Macedonian Urbanism? Cities, public building, and the character of political space in Macedonia, ca. 350–150 BC

VOLUME I: Text



Martin Gallagher
Wolfson College
Thesis accpted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Archaeology
Trinity 2023

Table of Contents

Abstract.....4

Acknowledgments.....5

Abbreviations and Conventions.....7

Chapter 1: An Introduction to the question of political space within Macedonian cities.....9
- **The nature of the problem**.....9
- **Archaeological identification of poleis**.....16
- **The status of cities within the Macedonian state**.....22
- **Political spaces and social interactions in Greek city-states**.....24
- **Macedonian Kings and Cities**.....34
- **Plan of the thesis**.....41

Chapter 2: The Public Spaces of the Macedonian heartland (Aigai, Mieza, Dion).....46
- **Introduction**.....46
- **Aigai: first city of the Macedonian kingdom**.....52
  - Topography and walls.....53
  - Sanctuary of Eukleia and agora.....60
  - The theatre and palace precinct.....71
  - The lower city.....78
- **Mieza: formative elite civic centre**.....81
- **Dion: Religious and political centre**.....89
- **Conclusions**.....94

Chapter 3: The *basileion* of Pella.....99
- **Introduction**.....99
- **Topography and the evolution of the old city of Pella (southern section and the hill/island of Phakos)**.....105
  - Pella's emergence as *basileion*.....105
  - Defining Pella as basileion.....107
  - The topography of Pella.....109
- **Public areas and the organization of space**.....114
  - The Sanctuary of Darron.....114
  - The monumental district south of the agora.....120
- **The monumental agora**.....128
- **The palace**.....144
  - Location and form.....145
  - Chronology and Function.....147
- **Conclusions**.....155

Chapter 4: Amphipolis, Kassandreia, Dēmētrias and the "new cities" of Macedonia.....159
- **Introduction**.....159
- **Amphipolis**.....165
  - Historical/Archaeological Context.....165
  - Gymnasion.....172
  - Acropolis and walls.....181

Kassandreia.....184
Historical/Archaeological Context.....184
Poteidaia and Corinth: territorial control within the walls.....188
From Poteidaia to Kassandreia: filling in the enceinte.....193
Dēmētrias.....197
History, Landscape and Surroundings.....197
Urban Development of Dēmētrias.....205
Conclusions.....215

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions.....219
Introduction.....219
Northwest Greece.....226
The Aegean Context.....234
Architecture, Space and Political History.....244

Bibliography (text).....249

Abstract

Macedonian Urbanism? Cities, public building, and the character of political space in Macedonia, ca. 350–150 BC

Urbanization has long been recognized as one of main structural developments of Macedonian social life. Despite extensive research into urban development in the lands conquered by Alexander the Great and the old city-state centres of Southern Greece, Macedonia still lacks a systematic study of the phenomenon. In its absence, various views have been advanced that ultimately depend on assumptions about the nature of Macedonian urbanism.

A major rethinking now underway of Greek urban development and its local variation makes reconsideration of Hellenistic Macedonia's role within it especially pressing. As in earlier research, the main focus of this thesis is the public and political centres of cities. In common with leading new research on Greek urbanization, however, the main evidence considered is concrete material detail for the functioning of public institutions. Equally, reconsideration of the relationship of major centres to federal regions, allows a closer understanding of Macedonian political space within its Northern Greek context.

The evidence from Macedonia is uneven, mostly unpublished, and not oriented toward what is traditionally classified as civic architecture. Despite the limitations, a certain amount of data has accumulated from the duration of excavations at key sites. I consider Aigai, Mieza, Dion, Pella, Amphipolis, and Kassandreia, which afford an initial reconstruction of public space and its relationship to overall layout, with sufficient detail to appreciate local context.

My research aims to show that major centres in Macedonia developed a public architecture reflecting the political constitution of Macedon, where power depended on a relationship to the king. It also considers how political space reflected the local history, customs, and function of each city within the larger Macedonian state and its national territory. This archaeological account of Macedonian cities provides new

insights for reading the well-studied epigraphic and numismatic record of the region.

Acknowledgments

The completion of a research project on fragmentary – and sometimes difficult to access – evidence comes with the accumulation of many debts. The greatest is to my academic supervisor Dr Maria Stamatopoulou for her friendship, patience and unsparing criticism. At first as Master's student and then throughout my thesis, she has trained me to think more carefully about the difficult evidence from Macedonia and Northern Greece. I have also learned a great deal from her as a teacher, and my work under her has definitively shaped my professional development. At trying times when research with teaching work to survive financially, she remained steadfast in her empathy and support. I also had the privilege as a Master's student to work with Prof Irene Lemos on the development of Archaic Greek settlements. This was a period of great growth in my academic outlook and her guidance in evidence-based investigation of urbanization in another period has helped me to contextualize my work.

My DPhil research was generously supported by the joint Oxford Journal of Archaeology-Wolfson College Isaiah Berlin studentship, and I am exceptionally grateful to the School of Archaeology at Oxford and the Fellows of Wolfson College for making my work possible. I also already received numerous travel and fieldwork grants from the Craven Committee of the Faculty of Classics and the Ancient World Cluster at Wolfson College that enabled me to regularly spend time in the field. I am especially grateful to Prof Jacob Dahl, Prof Susan Walker and Dr Peter Barber for their leadership of the cluster, giving me ample opportunities to present my work and receive financial support for it. These grants enabled me to acquire the greatest depth of understanding of the material for my thesis and also to pursue and develop other research projects that have helped my career as a junior academic off to a solid start. The support of the Macmillan-Rodewald Studentship in the British School at Athens immensely helped the data collection and site visiting phase of my thesis.

I was able to teach a wide range of modules in Oxford that helped develop me as an Archaeologist and Classicist, and provided additional funding. In particular Dr Lydia Matthews (Worcester, Oriel), Dr Katherine Clarke (St Hilda's) and Dr Theresa Morgan (Oriel) placed a great deal of trust in me to teach their students, and I am exceptionally grateful for those opportunities. Finally, my graduate career and professional

development was enhanced by participation in University Outreach and I was inspired by the passion of Dr Mai Musie to spread interest in Classics to underserved communities.

I was lucky to spend two academic years in Athens, before matriculating at Oxford in the American School for Classical Studies at Athens and then after the first year of my DPhil in the British School at Athens. Prof Margaret Miles (UC-Irvine), Professor Clemente Marconi (NYU) and Prof Jack Davis (Cincinnati) helped me to understand my abilities and develop the specialization that enabled me to succeed in Oxford. At the British School, I learned a great deal from the regional perspective and comparative approach of Prof Catherine Morgan, and was also grateful for the exceptional friendship and advice of senior scholars, especially Prof Anthony Spawforth (Newcastle) and Prof David Braund (Exeter). I have always been made to feel at home in Greece, and experienced the legendary hospitality frequently on the road there. Prof Ioannis Akamatēs (Thessalonikē) and Dr Christos Kleitsas (Ioannina ephoreia) were exceptionally good hosts and gave me generous access to unpublished material.

At Oxford, I also benefitted from an exceptional cohort of fellow graduate students who provided collegiality, criticism and support. My graduate experience was particularly enhanced by the substantial presence of Historians and Archaeologists who were working on regional approaches to History or the History and Archaeology of Macedonia, especially Dr Aneurin Ellis-Evans, Dr Benjamin Raynor, Dr Maria Kopsacheili. The exceptional graduate and junior academic community at Wolfson College was a special source of day to day refuge. My time in Oxford would have been considerably less fun without our lunches and pub sessions and I learned a great deal from their passion and interests. I am also thoroughly grateful to my examiners Prof Dominik Maschek, Dr Maria Kopsacheili and Dr Annalies Casemier for their careful examination and incisive comments, helping me to clarify various points and overcome potential misreadings of my arguments.

Finally, I am most grateful to my family who have been with me through all the fits and starts of my dream to pursue an academic career, and have also filled in the gaps financially. The love and support of my parents, Kelly and Martin Gallagher, and my sister, Kathleen Gallagher have kept me grounded throughout.

Abbreviations and Conventions

Abbreviations follow the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed., edited by A.J.S. Spawforth and S. Hornblower, with the exception of the following:

AEph	*Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς*
AMNG III	F. Imhoof-Blumer, ed. *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands* (Berlin 1898 - 1935), Vol. III. H. Gaebler, *Macedonia and Paionia* (Berlin, 1935).
ANSMN	*American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*
Athenian Agora XIV	H. A. Thompson & R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens: The history, shape, and uses of an ancient city center* (Princeton, N. J., 1972)
Athenian Agora XX	A. Frantz*, The Church of the Holy Apostles* (Princeton, N. J., 1971)
Athenian Agora XXVII	R. F. Townsend, *The east side of the Agora: the remains beneath the Stoa of Attalos* (Princeton, N. J., 1995)
Athenian Agora XXVIII	A. L. Boegehold (ed.)*, The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure, and Testimonia (Princeton, N. J., 1995)*
Athenian Agora XXXI	M. M. Miles*, The City Eleusinion* (Princeton, N. J., 1998)
BMC VIII	B. V. Head & R. S. Poole, *Catalogue of Greek coins : Central Greece (Locris, Phocis, Boeotia and Euboea)* (London 1884)
Dēmētrias I	V. Milojčić und D. Theocharis, *Dēmētrias* (Bonn 1976)
Ephesos XIII/2	P. Scherrer & R. E. Trinkl*. Die Tetragonos Agora in Ephesos* (Wien 2006)*.*
Eretria III	C. Bérard, *L'Hérōon à la Porte de l'Ouest* (Berne 1970)
Eretria IV	C. Krause*, Das Westtor : Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen,1964-1968* (Berne 1972)
Eretria VIII	P. Ducrey, I. Metzger & K. Reber*, Le quartier de la Maison aux mosaïques* (Lasaunne 1993)
Eretria X	K. Reber, *Die klassichen und hellenistichen Wohnhaüser im Westquartier* (Lausanne1998)
Ergon	*Το έρβασγον της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*
I.Beroia	L. Gounaropoulou and M. Hatzopoulos, *Ἐπιγραφὲς Κάτω Μακεδονίας. Α' Ἐπιγραφὲς Βεροίας*. Athens, 1998.
Kerameikos X	W. Hoepfner*, Das Pompeion und seine Nachfolgerbauten* (Berlin 1976)
Locri Epizefiri I	M. B. Bagnasco et al.*, Richerche nella zona di Centocamere* (Firenze 1977).
Milet I, 7	H. Knackfuss & H. Rehm*, Der Südmarkt und die benachbarten Bauanlagen* (Berlin, 1924)
Mionnet	T. E. Mionnet*, Description de médailles antiques, grecques et romaines.* 6 tom. [with] Recueil des planches [and] Suppl. 9 tom. (Paris 1806–37)

New Pauly	H. Cancik and H. Schneider, eds. *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World. Antiquity* (Boston, 2002–2010)
Olynthus VIII	D. M. Robinson & J. W. Graham, *The Hellenic House* (Baltimore, Maryl. 1938)
Olynthus XII	D. M. Robinson, *Domestic & Public Architecture* (Baltimore, Maryl. 1946)
Prakt	*Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*
Sear	Coins in the collection of David Sear, a private collector (http://www.davidrsear.com/index.html)
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
SNG Alpha Bank	*Νόμισμα Ελληνικόν. Η Συλλογή της Alpha Bank* (Athens 2007)
SNG Copenhagen	*The royal collection of coins and medals, Danish National Museum* (Copenhagen 1943–1986)

Ancient names are used except when there is a common English equivalent, e.g. 'the Athenians' instead of the 'Athenaioi', 'Cassander' rather than 'Kassandros' but 'Kassandreia'. References to the *ΑΔ* are Χρονικά unless noted otherwise. Figure and plate numbers are given when they are not included in the ordinary pagination, or for emphasis.

Chapter 1: An Introduction to the question of political space within Macedonian cities

The nature of the problem

The question of public space in Macedonian cities from ca. 350 to 150 BC intersects with and involves a number of persistent trends in Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, some of which are divergent. For a long time, urbanization has been recognized by historians as one of the key features of the period, with Philip II as its instigator (on the authority of Arrian, see p. 22–3, below).[1] In a recent handbook, Errington mentions 'the continuation of the process of urbanization begun under Philip II and further developed under Kassander' as a principle feature of Hellenistic Macedonia.[2] At the same time, however, the primary mode of civic life in Classical Greece, administration based on city-state (*polis*) centres, has often been thought to be in decline.[3] A more archaeological approach, but still dependent on literary sources for the interpretation of archaeological evidence, suggested that the principal features of Greek urban life were established in the Classical polis.[4] In traditional accounts, these aspects (physical and otherwise) took a regular and repeated form in the course of the Classical period, only to be (usually over-) embellished and sometimes

1 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 63–8; Rostovtzeff 1941, 251–2.
2 Errington 2008, 103–4 (quote from 103).
3 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927]62–7; Gruen 1984, 133–42; Cawkwell 1996.
4 Martin 1951, 309–75, 543–5; Id., 1974 [1956], 84–126, 253–86, 332–4; Wycherley 1962 [1949], 1–27, 50–71; Owens 1991, 51–73.

corrupted in Hellenistic times.[5] One must now reassess the historical view, based on the pioneering epigraphic work of Louis Robert[6] along with the more recent work of Gruen and the *Copenhagen Polis* project,[7] both suggesting the vitality of the polis well beyond the Hellenistic period. The archaeological study of urbanism has been, until very recently (see p. 20–1 below), based on a very small number of cities, with evidence imported from later periods to demonstrate supposedly Classical phenomena, and at times outright confusion of questions and chronology.[8]

The consistent orbit of these questions is around the problem of Macedonian urban development, how much it was a feature of the Hellenistic period and how far it marked a departure from the precedent of Classical Greek cities. Hatzopoulos has transformed the discussion with his argument that Macedonia had *poleis* as early as the Late Archaic period, and has also considered their history in site-based rather than strictly regional terms.[9] The entry of Hatzopoulos and Paschidēs in the Copenhagen *Inventory* suggests that there were seventeen such centres

---

5 Martin 1951, 382–446, 503–41, 545–6; Id. 1974 [1956], 127–85; Wycherley 1962 [1949], 27–35, 71–86; Owens 1991, 74–93.

6 Robert 1969, 42: 'The Greek city did not die at Chaironeia… nor throughout the whole Hellenistic period…*civic life* continued in the *same cadre* and with the *same ideas*' [emphasis mine]. Gauthier elaborates the point in several influential articles, *e.g.* Gauthier 1982 (repr. Gauthier and Rousset, 2011, ch. 11); Gauthier 1993. See also Ma 2000, with Gauthier 1987 (repr. Gauthier and Rousset 2011, ch. 13). The 'end of the classical city' is now considered a subject for Late Antique history (Ward-Perkins in *CAH*[2], 1998, 371–382).

7 Gruen 1993; Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 19–20, with earlier references.

8 Lawrence 1950, already notes that Wycherley (1962 [1949]) ignores the more robust Hellenistic evidence, whilst the bulk of his examples and nearly all of the illustrations pertain to this period. Wycherley (*ibid.*, 74–5) and Martin (1951, 401–4) date the agora of Priene to the fourth century BC. We can perhaps overlook these as honest mistakes of early research, but when Owens (1991, 75–77) suggests that Kassopē, which he calls 'Kassopeia', was founded and laid out in the third century, he apparently confuses these events with the date of major public monuments. See further Dickenson 2012, 24–37.

9 Hatzopoulos 1996, 108–23; Hatzopoulos 2011.

west of the Axios River in the Classical period.[10] Hatzopoulos' point of departure, that Thucydides describes Macedonian cities under siege, and therefore that they had some type of fortification, is not entirely convincing because fortifications are not connected exclusively with polis-centres in the Ancient Greek World.[11] He engages at times with archaeological questions, especially the identity of sites and location of territorial boundaries,[12] but his claim that the archaeological record confirms the emergence of poleis in pre-Hellenistic Macedonia cannot be sustained.[13] At present, there are only two sites in Macedonia west of the Axios River[14] with potentially public architecture that is pre-Hellenistic, Aianē[15] and Methonē[16] (see fig. 1 for locations of sites mentioned in Macedonia). It is unfortunate that we cannot trace development forward at either of these sites because of the absence of evidence for Hellenistic building and the erosion of later evidence on the apparent acropolis of Methone. The evidence of archaeological survey (extensive and intensive) suggests a movement of people, or a

10 Hatzopoulos and Paschidēs 2004.

11 Note 9; Hatzopoulos 1996, 103, explains this use of Thucydides: 'Evidence from Tymphaia, Orestis, Derriopos, Lynkos, Elemia and Eordaia attests to the permanence of the old style of political organisation, which can best be described in Thucydidean terms: a majority of unwalled villages federated into *ethne.* Recent epigraphic discoveries both in Epeiros and in Macedonia have amply demonstrated that this kind of organisation was not incompatible with a very high degree of political maturity and sophistication.' However that may be, a number of walled villages are attested in both regions; Epeiros: Hammond 1967, 659–60; Dakarēs 1971, 51, 80; Dakarēs 1972, 52, 96, 99, 102, 115 [fig. 31] 134 [fig. 22], Corvisier 1991, 219, 287; Funke, Moustakis, and Hochschulz 2004, 340; Lazarē, Tzōrtzatou, and Kountourē 2008, esp. 23–24 (images), 31–8 (text & images); Macedonia: *I.Beroia* 41; Hammond and Hatzopoulos 1982, 143; Papazoglou 1988, 181–2; Mitrevski 1996; Hatzopoulos and Paschidēs 2004, 796.

12 *Esp.* Hatzopoulos 1996, 105–23.

13 Hatzopoulos 2011, 239.

14 The Axios is the traditional boundary between the Macedonian heartland and later additions to the kingdom (*cf.* Hdt. VII, 123.3). Because of fluctuating border, it is difficult to establish how far urban development east of the river was Macedonian, and in any case it is mainly confined to Greek colonies.

15 Karamētrou-Mentesidē 2008, 27–35, with plans and figures.

16 Besios and Tziphopoulos 2010, 105–15.

comparative rise in population there from the fourth century BC, at the same time as the shift in political and military narratives from Southern to Northern Greece.[17] This evidence should be weighed against the uneven coverage and differences in methodology, especially between extensive and intensive surveys, and considered in light of site-based research, which also takes on the surrounding landscape.

Equally important for our understanding of the place of Macedonian urbanization within Greek History is Hatzopoulos' suggestion that Macedonian cities developed autonomous polis-oriented institutions in the late Classical period. He prefers a date in the reign of Philip II, but Lane Fox has expressed skepticism.[18] Elsewhere in the Greek World, especially in Asia Minor, Hellenistic inscriptions show the exercise of local prerogatives, including cities waging war with one another, [19] agreeing arbitration of disputes by judges from another city,[20] and exercising influence over religious practice. Though important evidence for the last of these has been adduced from Dēmētrias, civic officials, such as the *politarchai* in Amphipolis, represent a royal institution, with local officials

17 Bintliff 1997, 1–17, with figs. The weakness of Bintliff's model is that it is based only on survey data, and Macedonia has not benefitted from this methodology as much as other parts of Greece. What surveys have occurred in Macedonia focused on Bronze Age (and earlier) sites, *e.g.* Andreou and Kotsakis 1994; Kokkinidou and Trantalidou 1991 (covering Langadas, northeast of Thessalonikē and Western Macedonia). Hammond's (1972) extensive survey did cover all of Macedonia. Nevertheless, it provides a useful hypothetical starting point for considering the excavation data from Northern Greece (C. Morgan, *pers. comm.,* October 2013).

18 Hatzopoulos 1996, 51–165, Id. 1997, Lane Fox 2011, 376–83, with further bibliography.

19 Ma 2000.

20 Crowther *e.g.* 1993; 1995; 1996, 2006, 2006) published many of the relevant texts, but see Scafuro 2014, Magnetto 2015 (online), and *ead.* 2018 for recent assessments and earlier bibliography.

probably appointed by the king.[21]

Compared to the important discussions of Macedonian political institutions based on the fresh treatment of epigraphic evidence, including newly published material, there is a notable lack of comparable attention to the archaeological record. The importance of material evidence for these institutions is clear at various points in Hatzopoulos' work, *e.g.* the claim that Macedonian political centres were Greek-style *poleis* (as above), that palaces were the meeting place of king and city,[22] and that Macedonian cities served complimentary functions in the kingdom.[23] In particular, whether it is appropriate to consider Macedonian cities as states (as the word *polis* implies) would be enhanced by analysis of the spaces where local officials would have congregated. For the emergence of cities in Macedonia, their relationship with Classical Greek poleis, and with contemporary Greek cities in the larger *oikoumenē*, an archaeological synthesis is badly needed.

Miller's study of Macedonian Architecture from the early 1970s examined fundamental aspects of its style, and buildings then known, which included the palace at Aigai and monumental houses at Pella.[24] The overwhelming bulk of material that could then be considered consisted of tombs and free-standing monuments, with much of the latter found outside of Macedonia. With this evidence, the nature of public space in the region could not yet be considered. Her thesis was never published,

21 On Dēmētrias, see the somewhat contrasting interpretations of Kravaritou 2012, 271–2 & Mili 2015, 201–3. For Amphipolis, see Errington 2007.
22 Hatzopoulos 2001.
23 Hatzopoulos 2013.
24 Miller 1971.

and is not extensively cited in historical or archaeological scholarship. Nonetheless, together with her subsequent scholarship and newer editions of leading architectural handbooks, it remains indispensable for questions of Macedonian style, which are broached as necessary but do not feature prominently below.[25] Some recent historical theses have endeavoured to incorporate archaeological evidence, but they overlook or confuse important details.[26] Finally, Kopsacheili's admirable study of palaces brought together important details for the built manifestation of the *basileia* institution from mainland Greece and the Hellenistic East, but her focus prevented much treatment of the relationship of palace and public space, a *topos* in Macedonian studies.[27] The benefit of this body of work is the robust context provided for attaining the functional appreciation of societal structure, which is a desideratum of modern settlement archaeology.[28]

No one would dispute the major development of cities in Late Classical and Hellenistic Macedonia, but in what sense does this correspond to the emergence or embellishment of Greek *poleis* in the region? Radically different answers are on offer. If we accept Hatzopoulos' view, the apparently civic language of Macedonian foundation myths and Thucydides' testimony about sieges of Macedonian centres suggest that the later evidence is merely the physical manifestation of what became a lived reality in Late Archaic or Classical

25 Makaronas and Miller 1974; Miller 1982; Pollitt 1986, 240,42; Lawrence 1996, 156–9, 185–6.
26 *E.g*. Boehm 2011 and Raynor 2015.
27 Kopsacheili 2013.
28 See further in the methodological section below.

times.[29] On the other hand, Papadopoulos has suggested that Philip II and Cassander transformed Macedonia from a collection of inward-looking villages on the fringes of the Greek world to a world of 'mega-cities', having nothing to do with the *poleis* of the Greek heartland.[30] Implicit in Papadopoulos' reading is that these new mega-cities 'were the product of a political system that stands in stark contrast to the seemingly stable and successful polis.'[31] Since earlier evidence is elusive, the question can only be asked in the Hellenistic period: does the physical evidence for political space reflect traditions of localism congealing into independently functioning local centres? This question presupposes: a) that in normal circumstances, Greek city-states built a public environment reflective of their administrative constitution, and b) that there is a distinction to be drawn between localism and functional independence. These presumptions are engrained into discussion of Greek cities, but the second is especially prominent among scholars who study states at the periphery of Classical Greek political history, and is clarified by embracing a broader range of settlement studies.[32] Traditional approaches are in fact not wholly adequate to understanding urbanization in a range of Greek states, especially those with substantial interfaces, and I consider below a more suitable approach that shapes my treatment of Macedonian cities.

In this chapter, I introduce the problem of Macedonian public space in the

29 Hatzopoulos 1996, 464–72.
30 Papadopoulos 2016, esp. 449–50.
31 Papadopoulos 2016, 436.
32 Morgan and Coulton 1997, esp. 89, 120–6.

context of historical and archaeological discussions of Greek *poleis*, or city-states. After a general introduction to the problem, I turn to a methodological discussion of approaching cities in Ancient Greece. Because the standard studies of Greek urbanism[33] date to the middle of the last century, we may be due for a methodological rethink. My suggestion is that a strictly "Weberian" approach to the subject, followed by Childe and Adams in the mid-20th century, and overly focused on set criteria has shaped discussion of Greek public space. This is particularly evinced by the influential work of the *Copenhagen Polis* project, which catalogued historical and archaeological evidence for the identification of Archaic and Classical Greek city-states.[34] At the same time, archaeologists of other periods and regions have integrated perspectives inherited from the work of Durkheim and his contemporaries, which stress the interaction of institutions to realize discrete social functions in each society.[35] This perspective avoids the criticism of Greek urban studies as excessively teleological[36] and is particularly appropriate for the combination of documentary and archaeological evidence relevant to Macedonian urbanization.

I then reconsider the background of twentieth-century approaches to Macedonian urban development, the so-called decline of the *polis*, and

---

33 I use the term "urbanism" to refer to the synchronic study of the relationship among built features in a city or cities, and "urbanization" for the diachronic process through which such features are realized. "Urban development," is a phrase that addresses the need to cover both concepts. See further on urbanism: Owen and Preston 2009, esp. 2–4; May and Steinert 2014, esp. 8–11; on urbanization: Schallin 1997, esp. 17–22; Osborne 2005. For the historiography of this terminology: Vink 1997, 112–18; Donati 2015, 270–2.

34 The bibliography of this project is available online: http://www.teachtext.net/bn/cpc/.

35 Ucko, Tringham, and Dimbleby 1972, remains fundamental.

36 Morgan and Coulton 1997, 129; Polignac 1999; Haggis 2015, 220–4.

the privileging of Classical urbanism. Modern criticism of earlier approaches is important, but as fourth-century and Hellenistic evidence has often been adduced to explain Classical urbanism, the consideration of literary sources especially in Martin's fundamental monographs[37] still has much to recommend it. It turns out that new approaches also lead to new appreciation of written sources, especially where for the organization of cities Plato emphasizes the division of labour, Durkheim's main preoccupation. Moreover, the long-standing discussion of ethnos-states, now under re-evaluation, provides meaningful resources for thinking about Macedonian built environments in their regional contexts.[38] Due to Macedonia's fundamental role in narratives of *polis* decline, Martin's conceit that transformations in public space were an index of that decline, and the more recent evocation of the relationship between political centres and social functions, it makes sense to finally study Hellenistic Macedonian urban development in its own right. I identify six politically important sites where the public core can be studied in a meaningful way: Aigai, Mieza, Dion, Pella, Kassandreia (Classical Poteidaia), and Amphipolis. Their treatment in subsequent chapters aims to be responsive to both the well-established themes of Greek urbanism and new scholarly directions. Finally, I consider the relevance of new approaches to Greek cities, which evaluate urban institutions as a way of life, and how public structures shape local identity.[39]

37 Martin 1951; Martin 1974 [1956].

38 Larsen 1968 remains fundamental, but see Beck and Funke 2005 and, on cult centres particularly, Funke and Hakke 2013, both with intervening bibliography, and Beck and Funke 2015.

39 An introduction to the project, *Die hellenistiche polis als Lebensform,* is available online: http://www.poliskultur.de/2018/07/22/the-hellenistic-polis-as-a-living-space/.

Archaeological identification of poleis

The Copenhagen symposia have included discussions of the polis as an "urban centre", but mostly with an emphasis on identifying various kinds of political architecture. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen documented five buildings they expected to find–to varying degrees–in Greek *poleis* (prytaneia, bouleutēria, ekklēsiasteria, dikasteria, stoai) and one they did not (palaces).[40] Hansen surveyed pre-Hellenistic written sources for the physical space of the polis and concluded that poleis should have houses for citizens and metics (resident aliens), extra-mural burials, sanctuaries and festivals recognizing outsiders, publicly supervised gymnasia, an agora as the social and economic centre, political meeting places, theatres and territorial boundaries. Hansen adds to his earlier catalogue (with Fischer-Hansen) the expectation of public archives.[41] He also embraced the Weberian criteria for the definition of a city: a) concentration of political activity in the urban centre, b) density of settlement with a population too large for face-to-face society, c) citizens obtaining the necessities of life from a market rather than relying on subsistence farming, d) being a "consumer-city" focused on satisfying a bureaucracy of magistrates.[42] Polis Centre collaborators sought to identify political buildings as part of their *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*.[43]

---

40 Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994.
41 Hansen 1997, 13–17.
42 Weberian criteria as understood by Hansen: ibid., 32–57
43 Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 157–1250, 1376–1381 (catalogue).

This runs the risk of a “checklist” definition of cities, and limits our chronological and regional approaches, as Morgan and Coulton note in their important response to Hansen.[44] They oppose to this a model traced to Durkheim, which sees the city as a mode of social interaction. Although the influence of Durkheim has been pronounced among scholars of other regions and periods, his perspective is little discussed among students of Greek *poleis*. The German scholarship discussed in the final section of this chapter, emphasizing the polis as a ‘way of life’ is an effort in this direction, but we should now consider some of the aspects of what this means. Cities are among what Durkheim categorises as “social facts”: ways of seeing, thinking, acting and feeling, governed by convention and acculturation. Observing such phenomena directly leads to a series of concepts representing their ideology, and it is only indirectly in their individual actualization that we can approach them as objects of study.[45] One of the criteria for explaining a social phenomenon is apprehending its efficient cause and the function it fulfills.[46] Durkheim distinguished between two kinds of social solidarity: mechanical and organic, the former referring to a body of repressive law that creates a collective personality and the latter to the heterogenous capacities that join together in a system of different and special functions united by definite relationships.[47] This is clearly the way ancient sources write about public life, as discussed further below, and the public life of the city is a subject concerning the

44 Morgan and Coulton 1997, esp. 89–90.
45 Durkheim 1938, 1–31.
46 Durkheim 1938, 89–97.
47 Durkheim 1984, 31–87.

organic type of social relationships.[48] It is also not to say that the identification of fixed characteristics will not form part of the analysis of cities, but that they should normally be related to the functioning of the city at or within a specific period of time.

In their landmark study of Mediterranean history, Horden and Purcell also criticize the role the study of towns has played in the interpretation of Ancient (and Medieval) society.[49] From an archeological point of view, their criticism of Lefebvre's notion of constructed space is most interesting. For Horden and Purcell, the unit of analysis is either too small (by failing to account for social relationships), or too large (not accounting for smaller social groups).[50] What is affected and by whom? These are of course central questions in any account of settlement change, but do they really reduce towns to mere 'addresses' that 'make nothing happen'.[51] It is easier to accept that a town is less an *explanans* than an *explanandum*, but the rarity of city life, still observable today in traditional Mediterranean villages, is precisely what makes urbanization interesting. Clearly, however, Lefebvre's abstraction of constructed space from concrete social relations is problematic in view of the move away from fixed properties in modern discussions of social space.

As Savage has suggested, help may be available from Bourdieu's later idea of 'field study'. Here, the focus is on mutual, reciprocal, and

48 For the relationship of Aristotle's and Durkheim's views on social order, see Hawkins 2014. The main difference is that whilst Aristotle is guided by a comprehensive view of human nature, Durkheim is only interested in the analysis of advanced societies (but *cf.* Verdon 1982). At the level of analyzing a given society, however, there is a greater level of correspondence.

49 Horden and Purcell 2000, 90–105.

50 Lefebvre 1991 [1974]; Horden and Purcell 2000, 93–97.

51 Horden and Purcell 2000, 98.

external relationships of social agents and the physical places where their interactions occur. On this view, physical properties of space do not *determine* social relationships, but are interdependent with them. Crucially, for the student of urbanism, physical space *marks* the social interactions that take place within it.[52] The advantage of this perspective is that it gives due attention to human agency in creating, managing, and using space, to the importance of interactions between social groups, and within networks across the landscape. Through these activities, however, a town is not merely a passive *explanandum* but plays a role in shaping how they occur. In the words of Winston Churchill: 'we shape our buildings and afterwards our buildings shape us.'[53] This framework provides the optimal basis for defining urban space.

'Urbanism is one of the most protean of terms', Wheatley famously remarked,[54] but there is little need to rehash old debates, only to recall certain concepts of interest to the present study. The first is an emphasis on "settlement archaeology", the study of space rather than individual buildings, attending to perceptions of the natural and built environment as they pertain to social structure. The settlement is the place where a community conducted its everyday affairs, and individuals pursued their social roles in a definite period of time.[55] This involves three levels of the analysis: micro (individual buildings), semi-macro (relationship of structures in the community layout) and macro (the relationship of sites on a regional scale).[56] Settlements identified as "cities" exist on a

52 Bourdieu 2000; Savage 2011.
53 House of Commons Debate 28 October 1943 vol 393 cc403.
54 Wheatley 1972, 601.
55 Trigger 1968; Tringham 1972, xix–xxii; Clarke 1977.
56 Trigger 1968, 159–61, Tringham 1972, xxii–xxiv.

continuum from proto-urban villages to modern industrial centres, reflecting a difference in scale of centralization and complexity. Urbanism, as a functional qualification, is not to be confused with either.[57]

Human evolution, and the pattern of adaptation to natural environments studied in various human sciences, has proved an invaluable tool in understanding the need for fixed resources and built facilities inherent to urbanization.[58] This takes three forms: cognitive adaptation to natural and built environments, natural selection and the formation of hierarchies, and ideological frameworks that shape the experience of space.[59] Such a perspective largely has replaced the traditional Aristotelian notion of the evolution of settlement, and essentialist division between urban and rural landscapes. It is now widely accepted that ancient communities combined hunter-gatherer and fixed agricultural society rather than moved from one to the other.

A few recurring variables may be cited briefly. Morgan and Coulton note that few would doubt the polis status of a newly discovered settlement of 50–100 ha.[60] Nevertheless, it is usually difficult to establish settlement (or territorial) extent, overall scale and concentration of buildings, size and density of populations. Much less is there any agreement that any of these variables or a consistent function provide an unambiguous index of urbanization. The problem hardly disappears in the

57 The mistake of conflating complexity, and thus civilization, with urbanism is inherent in the approaches of Weber and Childe. Within Greek Archaeology, Morris 1991 is conveniently cited as an example of mixing centralization with urbanism (*cf.* Hansen 1997).

58 Bintliff 2010.

59 Martin 1972.

60 Morgan and Coulton 1997, 91–6.

Hellenistic period, as we shall see in the case of Dion below (p. 89f.). *A fortiori*, political buildings are known from subordinate communities, including the demes of Attica and the countryside of Phoinikē, the main centre of the Chaonians.[61] The main trouble is the pre-Hellenistic focus of this project; from this vantage point it is impossible to comprehend the evolution of Ancient Greek cities. This is true from a historiographical perspective, where the *Inventory* relies heavily on seemingly endless subcategories, but has to leave off the main category of evidence for territorial states, Macedon and other Hellenistic *koina* formed in response to its growing power.[62] For the physical definition of poleis, one is still dependent for an understanding of overall space and iconic buildings, at least in the Classical to Hellenistic transition, if not a robust understanding of fully-fledged Hellenistic urbanism.

If we take the criteria of a *polis* as offered by the Copenhagen project as a starting point, we have to admit that there is no positive evidence for four of the five buildings they identify, and the evidence for stoas in public spaces is heavily weighted toward enclosed peristyles. The former are also associated with the space of Macedonian palaces, which the Copenhagen scholars think should not be found in a *polis.* Hatzopoulos' view that Macedonia featured Greek-style *poleis*, with increased political roles from mid-fourth century, appears to be ruled out.

It is thus amply clear that the traditional discussion of Greek *poleis* lacks the resources to help us determine how far Macedonian cities were functionally independent and that this task must fall to archaeological

61 Paga 2010; Bogdani 2012, 371–84.
62 See further on this problem: Pierre 2008

investigation of key sites in Hellenistic Macedonia. The response of Morgan and Coulton to Hansen's essay provides methodological direction for the archaeological identification of characteristics relevant to specific social processes.[63] These include the use of space across the site, evidence for craft specialization, monumental political architecture, signs of social stratification, inscribed documents, and the attestation of foreign trade. Due to the political and public focus of this study, not all the ground they identify is covered: *e.g.* the density and differentiation of housing. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence to consider topics such as craft specialization, social stratification, and foreign trade within the public space where reference to the evidence of domestic architecture is also appropriate. For in considering these aspects of domestic space, valuable detail about the social functioning of institutions and the elite ideologies that support them is ascertained.

For the functional appreciation of civic life I have been urging, the definition of a city should be qualitative as much as quantitative, along the lines Morley has suggested. Cities are places where one finds: a) the concentration of people and resources, b) the crystallization of forms of power, c) social and cultural integration, and d) political and class-based differentiation.[64] Consideration of public centres should be on the basis of local evidence for their use of space, political architecture, inscriptions and evidence for specialization, social stratification, and trade with attention to institutional and ideological questions. Such a procedure allows us to form a functional picture based on material evidence, before

63 Morgan and Coulton 1997, 91–120.
64 Morley 2011, 154–6.

confirming its adherence to any generic models. It is therefore much preferable than assuming such a model, which archaeological evidence is then adduced to support.

The status of cities within the Macedonian state

The frustration of traditional methodology in view of the Macedonian evidence suggests a modulated approach, based both on the expectations of cities in the Greek world and the particular constitution of Macedon. Macedon is sometimes held to have a 'Homeric' form of kingship,[65] and the influence of Athens is reflected in the mid-fourth century dedication in the Sanctuary of Eukleia at Aigai (see below, p. 59) so it is important to understand the potential of ideas coming from Archaic Greece, and from Athens. Modern research has always recognized urbanization as one the foremost developments of Macedonian social life in the late Classical and Hellenistic periods, with Philip II (359–336 BC) and Alexander the Great (336–23) cited as its chief architects. This view has the ancient authority of Arrian, who reports of how an exhausted Alexander addressed the prospective mutiny of his troops at Opis. Philip–Alexander is supposed to have reminded them–

'brought you down from the mountains to the plains; he made you a match in battle for the barbarians on your borders, so that you no longer trusted for your safety to the strength of your positions so much as to your natural courage. He made you city dwellers and established the order that comes from good laws and customs' (*Anab.* VII, 9.2, excerpted translation of P.A. Brunt).

65 Carlier 2000.

This passage is somewhat relegated by both Hatzopoulos and Lane Fox, the former to dismiss the idea that Macedonia could not have had Greek-style *poleis* in the Classical period, and the latter to reject development of political institutions under Philip II.[66] Arrian's historical context should indeed make us wary of accepting any specific historical development on his testimony alone, but the Roman senator and general's understanding of what Macedonian urbanization entailed brings us far closer to reality than the alternative of relying on modern preconceptions. The description of how Macedonians fought before the reign of Philip II is confirmed by the late-5th century witness of Thucydides (II.100). The Athenian historian recalls that when Sitalkes invaded from Thrace, the Macedonians did not attempt to defend any fixed position, but made sallies from the mountains.

More important for our purposes is the connection Arrian's Alexander makes between the move to cities and suitable laws and customs (πόλεών τε οἰκήτορας ἀπέφηνε καὶ νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσιχρηστοῖς ἐκόσμησεν). The Greek word ἀποφαίνω has political and potentially legal connotations, as when Kleon is accused of reversing the accomplishment of Themistokles making the Athenians citizens of an insignificant state (μικροπολίτας ἀποφῆναι, Ar. *Eq.* 817).[67] It means he 'declared' or even 'decreed' them city-dwellers, making them to live in that way. The next phrase goes with this, as κοσμέω fundamentally indicates the establishment of appropriate order, in this case with laws and customs typical of city-dwellers.

---

66 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.50–1; Lane Fox 2011, 381.

67 *Liddell, Scott and Jones' Greek-English Lexicon* (*LSJ*) ad loc. A.IV.2.

Demosthenes suggests that Philip's foundation of cities outside of Macedonia was transformational (and dangerous to a traditional Greek power like Athens: IV.48, I.12). A well-known passage in Justin's *Epitome of Pompeius Trogus* (VIII, 5.6) reports that Philip moved substantial parts of the population from conquered territories to augment Macedonian cities.

The legal aspects of Greek citizenship along with associated institutions are well-studied, not least by Hatzopoulos' pain-staking monograph and the work of the Copenhagen centre. At Dion, the magistracy of an *epistates* is attested already in the Classical period, a position filled by a local resident.[68] It is natural to assume that if Philip made Macedonians more like *polis*-dwellers, he would have relied on existing institutions. The full ramifications of such a change are inaccessible due to the thinness of Classical evidence, although important hypotheses have been advanced regarding military organization.[69] More can be said about the customary modes of behaviour, which are more intimately related to a study of political space. Put simply, the question is: in what sense were the lives of Macedonians within central places organized like those of Greek *polis*-dwellers?

Political spaces and social interactions in Greek city-states

68 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.372–5; *SEG* XLVIII (1998) 785; Lane Fox 2011, 379.
69 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.443–460; Lane Fox 2011d, 369–76.

Wycherley and Martin assumed that the physical enclosure of public space in the Hellenistic period marked a fundamental departure from Classical ideals.[70] As noted below, archaeological evidence now suggests the iconic embodiment of such enclosure, the fully peristyle agora, was limited in use and usually developed over time (see below, p. 121–3). If formal criteria are not as dispositive as they once seemed to scholars working with a far more limited sample of evidence, we can still learn a great deal from how their study of written sources adds depth to our understanding of Greek public spaces in use. Martin in particular offered the most detailed treatment. Such an approach is more informative for understanding the function of space than lists of what building types have been identified at sites across the Greek world. Raaflaub suggests that written sources should compliment archaeological evidence to provide 'the history of the relationship between people and communities.'[71] In line with the Bourdieusian perspective outlined above (p. 16–7), however, this is only an intermediate step in my analysis. It is finally the task of the archaeologist to show how the regional specificity and diachronic detail of material evidence can lead to a thicker description, and sometimes even allow us to understand the textual evidence differently. We can then ask the functional question: how does the appearance and role of cities in Hellenistic Macedonia fit the way other Greeks seem to have thought about urban life?

In Hesiod's *Theogony*, it was in Pieria, cradle of Macedonian civilization (see Chapter II, below), that Zeus lies with Mnemosyne

70 Wycherley 1962 [1949], 83; Martin 1951, 375; *Cf.* Dickenson 2012, 25–6.
71 Raaflaub 1993, 43.

(Memory) for nine consecutive nights, giving birth to the nine muses (53–62). Chief among them is Kalliope who, on behalf of Zeus, ordains kings with sound judgment (ἰθεῖα δίκη), speaking surely in the assembly (ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύων), so that they settle even the most difficult disputes with ease, prevailing by the power of persuasion (79–90).[72] Homer's Odyssey (VI.262–7, VII.43–5) speaks of the agora as fundamental–along with well-girded walls–to the vision of the city, describing the agora of heroes in the idealized town of Scheria, with its deep stone foundations.[73] Ithaka also has an agora, where a political council of elders meet, positioned away from Odysseus' house and near the harbour (*Od.* II.10, 26–35; XXIV.420).[74] What emerges from these early accounts is the public space as a place embedded with the characteristic activity of king and civic elites.[75] At the same time, there is the more negative portrayal as a place of legal wrangling and trade, where brothers dispute their inheritance, leaders devour bribes and pass crooked judgments, and everyone is corrupted by the luxury of foreign spices and fabrics (Hes. *WD*, 30–41, 220–4; *cf.* 630–40).[76] The public space reflects both the promise of the city and the seed of its destruction, but the former is more common, with a thread of associations of Δίκη and ἀγορά running throughout the Archaic texts of Archilochos, Theognis, Tyrtaios and Solon. The agora is identified as the place of public assembly *par excellence*, with Archilochos (fr. 16; the oldest of these sources) especially

72 Martin 1951, 151–3; See now Scully 2015, 31–49, Clay 2016, with earlier references.
73 Scully 1990, 46–47.
74 Scully 1990, 101–3.
75 Martin 1951, 28–31.
76 Martin 1951, 153–6.

emphasizing the agora as a place for the mustering of troops (which is also implied at *Theog.* 247).[77]

Classical authors develop the concept of justice and aristocratic rule in the agora, with spatial connotations. Pindar's third *Nemean* ode (14–20) specifies that the agora of Aegina is a place of honour and commemoration for its ruler; the excellence in victory of the city and its leader are explicitly associated with the agora itself.[78] Aeschylos' *Seven Against Thebes* (271–5) describes the city's gods as those who protect the citizens and their agora. The same poet's phrase 'the gods of the heavens and the agora' (*Ag.* 90; *cf. Septem* 271–2) picks up the Hesiodic association of divine and human justice in the political space. Zeus takes the epithet *Agoraios* in the *Eumenides*, representing the triumph of justice in Athens' mythical prehistory, and the centrality of the marketplace as a venue for settling disputes.[79]

As kings are mostly confined to the mythical past for Archaic and Classical Greek *poleis*, and occasional periods of tyranny, internal contest and strife is a recurring characteristic of the civic centre. The agora as an elite centre was a place of contest for competing elites and–from the late fifth century–commemorating the results of that competition, which often unites the political and religious functions of the space. This includes probouleutic (*i.e.* involving political deliberation), judicial and commemorative roles.[80] The agonistic function–in Martin's view–arose directly from the political and religious character of the space, as powerful

77 Martin 1951, 156–8.
78 Cf. Smith 2007
79 Martin 1951, 181–6.
80 Martin 1951, 204–17.

families fought for the commemoration of heroic ancestors and the ancestral cults also associated with kin groups. This is particularly well-known from Thasos, where Martin and now Grandjean have suggested the Herakleion competed with the ultimate agora to become the civic centre.[81] In this specific connection, various civic deities were common in the agora in addition to Zeus Agoraios, along the lines of Aeschylos' ἀστυνόμοι θεοί (*Ag.* 88 cf. *Septem* 271-2), who protected the city and governed city life.[82] These include manifestations of Artemis, Apollo and Hermes associated with the agora, liminal space, political counsel and the heroic lineage of elite families.[83] It is notable in connection with the last that a heroön is an iconic–and often quite early–indication of the public space.[84]

Apart from deliberate foundations abroad, some of the earliest Greek agorai were found on defensible hills, with a resulting enlongated flank-like organization entailing limited access via a winding path.[85] Some of the most common buildings were theatre-like structures for public assembly and sanctuaries: unsurprising given the deliberative and religious function of public space suggested by literary and epigraphic sources. Athens reflects this trend in its early hall building and temples on the west side of the agora.[86] In the Classical period, Athens deployed socially significant art and architecture throughout the agora to develop

81 Martin 1978.

82 *LSJ* ad loc. 'ἀστυνόμος', definition A.

