitolarchia) deceased and resurrected in the ninth month after his death. He arrived at general assembly of the Aetolians and made the best counsels concerning the disputed issues. Witnesses of that are also Hieron of Ephesus and other historians ascribing the event to the time when the King Antigonos and some of his friends departed this life“. — The same story is recounted in fuller with more fabulous details by Phlegon of Tralles (FGrHist 257 F 36). Both authors quote as sources Hieron of Ephesus and others (Naumachios of Epirus, a medical writer, is the main source of Proclus), Phlegon attributes to the Aetolian assembly alternatively names *demos* and *ekklesia*. Of course, marvels de-

κοινή ἐκκλησία. Let us note that the story of Polycritus — *strategos* in the late fourth century B.C., reappearing before the Aitolian assembly, though directly based on less famous writers, must have been indirectly drawn from Hieronymus. Undoubtedly, the original source of information on the Akarnanian „general assembly“ was Hieronymus, too. Thus one can conclude that Hieronymus sometimes translated *to koinon* of documents into *koinē ekklesia* more comprehensible to his readership. Of course, he sometimes just retains documentary style — and the same institution is named *koinē ekklesia* a one time, and *koinon* — another one³⁷. The same must be said about Hieronymus' terms for Macedonian assemblies — Polyaeus mentions *to koinon ton Makedonon* in the story of Pithon's defection from Antigonos (4, 6, 14):

Ἐντὶ γινώσκων Πίθωνα σατράπην Μηδίας πυθόμενος ξενολογεῖν καὶ χρήματα συλλέγειν, ἀποστήναι βεβουλευμένον ἀπιστεῖν τοῖς ἀγγέλλουσι προσποιήσατο φάσκων „οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ πιστεύσαιμι ταῦτα Πίθωνα πράττειν, ᾧ πεντακισχιλίους Μακεδόνας ὀπλίτας καὶ Θρᾶκας χιλίους φύλακας τῆς σατραπείας πέμψαι παρεσκεύακα“. ταῦτα Πίθων ἀκούσας πιστεύει τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ καὶ διὰ τάχους ἦκε ληψόμενος τὴν ἐπικουρίαν. Ἐντὶ γινώσκων δὲ ἐς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐσαγαγὼν Πίθωνα ἐλὼν τιμωρησάμενος ἀπέκτεινε.

„Antigonos, when learned that Pithon, the satrap of Media, had decided to revolt and was recruiting mercenaries and collecting money, he pretended not to believe the informers, saying ‘I do not believe Pithon would do these things, since I have prepared 5000 Macedonian hoplites and 1000 Thracians to send him as guards of the satrapy’. As soon as Pithon heard this, he trusted Antigonos' benevolence and quickly arrived to take command of the auxiliary force. Antigonos had arrested him and brought before the Macedonian assembly, and punished him with death“.

We cannot be sure whether Polyaeus used Hieronymus directly or not³⁸. The indirect use would not tell against the thesis that it was Hieronymus who coined these

scribed by Proclus and Phlegon do not reduce importance of their wording for revealing the very nature of the institution covered under the name κοινή ἐκκλησία.

³⁷ E.g. τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν in Diod. 19, 66, 2 (Ἀριστόδημος μὲν ὁ κατασταθεὶς ὑπ' Ἐντιγόνου στρατηγὸς ὡς ἐπύθετο τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πολυπέρχοντος ἀπόστασιν, ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν δικαιολογησάμενος προετρέψατο τὰ πλήθη βοηθεῖν τοῖς Ἐντιγόνου πράγμασιν. — „Aristodemus who had been made general by Antigonos, on learning of the defection of Polyperchon's, son Alexander, presented his own side of the matter to the general assembly of the Aetolians and persuaded the crowd to support the fortunes of Antigonos“ — or in 20, 20, 3 and 20, 99, 3. Cf. Rzepka, *Koinon, Ethnos, Sympolitēia and Greek Federal States* (s. n. 2), 232.

³⁸ R. J. Philips, *The Sources and Methods of Polyaeus* (Harvard University Diss. 1971, summarised in HSCP 76 [1972]) 297–8 states for example: „Polyaeus' special interest in his native Macedonia led him to devote a great deal of space to Macedonian affairs. Evidence for direct use of Hieronymus is particularly strong“. In the light of all factual errors harming the quality of Polyaeus, Macedonian Book, J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford 1982, 74–5 argues for a selective and indirect use of Hieronymus in Polyaeus. Conclusions of my own study of Polyaeus' picture of the Macedonian monarchy, especially of the Successors are close to Hornblower's ones (to be published as *Polyaeus the Macedonian in the Acts of Taktika. The First Conference on the Greek Tactical Writing*, Torun, 8–10 April 2005).

names for various assemblies. Moreover, this time Polyaeus should be given precedence before Diodorus 19, 46, 4 on the same event (ὁ [Ἄντιγονος] δὲ κυριεύσας τοῦ σώματος καὶ κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος ἐν τοῖς μετέχουσι τοῦ συνεδρίου ῥαδίως κατεδίκασε καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀπέκτεινε — „Antigonus, when he had gained possession of his [i.e. Pithon's] person and had accused him before the members of the council, easily won a conviction and had him executed at once“). Diodorus, was this time innovative, tried to render documentary *koinon ton Makedonon*, in a more pleasant from the literary point of view way, as a *synhedrion*. No doubt there was no abbreviation of Hieronymus in this chapter of Diodorus. Rather, the next sentence with a change of an institution involved (συναγαγὼν δὲ τὸ στρατόπεδον εἰς ἓνα τόπον σατράπην μὲν ἀπέδειξε τῆς Μηδίας Ὀροντοβάτην Μῆδον, στρατηγὸν δὲ Ἰππόστρατον, ἔχοντα πεζοὺς μὲν ξένους τρισχιλίους πεντακοσίους — „he had gathered the army [camp] into one place and, appointed Orontobates, the Persian satrap of Media, as well as he made Hippostrates general with an infantry force of 3500 mercenaries“) makes clear that the issue was discussed and the final decision was taken in the assembly of the Macedonians.