83 Martin 1951, 186–94.

84 Martin 1951, 194–201.

85 Martin, 225-9.

86 The traditional interpretation of the hall building as the 'old boulēterion' was questioned by Miller, who instead sees it as an earlier *Metroön*. There is no evidence for the seats shown in reconstructions (*cf.* fig. I.1), (limited) small finds are consistent with Miller's interpretation, but there is no decisive evidence as arguments are based on two narrow trenches.

what Hölscher has called ‘the political activation of space’, reflecting its particular civic identity and hegemonic status in the Greek world.[87]

The influence of Athens is immense, especially in the development of the agorai as commercial spaces, and the greater elaboration of political functions. Along with the judicial, political and religious connotations in Aeschylos, Herodotus begins to mention the agora as a place of market throngs, and leisurely gatherings. The term ‘ἀγοράζω’ is first attested in this period to designate the activity of frequenting the agora, usually in an unfavourable light.[88] Aristotle was so concerned about the corrosiveness of these activities that he designated the need for a ‘free agora’ exclusively devoted to the traditional roles of religious and political assembly.[89] This may have happened at Thebes[90] and at Hellenistic Dēmētrias (see below), but more common in the Classical period is evidence for the division of space within the agora. The commercial function is indicated especially by the association of emporia and agorai, and the role of the latter near ports, even when this required a location outside of the city walls (Thuc. I, 62; III, 6; VI, 50; VII, 39–40).[91]

One of the signs of the elaboration of political functions in the democratic city, where the victory of the *demos* is being celebrated, is in the growth of theatral spaces and outright theatres. At Athens alone, we

87 Hölscher 2012 [2009]

88 *LSJ* ad loc. ‘ἀγοράζω’; *cf.* ‘ἀγοράομαι’ and ‘ἀγορεύω’, in use since Homer as terms indicating public speech, as well as ‘ἐκκλησιάζω᾽, coined in the Classical period to specifically connote political assembly, largely supplanting ἀγοράομαι.

89 Robert 1937, 244–5; Martin 1951279–82.

90 A place of assembly with sanctuaries of Herakles, Athena Onga and Eukleia was identified in the plain southeast of Kadmeion (Ἀρχ. Ἐφ. 1909, 121–2; *AΔ* III (1917) 121–2. By the fourth century, Xenophon attests another at the Kadmeion (*cf.* Paus. IX, 12.3; Martin 1951288–9)

91 Martin 1951, 283–5.

know of the *ekklesia* on the Pnyx hill,[92] theatres on the south slopes of the Acropolis, north of the Erechtheion,[93] and on Mounychia hill near the port of Piraeus.[94] Shortly after 450 BC, construction of the Hephaisteion began behind (west of) the earlier structures, and (ca. 430–20) the small temples east of the hall building were replaced by the construction of the Stoa of Zeus (Eleutherios), and perhaps a terrace wall connecting the two buildings, creating a two-tiered complex. It was furthered elaborated in the fourth quarter of the century, with a "new" bouleterion next to (north of) the hall building and the Tholos to the east. These buildings were now united by connecting walls creating an independent square within the agora for the most important political buildings. Nevertheless, important judicial functions occurred in the northeastern part of the agora, and the first "South Stoa", contemporary with the Stoa of Zeus, was apparently a dining hall for public officials. Commerce and congregation of large crowds occurred throughout the agora, and the later account of Athenaios probably well captures its feel in the Classical period: 'You will find everything sold together in the same place at Athens: figs, summoners, bunches of grapes, turnips, pears, apples, witnesses, roses, medlars, haggis, honeycombs, chickpeas, lawsuits, puddings, myrtle, allotment machines, lambs, water clocks, laws, indictments' (640bc).

Although elements of civic identity and even particular buildings and institutions can be traced to Homer and Hesiod, the systematic thinking about the physical organization of cities cannot be detected before the

92 *Hesperia* I (1932) 90–217.
93 *Hesperia* XV (1946) 97–102.
94 McDonald 1943, 44–61; Martin 1951, 289–90.

fifth century BC. Herodotus (III, 60) praises the Samians for three great engineering marvels: the aqueduct of Eupalinos, the breakwater allowing for its port and the great temple of Hera. Thucydides (I, 10; II, 15), though, offers the best sense of Classical thought regarding the growth of cities, and it is tied up with the idea of *synoikismos* (synoikism, or the joining of communities).[95] The scholarly consensus rejects the historicity of Theseus' synoikism of Athens, but Thucydides takes it for granted and the main point is that in the late fifth century, the Athenians believed this to be the cause of their growth. The historian specifies that Theseus required the abolition of the councils [*boulēteria*] and magistracies [*archai*] in the villages of Attika and established a boulēterion and *prytaneion* [executive council chamber] in the centre of Athens. This move, and the payment of taxes to the central state, made Athens great (according to Thucydides, II, 15.2).[96] Aristotle (1252a1–24; 1253a1–19) similarly regards the city-state as the community (*koinōnia*) formed of several villages that is politically self-sufficient with a view to the advantage of its citizens and the administration of justice among them. Humanity is distinguished in this kind of community by the faculty of speech, which affords argument about and discrimination between good and evil, advantage and disadvantage, and justice and injustice.

The Sophoklean hero dramatically struggles with the boundary between leadership in the city and being outside of it, where justice is impossible:

---

95 Martin, 13–15, detects an increasing politicization of the city in these texts, which would support Hölscher's perception of space becoming "politically activated" in Classical Athens.

96 Martin 1974 [1956]1974, 13–15.

365 σοφόν τι τὸ μηχανόεν τέχνας ὑπὲρ ἐλπίδ᾽ ἔχων τοτὲ μὲν κακόν, ἄλλοτ᾽ ἐπ᾽
ἐσθλὸν ἕρπει, νόμους γεραίρων χθονὸς θεῶν τ᾽ ἔνορκον δίκαν,
370 **ὑψίπολις: ἄπολις** ὅτῳ τὸ μὴ καλὸν ξύνεστι τόλμας χάριν. μήτ᾽ ἐμοὶ παρέστιος

375 γένοιτο μήτ᾽ ἴσον φρονῶν ὃς τάδ᾽ ἔρδει.

[365] Possessing resourceful skill, a subtlety beyond expectation (man) moves now to evil, now to good. When he honors the laws of the land and the justice of the gods to which he is bound by oath, [370] his city prospers. But banned from his city is he who, thanks to his rashness, couples with disgrace. Never may he share my hearth, [375] never think my thoughts, who does these things! (*Antigone*, tr. Jebb)

This chorus is a virtual handbook of good governance, displaying the poet's virtuoso precision. Similar to Herodotus' encomium for the Samians, it presents technical resourcefulness as the key to human achievement (beyond expectation), but at the same time the capacity for the extremes of behaviour noted by Aristotle. *A fortiori*, it presents these extremes as equivalent to life inside and outside of the city, both from the perspective of the civic hero (who can bring prosperity through exalted leadership, or be banished for impudence), and the city (which must administer justice to its members and expel the unjust).

New research and speculation in medicine, meteorology, mathematics, and philosophy led to theorizing about the ideal conditions of *polis* life. The Hippocratic treatise 'Concerning Airs, Waters, Places' considered health from a geographical standpoint, emphasizing the importance of salubrious breezes (neither too hot nor too cold), cleanliness of the water supply (from mountain foothills) and the produce of the land (preferably just above subsistence level). These factors affected not only physical but psychological constitution as the appropriate mean contributed to evenness of temperament and bravery.

By the mid-fourth century, such concerns were systematized in Plato's *Laws*, where the philosophical concern for virtue is explicitly tied to the physical arrangement of the city. The Athenian Stranger, Plato's main speaker, identifies the goal of the polis as making citizens as good and happy as possible, and united in mutual friendship (742d–743c). He views the Hippocratic emphasis on subsistence as an unattainable ideal, but specifies an allotment equal to a person's station and limits personal profits, with surpluses to be turned over to the State. In order to achieve these goals, the first practical consideration is the choice of site, and the Hippocratic influence is clear in his criteria: land that allows for equal land allotment with good soils, near relevant resources, with favourable winds and sunshines. To encourage fair dealing among citizens and the protection of state assets, the Stranger recommends the appointment of managers for temples, roads and buildings (*astynomoi*), markets (*agoranomoi*) and harbours (758e–760c). He also suggests the division of the surrounding countryside into districts and the appointment of land commissioners (*agronomoi*) to make regular progress throughout the landscape and identify resources for the city (760b, 761a–d). The construction of roads and waterworks should allow for the commerce of citizens, whilst hindering outside attack (761c).

The Stranger's discussion of the selection of citizens and the allotment of land uses language of settlement and synoikism, and he unites it to the founding of a settlement, bringing together two ideas that Thucydides had kept separate. They are in turn linked with a well-established metaphor used to describe Plato's intellectual project (*Sophist*

282) and good governance (*Statesmen* 281). In the crucial passage, the statesman is called upon to settle the citizens and then to organize distinct classes of workers.

After allowing that the social equality regarded as ideal is impractical in an actual state, due to the variability of the landscape, the dialogue turns to the practical considerations that will afford its approximation. The first consideration introduced is the choice of site that will allow for equal land allotment with good soils, near relevant resources, with favourable winds and sunshines. In the context of discussing suitable magistrates, he designates adminstrators of temples, the market, roads and other buildings to encourage fair dealing among the citizens (759) and the guarding of state assets. The construction of roads and waterworks should allow for the commerce of citizens, whilst hindering outside attack (761). The stranger provides for the appointment of 60 land-managers and 12 city-managers, who are required to undertake expeditions to understand the landscape of the city and its surrounding territory, both for defence and for public provisions (765).

Aristotle's *Politics*, especially Book VII, essentially follows the scheme elaborated in Plato's *Laws*, emphasizing the choice of site, the material provision of citizens, facilities for improving hygenic conditions, and the circulation between buildings.[97] Overall, he seemed more concerned to connect these concerns with the quotidian practice of political life and fully reflects a tradition of political theory that had grown frustrated with the limitations of older Greek cities. The peripatetic Ps.-

97 Martin 1974 [1956], 21–2.

Deinocrates had remarked of approaching Athens from Eleusis: ‘The road is agreeable, and the countryside is well-cultivated, with a welcoming aspect. But the town is arid, lacking water and badly organised in an Archaic manner.’[98] In a passage that still confuses scholars, Aristotle had described the method of Hippodamos to lay out private dwellings along straight streets as useful, convenient and modern for cities at peace (1330b21–27).

We should now see in the literary evidence less a technique than a practical and functional approach to the question ‘what is a city?’. The various structures associated with civic life–the theatre for public gatherings, fortifications for the defence of the city and surveillance of the territory, and the administrative centre of the agora with its council halls, archives, porticoes for judges and magistrates–provided an indispensable affirmation of polis-identity (*cf.* Thuc. I, 10.2, Paus. X, 4.1).[99] In view of the importance of public functions, Aristotle (*Pol.* 1328a) required that cities be divided into two parts, one of as common domain and the other for individuals.[100]

Literary sources thus emphasize a cluster of interactions that take place within the public space (political meeting, elite rivalry, exchange across classes and sometimes ethnic groups). The political buildings facilitating those interactions receive greatest emphasis, particularly theatres and public works (usually related to supply of clean water), and buildings connected with public officials. We should expect to find these

98 *FGH* II, 254–256; Martin 1974 [1956], 24–26.
99 Martin 1974 [1956], 30–3.
100 Martin 1974 [1956], 48.

features in Macedonian cities to the extent their political organization suggests similar roles. Macedon was, for all intents and purposes, a national and constitutional monarchy, which is to say that political authority depended on a territory composed of people believing they shared kin relationships (an *ethnos*) and also upon established customs (Thuc. II, 99.2 & 6; Arist. *Pol.* 1285a19–28, 1324b11–17; Just. *Epit*. VIII, 6.2).[101] There are two questions here: how Macedonian kingship should be characterized, and the nature of territorial organization within Macedonia.

Macedonian Kings and Cities

As Ma suggests, it is necessary to understand Hellenistic royal institutions on the basis of the diverse strategies of rule now known, in their interaction with local traditions.[102] This is no less true in the Macedonian heartland than in other parts of the *oikoumenē*. Some of the most interesting questions posed recently have concerned interactions of kings and networks of cities. Scholars usually distinguish Macedon's national monarchy from the personal empire building characteristic of Asia and later Hellenistic states.[103] Raynor suggests that the distinction between

---

101 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 51; Hammond and Walbank 1988, 180–1. The term *ethnos* has garnered much recent attention, including the challenge of some traditional views (Funke and Haake 2013; Beck and Funke 2015, with earlier bibliography). For our purposes, the main point is to understand it as a people group, dependent on a territorially delimited state, that is one whose extent expands and contracts over time. As a consequence, the identity of peoples and territory is flexible throughout history, in contrast to the Athenians/Attika, the Spartans/Lakedaimonia, and other states based upon a *polis*-centre (on this point, *cf.* Hammond 1989, 49–52).

102 Ma 2003.

103 Aymard 1950, 119–22; Borza 1990, 14–16; Carney 2000, 6–8; Hatzopoulos 2001, 192.

national and personal monarchy has been overstated,[104] but cites only Lane Fox's cogent argument against the '*primus inter pares*' view of Macedonian monarchy.[105] As Lane Fox notes, it is no longer possible to maintain a break in royal titulature, and the extreme view of Schachermayer that the Macedonian kings shared rights with landed gentry[106] is perhaps more appropriate to an early Germanic model of kingship (*cf.* Tac. *Germ.* VII).[107]

Nevertheless, a sense of national kingship still helps us understand the origins, institutions, ethnic claims and political interactions of the Macedonian monarchy, relatable to the public building studied in this thesis. Unlike the *condottieri* operating in the East, Philip II may not have perceived the need to establish an absolute personal charisma, as much as to reinforce his status via the means of aristocratic display and established court culture within Macedonia. Alexander is often (and conveniently) cited as a precedent for the emergence of a more personal monarchy (Plut. *Alex.* 51), as he found it appropriate to adopt Achaemenid ritual, inaccessibility, and (if Arrian is trustworthy) even viewed himself politically as the successor of Darius.[108] The adaptation of Macedonian kings to local circumstances was probably more important than any linear development of custom. This is perhaps suggested by the importance of Beroia as the ancestral homeland of the Antigonids, and the promotion of

---

104 Raynor 2015, 230–232.
105 Lane Fox 2011.
106 Schachermeyr 1949, esp. 323.
107 For an attempt to understand Macedonian kingship in these terms, see Granier 1931, esp. 1–3, 13–15, 49-52. *Cf.* the response of Briant 1973, 279–96.
108 Notes 102, 103, 105.

the Beroian cult of Herakles Kynagidas across Macedonia.[109]

These themes are addressed at particular sites below, but I want to sketch briefly what they mean in a more general way for Macedonian royal tradition, political institutions, ethnicity, and public interactions. Carlier's important article found that in the main Macedonian and Homeric kingship bore a resemblance, once the usual caveat about the distance between a poetic ideal and practical reality is acknowledged. For instance, there is not a parallel in accounts of Macedonian kings for the Homeric device of focusing on the character flaws of Agamemnon, Achilles, and even Odysseus.[110] As might be expected, the role of the elders and people is not sketched out in institutional terms. Nevertheless, Carlier found that the regional organization of hereditary kings in relationship to cities attested in Macedonian epigraphy has an apt parallel to the boroughs, military-political units, and pan-Achaean community in the *Catalogue of Ships* (*Iliad* II).[111] There are also common institutions of the people's assembly (*laoi/synēdrion*), close companions of the king (*hetairoi*), and the political rights of the military or the community as a whole in extreme situations.[112]

It is indicative that the question of Macedonian kings and cities hinges on the question of territorial organization and in turn on the relationship of the Macedonian administration to that of Greek federated regions (*ethnē*).[113] Although the existence of a Macedonian koinon is

109 Allamani-Souri and Voutyras 1995
110 Carlier 2000, 263.
111 Carlier 2000, 260.
112 Carlier 2000, 261, 264–5.
113 For a full treatment of this question, see now Hatzopoulos 2015.

assumed by Tarn,[114] Macedonia is mostly absent from Larsen's classic study.[115] The issue is clarified by Hatzopoulos' criticism of Larsen's denial that a *synedrion* could have existed for all of Macedonia. The qualification of Greek ethnic identity then becomes one of representation in a national council.

Larsen believed that local units of federal states could be either tribes or cities (poleis), but the latter was more common because 'the city-state was the most widely prevalent political unit among the ancient Greeks.'[116] The assumption that poleis and *ethnē* are different levels–rather than different modes–of political organization is common recent scholarship. A half-century on, this approach seems the soundest, and the question becomes in what senses state functions occurred territorially and at particular sites. Some federal states are particularly notable for the strength of the cities within them: Thessaly is a particular case, where civic coinages are known from ca. 500 BC and even small, less significant towns could grant *asylia* and *ateleia* and were responsible for policing their surrounding countryside.[117] Cities also became centres for local elite power bases and the conflicts between them as is evident from Pindar's praise of the Aleuadai for their 'careful piloting of cities' (*Pyth.* X, 72) or in Thucydides' account of Brasidas' crossing in 424 BC (IV, 78).[118] Other federal states, such as Boiotia, never developed strong central institutions

114 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927].

115 Larsen 1968. He treats only the "four Macedonian republics" formed after the Roman settlement of 167 BC (295–300) and the Hellenic League of Antigonos Doson (318–38). This compares to a larger emphasis on the antagonism between Macedon and Greek federal states (359–498).

116 Larsen 1968, xv.

117 Ibid., 20; *SIG*^{3} 55: for the relevant magistrate (the hyloros), see Arist. Pol. 1321b30.

118 Ibid., 21–2.

and were subject to the domination of a single polis.[119] The Chalcidic Confederacy is notable for forming a formidable federal state composed of Greek cities on the border with Macedonia. Nevertheless, at crucial events, stronger cities stood apart from the league (see further on Poteidaia, below), and it was at Macedonian instigation that the *anoikismos* at Olynthos provided a stable land power base.[120] It has been tempting to interpret such cities as political capitals, but the concept is probably anachronistic, and recent rethinking of the *Thersilion* in Megalopolis is instructive.[121]

Nevertheless, the question of how far Macedonia resembled other Greek federal states remains unsettled and often under-discussed, even though it must lie beneath the surface of any discussion of Macedon's constitutional arrangements. The phrase κοινὸν Μακεδόνων is scarcely attested in contemporary sources for the Hellenistic period, although it appears in the later narratives of Alexander the Great (Arr. *Anab.* VII, 9.5; Diod. Sic. XVIII, 4.3).[122] The main evidence for this institution comes from inscriptions in its name paying honour to Philip V set up at Samothrace and Delos.[123] Politically, this involved the association of myriad communities into a regional community or league (*koinon*) often focused upon a sanctuary as a central meeting place. If a polis may be straight-forwardly defined as a political centre with a surrounding and dependent

---

119 Ibid., 31–8; Psoma 2011.

120 Ibid., 58–66.

121 As the meeting place of the Arkadian Confederacy : Braunert and Petersen 1972, 79–87; *Contra:* Tsiolis 1995, 57–67 & Roy 2007, 291–2.

122 Hammond and Walbank 1988, 483–4. Individual Macedonian tribes also were described as *koina*, but their discussion is beyond the scope of my research.

123 *Hesp.* 48 (1978) 16, *SIG* 575; see also Hammond 1980, 461–76.

chora, *koina* are notoriously more difficult to circumscribe, as they involve various kinds of more and less formal political relationships. One thing is especially clear, namely that the formality, power and influence of such leagues grew immensely during the Hellenistic period, perhaps in response to the Macedonian dominance. Scholars long have distinguished between the *Staatenbund*, an alliance such as the Peloponessian League or the League of Corinth, and the *Bundesstaat*, or the Federal State proper.[124] Arrian's report of Spartan hesitancy in joining the League of Corinth, because the Lakedaimonians had never been party to a military alliance they did not lead, shows the sacrifice of authority inherent to the *Staatenbund*. Member states ceded the power to determine military strategy, the manner of coming to terms with their enemies and could be invaded by their allies in the case of revolt. After the death of Philip, Alexander's mere appearance convinced potential defectors to rejoin his cause. Nevertheless, at least in theory, members of such alliances remained sovereign states.

In the century and a half leading up to the Battle of Chaironeia (338 BC), when Philip II resoundingly defeated the unified forces of southern Greece, Greece had been led by a succession of hegemons: The Delian League against Persia, the Athenian Empire, the Spartans, the Thebans and then a new Athenian League. What changed was the speed at which potential revolts could be addressed, although Alexander eventually gave up on the Spartans and the ability to control allies varied much over the course of the Hellenistic period. The spurious misunderstanding that the

124 For an introduction, see Funke 2007, with earlier bibliography.

rise of Macedon led to the ‘end of Greek freedom’ is based on an uncritical appropriation of Athenian orators and does not warrant any further reflection. The overwhelming majority of Greek states had not experienced true independence since the Early Archaic period.

It was out of the fertile ground of the Greek tradition of *Staatenbünde* that the Hellenistic *Bundesstaat* emerged, when Philip II assumed hegemony over the Thessalian League, followed by every Macedonian king until Philip V lost the territory in 197 BC. Albeit more sporadically, the Molossian monarchy exercised a similar leadership over the Akarnanian League, and more directly controlled the Epeirote leagues such as the Thesprotian and the Chaonian until their dissolution in 234/3.[125] Likewise, Antigonos I, unable to reconstitute the League of Corinth, created various territorial leagues in Ionia, Aeolia and the Cycladic islands.[126] Although lacking in constitutional authority, such leagues represented the authority of the king to control regions in question. In response, leagues in Achaia, Aitolia, Akarnania, Arkadia and Boiotia were revived or created and grew in prominence throughout the Hellenistic period.

At the same time, various cultural factors and political institutions were at work, which played a role in promoting pan-Hellenic unity, perhaps working toward Alexander’s purported goal of creating a commonwealth of Greeks and Persians. The first was the influence of Aristotelian philosophy (in the case of Philip and Alexander), and then

125 Hammond 1991.
126 Billows 1990, 144-145, 220–230.

Platonism and Stoicism (among the successors).[127] Archaeologists have located a dipartite temple in Ouranopolis, a town found on the third finger of the Chalkidikē founded by Cassander's eccentric brother Alexarchos.[128] They believe that the two sections of the temple show the city took Plato's advice to have a cult of Apollo for the common people, and a cult of the Sun for the educated (see *Rep.* 507c-509b; *cf. Apol.* 20d).

The philosophical interest in social ideals of civic life was matched by the elaboration of political institutions. The interest of Macedonian kings to promote *omonoia* in the lands they contolled was matched by the inter-city arbitration of disputes, which might otherwise have evolved into open conflict. Certain sanctuaries sought to be *asylia* (free from armed attack) such as Tenos, Kos and ultimately Delphi itself. It was a special honour, allowing such places to advance their political objectives with near impunity.[129] Grants of citizenship to the whole citizenry of another city (*isopoliteia*) added to more established honorary grants for foreign individuals (*proxenia*), which also expanded greatly, to promote Greek unity.[130] Foreign judges were called in to settle disputes among cities, or individuals from different cities (growing the Ancient *symbolon*), previewing the idea of international courts not realized until recently.[131]

One of the main functions of a city is to organize resources, and economic factors no doubt weighed heavily. With the new spirit of cooperation, there was a loss in the ability in cities to fund major civic

127 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 79–81.
128 Tsigarida 1997.
129 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 83–4.
130 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 85–6.
131 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 88–91. *Cf.* note 20.

projects, not only temples, but basic infrastructure and cities increasingly relied upon kings or wealthy individuals for the fulfilment of basic needs.[132] Fluctuations in the corn supply are prominent in the historical record and required the intervention of kings or inter-city cooperation. The relationships of monarchs and cities in these matters as elsewhere became an issue of cooperation more than a decisive change in power structure, probably because of the kings' limited abilities or interests to meddle in every local question.[133] Invaluable evidence of this disposition comes from Antigonos' letter outlining a requirement that cities remain in agricultural surplus (*Syll.*^{3} 344).

Kings also exercised power over cities by means of synoikism (joint settlement),[134] combining two or more cities into a single centre, notably at Thessalonikē, where 26 Greek poleis surrounding the Thermaic Gulf and neigbouring inland reaches were combined in Cassander's new foundation of 316/5 BC. The old cities survived as *demoi* (towns within the city's territorial ambit), but much of the population moved to the new centre, which as the administrative centre became the focus of public building.[135] Another strategy was to associate such synoikisms with pre-existing and historically significant Greek cities. Cassander founded his eponymous city at the site of Poteidaia, completing a play on the Aegean sea front where it is best connected to Macedonia (fig. 1), which had been contested since the mid-fifth century, and was in Thucydides' view one of the principal causes of the Peloponnesian War (I, 56–8, 71, 85, 118: 'the

132 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927] 100.
133 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.52-58, with earlier references.
134 Recent assessments include Moggi 2008; Schuler 2015.
135 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.120-122.

Corcyrean and Potidaian affairs and everything else that constituted the cause of this war' [tr. Lattimore], 119, 124, 139–40). Demetrios Poliorketes' eponymous synoikism likewise brought together populations from Thessaly and Macedonia's kin allies in Magnesia, effecting a major rupture in the ethnic geography of the Pagasitic Gulf.[136] The erosion of ethnic boundaries in Hellenistic times is thought to be one of the major departures from the *polis* context of Classical Greece. Despite this change, a new homogeneity resulted, with Macedonian and other Greek cities now organized alike with a single polis controlling surrounding territory (its *chora*). Adding to this commonality in settlement structure was the adoption of Attic Greek in Macedonia and the tendency of cities to be democratic, replacing the tension between oligarchy and democracy characteristic of the Classical period. Despite the evidence for magistracies discussed above (pp. 12–13, 24), it is not yet clear that they functioned democratically, and barring further epigraphic discoveries, this question should be addressed in view of the archaeological record.

Plan of the thesis

My approach to Macedonian cities relies upon the functional approach I have outlined above, the social expectations of Greek cities found in literary sources, and the political organization of Macedon. It is not enough to see superficial differences in building types and organisations; an understanding of how buildings were used and shaped the life of the

136 Tarn and Griffith 1961 [1927], 67–8.

community is needed. The sites eligible for discussion were circumscribed by this aim to places where a significant amount of public architecture is known, and something of the overall layout of the site can be ascertained. Most Macedonian cities well-known archaeologically are in some sense royal centres; this could reflect a bias of research, but it is more likely that this reflects something more fundamental about the organization of settlement.

I have justified at length the importance of understanding the development of Macedonian poleis in the Late Classical and Hellenistic period, ca. 350–150 BC. These round dates prevent us from injecting any bias of periodization formed in reference to other regions of the Greek world. Also, Greek excavators have suggested dates for the palaces of Aigai and Pella around the mid-fourth century, so a starting date of ca. 350 allows us to consider the important of these palaces in relationship to Hellenistic urban development, without prejudging whether they should in fact date so early. The intent is to understand major developments or changes that happened within this time frame so at times it will prove necessary to discuss archaeological evidence known from the immediately preceding period. On the other hand, it is of some interest to consider what is known from the initial period of Roman hegemony within Macedonia. Why not, then, with a view to adequately understanding the Hellenistic period, expand the time to frame to, e.g., 400-100 BC? The trouble is that such an approach could not be applied consistently. As already mentioned, the evidence for key Macedonian sites does not emerge prior to the second half of the fourth century. For the case studies

discussed below, it is often difficult to follow developments in public space much after 150. Additionally, other sites where our ability to understand pre-Roman evidence for the organization of public space is limited, notably Beroia and Thessalonikē, would need to be a major focus of research purporting to elucidate the arcahaeological record.

The evidence from Northern Greece remains difficult as there is virtually no formal archaeological publication of any site in Macedonia, Thrace or Epirus. The situation is especially challenging for the themes of architecture and political space discussed below. Nevertheless, we have reached a point where sufficient details are known to form a synthetic idea of Macedonian urbanism, the relationships of sites within Macedonia and Northern Greece and their potential impact on broader discussion of Greek urbanism. The lack of publication does mean that certain details of stratigraphy, construction and relevant small finds are not accessible to the extent possible with fully published material. In most cases, where such details needed clarification, I have had to rely on personal communication with excavators.

It is my conviction, through observation and discussion with relevant experts in Athens and Oxford, that the evidence considered below was generated according to sound methodological practice. I then subjected what excavators told me to a ‘coherentist’ analysis in view of relevant comparanda presented with a greater degree of precision. The one notable exception to the problem of underpublication in the case studies considered is Dēmētrias, where the reverse is true: an admirable level of publication is available. We are also able to benefit from the substantial

analysis of public space by Peter Marzolff, whose conclusions are analogous to and compatible with my attempts to rationalize the more sporadically presented evidence from other Macedonian sites. We can hope that further light cast on Macedonian and related sites in Northern Greece, and the connections they have with understanding Greek urbanism more broadly, will spur interest in greater publication. Hopefully, what I offer below can serve as a useful building block for subsequent study.

Turning to the chapters themselves, I begin with the traditional heartland of Macedonia west of the Loudias/Axios rivers, including the original royal "capital" of Aigai, Mieza (best known for its elite tombs and the School of Aristotle, and the federal sanctuary of Dion. The location of the public centre at Aigai is uncertain, but I support the excavators' suggestion it should be sought near the Sanctuary of Eukleia. This sanctuary is linked with a concept of family and royalty appropriate to Macedonia. Together with the theatre and palace, it marks a kind of royal district topographically and substantively separate from the rest of the city. At Mieza, I consider the so-called *Asklepieion* complex as an attempt to form a monumentalized public square. Dion is interesting for the interaction of a major sanctuary with an adjacent town, apparently founded under Cassander.

Pella provides the opportunity to consider a town laid out completely according to a deliberate plan, also under Cassander. It is also the only place in Macedonia where a fully functioning agora, at a scale unprecedented elsewhere in the Greek world, can be observed. I argue

that its diversity of space reflects the city's role as *basileion*, or royal administrative centre. Like the Asklepieion at Mieza, the agora is stadion-length, and at Pella, there may be positive evidence that it was used for this purpose. Unfortunately, not much is known about the pre-Cassandrian form of Pella, but I think the Sanctuary of Darron is a likely candidate for a second public space within the city, with use stretching back into the Classical period. At Pella, there is also a firmer separation between the royal family and an active civic elite.

The last of the evidence chapters concerns new foundations or reorganization of settlement Eastern Macedonia and Thessaly, and the new attempts at urban development there. In particular, we can better appreciate what is unique about Macedonian urbanism by considering the importance of local traditions at the these sites. At Amphipolis, Macedonian redevelopment seems to have focused on the gymnasion, on the first of the great Hellenistic examples of this form. It may be part of an attempt to create a new, more monumental public space there, in an area considered suburban in the Classical period. Kassandreia (Classical Poteidaia) continues the theme of expanding an old centre and creating new public space there. Because of its foundation in the early 3rd century, and generally later development, Dēmētrias offers an opportunity to consider the impact of influence coming back to Greece from Alexander's campaigns in Asia Minor. Nevertheless, we still see a combination of royal initiative and respect for the traditions of the cities including in the synoikism, particularly Iolkos.

In the concluding chapter, I try to put the sites considered in a

broader regional and Aegean context. Broadly, I argue that we can best appreciate developments in the public space of Hellenistic Macedonia with attention to specific local features of each case study, and in the inter-relationship of cities. In this sense, Macedonia shows continuity in the polis traditions of Greek cities; nevertheless, in the specific analysis of institutions represented in the archaeological record, substantial evidence of regular royal intervention is apparent. Moreover, in the record of Macedonia's western neighbour Epirus, we can observe a return of more specifically polis-oriented local institutions. So the importance of royal prerogatives cannot be discounted, but what of the characteristic localism of Greek poleis? Is this merely a façade or even a mirage? Help comes from consideration of Roman Macedonia, where there was a more fundamental institutional change and reorganization of the geography of power. This helps to reveal the specific motivation for Macedonian kings in supporting the development of *poleis*: the specific local institutions actually supported their broader 'national' agenda.

Chapter 2: The Public Spaces of the Macedonian heartland (Aigai, Mieza, Dion)

Introduction

This chapter treats the centres of the Macedonian heartland, i.e. Ēmathia (Aigai, Mieza) and Pieria (Dion), which provide an incomplete but essential introduction to the development of civic space in Hellenistic Macedonia. It is incomplete for the fragments of the cities discovered, but essential for

the uncovery of developments in places where the Macedonian state was nurtured. These centres are traditional in their site locations (mountain foothills that require extensive terracing works) and as places of cultural memory already attested in the earliest sources of Macedonian history. Homer (*Iliad* XIV.226) speaks of Pieria and 'lovely Ēmathia' as lying between Mt Olympos and Thrace. Hammond believed it was on either side of the Pierian Mountains that the *Makedones* adopted their first fixed settlements ca. 650 BC.[137] Ēmathia and Pieria comprise the area Herodotus (VII, 127.1) calls Μακεδονίδα, whence in the period following the Persian Wars the Argead kings issued forth to conquer lower Paionia, the territory of Pella and Ichnae, Mygdonia and parts of Bisaltia and Crestonia up to the Strymon. In these latter territories, they encountered well-established Greek *poleis*, that stood in contrast to the more traditional, pastoral form of life in Μακεδονίδα. Nevertheless, by the time of the Peloponnesian War, Thucydides (I.61.2–4, II.100.3) names Beroia and Pieria in the Macedonian heartland, as well as Europos in Bottia, as Macedonian *poleis* capable of withstanding siege.[138]

In Classical and Hellenistic times, the identity and boundaries of Ēmathia and the neighbouring territory between the Loudias and Axios rivers are somewhat more problematic. For Herodotus (VII.127.1), the Loudias River, and its joining with the Haliakmon is the border of Μακεδονίδα and Bottia (fig. 1).[139] In a parallel passage, he notes that the Axios River is the border of Mygdonia and Bottia, the latter of which holds

137 Hammond 1989, 7–8.
138 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.105–8.
139 *Cf.* How and Wells 1928, ad loc.

Ichnai and Pella on a narrow strip of land toward the sea (VII.123.3). Thucydides (II.99.3) echoes this language, describing the territory of Pella as a narrow bit of Paionia beside the sea. Euripides (*Bacchae*, 571–5) also singles out the Loudias and its 'blessed streams' as bringing wealth to the Macedonian heartland.[140] Although the narrative of Herodotus and Thucydides is probably influenced by Hekataios (ca. 500 BC), both historians had first-hand knowledge of the region.[141] Euripides probably performed his play at Aigai or Dion, where there are well-attested theatres, and reflects the imposing view of the plain, afforded from the standpoint of cities such as Beroia and Aigai.[142]

Based on the absence of explicit reference to 'Ēmathia' in Classical sources, Hatzopoulos has suggested that it had become an archaism, replaced by Bottia and therefore merged into its territory of Bottia, citing Herodotus VII.123 and Thucydides II.99.3 and 100.4 as exemplary.[143] Nevertheless, Herodotus' reference to the Loudias as the eastern border of Μακεδονίδα and Thucydides' characterisation of Pella's surroundings as 'Paionian' must indicate that the two regions were still considered culturally distinct in the last quarter of the fifth century. The first explicit evidence for a collapse in the ideas of Ēmathia (or Μακεδονίδα) and Bottia

---

140 See Dodds 1960, on 565–75 (p. 147), for discussion of venue: on 409–11 (p. 126).

141 Herodotus displays a personal acquaintance with the mysteries at Samothrace (II.51; Cole 1984, 28–9, 38), visited Dodona (II.52, 55–7), relates local Macedonian history (V.17–22) and saw the mines at Scapte Hyle (VI.46). Thucydides had mining rights and was well-connected in the territory of Amphipolis, where he served as a general (IV.104–5) and shows knowledge of the Macedonian road system (II.100) before and after the reign of Archelaos (413–399 BC).

142 Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 40–5. Scullion 2003, raises questions about the tradition that Euripides abandoned Athens for the court of Archelaos and died there, but not that he visited Macedonia, for which Aristotle (*Politics*, 1311b30–35) provides decisive testimony; *cf.* Hatzopoulos 2011, 59.

143 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.239–42.

comes from the ΗΜΑ(θίας) stamp on early Hellenistic water-pipes at Pella,[144] roughly contemporaneous with late-Classical sources that regard Ēmathia as an ancient name for Macedonia,[145] and Marsyas of Pella's genealogy making Amathos and Pieros the two sons of Makedon.[146] The contemporary source of Martianus Capella (6.665) distinguished Macedonia west of the Axios as *Pieria Emathiaque*.[147] Polybius' mention of Emathia as what used to be called 'Paionia' reflects the conflation of Ēmathia and Bottia (XXIII, 10.4). The situation had clearly changed by the reign of Philip V, when Ēmathia and Bottia where included in the third district of Macedonia and coins were minted at Pella with the legend ΒΟΤΤΑΕΑΤΩΝ.[148] Hatzopoulos was right to see in the stamps from the water pipes at Pella and the legends of Philip's V's district coins as having a distinct meaning, as an ancient name for Macedonia and a regional district. Although Pella is identified as an administrative capital (*basileion*) in Pseudo-Scylax (ca. 380–60),[149] the water pipes are illustrative of the physical realisation of this change at the end of the fourth century. On the other hand, ancient sources, although differing in nomenclature, consistently distinguish between the territory on either side of the Loudias (*e.g.* Emathia or Μακεδονίδα; Bottia or Paionia).[150]

---

144 *SEG* XXIV (1969) 557.

145 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.239 (n. 3), citing Justin (Pompeius Trogus) 7.1.1, 7, after Theopompos, and Strab.7, frg. 11, after Ephoros.

146 *FGrHist* 135-36, F 13, with commentary.

147 Discussed by Hatzopoulos 1996, I.241.

148 Gaebler 1906, II.2; Papazoglou 1988, 124–6 (n. 3); Hatzopoulos 1996, I.241 (n. 3), 478–85.

149 Hammond 1972, 132–3, 148.

150 Esp. Hdt. VII.123.3; Thuc. II.99.3, 100.4; Marysas of Pella: n. 134.

I underscore this geographical problem because of the different nature of the archaeological evidence west of the Loudias basin. Here, substantial building complexes have come to light at Aigai and Mieza, but no unquestionably civic architecture has emerged at Aigai and the relationship of major built spaces to the overall organization of the site cannot be determined. In the final years of the fourth century, a new city plan was developed at Macedon's national sanctuary of Dion on the east shoulder of Mount Olympos at the same time as the sanctuary (separate from the city) was adorned with new buildings (see fig. 2 for location of sites discussed, fig. 45 for a plan of Dion).[151] Unfortunately, no aspect of the built space within the walls is discernible due to Roman overbuilding. The location of the agora may be indicated by a Macedonian shield monument and its shape shown by changes in later buildings.[152]

In the region more broadly, the best-known historical sites west of the Loudias are located along the Haliakmon river (Aigai, fig. 3, and Beroia) and its Astraios spur (Mieza and Edessa). The main communication routes have been reconstructed based on Roman mile-markers, second-century BC troop movements, *theorodokoi* lists and some archaeological evidence. In addition to the markers of the *Via Egnatia*, which are known from Edessa, Pella and Allante, milestones discovered between Beroia and modern Alexandreia via Stavros suggest a northeasterly road between Beroia and Pella. Other mile-markers at Livadi (south of Beroia and Lazochōri) suggest secondary routes along the Astraios (toward Mieza and Edessa) and toward Pieria via Aigai along the

151 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 96–8, 132–6.
152 Pantermalēs 1992, 187.

northern edge of the Pierian range.[153] The fourth-century *theorodokoi* of Nemea continued from Dion to Pydna, Beroia, Mieza, Edessa, Pella, Europos, Ichnai, Allante and Thessalonikē. Another list from Argos mentions Aigai and Beroia followed by Edessa, Allante and Europos.[154] Both lists underscore the route along the Astraios between Beroia and Edessa, but the second may testify to a more difficult direct road between Aigai and Macedonia's southern defences facing the Vale of Tempe at Leibethra and Platamonas. The existence of this road is suggested by the position of the main gate known from Aigai (discussed below) and has recently been mapped and documented by ceramic evidence at key sites.[155]

The impression gleaned from Thucydides (I, 61.2–4; II, 100.3) for the establishment of fortified *poleis* by the time of the Peloponessian War is perhaps supported by evidence for fortification and early walls from Aigai, Beroia, Edessa, Pydna and Methonē.[156] Although the organisation of specifically civic space is difficult to understand from the latter four sites, it is worth mentioning the evidence briefly so as to contextualise the developments of the Hellenistic period. At Beroia, the extension of the Thessalonikē road northeast of the city revealed 21 pit graves and one chamber tomb of the late-fifth and fourth centuries, oriented in an east-west row, perhaps as part of a larger cemetery.[157] Another 11 graves in

153 Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou 1987, 28–36.
154 Id., 46–7.
155 Pikoulas 2011; 2013; 2014.
156 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.114–9.
157 *AΔ* 29 (1973–4) 714–5 [G. Touratsoglou].

the southern cemetery followed the same orientation and burial practices.[158] The earliest stone walls at Beroia date to ca. 300 BC, mainly in the southwest and northwest parts of the city. Dating to the same period is a long rectangular building (9.5 x 19 metres), with a Doric capital and evocative portable finds including the male chest of a marble sculpture and inscribed drinking vessels. It was parallel to the Roman road discovered underneath Mitropoleos street, and had evidence of canalization similar to the practice at Olynthos and Pella.[159]

Evidence for further canalization along a multi-roomed Hellenistic building complex at the intersection of Venizelou and Megalou Alexandrou streets probably indicates a different orientation of streets in the northern part of the city. A test trench here revealed a continuous sequence of levels dated by numismatic evidence from ca. 310–300 to 187–80 to BC.[160] The two axes of the city correspond to important cult locations. Two inscriptions related to Herakles Kynagidas were found near the southwest gate and further along Venizelos street (near the Hellenistic building complex).[161] The multi-roomed building on the northern axis is in the vicinity of an inscription dedicating two stoas in the sanctuary of Athena by Philip V.[162] Ca. 250 metres northeast, an architrave block was inscribed with the name Dionysus and several Doric, Ionic and Corinthian capitals are incorporated in the early-Christian basilica.[163] Parallel to the multi-roomed building, and ca. 300 metres east at the presumed edge of the

158 Graikos 2008, 821–4.
159 *ΑΔ* 32 (1977) 226 [P. Pantos].
160 *ΑΔ* 33 (1978) 263–6; Brocas-Deflassieux 1999, 45–6.
161 Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos 1998, no. 29; Brocas-Deflassieux 1999, 66.
162 Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos 1998, no. 17; Brocas-Deflassieux 1999, 74.
163 Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos 1998, no. 21; Brocas-Deflassieux 1999, 75.

city, an inscription and an inscribed statue base mention a cult of Apollo, Asklepios and Hygeia.[164] The gymnasion of Beroia may have been located outside the south gate, based on the detailed gymnasiarchal law discovered there.[165]

The range of activity attested epigraphically in Hellenistic Beroia is unmatched elsewhere, but the impression of an emergent city roughly defined by its cemeteries in Classical times is yet more clear through recent publications at Edessa and Pydna. In Edessa, it also possible to see, as at Beroia, the clear definition of stone walls in the early Hellenistic period.[166] Like Beroia, Edessa was divided into a two-part town, with a fortified acropolis and a lower city, in the present agricultural and forested area known as ‘Longos’. A good part of the twelve cemeteries on the north, west and south sides of the acropolis and the north, east and south sides of Longus were intensively and regularly used from the late fifth-century.[167]

The location of vast and packed cemeteries at Pydna, with their ample sculpture and ceramic evidence, has suggested to excavators a dense, thriving and well-connected city of ca. 250 ha between the Aliki salt mines and modern Makrygialos by the end of the fifth century.[168] On current evidence, the organisation of population centres in Μακεδονίδα was widespread in the Classical period, but the specific reflection of civic

164 Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos 1998, no. 16; Brocas-Deflassieux 1999, 69–70.
165 Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993; Brocas-Deflassieux 19991999, 86–90.
166 Chrysostomou 1988, 161–6, 171–2 (plates).
167 Chrysostomou 2013, 89–192.
168 For a concise summary, see Besios 2010, 113–27.

character in built space is a characteristic of the Hellenistic period at choice sites that seemed to have developed for specific reasons.

The limitations for wholesale urban redevelopment may undermine our appreciation of any civic space that might have been articulated in Μακεδονὶς γῆ, the mountain landscapes meant access to good quality limestone, which can now be appreciated without the challenges of disintegrating stone at Pella, which must have also been faced in antiquity.[169] As will be discussed further in Chapter V, below, mountain landscapes meant immediate access to potable water. The great advantage of Aigai, underscored by the water pipes found in the Acropolis walls, was its access to water at a relatively low elevation, giving it its earliest name, Edessa, the 'water site' (Justin VII, 1).

Aigai: first city of the Macedonian kingdom

Aigai was the ancestral first city of the Macedonians, and, to the end of the Macedonian kingdom, the main centre of royal burial and monarchic identity. Diodoros (XXII.12) referred to it as the hearth of the Macedonian kingdom, and its geography in particular suited the concomitant needs of the growth of fixed agriculture, the movement of people and goods and security along well-travelled routes. It was located in the northern foothills of the Pierian range, offering fantastic vistas across the vast central plain and particularly the Loudias River, which by its westward migration was producing exceptional arable land both on its left bank near

169 I M Akamatēs, *pers. comm.*

Aigai and on its right toward Pella.[170] At the same time, the name ‘Aigai’ refers to the goats that roamed the Pierian mountainside, prominently displayed on the obverse of coins ca. 500 BC (fig. 5). Hammond observed the force of the aphorism recorded in Justin (8.5) that Philip II herded people below between Pella and Florina as a shepherd does for sheep.[171] Philip’s campaigns featured the founding of cities,[172] but for the Macedonians of this period it still would not be unusual to have seasonal migration of flocks over a distance of 100 kilometres. Hatzopoulos notes that this traditional way would have been strikingly different from the ‘sophisticated urban life-style’ the Macedonians would have encountered among the mixed and Greek populations east of the Loudias.[173]

Topography and walls

The historical city extended from a conical acropolis summit in the mountain foothills (just over 1.6 kilometres south of modern Vergina and the Museum of the Great Tumulus). That Aigai was passed over by the Nemea *thearodokoi* emphasises its position just off the main roads discussed above (p. 44–5). In early periods, its location allowed the Macedonian kingdom to grow in relative obscurity, but after Archelaos (413–399) built roads through the forests (Thuc. I, 100.1), and Philip II had so quickly transitioned between campaigns in Thrace, Thessaly and Illyria

170 On the importance of the Loudias for Pella, see Chapter III below.

171 Hammond 1972, 7.

172 Demosthenes’ suggestion that fortifying cities was a feature of Philip’s campaigns (ca. 350: IV, 48; I, 12); see Hammond and Griffith 1979, 304–6, 558–60. On the ‘deep frontiers’ characteristic of Philip’s settlement policy: Adams 2007.

173 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.105–8.

(Dem. I, 13), any development at Aigai should probably reflect social memory rather than strategic need. Its strategic obscurity was missed by the earliest travellers, until the French explorer Leon Heuzey was led there by the tip of a local priest in 1885.[174] The historical significance of the site was not recognised until Hammond established its identification by topographical argument in the late 1960s.[175]

Heuzey described the approach from the Lower Axios valley as a 'long frontier of fertile hills' with high forests of 'magnificent elms… interrupted by fields of sesame and maize.'[176] He made his approach, now accompanied by the architect Henri Daumet, from Palatitza, then the largest of a number of villages, lying among the dominant hills descending from the mountains 'covered with forests, silhouetted with ravines'.[177] To the north, the tree-lined bend of the Axios opened up for him a stunning horizon toward the Central Plain, as if overlooking an immense prairie. In view of the dark green mass of the plateau of Holy Trinity Church (roughly 1300 metres to the east), where he would ultimately excavate the east side of the palace at Aigai, he observed a long embankment (ca. 500 metres according to his plan, fig. 3), leading to two flat-topped stone piers with no trace of cement. These appeared intended to carry planking across a small ravine, which yielded fragments of Greek tiles; it is very likely that the embankment represents the remains of a pre-Roman road and gate house.[178] Climbing above the plateau at an extreme angle, he

174 Heuzey and Daumet 1876, 177.
175 See Hammond 1972, 58–67; Hammond and Griffith 1979, 156–8.
176 Heuzey and Daumet 1876, 177.
177 *Ibid*., 178.
178 *Ibid*., 178–9, 226; Hammond 1972, 156.

observed impressive lines of fortification passing over the turning hillsides, which suggested phases of fortified terracing on the "Acropolis".[179] At the western corner of its triangular summit, building foundations mark the location of an ancient gate, known as *Palaioporta*, traversed by an ancient path leading to the high pass in the Pierian mountains known as Galakto. This gate was particularly notable for its strong construction: its substructures and the high walls that descended rapidly into the forest.[180]

Excavations resumed at *Palaioporta* in the 1980s, revealing a second gate to the west and parts of a 3-metre wide road (fig. 6) leading from the palace in the direction of Pieria (see fig. 4 for a plan of the walls). Finds from the road include two large stone thresholds, west slope pottery, remains of well-carved terra-cotta akroteria with flower and wave patterns, a bronze Hermaic stele, and mould-made bowl with patterned and figured scenes (both Homeric and erotic, fig. 7). This gate was built with local stone, with walls up to 1.7 metres thick, preserved to a height of 0.8 metres.[181] A pair of 2-metre square pits found on either side of the road are critical to dating the use of the Akropolis. In the eastern deposit, at the maximal depth excavated of 1.2 metres, ceramics of the third century were uncovered, along with stone and lead loomweights, a clay cast and protome of Aphrodite. The herm was found in the vicinity, along with a denarius of the first century BC and iron tools.[182] Excavation of the western pit revealed coins of Philip II, "West slope" pottery, leaden

179 Heuzey and Daumet 1876, 179.
180 *Ibid*., 177.
181 Andronikos 1986, 43–4.
182 *Ibid*., 44.

loomweights, and, in the upper levels, bronze coins of Pella with a clay female figurine and fragments of Laconian rooftiles, one incised with the letter K.[183] A second gate (II, fig. 8) was excavated to the east, measuring five by three metres, preserved to a height of up to 1.9 metres. A "west slope" kantharos and bronze coins of Pyrrhos were identified in the backfill, whilst a pit similar to those associated with the first gate contained another "West slope" kantharos, a piece of Corinthian tile with carved floral pattern and a female figurine.[184]

The walls extended, along the twists and sharp slopes of the hills toward the north (from the south-western corner of the summit) and to the east. Judging from the geomorphology of the landscape, the road leading from the pre-Roman bridge likely continued to the southeast, across the so-called "Isba field". Near the bridge, a ca. 800 metre stretch of wall was identified, built upon a 1000–1200 metre long artificial terrace. Along the modern road toward Koutles, a further terrace was discovered 600 metres in length, which likely served as a road linking another small bridge of pre-Roman construction (which is unfortunately not described). Further on, the road seems to descend toward the Haliakmon, in the direction of the large *tumuli*.[185] It is reasonable to assume that the fortifications in the lower part of the city followed the edges of Isba field, near or along the Haliakmon basin, where the ground quickly drops from 80 masl to just above sea level. The road, roughly following the modern one from Palatitza to Koutles, criss-crossed the lower city (Isba field) and

183 Andronikos 1985, 66–7 with pl. 18.
184 Andronikos 1988, 67-8.
185 Heuzey and Daumet 1876, 180.

exited the city in the direction of the Great Tumulus. Our poor understanding of the northern stretch of city wall is not as detrimental as is sometimes implied,[186] as we can now trace the patterns of building across the site, although this limits our chronological horizon to the fourth century onwards.

More problematic is the chronology of the walls, and concomitantly their extent in any historical period. Although the excavations of Andronikos and Phaklarēs are full of interesting detail, the nature of reporting throughout the 1980s and early 90s makes it difficult to ascertain the precise areas of excavation. Unlike the civic buildings discussed below, no plan has ever appeared of the walls, either as an overview or detailed identification of the section under excavation. Therefore, only a general summary is possible. The walls were constructed of well-dressed local stone, in pseudo-isodomic masonry, with shoulder plinths employed at the corners. It had a width of 2.2–2.8 metres on the west side (from the northwest corner) and is preserved up to a height of 1.9 metres, but in most places only 0.7–1.0 metres survives. The acropolis peribolos had a perimeter of some 210 metres, and overall at least 20 metres of wall have been excavated.[187] Four square towers have been investigated (with widths of 4.7 by six metres) and one semi-circular tower with a diameter of 6.3 metres.[188]

The wall to the east of Gate II is preserved to a height of 0.9 metres; it is not clear how far it was excavated, but the excavators note that there

186 Most recently, Drougou 2011, 247.

187 The figure may be quite higher due to problematic reporting. Phaklarēs 1992, 37, indicates that 14 metres had been excavated by Andronikos.

188 Andronikos 1986, 42–3, 44–5; Phaklarēs 1992, 37–8; Phaklarēs 1997, 70.

is considerable use of natural fortification, and the strong semi-circular tower is located some 16 metres from Gate II. The backfill from these areas included bronze coins of Alexander III and Cassander, but also civic emissions from Thessalonikē, Amphipolis and Pella.[189] The wall was joined to the semi-circular tower with shoulder plinths and the tower itself was constructed of carefully worked blocks of local limestone. Finds (from the north-western vicinity) largely date to the first century, when the tower was out of use.[190] In 1992, 13 metres of the inner face of the east Akropolis wall were explored, uncovering two pits (1.5 metres deep, with a diameter of 1.4) yielding a clay mould for relief vases, part of a stone mould for metal tools, three lead weights and a hoard of 85 bronze coins, dating from the fourth–first centuries.[191] A 1.5-metre wide staircase up to a height of 16 metres was explored in the same area, and definitive evidence for domestic workshops of the second–first centuries emerged. Some of the most interesting finds include a stamped amphora handle of King Perseus (179–167 BC), and fishing equipment (led net sinkers and a large bronze hook).[192]

The eastern part of the wall, in the vicinity of Gate III (fig. 9), known from Heuzey & Daumet's initial reconnaissance, where they commented on substantial landscape modification, was explored briefly in Andronikos' final excavations in 1991, but recently new excavations have added tantalising detail. The 1991 excavations revealed a 16-metre stretch

189 Phaklarēs 1992, 38–40; Andronikos, Drougou, and Phaklarēs 1992, 187–8; Andronikos, Drougou, and Paliadele 1994, 188–9.
190 Andronikos et al. 1990, 170–2.
191 Phaklarēs 1995.
192 Phaklarēs 1997, 1998.

preserved for two or three courses of poros limestone to a height of up to 1.26 metres, with a width of 2.86 metres. A strong, semi-circular tower was identified with a diameter of 6.5 metres, preserved in two courses of foundations (0.8 metres). A single bronze coin of Antigonos Gonatas, a 'mother' figurine, inscribed sherds of skyphoi and fragments of rooftile were found on the inner face of the wall.[193] Recent excavation revealed a second tower of similar dimensions, which stands with the first in ca. 40-metre projections from the wall, guarding a gate area ca. 10m in width.[194] The walls have a width of ca. 2.9 metres and are preserved to a height of 1.9 metres. Overall, ca. 700 metres of the enceinte were explored in this area, with a width of ca. one metre, in two courses of orthogonal blocks and later repairs (fig. 10). The fortification was roofed its entire length, according to the excavator, and here some tiles uncovered were stamped with a distinctive type of Macedonian shield (fig. 11).[195]

In the late 1980s and 90s, Phaklarēs' reports defended a later date for the walls at Aigai, justified mainly on stylistic criteria, such as the existence of a semi-round tower.[196] However, there are examples of rounded towers in the mid-fourth century and students of fortification usually emphasise the importance of landscape and function in determining chronology.[197] In connection with her study of burials south of the city, Kottaridē has made a useful contribution to study of the walls,

193 Andronikos, Drougou, and Paliadele 1994, 68–70.

194 The width of the road is not given in the report, so this figure is estimated from the photograph.

195 Phaklarēs and Stamatopoulou 2014, 115–9.

196 Phaklarēs 1993, 394–5.

197 *E.g.* Winter 1971, 192 (with strong emphasis regarding rounded towers) Adam 1982, 62–5; McNicoll and Milner 1997, 9–10.

and offered our only glimpse of their course in this area, where they do seem to run quite close to the Haliakmon embankment. It is not clear how much of the 56-meter course (figs. 12–13) she was able to excavate systematically (with a reported width of 2 metres), but she provocatively claimed to have identified a coin of Perdikkas (III?), five of Amyntas III and one of Poteidaia in the infill of the wall.[198] This may suggest that the lower city was already incorporated in the enceinte by the Classical period. She also explored a tower with coins of Alexander III in its infill, next to a 2 meter wide gate with two three by three-meter towers to the west (fig. 14).[199] Following Kottaridē's excavations, Phaklarēs (with Stamatopoulou) claimed that coins inscribed with the name of 'King Cassander' (after 305 BC) had been found at the level of foundations, but more detail is required to evaluate this evidence.[200]

It is probably best to accept multiple phases of building for the Aigai enceinte, beginning in the second half of the fourth century, with at least some work carried out under Philip and Alexander. It certainly included a stage after the sack of Pyrrhos in 276 BC, and both of these phases were well-documented in Andronikos' excavations mentioned above. As for Phaklarēs' emphasis on the late-fourth century, it is reasonable to assume that a major part of the wall was completed in this period, especially strengthening the Acropolis defences, since this is a major period of wall construction throughout Macedonia. Unfortunately, the specific evidence from Aigai cannot be evaluated, due to its tendentious presentation.

198 Kottaridē 2004, 531.
199 *Ibid*., 533–5.
200 Phaklarēs and Stamatopoulou 2014, 120.

It remains to describe the overall landscape of the city between the Pierian summit and the Haliakmon watershed (fig. 15). The division of the city between the sweeping hills and then sharp plateaus, which peer impressively over the lower city, especially the plateau of the palace (170–200 masl), corresponds roughly to the patterns of building known from excavation. The ancient theatre is just below the palace (ca. 165–170 masl), and the Sanctuary of Eukleia, thought to mark the location of the ancient *agora* stands at ca. 145–150 masl. A level area extending on the north side of the temple has been identified as the agora.[201] If these hills are less than impressive, we should not imagine they were so in antiquity, because of the loss of the great forests still described by Heuzey & Daumet. This has no doubt led to run off from the thick clay deposits of the acropolis, which have filled in the surrounding landscape.[202] Just how intense this effect might be was suggested in one winter's rain, which revealed the ancient drainage works northeast of the sanctuary of Eukleia, as will be discussed further below.

From the agora terrain begins a gentle north-eastern descent toward the lower city in the general direction of the Paliura torrent. The steeper terrain was characterised by the use of terracing for monumental and civic buildings, especially the palace, theatre and Sanctuary of Eukleia.[203] In what follows, I begin with the Sanctuary, since it offers the clearest indication to the fraught question of what characterises civic space, and how it is organised, at Aigai. The discussion then moves to the

201 *Cf.* Drougou 2011, 246–52, with earlier references.
202 Drougou 2011, 247.
203 *Ibid*., 247–8.

theatre, often a crucial component of civic ritual in Greek cities, but that here forms part of a complex with the palace, in an unnatural location that underscores its connection rather with royal ritual. Finally, I turn to other parts of the city, which bring the monumental civic sector into sharp relief and demonstrate the irregular and sporadic planning of Aigai.[204]

Sanctuary of Eukleia and agora

The architects of the civic buildings of Aigai, concentrated in the north-western part of the site (fig. 16), always had to contend with the undulated hillocks of this area, typically handled with strong walls or artificial terraces. The Sanctuary of Eukleia (figs. 17-18), an architectural complex of more than 3000 square metres, was separated into two distinct parts, divided by a substantial wall constructed of fieldstones and large corner pieces of poros limestone.[205] The incline of the hill has been estimated at just under ten percent toward the north and northeast. Waterworks (see below, p. 75–76) and some evidence for a road suggests that the communication route to the north was on an axis with the Rhomaios tomb. A marble threshold seems to mark the intersection with the asphalt road leading to the theatre, ca. 80 metres south. It is marked by rubble built walls 3 metres apart uncovered for 10 metres on the south and 3.5 metres on the north side.[206]

---

204 *Ibid*., 249, 251.

205 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1997, 58. This is the main construction material at Aigai, and all ‘stone’ hereafter is poros unless noted otherwise.

206 *Ibid*., 55–7.

The sanctuary was built on a single terrace, with strong walls at the north and south, but the eastern and western edges have not been explored; a separate terrace marks the space to the south, identified as the ancient agora.[207] The excavators identified five structures, which belong to a first phase of building (fig. 18), characterised by strong walls with careful stone construction (fig. 22). These include, in the eastern section: a larger temple, the three-roomed temple articulated to its south, the altar in front of the temple's eastern entrance, and three marble statue bases. The section west of the dividing wall seems to have been dominated by a peristyle court, but this area has not been fully excavated to reveal the western end. Two of the bases have yielded inscriptions reading *ΕΥΡΥΔΙΚΑ ΣΙΡΡΑ ΕΥΚΛΕΙΑΙ* (fig. 15).[208] The uncommon patronymic and mid-fourth century lettering immediately led to the conclusion that the dedicant was Eurydike, the mother of Philip II, whose tomb has been dated, based largely on the fragments of three Panathenaic amphorai found above the tomb, to ca. 340 BC.[209]

Unfortunately, it is difficult to assess the chronological claims for the evolution of the sanctuary because the excavators do not always make clear the evidence for the format of individual components. For this reason, I have attempted to bring together the evidence for each building in turn, beginning with the area of the western peristyle, before returning to their relative chronology. This part of the sanctuary was identified ca.

---

207 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1995, 247–9; Saatsoglou-Paliadele 1997, 56; Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 2001, 533–4.

208 First report: Andronikos 1986, 52; Full summary/discussion: Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 2000, 392–401.

209 Andronikos 1988, 83.

30 metres west of the larger temple by geophysical research, which suggested a separate building complex. It was entered via a staircase on the north side (fig. 18), leading to the asphalt road along the eastern part of the peristyle.[210] The staircase suggests there must have been a small road on the north side (fig. 19), which effectively means separate paths offered access to either the peristyle or the temple(s). The main excavations are represented in fig. 23, including the bulky (0.85 metre) crosswall dividing the peristyle and temple areas (α), the walls lining the entrance on the east side of the peristyle to the east (β) and west (γ), the peristyle (δ) and the north wall of the asphalt path along the south side of the sanctuary (ε).[211]

The stout wall α, preserved for 11.15 metres in the south, has at least two phases. The upper part is a mixed construction of fieldstones with pieces of stone blocks and cornerstones, but the lower portion is mostly fieldstones mixed with black glaze sherds, to a height of 1–1.4 metres west to east. Strewn along the wall among fallen fieldstones are fragments of Lakonian rooftiles, suggesting destruction debris. The fieldstone wall β runs a distance of 10.8 metres composed mostly of the fieldstone mix of wall α but with a course of stone blocks in the northernmost section; a dark layer was also found. Wall γ, 3.4 metres to the west of and parallel to β, is preserved for a total of 15.4 metres, including a turn to the west where it meets ε for a distance of 4.35 metres, and is reinforced by megalithic stones (up to 1.7 metres in depth) at

210 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 2001, 545.
211 Andronikos 1991, 59–66.

regular intervals.[212] The northern extension of the wall (ε) continues for a further 8.4 metres, above the dark layer, where a water pipe was discovered, said to be of the same type found in the eastern stoa of the palace, though unfortunately it is not described in either case.[213]

A rectangular courtyard (δ, fig. 23), ca. three metres west of wall γ is estimated to enclose an area of 9.3 x 12.08 metres, mostly preserved to foundation level with a width of 0.85 metres. On the west side, the foundations (fig. 24) are preserved for ca. 10 metres, and the remaining distance is an estimate based on the morphology of the hill.[214] The figure shows a short section of a single Doric column, and the peristyle is represented on subsequent plans (*e.g.*, fig. 18) as having five columns on the east (and west, which must be entirely supposititious), seven on the north and eight on the south, but sadly the survival of columns or evidence from foundations has not been reported. Peristyle δ and wall ε have completely stone foundations across their entire course for a single-phase monumental construction, but neither the evidence for the north and south sides of the outer wall, nor for the eastern doorway have been presented, and the west wall must be a conjecture since the full length of the peristyle is unknown.[215] By the style of construction, walls β and γ were associated with the palace of Aigai, wall γ with courtyard δ and wall ε with the existence of the water channel discussed below. Numismatic evidence may suggest use of this part of the sanctuary from the mid-

212 Andronikos 1991, 60–3.
213 *Ibid*., 65; *AΔ* 17 (1961/2) 228 [Id.]
214 Andronikos, 1985, 65.
215 *Ibid*.

fourth to the second century BC, such as coins of Philip II, of the late Classical Apollo and horseman type, as well as civic emissions of Pella.[216] This evidence is not sufficiently well-provenanced, and is therefore of dubious value for fixing building phases. However, a lamp fragment and some sherds from the early fourth century in association with the first phases of wall γ could indicate this area was in use from that date, and that the road on the east side of the peristyle was also functional from this time.[217]

Further walls (fig. 25) were discovered leading north-south for 6.5 metres along the back (west) wall of the tripartite stoa, which then turns to the west. The west part of the south wall is unexcavated but the a 23-metre extension to the east meets another north-south wall, which is articulated two-roomed temple-like structure to the north, which faces south. The internal (northern) face of the terrace wall followed the slope of the hill, whilst the external (southern) face was considerably lower. The placement and morphology of this wall suggests that it served as a retaining wall for the terraces.[218]

The temple (*cf.* fig. 25) was built with large orthogonal stone blocks and measured eight by five metres east to west, divided into a four by four metre cella and a 4 x 2.35 metre pronaos.[219] A small block in the centre on the north wall of the cella indicates the passage from the pronaos, where a large marble door threshold served as the entrance to the cella. A destruction layer of Lakonian rooftiles is dated by lamps and

216 *Ibid*., 65–6.
217 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1998, 110–1.
218 Andronikos 1991, 140–141; *Ergon* 1987, 59–60.
219 Measured by interior space.

figurines to the mid-second century BC.[220] A marble threshold with fittings for a door is preserved here, and in the pronaos a destruction layer came to light, consisting of terracotta figurines, unglazed pottery sherds and a stone lamp, dating to the mid-second century (fig. 26). A *stamnos*-shaped *pithos* of this date was found in the cella, where near the south wall stone bases with cavities for marble statues were found with broken fragments of such statues (neck, shoulder, right foot). Along the west wall outside of the cella, the first of the stone bases for marble statues was found, small pieces of which were scattered in the surrounding ground level. In the context of the earliest use level of the earthen floor a few sherds date to the end of the third century, providing a *terminus ante quem* for its construction. The presence of a beaten earth floor and architectural fragments indicate that an earlier building preceded it.[221]

The larger temple had an external perimeter of 8.5 by 12.6 metres, divided into a cella with internal dimensions of 6 by 6.5 metres, and a 3.35 by 6.5 pronaos. The front room of the temple had mainly a collapsed roof tile layer, suggesting a late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial phase based on the tiles and the style of their guide lettering. Also, the letters I A. O could suggest an Ionic porch, at least in the latter period.[222] The size and the thickness of its walls distinguish this temple from the rest of the sanctuary. On the basis of the large coiled snake (fig. 27) found in its forecourt and the grill (thought to be appropriate for a god of vegetation and fertility) discovered in the main court, it has been suggested that the

220 *Ergon* 1983, 29.
221 Andronikos 1984, 54–55; Andronikos 1986, 50–2; Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1992, 27–8.
222 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1992, 30–1.

large temple is dedicated to Zeus Meilichios.[223] On the south side of the temple, a 9.6 by 11.15 metre stoa complex was directly articulated, divided at the back (west) into three room measuring three by 3.5 metres each. In the eastern part of the stoa (fig. 28), remains of Doric columns were found, with base diameter of 0.5 metres. Traces of a prostyle colonnade were reported, but without measurement and the plan shows an irregular spacing of columns.[224] The floor levels of the temple and stoa are shown to communicate via their shared wall, but I have not found this issue discussed in the reports (see figs. 22, 29).

Directly in front of the large temple are the foundations of a large stone altar (6.5 x 4.5 metres)[225]. The excavators report that no chronological conclusions could be drawn about the character of its workmanship. Once the larger temple was discovered, it became clear the that altar is a focal point of the site.[226] Evidence for further buildings in the Sanctuary of Eukleia (fig. 30), which are important for the use of space over the course of the Hellenistic period, can only be mentioned in passing due to scarce reporting. The walls of later buildings are characterized by smaller blocks mixed with pieces of limestone and marble in second use. This includes the stoa articulated but not engaged to the *naiskos*, which incorporates the southernmost of the marble bases, and incorporates stone from the altar. A coin of Thessalonikē found at ground level suggests the building was in use by the mid-second

223 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1995, 53–4.
224 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1992, 30.
225 Andronikos 1986, 53–4; Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1992, 31–2.
226 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1992, 55.

century.[227] There were also extensions of two short rooms on the east side of the larger temple. Small stone *aedicula* were set up to connect to the temple, altar, the two northernmost marble bases and the new stoa. Cumulatively, the latest additions (in the second half of the second century BC) have the effect of enclosing the sacred area into a single complex, excluding the *naiskos*.[228]

The western peristyle and the eastern sacred area formed a continuous built space, enclosed and divided from one another by terrace walls. The sanctuary is situated to the west of the main north-south road leading from the palace, around the theatre, to the agora. The location of the agora is unexplored, but is supported by the existence of drainage works on the northeast side of the sanctuary, which do not follow the natural terrain and suggest a major effort to drain water from this area (see below, p. 75–6). Another road is known along the north side of the sanctuary, connecting the peristyle and sacred area and dividing the sanctuary from the agora. This road intersects with the 3-metre wide path on the east side of the peristyle leading to the south staircase, which probably suggests a road on the south side of the sanctuary. In its mature use, it makes sense to have a separate entrance to the peristyle, which could have been used as a staging ground for activities in the sanctuary. Since the peristyle area was in use from the earliest phase of the sanctuary (mid-fourth century), this may have been the original point of access.

---

227 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1998, 112–3.
228 Saatsoglou-Paliadele 1997, 51–3.

On the basis of similar construction techniques, the western peristyle and–in the eastern part of the sanctuary–the larger temple, the tripartite stoa, the altar and the three statue bases have been argued to be in the first phase of construction. In 1990, an intact *peplophoros* statue was uncovered between the bases and the northwest corner of the temple, 1.65 metres in height. In the same ditch, two intact marble heads of similar composition were found (fig. 21). The statue was compared (tentatively) to the Peace of Kephisodotos (conventionally dated ca. 370 BC), though thought to be an imitation with a date just after the mid-fourth century.[229] Lane Fox has suggested a specific historical context, the initial period of friendship between Philip II and Athens immediately following his ascendancy, which pushes the date back a decade to 360/59.[230] Excavators also note the axial alignment of the temple and altar, and then of the altar to the statue bases, although this second alignment is more pronounced in reconstructions than state plans (see fig. 17–18, *e.g.*) where the northernmost base, in particular, seems askew from the orientation of the altar. The articulation of the three-roomed stoa to the south wall of the temple (fig. 22, 29), where the west wall of the buildings form almost an exact line with overlapping foundations at the corner also suggests that these two buildings must be contemporary.[231] The peristyle, which is connected to the eastern part of the sanctuary, is then associated with the construction of temple. Finally,

229 Andronikos, Drougou, and Paliadele 1994, 177–180; Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1993, 26–8; Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 2007, 353–4.
230 Lane Fox 2011, 262.
231 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1993.

it is maintained that the marble statues could be best appreciated within the built context of the structures.

Saatsoglou-Paliadelē, citing the large number of *comparanda* from other Greek cities, suggested that the Sanctuary of Eukleia at Aigai should be interpreted as a monument honouring personal glory in service to the city. She highlights in particular the cults of Artemis Eukleia, and a reference in Plutarch (*Arist.* 20.5) that such cult belongs in the agora of Greek cities and the specific testimony for Plataia (ibid.), Thebes (Paus. IX, 17.1–2) and Athens (Id. I, 14.5).[232] The passage from Pausanias specifically refers to Artemis Eukleia, but it is Plutarch (ibid.) who suggests that most people associate Eukleia with Artemis. In any case, he adds that Eukleia has an altar and statue in the agora of every Greek city and that participants are those soon to be married (20.6). Xenophon's reference (*Hell.* IV, 4.2) to a festival of Eukleia at Corinth, where people would be gathered in the agora, may also suggest a sanctuary in the agora of Corinth.

It is worth noting Pausanias' reference to the Athenian agora refers to Eukleia, but Braund points out that the connection with Artemis is implicit in Greek Tragedy, and, particularly in Euripides, *eukleia* is associated with the fame mothers receive through the heroic deeds of their sons.[233] Euripides' presence at the court of Archelaos (when Aigai was still "capital", as I believe, see Chapter III, below) is well-known and Sourvinou-Inwood has particularly underscored the importance of local religious language in Euripides, emphasizing *Eukleia* as a proxy for the

232 Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 1987, 738–43.
233 Braund 1980.

wide fame that comes through military victory.[234] The dedicatory communication of the Queen Mother highlights the aspect of mothers and sons, that she would pray for the success of Philip II in the same way just as ordinary women might pray for the success of their sons on campaign. *Pace* Hatzopoulos, it was in the sanctuary and agora, rather than the palace, where the royal family met the city.[235]

The involvement of Zeus Meilichios raises greater complications, but the view of the excavator that the larger temple was dedicated to the snake-god should be rejected, especially for our period. Quite unlike the civic values connoted by the cult of Eukleia, Zeus Meilichios is generally regarded as an individual or family cult. Despite several dedications to Zeus Meilichios from the Athenian agora, Lalonde rejects the identification there, which is not attested in Pausanias, in favour of a sanctuary on the north side of the Hill of the Muses with no main temple but numerous rock-cut areas established by individual initiative.[236] Perhaps the best *comparandum* for the presence of Zeus Meilichios at a major state sanctuary is in the Sanctuary of Demeter Malephoros at Selinous. Here, painstaking review of the excavation journals has clarified the topography of the Zeus Meilichios precinct within the sanctuary and, as in Athens, the former is non-monumental and votive in character.[237] Wariness about the identification of the main temple with Zeus Meilichios does not detract from the social implication of having the dedication in such an important location. The suggestion that in Classical and Hellenistic cult, the god had

234 Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 40–5.
235 Hatzopoulos 2001.
236 Lalonde 2006, esp. 13–40, 52–4.
237 Grotta 2009, 63–100, 221–232.

moved away from his role in connection with internecine bloodguilt and was ‘aimed at the prosperity of the individual and his or her family’[238] supports the connection drawn by Eurydike’s dedication to Eukleia. Uniquely here, we are entitled to speak about the prosperity of the individual (Eurydike), her family (the royal house) and the city (as ancestral royal capital) in an inextricably intertwined way.

Whilst a date ca. 360–40 for the inscriptions and statues is broadly reasonable, the effort to associate the architecture on stylistic grounds cannot cut any ice. It is simply just as easy to imagine that the altar, temple and stoa were given as an architectural context to the statues at a (slightly) later date. A fixed date for the dedication(s) implies the existence of a defined sanctuary but not necessarily any other monuments that cannot be independently dated. There is scarcely any evidence for the built character of any other sanctuary of Eukleia (or Artemis Eukleia), so it is entirely possible that a defined sanctuary could have functioned here before any of the buildings were constructed. Apart from the dedications, the western peristyle is the only part of the sanctuary with an independent date, supplied by numismatic and ceramic evidence, showing it was in use from the mid-fourth century. The peristyle itself is associated with the water channel beneath it, the sediment of which provide a *terminus post quem* of ca. 325–300 BC. At a minimum, the similarity in construction techniques between the statue bases, the peristyle, the altar, the larger temple and the tri-partite, should suggest a date in the second half of the fourth century (i.e. not necessarily

238 Jameson 1993, 103.

ca. 350), but development in the early third century on the evidence presented so far. The importance of altars in Greek sanctuaries could imply that the altar was constructed early in this period, or that it had predecessor for which evidence does not survive. The articulation of the temple and the tri-partite stoa means that they were probably contemporaneous.

The use of the sanctuary may go back as far as the early fourth century and the road on the east side of the peristyle could also be this early, presumably linked to the road I have hypothesized on the south side of the complex, when the sanctuary may have had a more open plan. The road between the peristyle and the sacred area on the north side may be contemporary with the palace. The dating of the final phase to the second half of the second century is more secure, as it is based on ceramic and numismatic evidence, at which point the *naiskos* and probably also the south stoa were added.

The theatre and palace precinct

The theatre of Aigai was located ca. 80 metres to the south of the Sanctuary of Eukleia. Its siting between the sanctuary and the palace–the north wall of which nearly touches the suggested limit of the cavea (fig. 31),[239] is almost certainly intentional, for the natural contours of the ground were less than ideal.[240] The auditorium was divided into nine

239 Drougou 2003, 143; the measurement of 60 metres, which often appears in reports, is from the first row of seats.
240 Drougou 2002; Drougou 2011, 249.

sections, with a diameter of 28 metres and there was a second koilon, which is not fully explored. Only the first row of seats were made in stone (0.68–0.72 wide and 0.33 metres high), which probably alleviated the uneasy fit of the auditorium, especially at the east, with the natural landscape. The eight aisles of the lower koilon were also stone-built with a width of 0.7 metres, preserved for up to 20 metres. Andronikos believed that the rest of the auditorium was built in wood, and thus scaffolding could have addressed the problem of support on the eastern side. Drougou has suggested another reason for the absence of support, namely the presence of a reception area, but the evidence for this is unclear.[241] In any case, the access from the palace is much less strictly controlled than the road from the Sanctuary of Eukleia.[242] Andronikos rightly underscores the absence of any seats of honour, a usual feature of Greek civic theatres. At the centre of the orchestra the base of a small stone podium (0.4 by 0.7 metres) is preserved with a dowel hole in the middle.[243] A stone drain (0.5 metres wide, 0.27 deep) ran in front of the first row of the orchestra westward toward the city wall along a decline of 0.32 metres.

The L-shaped eastern foundations of the scene building are preserved for 12.4 (alongside the orchestra) by 2.5 metres, with a first course on the east side and 5.12 of the south. The theatre is set apart from its surroundings by walls up to 0.6 metres in width, which have been pursued for a distance of 20 metres on the east side (up to a height of 2

241 Drougou 2011, 248.
242 Drougou 1992, 13–5.
243 Andronikos 1984, 46–8; Andronikos 1986, 46–8

metres)[244], 15.23 on the north (following the eastern slope of the hill) and 13.85 on the west. These walls, which were constructed of fieldstones, make the theatre readily accessible from the palace but control its access from other parts of the city, including the Sanctuary of Eukleia and agora.[245] A series of foundations leading east from the scene building raise the possibility that it was articulated to and contemporary with the eastern peribolos. The 'petal-scheme' relationship of the auditorium and the orchestra has been compared to Megalopolis[246] and Eretria,[247] which have orchestra diameters of 22 and 31.52 metres, respectively, so Aigai's diameter of ca. 28 metres fits well within this range. Both of these theatres are generally regarded as post-Lycurgan, suggesting stylistic dates in the last quarter of the fourth century BC.

The existence of a theatre in Aigai is attested by Diodorus' account of Philip II's assassination there in 336 BC, and no other location for a theatre can be identified in the confines of the city. However, Diodoros' (XVI, 91–94) narrative does not require a semi-circular stone theatre and a date before 336 would be disruptive for the usual dating of such theatres after the theatre of Lycurgus, a disruption that requires a firm evidentiary basis for its defence.[248] On the basis of comparisons to Megalopolis and Eretria, it is most likely that the theatre as it stands in Aigai belongs to the last quarter of the fourth century. The amount of bronze and silver coinage of Philip V and civic emissions from Pella and Thessalonikē

244 Andronikos 1991, 142. Not in bibliography
245 Andronikos 1986, 48.
246 Fiechter 1931; revised date: Lauter and Lauter-Bufe 2004, 147–59.
247 Fiechter 1937; Isler 2007.
248 See now Moretti 2014, esp. 134–37: the proposed dating would make the Aigai theatre the first theatre with such a rounded *koilon*.

suggests the theatre thrived throughout most of the second century BC.[249] The theatre in Greek cities plays a central role in civic identity, but in Aigai it is inextricably tied to the palace physically, and probably ideologically as well.

The sharp pitch of the hill where the palace (figs. 32) was situated, the size of the structure (over five times the footprint of the Eukleia sanctuary), and the distribution of its weight over the steeper incline, required exceptional structuring works. In addition to the usual excavation of a level terrace, a two-metre thick retaining wall was built over a distance of 134.5 metres, varying in height from 7.35 to 13 metres (east to west) and turning to join the foundations of the building on either side (fig. 33). The excavator estimates the overall ground area covered by the palace foundations to be over 15,000 square metres, which is confirmed by aerial photography. The stone foundation (up to 1.8 metres thick) and retaining wall (more than 2 metres) is formed of nearly perfectly cut isodomic blocks.[250] The impressive north wall would have been the main view afforded from lower parts of the city, and would have seemed to loom over the lower civic area especially.[251]

There is not space here for a full description of the palace, which is available in recent accounts.[252] I shall rather focus on a few features, which distinguish the palace from the civic architecture discussed in this chapter. The principal focus of the palace is its large peristyle courtyard, which was the focus of communication between the main entrance and

249 Andronikos 1986, 49–50.
250 Kottaridē 2011, 307–8.
251 Kopsacheili 2013, 46.
252 Kottaridē 2011; Kopsacheili 2013, 45–69.

rectangular rooms of varying dimensions on every side. The fact that the Doric columns framing the courtyard (16 on each side) are larger than any on the exterior of the building emphasizes not only the physical, but especially the substantive centrality of this area for the entire building.[253] Three rooms with colonnaded entrances (F, M2, N2) controlled access to the rooms that flanked them (E and G, M1 and M3, N1 and N3, respectively), whilst rectangular anterooms (such as A and O) afforded access to quarter-size square rooms (A1, A2, N5, Q1, Q2).[254] These suites are commonly known as 'Flügeldreiraumgruppen' consisting of a large central room with columns in *antis* flanked by two rooms with couches, and thought to be a distinguishing mark of palace architecture.[255] For the rooms to which they led, the lack of direct access to the court combined with their size variations would have created a great scale of privacy and intimacy suited to different types of gatherings, perhaps simultaneously, as the number of similarly equipped rooms suggests. The conclusion that the main purpose of these gatherings was for festive banquets is supported by the presence of couches and asymmetrical doorways in the plurality of rooms that do not serve as corridors to other rooms.[256]

The main approach to the palace was via a long ramp faced by a monumental two-story façade, roofed and covered apart from its stoas (T–X), by what was probably the tallest building of the compound; it is split in the middle by the propylon with a perpendicular roof. On the other sides

253 Hoepfner 1996, 9.

254 The evidence for the additional quarter-size rooms not included in earlier plans (N5, Q1, Q2) is the position and arrangement of foundations newly revealed by recent excavations (Kottaridē 2011, 327).

255 Heermann 1986, 345–62; Nielsen 1994, 91.

256 Nielsen 1994, 83–84.

the stoas are continuous but the architecture is otherwise similar in form.[257] Entrance to the palace was from the east through colonnaded passage ways that led through two anterooms (Pr. 1–2) that crossed two sets of long and narrow rectangular rooms (T–X), which led to the door of a third room (Pr. 3), which in turn was part of the East wing of rooms surrounding the peristyle court. There is now evidence for seating areas in the second entry room (Pr. 2) as well as in two of the long narrow corridors (T and X).[258] The length of the entrance corridor and the adjoining long and narrow rooms on both sides emphasize the initial complexity and waiting time involved in accessing the palace, before entering the central peristyle area, where communication of spaces is far more free and open.

Kottaridē has suggested that the palace should date ca. 360/50–336 BC (i.e. prior to the death of Philip II. Many of the arguments are specious (comparison to Tomb II, the date of which is highly controversial; date of the theatre based on Philip's assassination there; style of the mosaic floors). Her strongest case comes from dimensions of columns and proportion of the architecture, as proposed in the new reconstruction of the façade. In her view, the palace falls between the Temple of Athena Alea in Tegea (360–45 BC) and the Temple of Zeus at Nemea (ca. 340–20 BC).[259] Unlike stylistic features, the technical details of the building are most consistent in their change over time, but for the fourth century the change is much less dynamic and draws on a smaller body of

257 Kottaridē 2011, 313.
258 Kottaridē 2011, 314–315, suggests that the stoas could have seated up to 130 people; Kopsacheili 2013, 47.
259 Kottaridē 2011, 313–22.

comparanda. Temples of this period also have a conservative and archaizing tendency, especially the Temple of Zeus at Stratos (dated to ca. 320 BC on ceramic, rather than stylistic or technical, grounds), which is almost never discussed. All of this is to say it is not possible to distinguish a date of the palace more refined than the second half of the fifth century. One factor that tends toward a later date is Pandermalēs' dating of the roof tiles to ca. 315–10; it is conceivable that these could be a repair, but until earlier tiles are found, taken together with other evidence, it remains difficult to remove doubts about a higher date.[260]

Unlike civic and religious architecture, which tended to feature a simple monolithic rectangular superstructure, a ceiling that is even throughout and a roof that is vaulted evenly across all parts of the structure, the building as a whole has an agglomerative feel. One unit is formed by the lower roof of the banquet rooms with the open-air court in the centre. This, incidentally, along with the courtyard as a central axis of communication marks the 'palace's' appropriation of features characteristic of 'domestic' (or perhaps gymnasia) architecture. Quite like temples and stoas, however, the building had a Doric frieze of triglyphs and metopes. Stone geison blocks supported terra-cotta roof tiles and akroteria at each intersection of tile on the edge of the roof, and drains decorated with painted meander and flower patterns terminating in lion-head water spouts.[261]

---

260 Kopsacheili 2013, 57–60, who suggests construction began at the end of Philip II's reign (after 340 BC) but was finished under Cassander. She focuses on the Doric columns (and the rooftiles), but does not discuss proportionality, which is much more reliable than individual measurements. A more detailed discussion will be possible after the evidence from Pella is considered (see below, Chapter III).

261 Pantermalēs 1987, 581–599.

What rather typifies this structure is a near exclusive emphasis on symposiastic space. On Kottaridē's new reconstruction the palace included a façade of continuous two-storied stoas, interrupted only by a monumental *propylon* and a service-court at the east front. The propylon was considerably taller than the stoas on the first level resulting in much higher roof heights at floor level and false windows divided by Ionic half-columns above. There were no less than three gates controlling entry and the stoas served to create long waiting rooms and benches have been found in T and X as well as the entry rooms Pr. 2-3.

In the palace at Aigai, the domestic symposium is converted into a state political ritual with over 16 rooms, capable of accommodating between 7 (A1, A2, Q1, Q2, N5 x2) and 30 (M1, M2) couches. This feature should be understood in connection with Bergquist's idea that a traditional domestic symposium comprised a single social group (7 couches). Civic and religious rooms of similar function could have up to 11 couches (though this is not common in the Classical period) and in exceptional cases 2 groups could be accommodated in public contexts of the highest order, e.g. the Pompeion at Athens, the Argive *Heraion,* the Herakleion in Thasos etc.[262] What is unique at Aigai, and to a lesser extent in the elite houses at Pella,[263] is the connecting of rooms in a single facility; (rarely more than a few) rooms appear side by side at some sanctuaries, but the palace at Aigai had 16 such rooms with space for over 230 couches. The largest rooms could accommodate 4-5 social groups on Bergquist's calculations (already a small community), but there were still the

262 Bergquist 1990, 44–54.
263 Chapter III, below.

traditional rooms for the most intimate gatherings and the complicated access through narrow easily guarded corridors (in two cases, two of them) suggests their importance. At the same event, the "palace" could thus accommodate large groups of elites and the king's most intimate friends.

Theatres are one of the most typical structures of Greek cities, and their presence in Aigai and Dion (see below, p. 90-1) signals the interest of the Macedonians in communicating this aspect of Greek cultural identity in their ancestral centres. Moreover, the performance of Euripides' *Bacchae* in Macedonia suggests a reciprocal belief between the Athenian poet and his hosts that the aura of Greek drama could be appreciated within a Macedonian theatre. The point is underscored by the poet's specific reference to aspects of the Macedonian landscape, for a god with particular connections to Macedonia. Nevertheless, the role of the theatre in shaping the political spaces of Greek cities was not imported wholesale, at least in the case of Aigai. The palace, as we have seen, may have been constructed before the theatre and the two buildings are architecturally integrated so that we should speak of the palace-theatre complex. So whilst we might expect that the type of plays we know from preserved Attic drama might be performed here as a civic spectacle, so the theatre was also integrated into the spectacle of monarchy: the palace itself and the royal processions and appearance that enabled.[264]

The lower city

264 For an elaboration on the importance of this theme, see esp. Strootman 2014, 233-263.

Although the main interest of intramural excavations at Aigai has been on the southwestern monumental sector, civic or religious buildings have been discovered on diverse and unrelated alignments throughout the lower city. This evidence, together with geophysical prospection, lends weight to Kottaridē's suggestion that Aigai was a city in clustered villages (*kata komas*) and remained so throughout the Hellenistic period.[265] In the north-western section of the city, near the Rhomaios tomb, successive buildings were constructed on a northwest-southeast alignment from the fifth century BC (fig. 15, no. 5). Together with the wall, the building activity shows that the lower city of Aigai already extended as far as the Haliakmon in Classical times. Two major building phases date to the end of the fourth through the third century and the first century BC–the first century AD. In these phases, the structures were of a public character, judging from the strength of their walls.[266]

One of these buildings, KI was located mostly outside of the peribolos wall, and oriented slightly more northwest to southeast than the rest of the sanctuary. Its eastern foundation is preserved for 17.3 metres and its northern foundation for roughly 6.6 metres, including its north-eastern corner. The eastern section preserves the first course of its foundation, 1.1 metres thick to a height of 0.3 metres for a length of 7.5 metres, for the rest only the underpinning is extant. The north wall is less strong (0.7 metres) and is preserved only in its underpinning, up to the northeastern corner, where there is greater depth following the incline of

265 Kottaridē 2008, 778.
266 Kottaridē 1988; Kottaridē 2008, 775–6.

the hill.[267] It dates to the late fourth century based on the head of a female figurine found underneath the east foundation, but a coin of Cassander offers a more precise date.[268] Pieces of Corinthian tile, 'perhaps from the roof', were found in excavated backfill 'from a nearby field.'[269]

Stone drains were built into the foundations of KI. The stone channel A1 follows the west wall for a distance of 11.5 metres, and from the northeast corner for 12.8 metres to the east and 7.2 metres to the south (fig. 34). The water line is constructed with stone plates 0.3 metres high with an average length of 0.5 metres and a width of at least 1.13 metres. It is carefully constructed and fitted, and said to be comparable to the technique of the theatre and the palace. Another drain (A2) ran southwest of the building, with a width of 0.66 metres and a depth of 0.5 metres, and was pursued for a distance of 14 metres. As well as its impressive scale, this channel is notable for its use of Corinthian crossties, and it may have replaced an earlier ceramic channel. The fill of the eastern water channel is described as containing building remains, pieces of pottery and crushed vessels from different periods. Its southern extension also contained a coin with a head of Perseus (obverse) and eagle (reverse), and another with a head of Poseidon (obverse) and Pellan ox (reverse) dating to the second quarter of the second century.[270] This

267 Andronikos and Kottaridē 1990, 103–4

268 They prefer the third quarter of the century; an 'architectural member' of this period is also mentioned but not shown or otherwise described.