5. The epigraphic evidence — Opramoas' dossier

Our only epigraphic attestations of *koinē ekklesia* are also preserved in evidence produced by a federal sympolity. All they come from the Opramoas dossier (TAM II, 1–3, 905 form c. A.D. 105–152). *The common electoral assembly of the nation of Lycians* was there enacting body of many decrees (see documents 12, 15, 17, 30 containing the formula ἔδοξε τῇ κοινῇ τοῦ Λυκίων ἔθνους ἀρχαιρεσιακῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. In a few other documents the assembly is followed in the enactment formula by the council, as in documents 21, 22, 23, 32: ἔδοξε τῇ κοινῇ τοῦ Λυκίων ἔθνους ἀρχαιρεσιακῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ βουλῇ) and the addressee of a letter sent by a Roman official (document 15)³⁹. Although in the second century A.D. *the common electoral assembly* was — in all likelihood — a representative body known from Strabo (14, 3, 3), one should assume that originally there had been electoral meetings of all Lycians. Even after a transformation (we cannot define its date) into the representative body of the electors (*archostatai*) it was not identical with the council (see documents 21, 22, 23, 32 which have both, the *common electoral assembly* and the council). It would be interesting to answer, when a concept of the common electoral assembly was born. We have also a number of decrees by the Lycian κοινόν, earlier (for instance OGIS 551 from the second century or SEG 18, 143 from the first century A.D.) and later (IGRR III 473, the turn of the second century A.D.) than the Opramoas dossier. Given the date of Opramoas records' production it is thinkable, on the one hand, that the *common electoral assembly of the nation of Lycians* was a nomenclature influenced

³⁹ The classic treatment of the Lycian Confederacy and its constitution in Larsen, *Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism* (s. n. 11), 70–87 is now replaced by A. G. Keen, *Dynastic Lycia. A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers c. 545–362 B.C.*, Leiden, Boston 1998, 177–181 (with an analysis of early documents witnessing a kind of *sympoliteia* in Lycia).

by literary works. On the other hand pairing of *boule* and *common assembly* in some documents of the *dossier* could have indicated that the representative assembly developed from the much older primary assembly of the Lycians.

6. „*Koinon ton Makedonon*“ of the Hellenistic Age

Having surveyed the data from Hellenistic federal states, let us turn our attention to one isolated documentary source that mentions the τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μακεδῶν. It is a Macedonian dedication of Philip Vth statue at Delos with a following inscription: „the koinon of Macedonians (devotes the statue of) King Philip, son of King Demetrius for his virtue and goodwill to Apollo“ (Syll.³ 575 = IG XI 4, 1102: τὸ κοινὸν Μ[ακε]-δόν[ων] | βασιλέα Φί[λιππον βασιλέως] | Δημητρίου ἀ[ρετῆς ἔνεκα] | καὶ εὐ-νοία[ς Ἀπόλλωνι]). An almost contemporary dedication (IG XI, 4, 1103) comprises in all probability a similar, however badly injured, text (τὸ κο[ινὸν] - - | βα[σιλέα] - - | [Μακεδ]όνων). Both texts were taken by Fanoula Papazoglou as an indication that the Macedonian state was transformed into a *quasi*-federal state under the Antigonids⁴⁰. This view is shared also by a few Greek scholars (among them Miltiades Hatzopoulos and Kostas Buraselis), who notice that Macedonia (as other Northern Greek kingdoms) in many ways resembled the Hellenistic federal states. Buraselis while mentioning the royal protocol of Antigonos Doson, points even that „Macedonia should not look old-fashioned in a new period of federative boom“⁴¹. Hatzopoulos goes further and indicates other resemblances, beyond the sphere of official language as well⁴². The „federal“ state in Hellenistic Macedonia seems a bizarre idea. On the other hand, one cannot overlook the very end of the Macedonian monarchy. Its disbandment and reorganization of Macedonia into four local leagues (called republics by modern students) served the Roman interests. We hear, however, no accusation that by this the Romans violated Greek freedom or Macedonian customs (it was a destruction of the monarchy that woke Macedonian resentments⁴³). Why? The Romans,

⁴⁰ F. Papazoglou, *Sur l'organisation de la Macédoine des Antigonides*, in: *Ancient Macedonia III*, Thessaloniki 1983, 195–210. K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte IV I*², Berlin 1927, 383.

⁴¹ K. Buraselis, *Considerations on Symmachia and Sympoliteia in the Hellenistic Period*, in: K. Buraselis, K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings vol. II: Aspects of connecting poleis and ethne in Ancient Greece*, Athens 2003, 49.