269 Andronikos and Kottaridē 1990, 104–105.

270 Andronikos and Kottaridē 1990, 106, citing Gaebler 1906, pl. XVIII, 29 & XXXVI, 2.

channel was out of use by the time Building KV was constructed (mid-second century) but newer than the late fourth/early third century.[271]

The drainage works probably correspond to the axis of the ancient road leading to the gate discussed above. Outside the walls, a well-built structure with phases from the late fifth–first century BC, which had long stoas, a paved courtyard and large open spaces in the last third of the fourth century has been identified as a gymnasion (fig. 35).[272] Further detail of the excavation is required to assess this claim, but if correct it raises an interesting parallel with Beroia, where the gymnasion has been assigned a similar location based on epigraphic evidence. Along the same road a number of extramural settlements have been excavated, which correspond to an upsurge in evidence for settlement growth around Aigai in the late fourth and early third centuries. It suffices to mention here the site 2.5 kilometres west of Aigai on the border of the modern prefectures of Vergina and Pournari, where two large structures were discovered 1.5 metres apart that may have been part of single complex. These include a long rectangular foundation divided into two spaces 19.5 by four metres, and a second with preserved walls of 9.4 metres long and 5.5 metres deep, but that seem to have continued much further. No small finds were reported, but the buildings had two phases with little change in format[273], and the combination of large and small stones in the foundation is consistent with late Hellenistic and early Roman construction[274].

---

271 Andronikos and Kottaridē 1990, 104–6; Andronikos 1991, 132, KV: 136–7.
272 Kottaridē 1997.
273 The first building may have only been half as deep, based on evidence from the west end.
274 Kottaridē and Vakoulēs 1995.

On the east side of the city, excavations around the Sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods have revealed yet another nucleus of activity. The cult is known from the late fourth century, but Drougou suggests that it is a more ancient cult, which could represent one of the original centres of settlement.[275] The sanctuary consists of a multi-roomed complex of the late-fourth century with rooms dedicated to storage of the vast quantity of sacred objects, including the small votaries that testify to the sanctuary's popularity.[276] The evidence of clay stamps and inkwells may testify that the Metroon also served as an archive, but further details are needed to examine this possibility. Finally, the geo-electric scan of Aigai confirmed the importance of the main buildings and roads that have come under investigation identified and identified new areas. It also showed that there were vast tracts of vacant land, notably along the road to the Sanctuary of Eukleia southwest of the theatre (fig. 36).[277] This, along with the sporadic and irregular organization of the lower city confirms that Aigai was never grid-planned and developed piecemeal over the course of the Hellenistic period.

Mieza: formative elite civic centre

Mieza is referred to as a 'royal city' in pre-Classical sources,[278] but it is the only centre in Macedonia where archaeological evidence relates mainly to

275 Drougou 2011, 251; the identification is based on a west-slope black-glazed kantharos incised ΜΗΤΡΙ ΘΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΝΤΕΛΗΑ[Ι] (Drougou 1993, 9).
276 Drougou 1993; Ead. 1997; Ead. 2011; Kallinē 2014.
277 Tsokas 2006.
278 Koukouvou and Psarra 2011, 233. There is no mention of special status in the lists characteristic of history literary and epigraphic sources.

its civic status. Unlike the important Greek centres east of the Axios, its secure position in the Macedonian heartland did not require even a strong royal claim such as is reflected in the heroa of Pangaion and Philippi or the new district of the gymnasion of Amphipolis (see Chapter IV, below). Although the problem posed by Aigai of relating a probable monumental civic centre to the overall development of the city is yet magnified at Mieza, everything we know about the city is relatable to local civic functions. The importance of Mieza as a civic centre is underscored by the number of Macedonian tombs in its territory, which also enable a reconstruction of the roads leading to the city and some sense of the city's limits (fig. 37).[279]

The 'School of Aristotle' (fig. 38), where Philip II asked the philosopher to tutor Alexander the Great and his contemporaries, has also been identified at the Nymphaion near Isvoria on the road between Naoussa (4 kilometres) and Kopanos (3 kilometres). It consists of a Π-shaped stoa with Ionic columns built into a vertically carved out rock-face with three natural caves.[280] Such a characteristic monument of Greek civic architecture (the free-standing stoa) is otherwise unknown in Macedonia, and likewise its preserved terra-cotta sima with gentle floral decoration and lion head spouts is unprecedented in proportions and decoration for the region. Perhaps the philosopher had an influence in the architectural design, and certainly it is appropriate for the different kinds of activities that went on in the School. Three of the best known

279 Rhomiopoulou 2002, check pages. Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2009, 21–2.
280 See esp. Petsas 1967, Petsas 1970; Siganidou and Trochidēs 1993; Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2009, 18–19.

monumental tombs–of Judgment, Lyson and Kallikles, and the Palmettes–are worth special mention for the details of the imitative architecture.[281] Detail of such tombs is often limited to the oikos façade, door and sometimes columns, but these tombs imitate a higher level of detail (fig. 39). The Tomb of Judgment has a two-storied architectural façade of a length more reflective of political architecture than a temple. Kottaridē has made it the basis of her reconstruction of the palace façade at Aigai, and the interior of the tomb also is elaborately articulated.[282] The Tomb of the Palmettes had carved half-Ionic column profiles with painted mouldings (egg-and-dart, bead-and-reel), a dentillated cornice, an Ionic frieze, the same moulding pattern above the architrave and the large akroteria for which it is named.[283] The tomb of Lyson and Kallikles is famous for the 'architectural style' of its paintings.[284]

Mieza seems to have been located on a generally level plateau immediately northwest of modern Kopanos (ca. 115–120 masl). Mieza is positioned in the foothills of Mount Bermion, off the main communication routes with Western Macedonia, the Via Egnatia and Southern Greece, all three of which were via Edessa and Beroia.[285] Its local topography, however, could not contrast more with the undulating and varied landscape of Aigai. On the north side of the plateau there is evidence of a

281 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2009, 17–18.

282 Petsas 1966, 44–113; Kottaridē 2011, 319.

283 Rhomiopoulou et al. 2010, 252–3.

284 Miller 1993, 93–100.

285 The road connections of Mieza have received scant discussion, but see Edson 1955, 187 (n. 66); Hatzopoulos 1996, 114–6. In addition to the Pella and Beroia roads mentioned above, it is clear from the funerary monuments at Stenemachos (*BÉ* 1965, 792 & 1998, 830, no. 9) that Mieza was connected to the modern wine heartland northeast of Naoussa.

strong (1.6 metre-thick) wall that was excavated for ca. 61 metres, preserved up to a height of 1.7 metres (up to three courses).[286] Hellenistic rock-cut tombs have been found on the north side of the modern Kopanos-Naoussa road, in the direction of Beroia and Mount Bermion, and the main Hellenistic cemetery lies to their north.[287] The monumental tombs lie to the east of modern Lefkadia, on the way toward Pella.

A late Hellenistic building complex is located between the rock-cut tombs and the cemetery,[288] but it is difficult to imagine how it was intramural, as a narrow downhill extension of the fortification would have been required. The city could have extended to the east (north and east of Kopanos), a broad gently sloping plain (70–20 masl at the Moglenitsas) was faced by the late-Hellenistic theatre. Major public building has been identified in the area of the Bronze Age settlement, ca. 1.5 kilometres south of the tomb of Kallikles, so a topographical relationship between the tombs and civic centre should not be ruled out. If the entire plateau was settled, the city could have been as large as 135 ha, but further exploration is required to determined its extent.

Leake and Delacoulonche misidentified the location of Mieza closer to Naoussa, and its location still requires explanation.[289] The answer lies in Pliny's (*NH* XXXI, 20) description of the water that turns into petrified stone. This phenomenon, especially in caves, known as stalactite, occurs in the caves within the school of Aristotle.[290] This corresponds to the P-

286 Allamanē and Misaelidou 1995, 80–4.
287 *ΑΔ* 36 (1981) 325; Misaelidou-Despotidou 1993.
288 Probably an early-Roman bath: Allamanē and Misaelidou 1995, 208–12.
289 Leake 1835, III, 288; Delacoulonche 1858, 39–41.
290 Faugeres 1981.

wave velocity in the stone, which led to the highest quality building material in Macedonia, comparable to the stone found on Delos and Rhodes (which also have stalactite deposits).[291] The geology of the Bermion region also made it suitable for the production of pigments used on Macedonian tombs.[292] At the same time, the plateau was at a similar elevation to Beroia, whence Mieza could command a considerably rich agricultural territory. The third century deeds of sale, found in the antechamber of the Tomb of Judgment, record a land value 132 percent of that recorded on comparable documents from Amphipolis.[293] These also give important evidence for the privileges of civic elites such as those who occupied the monumental tombs, as a certain Zopyros acquired lands of ca. 100 hectares.[294]

In 1969, excavation uncovered a series of parallel foundations indicative of a courtyard, preserved to a height of up to 1.75 metres. To the north(east) of this space remains of half-columns were discovered in an area without stone foundations, which the excavator found comparable to the Rhomaios tomb at Aigai and the Tomb of Judgment. Beyond this, there was another wall with remains of an earthen 'bench' (fig. 40: 0.5 metres high, 0.47 metres long) where there were also remains of two Ionic columns, again comparable to the Rhomaios tomb.[295] Full-scale excavations from 1992 have revealed that the northeastern area was a corridor leading into the complex, a temple and an additional set of rooms

291 Christaras 2009.
292 Perdikatsis, Maniatis, and Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 2002, 252–3
293 Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 116.
294 Raynor 2015, 123.
295 *AΔ* 25 (1970) 387–9 [A. Rhomiopoulou, I. Touratsoglou], 26 (1971) 407–9 [Eaed.].

between the corridor, a peristyle courtyard, and a further monumental space to the south. All of this amounts to a monumental complex of ca. 300 by 150 metres (ca. 4.5 ha)[296], more integrated than the Sanctuary of Eukleia, which deserves to be compared to the agora of Pella (261 by 234 metres, or 6.1 ha: see Chapter III below). When the maximal size of Mieza (135 ha) is compared to the size of Pella (just over 400 ha), the scale of its monumental centre is all the more impressive.

The complex (fig. 41)[297] was constructed on successive terraces, the easternmost (and lowest) supporting the seven-metre wide corridor, which was 51 metres long. It was linked, immediately west of the space of the semi-columns (A), by a ramp and single stone stair, with evidence for three columns (B, rising three metres over a distance of 21 metres), along which the space narrows to 2.65 metres.[298] Along the north side, articulated to the north wall enclosing the ramp stands a Doric distyle *in antis* temple (Γ, 16.2 by 7.3 metres, with only a two-metre porch).[299] The parallel foundations turning to the south enclose the porch of a long stoa (E), from which four rooms have been excavated.[300] The stylobate, constructed of stone plinths and fieldstones, was explored for 21 metres with evidence for 11 Doric columns (diameter: 50 centimetres). The rooms (ca. four by four metres) have 'simple mosaic' floors, a type known from the houses of Olynthos, the palace of Aigai and the monumental

296 Koukouvou and Psarra 2011, 225; Psarra 2013, 105–6.

297 The reconstructed plans should be used with care, because the relative dimensions of spaces do not match reported measurements or published state plans (*e.g.* see below, on the east-facing stoa)

298 Allamanē and Misaelidou 1995, 202–4; Psarra 2013, 106–7.

299 Allamanē and Koukouvou 1998, 86–7.

300 Psarra 2013, 107–8.

houses from Pella.[301] This stoa faced onto a terrace (I), which could also be reached via a stone staircase (Γ) against the wall with semi-columns.[302]

Behind the stoa was a prominent peristyle courtyard (ΣΤ, 37 by 32 metres), with several rooms facing onto it (67 by 62 metres in total), measuring 4.8 by 4.8 metres, as well as raised levels for couches. Each set of two rooms in entered through a rectangular anteroom.[303] In 2008, a second rectangular complex was explored to the south on a separate terrace, divided into three long rectangular spaces on the west and a single line of shorter rooms (but apparently with the same depth) at the north.[304] Unfortunately, measurements and other detail of these spaces have yet to be published.

As the excavators suggest, the building complex of Mieza is an emblematic symbol of Macedonian civic architecture. It shares many of the stylistic and organizational features known from Aigai: an artificial façade with engaged half-columns, symposiastic space, Doric stoas as part of an architectural complex and the use of extensive terracing. Particularly notable is the presence of an east-facing temple integrated to and yet architecturally distinct from a large complex, anchoring civic space.[305] These complexes are also divided architecturally into distinct zones suggesting open, and non-axial, movement throughout. The prothalamos of the symposium rooms in the northwestern peristyle has been compared to the format of the gymnasion at Epidauros, and the

301 Allamanē and Koukouvou 2000, 376–8
302 Koukouvou and Psarra 2011, 227.
303 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2004, 574.
304 Psarra 2013, 109.
305 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2009, 22.

grouping of rooms at Perachora, in the Leonidaion at Olympia and the series of rooms in the *Askelepieion* at Athens. The simplicity of the rooms has likewise been associated with sanctuaries of Asklepios at Epidauros, Troizen, Athens, Corinth and Delos.[306] Attestation of an *Asklepieion* in Mieza, and the central role Hatzopoulos and Errington have held priests of Asklepios to play in Macedonian civic life, [307] finally convinced the excavators to suggest this identification.[308]

A theatre dating mostly to the second century BC has been excavated 75 metres southwest of the *Asklepieion* (for the relationship of the *Asklepieion* and the theatre, see fig. 44).[309] It demarcates the southwestern point of the civic 'acropolis', and there is no sign of building between the theatre and *Asklepieion*, perhaps suggesting an open public square existing in the intervening space.[310] The first seven steps of the *koilon* are thought to represent an earlier phase, dating to the mid-fourth century BC, based on the straight line of the paradromos blocks and the steps, rather than the blunt curve characteristic of later periods.[311] The earliest small-finds of the theatre also included bronze coins of Philip II and black-glaze and red-figure pottery sherds.[312] The theatre was built into the slope of a low hill, and the first seven courses of seats and the first 19 steps of four staircases are constructed of poros limestone and

306 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2004, 575–77, with earlier references.
307 Hatzopoulos 1996 I.139–56, 378–84, 393; Errrington 2007.
308 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2009, 25.
309 In its final form, the theatre combines Hellenistic and Roman elements: Poulakakēs 2011, 161–6, with earlier references.
310 Psarra 2013, 106.
311 This chronology is based on comparisons to theatres in Sicily and at Maroneia: Moretti 2007, 154–5; Karadedos and Karadēma 2004, esp. 12–15.
312 Poulakakēs 2011, 166–7.

take advantage of the natural terrain. The blocks of the paradromos run parallel to the early-Roman *paraskenion*, creating a semi-circular orchestra with a diameter of 22 metres (fig. 42).[313] Given the similarity in construction style, that is to say that the theatre at Mieza was roughly the size of Megalopolis' but a bit smaller than Aigai's (see above, pp. 68–70).

The theatre was discovered in 1992, whilst excavators were exploring the water line beneath a Hellenistic and Roman complex to the west of the *Asklepieion* (fig. 43). The complex, which in its latest phase takes the form of a Roman atrium house, with a small Ionic colonnade, was in use from the third century BC until the first century AD, based on coins of Cassander, Antigonos Gonatas, Philip V, Perseus, Amphipolis and Pella. Coins of Antigonos Gonatas have also been associated with a destruction layer. Evidence for the pipeline is not well presented, but it should date before this complex, ca. 300 BC.[314] Its position suggests that water may have come into the city centre from Mt Bermion through the modern wine district. Since a partially uphill route would have been all but required, it is highly likely that the space between the theatre and *Asklepieion* is the agora of the city, and it is thus appropriate to comment on this area's distinct character as civic space.

The northwest peristyle of the *Asklepieion* has an L-shape of rooms facing the square but rooms on its east side do not; the rooms facing the square is feature of the more integrated peristyle agora at Pella, and this could be indicative of civic space in Macedonia. In the excavator's view, it

313 Poulakakēs 2011, 160–1.

314 *ΑΔ* 47, 1992, 454 (V. Misaelidou-Despotidou); Allamanē and Misaelidou 1995, 208–12; Poulakakēs 2011, 159.

cannot be excluded that the stoa extended for 170 metres, which is also the length of the north, agora-facing side of the Sanctuary of Eukleia. There is no clear indication that a running track filled these spaces (as at Pella, see Chapter III, below) but the stadial length seems to have played an important role in the design of Macedonian agorai. Panathenaic amphorai of the fifth and fourth centuries have been found in the small temple and in the foundation layer of the wall with engaged semi-columns, supporting the idea of ceremonial space, perhaps connected with games.[315]

Two glass beads from one of the rooms around peristyle ΣΤ are said to date to the mid-fourth century, but their precise context is unclear.[316] The firmest chronological evidence for the date of the *Asklepieion* comes from the pottery and coins in the strata of the corridor, dating it to the last quarter of the fourth century BC. A pre-construction layer at a depth of 1.8 to two metres contained bronze coins of Philip and Alexander, amidst sheep, lamb, pig and ox bones. A higher layer (1.25 metres), associated with the first phase of use, contained bronze coins of Cassander and Lysimachos and red-figure Kerch-style pottery.[317] Because of the discontinuous excavation of the corridor and the western space, it is possible that the corridor was a renovation, but on balance the likelihood is that the whole structure was constructed after 323. In the western rooms of the north peristyle, a destruction layer was found, but whether this was a final destruction or, if it was rebuilt, requires further study.

---

315 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2004, 577–8.
316 Allamanē, Koukouvou, and Psarra 2004, 574.
317 *ΑΔ* 26 (n. 121) 409.

Unlike Pella's rather contiguous urban space (see Chapter III, below) framed with peristyle architecture, the area between the theatre and the *Asklepieion* seems to have been a largely open civic square, but this needs to be confirmed by geophysical analysis.

Dion: Religious and political centre

The importance of religion shown by the agora sanctuaries at Aigai and Mieza for the space of Macedonian cities is especially relevant for the Macedonian religious centre at Dion (fig. 45). It poses a different set of problems but also a unique opportunity. Whilst substantial Roman overbuild hinders almost any sense of Hellenistic civic building, the creation of a fortified, orthogonally gridded city has a secure date at the end of the fourth century. Despite the existence of a settlement (from at least the Geometric period) adjacent to the eastern peribolos wall at Delphi, Dion provides the only opportunity to study the deliberate creation of urban space at a wide-reaching (Pan-Hellenic or regional) sanctuary. This is all the more significant for the known embellishment, and important dedications in the sanctuary during the last third of fourth century.

Dion lies on the northeast shoulder of Mt Olympos at the southern edge of the Macedonian heartland and of Pieria (situated between the Haliakmon and Peneios Rivers, (fig. 46). Leake described the approach to Dion (from Olympos) as similar to the 19th century landscape of Aigai: fields of paliuri between groves of plane and oak tree, but the site was

further into the plain. [318] There is no evidence that marshland around Dion was drained, and it could have been toxic as at Pella (see Chapter III, below). Heuzey mentions that in his day local residents suffered from acute fevers, indicative of malaria. The steep slopes of Olympos make it particularly vulnerable to winter rains and even today the site is often subject to inundation.[319] As I shall argue for Pella also, the environmental conditions show very clearly why the marshes were never a desirable place for pre-historic settlement. Their development in historical periods shows an overwhelming strategic desire to control the territory in question, and for Dion it is the access from the Pēneios valley that made it such a valuable and culturally significant site.

Leake and Heuzey observed the outlines of a theatre and a stadion of the usual length, as well as the remains of a large building, and walls. Leake identified the building as the Temple of Olympian Zeus, and the theatre and stadion as part of the sanctuary in comparison with Olympia, Nemea and Isthmia.[320] Heuzey surveyed the walls, which he found unusual for their situation in the open countryside, without an acropolis.[321] The massive walls give us a rough idea of the city plan. They were constructed of conglomerate from Olympus, with 17-18 towers (5.5–5.6 metres apart) on every side of nearly a sqaure enceinte (642 x 682 m).[322] At less regular intervals, gates led to major streets, which divided the city into at least six (and possibly as many as 9, rectangular sections of

318 Leake 1835, III, 408.
319 Leake 1835, 412–13; Heuzey 1860, 114.
320 Leake 1835, 409–11; Heuzey 1860, 114–5.
321 Heuzey 1860, 115–118.
322 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 96-98, 113-119.

varying proportions.[323] This τετράγονον σχῆμα (fig. 47), is a feature of the settlement at New Halos in Thessaly as well and, as Strabo (XII, 4.7) mentions, Nicaea. Stephanidou-Tiveriou argues that it was an outcome of Alexander's experiments with urban foundations in the East, such as Damascus, Syrian Beroia, Doura-Europos, Diberǰn and Vorsippa (Iraq).[324] Nevertheless, Dion, which Thucydides had called a πόλισμα (IV, 78) remained an *urbs non magna* (Liv. XLIV, 7) at the end of the Hellenistic period, covering less than 45 ha.

In a pit at the level of the euthynteria 3.5 metres south of tower Δ4, a bronze coin of 'King Cassander' was found. Together with similar coins found at foundation level on the south wall, between towers N3 and N4 as well as to the east of N7, it gives a terminus post quem for the first phase of the fortification as after 305 BC.[325] This period is well-represented by roughly 72% of the length of the wall in the north, 50% in the west, 43% in the south and 3% in the east. The substantial reduction of the walled city from the east in the late Roman and the early Christian periods accounts for the low percentage of surviving evidence from the east face.[326] The early Hellenistic phase was constructed almost entirely of orthogonal stone blocks with nearly undisturbed soil composition (fig. 48). The towers and gates were also orthogonal with axial entrance, except for some towers with multiple narrow axial and diagonal corridors.[327] In the subsequent phase (fig. 49), many of the large blocks were reused but

323 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 121-133.
324 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 218–233
325 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 133–4, 216, 236 no. 21, 22, 24.
326 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 96, 157–215.
327 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 98–124.

gaps were filled in with crushed stone from what had been the invisible substratum and spoliated column drums. The disturbance of the soil is shown by its largely diagonal levels and the presence of stone debris. Dating in this period is less secure and the excavator was inclined to see two phases of repair, contemporaneous with the Aitolian sack of Dion (219 BC: Polyb. V, 8.4–9, 9.1–6) and the second Macedonian War (197 B.C.: Livy XXXIII, 3.5).[328]

The gates provide our best evidence for the street system of Dion, and especially of the relationship of major and minor roads. *E.g.,* Gates BII, which is flanked by two towers, B4, B5, and ΔI had openings of 4.5 metres (fig. 50), which correspond to two of the largest streets criss-crossing the city, whilst other gateways were ca. 2 metres or less. A large opening in the door threshold of ΔI allowed for the passing of a led pipe, probably bringing water from the environs of Olympos.[329] Unfortunately, very little is known about the structure of the Hellenistic city within the walls, due to Roman overbuilding, but Pandermalēs suggested that the so-called Monument of the Shields was the back wall of a building marking the southern edge of the agora in the southern part of the later Roman one (fig. 51).

A destruction layer in the middle of the agora cornerstones may indicate the Hellenistic agora was about half the size of the Roman complex.[330] Underneath a Roman temple, finds include red-figure, black-glaze and unglazed pottery, Macedonian amphorai, lekanai, oinochoai,

328 Stephanidou-Tiveriou 1998, 137–56.
329 Ibid., 149
330 Pantermalēs 1994, 138; Id. 1997, 209.

askoi and pestles of the fourth century. There were also pointed amphorai, terra-cotta figurines, figurine molds and lamps of the fifth and fourth centuries, probably indicating a trade function for this space. Beneath the foundations of the Imperial South Stoa remains of an earlier wall and a stone water channel were discovered. The fill of the channel included pottery of the fourth century, silver coins of Cassander and Lysimachos, bronze coins of several kings, ceramic lamps and figurines and fragments of Rhodian amphorai similar to those from Pella.[331] The wall was pursued for 32 metres, and near the middle was divided by a tetragonal space (8.4 by 7.6 metres) lined with a Π-shape of stone benches 60 centimetres deep.[332] The Shield Monument overlooked the main street, a Roman decumanus, which goes up to the edge of the building but was probably 1–1.5 metres narrower in Hellenistic times (fig. 52). Markle has suggested that the shields correspond to those used by Macedonian hypaspists ca. 360–300 BC, so the monument may belong to the public space in the earliest phase after the rebuilding of Cassander.[333]

To the east of the main road in the approximate centre of the walled city, underneath the Villa of Dionysos, near the bath, pieces of sculpture resembling the Farnese Herakles were found.[334] Nearby, a bronze water pipe (fig. 53) was found, the first musical instrument discovered in Macedonia, which the excavator dates to the first century BC based on comparisons from throughout the Hellenistic World.[335] These finds

331 Pingiatoglou 2008, 581–2.
332 Pingiatoglou et al. 2013, 144–5
333 Markle 1999, 241–6; *cf.* Pingiatoglou 2008, 580.
334 Pantermalēs 1994, 139.
335 Pantermalēs 1995, 217–9; Id., 1997, 209.

combine to suggest that the area had an important civic or elite function in the Hellenistic period. Along the west side of the central road, south of the agora, pottery of the late fifth-century and coins of the Classical and Hellenistic periods were found. A 12.5-metre east-west wall was identified north of the pit with monumental constructions and signs of columns.[336] It dates to the Hellenistic period, based on red-figure and black-glaze pottery as well as coins found within the foundations. A second wall within the southeast corner of the agora, built with spoliated remains of column drums, column capitals and architectural members along with coins of the fourth to second centuries, is perhaps related to the Hellenistic building.[337]

Quite apart from its development as a city, Dion served as a national sanctuary of the Macedonian state from at least the reign of Archelaos (413–399), who established a festival of Zeus and the Muses there (Diod. XVII, 16.3–4). Several royal letters have been discovered within the *temenos* of the Sanctuary of Zeus Olympios addressed to the *epistates* and sometimes the Macedonian civic body.[338] The problem of the *epistates* cannot be discussed at length here, but suffice to say that its traditional interpretation as a royal functionary has been questioned. At Dion, as in other cities, the *epistates* has been recognized a local man, who serves as a link between royal policy and local civic administration.[339] By the late Antigonid period, there is also evidence for decisions taken by

336 Pingiatoglou 2008, 579–80.
337 Pingiatoglou et al. 2013, 143.
338 Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 323, 326, 464, 482; Pantermalēs 2009, 261–3.
339 Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 372–409; *SEG* XLVIII (1998) 783; Raynor 2015, 17 (with n. 69), 63–4.

an assembly of the Macedonian *koinon* at the annual *panegyris* in Dion at the end of the campaign season in October.[340] As in other federal capitals, the theatre at Dion is a likely venue for such an assembly, but the precise relationship between national and civic institutions within this space remains a question for further study.

The Hellenistic theatre within the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus was built into an artificial hill, with its koilon constructed of large, slightly curved, stone plinths (ca. 50 by 50 by 6.5 centimetres), supported by dense filaments of crushed rock and earth. The preservation and reuse of straight plinths indicates an earlier phase, probably dating to the fourth century.[341] Its orchestra had a diameter of 26 metres, roughly the size of Aigai's, and was framed by a large stone gutter, and traces of it beneath the foundations later scene building indicate the orchestra was originally circular (fig. 54).[342] The 2.5-metre fill to support the scene building suggests that it was initially constructed in the mid-third century, and the curved plinths of the koilon may also belong to a large-scale reconstruction at that date.[343] I should also mention briefly new construction in the Sanctuary of Asklepios, since this god is often connected with Macedonian civic identity, including a small two-room temple and a long (110-metre) stoa to the east (fig. 55), dated to the end of the fourth century based on pottery sherds and fragments of ceramic lamps.[344] The finds from the sanctuary were mainly characteristic of the

340 Papazoglou 1983, 208–10, plausibly suggesting organization under Antigonos Gonatas (277–39 BC); Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 270; II, nos. 32–35; Raynor 2015, 14, 102.
341 Karadedos 1986, 332–5; Karadedos 2007, 384–7.
342 Karadedos 1986, 329–32; Karadedos 2007, 382–4.
343 Karadedos 1994.
344 Pingiatoglou 2008, 577–8.

healing god, but topographically played an important role in the provision of water for a public latrine.[345]

Conclusions

The archaeological evidence from Aigai, Mieza and Dion reveals distinct aspects of the redevelopment of civic spaces in traditional Macedonian centres from the second half of the fourth century BC. Because I have suggested the possibilities of higher dating for the Sanctuary of Eukleia and the *Asklepieion* at Mieza, development in the late Classical period is not out of the question. Indeed, the ready access to building materials from the mountains in southwestern Ēmathia and Pieria make these places where one should look, and not at Pella as I shall argue below, if we ever hope to resolve the difficult question of development in late Archaic and Classical Macedonia.

The position of the three centres discussed here, off the main roads, provided security to develop amidst the tumultuous invasions prior to the settlement of Philip II, but hindered their wholesale redevelopment in Hellenistic times, and what building we have is thus more a matter of historical memory than practical necessity. Changes in the use of space at Aigai and Mieza seem to have focused on monumental districts that did not alter the overall layout of the cities. The presence of mosaic floors in the dining rooms of the palace at Aigai and the Asklepieion at Mieza links these traditional centres to similar practices both in the domestic and

345 Pingiatoglou 2005, 431–2.

sacred architecture of Southern and Eastern Greece. The overall importance of sanctuaries in defining space at all three sites should mitigate any notion that religion had diminished in the civic life of Hellenistic Macedonia. Although it is not possible to fully assess the stone theatres at these sites, they all seem to reflect well the function of cities, with the ancestral royal centre of Aigai's connected most strongly to the 'palace', the elite civic centre of Mieza's to the agora and the religious centre of Dion's to the most important temple there. The importance of the theatres, in accompaniment with sanctuaries to help define spaces in the city, reflects the sense of the theatrical in the Macedonian kingdom, underscored by Diodoros' (XVI, 91–94) account of Philip II's assassination.

At Aigai, the evidence includes the development of a royal district with a palace, but also the all-important Greek civic monument of the theatre, and an agora sanctuary replete with royal influence. This needs to be separated from the wholesale re-planning of cities, often thought to be a mark of royal initiative. Aigai gives evidence for a crucial western axis including the Acropolis, the theatre, the Sanctuary of Eukleia and the Rhomaios tomb. There were also three different axes, including one that extended outside the walls including a possible gymnasion. This location would mirror Beroia, but in this case it could not have been for want of space. The focus of redevelopment on royal ideology, and the probable contemporaneity of building at Aigai, strengthens Hatzopoulos' argument that, whatever happened with the 'movement of the capital', Aigai remained indispensable as the royal ideological centre of Macedonia.[346]

346 Most recently in Hatzopoulos 2013, 166–7.

In the next chapter, I shall argue that the market and record-keeping orientation of the agora at Pella and the different function of its palace, *inter alia*, necessitate a strict interpretation of its role as an administrative centre.

In contrast to Aigai, the slight evidence for civic building at Dion, does not add a great deal to our understanding of its role as a political centre, already highlighted by the display of the Granikos monument, Cassander's statue and royal treaties and decrees. Nevertheless, the deliberate planning of an organised settlement at the end of the fourth century, shows that by this time, its importance as a city and not just a political sanctuary was being emphasised. This is true even if we assume that, as at Delphi, a settlement existed alongside the sanctuary from an earlier period. The role of Dion as federal capital cannot be addressed on the basis of evidence from the city centre, but within the adjacent sanctuary area it reflects the balance of royal and civic institutions. The triad of royal centre, political centre and administrative centre has no real compliment in Epeiros, as I shall have occasion to discuss in Chapter V.[347]

At both Aigai and Mieza, large religious complexes, which I have called agora sanctuaries, seem to define civic space. This allows us to put to rest the always benighted suggestion that religion did not play a significant role in Macedonian building.[348] The Sanctuary of Eukleia, on current evidence, most clearly relates to royal ideology, though we should not underestimate its impact on and use by the citizens of Aigai. It was, as I have suggested, where royal family and city met. If the suggestion

347 *Pace* Hatzopoulos, 2013.
348 Christesen and Murray 2010.

that the agora sanctuary in Mieza is an *Asklepieion* is correct, it provides a clear example for the importance of Asklepios in formulating the civic identity of Macedonian *poleis*, which Hatzopoulos and Errington have underscored based on epigraphic sources.[349] It also suggests a fundamental difference in the function of the agora sanctuaries in the two cities, and probably a corresponding difference of identity in the Hellenistic period.

Façade architecture emphasizing entrance and procession in a non-royal space shows the influence royal ideology was having in non-royal architecture within Macedonia. It should be added that the semi-columns known from the Sanctuary of Zeus Ammon in Aphytis (see below, p. 187) may indicate a role in religious architecture. Until a full study of the columns from the Palace of Aigai and the Asklepieion at Mieza has been undertaken, it is imprudent to date any of these buildings more precisely than ca. 350/40–320/10. The corridor, semi-columns, stone bench and ramp of the Asklepieion shows that the elaborate ritual of entrance, so well illustrated by the palace of Aigai, could extend to civic space as well. What distinguishes the sanctuary/civic space of Aigai and Mieza is the existence of multiple axes and routes of access. The seven-couch suites of the northwest peristyle of Mieza each accommodate one of Bergquist social's groups,[350] and their equal size is in common with the *hestiatoria* of sanctuaries in the Greek world. The issues of access and control of space become most clear in the agora at Pella, to which I shall now turn.

---

349 Hatzopoulos 1991; Errington 2007.

350 Note 260, above.

Chapter 3: The *basileion* of Pella

Introduction

For a study on the use of civic architecture to define urban space, Pella presents rich opportunities, but as many challenges. The striking visage of its peristyle courts, especially seen from above (fig. 1), along with our imagination of what the peristyles of the agora and palace must have looked like at their full height, supplies a vision of what significant individual buildings might have meant for organisation at Amphipolis and Kassandreia, where it is more difficult to appreciate their context (see chapter IV, below). For it is in these cities east of the Loudias that we encounter the redevelopment of whole towns. Nevertheless, at no other site can we observe the proliferation of public architecture and the way it connects distinct parts of the city the way we can in Pella (fig. 2).

The absence of comparanda elsewhere in Macedonia–especially for Pella's monumental agora–is problematic for the lack of both contextual breadth, and understanding the significance of individual details. The discovery of the peristyle houses I, 1 & I, 5 along with the peristyle hall (I, 3) confirmed the identification of Pella (fig. 3), implied by Struck's suggestion for the identity of Phakos (the heart of Classical Pella)[351] sixty years before (fig. 4).[352] At the same time, they give evidence for a particular kind of city, the *basileion* (Ps. Skylax 66) or administrative centre (see I.2, below) of the Macedonian kingdom. This may be why the physical scale of Pella, 400 ha within the late fourth century walls,[353] is truly unprecedented, especially when we consider that every part of Pella

351 Struck 1908, 82-97.
352 P. M. Petsas, *Μακεδονικά* 7 (1966–7) 306–7 for full bibliography.
353 C. I. Makaronas, *ΑΔ* 29 (1973–4) 708.

that is known archaeologically is grid-planned. It naturally begs the question of how representative Pella might be for urbanism in Macedonia during our period.

Second, despite the quantity of buildings known, only two, the π-shaped Sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods immediately north of the agora,[354] and the Thesmophorion in the eastern periphery of the city,[355] have been properly published. For the rest, we have to rely on reports from sporadic periods of excavation and separate teams, who seldom place their work in the context of long-term excavation. This leads to extreme variance and incompleteness in the record, especially for the provenance of small finds, which are critical for understanding the dating and function of buildings.

These limits are severe, but not entirely insurmountable, especially when we consider the details that are available for building at Pella and also its use. First, there are a number of signs that whilst its role as *basileion* is inescapable, the function of Pella as a town, albeit it an exceptionally large one, was not entirely reducible to this function. The particular organisation of streets, monumental government building and civic monuments in Washington, DC–to take an extreme example–are related to its function as a political capital.[356] Nevertheless, many people live, work and carry out their everyday lives there in much the same way they would do elsewhere. In Pella, the apparent homogeneity of peristyle architecture from the sky or in ground plans would hardly have been the

354 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 2000.
355 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1996.
356 *E.g.* Minta 2009.

way it was experienced by its population on the ground. What may have struck someone taking in the view of the city from one of its surrounding hills would have been the exterior façades, the stoa of the palace, the massive terrace of the agora, the painted plaster walls of the houses. The main purpose of public space and civic architecture, though, made especially clear in ancient philosophy and drama was the focus on human interaction they facilitated and their functional interior space.[357] Circulating between and within buildings would shape the immediate, everyday experience of Pella's citizens, as would be the case in any other city.

Moreover, the distinct locations of structures must influence our interpretation of their role. In addition to major differences of building format, the monumental houses, which have been called 'palatial',[358] are a long way from the palace (and not only spatially) precisely because they are situated in the centre of the grid-planned city, steps away from the agora rather than on a hill 370m north of the edge of street plan's apparent termination. Especially valuable detail for the final phase of construction comes from the inscribed (royal, civic and individual) names on roof tiles, which do not indicate benefaction or owners, as is a possibility for Megalopolis in Arkadia and the Hellenistic Metroön in Athens,[359] but shows the collaboration of workshops across structures intended for royal and civic use.[360]

357 Rosen and Sluiter 2006, 1–3, citing the prologue of Aristophanes' *Clouds*; Zimmermann 2014, 27–32, citing Herakleides and the Hellenistic tradition preserved in Strabo.

358 Nielsen 1994, 84.

359 Donati 2010, 255–7; Dickenson 20122012, 543, both with earlier references.

360 Misaelidou-Despotidou 1993.

Pella is of course not the only major ancient city to suffer from a poor publication record of its buildings. To cite an example of the Greek city where we seem to know the public centre paradigmatically well: only three smaller buildings have been published from the Athenian agora, excavated almost continuously since 1931 by especially large teams. They are the Church of the Holy Apostles, the Square Peristyle underneath the northern part of the Stoa of Attalos and the City Eleusinion (Temple of Triptolemos), partially covered by the northern part of the same Stoa.[361] Nevertheless, this has not hindered robust commentary on the social implications of the site's organisation.[362] Of course, for Pella we also lack critical publication of how stratigraphic contexts are established, especially for pottery, but the Athenian Agora is scarcely in better shape now that Wilson has exposed decisively the methodological errors in the publication of fourth century and Hellenistic pottery.[363] The disturbing practice of assuming continuous evolution of shape over uniform periods of time is still the primary dating criterion for all periods in these excavations.[364]

The great advantage of Pella is that the realization of a physical expression of its status as *basileion* has a fixed date based on numismatic evidence, *viz.* at the end of the fourth century, when the walls were extended from what became the southern part of the agora and the district of monumental houses to the south up to and enclosing the palace

361 *Agora* XXI, XXVII, XXXI, respectively.

362 *E.g. Agora* XIV, XXVIII, 51–116; Shear Jr 1994, 1995; the most thoughtful contributions on the political topography of space in Athens are those of Hölscher 1991, 1998; 2010.

363 Wilson 2013, 128–9.

364 J. M. Camp & A. F. Stewart*, pers. comm.*

hill. Although the evidence for building before ca. 320 BC is especially sparse, study of long-term land use at Pella can help us to understand the degree of change at the end of the fourth century, as well as continuity in some areas.

In sum, the more we think about the historical context of change at Pella (revealed from both written and archaeological sources), how buildings in the site could have been used and overall circulation between them, the more we can lift the veil of similarity, see the underlying differences and understand Pella as a city.

The essential difference between the Macedonian centres of Aigai (see Chapter 2, above) and Pella is revealed first of all in their site locations. I therefore endeavour in the first section to combine the longstanding historical discussion of Pella's significance, based on written and (far more limited) archaeological evidence, with considerations of historical geography that help explain the choice of site for various activities over time. This encompasses the growth of Pella from a Bronze/ Early Iron Age hilltop settlement based at Phakos to a massive political centre incorporating a ring of hills (with Phakos as an island to the south). It is my ultimate contention that Pella, situated at an important crossroads first developed as early as Archelaos (413–399 BC), could only serve its ultimate function as an administrative and commercial centre once its security was ensured. Political history and the testimony of Ps.-Scylax 66 suggests a date in the 370s BC, but the physical realization of this political aspiration did not occur until the end of the fourth century.

The early history and identity of Pella leads naturally into a consideration of the original centres of activity, Phakos and the southwestern part of the mainland city, where the Sanctuary of Darron, a local healing god, has been excavated (fig. 7–8).[365] The sanctuary has an early fourth century phase and shows remarkable expansion at the end of the century. It included various sacred areas, water features, a fountain house and open courtyards, which indicate a space that is both sacred and public. Although only bare traces survive of its pre-Hellenistic phase, the location of this space and comparison with the Sanctuary of Eukleia at Aigai may suggest that it was already recognized as a public space in the Classical period, formalised and expanded in Hellenistic times.

The contemporary building of the peristyle houses south of the western side of the agora, ultimately along with a gymnasium and public halls defined a new elite power centre here. If we accept the dating of mosaics, this area provided the initial “building block” for the expansion of the city and its adornment with peristyle buildings in the centre of town. Recently, a workshop and bath complex has come to light in the southern part of the city, which has important implications for the history of bath complexes and the distribution of productive activities within the city[366]. In the second half of the second century, a new production area replaces the workshops of the Sanctuary of Darron, but without the latter’s political connotations.

365 Tziaphēs 2017, 185–8.

366 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 2008, 599-612, 614; Lilimpakē-Akamatē and Akamatēs 2010; Lilimpakē-Akamatē 2011; Lilimpakē-Akamatē and Akamatēs 2011.

Whilst at every other Macedonian site, we have to hypothesise the location and scope of the quintessentially Greek public centre, the agora, at Pella its physical aspects are dramatically revealed. The massive peristyle market and political centre, known especially from the second century, but occupying the same terrace from the end of the fourth was located in the precise centre of the town, applying an organising principle of peristyle architecture, centralisation, to the entire built fabric of the city.[367] Excavations over the last decade have helped to establish chronological phases on each side of the agora, but we cannot assign a definite built form for earlier periods, especially before the publication of architectural material in connection with its stratigraphic context. Although the specific elaborate division of market and political space belongs to the second century phase, the size of the terrace dictates major diversification from the beginning. With its separation from the end of the city's grid plan, the palace of Pella was physically separate from the rest of the city.

Analogously, the activities of the palace cannot be considered as simply larger versions of the elite houses, but in a wholly different category. Moving away from dating on stylistic grounds, I will suggest that this complex also emerged after 320 BC, based on reconsideration of the numismatic evidence. The palace was deliberately aligned to key columned buildings of the city centre, perhaps because each had similar function, underscoring the sense of centrality and balance in the organisation of the city as *basileion*. Finally, I move to reconsider the

367 Emme 2013, 295

extent to which the monumental houses can be considered private or public space.

Topography and the evolution of the old city of Pella (southern section and the hill/island of Phakos)

Pella's emergence as *basileion*

The role of Pella as capital has generated an extensive bibliography that cannot be revisited fully here, but rarely have historical reconstructions been related to archaeological evidence for the city's evolution.[368] Greenwalt, *e.g.*, imagined the functioning of Pella as a vibrant port toward the end of the Peloponessian War, and suggests the Macedonians provided timber to the Athenians there, but neglects to provide any support for the underlying assumption that it had become Macedon's first city in this period.[369] The usual assertion that Pella became 'capital' in the reign of Archelaos (413–399 BC) is not confirmed by any source, written or material. Thucydides (II, 100, 2) says only that this king cut straight roads across the plain, walled cities, established fortresses and organised military resources. The context of this passage, the Thracian king Sitalkes' invasion of Macedonia in 429, suggests the vulnerability of Pella. It is never identified as capable of withstanding siege, and thus having walls, like Pydna (a more natural place for the provision of timber during

368 Especially since Chrysostomou 1987.
369 Greenwalt 1999.

the Peloponessian War),[370] Beroia and Europos.[371] Instead, the Macedonians avoided infantry confrontations and fought the Thracians by making cavalry sallies from nearby hills (II, 100.5).

Would Pella have been among the walled cities of Archelaos and had fortresses established in its environs? Certainly as "capital" it would have become at least a strong point of defence. Nevertheless, any attempt made to defend Pella, let alone focus administrative or political functions there, was short-lived. It was captured by the Olynthians as a result of a territorial dispute in the mid-380s. Xenophon (*Hell.* V, 2.13) has ambassadors from Akanthos and (Bolbaic) Apollonia report that Pella had become ἥ μεγίστη τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ πόλεων (383/2). This probably means 'largest of the cities in Macedonia', not necessarily "greatest", as Akanthos and Apollonia had just been described as αἵ μέγισται τῶν περὶ Ὄλυνθον πόλεων (11). [372] It is Olynthos that had become 'capital', or rather the organizational centre of the Chalcidic League in 432, to obviate threats from the Athenian Navy, so whatever Xenophon means by μεγίστη/ μέγισται, it cannot imply leadership of the cities identified in the genitive.

Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou have suggested that instead of Archelaos, Amyntas III (392–370) first made Pella a 'habitual royal residence'.[373] Lane Fox rightly suggests that their evidence, a *basilikon* mentioned by Procopius (6th century AD) and Demosthenes' accusation

370 This could have been part of the agreement reached at Pydna (Thuc. I, 61), where Themistokles had obtained a ship during the Persian War (137).
371 Thuc. I, 61.3–4; II, 100.3; Hatzopoulos 1996, 108.
372 *Pace* Lane Fox 2011, 225.
373 Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou 1987, 42–5.

that Philip II had been reared at Pella, are hardly dispositive.[374] More compelling is the idea that movement of royal activities to Pella made sense only after peace with the Chalcidic League in the 370s.[375] The character of this activity is indicated by Ps.-Scylax's (66, 380–360 BC) use of the term *basileion*, indicating the royal house, as a centre of political administration.[376] Evidence for the physical manifestation of Pella's new identity, however, is not evident before ca. 320 BC and before this the function of Pella must be hypothesized based on later evidence.

For this reason, it is exceptionally difficult to credit the view that it became *basileion* in the late fifth century. If Archelaos had made the calculation that the Loudias basin could have been defended, as a royal centre, then it is especially surprising that Xenophon would not have recorded it explicitly, for it would have contained precisely the sort of Thucydidean lesson he prized. It is interesting that Demosthenes (XVIII, 68) can still refer to Pella as an 'inglorious city', and that reputed birth there would be an insult. This underscores the point that Pella did not take on the appearance of a royal city until Cassander's hegemony.

Defining Pella as basileion

Whatever changes happened at Pella in the late fifth or first half of the fourth century, it is clear that Aigai continued to function as an important

374 Lane Fox 2011, 228–9.

375 Psoma 2011, 123–4.

376 The singular need not imply a physical palace, for which the plural is more common (see *LSJ* ad loc. §A). When the singular is used, it normally means the 'royal house' or 'royal power' often identifying the king's possessions, or 'treasury'. Both the singular and the plural can indicate the organization of troops. For a 'new city' becoming administrative capital *cf.* Polyb. III, 15.3 on the Carthaginians.

site of social memory for the Macedonian monarchy. Dion also played a political role for the deposition of treaties and other documents related to the Macedonian political community as a whole. The epigraphic evidence for official activity at Pella is comparatively sparse, and Hatzopoulos has suggested recently that Aigai and Dion may have functioned respectively as a royal and political capital, like Passaron and Dodona in Molossian Epeiros.[377] The political function is expected of national sanctuaries in regions organized as *ethnē*, such as Thermon and Laphrion at Kalydon in Aitolia, Onchestos and the sanctuary of Athena Itonia at Koroneia in Boiotia, and Helike in Arkadia.[378] The trouble with Hatzopoulos' otherwise compelling hypothesis is that it minimizes the importance of Pella, and he is forced to suggest that Alexander's mustering of the troops there (Paus. I, 16.1; Ampelius XVI, 2) was coincidental. I think it is rather an indication of its organizational role, characteristic of the Greek understanding of a *basileion* from Herodotus onwards. The position of Pella on the road network made sense for this function, once Macedon was permanently prepared to defend it, and Hatzopoulos has well illustrated the limitations of addressing the question with one category of evidence.

What the archaeological evidence shows, in contrast to other historical sources, is that Pella assumed a central administrative and economic role from the end of the fourth century BC, which is perhaps unparalleled elsewhere.[379] The later date may be a limitation of current data, but it also could mean that the advantages of Pella as *basileion*,

377 Hatzopoulos 2013.

378 Mackil 2003, esp. 132–63, who criticises the idea of a 'federal capital.'

379 This issue, along with the question of how closely royal administration in Macedon parallels Molossian Epeiros will be taken up in the discussion chapter.

although perhaps foreseen since the reign of Archelaos, were not realized before the Hellenistic period. Pella was not the city of Archelaos, but neither was it the city of Alexander, and prior to 320 BC I can only cite two definite buildings, the Sanctuary of Darron (fig. 12) and an elite *pastas* house, as representative of the first half of the fourth century (see below, p. 110–113). The former underwent redevelopment and expansion, at the end of the fourth century, from a complex of small double rooms constructed ca. 400 BC. From the late fourth century, as we shall see, Pella was a city of a scale unprecedented in the ancient Greek world, which had an agora larger than the total footprint of a small Greek city. Its palace is more complex than Aigai's and the elite district south of Pella's agora shows that it was a nerve centre of Macedonian power. The royal and political functions that took place at Aigai and Dion, respectively, are complementary to Pella's role as an administrative and economic centre. As Mackil suggests for other federal states, I would argue that in Macedonia we have, instead of capitals, focal points where different kinds of communal interactions occurred along the lines just identified.

The topography of Pella

Pella is located on what would have been the northern banks of Phakos lake, amidst a series of rolling hills ca. 35–100 masl. Although Leake famously misidentified the location of Pella, he also observed the feature that would make it defensible as a large city, the ring of hills encircling

what he knew as Aláklisi.[380] These would be the basis for the city of Pella at its maximal extent and it is the journey from a small lentil-shaped toumba based at Phakos, to a royal centre of over 400ha that concerns us here. Today, it is difficult to recognise Phakos in the landscape, as it has become only a small rise (0–4 masl) in the area to the south of the modern Thessalonikē-Edessa bypass.[381] Excavations have been largely unsuccessful south of the bypass, because the water table is reached immediately below the surface. Perhaps the muddy waters of the Axios have progressively worn away the hills, but 'Phakos' is hardly archeologically distinguishable from the other areas with long term occupation, such as the 'Baths of Alexander' near New Pella, the tumuli north of Halikidona or in fact the environs of Old Pella north of the bypass.[382] The most recent explorations have identified workshops from the Late Hellenistic period,[383] which most plausibly belong to the period after it functioned as a royal centre. Our best recourse is the description provided by Livy (XLIV, 46), where Pella is said to lie on a hill, gently sloping to the southwest, and Phakos is located where the lake most nearly approaches the city. Another crucial detail is that from a distance Phakos appears joined to the city wall, but on approach Phakos is seen to be surrounded with a strong embankment, and a (very easily defended) bridge connects the island to the mainland.

The embankment was necessary, the passage implies, to protect the island from encroaching water. We can assume from this passage

380 Leake 1835, 260.
381 For the location of Phakos, see Chapter 2, figs. 1-2.
382 Makaronas 1960, 77–8, Lilimpakē-Akamatē and Akamatēs 2012.
383 Lilimpakē-Akamatē et al. 2011, 589, with earlier references.

that the water was a threat and Phakos had diminished significantly from the time when it could support a settlement. This is probably the basis of Hammond's assumption that Phakos was not protected before the reign of Philip II. The passage also indicates that the island was surrounded by a muddy swamp that made access to it and the city difficult. The terrain sloping upward toward the northeast made the swamp a valuable asset, for it defended what would have been the easiest approach to the city. Now the difficulty of access is explicitly connected with the 'reason why it was made capital'. This is an especially critical point, because before Pella was expanded under Cassander, it could not have been said, as there were several tumuli where an army could be stationed and then attack the city via manageable terrain. So Pella either had to be a small hilltop settlement or a city controlling an exceptionally large terrain. The early travellers had the same admiration when they looked out upon these hills, imagining an enlarged Pella that reached these hills. They are the reason why Pella had to be so large, and why serious questions must be raised about Pella's ability to function as the first city in Macedon before it reached its maximal extent.

Ca. 500 BC, it was still a tell site near the sea along the lines of Therme, Chalastra and Sindos;[384] Hekataios (*FGrH* 144) reports that it was by the sea and called Paōlos or Phakos, apparently after the name of the hill it occupied. The name "Phakos" applies especially to the lentil-shaped hilltop on which it is was centred. Hammond plausibly suggests Paōlos is an alternative spelling for Pella, which would show the earliest core of the

384 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.107, Tiverios 2009, both with earlier references.

city was based around what became the island of Phakos.[385] At this point, Hekataios (*FGrH* 145) makes clear that the Axios (Vardar) river, 10 km east of Pella, was the border between Bottia and Thrace.[386] As argued in the previous chapter, Pella and its surroundings were probably distinct from the core of the Macedonian kingdom in Ēmathia/Μακεδονίδα.

For Herodotus (VII, 123) and Thucydides (II, 99.3–4), the land between the Loudias and Axios–where Pella and Ichnai were sited–was next to the sea. Although the historians are silent on the matter, Euripides (*Bacch.* 570) has his chorus mention that Dionysos crossed the Loudias, suggesting that the god could now travel by land from Thrace to Pieria. It thus can be adduced that there was an alluvial area between the Thermaic Gulf and Phakos lake, making it a sheltered harbour. While the Axios is merely swiftly flowing (568–9), the Loudias now has independent valour, as father and wealth-giver to mortals, which 'fertilises'[387] the land of the beautiful horses with fairest streams.' Not only is the Loudias plain visible from the palace (and theatre) of Aigai,[388] it is from that vantage point that one sees it watering the central plain (after it has made a western turn away from Pella). Euripides' chorus is describing precisely the scene Euripides would have witnessed when his *Archelaos* was performed at Aigai. It is precious, and early, evidence that the agricultural plain was moving into the centre of Macedonian self-consciousness. It is

385 Hammond 1972, 147.
386 Hammond 1972, 146.
387 The word λίπαινω (anoint) has the sense of rivers 'fattening the land' in Euripides (*LSJ* ad loc. A.2, *Hec.* 454)
388 Lane Fox 2011, 209, citing personal communication with A. Kottaridi.

likely around this time that the idea of Bottia and Macedonia became merged, although we have no direct evidence (see p. 42–3, above)

The first time the area between the Loudias and the Axios is mentioned as unproblematically 'Macedonian' is in fact the speech of the ambassadors of Akanthos and Apollonia, reported by Xenophon (*Hell.* V, 2.11–13) as occurring in 383/2 BC. Here, the ambassadors claim that Pella has become the largest, not to say the first, city in Macedonia. If Hammond is correct to date the events described in Ps.-Skylax to ca. 380–60, it is this period when the river Loudias is first explicitly mentioned as separate, and Pella is described as *basileion* of Macedonia. The latter term, which refers to royal administration, needs to be distinguished from *ta basileia*, which means the royal court.[389] Neither explicitly imply the existence of a palace, but particular kinds of royal activity, and we must rely on positive archaeological evidence to establish how they were actualised.

The westward migration of the Loudias can now be put on firmer footing by geological survey of its lower valley near Klidi, just north of the current Aliakmon and Loudias deltas (fig. 6).[390] The main conclusion is that the altered course was a change that took place over the long term and that it may have shaped decisions by historical actors as much as have been caused by them. We know the formation of the lake came with negative consequences because Aristotle was apparently chided for the time he spent in the 'outflow of slime' caused by the arm of the Axios connecting it with Phakos lake (Plut. *Mor.* 603c). Athenaios (VIII, 41g) also

389 Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994, 27–29, with relevant ancient sources.
390 Ghilardi 2007, esp. 358–84 for conclusions.

reports that consuming the local water of Pella could lead to splenomegaly. Nevertheless, it apparently was a breeding ground for high-quality fish and eels, in comparison with the Kopais lake in Boiotia. In more recent history the enlargement of the Giannitsa lake promoted the spread of malaria and led to a major engineering project from 1925 to 1935 to drain it.[391] The major rivers were also re-routed, including the creation of the Aliakmon dam between Veroia and Velvento, which has altered the topography of Macedonia.

The written sources of course have their limitations; we cannot give explicit chronological limits to geographical change or assess how far they affected settlement patterns. What is nevertheless invaluable is the extent to which they suggest the malleability of Macedonian borders throughout the Classical period. Moreover, the picture drawn from written sources is broadly corroborated by archaeological evidence. If the Bottians are the earlier inhabitants whom the Macedonians evicted, then they must have settled east of the Loudias, for this is where the bulk of Early Iron Age settlements have come to light.[392] The burials in the region of Pella also show a strong local orientation, with influence from across the Greek world but focused on the trade routes uniquely accessible from the Loudias basin. When we turn to Pella itself, Phakos seems to have been settled from the Bronze Age, but the spread from this hill into the larger plain is mainly attested from the end of the fifth century. At this point, if we were not informed by written sources, we would hardly judge that this was a crucially important city, let alone a royal centre, but

391 Ghilardi 2007, 60–65, with earlier references.
392 *E.g.* Vokotopoulou 1985, esp. pl. v.

merely that the period of the first half of the fourth century was one of settlement expansion. We cannot, however, move from this change in perception to the conclusion that Archelaos moved “his capital”, a singularly momentous development that escaped the notice of Thucydides, Euripides and Xenophon.

In the course of the fourth century, Pella’s importance as a Macedonian royal centre must have grown substantially. Livy (XCIV, 5, 7) reports that the Macedonian treasury was located on the island of Phakos, which he describes as a mass of heaped up earth supporting a substantial fortification. The importance of Phakos in early accounts of Pella, the use of *basileion* to identify royal treasuries, and the later account that Phakos had served that purpose for a long time make it likely that establishment of Pella as *basileion* relates to the movement of the royal treasury to Phakos, reinforcing the sense of an economic centre. In the 340s, Demosthenes accused Aeschines of going up the Loudias in a canoe with Philip II by night.[393] This rather slim testimony shows that in the mid-fourth century the ability to travel up this river to Pella was known at Athens. Hammond has suggested that the situation became stable after the ascendance of Philip II (*i.e.* 356), so the geographical change was closely matched to plans for the expansion of Pella, which Strabo (frs. VII, 20, 23) attributes to this king. This is complicated, as discussed below, by the increasing archaeological evidence that suggests that the expansion was delayed until after 320 BC. However, there are also scraps of

393 Aeschines, *On the Embassy* 124-126; although Aeschines dismisses the allegation, its plausibility depends on the assumption that the river was easily navigable even at night.

evidence, from the palace, the elite residences and the sanctuary of Darron that some plans may have been afoot as early as Philip's reign (357/6–336).

Public areas and the organization of space

The Sanctuary of Darron

In 1914, near Phakos Lake and the modern canal (see fig. 9 for location), two well-built complexes of three rooms were discovered on either side of a crypt (entered from the southeast). The complexes had different orientations so that one was parallel to the crypt and another was south of it in a diagonal orientation. Both showed signs of continuing further but the north-south facing rooms produced evidence of a well-crafted bronze fitting (a horsehead for a couch and a bronze eagle) remains of a furnace and the base of a cooking smokestack.[394] In the following year, this complex was revealed to be the back of a south-facing pastas house (roughly 16.5 x 16.5 metres or 272 square metres excavated, but the structure was not fully revealed) with a pillared courtyard featuring a partially stone-paved floor with a fountain. The building should date to ca. 350 based on coins of Philip II and earlier kings.[395]

The early rooms were partially overbuilt with a large circular room (diameter: 30.5 metres, fig. 8, no. 1), the southern part of which overlapped the north wall of the pastas house. It was part of a large complex of circular and rectangular rooms extending over the better part

394 *Prakt* 1914 (G. P. Oikonomos), 133–48.
395 Oikonomos 1915.

of four 47x110 city blocks, which at their northern extent were roughly 350 metres southwest of the southwest corner of the agora. Overall, it is characterised by large, open rooms, a small temple, a fountain, various pits and a cistern. The two blocks to the west (fig. 8, no. 1–2; *cf.* fig. 9 for location) are identified as the Sanctuary of Darron, while the eastern blocks (fig. 8, no. 3–4) are another ritual complex, which included public buildings, assembly space and three cisterns. Excavators claim that in the Hellenistic period, this was both a religious and public area, so it is within the scope of the present investigation to consider its function within the city and how its role may have complimented the monumental agora.[396]

If this complex is an example of public space, Pella would then provide evidence for the creation of new political space and for the redevelopment of existing civic space, which as we shall see in Chapter Four is a mark of development in Kassandreia and Amphipolis. As mentioned above, there is evidence for two rooms in the sanctuary of Darron dating to the first half of the fourth century. The sanctuaries of Eukleia at Aigai and Asklepios at Mieza are held to mark the civic centres of two important centres in Ēmathia, but the built space cannot be definitively dated before the Hellenistic period.[397] Pella then provides the only opportunity to examine the physical transformation of such a space between the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

---

396 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1994; Ead. 1998.

397 See Ch. 3 above. Dion forms a separate case, since it is a sanctuary of the Macedonian *ethnos*, with extramural religious buildings, but one that corroborates the view that in the Late Classical and Hellenistic periods, religion was an indispensable part of civic identity. This tradition was apparently respected by Cassander's architects at Pella.

The Sanctuary of Darron is identified by a stone inscription set up in a courtyard in the middle of the western side of the complex, dating to the mid-second century BC: ΑΜΦΙΠΟΛΙΣ ΔΑΡΡΩΝΙ ΕΥΞΑΜΕΝΗ ΕΠΗΚΟΩΙ.[398] The circular space had a narrow wall (0.6 m) and three smaller circular spaces (diameter: 5.8 metres) on its southwestern, northwestern and northeastern sides. The southern part of the large circular structure was built with rough stones and had a deep gully clad with Corinthian tiles. Outside the circle were two wider and shallower channels, all of which lead into a small cistern within the circle, and are contemporary to it and related to its function.[399]

In the eastern part of the circular structure, a rectangular structure divided into three two-part units and a further single long unit dates to an earlier phase (fig. 7). The long and narrow building was covered by Laconian roof tiles with a surface area of up to 0.7 metres.[400] On the east and north sides of the circular structure, respectively, a nine-metre wide north-south road and a six-metre wide east-west road were excavated. They were initially stone-paved, with 0.5 metre pavements on either side, but had been built over with layer of soil, tile and river stones. The stone work of the earliest street layer appears to be contemporary with the circular structure, but an earlier phase cannot be ruled out, because the earlier structure's east wall follows the line of the street.[401]

---

398 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1994, 89.

399 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1988, 137–8. Unfortunately no further details are given in the report. Presumably, contemporaneity is established by the way the channel is built into the foundations of the circular structure.

400 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1988, 138–9.

401 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1988, 138; Lilimpakē-Akamatē 19941994, 83.

Another complex of dipartite rooms were revealed along the west side of the circular structure. It includes two series of five five-by-five metre spaces. These rooms were more closely studied and can be given a more precise chronology. Their walls have a width of 0.27–0.4 metres and were constructed with fieldstones upon a dense soil layer with black- and red-figure pottery dating from the late fifth until the middle of the third quarter of the fourth century. The same filling, with a deep layer of ash was discovered underneath the circular structure, so that these non-overlapping buildings can be given a *terminus post quem* of ca. 360–350 BC, i.e. they are later than the early-fourth century complex.

The circular space was hypaethral and paved with a mosaic floor featuring vegetal decoration, as was the smaller circle to southwest, which may suggest ritual feasting. The northern circles were also ornamented with the stone base for a bronze statue (at the precise centre of the northwest circle) and a column drum in the northeast. The nine-metre wide street on the west side of the complex is one of Pella's most important, as it leads from the Classical North Gate (also nine metres wide), and it runs between Phakos Lake and palace hill. The street was curved for the drainage of water and sludge and each side was fitted with a pavement featuring smoother stonework, ca. 1.8–1.9 metres wide.[402]

North of the circular structure (fig. 8), the complex is divided into eastern and western parts by a north-south wall (width: 0.5 metres) extending the length of roughly the northern two-thirds of the complex. Adjacent to the wall is a water channel, constructed with stone plates and

402 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1988, 137, 140; Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1994, 83, 85.

ceramic tiles, which serves only the large hypaethral spaces in the northeast part of the sanctuary. Beginning from the northern part of the eastern half, there is an open square 15 x 17 metres, enclosed by a a 2.5-metre deep stoa facing it from the west, buildings divided into rooms on the north and south sides, and a *temenos* wall dividing it from the street on the east. In front of the stoa, a line of stone bases for *stelai* were identified. On the north, east and south sides of the courtyard there are stone supports, probably for benches. On the north side a series of small rooms are found, which are closed to the courtyard but open to the north. Entrance to the entire complex is from this direction, by a serpentine gateway at the western end of the room series. The water from the north-south pipeline is drained by a larger channel into a cistern behind the northwest corner of the stoa.[403] In the southern part of this section there are two further courtyards: a smaller one in the middle and a much larger one to the south. The middle section was reported to feature a petal-shaped fountain house, with evidence for a frieze, which is unfortunately not described or depicted.[404]

The northwestern part of the sanctuary (fig. 8, no. 2), where the temple was located, was entered via a paved gateway (adjacent to the entrance to the north-eastern part), leading to a series of three rooms extending to the west. The south-eastern corner of the westernmost room was dominated by a large mortar-lined reservoir. In the same room excavators found large marble pestles, a millstone, and iron and lead tools. Almost at the precise middle of the north-western part is a stone

403 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1994, 85–87.
404 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1994, 88.

temple identified by thick walls, with an elongated western part (nine metres) and a shorter eastern part (three metres), where there was a two-metre wide opening. Another opening (2.2 metres) connected the two rooms of the temple via a step (0.4 metres high). The shape of the temple mirrors the Temple of Aphrodite and the Mother of the Gods north of the agora.[405] The southern part featured several more rectangular spaces and a stoa, which are not well-preserved/excavated. The state of the two large courtyards in the middle of the complex is similar (i.e. between the buildings just described and the middle sections). The physical separation between the public and cult areas of the sanctuary is palpable.[406]

A second building complex, similar to the northern part of the Sanctuary of Darron was excavated on the east side of the six-metre north-south road (fig. 8, no. 4). Its southwestern part is dominated by a large, open courtyard (19x35 metres). From the central part of the complex, three stone figurines were uncovered, including one in the form of a reclining Herakles. In the eastern part of the complex, two mosaic floors depicted the Cave of the Nymphs and Dionysos and a Centaur. In the northeastern corner, a two-roomed temple with similar shape to the temple in the Sanctuary of Darron is preserved. It only survives in patches, but a long wall seems to divide this eastern part of the sanctuary from the west, with its large courtyard. North of the large courtyard, the underpinning for the toichobate of a stoa was uncovered. In the

405 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1987, 196–7.
406 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1994, 87–88.

northernmost part, a smaller courtyard had rooms on its north and west sides.[407]

If not for the monumental agora to the northeast, the Sanctuary of Darron and the sanctuary to the east would be interpreted as marking the main public centre of Pella. Far less evidence is indeed adduced for a similar claim about the Sanctuary of Eukleia at Aigai. It is indeed tempting to suggest, based on the open assembly spaces, stoas and water features that these sanctuaries may represent the original public centre of Pella. The public character of these spaces is reinforced by the physical separation and non-communication of sacred and assembly spaces, which were entered separately from the street. Their key location opposite Phakos Lake buttresses the argument, especially if we are inclined to believe that the island was used for the royal treasury and perhaps other royal activity. However that may be, the stronger point is that Cassander's development embellished the public character of these sanctuaries. Yet more evocative is the placement of the elite houses and public hall buildings bordering the monumental agora to the north and the sanctuaries just discussed to the northwest. It is these two areas (the sanctuaries and the elite houses) that have helped to define the grid-plan of Pella. Moreover the monumental agora itself encourages a south to north hierarchy of movement, so it makes sense to turn briefly to the district immediately south of the agora, before progressing to city centre itself.

---

407 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 1998.

The monumental district south of the agora

Although Struck had already correctly identified the location of Phakos in the early 20th century (fig. 4),[408] it was with the discovery of the monumental houses west of the modern village that the identity of Pella was dramatically confirmed beyond any doubt. Initially, the houses were thought to be a palace, mirroring a confusion also made at Eretria. Instead, as at Eretria in the fourth century, the 'houses' mark an important private/public district, which also featured important civic buildings, including a possible gymnasium and temple,[409] and what are in my view public hall buildings (I, 2 & 4).[410] Though no longer considered 'palaces', the location of the houses in the West Quarter at Eretria, the quality of their construction and their fine mosaics have led the excavators there to associate these houses with high-status individuals. The case is yet stronger at Pella, not only because of their extraordinary scale, but even more importantly the quasi-public functions entailed by the number, size, and ornamentation of dining rooms.[411] In the royal city of Pella, high-status individuals probably means the inner circle of the king, and the iconography of the mosaics supports such an interpretation.

The excavations of 1957–1963 studied six quadrants (fig. 3), with which the houses have become identified, I, 1–5 & IV, 1–2. Like Macedonian palaces, these "houses" had the capacity to host a large number of banqueters, which in turn implies the ability of their owners to

408 Struck 1908, 59–84.

409 G. Akamatis, *pers. comm.* It has not been reported, but Akamatis informs me that in the square north of I, 5, an oikos and Doric columns were discovered, more likely as a peristyle defining the square rather than associated with the building.

410 *AΔ* 19 (1964) 335–40 (C. I. Makaronas, with figures).

411 *Cf., e.g.* Raynor 2015, 194.

draw courtiers. These buildings were situated along two wide avenues designed to control the city's major traffic. A full discussion of the excavations in this area could be the subject of a thesis in its own right, so I limit myself to detailed discussion of House I, 1 ("Dionysos") and I, 5 ("Rape of Helen"), which have been published, and relate most directly to the subject of this thesis.[412]

Two main roads link the old city (Phakos) with the monumental houses, agora and ultimately the palace. The houses are located one short block (37.5 metres, measured from the centre of the relevant streets) from the peristyle commercial centre (*agora*) of the city. The length of these blocks (29 metres), and of those with the largest peristyle houses (I.1, I.3, I.5: 110 metres), account for the extremities in the variation of plot sizes. All known plots have a width of 47 metres, so the dimensions of plots range from 29 x 47 to 110 x 47.[413] This means they were probably intentionally laid out with the buildings that occupy them extant or in mind. The construction of the peristyle houses is likely nearly contemporaneous with the street design, although the completion of the full grid of the city occured a bit later, as finds associated with the walls of the city suggest a date in the period of Cassander's kingship (305-297 BC). Excavators have dated the houses and associated roads toward the end of the third quarter of the fourth century (further details discussed in connection with individual cases below), so the main period for the urban

412 Makaronas and Giourē 1989.

413 For the houses: Makaronas and Giourē 1989, 3. Lilimpakē-Akamatē and Akamatēs 2003 give the figures for variant sizes but the actual size of individual plots often is unpublished; I determined them by electronic measurement whilst walking the plots and published plans, checked against measurements that are given.

development of Pella is the last third of the fourth century. It is thus a programme that likely began during the reign of Alexander the Great, and continued under the regency of Antipatros during the former's campaigns, but was completed finally at the end of the century. Either the area around the peristyle houses was developed (separately) before other parts of the city or the whole project was planned under Antipatros, but only completed when his son Cassander had re-established the stability of kingship. Given the scale of the project (the redevelopment of a 400 ha city)[414] with many new monumental buildings), it is also possible that it advanced continuously over 30 years, despite the turmoil after Alexander the Great's death in 323, but in any case the main point is the special place occupied by the peristyle houses in shaping the grid-plan of the city. Whether composed of separate projects or of a piece, the width and orientation of the grid-plan may have followed the precedent known from Classical Pella.

The heart of ancient Pella was discovered on a small hill to the west of the modern town of Palaia Pella (number 2 on Struck's plan, fig. 4). The first systematic excavations here uncovered the remains of a peristyle building (in quadrant I.1), with a northern, central and southern section, as well as roads on the northern, western and southern sides. The sections of the house have a geometric scheme, with each centred around a large interior peristyle, which creates a stoa-like hall in front of rooms on all four sides of each court (fig. 9). In the north and central sections, rooms were identified that could have functioned as dining rooms based on the usual

414 *ΑΔ* 29 (1973–4) 708 (C. I. Makaronas).

criteria: the presence of anterooms as well as off-centre doors, raised levels for couches, and high-quality mosaic floors in the main rooms. House I.1 is alternatively known as ‘the House of Dionysos’ from the mosaic (fig. 10) on the northwest side of the middle peristyle. The streets on the north, west and south were simultaneously excavated, which included large stone pipelines for water supply, including an extension that specifically served the house (fig. 11).[415]

The House of Dionysos fills plot I.1, and thus covers a land area 47 x 110 metres, or 5,170 square metres. It is divided into three sections, with its central peristyle measuring 12.7 x 13.57 metres, enclosing a space of roughly 172.34 square metres. The colonnade of the peristyle (fig. 12) was in the Ionic style, with Attic bases (0.194 metres high), and the column base diameter was 0.495 metres, the width of the stylobate itself, with an upper diameter of 0.42 metres. The columns (fig. 13) had an estimated height of 4.2 metres, yielding a base diameter to height ratio of 1:8.5. The finely carved capitals are also comparable to examples of Attic Ionic from the second half of the fourth century, featuring egg and dart mouldings and acanthus leaves at the edge, surrounded above and at the sides by thinly carved volutes usually joining diagonally at the corner of the column.[416] In the style of the volute, there were also some variations including more two-dimensional volutes with only the generic shape of a roll at the sides and even completely uncarved volutes (which, judging by their shape, were never meant to be carved).[417]

---

415 Makaronas 1960, 73.
416 Makaronas and Giourē 1989, 54.
417 Makaronas 1960, 73–75.

Around the peristyle, there were exceptionally large rooms to the north and west and long corridors on the south and west sides. The space between the peristyle and the rooms is roughly equivalent to the width of the corridors themselves, so there was ample room for traffic or congregation within the building. Two rooms at the northwest corner of the peristyle have characteristic raised levels for couches, off-centre entrances, and carefully composed mosaic floors. The smaller room (approximately 72 square metres) had the name mosaic (2.7 x 2 metres) of a nude Dionysos astride a panther, facing left with the animal, and holding his characteristic thyrsus.

In the larger room to the north, the lion hunt (fig. 14), a scene characteristic of Hellenistic, and especially Macedonian, royal authority,[418] graced the central mosaic. The lion hunt is best interpreted as a symbol of monarchy. The figures do not overlap and assume the 'heroic diagonal' of Classical Greek art and especially fourth century sculpture. The mosaic is even more radically individual with two hunters (perhaps brothers), which matches well with the isolation of Dionysos in the next room. Whilst exact stylistic dates are impossible, the artistic inspiration for these scenes, as the excavator notes, falls right at the transition between Classical and Hellenistic Art, ca. 340–310 BC.

To the east, now on the northern side of the central peristyle, was an enormous rectangular room, anchored by a geometric, diamond-

418 Pollitt 1986, 38–43 (with figures), who notes that 'it became standard to show [kings hunting lions] whether they did so or not' (38). On the lion hunt in Macedonia, see Lane Fox 20112011c, 10–13. On the lion hunt on Tomb II at Aigai, see esp. Saatsoglou-Paliadelē 2004; Franks 2012.

patterned mosaic (fig. 15).[419] In the southernmost section, another large courtyard was discovered, but its full exploration was hindered by the modern road; only its stylobate is preserved *in situ* but fragments of columns are reminiscent of the palace at Aigai.[420]

Only the north peristyle of House I, 5 is preserved, covering an area of 2350 square metres,[421] but the organization of dining rooms provides an interesting variation from the pattern of House I, 1. Only five capitals and ten drums are preserved from what was a massive peristyle, attested by the survival of its stylobate on the north side and in the southwest corner.[422] Suites of rooms (fig. 16) were excavated in the northeast corner of the peristyle, highlighted by a large room (Γ, 118 square metres) with a diamond patterned border for the name scene of the Rape of Helen (fig. 17). To the east (room Δ, 67 square metres), a vine pattern frames the stag hunt scene, which varies from the lion hunt by the presence of hunting dogs (fig. 18). Another room (B) to the west of Γ, the floor of which is not preserved, was the same size as room Δ and joined with it to flank the room with the name scene. An additional three room suite is preserved on the east side of the peristyle (Θ–K), but K is not well-preserved.[423] Interestingly, room H has a mosaic but was not fitted with couches and leads to Room Θ, which, depending on how room K was decorated, may indicate the presence of something like a

419 Note 414, above.
420 Makaronas 1960, 76.
421 Walter-Karydi 1998, 13.
422 Makaronas and Giourē 1989.
423 *AΔ* 17 (1961/2) 211–13 (C. I. Makaronas).

Flügeldreiraumgruppe,[424] but without the columns. Within the east side of the peristyle, a fountain was discovered (no. 1 in fig. 16).

Unfortunately, very few small finds have been published from the houses, so a precise date is difficult to ascertain. The treatment of architectural members is similar to the palace of Aigai, which has a date ca. 340–10 BC.[425] Ultimately, the date comes down to the treatment of mosaics, and Pella's mosaics seem to follow the generic trends of the second half of the fourth century, based on the diagonals of figures. Moreover, it is clear that some mosaics, which are more roughly designed, such as the mosaic from the round building,[426] belong to the end of the century. Another group, including the mosaics of Dionysos, the stag hunt and the Rape of Helen, more probably belong earlier (ca. 340/30–320/10).[427] It is therefore most likely, based on the comparability of the architecture to other Macedonian peristyles with similar function and mosaics, that these houses were built before the full grid plan and extension of the walls at the end of the fourth century. At this time, they were aligned to the earlier grid plan, but it is not clear that this plan was fully extended to the agora, much less the palace hill. Of course, the terrace of the agora also was yet to be built. This means that they would have formed the basis of the full extended plan, and explain the irregularity of the length of blocks on the south side of the agora.

---

424 See further below, p. 147–148.

425 Rhomaios 1953/4.

426 *AΔ* 19 (1964) 340–4 (C. I. Makaronas).

427 Makaronas 1970; Salzmann 1982, 12, 29, 105–108 (cat. nos. 98–105); Makaronas and Giourē 19891989, 164–73.

The elite peristyle houses at Pella are suitably understood in connection with the late Classical/early Hellenistic palace at Aigai. As discussed below, the palace at Pella itself, suitable for the city's role as *basileion* (administrative capital), has a much more varied role than Aigai's, which was almost completely dedicated to royal banqueting. The (reduced) scale of banqueting in the houses at Pella, and their prominent place in the grid-plan of the city, is indicative of families nearly at the highest-level of society, but not quite royal. Because there was little distinction between wealth and proximity to the king in early Hellenistic Macedonia, we may safely assume that the occupants of these houses were part of the inner circle of the king. The archaeology of their houses thus provides two key pieces of information about social life in the Macedonian capital. First, by the prominent placement of their houses on the south side of the agora, the occupants are shown to be integrated into the life of city and to have an elevated role within it. Second, the focus on banqueting space within their houses and the themes depicted on their mosaics show these families sharing royal ideology.

As in the Palace of Aigai, the families who lived in elite houses could have hosted multiple drinking parties at once, including those which well-exceeded the standard size of a Greek private symposion (7 couches). Their capacity for such large-scale functions marks out the houses as at least quasi-public space. They are, however, less public than the palace at Aigai, for there we do not find a single room of more intimate dimensions, but pairs of rooms side-by-side with (7) couches for a single social group. Larger rooms are also paired, side by side, or, more

commonly, entered through a columned reception area. The elite houses, as might be expected, maintain the singularity of a private family more than the banquets of the king. Another distinction of course needs to be made regarding the exterior façades, which have more in common with other Greek domestic structures. However, like the palace at Aigai, the elite houses in Pella have smaller andrones flanked by two larger ones. The presence of figured mosaics in the smaller rooms (which in fact accommodate a single social group), suggest that, like the palaces, these rooms would have served meetings of the owner's closest acquaintances. Each of these aspects is somewhat diminished from what we would expect of royal space, reflecting the station of their occupants immediately beneath the royal family in elite Macedonian society.

The diversity in the use of space south of the agora (*cf.* fig. 9) is shown by a metal-working district located 110 metres southeast of the agora. Although the most readable remains indicate an intensification of metallurgy at Pella in the second half of the second century, building phases go back to the first half of the fourth century and may represent a near simultaneous phase of "house" architecture employed exclusively for productive space.[428] The workshop is comparable to contemporary examples from the acropoleis of Aigai, Leibethra and western Macedonia. Before the Roman conquest, major workshop districts are associated with political space or sanctuaries, so the building of this space may represent the decline of Pella's political status.

428 Lilimpakē-Akamatē 2002, 410–6.

The Late Classical wall (location: fig. 9) runs northeast to southwest 2 blocks south of the agora. Immediately to the north was one of Pella's most important cemeteries, with burials until the mid-fourth century, but with a special peak at the beginning of the fourth century. The wall was 3m thick and fitted with gates and towers; it was in use from the end of the fifth century, and functioned until the late fourth, based on movable finds (especially lamps).[429] Because the wall runs immediately north of the Sanctuary of Darron, which is near the modern canal (marking the effective border of Phakos lake: *cf.* figs. 4, 6), and runs along the natural contours of terrain (today scarcely 10masl), it is unlikely that it could incorporate any of the surrounding hills. We must therefore accept that Classical Pella was an exceptionally small place, perhaps smaller than Aigai (49ha), less than one eighth the size of Hellenistic Pella.

The monumental agora

The agora of Pella (fig. 19) has been christened the 'first peristyle agora',[430] anticipating quite early what would become a popular Roman form. It is of course very useful to think of precedents in Northern Greece for what later became prominent at Roman sites: the so-called 'first Pompeiian style' of wall painting[431] comes immediately to mind. Unfortunately, the evidence so far uncovered is not sufficient to establish definitively how early Pella possessed a continuous peristyle. The agora

429 Lilimpakē-Akamatē and Akamatēs 2013, with earlier references.
430 Dickenson 20122012, 91–3.
431 *E.g.* Koukouli-Chrysanthaki 2011, 423. The phrase is often used imprecisely, *cf.* Bruno 1969.

at Pella is principally known in its latter phases of use from the late second century BC. Excavators believe that its format, as a contiguous square peristyle continues from its initial layout at the end of the fourth century. Over the past decade, the University of Thessalonikē excavations led by I. M. Akamatēs have re-explored systematically each side of the agora. Their general conclusion is that the format and division of rooms within the stoas that form the peristyle changed over time, but that the foundations of the stoas themselves, which were also reconstructed several times, remained the same.[432] What is unfortunately not so clear is the amount of evidence upon which these conclusions are based. At Ephesos, *e.g.*, the evidence for the earliest phase of the tetragonal agora, dedicated by Lysimachos in 270/60 (fig. 20),[433] is limited to the west side, one room on the north and traces of foundations within the square. The production of a similar plan for Pella would help us to assess the extent of the evidence there.

What I would rather like to emphasise is not the novelty of a peristyle agora but rather the exceptionality of peristyle agorai and therefore the interest of this form, where the peristyles of individual buildings are so prominent. Peristyle buildings often occupy parts of an agora or adjacent blocks, as we have seen them to do south of the agora at Pella, but the peristyle form of an agora itself is exceptionally rare. In addition to Ephesos, the square of Miletos' harbour agora was surrounded by stoas by the end of the third century, but this was accomplished by piecemeal construction over time, which was the general trend in the

432 G. M. Akamatēs, *pers. comm.*
433 *Ephesos* XIII/2.15–18.

Greek world, as Dickenson notes.[434] The next instance he cites of a fully peristyle agora is the Roman agora in Athens (dedicated 11/10 BC).[435] He could have adduced Alabanda (second half of the second century), Iasos (late fourth/early third) or perhaps Thelphousa in Arkadia (late fourth/early third), but these are three out of the seventy-six agorai catalogued by Sielhorst.[436] The experiment of a peristyle agora at Pella was hardly trend-setting, but it is significant that the peristyles at Ephesos and Miletos were funded by Macedonian kings. What is rather more common is the existence of peristyle buildings in squares adjacent to the agora,[437] but to my knowledge there is no other example including so many peristyle houses, and the particular constellation of houses and agora is especially striking.

The agora of Pella had a width of five insulae and the length of 1⅔ of the longer insulae found on its east and west sides (roughly 261 x 234 metres, or 6.1 ha); it is longer (by about 10 metres) than two of the shorter insulae, in which the monumental houses are found. The southern elite and public sector of the city discussed in the preceding section was separated from the south stoa by a 6.4 metre wide east-west street.[438] Some of the shops of the south stoa faced the street, as discussed in further detail below, so it is not possible to make a firm distinction between the space of the agora and the southern section. The Doric

434 Dickenson 2012, 94, 133.

435 Ibid., 223–5 (with fig. 33).

436 Ibid., 280–1, 298–300, 341–2 (cat. Nos. 2, 14, 45 with figures). What is required is of course the complete construction/reconstruction at a single point in times and cities seldom had the resources to do this.

437 *E.g.* the square peristyle at Athens (*Athenian Agora* XXVII, 50–163), the market building at Kassopē (Hoepfner et al. 1994 [1986], 127–32), *i.a.*

438 Akamatēs 1990, 428.

columns (base diameter: 3.63 metres) and pillars (0.5 metres high, 0.7 metres deep) of its nearly square peristyle enclosed a ground area of 3.64 ha (200.15 x 181.76 metres). Four connected “stoas”, six metres deep, enclose the square presenting a uniform colonnade on all sides, which would have created the impression of being in the courtyard of a building (albeit an exceptionally large one) in striking contrast to the usual openness of Classical Greek agorai. The colonnade belongs to the period identified by Coulton when stoas were admired for sheer size rather than architectural refinement, and in fact it is likely that the entablature was wooden as no stone members have been found.[439]

The agora was approached from the east and west via a 15-metre wide boulevard, and postholes for a gate have been found at the eastern entrance (fig. 23; location: fig. 19). On the west, there was a smaller gate with rooms interpreted as guardhouses, There were two smaller entrances on the south side of the agora, at the southwest corner and between blocks I, 2 and I, 4 and the paths entering the agora were 10 metres wide.[440] Postholes are also known from the approach between blocks I, 3 & I, 5, suggesting that this was the post whence southern traffic into the agora was controlled. A fifth 10 metre wide gate was located in the northeast corner, with a substantial water pipeline underneath, and leading to a fountain house in the north-eastern part of the central plateia.[441] The peristyle format strongly regulated access to the square. In the cleaning of the street a phase associated with the burial of large

439 Akamatēs 1991, 77–8; Dickenson 2012, 93.
440 Akamatēs 1990, 423.
441 Akamatēs 1991, 77–8.

collapsed stone blocks, was dated to the end of second/early first century (when the agora went out of use), but there were also two earlier phases excavated, each with remains of two columns. It stands to reason that the columns preserved *in situ* at the east gate represent the final phase associated with the collapsed stones and there were two earlier phases for the gate.[442] In the second century BC, silting began to limit access to Phakos lake, leading to a decline in the strategic importance of Pella, but a seismic event and associated fire led to the agora's final abandonment ca. 90 BC.[443]

The size of the agora at Pella affords an unprecedented differentiation of space. In describing the various activities attested, I begin from the main (east) gate and then proceed clockwise from the most accessible areas on the south side, which featured shops and workshops, to the space reserved for political and religious activities at the north end. The southern half of the east stoa and the south stoa contained the greatest variety of activities, including pottery workshops and storefronts for liquid products, fish and meat, along with traces of iron, lead and bronze slag and workshops for these products. As noted above, the excavators have suggested a continuity of function for most of the rooms surrounding the agora, and with the present presentation of evidence there are significant limitations to our ability to assess this claim. However, foundation deposits for the archive (architecturally integrated into the south stoa) and the various well deposits provide some chronological indications, as well as glimpses of the functioning market.

442 Akamatēs 2001, 474–8.
443 Akamatēs 1989, 177.

The wells were located in functional rooms of the agora and mostly contained waste of food and other products,[444] so their fill should be related to the regular use of these rooms rather than any clearing event, which would lead to more confusion of material. In the text below, I refer to material from primary deposits reasonably referable to a single deposition event or period. However, in order to further clarify the nature of the evidence, I have included a chart of these deposits below. A *terminus ante quem* is firmly established by the abondonement of the agora in 90 BC, but we expect more limited evidence and the significance of Pella diminished in the second half of the second century. Notwithstanding the chronological difficulties, we can appreciate the diversity of market spaces in Pella's agora, even if a clear picture of the full range of activities at one point in time or of the development of market space overall is elusive.

Table: Dating material mentioned in the reports of Pella's agora

Name (loc.)	Earliest Deposit (Chronology)	Later Deposit(s) (Chronology)
Well 1 east stoa	Bottom layers undatable, remnants of organic material including food, tools and wood	'Upper layers': *Lekanes and kanthoroi* datable to the end of Antigonos' reign and the reign of Demetrios II
Well 10 east stoa	Figurines and relief vessels of Eros, Mother of the Gods, etc., stylistically dated from the late third to the middle of the second century	--
Well 16 east stoa	Excavated to the bottom (18m) where *kantharoi*, lamps and coins of Cassander are found 15-18 metres in depth (end of the fourth/beginning of the	First 15m of excavation apparently took place in previous year; but no report has been published for this year (1996)

444 Akamatēs 1999, 206.

	third century) (Akamatēs 1999, 206-209)	
Well 3 south stoa (Akamatēs 1997, 183–184)	Discarded pottery fragments and waste from a pottery workshop in 4 strata; lowest stratum (4) dated by coins of Cassander (end of the fourth century, no other datable material)	Three further strata included similar material; dated by coins (1) of Philip V, Perseus and the *Makedones*, (2) of Antigonos and Demetrios II, (3) of Cassander and Lysimachos (first quarter of the third century

Various imported goods were sold on the west, interspersed with koroplastic facilities, which were also evident in the northern part of the east stoa. Manufacture of terracotta figurines along with religious and political functions occurred in the north stoa.[445] An intended progression through the agora may be indicated by the presence of columns on the south, east and west sides of the agora, whilst the north side is marked by pillars, similar to Unit I of the palace (see below).[446] The north stoa is physically higher than the rest of the peristyle, and its main approach was via a series of steps.[447] The presence of pillars instead of columns can only indicate the northern part of the agora was regarded as “interior” space, and that the most important functions of the agora took place in a kind of “inner sanctum”. Finds from the road south of the shops reveals the extent of trade connections at Pella, with stamped amphora fragments from Thasos, Akanthos, Rhodes, Knidos, Kos, Chios, Corinth, Corcyra, the Brindisian coast, Latium, South Italy and North Africa, along with the

445 Akamatēs 1991, 78–9; Akamatēs 2011, 402
446 Akamatēs 1989, 175.
447 Akamatēs 1991, 77–8.

Parmeniskos group produced at Mendē under the aegis of Kassandreia.[448] As discussed further below, the amphora origins are not consistent throughout the agora, so, although the limits of the evidence may give us some pause, it is possible to imagine individual shops obtaining liquid products from a distinct set of regional markets. Whilst the origins just indicated provide the range of trade relationships in Pella, then, we may get a sense of individual shopkeepers' relationships in the different parts of the agora.