⁴² M. Hatzopoulos, *Polis, Ethnos and Kingship in Northern Greece*, in: K. Buraselis, K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings vol. II: Aspects of connecting poleis and ethne in Ancient Greece*, Athens 2003, 51–64. Hatzopoulos, however, stresses the early existence of *poleis* in Macedonia. For a fuller presentation of his views, cf. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions I* (s. n. 3), 354ff.

⁴³ Pol. 31, 2, 12: συνέβαινε γὰρ τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἀήθεις ὄντας δημοκρατικῆς καὶ συνεδριακῆς πολιτείας στασιάζειν πρὸς αὐτούς. — „It happened that the Macedonians, being unaccustomed to democratic and representative form of government, were quarreling among themselves“. Polybius stresses also that the Romans pretended to have liberated the people of Macedon from the slavery to its monarchs (36, 17, 13: Μακεδόνες μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἐτετεύχεσαν φιλανθρωπιῶν, κοινῇ μὲν πάντες ἀπολυθέντες μοναρχικῶν ἐπιταγμάτων καὶ φόρων καὶ μεταλαβόντες ἀπὸ

probably, did not create new organisms. As often, they transformed an earlier local custom. The Macedonian kingdom of the Hellenistic age with certainty was not a federal state, the true federalism could not agree with the sovereignty vested in the King⁴⁴. Larger unitary monarchies of the epoch relied on local units which possessed a significant degree of self-government or freedom of action, at least (freedom of action enjoyed by satraps — servants to the Great King, the universal sovereign, is especially instructive in this respect).

Other striking similarities between Macedonia and Greek confederacies can be listed here. From the fourth century onwards we meet in the surviving epigraphic evidence Macedonians presented with the *double ethnic* (for instance *Makedon ek Thessalonikes*)⁴⁵. The double ethnic consisting of city ethnic and tribal (or supra-polis) ethnic is often understood as an indication of existence of the double citizenship and *eo ipso the federal sympolity*⁴⁶. The double citizenship of Macedonians is an idea that seemed doubtful to other scholars⁴⁷, but, as I am convinced, without reason. A way in which the *double ethnic* was attributed to Macedonians may at first glance appear irregular⁴⁸,

δουλείας ὁμολογουμένως ἐλευθερίαν κτλ. — „The Macedonians had met with many signal favours from Rome; the country as a whole had been delivered from the arbitrary rule and taxation of monarchs, and, as all confessed, now enjoyed freedom in place of servitude, etc.“). Cf. P. Tucci, *La democrazia di Polibio tra eredità classica e federalismo*, in: C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, G. Zecchini, *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milano 2004, 45–86 (on 51–58).

⁴⁴ But, see P. Zancan, *Il monarcato ellenistico nei suoi elementi federativi*, Padova 1934, *passim* and A. Giovanni, *Untersuchungen über die Natur und Anfänge der bundesstaatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland*, Göttingen 1971, 72, 80. M. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian institutions under the Kings. Volume I: A Historical and Epigraphic Study*, Athens 1996, 490–492 rightly stresses that — in contrast with „the southern republican ethne (Aitolia, Achaia, Boiotia etc.)“ — in Macedon there was no „federal“ council based on representation of *poleis* or districts.

⁴⁵ See, for instance, IG XII (9) 199 (Eretria, 4th cent.): Μακεδῶν ἐξ Ἀντιπολέως; IG XII (9) 1187 (Oreos, 4th cent.): Μακεδῶν ἐξ Αἰγέων; IG II² 710 (Athens, early 3rd cent.): Μακεδῶν ἐν Βερούαις; IG VII 295 (Oropos, 3rd cent.): Μακεδῶν ἐκ Θεσσαλονίκης. Cf. J. Gabbert, *The Language of Citizenship in Antigonid Macedonia*, AHB 2/1 (1988) 10–11, who noticed the diversity of ethnics applied to the Macedonians. For the sole exception, see: J. A. Alexander, *Cassandreia During the Macedonian Period: An Epigraphical Commentary*, in: *Ancient Macedonia I*, Thessaloniki 1970, 127–146, who noticed that Kassandreians were invariably introduced by the city ethnic and never by the ‘national’ ethnic *Makedon* (p. 131–134). Cf. A. Tataki, *Macedonians Abroad: A Contribution to the Prosopography of Ancient Macedonia*, Athens 1998, 28–99 (on the Macedonian ethnics generally); 85–97 (on the Kassandreians).

⁴⁶ E.g.: E. Szanto, *Das griechische Bürgerrecht*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1892, 111; J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, Oxford 1968, XIV; M. Sordi, *Città e stati federali nel mondo greco*, in: *La città antica come fatto di cultura*, Como 1983, 185–193, on 191; eadem, *Il federalismo greco nell'età classica*, in: L. Aigner-Foresti (ed.), *Federazioni e federalismo nell'Europa antica*, Milano 1994, 3–22; H. Beck, *Polis und Koinon. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1997, 174–181.

⁴⁷ Giovannini, *Untersuchungen über die Natur und Anfänge der bundesstaatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland* (s. n. 44), 80–92.

⁴⁸ Gabbert, *The Language of Citizenship in Antigonid Macedonia* (s. n. 45), 10–11.

but in undoubted sympolities, too, its use, though subjected to certain rules, may seem inconsequent. The main principle is that at home citizens are usually presented with a narrowing city ethnic (e.g. *Dymaioi* or *Megalopolitai* in the Achaean Confederacy), abroad as tribesmen (*Achaioi*, *Aitoloi*, *Akarnanes*). There is finally a category of foreign documents in which both a tribal ethnic and a mention of hometown are specified together (for instance *Achaios ek Dymes*, *Aitolos ek Naupaktou*, *Akarnas ek Thyrraiou*). Similarly, in two Macedonian fascicles of *Inscriptiones Graecae* and in works supplementing them we find neither Classical nor Hellenistic documents referring to internal affairs and containing the ethnic *Makedon* (in singular).

Absence of this *ethnic* from Macedonian inscriptions is well underscored by a letter of Philip Vth to Archippus, a royal *epistates* at Greia⁴⁹. There is a mention Corrhagus, son of Perdikkas, a personage being with such a name and father's name undoubtedly a Macedonian. His nationality remains, however, unspecified, what provoked a lot of discussion on his status⁵⁰. Corrhagus belonged to the „metics in Greia“ (τῶν ἐν Γρήϊαι μετοίκων), thus was there a foreign resident. It is unwise to hesitate whether Corrhagus, as a metic, enjoyed or not *enktesis* at Greia⁵¹ — how and why the discussed land was alienated from Corrhagus must remain an unanswerable question. Frederic William Walbank comparing Corrhagus' status with the position of πολιτεύοντες ἐν Αἰτωλῶναι⁵² (and κατοικέοντες ἐν Αἰτωλῶναι — one should add) took a step in the right direction. More likely, however, his status should be equated with the Aetolians κατοικέοντες | πολιτεύοντες in *poleis* of the Aetolian Confederacy⁵³.

⁴⁹ A. Rizakis, I. Touratsoglou, *EAM* I 87 = M. Hatzopoulos, *Epigraphic Appendix* no. 17, II. 1–9: [β]ασιλεὺς Φίλιππος Ἀρχίπ[ωι χαί]||[ρ]ειν· τοῦ δοθέντος μοι ὑπομνήματος [παρα τῶν] | [π]ερὶ Νικάνορα τὸν τετράρχην ἐκπέπομφ[α]σοι τὸ] | ἀντίγραφον συνχωρῶ οὖν αὐτοῖς [τὴν] Κο[ρ]ράγου [τοῦ] | Περδίκκου τῶν ἐν Γρήϊαι μετοίκων χώραν ψιλὴν, [ἦν] | [φ]ασιν εἶναι πλέθρα πεντήκοντα, ἕως ἂν συντελιῶσιν τὰς θυσίας ἐν τῷ Ἀπ[ε]λλῶναι μηνί, καὶ | τὴν ἐπιστολὴν δὲ [ἀναγράψ]ας ἔχθες πρὸ τ[οῦ] | ἐπιστασίου κτλ. — „King Philip to Archippus, greetings. I have sent you the copy of the memorandum submitted to me by the men around Nicanor, the tetrarches. I concede therefore to them arable land of Corrhagus son of Perdikkas, one of metics at Greia, which — as they say — is 50 plethra broad as long as they perform the sacrifices in the month of Apellaios. Having transcribed the letter, display it before the ‘epistasion’ etc.“.

⁵⁰ To quote only the milestones in the debate: *editio princeps* by Ch. I. Makaronas, *Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ βασιλέως Φιλίππου τοῦ Ε΄*, *Ephemeris* 1934–1935, 117–127; C. B. Welles, *New Texts from the Chancery of Philip V of Macedonia and the Problem of the Diagramma*, *AJA* 42 (1938) 245–260 (n.b. this splendid text definitely elucidating the very nature of the royal *diagramma* is completely mistaken in reconstruction of Corrhagus-position. Welles believed that the citizenship at Greia had been incompatible with the Macedonian citizenship, and for Corrhagus accepting the Greian rights would have been followed by a loss of the Macedonian citizenship; this was generally rejected in later studies).

⁵¹ Thus, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions I* (s. n. 3), 354, n. 6.

⁵² F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon*, Cambridge 1940, 7, n. 4.

⁵³ There was a subtle distinction between „residents in Aetolia“ and „residents in *polis* within Aetolia“. See: J. Rzepka, *Poleis czlnkowskie w polityce zagranicznej Związku Etolskiego w okresie hellenistycznym (Constituent Poleis and the Foreign Politics of the Hellenistic Aetolian Confederacy)*, *Przegląd Historyczny* 91 (2000) 157–180 (on 176–178). Since that article is in Polish (*and Polonica non leguntur*) I can only signal from this