In the south wing of the eastern stoa the remains of food and other products were discovered in purpose-built stone wells (1, 10, 16).[449] The wing consists of two deep rooms, probably functioning as shops, facing the street, analogous to the format of those built into the south side of the agora terrace. The earliest stratum of well 16 is dated to the late fourth/early third century, based on coins of Cassander, whilst the well in Room1 seems to have been opened after the mid-third century, based on coins of Demetrios II and Antigonos Gonatas, as well as associated ceramics (fig. 22).[450]

Among the pottery workshops, the well in space 3, which was excavated to a depth of 17 metres, was the most informative, revealing residue of firing, shells, a large number of bowls, copper and iron objects, jewellery, debris from a mosaic floor, many coins, pieces of roof tiles, breccia marble, high-pitched pottery, small glass objects, mostly Thasian amphora fragments, lead and clay loom weights. The workshop seems to

448 Akamatēs 2007, 421.
449 The numbers of wells refer to rooms in which they were found in the east stoa. However, the precise location of these rooms is not identified.
450 Akamatēs 1999, 206–8.

have specialised in red- and black-figure plates. Four phases are distinguished in the well dating to the reign of Cassander, the first quarter of the third century, the reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II. A well in space 20, excavated to a depth of 9.7 metres, containing carbonised material including dissolved mudbrick, various large stones, metal objects (especially iron), shell, bones and fragments of pumice, could indicate that the phases attested in other wells may relate to specific destruction events within the life of the agora.[451]

In the cleaning of the eastern stoa (fig. 24, no. 3), representative types of figurines depicting male figures, dolls, *paidogogoi* [teachers], Erotes [love spirits], Aphrodite, Priapos and Dionysos, date from the end of the fourth to the mid-third century. In the same place, diagnostic sherds of skyphoi, kantharoi and other vessels along with lamp fragments suggested a similar date. Three coins of Cassander, Demetrios Poliorketes and Antigonos Gonatas suggest specific phases in their reigns, adding support to the chronology established by the well.[452]

The format of the south side of the agora is mainly known on its west side where rooms are built into the terrace and communicate with the street to the south. At the southwest corner stood a peristyle (2 x 2) archive building (fig. 25), built with two stories of Doric columns and Ionic piers, but with a wooden architrative like the overall agora building. It is identified by numerous clay seals, a stone stamp, pens and inkwells dating to its final phase of use (the last quarter of the second century).[453]

---

451 Akamatēs 1997, 183–4.
452 Akamatēs 2005, 480.
453 Akamatēs 1995, 115; Akamatēs 2001, 479–82.

The entrance to the archive was probably marked by two Hermaic stelai, found amidst destruction debris, indicating the structure was thought of as a political space separate from the rest of the agora.[454] The upper story was accessed by a wooden peristyle in the southeast corner of the peristyle. Underneath the western stylobate of the peristyle, a well was created in the second phase of the archive's use, with its mouth constructed of two cornerstones (0.6 metres wide) and an Ionic column. It contained fourth period Rhodian and Koan amphorai, Macedonian amphorai, skyphoi, plates and lamp fragments.[455]

To the east, the archive is articulated to a row of shops, which have in their foundation deposit (between the level of the shops and cemetery closed in the mid-fourth century) coins of Philip II and Alexander III.[456] However, fragments of glass objects and clay figurines led the excavator to down date the stratum to the late fourth century BC (fig. 27).[457] In the eastern part of the south stoa, a second building phase is shown, dated by the excavator to ca. 280–75, based on contemporary silver tetradrachms of Alexander III minted at this time.[458] Spaces I–VI seem especially concerned with the sale of small molluscs and other salted fish. A large number of oil amphorai have been uncovered here, and some amphorae have traces of fish bone. Particularly interesting is the presence of

454 Akamatēs 1993, 144.

455 Akamatēs 1990, 427–9; Akamatēs 1999, 186–7.

456 Akamatēs 2001, 484.

457 Akamatēs 2004, 438–9. In *pers. comm.,* Akamatēs reports that Cassander period coins of Alexander III and 'King Cassander' have recently been found in further support of this dating.

458 Akamatēs 2004, 440.

solenidae, found in the shallow sub-tidal sediments of tropical or sub-tropical waters such as the Northern Persian Gulf.[459]

The south stoa is divided into two parts by the road between quadrants I, 2 & I, 4, which was built above a large water square channel, nearly one-metre wide. An upper storey of spaces to the east, beginning with deep and narrow corridors, communicating with the square (fig. 28), and the lower story mentioned above communicating with the street. In space 3 of the upper story kantharos fragments were found inscribed ΔΙΟΣ Φ[ρατρίου ἡ φιλίου], produced in the workshops of Pella for this local cult.[460] The channel ultimately connected with the water supply running east of House I, 1 mentioned in the previous section. A row of isodomic stones, which serves as the top of the channel also seems to have been a step on the road to the south (0.25m rise to the east), even with the beginning of square I, 2, and there was a second step a short distance on, with a similar rise to the east (fig. 29). Naturally, excavation could not dig through the stone channel, but sherds characteristic of the late fourth century are reported from the escarpment lying above the funerary area closed in the mid-fourth century.

On the other hand, the street level to the east is characterised by finds of the late second century, which are unfortunately not reported. What we do know is that the gradient of the street leading to the gate between blocks I, 2 & I, 4 (24 masl) was lower than that of the next north-south street to the east (i.e. east of blocks I, 1 & I, 2: 22.9 masl), which

459 Akamatēs 1997, 185–6; *Cf.* Saeedi, Costello, and Rv 2013. The discussion of Athenaios (*Deipnosophistai* III, 90) is indispensable.
460 Akamatēs 1995, 112–4; *Cf.* Papakōnstantinou-Diamantourou 1971, 43–4.

had pottery finds mainly from the second half of the second and first centuries (the last phase of the agora's life).[461] It stands to reason that the streets to the east may have been relaid in the mid-second century.

The façade of the agora to the east would have been a solid wall, and the presence of a higher storey raises the question whether there was also an upper level of rooms facing on to the square above the western, street level rooms.[462] From the evidence of the south and east stoas, then, it is an open question how far, as they stand in their second century forms, they would have depended on the substructure of the street level rooms (were they the basement of a fourth century stoa?), which could be addressed by full publication of all the blocks known from these critical areas. On the other hand, if the stoa (of any period) does not depend on these rooms, we would need independent evidence for the dating of each stoa.

In the southern part of the western stoa, there are a series of double rooms, mostly opening on the square. It is unclear whether any rooms communicated with the western street as to my knowledge excavations from the rooms near and north of the gate and the street west of the agora have not yet been conducted.[463] The destruction of the agora seems to have been more intense in this area, as a heavy destruction stratum of stone plinths from the exterior wall and roof tiles from the last

461 Akamatēs 1998, 47–8.

462 Akamatēs 2007, 413–20.

463 Unfortunately a clear plan of this section has not been published, but the rooms are numbered in ascending order from the south.

phase had to be cleared. The first discovery of mostly abraided pottery included skyphoi, painted oinochoai, and much sigillata.[464]

It is unclear whether material from the northern part of the archive belongs to it, or was redeposited from the southernmost shops. In any case, the areas seem to have focused on high-value ceramics and non-liquid products. The former include: a small krater on the north wing of the archive with an erotic scene comparable to Florina 5440, a krater depicting the Persian Wars and a large number of unused lamps of Ephesian types dedicated to Asklepios like those found on Athens and Delos. There were also amphorai from Macedonia, Kos, Knidos, Brindisi and Italian Chersonesos, often found with traces of pumice and silver-bearing lead, iron pyxides, iron filings, lead pyxides and loomweights dated to the end of the second century.[465]

A well in space 3 (fig. 24), explored from a depth of 17–19.5 metres, contains remains of a ceramic workshop and numerous coins of Cassander. Another well in space 5 contained, at a depth of 9.4–17.9 metres black-figure skyphoi, oinochoai, olpai and lekanai, west-slope kantharoi, bones, shells, bronze figurines, bronze masses, slag, pieces of pottery used in metalworking, pieces of tools and bronze coins. A well in space 12 revealed black-glaze pottery exclusively from the second half of the third century. Another in space 10 included a few figurines, red- and black-glaze pottery, and bronze coins from the second century. A number of pointed Thasian amphorai from the late fourth century, breccia marble and a few bones were found in a well in space 18. Finally, a well in space

464 Akamatēs 1998, 96–8.
465 Akamatēs 1998, 98–101.

20 featured corner stones, grindstones, faience, pumice, metal, glass and coins.[466] Throughout the southern half of the agora, all the major phases of Pella's agora, i.e. the late fourth, mid-third, early second and mid-second centuries are represented. Particularly the fourth century wells suggest the commercial character of Pella, with their numerous currencies and the commercial classification of pottery.[467] New excavations of the west wing of the agora are not yet formally reported, but particularly in the northwest section a change in the format of rooms but with continuity in the use of foundations, attests three phases (late fourth, mid-third and mid-second centuries).[468]

We should consider two possibilities for the presence of shops facing the street on the south and east (and possibly) west side of the agora. First, there may have been a spatial distinction between the area south of the eastern side of the agora, where the shops were located, and the area south of the western side, where the public archive, a possible temple and of course the elite peristyle houses were found. Our ability to assess this possibility unfortunately is hindered by limited knowledge of the former area. Although some building walls from the block south of I.7 give indication of rooms in structure(s), we do not know how far they were well-built complexes like the peristyle houses and the buildings associated with the agora itself. They could equally, on present understanding, be more like the workshop and bath to the south. Second, there may have been other parts of the city, with their own markets to serve those who

466 Akamatēs 1998, 48–50.

467 Akamatēs 1997, 239–40.

468 Akamatēs generously discussed the excavations with me and allowed me to photograph the remains for personal use in the Autumn of 2012.

did not have other business in the city centre. Here again, in the absence of a more comprehensive archaeological understanding of the city, this possibility is difficult to evaluate.

On the north side of the agora, the rooms behind the peristyle (*i.e.* to the north), communicate with the square rather than the outside street. This is probably the reason why the north end of the peristyle was adorned with Ionic pilaster capitals, which mark progression through parts of a Macedonian peristyle, rather than entrance to it. Apart from the pillars, the destruction layers contained geison blocks and other architectural material, indicating that construction techniques were similar to the southern side, including the presence of a wooden architrave.[469] In the northeast corner four double sets of rooms, similar to those on the east and south sides are built in to the terrace with a depth 2–4.5 metres beneath the level of the square, with a stylobate at 27.32 masl (fig. 30). The rooms are supported by a back wall composed of large isodomic blocks preserved to a height of 4.5 metres. It is here that most clearly we can see the changing orientations of rooms with the west side of each room moved slighty to the left, but with the original location of the entrance of preserved. In association with the two clearly attested phases, a silver tetradrachm of Alexander, dated by Price to the period of Cassander's hegemony, after 317 BC, and a silver denarius of P. Sula (ca. 151 BC) suggest construction phases in the last quarter of the fourth century and the mid-second century, respectively.[470]

469 Akamatēs 1991, 79–80.
470 Akamatēs 2005, 486–8.

As noted above (p. 127), the north stoa is distinguished architecturally as interior space, and it is here alone that the predominantly commercial nature of the agora's rooms is interrupted. This excludes the probable official character of the archive, which is more clearly separate from the rooms of the agora architecturally and functionally. In the western part of the north stoa a large room was excavated with a marble exedra (internal diameter: 14.5 metres). Evidence of a staircase was found in the front part leading to a similar level that was reached by the staircase in the eastern part. It leads progressively up along the edge of the exedra.[471] The political character of this area is shown by the recovery of pieces of stone inscriptions identifying public officials, especially the πολιτάρχαι, along with clay seals inscribed ΠΕΛΛΗΣ | ΠΟΛΙΤΑΡΧΗΣ. Pieces of marble and bronze sculpture, including a nearly intact marble eagle, also came to light.[472]

The demarcation of space, use of marble, ritual of access and small finds in the vicinity of the exedra is all the more exceptionally given the small space it occupied amidst the market orientation dominating the space all around it. The western part of the north stoa was also used for workshops, as two kilns, spindle whorls, an establishment for incense burners and masses of slag have been identified.[473] In the easternmost extremity of the north stoa (fig. 12, no. 1), a water main was discovered traversing burials of the sixth and fifth centuries,[474] above which a

471 Akamatēs 1992, 75–77.
472 Akamatēs 1990, 426–7. Akamatēs 1992, 77–78, 85 (fig. 1–2).
473 Ibid., 78–79.
474 Akamatēs 2005, 488–90

staircase (4m wide) was identified. The approach was by a serpentine path, the foundations of which respect the burials. The fill underneath the staircase is dated to the end of the fourth century based on the 'characteristic pottery of the period', including pieces of lekythoi, pseudo-Cypriot amphorai, red-figure skyphoi and parts of kantharoi.[475]

Very little work has been done on the interior of the agora square, but its measurements are evocative of the stadion-length of public spaces in Macedonia, here definitely observable in both dimensions. Dromoi (race courses) or stadia have been proposed as one of the main functions, even the original function of Greek public space.[476] In 2005, deep layers of sludge backfill were cleared, which had been allowed to build up since the abandonment of Pella's agora in the first century AD. A tract was cleared from north to south (fig. 21, no. 2). It was 38 metres wide for most of its length, with hard embankments on either side but the pliability of the soil allowed it to be widened to 62 metres in the south. Three isodomic stone blocks were identified at the southern end, 0.25–0.3 metres apart, with a width of 0.08–0.1 metres.[477] A column base was also identified, which should probably be understood as part of an athletic monument. Unfortunately, the small finds (black- and unglazed pottery, pieces of figurines, glass objects and a marble statue) are suggestive but not diagnostic of function.[478] These finds, together with the embankment,

475 Akamatēs 2007, 408–10.
476 See now Romano 2016, 314–8, with earlier references.
477 This is precisely the evidence that led Camp to propose the identification of a racetrack in the Athenian Agora.
478 Akamatēs 2007, 411.

the length and the stone (starting) blocks are fully consistent with the identification of a stadion that I have proposed.

An interesting comparandum for Pella comes from Stratos (fig. 31), the seat of the Akarnanian League and part of the Epeirote confederacy in the latter third century.[479] The chronology of the latter site's agora is unfortunately also problematic, pending further excavation. Since Cassander encouraged the synoikism of Stratos in 314/3 (Diod. Sic. XIX, 67.3–7), it is tempting indeed to suggest that the major development of the site, including the agora occurred as a result of that expansion, much as Olynthos had done after its *anoikismos* at the behest of Perdikkas a century earlier. It is also possible that the agora was at least in part developed before Cassander's intervention and played a role in its choice as a site for combining settlements but in any event it probably predates the agora at Pella.

In the case of Pella's comparability to Stratos, it may be possible to settle the elusive questions of how far urban development in Macedonia was influenced by conquered lands. For it is clear that even if the agora was built at the behest of Cassander, or (more likely) one of his functionaries, it nonetheless reflected and served local priorities, and especially Stratos' role at the head of the Akarnanian League. What is especially striking for our purposes is that a rectilinear agora closed with columned buildings on all four sides existed more or less contemporaneously at both Stratos and Pella. Given the extremely limited excavation of Hellenistic agorai in Northern Greece, it is hardly

479 Funke 2001.

rash to suggest that there were (perhaps several) more such agorai of similar date that have not yet come to light. Another possibility is that "peristyle agorai" were particularly appropriate to certain types of sites. Pella and Stratos were both regional administrative capitals of the Macedonian state and the Akarnanian League, respectively. Did Macedonian urban development, especially under Cassander and later successors essentially adopt for its national capital an organisation that worked for capitals of regional *ethnē*? This issue will be explored fully in Chapter 5. For now, it is sufficient to note the differences in the use of space, with Stratos featuring greater emphasis on political building and Pella's peristyles functioning more to enforce social divisions and to organise the use of an agora. On the latter point, it is possible that this was Pella's specific solution to the disquiet expressed in Aristotle (*Pol.* 1331a-b) about combining market and religious/political activity in the same public space. There may have been two agorai in Dēmētrias, which the philosopher says is a Thessalian tradition, but there is also evidence, from Hellenistic Thasos and Segesta, of a physical barrier dividing space in a public square. The designers at Pella probably thought the high level of organisation sufficient to make necessary divisions, but we cannorrt rule out the possibility, with less than 3 percent of the site known archaeologically, that there were additional public squares at Pella too.

The area of the agora at Pella was part of a vast cemetery until the mid-fourth century.[480] We can be sure the southern part of the agora terrace was heaped up, and at the height of the second century building

480 See esp. Akamatēs 1993, 146–9.

foundations, because a row of shops immediately south of the agora are built into terrace. Coins of King Cassander, ca. 305–297 were found in the foundation deposits of the shops. Moreover, a similar line of shops, also south of the agora in ancient Thasos town, are assigned a similar date by excavators there.[481] The massive agora terrace should therefore date to the end of the fourth century as the position of the shops would make their construction unsafe if the large buildings of the agora were already in place. Equally, a staircase built between the shops and an unidentified three-room structure, essentially continuing the path of the road between quadrants I.2 and I.4, presupposes the existence of important structures on the terrace, and the foundations of the agora's south stoa lie immediately above earlier burials.[482]

The palace

The palace at Pella (fig. 32) is much more difficult to read than its counterpart at Aigai, and for two reasons–the number of phases represented and the more complex structure of spatial organisation found within. Unfortunately, the difficulties are not helped by the often confusing presentation of evidence in archaeological reports, but mainly by tracing the hints offered in recent reports, we may be able to recognise the form of the palace at important stages in its chronology. Kopsacheili, in her important study of palaces in Macedonia and the Hellenistic East, has presented clearly and informatively the data for the palace at Pella,

481 *BCH* 80 (1956) 416-418 [F. Salviat].
482 Akamatēs 2007, 413–4.

and there is fortunately no need to recover that ground. Two issues central to the concerns of the present investigation are worth highlighting, however, the first chronological and the second a matter of palace form in relation to the civic architecture.

The palace at Pella is usually assigned a first phase in the third quarter of the fourth century BC.[483] As Raynor notes, the high chronology of the palace gives it an odd place in the city until the latter's expansion at the end of the fourth century.[484] One can perhaps account for this by accepting that plans for expansion go back to Philip II, and the palace was realised before that king's death with a building break until the reign of Cassander. A more serious problem arises from the stylistic criteria adduced for an early date, which are not reliable for this period. [485] Attention to descriptions and photographs of coins leads to a more economical chronology from the late fourth century to the first quarter of the second century.

Since significant interventions are attested during the reigns of Cassander (315–298/7 BC), Antigonos Gonatas (mid-third century) and Philip V (early-second century), the palace provides insight about spatial organisation uniquely relevant to our period of study, ca. 350–150 BC,

---

483 Chrysostomou 1997, 128–32; *Id*., 2011, 138; Hatzopoulos 2001, 191; Akamatēs 2011, 408.

484 Raynor 2015, 184.

485 This is because architectural members of fourth-century temples used as comparanda for those of Macedonian palaces are often archaising, were most frequently built as spatial ensembles rather than individual buildings, and differences in proportions (the most reliable dating criteria) are slight with too few examples to assess change over time. See Winter 1982, *e.g.* "When fixing the relationship of axial spans to column diameters, the Nemea architect [ca. 340–20 BC] simply borrowed the Tegea system [ca. 360–40] with little change" whilst the Stratos architect [ca. 320] followed the system used at Epidauros sixty years earlier (ibid., 396). Relying on criteria useful for dating in the fifth century thus might lead to a misdating of up to 60 years in the fourth.

covering periods of less intensive use for the space both before and after the palace's existence. This in a city where it can be compared to the development of both civic and elite domestic spaces. The palace also speaks particularly to the identity of Pella as a *basileion*, in contrast, e.g., to Aigai or Dion, on account of the range of kings who took interest in it, and its multifarious functionality. It is on this point that my view differs most strongly from Nielsen[486], for the palace of Pella is far more than a large version of the houses studied above; there is some use in thinking about Aigai's palace that way, but for Pella's it is fundamentally misguided and perverse. The earliest identifiable rooms of the palace may have been *androne*s, although they have a much more official feel and the evidence from small finds along with the foundations for honorific statues show an administrative and commemorative role for the palace already in the last quarter of the fourth century. Despite the variety of *androne*s in the elite houses, which, as noted above, could be used for official proceedings, there is hardly a trace of administrative space.

Location and form

The palace was located at the northern extremity of the grid-planned city, on the so-called "acropolis" hill[487] (*cf.* fig. 2), which is in fact not much of a hill at all, but part of a gentle rise in elevation from the south to north, standing at 65–70masl. The main approach seems to be by the continuation of the road between blocks I.3 & I.5, on the opposite (north)

---

486 Nielsen, 1994, 84–85.
487

side of the agora. The colonnade of the east side of the palace (peristyle V) was aligned to the road running between I.3 & I.1, and the palace's propylon lines up to the centre of the public archive, which leads to interesting questions both about the literal alignment of administration in the agora, as well as the general significance of blocks even with the west side of the agora. Regarding the chronology of building, there is very little evidence for a phase in the third quarter of the fourth century, and the material remains are not dispositive for determining the form of any building in this period.

The buildings of the palace complex (units I-VII, *cf.* fig. 32) are architecturally independent, built on five separate terraces by cuts and retaining walls, covering an area of 60–70,000m^2.[488] The earliest units, on either side of the propylon (I–II) comprise (or constitute?) a single architectural complex on a single terrace, which does have a superficial resemblance to the palace of Aigai, i.e. as one of the earliest double peristyles in Greek architecture. We should note, however, that the 16m wide propylon in fact split the two and projected 2.5m in front of them, which were of relatively equal size, in contrast to the placement of a propylon at the centre of the larger peristyle, with the smaller peristyle serving as a subsidiary service court. The palace at Pella was approached by a 15m wide staircase, which was mostly for show and only had three steps for an elevation gain of 2m to reach the podium of the same height on which the propylon stood. Underneath the foundation of the podium, a bronze coin of Cassander was found showing Herakles on the obverse and

488 Akamatēs 2011, 400; Nielsen 1994, 88.

a lion on the reverse (both facing right), dating to ca. 319–298 BC, but the simple *ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ* legend may indicate an early date within this range[489]. The appearance of the façade was similar to Aigai's, in this case with the tetrastyle Doric propylon dividing a stoa with 21 columns to the west (76m) and 17 columns to the east (66m), both having an average column spacing of roughly 2m. As at Aigai, the propylon had two stories, and there is evidence for Ionic semi-columns and false windows. Beyond the porch of the propylon (Pr 1), there was a similar passage through two additional rooms (Pr 2, 150m^2 & Pr 3, 90m^2).[490] Because the porch of Pella's propylon projects from the main building, however, these rooms are aligned to the twin long rectangular corridors behind the stoas, rather than to the second of these and the first set of rooms at Aigai. The result of this is that one would not have entered directly into the core of a single peristylar court but a wide corridor ultimately used for the west suite of rooms in peristyle I. Corridors are only used at Aigai as horizontally arranged waiting/display areas but here one enters a more complex building which might have contributed to a greater sense of magnitude. It is tempting to see this as a development of the building type, also followed at Dēmētrias, but it is more important as an indicator of function.

489 *Cf. AMNG* III.1/SNG *Alpha Bank* 878/Mionnet Supp. III.540, *SNG Copenhagen* 1138, 1140, Sear no. 6753 (with the legend *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΟΥ*).
490 Chrysostomou 1991, 114; Siganidou 1992, 60–2; Chrysostomou 1997, 121; Chrysostomou 20112011, 132; Kopsacheili 2013, 71–2.

Chronology and Function

Like the palace at Aigai, Chrysostomou's dating of the palace at Pella is mostly justified by comparison to the temples at Tegea and Nemea. The construction of the Philippeion and the similarity of the Leonidaion,[491] both at Olympia, to Macedonian peristyles makes it likely that Peloponnesian architects were active at Pella, so the comparisons are quite natural. Kopsacheili[492] cites approvingly the excavator's argument that the first phase of the palace at Pella could be dated to the third quarter of the fourth century,[493] and that the palace at Aigai should be later because of differences in the upper curvature of the echinus on their Doric capitals. Stylistic dating always carries a high risk, and although Kottaridē's dating of the palace at Aigai is certainly open to criticism, she at least attends to more persuasive arguments about proportions. Dating on the basis of a column capital's shape is highly dubious–the early fourth century Temple at Bassai has a pronounced curvature in its Doric capitals and the Temple of Nemea's have slight curvature, which might lead us to the conclusion that the palace of Pella was before the Temple at Nemea and the Palace at Aigai after it. The trouble is that the columns of the Temple at Tegea have a straighter echinus than either Bassai or Nemea, and if this variation can persist throughout the fourth century (fig. 33) it can hardly be the basis to date buildings within a quarter century. The curvature of the echinus probably relates most closely to the balance of weight on the building, and whether the palaces can be compared in this way to

491 Note 50, above.
492 Kopsacheili 2013, 72–3.
493 Chrysostomou 1997, 128.

temples, which have a different distribution of weight, requires further study. The safest assumption for the first phase of the palace is that it was built ca. 315–298 BC, probably in conjunction with the expansion of the gridded city (after 305 BC), or at least with it in mind.

Unit I (Kopsacheili's Unit I–II.A) was anchored by a large rectangular 11 x 13 Doric peristyle hall (28 x 32m, or 900m^2; 31 x 35.5m including the colonnade)[494] with evidence for a complex division of surrounding rooms, suggesting the kind of large banquet which is attested for peristyles of the gymnasia at Antiocheia (Polyb. XXX, 26) and Hermaia.[495] In front of the stylobate for the west stoa of the peristyle the foundation for an altar (3.2 x 3.65m) surrounded by a semi-circular exedra (1.82m wide with an external radius of 9.61m) were found. Among the finds discovered in association with the exedra was a bronze coin of Philip II with a head of Apollo facing right on the obverse and a horseman facing right on the reverse, a combination found on coins dating ca. 323–15 BC.[496] The better preserved northern rooms are dominated by a 'Flügeldreiraumgruppe' consisting of large central room with columns in *antis* flanked by two smaller rooms with couches.[497] In this case, the layout of the central room (22 x 12m = 264m^2) shows that it should have been fitted with 26 couches, with smaller square flanking rooms (approximately 9x9m each) accommodating 15 couches each. Instead of the usual entrance directly through the central room, there was a long group of porches (roughly 5m

494 Compared to 44.5 x 44.5 m at Aigai and 27 x 27 m for Section A at Dēmētrias.
495 Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 95–9; Skaltsa 2008, 22.
496 Chrysostomou 19971997, 123–4, 126; *AΔ* 53 (1998) 647; For the coin type, see *e.g.* Le Rider 1996, pl. 44.9, 44.14, 45.20, 45.30, 46.21, 46.29, 48.13 (–294 BC).
497 Heermann 1986, 345–62; Nielsen 1994, 91.

deep with four Ionic column pilasters for each of the small rooms and, 8 for the small rooms). It is possible that the columns on the sides, which Hoepfner claims are .25m in diameter were ornamental, but there is no evidence for a wall so we can only speculate about whether entrance was limited to the porch in front of the central room.[498]

The large open space (11m) between the north peristyle and the rooms and the row of what are probably statue bases (30m long with an average depth of 1.5m) would have emphasised the ceremony of approaching the impressive suite of dining rooms, which really have no equivalent. The largest 'Flügeldreiraumgruppe' in Aigai, M1–3, had almost as much individual reclining space but without the sense of hierarchy found in the Pella suite. As a matter of fact, the *in antis* stoas mark out a separate ritual of *axial* passage similar to the effect of the propylon. It is in this kind of space that one call well imagine a royal court proceeding or other official business of the king being transacted. The remaining space around the peristyle was divided into smaller rooms with an L-shaped corridor on the west and two exedrae, possibly with cult function on the east, which somewhat resembles the tholos at Aigai's palace. We should mention especially two rooms in the northwest and northeast corner of the complex, respectively carrying a small peristyle and a pi-shaped colonnade.[499] Finds from the peristyle have not been reported, but it is of some interest that the centre of the peristyle is aligned exactly to the centre of the peristyle archive in the agora and the pi-shaped room to the

498 Chrysostomou 1997 124–6, 2011, 132–3; Hoepfner 1996, 27–31; Kopsacheili 2013, 71–5.
499 Chrysostomou 1997 126.

pi-shaped Sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods and Aphrodite, both of which are contemporary. Nielsen's anachronistic suggestion that this space served as a garden is highly unlikely, as Kopsacheili notes,[500] because of another large semi-circular exedra (exterior length: 13m) found inside the peristyle's east colonnade.[501] The former's claim of a water pipeline underneath this peristyle seems to be a confusion with Unit I, which was more conveniently reached because the city's water supply ran along the east side of the "Acropolis" hill.[502]

Unit II (Kopsacheili's unit I–II.B) was separated from unit I by a massive wall (2.55m thick), which required it to be entered from the south near the propylon. It was organised around a large and impressive Doric peristyle court (16x16 columns, 50x50m, 6.5m thick), which was paved with packed earth and fragments of tile.[503] Rooms are reported on the north and west sides of the peristyle but their dimensions and evidence of their function is not discussed. Claims of a phase dating to the reign of Philip II are mainly down to a collapse of Corinthian roof tiles found on the west side of the peristyle, which are similar to those found on the Tholos at Epidauros.[504] The same sort of tiles were used for the Philippeion and are not diagnostic for assigning a date of 350 rather than, *e.g.*, 320.[505]

500 Kopsacheili 2013, 78 *cf.* Nielsen 2001, 178. On the absence of gardens in Macedonian palaces, see Kopsacheili 2015.

501 Chrysostomou 2011, 138.

502 Papakōnstantinou-Diamantourou 19711971, 61.

503 Chrysostomou 1997, 126–8; 2011, 133–4; Kopsacheili 2013, 77.

504 Chrysostomou 1997, 128; 2011, 138–9; Kopsacheili 2013, 72–3.

505 Raynor 2015, 183, but with some unfortunate misunderstanding of archaeological evidence: *e.g.* the profile of the Aigai column shown by Chrysostomou (2011, 139, fig. 16) *is* similar to the Doric columns from the House of the Rape of Helen (*e.g.* Makaronas and Giourē 19891989, 31, fig. 19, 33, fig. 21, 34, fig. 24, 37, fig. 29). So Raynor's argument about the 'variety of the forms of Doric capitals employed within a relatively short time' unfortunately does not cut any ice archaeologically, since the variety is actually Chrysostomou's point. Comparing Macedonian and Peloponnesian architecture

The most reliable dating comes from coins, the greater proportion of Laconian roof tiles, and clay sealings dating to the same period. The civic coinage reported is not described, but Raynor notes[506] that minting continued at Larisa well after Philip's conquest of Thessaly and the same is true for Boiotian federal coins, but coins from Akanthos do seem to have stopped ca. 350 BC.[507] Even after the destruction of Thebes, minting of Boiotian federal coinage continued.[508] The coins named are thus not dispositive for a mid-century date, without further identification of their types. Another phase is attested by the discovery of fittings for bronze tripods and even statues of the Antigonid dynasty among the statue bases north of the peristyle, perhaps of the 'Ancestor Monument'[509] or 'Bull Monument'[510] types, dating around the mid-third century BC.[511] We should also point out the mix of individual workshops (of Mondaia, Nikolaos, Aristonos, Sosia etc., ca. 325 [my dating] – mid-third century), royal workshops (first half of the third century , and civic workshops (ΠΕΛΛΗΣ, mid-third – 168 BC).[512] Philip II had a royal workshop, known to have made tiles for Florina, his foundation in Western Macedonia, so for it not to have been involved in his own palace at Pella would require

---

in this period is completely legitimate; as noted above, the trouble is whether we can establish a chronological gap of 20–30 years at a time when archaicizing architecture is common and change is slow.

506 Previous note.

507 Coins listed by Chrysostomou 1997, 138. The presence of the coins of Amyntas and Akanthos, along with mid-fourth century clay sealings, may support the suggestion of some activity on the hill toward the end of Philip's reign, but this unprovenanced evidence cannot establish a building phase.

508 338–15 BC: *BMC* VIII, 48–9; *SNG Copenhagen*, 170, 173.

509 Edson 1934, 213–8; Ameling et al. 1995, I.191–2 (cat. no. 129).

510 Schmidt-Dounas 2004, 282–4, with figs. 4–5.

511 Chrysostomou 2011, 133

512 Misaelidou-Despotidou 1993.

explanation. The date of the rooms cannot be determined with certainty; there are some lower (and lighter) foundations in the flanking rooms. In particular, the foundations and later comparanda justify Kopsacheili's suspicion that the L-shaped narrow corridors and small rooms in the northwest and northeast of unit I are of later date. The argument that the row of statues north of the peristyle there is also later, because of the use of spoliated blocks, is likewise convincing.[513] Nevertheless we can be confident on current evidence that the terrace was constructed at one time, ca. 319–298.

To the west of unit II on a separate terrace of slightly later date, one side of what was probably intended to be a further peristyle was constructed but work was never completed so it was subsequently covered over. Nevertheless, it offers essential support for the dating and grandiose vision of the palace at an early period. The size of 85x50m = 4250m^2 is often given, but this is somewhat misleading because it is a measurement for the whole terrace, whilst other units are measured by the scale of the peristyle. For comparison, we should note that similar measurements would result in dimensions of 75x75m and 63x75m for units I & II respectively, so the interpretation of its ostentation as a sign of Demetrios Poliorketes's kingship is out of order.[514] Adjacent to the west wall of unit II, the stylobate of the Building III's eastern stoa is preserved to a length of 85.5m. At the northern end, three courses of the crepis survive, and upon the uppermost course which stands the heavily

513 Kopsacheili 2013, 77–8, but she does not explain why they should date so late as she suggests (the reign of Philip V, i.e. after 219 BC), rather than the mid-third century phase better attested in this unit.

514 *Pace* Hatzopoulos 2001, 194, followed by Raynor 20152015, 182.

weathered lower drum of a Doric column (fig. 34). Further stretches of similar foundations are known on the north and south sides of the terrace and in the latter case the stoa is essentially an extension of the stoa west of Pr3.[515] In effect, the format of this building, namely the minimal depth of the stoas (ca. 5.5m) compared to the peristyle in unit 1 (which is over 28m from the back wall of the building), to take an extreme case–makes the comparison in peristyle size especially unhelpful.

Roughly two-thirds of the way north up the large courtyard of Building III are a stoa running east to west (44.5x5m) with a further slightly deeper stoa (dimensions not given, 8m estimated from plan) articulated to the western end, and extensive series of rooms to the eastern end (dimensions not given, 39 x 32m or 1250m^2 estimated from plan). The series of rooms is built on top of the east section of the stoa. A stone paved east-west path ran on the south side of both buildings (dimensions not given or pictured), built in part with collapsed Laconian roof tiles of the type known from Building I–II. The stylobate of fragments of a three step crepis of a further unfinished stoa (45x14m) are preserved underneath Building III. Bronze coins, red-figure pottery, Lakonian roof tiles bearing the names of Aristonos and Lysimachos,[516] and the inscribed bases of amphorai (none of which are shown or described), led the excavator to assign a date during the anarchic period (297–276) for the early stoa, and during the reign of Antigonos Gonatas for Building III.[517] Excavation is still ongoing, but building across the middle of a peristyle

515 Chrysostomou 2011, 135.
516 Misaelidou-Despotidou 1993, 978–9.
517 Chrysostomou 1997, 109–10.

square would require explanation, and given the narrowness of the corridors of the peristyle, a later date of construction (ca. 200 BC) seems plausible for the peristyle.

Building IV-V consists of two rectangular spaces divided into rooms on the north side of unit I (unit IV) and a signal large peristyle court on the north side of unit II (unit V). The poorly preserved unit IV seems to have foundations for a peristyle court on the south and an open rectangular court with a row of statue bases on the northern end, similar to those on the north side of the peristyle in Unit I. Crucially, there was greater spacing between them, probably indicating individual statues rather than a family group. Unit V's peristyle court dominates the space, roughly equivalent to the corresponding peristyle of unit II to the south, but with a row of rooms on the north side. The northern part of Unit IV (fig. 35) is anchored by a sunken (.5–1.3m deep) hypostyle cistern (Room E, 9.5x13m) with at least two rows of four pillars each. Underneath a corridor (Z) leading between this room and several others of various sizes is a water pipe (diameter 1.6–1.9m, preserved to a length of 9.5m, dated by coins and ceramics to the reign of Antigonos Gonatas.[518] Nevertheless, there were remains of earlier pipes, and the cistern has an early phase dated by coins of Alexander III & Cassander to the late fourth century BC. A second phase is attested both by the pipeline and the grooves for air circulation in rooms A & Z.[519] Essentially, the 'Great baths' complex

518 Chrysostomou 1991, figs. 8–10; Misaelidou-Despotidou 1992, figs. 2–3

519 Kopsacheili 2013, 80, mentions a 'water reservoir' as a possibly predecessor to the hypocaust, but focuses on the latter, leading her to adumbrate that the whole building may be after the mid third century. This, however, does not fully account for the two phases attested for Room E (Misaelidou-Despotidou 1991).

consisted of a large pool (K) in the southern peristyle of unit IV and a complex of rooms on its north and west sides dates to the mid-third century, but has evidence of use from the late fourth century.[520]

The gate and complex of rooms on the northeast side of unit IV, the so-called ‘royal ship’, have been interpreted as the royal apartments, but may have also housed the royal mint, judging from the coin blanks found in the vicinity. The gate has a date ‘after 334 BC’, based on coins of Alexander III, and probably in the reign of Cassander.[521] In general, the consistent dating of the walls in this area to the last quarter of the fourth century[522] is further evidence for the first complex also dating to this period, for the vulnerability of the hill to the northeast would have been too precarious for the effective functioning of a royal administrative centre.[523] The stratigraphy of space E and the bathing pool K (beaten earth and rubble sub-layer) suggest the comtemporaneity of units IV–V and the similarity of design units II and V suggest the latter was completed shortly after the former, perhaps by the same architect. These considerations support the impression that these four spaces–Building I–II and Building IV–V were both built during the period when Antipatros and Cassander controlled Macedonia, as regents (323–305: Building I–II) and king (305–297: Building IV–V) respectively.

The territory of the palace serves as a royal enclave, 370 metres up the hill from the edge of the grid-plan, and self-sufficient with its own meeting places and administrative functions. The parallelism of functions

520 Chrysostomou 1991, 115–121.
521 Chrysostomou 2004, 2005, 442–7.
522 Siganidou 1987, 765–8.
523 Raynor 2015, 179–81, 84.

is shown especially by the deliberate attempt to align rooms with those in the city centre of corresponding style and shape. Nevertheless, its principles of organisation are fundamentally different, defined especially in the front group (propylon, units 1 & 2), with impressive ceremony, megalithic appearance and axially-enforced hierarchy to the unmistakable unitary stoa and 'Flügeldreiraumgruppe'. Unlike the palace of Aigai, in Pella there are not multiple groups of similar rooms but one grouping of tripartite space where the central room is not an entry rooms but the heart of royal power. As Hatzopoulos notes, the built out area of the palace is not quite so large as the usually reported land area within its fortifications might suggest, and his estimate of 25,000m^2. The distinction that rather needs to be made is about its function. When we combine the evidence for the royal halls in Unit I with the indications of a court education, coin production and permanent royal residence the official role of *ta basileia* in the *basileion* of Pella becomes especially clear.

Conclusions

Pella's growth from a lentil-shaped toumba to a major population centre was in the first instance motivated by changing geology and its consequent strategic position. Such a conclusion stems from a more archaeological approach supplementing historical narratives. The earliest civic functions of the city are gleaned from pastas house near the sanctuary of Darron, and speculation about the early function of the sanctuary itself. On current evidence, Pella did not take on the

monumental aspect of a *basileion* until the intervention under Cassander at the end of the fourth century. Early development may have been underway in the district south of the agora as early as the reign of Philip II, but signs there are not sufficient to establish the public and civic character of the city. Late Hellenistic developments shroud the full revelation of Hellenistic Pella, but it is clear that in this period Pella's identity was once again transformed as its geographical and political importance diminished.

Although Aigai and Dion (Hatzopoulos' political and national "capitals") continued to have important roles as leading Macedonian centres, the archaeology of Pella emphasises its particular role as a political and administrative centre, under which perspective Alexander's use of it as a military centre makes sense. The recognition of complementary royal centres in Macedonia should occasion us to think more about networks of cities in the administration of royal power. As Mackil has pointed out for ethnos regions,[524] the identification of a single site as a capital says too much but also too little about the unique functions of urban centres in Macedonia.

Public space at Pella is marked by large, open squares, water provision and the regulation but not necessarily prevention of traffic. In this light, the Sanctuary of Darron area and the houses and other buildings south of the agora shared with the monumental agora a role in shaping the public life of Pella. The point is emphasised by shared water supply between House I, 1 and the agora. It is also reveals that leading

524 Note 357.

elites, probably members of the king's inner circle, and their social activities, were more integrated into the physical life of the city than the king himself.

The south to north progression of the agora mirrors the progression through Pella itself and also resembles palace layout, but without the strictness of control found in the latter structures. The physical division of the agora reflects Aristotle's concern that market and political activities be separate, not with two agorai, but within one, as at Thasos and Segesta. This is probably reflected in the entrance to the agora, with the north gate and its fountain serving those with political roles. The south gates served the market side of the agora and also those entering from the monumental area south of the agora. The main east and west entrances could serve the political/market centre as a whole. Despite the monumental marking of space, there is no evidence that communication between parts was blocked.

There are limits to the firm establishment of the agora's chronology, but the wells serve to establish phases that may have responded to specific construction/destruction events in the early fourth, the first half of the third, the mid-third, the early second, and the mid-second centuries along with the final destruction in the early-first century. It is that not all phases are evident throughout and the political spaces of the archive in the southwest corner and the north stoa mainly give evidence for an initial and mid-second century phase. If there is room for doubt about the initial extent of the agora it is in the northern part, while the south was almost certainly constructed at the end of the fourth century, based on

numismatic evidence in foundation levels and the nature of the architectural foundations themselves. This probably means that the evidence for changing room layout in the northern half of the agora belongs to second century development. The wells also emphasise the international commercial character of Pella.

Although the scarce foundation stones for the palace are not enough to suggest the manner of construction on the north hill during the reign of Philip II, there is just enough evidence for continuity, from the continuation of existing grid-plan established at Phakos to the scraps of evidence for land-use adduced by Lilimpakē-Akamatē. The most economical conclusion is that while the monumentally built structure of Pella probably emerged during Cassander's reign, it was part of a longer-term development of the site.

When we come to compare the elite houses, described by Nielsen as 'palatial',[525] to the palace itself, we find that the interpretation of it simply as a larger version of a house is wholly inadequate. Peristyles at Pella move from the independent role of Classical peristyle buildings in cities and sanctuaries. In fact, they seem to be the building blocks of urban organisation. In this connection, they become agents for the 'political activation of space' and a manifestation–probably even a deliberate communication–of elite ideology. The alignments observed may divide Pella into discrete, aligned zones or bands of architecture comparable to what has been shown for Priene.[526]

525 Nielsen 1994, 84.
526 Rumscheid 2014.

Chapter 4: Amphipolis, Kassandreia, Dēmētrias and the “new cities” of Macedonia

Introduction

When Arrian set out to write a history of Alexander’s campaigns, aiming to overcome the mass of anecdotal, legendary and conflicting material that had come to define the Alexander romance, he begun by tracing the king’s campaigns in Northern Greece (*Anab.* I, 1–6).[527] Here, Alexander

527 Hamilton 1971, 18–25.

was able to gain experience in cavalry combat over difficult passes, and try out stratagems that would be employed against a much more formidable foe in Asia.[528] Likewise, in order to contextualize the rich history of urban development that is emerging in new studies of the Hellenistic East, we need to understand how Macedonian cities transformed long-standing Greek traditions of civic life they inherited closer to home. As will be discussed further in the following chapter, the story is much more about the successors than Philip or Alexander, but the precedents for an Ephesos, Miletos or Priene may yet lie in Northern Greece, where the earliest evidence for Macedonian public architecture is found.

Two cities where the clear transformation of major Classsical cities can be assessed are Amphipolis and Poteidaia/Kassandreia. They certainly cannot match the scale of evidence from Pella, but compensate for this deficiency by providing numerous examples of public space, even if their form is not always clear in individual cases, where decisive traces of Macedonian intervention are evident. The strong index provided by evidence for the use of space and individual buildings before the mid-fourth century, especially at Kassandreia, affords a clearer assessment than at any other site in this study of changes that took place in our period. Further, now that the character of Macedonian courtyard architecture has been established at Aigai, Mieza and Pella as a definitive marker of public space above, it is sensible to ask whether such building is observable in the Macedonian redevelopment of Amphipolis and

528 Lane Fox 1973, 74–85; Markle 1982, 104–109.

Kassandreia. The answer is a resounding yes, but some issues cannot be addressed fully due to the lack of adequate reporting, even of measurements.