The only, however notable, exception to the rule which claims absence of the ethnic Makedon/Makedones in Classical and Hellenistic documents of Macedonia is an inscription containing the donation of Kallindoia to Macedonians by Alexander the Great (SEG 36, 626)⁵⁴. The donation reflects a new foundation of Kallindoia as a *polis* of Macedonians, and as Nicholas Hammond emphasises there is nothing in the text that could hint at grant for a number of individual Macedonians⁵⁵. On the other hand, persons introduced with their city ethnic are also absent from our pre-Roman dossier. The ethnic *Makedon* and the Macedonian city ethnics (or sub-tribal labels) are more widespread abroad. With such a basis one can neither agree with nor disprove Janice Gabbert arguing that the language of citizenship in Macedonia is full of inconsistencies⁵⁶. The use of ethnics abroad was not enough precise in the better known „Greek federal states“, either. All these similarities should not drive us to conclude that ancient Macedonia was a federal state in modern categories (in truth so-called Greek federal states hardly fulfilled all our criteria of being a federal state). On the other hand, terminological parallels between Macedonia and federal sympolities show that the Greeks counted them together, as a category of states different from *poleis*. Such an assumption finds additional support in attempts by Greek authors to describe „the world of states“. The Macedonians are often classified as an *ethnos* (τὸ ἔθνος was used for „a group of men“, then „a tribe“, „a nation“ or „a people“⁵⁷). A compound *poleis kai ethne* described „the world of states“, „all the states“, also „the world of Greek states“. Although the kings are who represented monarchies in foreign relations, a somewhat more detailed composite *poleis kai ethne kai dynastai* (or *basileis*) is not equally often⁵⁸. *Dynastai* and/or *basileis* were listed together with

place a fuller treatment of the problem in my forthcoming book on the *Rights of the Cities within the Aetolian Confederacy*.

⁵⁴ [Ἄγαθά]νωρ Ἀγάθων[ος] | [ιερατε]ύσας Ἀσκληπιῶι | [Ἀπόλλ]ωνι ἀνέθη-
κεν· | [οἷδε] ἱερεῖς ἐγένοντο | [ἀφ’ οἷ] βασιλεὺς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔδωκε Μακεδόσι |
Καλίνδοια καὶ τὰ χωρία | τὰ περὶ Καλίνδοια (Agathanor son of Agathon after he had
been a priest of Asclepius dedicated to Apollo. These were priests since King Alexander
gave Kalindoia and places in vicinity of Kalindoia to Macedonians).

⁵⁵ For this document see: N. G. L. Hammond, *The King and the Land in the Macedonian Kingdom*, CQ 38 (1988) 382–391, esp. 386.

⁵⁶ See closing remarks of Gabbert, *The Language of Citizenship in Antigonid Macedonia* (s. n. 45), 11: „Even in the few inscriptions sampled here, the variety of nomenclature is daunting, often contradictory. I see no way to explain it as indicative of different classes of citizenship. The various usages may have no significance. All individuals may equally be Macedonian subjects and the variety of the language employed an example of human diversity. The conclusion must be negative: language alone does not indicate the citizenship status of any individual in Macedonia. The existing evidence, sparse though it is, contains too many contradictions“.

⁵⁷ See LSJ, s.v. ἔθνος.

⁵⁸ E.g.: Xen., *Anab.* 3, 1, 2 (ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις); Dem. 18, 271 (πόλεις ὅλαι καὶ ἔθνη); Arist. *Pol.* 1284, 38 (περὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ἔθνη). Diodorus uses *poleis kai ethne* (Diod. 16, 29, 1 τῆς τῶν ἔθνῶν καὶ πόλεων αἰρέσεως), 1 and *ethne kai poleis kai dynastai* (Diod. 19, 57, 3 Antigonus Monophthalmus invited to join his alliance τὰ τ’ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις καὶ δυνάστας) — no chronological rule (for instance, that he uses the shorter phrase in earlier books) can be established here. Polybius 5, 90, 5; 7, 9, 9 (χωρὶς

poleis kai ethne in the Hellenistic period mainly, and their presence in the lists shall mean that the federal polities were perceived to have been a distinct kind of states, separate both from the *polis* and the monarchy⁵⁹.

However, it is the right place to remember that the Greeks did not consider unnatural that the Macedonians were listed among members of the Hellenic Alliance of Antigonos Doson (*StV* 507 — esp. Polyb. 4, 9, 4: ἔτι γὰρ ἔνορκος ἔμενε πᾶσιν ἡ γεγενημένη συμμαχία δι' Ἀντιγόνου κατὰ τοὺς Κλεομενικούς καιρούς Ἀχαιοῖς, Ἡπειρώταις, Φωκεῦσι, Μακεδόσι, Βοιωτοῖς, Ἀκαρνᾶσι, Θετταλοῖς — „for the sworn alliance negotiated by Antigonos during the Cleomenic War was still in force, and included the Achaeans, Epirotai, Phocians, Macedonians, Boeotians, Acarnanians, Thessalians“). This very league consisted of acknowledged federal sympolities mainly⁶⁰ and it would go beyond the aims present paper answer all questions that this Polybian passage had posed⁶¹. It remains to stress here that, in eyes of Polybius at least, Macedonia did not look „old-fashioned in a new period of federative boom“ and Macedonians were more that just servants or simply subjects to the King. It implies some degree of sovereignty incarnated in the people of Macedonia (gathered in assembly).

Hence, if the Macedonian assembly ever existed, more or less regular, it must have recalled assemblies of Greek „federal“ states, not of *poleis*. We now can understand astonishment, with which Diodorus (or his source) emphasised working of the Macedonian state⁶² in a manner of democratic *polis* (Diod. 19, 15, 4: πάντων δὲ διασημαιομένων τὸ ῥηθὲν ὡς συμφέρον εἰρημένον συνήγε καθ' ἡμέραν συνέδριον οἰόν τινος δημοκρατουμένης πόλεως „Since all approved his proposal as made in the general interest he called a council each day like that of some city ruling itself according to democracy“). Earlier Diodorus reported a summoning of *koine ekklesia* by Eumenes (Ἐπεὶ δὲ παρεγενήθησαν εἰς τὴν Σουσιανὴν πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Εὐμενῆ, συνήγαγον ἐκκλησίαν κοινήν, ἐν ᾗ πολλὴν συνέβη γενέσθαι φιλοτιμίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς

βασιλείων καὶ πόλεων καὶ ἐθνῶν); 9, 1, 4 (πράξεις ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων καὶ δυναστών); 21, 42, 24 is equally irregular in adding „monarchs“ to „cities and peoples“. Of course, for our purposes the positive evidence, when „monarchs“ are listed alongside „cities and peoples“ is more important. Cf. the next note.