Both sites preserve a prominent example of public space organised around a courtyard, as a marker of new Macedonian development. The gymnasion at Amphipolis is one of the earliest preserved examples of this form, and embraces most fully the principles of Macedonian public architecture, with rooms on all four sides of its palaistra. Another courtyard building is known from Kassandreia, which has been regarded as a 'peristyle house',[529] but the complexity of its rooms is more characteristic of public space. Moreover, its east side has not been excavated, so the existence of a peristyle at all is supposititious. There are indications that there may be additional parallels, appearing across the sites, but only fragments of their architecture have been excavated. Both buildings feature elongated rectangular courtyards, which may be a local preference preserving the general shape of open spaces known from the houses at Olynthus.[530]

Regarding the physical expansion of cities, Amphipolis and Kassandreia present alternatives. Amphipolis was greatly expanded, perhaps soon after its conquest by Philip II in 357, to ca. 240 ha, and the gymnasion played a large role in developing an area that had been its rural *proasteion*. Kassandreia's predecessor Poteidaia was already quite large, ca. 150 ha based on the late Classical walls, perhaps owing to its Corinthian heritage. The main change of the early Hellenistic period was

529 Winter 2006, 135, with fig. 23 below.
530 Olynthus XII.

probably not to enlarge it, but to develop available space. In order to assess the extent and function of physical transformation, the discussion of each city begins with an account of what is known about the significance of the city in the late fifth and fourth centuries, drawing from both written and archaeological evidence. Amphipolis, together with the foundation of Philippi on the other side of Mt Pangaion, was meant to take advantage of that region's precious metal resources, along with land access to Thrace. The historical memory of early coinage, perhaps even the local god Artemis Tauropolos, is preserved on Macedonian coins from Amphipolis, one of its largest mints. In a similar vein, Kassandreia is valuable for its critical position in sea trade, with analogy to Poteidaia's mother city of Corinth. Instead of Thracians, Poteidaia was rather surrounded by earlier Greek colonies, which also had proven economic potential, now incorporated into the economy of Kassandreia, most famously in the case of Mendaian wine (Ath. *Deip.* 11.28).[531] Whether by intention or not, these new elite centres had a history of playing an independent role in the vicissitudes of their surrounding regions.

The remainder of each section is devoted to assessing a major public building and its relationship to the overall archaeology of the site. The gymnasion at Amphipolis is a marquee monument for this study and, though sadly unpublished, reports of its excavation are thorough enough to afford detailed discussion. The area around the gymnasion may feature the peristyle-theatre-sanctuary combination known from Aigai and I explain the reasons why the more fragmentary evidence from other

531 Salviat 1990; Papadopoulos and Paspalas 1999.

parts of the site, especially the Acropolis and its environs, could indicate the existence of further public complexes, structured around courtyards (whether columned or not).[532] At Kassandreia likewise, courtyard architecture marks the redevelopment of space in areas that had long been significant, as well as newly developed ones. Despite the difficulties, Amphipolis and Kassandreia show clearly that the introduction of Macedonian-style public architecture is a very clear physical marker of spatial organisation once a city is incorporated into the Macedonian administrative system. Further, it plays the role common in royal and elite centres of providing an enclosed context for activities central to the self-identification of high-ranking persons that otherwise might have been performed outside.

A third case study, Dēmētrias, shows the transformation of Classical *polis* life on the Pagasitic Gulf, where three *poleis* are relatively well-known: Phthiotic Thebes, New Halos and Goritsa. Here we have the fortune of four well-published sites, but it is sometimes difficult for various reasons to get a good sense of the layout and interactions of public spaces. Nevertheless, available evidence makes it especially clear the extent of the change brought by a new Hellenistic city, which was dubbed one of the 'fetters of Greece'.[533] The architecture of Dēmētrias is well-studied by Marzolff, who suggests the influence of city planning brought back from the East.[534] This intervention presents a unique opportunity to study the effects of a new Macedonian city and synoikism in a landscape

532 As suggested by Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 421.
533 Together with the Southern Greek ports of Chalkis and Corinth, purportedly by Philip V (see Polyb. XVIII.11).
534 See further below, but key points are summarised in Stamatopoulou 2018, 348.

with a longstanding tradition of numerous independent (if not entirely autonomous) *poleis*. It is worth reiterating, however, the long-standing Macedonian contacts in the bordering regions of Perrhaibia (by land) and Magnesia (by sea). The debate about the temple of Artemis Olkia (below.) shows the extent to which the need to merge Macedonian and Thessalian traditions was sensed in third century Dēmētrias.

Stamatopoulou raises some of the most important questions for the Hellenistic city: a) how the synoikism and later decline of the city affected the larger landscape, b) to what extent archaeology and epigraphy can elucidate diagnostic features of its character and c) how it compares to other Hellenistic royal foundations. Stamatopoulou discussed archaeological evidence supporting the transfer of populations in the immediate environs of the Pagasitic Gulf, from Damari near Velanidias to the south and Goritsa to the northeast, already areas of Macedonian intervention in the late Classical period (fig. 25). The coastal town of 'Soros', perhaps identifiable as ancient Amphanai.[535] The capture of Pagasai by Philip II was a key event in establishing his control and archonship of Thessaly, and now the foundation of Dēmētrias may have assumed some of Pherai's strategic roads and territory.

As tempting as it is to pinpoint specific effects of synoikism, what is really crucial is to understand overall changes to political geography and expressions of power in the landscape. Although, some aspects of the

535 The identification of Amphanai rests primarily on a reading of a text of Ps.-Scylax, 64, which seems to place Amphanai & Pagasai, the port of Pherai, as coastal cities after Achaia Phithiotis and, thus proceeding north and also that the projecting land is visible 'from both sides.' See *e.g.* Adrymi-Simane 2012, 156, with earlier references. For the identification with Pagasai, see *e.g.* Boehm 2018, 80-81, with earlier references.

foundation of Dēmētrias build on Philip's legacy, especially his interest in the Pagasitic gulf, the personal relationships that underlied Macedonian-Thessalian relationships for centuries are progressively supplanted in the course of the third-century by a greater concern for territorial control. Marzolff's idea of Dēmētrias as an über-national city is really crucial here, for quite unlike Philip II Demetrios spent very little time in his eponymous town and, while it was a favoured residence of Philip V, he saw it as an ideal hub to consolidate power. Through cult, and the imposing Antigonid palace, royal power became immediately conspicuous in the life of the *polis*. To these interests, territorial control and the direct expression of royal power, were subordinated traditional ideas of kinship and the agricultural life of Thessaly.

Nevertheless, this is not to diminish the importance of local factors, especially the relationship of Dēmētrias to the territories of Pherai, Magnesia and Phthiotis. Like other the Macedonian reconfigurations discussed in this chapter, there is an emphasis on preservation of local traditions and the functioning of Dēmētrias as a *polis,* whether as genuine deference to the community, or a further assertion of Macedonian power. This is shown as at Amphipolis and Poteidaia/Kassandreia, primarily through attestation of cult practices and political offices.

In Dēmētrias itself, Marzolff has documented the phases of urbanization, offering a unique opportunity to understand Macedonian urbanization there diachronically. Marzolff's understanding of Dēmētrias as an "über-national" city is important for distinguishing it from other Macedonian cities, including those discussed in this thesis, where

individual building or patterns of activity testify to the interconnectivity of the *oikoumenē*.[536] Dēmētrias is unique in being planned from the beginning with the infuence of Eastern architecture already in mind.[537] Nevertheless, the role of Dēmētrias in the religious landscape of Thessaly shows the continuing importance of local considerations. The 'diagnostic features of its character' are thus integral to assessing the comparability of Dēmētrias to other Hellenistic foundations.

It is unfortunate that the archaeology of Thessalonikē could not be included in this chapter, due to the absence of clear evidence for the form and impact of Hellenistic public space there. Tracing the evidence for building is exceptionally difficult for this period, not only because of extensive modern overbuilding, but especially for the significant architecture of Imperial and Late Antique times.[538] Although from the standpoint of our period there could hardly be a more important place to investigate, the nature of the evidence strongly limits what we can say. Nevertheless, it is clear that a grid-planned city developed here at the end of fourth century, with walls built from local material,[539] and in the third-century the city had a port *agora*,[540] an important sanctuary of Serapis[541] and the area of the Roman *agora* seems already to be emerging as an important public space.[542] Moreover, the growth of the city and probably changes in the shoreline, prompted a new grid-plan in the first-half of the

536 Note 532.
537 For the palace, see Kopsacheili 2013, 84-94.
538 Grammenos et al. 2003; Nasrallah, Bakirtzēs, and Friesen 2010.
539 Grammenos et al. 2003, 123–6
540 Adam-Velenē 1992, 234–5; Velenēs 1997, 491–2
541 *Μακεδονικά* 1 1940 464–5 [C I Makaronas], with earlier references.
542 Adam-Velenē 2013.

second century, changing to the approximately 45-degree orientation the city effectively followed until the great fire of 1914.[543]

Amphipolis

Historical/Archaeological Context

Amphipolis (map of sites: fig. 1) was one of the most consequential cities of the Greek world from the time of its colonization by the Athenians until its decline after the mid-first century BC.[544] In late Roman times, the city's fortunes rose again (in this its long-term settlement history is comparable to the sites of Thesprotia discussed in Chapter V). Its significance derives from its location (fig. 2) along a bend in the Strymon River (which effectively bordered the Hellenistic city on three sides) and in the western environs of Mt Pangaion. The path of the Strymon river was particularly useful, linking the Aegean east of Chalkidikē to what is now southwestern Bulgaria (fig. 3).[545] Strabo fr. VII, 37 mentions the possibility of navigating up the Strymon, at least as far as Bergē. Mt Pangaion's gold, silver and timber resources were attractive enough in themselves,[546] but the combination of a resource rich environment with the fertile fields in the Strymon basin and good communication via the river made Amphipolis irresistible. Hill 133 (fig. 2, no. A) northeast of the historical settlement

543 Adam-Velenē 1992, 228–9.

544 *E.g.* Zahrnt 1971, 45, 66–72, 101; Papazoglou 1988, 392–7; Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 134–51; Lazaridēs 1997, 14–20; Zahrnt 2006, 607–11; Mari 2007; Ead. 2012; Ead., 2012.

545 I.e. avoiding the treacherous fingers of the peninsula to access the Eastern Aegean. The source of the Strymon was among the Dentheletai, between the Dardanians and Aegean; *cf.* Tatcheva 1989; Stoyanov 1999.

546 *New Pauly,* s.v. 'Pangaeum' [I. von Bredow]; Lazaridēs 1963; Schütz and Unger 1981; Unger and Schütz 1982; Unger 1987; Rabadjiev 2007.

was occupied from Neolithic times, and the centre of a major Iron Age toumba settlement,[547] of the type found along major river routes between the Balkan interior and the Northern Aegean throughout Macedonia and Thrace (fig. 4–5).[548] The native settlement Ennea Odoi has been localised here, and Archaic tombs have been found throughout the area between the hill and the "Kastas" tumulus.[549]

The appeal of the lower Strymon soon drew interest from abroad and by the end of the seventh century, Eion had been settled on the Profētēs Ēlias hill (fig. 5), near the coast on the west bank of the Strymon.[550] Herodotus reports that Peisistratos derived most of his income from the Strymon valley (I, 64.1),[551] and a late sixth century epigram implies the presence of Parians by that time.[552] Eion had a civic centre and a defence circuit (Hdt. VII, 107.2, 113.1), but Thucydides (IV, 102.3) regarded it as an emporion, which in his time served Amphipolis. Carbon dates for the wooden bridge across the Strymon suggests a main phase of construction ca. 505–430 BC,[553] so its initial role may have been to link Bisaltia and Ennea Odoi,[554] which helped determine the later topography of Amphipolis. In the early Classical period, Eion (30 stadia

547 Lazaridēs 1964, 37–9, pl. 20–271965, 50–2, pl. 65–82; Vanderpool 1965.
548 Rey 1921, pl. 1 + 1–175; Casson 1968[1926] 120–7, 142–54; Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 1993.
549 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 1993, 682–4; Malamidou 2008, 186–90; Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 409–10.
550 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 1993, 684–5.
551 Cole 1975.
552 Base of an equestrian statue: Lazaridēs 1976; *BÉ* 1978, no. 297, *SEG* XXVII (1977) 249. *Cf.* Lazaridēs 1997, 15, fig. 3.
553 Maniatis, Koukouli-Chryssanthaki, and Malamidou 2010, 53: 1-σ, 505–400 BC (68.3p) & 2-σ, 515-430 BC (60.5p).
554 D. Malamidou, *Arch. Rep.* 54 (2007–8), edited by D. Evely *et al.*, 80, giving date of ca. 550–480 BC.

from Amphipolis, i.e. 4.7km) and Ennea Odoi were part of a larger, dispersed settlement network, across the lower Strymon valley. Southeast of the Classical bridge the “Thesmophorion” at the later north wall was already established[555] and the sanctuary of Klio in the northwestern part of the fortified area represents the oldest attested cult (Hom. *Il.* X, 435–41).[556] Whilst Dareios was attempting to dig a canal in the Aktē peninsula (easternmost finger of the Chalkidikē), Herodotus (VII, 25.2) reports that he maintained depots at Eion, in Macedonia and Perinthia (Hellespont), where the Edonai had earlier waged war (V, 1). This underscores the important middle-ground played by Edonai between Macedonia and the Hellespont, which the historian emphasizes was not far from the Strymon (V, 13.3).

After the Persian wars, the Athenians sent 10,000 citizens and allies to colonise Ennea Odoi, with a clear aim of controlling the Strymon route, for Thucydides (I, 100.3) tells us they were cut off at Drabeskos when advancing into the interior. In 437, they established a colony called Amphipolis, because the river flowed around it on two sides (Thuc. IV, 102.3, see ii.1 below). It was lost in 424/3, when Brasidas crossed the undefended bridge and occupied the city. Owing to its importance and Thucydides’ impending arrival, he offered more amicable terms than usual, particularly the right to remain and maintain property. Thucydides’ control of the gold mines in the area is testimony, over a century after

555 Originally a small Nymphaion: Lazaridēs 19971997, 26–29, fig. 10.

556 Lazaridēs 1997, 44–45, fig. 24, dates the extant building to the 1st half of the 4th century, based on inscribed letter forms; Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2002, 57, suggests ‘the earliest phase of the colony’ but the stones shown at right in Lazaridēs’ photograph could well pre-date 437.

Peisistratos, to the continued economic interests of persons from abroad in the region. The loss of Amphipolis effectively denied Athens access to crucial timber and monetary supply. Brasidas was hailed as a new founder, and a tomb near Gate F may be his heroön, rediscovered a century later during the laying out of a Macedonian water pipe.[557] Thucydides makes clear that the appeal of Spartan hegemony in the region was Brasidas' liberality, moderation and promise of freedom to all who would join them (IV, 107.2, 108.2–3).[558] When the Athenians demanded back Amphipolis as part of the peace of Nikias, the Spartan eventually withdrew their governor and claimed it was outside their authority (V, 21.2–3, 35.5).[559] The archaeology of what transformed from a dispersed network of small sites, anchored by Ennea Odoi and Eion, to an especially extensive town is difficult but rewarding. The blanket statement that Amphipolis and Abdera 'have proved hard to investigate, precisely because of the extended nature of their topography' surely will not do.[560] Whilst it is impossible to understand the complete layout of the town, we can understand how the use of various sections changed over time.

The core of Amphipolis' appeal was, like most colonies of the area, access to the Northern Aegean trade markets, bolstered by the city's unusually strong location, but also by the ready access to coin (Hdt. VII, 112; Str. VII, fr. 34). The mines of Mt Pangaion and Mt Dysoros, unrivalled

557 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2002, 66–72.
558 Kallet 1993, 175–6
559 Zahrnt 2006, 607–10, Psoma 2011, 117–8.
560 Archibald 2013, 68.

as a regional source of precious metal,[561] not least for Macedonia, except, possibly for Damastion (unlocated, probably on the east side of Lake Lychnitis/Lychnidos (now Ohrid, location: fig. 1).[562] Evidence for the extent of early overland communication and Northern Greek trading networks is provided by the comparability of coinage from the Chalkidikē and Illyria, complementing the evidence of elite burials between Macedonia, the Thermaic gulf and Lake Lynchnidos.[563] There is already a local component in early coins from the Strymon region, with centaurs and satyrs carrying off nymphs, a pun on the mountain origin of coins and Dionysiac cult.[564] Coinage often offers a window into the importance of topography for local identity, and although it was a short series, Amphipolis' representation of the freshwater crab (like Akragas) reveals the importance of an upriver location to local identity.[565] On Lorber's chronology, this occurred precisely at the time when Amphipolis was negotiating its relationship with the Chalcidic League and Macedonia (369–8).[566]

---

561 Casson 1968, 63–66, 88–90.

562 The interesting hypothesis that Philip could have utilised the Damastion mint (Millett 2010, 493) has unfortunately never been corroborated by physical evidence. An important silver coinage of the Damastini was in circulation before and during Philip's reign (from ca. 395–80), influenced but not determined (in weight standard and iconography) by Chalkidian issues. *Pace* Millet, I think the point is rather that Philip obtained a monopoly on coinage, not that he (or later Macedonians) actually used the Damastion mine, but the issue requires further study. See further Str. VII, 7.8; May 1939, esp. 15–32, *cf.* 63–163 (catalogue); Schwabacher 1943; Hammond and Griffith 19791979, 71, 73–4, 189–90, 655 (Map 9), 668; Schwarz 2012.

563 Connection between coinage and elite burials, including topographical significance: Hammond and Griffith 1979, n. 12 + 91–92.

564 Hind 2001.

565 Lorber, Schwabacher, and McGovern 1990, 81–83 (mentioning the fish/crayfish river god of Katane, but strangely omitting the more direct parallel from Akragas, on which see Rutter 2000).

566 Lorber, Schwabacher, and McGovern 1990, 54 (Table VI).

Diodoros (XVI, 8.6–7) claims that Philip II funded his conquests with coin from Pangaion, and even if this cannot be accepted in full, its incorporation was clearly a boon to the Macedonian economy.[567] What is more clear is that Amphipolis served as the main mint for the posthumous tetradrachms of Alexander under Cassander and Demetrios Poliorketes (based on locally significant mint marks), and then resumed production for Antigonos Gonatas' silver coinage. For the most significant issues in the late fourth and first half of the third centuries, Amphipolis seems to have functioned as the primary mint.[568] It is well worth stressing again the lower volume of output prior to ca. 315 BC, such that silver and gold coinage may have been produced at the same mint.[569] The so-called 'Torch series' produced under Cassander and Demetrios Poliorketes is especially important, because of the torch's association with the races held for Artemis Tauropolos,[570] which may mean that the Amphipolitan origin was reflected on the Macedonian state coinage of the early Hellenistic period. The debate about whether the torch is a symbol of Alexander or of the city[571] can be resolved by the two types of torches shown. The first, less common, bushel torch, also known from Asia Minor (mainly Sardes) may be a more universal symbol, but the thin racing torch especially with its flame flaring to the left as on late Classical coins of Amphipolis is almost certainly a symbol of the city (fig. 6). This athletic

567 Millett 2010, 493, with earlier references.

568 Newell 1927, 101–18; Mathisen 1981, 96–99, 107–110; Price 1991, 130–1; Panagopoulou 2001, 349, 360 (n. 60); Callataÿ 2005, 89 (n. 11: estimate of 1000 dies).

569 Troxell 1983, 69.

570 Lorber, Schwabacher, and McGovern 1990, 81. On the cult, see Mari 2012.

571 Thompson 1981, 42; Price 1991, 88, 130. Thompson (n. 20) estimates 400 dies for the Alexander coinage.

focus could help explain the significance of the gymnasion as the main public monument known in Amphipolis.

The city has recently been in the press for new excavations of its impressive Tomb 3 in the ‘Kastas’ tumulus, one of several “Macedonian” tombs excavated primarily on the route leading from outside the east walls of the city toward Hill 133 and ancient Bergē.[572] It has generated spectacular finds, including parts of Amphipolis’ lion monument, the painted façade of a door threshold with Ionic pilaster-columns topped with sphinxes, an 8m^2 vault, a marble door, Caryatid statues and an impressive pebble mosaic depicting the Rape of Persephone.[573] It is too soon to comment fully on the ongoing research at this tomb, but it has once again underscored the importance of representative architecture to Macedonian identity. Its location is also important, next to the prehistoric settlement on Hill 133 and a recently discovered possible (late 4th century) Heroon in the foothills of Mt Pangaion, consisting of a Π-shaped room with three couches surrounding a central courtyard.[574] The spectacular discoveries should not distract us from the holistic archaeology of the site, but rather remind us of the potential re-exploration will surely bring across a site, the limited study of which is most out of proportion to its historical significance. Elsewhere, the archaeology of Amphipolis is dominated by the walls, and associated buildings, but burial evidence and the known locations of cult. The Early Iron Age burial mounds to the east of Hill 133

572 Lazaridēs 1997, 61–64 (including map, fig. 35).

573 Searchable catalogue of bulletins: http://www.yppo.gr/2/g21.jsp

574 Not yet published. Another example is the tomb of Nikēsianēs, excavated by Lazaridēs (see *Prakt* 1959–64), with gold staters of Philip II and impressive metal vessels. Unfortunately, a report on the Pangaion tomb has not yet appeared.

contrast with the Late Archaic and Classical move to the west and ultimately the bridge linking Bisaltia and Edonai. The Athenian colony of Amphipolis then took advantage of the line of hills southeast of the northeasterly bend of the Strymon.[575]

The well-attested topography of cult at Amphipolis is an important way of tracing continuity and change over time. In addition to the known sanctuary buildings of the 'Thesmophorion' and the sanctuary of Klio: a stone relief, inscriptions and votive offerings indicates the cult of Artemis Tauropolos along with Artemis Bendis, Apollo, Dionysos and Aphrodite and others on the acropolis and there is evidence that their cults go back to the Thracian heritage of the city and corresponds to the fourth century numismatic evidence for civic identity.[576] Alternatively, Attis seems to have been the only god introduced in the Early Hellenistic period (ca. 323–167 BC), and there is no evidence for the cult of the Egyptian gods until the second half of the second century. Changes to and building by the walls reveals topological changes ca. 350–150 BC and the introduction of new infrastructure. In the west part of the fortified area approximately 450 metres southwest of the sanctuary of Klio, a pi-shaped hypaethral structure (9 x 4.1 metres) similar to the 'Heroön' on the slopes of Mt Pangaion was in use by the second century BC. The rough isodomic masonry had a consistent width of 0.4 metres with up to 0.74 metres surviving (on the north side). It faced east and had a pebble courtyard (7.4 x 4.7 metres preserved) with a circular hearth (diameter: 1.5 metres) and several bases for statues and stelai along the west wall along with a

575 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 412.
576 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011.

column drum (diameter: 0.67 metres). The identification of the building comes from a figurine of Attis (0.18 metres high, headless) and this and others, seem to support use in the second century, whilst a coin hoard of second and first century civic issues gives a *terminus ante quem* for its abandonment, but no details of the findspots are provided. Figurines above floor level most likely date from the last phase of use and do not provide a construction date.[577] The separately fortified acropolis hill has revealed little evidence of building in the Classical period but developed residential districts including a possible royal centre were built ca. 350–250 (see §iv, below). Further domestic evidence of similar date has been identified north of the acropolis between the sanctuary of Klio and Gate F. At present, it is difficult to locate the *agora* of Amphipolis; this problem is shared at a number of Late Classical sites in the Northern Aegean (see discussion below), but is more troubling for a Hellenistic Macedonian centre. Nevertheless, south of the Acropolis (a 'second agora'?), several buildings went up on virgin soil after 350. Because of the importance of individual buildings (one of the oldest and most unique gymnasia in the Greek world and a late Hellenistic house with well-preserved wall painting), and the relative clarity of evidence for space-making, it is suitable to begin there before moving on to the more difficult evidence in different parts of the city.

Gymnasion

For the development of civic architecture in Macedonia, and its impact on the delineation of space in Greek cities more broadly, it is difficult to think

577 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 423.

of a more significant single building than the 4th century gymnasion at Amphipolis (fig. 7).[578] It is surprising, if understandable due to the limits and unclear presentation of the excavation, that this seminal building has not assumed its proper place in the architectural history of ancient Greece.[579] Lauter's now widely accepted view that Hellenistic gymnasia imitated the form of the agora,[580] written while Amphipolis' gymnasion was under excavation, finally must be reassessed. On the other hand, the important changes introduced by the construction of the gymnasion at Amphipolis validate Robert's seminal observation that these buildings could function as a kind of 'second agora'.[581] Constructed in an area Thucydides called 'Amphipolis outside the walls' (IV, 103.4) and Diodoros (XII, 68.3) the 'proasteion',[582] it shows monumental development of a new public centre in the first phase of Amphipolis' life under Macedonian oversight. The ancient authors indicate houses in the vicinity but the gymnasion was constructed on virgin soil, although accompanied by a great deal of Hellenistic (and perhaps some early Classical) construction in the immediate and broader vicinity, marking spatially the arrival of Macedonian hegemony.[583]

---

578 See Lauter 1986, 143–155, for the best introuduction.

579 Although Emme 2013, 123–8, well-describes the gymnasion, it is strangely absent from his discussion of urban space.

580 Lauter 1986, 185; Skaltsa 20082008, I.22.

581 Robert 1960, 298; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 85–7; Emme 20132013, 157–8.

582 Lazaridēs 1997, 52. For the concept of the *proasteion*, helping to define bifocal early cities in Northern Greece: see Winter 2006, 137–40. It is often translated "suburb" but usually there was only one; a *proasteion* can have signigificant buildings, such as the temple of Poseidon at Poteidaia (Hdt. VIII, 29.3) and Torone's was fortified (Thuc. V, 2.4).

583 Lazaridē 1989, 549–50; Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 422.

The local impact it would have made can be measured by its extraordinary scale in comparison to earlier known buildings (fig. 8) and the significance of gymnasia in Macedonian education.[584] What is most extraordinary, however, is how dissimilar Amphipolis' gymnasion is from anything contemporary or indeed anything that came after. As Skaltsa notes,[585] it is unique for the appearance of rooms on all four sides of its peristyle, but she does not draw this closely together with its articulated xystos (fig. 9). This helps to explain why this gymnasion, in possible contrast to others in the centre of cities, did not omit the xystos.[586] The number of rooms and articulation of the xystos are connected by the principle underlining Macedonian peristyle architecture, housing a number of activities that would have once taken place outside in the built space of a single structure.[587] Of course, at Amphipolis the gymnasion did not have to fit into an existing plot, which makes its form all the more remarkable. It is as if the space of the city and of an individual building were conceived as one.

The excavator suggested that the gymnasion at Amphipolis dates to the reign of Philip II, due to coins of that king, Alexander III and Cassander in the first layer of use of the palaistra.[588] In the northwest corner of the courtyard, pieces Attic black-figure amphora inscribed with dedications to

584 Préaux 1978, 653–5; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 19931993, 68–76; Skaltsa 2008, 17.

585 Skaltsa, 2008, 27.

586 Ead., 18. Unfortunately, there are not sufficient examples in urban contexts to support this interesting idea. Eretria provides an fascinating alternative where the gymnasion may have been placed about 25m to the north of the stadion (Mango et al. 2003, 24–29).

587 Lauter 1986, 40, 132–6; Emme 2013, 230–1.

588 Lazaridē 1987, 164–5; Lazaridēs 1997, 54. He does not fully explain the early date in reference to later evidence reported, but seems to imply it is a layer of use, and so would include material from throughout the period of use. However, I offer a later date myself below.

Herakles (typical for athletes) and red-figure pottery date to the second half of the fourth century.[589] *Pace* Raynor, the section of a red-figure Kerch style vessel of the same period cannot be assessed because no context has been provided, and averring that 'the gymnasium can be dated fairly securely to the middle of the fourth century BC and Philip II's building programme' is exceptionally careless.[590] In fact, both Classical and Hellenistic pottery were found in foundation deposits from the area of the north bath complex, a foundation trench for the water pipe, and south of the gymnasion underneath a wall plausibly interpreted as a temenos (see below). Two levels are identified with coinage of Philip II, Alexander III, Cassander, and Philippi along with amphora fragments primarily dating to the first half of the fourth century or the early third mainly from Thasos but several from Knidos and some from Rhodes and then coins from Amphipolis (second–first century BC) and Philippi (Augustan period).[591] Taking the view of the excavator in the best possible light, we can perhaps accept some use of the palaistra in the third quarter of the fourth century prior to its first architectural phase. The main construction phase of the gymnasium structure, however, was probably ca. 325–290 BC. Perhaps, like so much else in Macedonia, it was envisaged during the reign of Philip II, but mainly constructed under Cassander, though firmer conclusions would require clearer presentation of the evidence than is at hand.

589 Lazaridē 1987, 319.

590 Raynor 2015, 266. *Cf.* Lazaridē 1990, 255.

591 Lazaridēs 1982, 47: 'it should have been built…in the Hellenistic period'; Lazaridē 19871987, 164–5. Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 20112011, 422, accepts a date during Cassander's reign.

The building is absolutely revolutionary for its use of space. Because of its centrality for Amphipolitan and Macedonian identity and its unusual character, which in way internalises a kind of civic space, we should consider in greater detail the function of the gymnasion and its various parts. It was approached from the east, like temples and palaces, via a massive stone staircase 8.7m in width with 12 surviving steps perpendicular to a toichobate with carefully dressed isodomic masonry and letters (esp. N & K) to guide the placement of the blocks (figs. 10–11). Another wall ran along the south side of the staircase and continued for a total length of 8.3m. It joined at a right angle a further wall (8.7m long), and together they seem to form an annex, composed of a rectangular chamber and anteroom, but its south wall is not well-preserved. A wall joining the staircase on the north is preserved for a further 11.6m,[592] but without question it originally extended much further, for another 50m or more.[593] After ascending the staircase one reached the main peristyle building (fig. 12), with dimensions of 46.1x36.7m, covering a ground area of 1761.69m^2 including the annex. In comparison to near contemporary palaistras, this is around the median, almost 1.5x the scale of Delphi and slightly larger than Eretria, but conversely about ¾ the size of the Lykeion outside Athens and gymnasion at Sykeion.[594]

The relationship of the terrace and the peristyle should prompt us to consider the strong differences in entry space between the Amphipolis gymnasion and the palaces and elite houses at Aigai, Pella and

592 Lazaridēs 1982, 45; Lazaridē 1990, 246; Lazaridēs 1997, 52.
593 Estimate based on on-site reconnaissance and online mapping tools.
594 Skaltsa 2008, fig. 67.

Kassandreia. These were of course elevated and probably approached by staircases, but there is no evidence for one integrated with the terrace and indeed the building, as we find in the Amphipolis gymnasion. Moreover, the projecting annex, accessed only from within the peristyle is at the approximate location (centre of the eastern façade) where we find the propylon of palaces, controlling axial passage directly into the peristyle court. Upon ascending the staircase at Amphipolis, there was instead a choice, either of entering the peristyle building or turning right toward the terrace. A threshold shown on the plans (see esp. fig. 10b) may well indicate that a door-controlled access to the palaistra and terrace, but then the terrace was directly ahead and a sharp left required to enter the palaistra.

Past the threshold and into the palaistra, there was narrow corridor with a dirt floor through which one entered the building leading to a larger, parallel rectangular room over roughly the eastern half of which a tile floor is preserved[595]. It seems to be the forecourt of a large (12.17x7.1m) bath behind it where marble washbasins were set up on marble stands during its final phase (from the 2nd century BC, see on this layer above, p. 172), and four of the basins were found in secondary use (fig. 13)[596]. The entry corridor and forecourt of the bath both had plaster walls and fragments of names were found inscribed in the corridor. The mean and undistinguished entrance to the gymnasion was noticed by Roman times when a new Ionic distyle porch was built at north entrance and the east staircase seems to have been closed off because of a conduit

595 *Ergon* 1982, 15. Dimensions not given.
596 Lazaridēs 1984, 33–5.

running above it[597]. At this time the square (7.05 x 7.05 metres) room adjacent to the west of the large rectangular bath would have become an entry court. However, the excavator suggested that originally this might have been yet another bath with marble basins but the evidence for this is unclear[598]. The room in the northwest corner of the peristyle building (fig. 14) is also interpreted as having a bathing function, but is less well preserved.[599] All of this is thought to amount to a "bathing complex" on the north side of the building. In the northern exterior of the building, remains of architectural decoration, notably a triglyph and metope frieze was found, which probably ran along the north side of the building. The rooms on the south side of the building are of the same dimensions as the north (12.17 x 7.1 + [3x] 7.05 x 7.05) but in reverse order so that the rectangular room is furthest west and the square rooms are to the east. They have not been excavated so their function is unclear. The whole complex was served by a large water channel (13.3m was uncovered, with a diameter of 16–17.5 cm), which led underneath the staircase and the north side of the peristyle, ultimately leaving the building to the west.[600]

The west side of the building (fig. 15) is dominated by the long and narrow (15.3x4.83m) pentastyle stoa. Hermaic stelai including an athlete, wearing a tubular headband, were found inside,[601] and another of Hermes was found between the stoa and the peristyle.[602] The stoa's colonnade

597 Lazaridēs 1997, 57.
598 Lazaridēs 1984, 35–6.
599 Lazaridēs 1997, 52–3.
600 Lazaridēs 1984, 36.
601 Lazaridēs 1982, 46, pl. 24a-b, with interpretation of headband as a diadem and thus athlete as a member of the royal family; Hellenistic, perhaps 3rd century; Lazaridē 1990, 252, fig. 14; Skaltsa 2008, II, no. 5.
602 Lazaridēs 1982, 46, pl. 24c; Lazaridē 1990, 252–3, fig. 15; Skaltsa 2008, II, no. 6.

had a length of 8.4 metres and four preserved column bases are 0.5 metres in diameter. A large paved semi-ovular area (3-4 metres in diameter) roughly in the centre of the stoa would have provided an additional wrestling space, using a combination of curved and straight tiles to ensure consistent smoothness, as was done within the peristyle at Olympia.[603] In the same area, a statue base of the gymnasiarch Apellas was found with a laurel wreath and other symbols carved underneath the crown.[604] A small room (4.83 x 3.05 metres) adjacent on the north side included an inscribed statue base of a dedication to Hermes, by the gymnasiarch Antigenes, son of Diogenes, carrying a laurel relief underneath the inscription and dating to early imperial times (based on the style of writing).[605] Five herms were reported found in the gymnasion, at least one comes from the east side of the building (see below), but no findspots or other details are available from the other two.[606] In between the smaller rooms a stone path was discovered 16.5 metres long x 1.7 metre wide, leading to a western doorway (*cf.* fig. 15).[607] One of the most interesting discoveries within is a stone-paved wrestling oval (3–4 metres across) in the northern part of the stoa,[608] showing these places of active elite display functioned as training ground as well. In the appearance of a small stoa, the open space of the peristyle, the small path, the presence of herms at key locations (either side of the peristyle) and in the stoa, the building and especially the western side is marked out as a public space

603 Skaltsa 2008, 21.
604 Lazaridēs 1984, 36.
605 *Ergon* 1982, 16; Lazaridēs 1982, 46-47, pl. 26b; Lazaridē 1990, 253.
606 *Ergon* 1982, 15; two herms were in front of the stoa (Lazaridēs 1984, 36).
607 Lazaridēs 1985, 71–2; Lazaridē 1990, 247.
608 Lazaridē 1986, 136

and place of elite communication, not unlike an agora. Although the gymnasion lacks the axiality of a palace, the importance of the western side directly opposite the monumental approach from the east somewhat approximates this idea (*n.b.* the columned entrance room F in the palace at Aigai leading to the two equally sized *androne*s). The existence of parallel rooms of equal size is shared by both buildings, and is also common to the hestiatoria of sanctuaries.

The peristyle (fig. 16) was the heart of the gymnasion complex, identified by Vitruvius (V, 11) as the wresting ground, (palaistra).[609] However, his suggestion that a running track should exist around the peristyle would only be appropriate for a gymnasion of much larger scale, as the existing space was required for communication among rooms. It was also unnecessary because of the half-stadion xystos at Amphipolis. The palaistra had dimensions of 20.6x15.4m, and thus covered a ground area of 317.24m^2.[610] The stylobate only survives on the north side and in the southwest corner, and parts of three Doric columns were found, but their details are unpublished.[611] The peristyle is roughly 2.5 metres from the north series of rooms and up to 4.7 metres from the west[612], which also underscores the importance of this wing. Comparison to the near contemporary gymnasion at Delphi (fig. 17) is especially instructive. It had one of the smallest known palaistras (177m^2),[613] but had a massive freestanding xystos (165m) on its upper terrace. Amphipolis' peristyle

609 Skaltsa 2008, 17–18.
610 Lazaridē 1987, 163.
611 Lazaridē 1990, 247–8.
612 *Ergon* 1985, 16–17.
613 Skaltsa 2008, 18.

had roughly the same width as Delphi's but greater length, and consequently Delphi's palaistra only covers 55 percent of the surface area of Amphipolis'. It is more difficult to compare the surface area covered by the entire complex, but I estimate (based on published plans) that the land area required for Amphipolis gymnasion was 60% that of Delphi's, because the shortening of the xystos (to 80m) and its articulation left a smaller overall footprint[614]. This is appropriate for an urban context, but what is interesting is that because it was in a newly planned area, it dimensions could have been whatever the planners and architects desired. There seems to be a commitment, already expressed at this early date, to emphasize as essential both the gymnasion cum xystos public space, but its place with an urban complex.

Behind the *paradromos* of the xystos, foundations for another pair of rectangular buildings (fig. 18), exactly aligned and parallel to the *xystos* with only a small passage (2m) between them were discovered. The building on the west is divided into three rooms (individual dimensions not given, 27.6 x 6.5 metres total), apparently entered through an opening in the northwest. To the east was a stoa or temenos (no dimensions given, but with a similar depth and perhaps 5m longer) with large storerooms characteristic of a sanctuary. The complex is interpreted as a sanctuary of Dionysos, based on associated sculpture: heads of Dionysos and satyrs, and part of a peplos (material of the sculpture not given). An association with athletics is also possible given its proximity to the gymnasion and part of a red-figure krater depicting an athlete. The walls of the building

614 Lazaridē 1989, 207–9.

show evidence of four construction phases but pottery and coins of Akanthos indicate the area was in use from the first half of the 4th century.[615] Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē suggests the city's theatre could be located to the north, known to have existed nearby from inscriptions.[616]

Some general comments are in order. The format of the gymnasion at Amphipolis reflects both its function and its place within the new Maceedonian order. Delphi is in fact exceptional for the presence of a square peristyle, but even with the elongated peristyle, no other gymnasion incorporated the amount of space in surrounding rooms relative to its size that Amphipolis does. The rooms, their patterns of arrangement and the importance of the west side (on the opposite side of the peristyle from the east gate) all provide links to contemporary Macedonian architecture, and show the emphasis on accommodating a diverse range and scale of activities indoors that would otherwise happen outside. It may seem strange for the palaistra to have functioned for a generation before the gymnasion was completed, but by comparison to the predominantly Roman baths at Gortys,[617] where a single room functioned for centuries before a huge complex was built around it, the break is not so serious. Finally, the creation of a new urban area is indicative of Macedonian policy in the wake of Philip II's victory. However, if the terrace of the buildings behind the xystos was in use in the first half of the 4th century, we must contemplate the possibility that the lower terraces, where the xystos and palaistra ultimately were constructed, then

615 Lazaridē 1989, 212–15.
616 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 422, with a slightly different interpretation from the excavators.
617 Ginouvès 1959.

it is likewise possible that a major development was planned before Philip came to Amphipolis.

The examples of Amphipolis, Pella and Kassandreia (see below), suggest a preference for the expansion and development of already significant centres, rather than the emphasis on new sites often thought to be a hallmark of Macedonian urbanization.[618] In the main, the newness of town life at the site of Thessalonikē is what stands apart, and what we to tend see is rather the redevelopment of an established centre, often anchored by a peristyle building complex. In Amphipolis' case this is the gymnasion, and even though some buildings in its vicinity are known, we do not know how the area was developed overall. Nevertheless, the analogue to the apparent Macedonian policy of redeveloping existing centres is the respect for local traditions, as is shown by the importance of the racing torch on coins of Alexander minted in the city. Perhaps one could even wonder about continuity in the topography of such traditions, if indeed the sherd of a red-figure krater is enough to suggest the area had athletic connections before the construction of the gymnasion. The limited excavation of Amphipolis draws firm boundaries on our ability to assess building across the site, but there is evidence of building complexes at different parts of the site, and I turn to explaining why we should believe they may represent political space in the next section.

618 For an example of the popular conception, see Green 2007, 55-60.

Acropolis and walls

Whilst there are certainly gaps in our knowledge of the gymnasion, in other parts of the city it is far more fragmentary. Substantial stretches of the walls along the Strymon and to the north and east (especially the southeast side of the acropolis, fig. 19) have been preserved. Substantial bits of the acropolis fortifications are also known, especially on the south and west sides, and the east wall is shared with the main enceinte. They are constructed in isodomic and pseudo-isodomic poros masonry, with dressed vertical faces and outer edges, and raise to the imposing height of 7.25 metres. Orifices (20cm wide) are built into the walls to facilitate drainage, constructed with columns, sometimes having a semi-circular front, reminiscent of the column-pillar combination known in Macedonian architecture. On the north wall, a Hellenistic gate (3m wide) was built 2m above the Classical foundations replacing an earlier court entrance.[619] I have calculated that the walls enclose an area of 200–240ha, and the acropolis walls ca. 60ha, but such estimates remain tentative. Some of the most interesting detail has come from the area of the northeastern Gate F (fig. 20), in the northeastern part of the city. Underneath the northern part of the archaeological museum, a cist tomb in a built courtyard was discovered including a silver larnax with gold wreath inside. Next to it was a storage pit with various tableware mostly fine Attic black-glaze skyphoi, bowls, plates and a kantharos–dating from the third quarter of the fifth to the second quarter of the fourth century. The tomb would have been destroyed in the 4th century BC when a water pipe was laid

619 Lazaridēs 1975; Lazaridēs 1997, 21–6.

over it in the mid-fourth century, associated with extensive building works, wall repair, and the closing of the gate.[620] If, as the excavator suggests, this is indeed the tomb of Brasidas, discovered in the course of mid-fourth century building, local traditions about this earlier civic benefactor under whom the walls were refurbished may have inspired Macedonian policy for Amphipolis. The two buildings on either side of the road served by the gate were refurbished or built to include a large courtyard in the southern part of the northern building and the centre of the southern building including a central peristyle, respectively[621]. The excavator has suggested they served as storage complexes but it is difficult to assess their function without reports of greater architectural detail and information about small finds.

On the acropolis, Pritchett sensibly suggested the better-preserved south wall should be a Macedonian construction, based on the longer style blocks and appearance of mortar in the joints.[622] Architectural remains are lacking for the acropolis in the Classical period, even though it was a well-established centre for cult (p. 167, above).[623] Various walls of buildings have been discovered, but the most legible remains are of the mid-fourth century, ‘Classical house’. Two rooms were found side by side (4.5 x 3.9 metres and 4.3 x 3.9 metres) west of parallel corridors (1.7, 1.15 metres). A thick, six metre long wall separates one of the rooms and

620 Lazaridēs 1997, 21; Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2002.

621 According to the plan (Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2002, fig. 2), the building should be roughly 45x35m, or 1575m^2.

622 Pritchett 1980, 304. On the use of mortar, see Winter 1971, 91–95, the long and narrow blocks are comparable to the slate walls at Thessalonikē (Grammenos et al. 2003, 123–6).

623 Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 2011, 420–1.

the two corridors from another series of rooms (for which no information has been provided), and the wall seems to be constructed with a different technique than the other walls and may indicate the rooms were an additional wing. This and the layout of the corridors suggests that the rooms may be part of a building complex of Macedonian type. The SE corner of the westernmost corridor and the rooms to its south have evidence of a water pipe and hydraulic mortar suggesting the presence of an independent water supply for a bath or other facility that required it. The walls of the southern room had a thick layer of plaster and traces of white, red, yellow and grey paint along with signs of fire. This combined with the limited finds (a gold stater of Alexander III, 336–333 BC) and red-figure with black glaze pottery, suggest the rooms had a very limited life in the third quarter of the 4th century.[624]

Another large complex, more fully explored, was located on the northern slopes of the acropolis almost adjacent to the wall, covering a surface area of 960 square metres, the scale of some of Macedonia's smaller elite houses. A date from the late fourth century, with use throughout the third and second centuries, is suggested based on numismatic evidence. It was centered on a large mosaic courtyard (4.8 x 5 metres) inscribed with a stone well (0.5 metres in diameter) in the middle, and four of its auxiliary rooms also had mosaic floors. Several of the rooms had painted walls and a multitude of statuettes were found including of Artemis and the Mother of the Gods enthroned, the first dating from the late fourth (one example) and throughout the Hellenistic

624 Lazaridēs 1971, 54–7; Lazaridēs 19821982, 49–50; Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē 20112011, 421; Raynor (n. 35) 262–3.

period. The continued worship of Aphrodite, together with the Mother of the Gods, is an important sign of continuity in Amphipolis together with the introduction of new gods. There were a total of 17 rooms arranged around two courtyards.[625] At the same time, cult continued on the Acropolis, with a multitude of dedications now attested to the same deities venerated in the Classical period.