⁵⁹ See: C. Bearzot, *Il concetto di „dinasteia“ e lo stato ellenistico*, in: C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, G. Zecchini (eds.), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milano 2003, 21–44 (esp. p 24–26) and E. Vimercati, *Il concetto di „ethnos“ nella terminologia politica ellenistica*, in: C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, G. Zecchini (eds.), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milano 2003, 111–126 (esp. 121–122).

⁶⁰ Polybius recites a different catalog of the allies with the king as a member of the symmarchy in the year 207 (11, 5, 4): τούτῳ (Philip V) δ[ὲ] συμμάχων ὑπαρχόντων Πελοποννησίων τῶν πλείστων, Βοιωτῶν, Εὐβοέων, Φωκέων, Λοκρῶν, Θετταλῶν, Ἡπειρωτῶν. Newcomers in the list were Macedonian subjects — what is interesting they were listed as federal states.

⁶¹ A catalog of problems and possible solutions, as formulated by E. Will, *HPMH* I², 394–395, is still valid.

⁶² Or, rather, of its part pretending to be the whole. The passage depicts preparations of Eumenes, Peucestas and Antigenes before a campaign against Antigonos Monophthalmus in 317.

ἡγεμονίας). The opposition of *koine ekklesia* in Diod. 19, 15, 1 and a council in Diod. 19, 15, 4 could seem not enough strong, though Diodorus informed twice that meetings of the council had taken place every day (*kata hemeran* — Diod. 19, 15, 3 and 19, 15, 4). In one instance (Diod. 19, 15, 3) he disguised members of the council as the satraps and generals pre-selected (or simply — selected earlier) by the *plethos* (*the crowd*)⁶³. However, usual working of the Macedonian state, including the assemblies, did not excite curiosity of Diodorus or his source. It is also thinkable that Diodorus, source for that event, definitely Hieronymus of Cardia, was close to the very motives of Eumenes, who created the council.

The adduced evidence seems to have supported the conclusion that the Macedonian assembly — in ancient Greek eyes — was similar in structure to the assemblies of Greek federal states as the Macedonian kingdom resembled — in many important respects — these states.

7. Diodorus 16

At least one of examined „general assemblies, of the Macedonians“ that held in Triparadeisus, issued directly from a state of political turmoil. But were the remaining assemblies organised as constitutional and regular meetings of the people that had right to assemble and debate upon matters important for them own? One cannot overlook that all Sicilian evidence of *koine ekklesia* (a third of Diodorus uses of the phrase) traces back to the revolutionary situation.

This wording was used, for instance, in a passage describing a meeting of the Syracusans revolted against Dionysius II convened by Dion in 357. The general assembly, though irregular, was turned into an election, Dion and his brother were chosen *strategoí autokratores* (Diod. 16, 10, 3–4): συναγαγὼν δ' ἅπαντας εἰς κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπεφαινότο μὲν ἑαυτὸν ἤκειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐλευθέρωσιν τῶν Σικελιωτῶν, παρεκάλει δὲ στρατηγούς αἰρεῖσθαι τοὺς εὐθέτους πρὸς τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς αὐτονομίας καὶ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῆς ὅλης τυραννίδος. τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ὡσπερ ἀπὸ μιᾶς φωνῆς ἀνεβόησε στρατηγούς αἰρεῖσθαι τὸν τε Δίωνα καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Μεγακλῆν αὐτοκράτορας. — „Then having brought them all to a general assembly, he disclosed that he had come for the liberation of the Greeks of Sicily, and he urged them to elect as generals those men who were well qualified to effect the restoration of their independence and the dissolution of the entire tyranny. The crowd as with one voice cried out that it chose Dion and his brother Megacles as generals with absolute power“.

⁶³ Diod. 19, 15, 3: Εὐμενῆς δὲ φοβούμενος μὴ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους στάσιν εὐχείρωτοι κατασταθῶσιν Ἀντιγόνῳ, συνεβούλευεν ἓνα μὲν μὴ καθιστᾶν ἡγεμόνα, πάντα δὲ τοὺς προκεκριμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους σατράπας καὶ στρατηγούς εἰς τὴν βασιλικὴν αὐλὴν συνιόντας καθ' ἡμέραν βουλευέσθαι κοινῇ περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων — „Eumenes, however, fearing that through their rivalry with each other they would become an easy prey for Antigonus advised that they should not set up a single commander, but all the satraps and generals who had been selected by the mass of the army should gather in the royal tent each day and take counsel about what was to the common advantage“.

The second passage also refers to an assembly that cannot be conceived as a constitutional occasion — Diodorus presents two meetings of Dionysius' II, mercenaries who stationed at the citadel of Syracuse (a one simply as *ekklesia*, another as *koine ekklesia*). The first night assembly having been convened by mercenaries themselves was directed against Nypsius of Naples, their commander, and decided to hand over akropolis to the revolted Syracusans (Diod. 16, 18, 2: οἱ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν μισθοφόροι τοῦ τυράννου (...) συνδραμόντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαν νυκτὸς ἐψηφίσαντο παραδοῦναι τὴν ἀκρόπολιν καὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τοῖς Συρακοσίοις ἅμ' ἡμέρᾳ — „The tyrant's mercenaries, stationed on the acropolis (...) came together in an assembly at night and voted to surrender the citadel and themselves to the Syracusans at dawn etc.“). The subsequent *koine ekklesia* was called together by Nypsius to stop that decision (Diod. 16, 18, 3: ὁ μὲν στρατηγὸς Νύσιος ἐκβιβάσας τοὺς στρατιώτας, κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγὼν καὶ διαλεχθεὶς οἰκείως τοῖς παροῦσι καιροῖς, προθύμους κατεσκεύασε πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας κινδύνους — „the general Nypsius, after disembarking his soldiers, held a general assembly, presented arguments suitable to the occasion and won the support of the men to meet the perils in store“). I believe that it would be unwise to overestimate contrast between *ekklesia* of mercenaries and *koine ekklesia* summoned by Nypsius. Rather, a difference is mere nuance, and Diodorus used the term under discussion to stress that the assembly was now attended by the new troops that had come with the general.

The third example of Sicilian „general assemblies“ in Diodorus is again an account of revolutionary movements and depicts a take-over of Rhegium by Timoleon in 344 (Diod. 16, 68, 5: καὶ τῶν Ῥηγίνων συνεργούντων τῷ Τιμολέοντι καὶ κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει συναγαγόντων καὶ περὶ συλλύσεως δημηγορούντων κτλ. — „when the people of Rhegium called a general assembly in the city and staged a debate on the subject of a settlement etc.“). Plutarch, while describing the same event, uses a simple form *ekklesia* (Plut., *Tim.* 10, 4; 11, 1).

The fourth and last Sicilian episode to be adduced here, another scene from the history of Timoleon resembles in its most important respect the story of Dion's dealing with *koine ekklesia*. It also revokes the „Phocian and allied“ *koine ekklesia* from the same book of Diodorus (16, 32, 2). Diodorus (16, 78, 2) writes again about a general assembly of citizens and mercenaries, and allies as well (εὐθὺς οὖν τοὺς τε μισθοφόρους καὶ Συρακοσίους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους συμμάχους ἀθροίσας καὶ κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν συναγαγὼν παρώρμησε τοῖς οἰκείοις λόγοις τὰ πλήθη πρὸς τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὄλων ἀγῶνα — „He assembled his mercenaries immediately, together with the Syracusans and his allies, called a general assembly, and encouraged the crowd with appropriate words to face the decisive struggle“). The participants of this meeting belonged thus to categories that did not match up one another (mercenaries — Syracusans — allies).

8. Summary of conclusions

Having collected all Classical (or coming not from Christian sources of Late Antiquity) attestations of the phrase *koine ekklesia*, I can divide them into three groups:

1. Regular federal assemblies (the Acarnanians in Diodorus; the Aetolians in Proclus; the Etruscans in Dionysius of Halicarnassus)

2. Meetings of „the Allied“ in symmachies (the Phocians in Diodorus; the Greeks allied against Persia in Plutarch’s *Life of Aristides*)

3. Irregular meetings of a crowd in turmoil (Sicilian general assemblies as listed by Diodorus, Iphicrates’ soldiers in Polyaeus, and — quite likely — the Capuans as well).

The mention of the Lacedaemonian *general assembly* cannot be catalogued in any of the three groups — a use of the phrase *koine ekklesia* for a regular meeting of the assembly in a city-state is exceptional. None of the known Macedonian assemblies can be catalogued in the second category. The remaining two face us with a dilemma. If all Macedonian *koinai ekklesiai* were counted among constitutional irregularities⁶⁴, some equation that I (and others) postulate between federal sympolities and the Macedonian realm would be nonsense.

Therefore, two main groupings of the phrase *koine ekklesia* in Diodorus are Hieronymus-based *Histories of Successors* (Books 18–20)⁶⁵ and *Res Siciliae* in Book XVI⁶⁶. The unusual concentration of occurrences in a few books only indicates that in each case the wording was borrowed from the sources that Diodorus followed. On the one hand, this conclusion does not mean an attempt to deprive Diodorus the glory of having written *Bibliotheca* with some literary talent and stylistic uniformity. On the other hand, it could be noted that the Classical events disguised as *koine ekklesia* apart from Diodorus, may have been also borrowed from a source that he used for the Books

⁶⁴ See e.g. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens* (s. n. 3), 196–205, who agrees that there were Macedonian assemblies, but argues that they were uneven and tumultuous events.

⁶⁵ My conclusion that Diodorus was heavily indebted to Hieronymus also as far as the diction is concerned agrees with more recent studies: P. A. Brunt, *On Historical Fragments and Epitomes*, CQ 30 (1980) 477–494, 478 and Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (s. n. 27), 263–281. However, borrowing of some parts of the text do not exclude independent composition of other portions of the same work. It is neatly shown by C. Rubincan, *Did Diodorus Siculus take over the Crossreferences from his Sources?*, AJP 119 (1998) 67–87.

⁶⁶ The sources of Diodorus 16 are fiercely discussed. Modern students often contradict themselves, as Hammond (*The Sources of Diodorus XVI*, CQ 31 [1937] 79–91, continued in 32 [1938] 137–151, see esp. 150–151) considering Diodorus *a careless and unintelligent compiler of a compendious narrative* (p. 79) and drawing a highly complicated list of sources exploited by Diodorus in his Book 16 (see esp. p. 150–151). According to Hammond, Diodorus’ source for Sicily was Theopompus, which view was rightly criticised by R. J. A. Talbert, (*Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily 344–317 B.C.*, Cambridge 1975, 22–38), who however unconvincingly argues for Timaeus as a source of Diodorus on Timoleon (esp. from 16, 65 to 16, 90). Diodorus’ use of Timaeus for *Sikelikiaka* was also defended by K. Meister, *Die sizilische Geschichte bei Diodor von den Anfängen bis zum Tod des Agathokles*, München 1967, 120–129. T. A. Tonni, *Problemi di fonti nei libri XVI e XVII di Diodoro*, in: E. Galvagno, C. Molè Ventura, *Mito storia, tradizione: Diodoro Siculo e la storiografia classica*, Catania 1984, 65–75, esp. 69–73 sees Diodorus’ source in Diyllus. E. I. Mc Queen, *Diodorus Siculus: The Reign of Philip II. The Greek and Macedonian Narrative from Book XVI*, Bristol 1995, 8–14 argues for Diodorus’ intense use of Ephorus, for events in mainland Greece, at least. H. D. Westlake, *The Sicilian books of Theopompus’ Philippica*, in: H. D. Westlake, *Essays on the Greek Historians and Greek History*, Manchester 1969, 226–250: 248–250 argues that Diodorus used Ephorus for the history of Dion (convincingly, cf. next note), and another source for Timoleon (this given Diodorus’ employment of *koine ekklesia* in 16, 68, 5 cannot convince me, rather I believe that one source must have been used for most of Diodorus’ treatment of Sicily’s history).

11–16 (Plutarch on Plataea, Polyaeus on Iphicrates). This, however, will remain conjectural, and sources of particular chapters in Diodorus' Books 11–16 difficult to define⁶⁷. The employment of the phrase *koine ekklesia* in Diodorus 18 and 19 must be compared with its absence from Diodorus 17. In this book Diodorus describes numerous assemblies (of the Macedonians) as well. Most likely, he did not find this wording in a description of Alexander's history he exploited.

It is, therefore, to conclude that the Macedonian „general assemblies“ were, for Hieronymus at least, quasi-federal assemblies⁶⁸. This preliminary conclusion shall give a stimulus to a further investigation in the „federative aspects of the Macedonian monarchy“ as well as in work of the Macedonian state. Such a large-scale study is certainly needed. The task, however, surpasses frames of an article-long study⁶⁹.

Warsaw University
Institute of History
Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
PL-00927 Warszawa

Jacek Rzepka

⁶⁷ Variety of examples spanning almost over two centuries from the Persian Wars to the Sacred War, over the entire Greek, *Megale Hellas* and mainland Greece included, can suggest a historian writing a general history. Thus, Ephorus of Cume is likely (but still impossible to be proven as the source behind pre-Hellenistic *koinai ekklesiai*). J. Palm, *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien. Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa*, Lund 1955, 55–60 plausibly demonstrates how Diodorus hesitated between quoting Ephorus verbatim and paraphrasing him. Palm's test-case is a papyrus fragment of Ephorus (*P.Oxy* 1610 = Ephorus, *FGrHist* 70 F 191). It is worth noting that Diodorus' text is especially close to the portions of the Ephorus' papyrus referring to institutions. On the other hand, K. S. Sacks, *Diodorus and his Sources. Conformity and Creativity*, in: S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, 213–231, 216–219 is able to show that Diodorus himself changed more abstract constructs of Ephorus. Of course there is a problem of Timoleon dealing with *koine ekklesia* in 342. Most likely, Ephorus' *Histories* reached beyond 356 or his sequel-maker was congenial with his language. Since his best-known follower was his son Demophilus we can assume that „the name only has changed“.

⁶⁸ Brown, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (s. n. 27), 695 argues for Hieronymus, having underestimated the growth of Greek federal states („he was too closely associated with monarchy all his life to acquire an adequate understanding of the needs and aspirations of the Greek city and league. Another capable historian, living at the same time as Hieronymus but with a different background, might have centered his interpretation on growth of the federal principle“). The present study permits the conclusion that Hieronymus understood also the federal states.

⁶⁹ This study is a part of the research project 2 H 01 G 02525 financed by the *Polish State Committee of Scientific Research*. However, the work on it had been initiated already in 2003 during a research stay at Rome, possible due to a scholarship, generously granted to me by The Foundation of Lanckoroński de Brzezine. It is also my pleasant duty to express my gratitude to Prof. Włodzimierz Lengauer, Prof. Peter Siewert, Prof. Nicholas V. Sekunda, Dr Marek Węcowski and Dr Aleksander Wolicki who read earlier drafts of the text and suggested significant improvement (at the same time I would like apologise for not always following their advice). I could always, at various stages of this production, profit from friendly help of Mr Tomasz Mojsik, who sacrificed much of his research trips to look for the literature I suddenly found necessary to complete this study.