Kassandreia

Historical/Archaeological Context

Kassandreia (*cf.* fig. 1) was founded on the site of Poteidaia, but with a hiatus of forty years from the political stage, during which–we may imagine–a remnant of the population hung on, as has been shown at Olynthos from the *andrapodismos* of 348, until it too succumbed to the foundation of Kassandreia in 316. Poteidaia, founded as a Corinthian colony, had been a tributary of the Delian League until the outbreak of the Peloponessian War, for which its revolt was one of the opening salvos. Situated astride the isthmus of Pallene, the westernmost finger of the Chalkidikē, Poteidaia had an outlet toward Sithonia, the central finger, as well as to the Thermaic gulf. It was the latter which the Athenians chose to blockade for three years, eventually starving the Poteidaians into submission. The Athenians had also cut the Poteidaians off from their Macedonian allies, which seems to validate Perdikkas' suggestion that the Chalkidians move from their coastal homes to form a joint inland

625 Malama and Salonikios 2002.

settlement at Olynthus.[626] Poteidaia, meanwhile, continued to represent the fundamentally maritime character of earlier Greek settlement in the Chalkidikē. It joined the league in the 380s, but there is no report of resettlement and Poteidaia continued to chart an independent policy course, leading to the deep rivalry and enmity from the Olynthians. At the same time, Macedonia was beginning to develop an interest in maritime hegemony beyond Pieria, as shown by the treaty with the Chalkidians regulating the export of timber and movement of the capital down to Pella, then on the Thermaic gulf.

In perhaps his most serious lapse of judgment, Philip II awarded Poteidaia to Olynthos after the former's destruction in 357, making the Chalkidians a secure land power with the ability to project into the Aegean. Poteidaia still existed as a Macedonian dependency in 355 (Dem. XX, 16), but we hear nothing after that until 316, although there is no indication in the description of the synoikisms that it was a defunct city. Especially after the destruction of Olynthos less than a decade later, Philip's decisive victories against the Chalkidians no doubt struck intimidation in potential adversaries. Nevertheless, his development of cities (as far as we know from written and archaeological evidence), is still focussed on the trans-Balkan economy: Styberra and Aghios Panteileimon, Florina near the Illyrian border and Amphipolis and Phillipi on either side of Mt Pangaion, and Aigai as a cultural centre for the kingdom. There is also silence under Alexander and Antipater. When Cassander founded his

626 Thuc. I, 58.2: Περδίκκας πείθει Χαλκιδέας τὰς ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ πόλεις **ἐκλιπόντας** καὶ **καταβαλόντας ἀνοικίσασθαι ἐς Ὄλυνθον** μίαν τε πόλιν ταύτην ἰσχυρὰν ποιήσασθαι.

namesake city on the site of Poteidaia, it was the first time Macedon had made a concerted effort to take advantage of the Chalkidikē. Antigonos' propaganda about Cassander reversing the Temenid legacy, by refounding Olynthos and Thebes (Diod. XIX, 61.2) is probably best read in this light. It is doubtful that the 'Olynthians at Kassandreia' would have exulted in being moved to the site of their erstwhile arch-rival.

This brings us naturally to the problem of the synoikism. We should attend carefully to the language of Diodoros, which probably follows or approximates that of his source, Hieronymos of Kardia, a contemporary to the events described. Two verbs, συνῴκισε and κατῴκισε, unite the usual expressions for the political unification of cities and the foundation of a "colony", to the effect that Cassander united the cities of the Pallenē peninsula with Poteidaia, and settled them in the latter city. The range of these two words, is made clear in Plato, *Leg.* 858e, the only other instance where they appear together. The latter means to settle a new population within a civic centre (*cf.* esp. Thuc. VI, 2–5), whilst the former involves uniting distinct groups for the optimal functioning of the city (*n.b.* συνοικίζειν γένη), whether it is Plato's collaboration of farmers in the countryside or Thucydides' uniting of political functions in the centre (II, 15). That Kassandreia was already an economic synoikism of the type Rostovtzeff found characteristic of the Hellenistic period[627] is shown by the continuing importance of the Mendaian wine industry. In a telling passage of Athenaios (XI, 784c), Cassander is said to have had Lysippus design a *keramos* because wine was once again exported from Mendē (I leave the

627 Rostovtzeff 1941, 155–8.

ambiguities as they are in the passage). Cassander's humble *keramos* is striking as it comes amidst anecdotes about the gold cups and lavish drinking parties of Philip, Alexander and the Ptolemies. The wine industry is best known from the so-called Parmeniskos amphorai, and part of large amphora workshop has recently come to light, which functioned from the fourth through second centuries (perhaps starting before the synoikism).[628] There was also some minor building at the sanctuary of Poseidi in the second half of the fourth century.[629]

The Doric temple of Zeus Ammon, built in the extensive, long-used sanctuary near Aphytis,[630] is usually dated to the third quarter of the fourth century, based on the style of its marble columns and comparison of its Corinthian rooftiles to the South stoa at Corinth.[631] The date of the latter recently has been lowered to the early 3rd century based on the restudy of nearby wells. Juri compared the column height at Aphytis to Tegea,[632] but in this period the small number of preserved temples makes close chronological comparisons based on style especially hazardous.[633] Worship of Dionysos and the Nymphs is known in the sanctuary from the eighth century BC, but there are also remains of a temple with only the stylobate of its cella (three by three metres) preserved. A stone sima found in front of the building[634] is stylistically comparable to the marble

628 *AΔ* 60 (2005) 635–7 [Ē. Anagnōstopoulou-Hatzēpolychronē]; *cf.* Papadopoulos and Paspalas 1999, 177–80.
629 Vokotopoulou 1994, 305–8
630 The cult goes back at least to the 1st half of the 4th century, when a new *peribolos* was undertaken. For an overview of the sanctuary, see Tsigarida 2011.
631 Juri 1971, 359–360.
632 Juri 1976, 144–9.
633 See the discussions of palace dating above.
634 Juri 1971, 363–4.

sima of the temple of Zeus at Nemea (ca. 330). The architecture in the sanctuary of Zeus Ammon is badly in need of full architectural study, not least for its significance for Macedonian architectural development: e.g., the Ionic half-columns at the site have never been discussed. Alexander's interest in Zeus Ammon did not begin until the end of his reign, and it is impossible to assess whether a third-century frieze belongs to a repair (as reported) or is original. For now, these considerations along with the lowered date of rooftiles from Corinth, leads me to assign a date of ca. 325–275 BC.

Poteidaia and Corinth: territorial control within the walls

Poteidaia and later Kassandreia sat astride the isthmus between the Chalcidic mainland and the Pallenē peninsula. Ca. 200 metres north of the modern canal (map: fig. 21, no. 1), 110 metres of wall were uncovered, with a staggering width of 2.8m, preserved to a height of 0.8 metres, dated to the late Classical period based on construction technique.[635] 12.45 metres of the south wall (fig. 21, no. 2), of similar construction to the north but with reinforcing stone "cavities", was discovered directly to the west of the Nea Phōkaia road, preserved to a height of 1.3m with an even greater width of 3.2m at the western end.[636] If the late Classical walls followed the contours of the natural landscape, this means that by the end of its life Poteidaia had north and south walls enclosing an area of

635 Small and large cornerstones, hard pack of roughly cut stones and pressed clay, mudbrick superstructure; see *AΔ* 41 (1986) 147 [K. Sismanidēs], with pl. 147c–d & Winter 20062006, 133.
636 *AΔ* 40 (1985) 237 [K. Sismanidēs]; Winter 2006, 137.

ca. 150 ha. An ancient source compares Poteidaia to Corinth on account of their isthmuses; though of course the Isthmus of Corinth lies outside its city walls the extent of land enclosed by its Classical enceinte (555 ha including Acrocorinth) is best explained by the ambition for territorial control throughout the Corinthia. Likewise, for commercial and defensive reasons, the Poteidaians would have wanted to control the narrowest part of their Isthmus and the higher elevations to the south (up to 57 masl).

As in Isthmia near Corinth, the Poteidaians may have marked their Isthmus with a temple of Poseidon. Herodotus (VIII, 126.1–2 & 129.2–3) mentions that this temple, which was defiled by Artabazos, was located by the *proasteion* as Artabazos approached the city from Thessaly. Along the area of the north and south medieval walls which frame the modern 'Nea Potidaia' (so-called since its formation as a refugee settlement in 1924), several architectural members have been found, including parts of columns, blocks of superstructure, triglyphs and undecorated metopes. J. A. Alexander believed that these likely belong to 'the very early history of the town,' though he hesitated to assign a more precise date.[637] I rather think they are quite later judging from the lack of a pillow-like echinus characteristic of Archaic temples (fig. 22). Though most of the blocks have T-clamps, in use throughout the Classical period, some have more typically Archaic 'dove-tail' clamps and the most economical conclusion is that an Archaic temple was substantially rebuilt in the last third of the 5th century at the earliest.

637 1963, 3–8.

In connection with the reconstruction of the bridge across the canal, two temples (of the 5th and 4th centuries) and the destruction level of a third were identified (fig. 21, no. 3). The wall of a temple with two phases, was discovered between two Hellenistic buildings, along with a destruction fill containing pieces of a kylix-skyphos from the workshop of the Haimon painter (480 BC), a skyphos of the CHC group (500–490), and the head of korē statue of the early fifth century. Another fill nearby was found with rooftiles of a building in use throughout the fifth and until the mid–fourth century.[638] The two temples were discovered on either side of where the temple wall was found. The south building appears to be earlier and was perhaps constructed after the Persian destruction, but was in use until the mid-third century based on coins of Alexander, Cassander, and Antigonos Gonatas, found amidst a few pieces of figurines, a bronze pendant depicting horses, bronze, lead almond-shaped projectiles. The euthynteria is preserved for eight metres on the north and 13 metres on the east, consisting of large stone plinths; outside the east front, there is another set of foundations 4.5 metres north-south with a maximum width of 1.5 metres, which functioned to support a retaining wall. The temple is estimated to have a width of nine to twelve metres and a depth of 23 metres.[639] The temple to the north should date to the first half of the fourth century based on the amount of coins and figurines from the period, but likewise continues in use until the mid-third century, with west-slope pottery, some coins of Cassander, and many more of Antigonos Gonatas. Its east wall is preserved up to a height of 1.8m, and

638 Kousoulakou 2002, 325–6.
639 Kousoulakou 2002, 321–2.

its south wall up to 1.5m, but unfortunately no further details are given. Based on the published state plans, the temple appears to have a pronaos roughly five metres deep with approximately eight metres of the east side preserved.[640] If the paved surface shown (about 3 x 1.5 metres) is the main entrance, the east front could be around 17.5 metres long. The other line of foundations shown, between the two buildings, with two phases is only mentioned in connection with the Persian destruction layer, but in its later phase it is probably connected with the latest (northern building). It is slightly narrower than the walls of the main building, and could be for a peristyle (roughly 3 metres from the cella/pronaos) wall. The foundations have isodomic façades but a packing in the middle similar to the composition found in the north and south walls. The layout of what could be very impressive peripteral temple from the last phase before Philip's conquest requires further study.

In the southwestern part of the modern town (sector 129; fig. 21, no. 4) settlement fills of six building phases dating from the Archaic to Byzantine periods were investigated.[641] The pottery shows the changing trade relationships of Poteidaia over time, with a mix of imported Corinthian (early sixth century), Attic (late sixth) and Ionic pottery (second quarter of the fifth).[642] There is some evidence for Archaic building in this area but it is exceedingly difficult to understand. In the vicinity of a fifth century well, there is evidence in the first half of the 4th century for a

640 Kousoulakou 2002, 322–4.

641 Kousoulakou and Mēsaēlidou-Despotidou 2008, 507–9.

642 Sismanides and Karaiskou 1995, 488–9; Kousoulakou 1998, 308–9; Winter 20062006, 134–5.

paved east-west road, which covered the well,[643] and three parallel rooms (roughly five by five metres each) on the north along with a cluster of four rooms on the south (anticlockwise from northwest: 3.5 x 5.5, 3.5 x 4, 3 x 4, 3 x 7.5) [both complexes may extend further]. The westernmost room on the north contained figurines of a philosopher, child with rocking horse, and nude and clothed women. In the southwestern part of the eastern most room a Panathenaic amphora showing Athena was found with the inscription ΤΩΝ ΑΘΗΝΗΘΑΝ ΑΘΛΩΝ. Another amphora, on which part of a chariot is preserved, was inscribed ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ | ΕΥΒΟΥΛΙΔΟΥ | [ΑΡ]ΜΑΤΙ.[644]

This sector near the south wall is the archaeological focal point for transition from Poteidaia to Kassandreia.[645] To the west, there are remains of an earlier 5th century sanctuary of rather unique design, dated securely by Attic and Corinthian black and red-figure pottery to the earlier decades, ca. 500-480, probably destroyed by the Persians.[646] This area also contains evidence of housing from the late 5th and especially the 1st half of the 4th centuries, and trade with Thasos, indicated by a large cache of stamped amphora handles.[647]

Whilst the western area contained material from Archaic to Byzantine times, to the east the earliest phases are Hellenistic. Excavation of this area, revealed a complex of three related buildings on a terraced hilltop (fig. 24). Their shape and the roads identified suggest

643 Kousoulakou 1998, 307.

644 Sismanides and Karaiskou 1995, 485–8.

645 For the evidence of a Doric column amidst remains of stone and tile, cf. Kousoulakou and Mēsaēlidou-Despotidou 2008, 507-508; the interpretation of the lack of any further evidence until the Roman period is my own.

646 Kousoulakou 2002.

647 Sismanides and Karaiskou 1995.

orthogonal planning of a short rectangular variety that follow an axis along the cardinal directions in contrast to the ordinal axis of late Hellenistic remains. The western structure centred around a large central courtyard with adjoining rooms on the E-W sides; a well at the NE corner has various remains of pottery, including black-glazed lamps as well as tools. In the nearly adjacent buildings large square rooms with floors sealed by hydraulic mortar were found; clay pipes bring water into the complex and there are two large clay pithoi in the middle of the west room. Pottery dates the original phase of the complex to the last quarter of the fourth century and there is no earlier fill.[648] The peristyle, use of hydraulic mortar and elaborate piping suggest that this is a bath complex, similar to what Cassander constructed in Nemea.[649]

Roughly 200 metres south-southwest of the modern town (fig. 21, no. 5), a pit (depth of 1.5m) and two rooms (5.7 x 3.5 metres and 4 x 3), monumentally built with three courses of orthostate blocks preserved, were discovered. Fragments of architectural members were found, dated by excavators to the fourth century BC (without reasons given), including columns, stone bases, pieces of marble and plaster.[650] 80–90m to the west the upper body of an Archaic kouros (.5m) was found beneath the floor of a Roman building.[651]

---

648 Kousoulakou and Mēsaēlidou-Despotidou 2008, 504-507.

649 Miller, Birge, and Kraynak 1991, 188-261. A single room of the extra-urban bath in Arcadian Gortys (see above, p. 26) may be slightly earlier and an early phase of the bath complex at Olympia (Haseley 2004, with earlier references) may also be contemporary.

650 *AΔ* 40 (1985) 238.

651 Winter 2006, 134.

One aspect which might make Poteidaia seem smaller than Kassandreia[652] is in the location of its Archaic and Classical burials. We must exercise caution because, again as at Corinth, in sites where large areas went unbuilt, intermural burial may not have been unusual. In particular, only 400m north of the major settlement area discussed above (sector 129: fig. 21, no. 4), which was clearly part of the urban ensemble from the beginning of the synoikism, a Classical grave stele was found in secondary use in association with a Roman cist grave (fig. 21, no. 6).[653] An object of this size could of course have been moved, in a crisis of building materials, but on the eastern shore, directly to the west, near Hellenistic fortifications but with Hellenistic buildings, numerous tombs, grave stelai and burial pithoi of the sixth and fifth centuries were uncovered.[654] In 364 BC, under threat from their neighbours, the Poteidaians actually invited the elsewhere-hated institution of Athenian cleruchy to return.[655] A group of 12 grave stelai, found in an elevated area (ca. 30 masl) 2 kilometres south of the canal (fig. 2, no. 7) well within the late Classical wall suggests the presence of Athenians from the capitulation of 430 until the first half of the 3rd century being buried in this specially reserved area.[656] Among the burials was a stone sarcophagus dated to the early fourth century (Rhomiopoulou) now in the Thessaloniki museum.[657]

---

652 Tsigarida 2011, 154.

653 Thessaloniki Museum, inv. 7636; *AΔ* 35 (1980) 371 [G. Gounaropoulou, V. Allamanē]; Winter 2006, 135–6.

654 Alexander 1963, 6; *AΔ* 42 (1987) 367 [S. Moschonēsioutou]; Winter 2006, 137.

655 Alexander 1963, 77–9 with Moreno 2009.

656 *IG* I^3 1510–4, *SEG* XLV (1995), 797–9. *AΔ* 29 (1973–4) 677 [K. Rhomiōpoulou]; Ead. 1974; *BÉ* 1976, no. 458 [J. & L. Robert]; Sismanides 1998.

657 390/80 BC (Stephanidou-Tiveriou, see Winter 20062006, 133 n. 784).

From Poteidaia to Kassandreia: filling in the enceinte

The most dramatic change in the built environment at Kassandreia known from the record was the construction of large quadrilateral structure (fig. 23) over the earlier remains of sector 129 (see above, p. 182–183; fig. 21, no. 4). It has been reconstructed as a peristyle house, but only the west and a little over half of the north rooms are preserved. The building is on a 6° north-south axis, the same as I have recorded for the grid-plan at Dion (see chapter 2, above). Outside of the west façade, a stone road came to light, and there was a wall to the north and a large open space to the south and southeast. Parts of a small water channel (not shown or described) running north-south and a staircase are preserved in the southwestern part. The building layout at the end of the fourth century includes sets of three (or more) rooms on its western and northern sides, including some rooms reused from an initial phase suggested in the first half of the fourth century. The date at the end of the fourth century is based on small finds underneath the floors (mainly amphora fragments). Some rooms, particularly the northernmost on the west side have evidence of plaster floors on the interior stone on the exterior. The walls are preserved up to about 0.5 metres, and probably had mud brick superstructures above that level.[658]

Just 200 metres to the south another set of three rooms (5.7 x 3.5 metres, 4 x 3, unclear dimensions) was found with phases said to be typical of (the first half of?) the fourth century temple and public buildings

658 Sismanides and Karaiskou 1995, 488; Kousoulakou 1997, 455–8; Winter 2006, 135.

[large stone blocks, fragments of marble, column capitals, stone bases], as well as Hellenistic [pottery sherds, coins, plaster, pyramid-shaped loom weights].[659] The stone base of a column was found approximately 2.5 metres to the east of the western rooms and on the eastern side, near a destruction level with 18 loom weights, the foundations of the northeastern part of the courtyard were discovered. The Hellenistic structure reuses some of the early fourth century rooms but unites them in a single building complex.[660] The earlier walls are constructed of a similar technique to the city walls and temple, but the Hellenistic walls are bulkier and built of larger and more tightly packed stones. The excavators were clearly less interested in this building than in earlier levels, but we can estimate that the peristyle was 14.4 x 10 metres and the building as a whole had a ground footprint of around 1200 square metres. The foundations of small rooms behind the parallel north rooms are unusual and their circulation with one another shows they may have communicated with the street. There were also rooms on the west side that reached the courtyard directly. This complex arrangement of rooms is a result of earlier building phases, perhaps comparable to the introduction of a peristyle in the House of the Comedian at Olynthos[661]. Alternatively, it also looks forward to the late Hellenistic houses on Delos (see Chapter VI, b.i, below) and the Antigonid phases of the Macedonian palaces.[662] Nevertheless, the location of this building and its incomplete excavation make it impossible to determine whether it should be an elite

659 *ΑΔ* 40 (1980) 238 [G. Gounaropoulou, V. Allamanē]; Winter 2006, 136.
660 Kousoulakou 1998, 308.
661 Cahill 2002, 137–8.
662 Kiderlen 1995, I, 88–118; Trümper 1998, 77–119; Winter 2006, 251.

house, like those south of the agora at Pella, or a public building with a central courtyard, where a peristyle is likely but unproven.

Near the central square of the modern village (fig. 2, no. 8), around 450 metres northwest of sector 129, a Hellenistic building was excavated approximately one metre south of Roman burials but never reported. A hoard of 148 staters of Philip II (4), Alexander III (138), Philip III (4) and Lysimachos was found in the building. It provides a good indication of the amount of new money those who fought with Alexander's successors might have brought back to Macedonia, for a little less than half of the coins were minted in Macedonia, with the bulk of the others coming from Asia Minor and several from the Levant.[663] Such a treasure may have come from a public building or elite peristyle house, but further comment is impossible due to the lack of reporting. About 350 metres to the southeast of sector 129 (fig. 21, no. 9) on the slopes of a steep hill, an impressively built structure was discovered with an east wall preserved with a width of 0.6 metres for a length of 9.7 metres joining a north wall with a length of 7.9 metres, both 1.5 metres wide. A cross wall perpendicular to the north wall runs roughly from the middle of it for 2.5 metres to the south, dividing the space into two rooms. The complex is said to date to the first half of the third century, based on unspecified numismatic evidence. In flat, coastal land a further 200m south, a long east wall (ca. twelve metres) was excavated, with two rooms to the west (3.2 x 5.8 metres, 7 x 5.8 [estimated from plan]).[664] Whilst the sporadic rescue excavations of these buildings leave serious questions about their

663 Le Rider 1991, 89–94; Winter 2006, 136.
664 *AΔ* 32 (1977) 202–3, pl. 128β [A. Rhōmiopoulou]; Winter 20062006, 137.

form and functions, the evidence of large-scale complexes, with well-built and parallel rooms suggest they might have been part of a public, elite or mixed-use area.

Further light is cast on the urban topography of the city from the area of the spout well excavated in the southern part of the city, roughly 550 metres south of sector 129. The well is enclosed by a quadrilateral circuit (1.9 x2 metres) constructed of stone blocks with a width of 0.3 metres, and the interior of the structure had a tesserated stone floor. Around 90 metres to the south, two parallel walls were found oriented east-west, one preserved on the north for 10 metres and another on the south, with large stone blocks including a Doric geison in between. Part of a cymation from the corner of a toichobate and the piece of an Ionic column is preserved. The north wall has two phases with large seriated poros plinths for a little over half of its stretch and then the rest (with does not join the plinths) is of shabbier construction with rubble material. The south wall has the same shabby construction. Winter sensibly argued that the built public structure surrounding a water source is characteristic of an agora, with comparison to Stageira.[665] We must exercise caution because of the limited evidence for the area's built structure, the lack of water pipelines (it is a spring, and not a fountain), and the presence of Hellenistic and Roman burials in the area. Moreover, the evidence for coins of Cassander and Antigonos did not come from the spring, as she states, but from an 'earlier level of the same site'.[666] Collapsed building

665 Ibid.
666 Kousoulakou 1997, 460.

tiles are said to have a stylistic date of the mid-third or second century, so this area could have been a new development of that period.[667]

We also can assess, to some extent, the changes which took place during the Roman period, when a tile and pit grave, perhaps part of a larger cemetery, were found in sector 129, and water seems to have flowed east-west.[668] This appears to have followed upon a major catastrophe, toward the end of the Hellenistic period or in early Roman times, for the use of space around the “peristyle” building is found in lower layers.[669] As at Amphipolis, there seems to have been a contraction of the city in early Roman times, with areas built out in Hellenistic times possessing only evidence for burials, followed by a resurgence in the Late Roman period.

Dēmētrias

History, Landscape and Surroundings

Dēmētrias, established by Dēmētrius I ca. 290 BC, was the westernmost of the large new foundations of Alexander and his successors. Like Kassandreia, it was set up as a synoikism, in this case combining Magnesians, neighbouring Thessalians (map, fig. 1) and a merchant class derived from across the oikoumenē.[670] Moreover, Dēmētrias (location/environment, fig. 2) was intended to be an independent *polis* with mixed population, at least partially overlapping the site of a Classical

667 Kousoulakou 1997, 458–60.
668 Kousoulakou 1998, 307.
669 Kousoulakou 1997, 456; Kousoulakou 1998, 308.
670 Marzolff and Lohmann 2006.

centre, as Kassandreia incorporated the site of Classical Poteidaia.[671] There is also evidence of Mycenaean activity in the eastern part of the city, known as Peukakia.[672] Human occupation continued here as late as Classical times, and in the historical periods the area was probably an anonymous satellite of Iolkos, sometimes identified as 'Neleia'.[673] Marzolff has suggested exigent remains represent a fourth century fortification.[674]

As Kravaritou[675] and Stamatopoulou[676] have aptly noted, it is difficult to understand the nature of the synoikism – whether physical or political. Nevertheless, knowledge we have of Classical centres included in the probable territory of Dēmētrias and the closely intervening history of Thessaly help us to under the evolution of Dēmētrias' impact on landscape and settlement in Pelasgiotis and Magnesia. A royal inscription from Dion defined the border of Pherai and Dēmētrias, confirming the ongoing significance of the former city.[677] Although the part identifying the border is lost, a sensible limit for Dēmētrias' territory would be in the low-lying areas past Sesklo, some 13km from the centre of Dēmētrias. For the southern border, it is unclear what happened to Pyrasos, where Cassander had attempted a synoikism with Phthiotic Thebes (Diod. Sic. XX, 110.3),[678] but this site (15km southwest of Dēmētrias) provides a terminal limit for Dēmētrias' territory to the south given the resuscitation of Thebes in the third century. These considerations, along with the account of the synoikism in Strabo (IX, 5.15) focus our attention on the immediate environs of the Pagasitic gulf to Magnesia (where Strabo,

671 Represented by a Classical pottery kiln, and sixth to third century burials: Baziou-Efstathiou 2002, 9–10
672 Baziou-Efstathiou 2002, 7–8.
673 Marzolff 1994, 57–60; on 'Neleia', see Bakhuizen 1996.
674 Marzolff 1996, 48–9.
675 2013, 261–262
676 2018, 346.
677 Hatzopoulos, 2006, 88–89,
678 Boehm 2018, 68; Stamatopoulou 2018, 344.

somewhat problematically, as we will see, suggests Dēmētrias' control of the both the areas of Mt Pelion and Mt Ossa.

The Macedonians had longstanding kin connections with the Magnesians, through the genealogical myth that Makedon and Magnes were grandsons of Deukalion. They had migrated from Epirus respectively to the 'Makednon oros' (Hdt. VII, 131) north of Olympos, and the coast of northeastern Thessaly. [679] In the Homeric catalogue of ships (*Il.* II, 749–760), a related group from Dodona, the Enienes and Perrhaibians had recently migrated into what was thereafter Perrhaibia, and controlled the Volutsana pass between Macedonia and Thessaly.[680] Figured tombstones from Macedonia, particularly places situated on the routes to Thessaly, such as Dion, Pydna and Beroia, show a close relationship in style and theme with Thessalian tombstones. These suggest the communication between workshops in both regions as well as both with the Aegean islands and Attica from the 5th century BC. [681]

Despite Stamatopoulou's concern about 'over-optimistic attempts at reconstruction', we may be able to establish the limits of the syniokismos of Dēmētrias within Magnesia. On the hill of the Prophet Elias, 15km north of modern Volos, in the municipality of Glaphyrai, a substantial walled settlement was explored in the 1950s and 60s including extensive cemeteries and marble sculpture. The wall was apparently maintained throughout the Hellenistic period and surface finds seem to indicate continuous habitation from Classical to Roman times. Another settlement, just further north on the east side of Lake Karla, had walls of similar construction to those at Glaphyrai, but surface finds show activity mainly in the Classical and

679 Hammond 1972, 276; Hatzopoulos 2011, 57.
680 Hammond 1972, 294–295.
681 Hatzopoulos 2011, 55; Kalaitzi 2016, 21–23, 64–65, 116–117.

late Hellenistic period. So it is possible that this site was abandoned for a period after the synoikism of Dēmētrias. On the Aegean side of Magnesia, Kasthania was not included in Strabo's account of the synoikism. A Classical walled centre, and lower town has been identified northeast of Keramidi (44km northeast of Volos).[682] The identification of these towns as *komai* of Dēmētrias is problematic and based on 2nd century inscriptions related to the Thessalian confederacy, but it is nonetheless possible that they continued as areas of settlement.

About 3km inland from the eastern coast of the Pagasitic gulf opposite Dēmētrias and Soros on the north side of modern Anō Lechōnia is the Ancient town of Methonē, with one of the strongest polygonal walls in the area. Methonē was still and important town in the 4th century, minting its own coins and contributing to the Amphictyony. Helly[683] suggests that the city moved to the unidentified site at Goritsa (see below), but in any case its absence from the record after the synoikism is significant. Likewise at Koropē, roughly 10km to the southeast, site of the sanctuary of Apollo Koropaios, in use from Archaic to Roman times, one of the better known cults in Magnesia, has not produced settlement evidence from the time of synoikism. Spalauthra (localized 20km to the south) and Olizon (10km further south near the seaside were likewise both sanctuary sites with continuity of use. The honorific document from Spalauthra does provide evidence tantalizing for the functioning of local institutions under the *koinon*, but it is unclear whether the local had remained there, or returned later. At Olizon, scattered evidence of Hellenistic building is available, but it cannot be dated precisely.[684]

---

682 Adrymi-Sismani, 170-174.
683 2006, 145-169
684 Adrymi-Sismani, 176-181, with earlier references.

The mountain ridge south and southwest of Dēmētrias, as it approaches the coast has an ancient circular fortified centre that probably functioned as a port in Classical times, in the modern municipality of Soros, which as noted above most recent scholarship has associated with Amphanai. The site laid on a precipitous citadel with impressive fortifications overlooking two natural harbours, with a radial plan characteristic of early Greek urbanization and an extra-urban "temple with a hearth" (of Pagasitic Apollo).[685] The small, orthogonally planned settlement was also identified along the eastern wall of Dēmētrias, guarded the passage to Aligarorema valley. Classical Iolkos itself has been suggested on the edge of modern Volos, where the church of Aghioi Theodoroi likely stands on the site of the temple of Artemis Iolkia, the civic patroness.[686] The initial period of Macedonian control is thought to be represented by the independent coinage of Iolkos.[687] Despite the more or less consistent occupation of the Pagasitic coast and the history of Macedonian connections, it took two generations before the realization of a decisive urban imprint.

The settlement history of the gulf suggests that Dēmētrias was carefully chosen for its sea and land connections (fig. 3), to be the seat of an Aegean empire, to control Central Greece and to serve as a commercial entrepôt. The fortuitousness of its location is shown by its continued role as a Magnesian central place after the Roman conquest,

685 Mazarakēs 2009.
686 Pagasai and Iolkos: Marzolff 1996, 48, 50; see now Mazarakēs Ainian 2012.
687 Liampi 2005, 23–30.

rather than slipping into immediate decline, as had happened in Pella.[688] The Pagasitic gulf is the main sea outlet for Thessaly (*cf.* figs. 1–2), framed by the southern defiles of Mt Olympos and the Pelion range. It is thus at the same time the link between the southwestern frontier of the mountainous Balkans and the coastal defiles of the Aegean peninsula. The mountains are an important source of stone and water resources, as well as vegetation and forests. Land communication from what would have been a narrow and sharp coastline is possible through the Vale of Tempe toward Perrhaibia and Macedonia and a system of inland waterways leading to Pherai/Larisa, Pharsalos and the Gulf of Malis (see fig. 1). What made the site of Dēmētrias so attractive was the combination of the sheltering and resource-rich mountain with the sea access, no more than 100 kilometres from any part of the vast Thessalian plain (fig. 1).[689] Here there was no compromise, as there had been in Macedonia between the traditional mountain cities of Ēmathia and the cosmopolitan possibilities of Pella.

Thessaly is unique for the interaction of city-state (*polis*) culture with traditions of cohesion across a national territory (*ethnos*). Kingship was not a feature of Macedonian society, and Helly has shown that the office of *tagos* was not a permanent federal chief, but utilized in times of external threat.[690] Nevertheless, the acceptance of intervention by Macedonian kings probably depended on their supposed kin ties to the quasi-mythical Aleuadae, through their shared descent from Herakles.

688 Marzolff 1975, 44.
689 Stählin 1924.
690 Helly 1995, *passim*.

Morgan developed, from a more archaeological point of view, an important distinction between ‘big sites’ and political states.[691] Although she was explicitly interested in the Iron Age to Archaic transition, Thessaly still in Classical and Early Hellenistic times possessed a large number of medium-sized cities, functioning in a multi-polar network of peer states. By the late-6th and early-5th centuries, religious architecture at least began assume monumental form but unfortunately, the physical evidence of settlement is still limited, and has been reviewed by Stamatopoulou,[692] but for our purposes it is worth stressing the limited number, and generally late date of *agorai* in Thessaly. Several historically significant sites, such as Krannon/Skotoussa, Atrax and Metropolis have not been excavated, and Larisa remains difficult, so future research could change the present state of our knowledge.

Historical accounts of population movement and nilitary campaigns do give us some insight into important poles and the overall strategic topography, when combined with appropriate archaeological evidence. The regions of prime importance for both Dēmētrias and Macedonian involvement in Thessaly more broadly, are the tetrad of Pelasgiotis and the perioikic regions of Perrhaibia to the north, Magnesia to the east, and Phthiotis to the south. Perrhaibia and Magnesia are particularly important, owing to long-standing kin associations and trade with Macedonia.

The earliest public space known is in Goritsa (fig. 4), which replicated the fourth-century orthogonal planning known from Olynthos

691 Morgan 2003, 18–24, 85–106.
692 Stamatopoulou 2007, 316–27, 40–1.

and Kassopē,[693] with similarities to the topographic situation of Priene in the time of Cassander, matching the achievement of Halos in neighbouring Achaia Phthiotis.[694] Defending the narrowest pass between Magnesia and the Pagasitic gulf from a projection of the Pelion range, Goritsa has been regarded as a predecessor of Dēmētrias on the opposite side of modern Volos. The new settlement transformed Macedonia's long-standing provincial confederate territory with an urban centre providing secure defence from Thessalian incursion.[695]

Mainly, Goritsa follows the paradigm of a military camp, but two open areas were identified, which interrupted the plan of neighbouring streets. A natural rock edge and rock-cut terracing define a pentagonal area north of the intersection of streets D & 7 (fig. 4, no. 1.III–IV). In space III, the highest part of the settlement, two detached structures of uncertain plan, a round foundation and a square building were identified.[696] The flat terrain of space IV has been identified as an agora, based on the long edge of an edifice and the water channel behind it.[697] Bakhuizen suggested that space III is more likely to be an agora, but as he did not investigate further space IV, his claims are difficult to evaluate and nothing excludes the entire area serving as public space. Excavation of these structures was not diagnostic, but the evidence is consistent with the commemorative and sacral activities characteristic of Greek *agorai*. A further naturally-flat open space existed between street 18 and the east

693 Bakhuizen 1992.
694 Reinders 1988; Reinders and Prummel 2003; Reinders 2014.
695 Marzolff 1996, 51.
696 Bakhuizen 1992, 230–41.
697 Magnētos 1860, 38; Friedrich 1905, 238; A S Arvanitopoulos, *Prakt* 1907, 173; Bakhuizen 1992, 241–2.

wall (fig. 4, no. 2.IV–V), where there is exigent evidence of large-scale construction (an orthostate blocks and a door threshold) disturbed by modern building. It is difficult to go further than the excavator's characterization of an important building in public space.[698]

The Hellenistic town of New Halos was founded ca. 300 BC by Demetrios I or Cassander in the southern Almiros plan near an inlet on the west side of the Pagasitic Gulf near a spur in the Othris mountains.[699] The area was the site of a struggle by Demetrios and Cassander, and Halos is not mentioned in Diodoros' account (XX, 110.4–6). A coin hoard found outside the southeast gate, dating to the end of the fourth century and consisting of issues from Ephesos, Tenos, Karystos, Chalkis, Histiaia, Boeotia and Alexander the Great. The deposit is consistent with non-Macedonian Greek troops of Demetrios I, but does not establish Demetrios as founder, for which there is no positive evidence.[700]

The city of New Halos extended from a conical acropolis on the lower slopes of Almiros (ca. 40–170 masl) into the sloping plain, separated from the sea by a salt marsh. The marsh extended along the northwest edge of the lower city, and a flood plain also existed to the southeast, providing natural barriers of access (fig. 5).[701] The location of two main gates (in the northwest corner and the southeast gate), and major east-

698 Bakhuizen 1992, 242, 244. It is unclear to me whether Aristotle's discussion of the need for two agorai (*Pol.* VII.1331) is appropriate here, as the character of the public spaces is insufficiently clear (see further on Dēmētrias below).

699 Reinders 2014, 7.

700 Reinders 2014, 16–20, 193–7 (catalogue). The hoard is atypical for the number of civic issues (*cf.* Oeconomides 1994). Reinders rules out foundation by Cassander based on the differences in technical details of artillery towers between Dion and New Halos, but then goes on to describe a wide range of variations throughout Thessaly (307–330). These local construction techniques cannot establish the identity of the founder, as his discussion makes clear.

701 Reinders 2014, 27–32.

west avenue suggests one mode of circulation through the town, and eastern and western gates have also been proposed.[702] In the geographical centre of the city, the east-west avenue broadens from 9.11 to 10.47 metres, and exigent remains were of a different character than the better preserved housing districts.[703] On the north side of the street (where it broadened), dressed isodomic blocks were discovered up to a metre long and 0.5 metres thick, along with upper column drums (0.45 metres high, diameter (top-bottom): 0.3–0.33 metres). The excavator believed the finds were consistent with a small agora, but unfortunately they have not been published, and the area is mostly inaccessible. [704] Another area of public building (at least 16 buildings) was uncovered between the quarry and the upper acropolis (45–95 masl), but their plans vary and mostly cannot be reconstructed; much less can their function be determined.[705] On the acropolis, a built area with a cistern (35 x 30 metres) was discovered. The clearest building has been identified as a temple of Demeter and Persephone (10.4 x 8 metres) on the basis of a 4.5 x 1.69 metre rock-cut rectangular pit (originally identified as a grave, depth not given!) containing small hydriskoi, a life-sized ceramic head and thymiateria.[706]

---

702 Reinders 1988, 147–51; Reinders 2014, 39–59.

703 Reinders 1988, 108–33; Reinders and Prummel 20032003.

704 Reinders 1988, 134-5; Reinders 2014, 38.

705 Reinders 1988, 135, 137.

706 Reinders 1988, 137–47; Reinders 2014, 38–39, reporting the assemblage in under study by Collette Kruijshaar.

Urban Development of Dēmētrias

Dēmētrias lies on a peninsula projecting into the southwestern part of the Pagasitic Gulf, surrounded by a number of hills with extensive built terraces (plan: fig. 5).[707] Apart from the main harbours, various small beaches are available for landing, but hills and marshlands make access foreboding, and a channel (apparently built) leads inland from the commercial harbour.[708] Surrounding mountain foothills rise to a height of 200 masl. The subsoil contains layers of marble, granite and slate, pure marble or limestone, and gravel surface, with strong karst deposits on the northern coast. Fortifications are securely fastened with symmetrical, trapezoidal cuttings into the composite bedrock.[709] The immediate aftermath of the synoikism is represented by the wall circuit enclosing 440 ha, roughly the size estimated for Pella, though without precedent elsewhere. The early fortification demarcated an upper and lower city (comparable to Sikyon), but is overall remarkable for not following the terrain and inclusion of much inhabitable land without any discernible defensive purpose.[710]

Marzolff distinguishes three major phases of urbanization. Then initial demarcation was followed closely by a reorganization after 276 BC (i.e. under Antigonos Gonatas) involving staged fortification and an enhancement of existing walls, creating one of the strongest citadels in Greece, justifying its (later) place among the ‘fetters of Greece’ (Polyb.

707 Stamatopoulou 2018, 343.
708 Batziou-Efstathiou 2012, 6; For the idea that Dēmētrias had a second harbour at Alykes: Stamatopoulou 2018, 351.
709 Marzolff 1975, 46–7.
710 Marzolff 1994, 50.

XVIII, 45). Of particular interest in this connection are the offensive batteries (up to 152 metres in width) in the direction of Thessaly, suggesting that whereas Goritsa appears meant to defend Magnesia, Dēmētrias was built to control Central Greece.[711] The changes of this period meant a smaller enclosure of ca. 270 ha, but with a definite system of roads and buildings. Nevertheless, no major temples are known to have functioned in this period, apart from the presumed heroön, in the western extremity of the city. This still included uninhabited space, but of clear productive value: particularly farmland, stone quarries, harbours to the north and south. Bulwarks seem to be positioned to control local quarries and the water supply.[712] At the edges of the city, stone extraction is evident ranging from the clearing of cliff faces to the methodical cutting of defined blocks, with correspondence to the diversity of building materials utilized throughout the city. Large centrally-located quarries have also been identified in the upper reaches of the mountain foothills, which served the needs of the inner-city. More limited stone-extraction is also evident at the site of major buildings particularly the rocky hills of the Heroön and the palace. The Acropolis especially reveals evidence of extensive iron ore mining, and wells and channels east of the city suggest the movement of water from the upper reaches east of the city.[713]

A division was created between the fertile western area of Aligarorema valley, and the defensive nucleus of the east, with its

711 Stamatopoulou 2018, 349–350; Baziou-Efstathiou 2002, 17.
712 Marzolff 1994, 60.
713 Marzolff 1975, 57.

technically impressive Mediterranean fortifications.[714] The bastion of the palace is one of the substantial extant examples of Greek military architecture, but only traces of the palace survive and its overall form is unrecoverable in this period.[715] The defensive works, with stone superstructures on mudbrick socles, mark an exception to the general accessibility of various parts of the low-lying plan (typical of a coastal Greek centre), but they effectively divide Dēmētrias into controllable sections.[716] The plan of the eastern sector of the city was rectangular with blocks of 51 x 101 metres enclosing spatious plots of 350 square metres. To our current knowledge, the most sumptuous houses with mosaic floors clustered along the coastline. Large pipelines fed water to the lower parts of the city, whilst in the upper part, wide channels were cut into the stone foundations.[717]

Between the palace and the south fortifications and again the Acropolis and the east fortifications, a different land division is followed, creating city blocks measuring 98.3 x 177.5 metres. Immediately to the south of the palace, a public space named as the ‘sacred agora’ in epigraphic sources, was also constructed in this period. It consisted of porticoes with rows of rooms framing three sides and one open side.[718] Only a single thoroughfare touches its narrow eastern side en route to the southeast gate. The compact and elongated rectangular dimensions of this space are reminiscent of public spaces in Ionia (such as Priene below,

714 Marzolff 1975, 48–50; Marzolff 19961996, 51.
715 Marzolff 1996, 53.
716 Marzolff 1975, 47.
717 Marzolff 1994, 60–1; Marzolff 19961996, 56.
718 Marzolff 1994, 62, 64.

p. 236–40). In the western part of the open space a small, peripteral Ionic temple (peristasis: 6 x 10, approximately 9.6 x 16 metres) was constructed, identified with Iolkian Artemis, a principal divinity of Dēmētrias. The temple is typical of the smaller, but well-built, axial religious spaces in Hellenistic cities such as Assos, Magnesia and Pergamon.[719]

A second agora has been proposed to have existed in the flat northwestern section of the city, with a direction connection the main port. It is dated to the period of the palace quarter, which coincided as well with the redevelopment of a number of houses, leading to a clear division between the eastern and southwestern parts of the city.[720] The suggested location of the commercial agora would have been well-connected to the heroön and theatre, potentially creating an important western axis of civic space at this time.[721] A west-facing "Rhodian peristyle" was then constructed around the heroön, with major pipelines redirecting water to this part of the city, and cisterns to store it there.[722] It was 137 metres wide and its marble Ionic decoration ranks among the finest in the Greek world.[723]

The theatre was located on a separate terrace in the lower slope of the Heroön hill was constructed completely of limestone, showing the impact of the abundant resources in Dēmētrias. It would have overlooked the city centre with a view toward the commercial harbour. The standing

719 Marzolff 1975, 52–3.
720 Marzolff 1996, 56–8.
721 For the royal cult: Kravaritou 2002.
722 Marzolff 1994, 64–5.
723 Marzolff 1994, 62.

scene building, in an independent alignment, belongs to Roman Imperial times, but enough of the foundations of the Hellenistic foundations and adopted intersections remain to suggest a simple stage building without a pedestal, but accessed by side-ramps. The 2.9-metre deep proedrion was constructed of dichrome marble. The orchestra had a semi-elliptical shape, leading to a two-tiered *koilon*. Its design is typical of the early Hellenistic theatres discussed above, with similarities to the theatre of Priene.[724]

On hill 84 in the city centre, a ship-shaped *temenos* was constructed, measuring 37 x 150 m, on a built terrace with a sightline directly overlooking the palace district and also aligned to the heroön. A substantial and monumentally constructed road passed over the descending slopes toward the palace. It was apparently never finished, but we may imagine a process from the royal palace was intended, similar to what has been suggested between the palace and Sanctuary of Eukleia at Aigai (p. 60–67, above). Within the walls were smaller buildings, including subterranean rooms, but precisely on the central axis within the eastern third of the *temenos* stood a transverse rectangular building (10.7 x 15.9 metres). The measurements yield a precise 2:3 relationship of its sides and 1:2 relationship to the temenos wall. It had a large rectangular cavity, probably serving as a bothros or a burial chamber.[725] The quality of its construction and workmanship stands out among the architecture of Dēmētrias, particularly in the employment of bichrome Parian marble,

724 Marzolff 1975, 55; Id., 1996, 55; Baziou-Efstathiou 2002, 33–34.
725 Interpreted by (Batziou-Efstathiou 2012, 21) as a *xystos*, but the shape and its depression are not explained.

which is unique in Thessaly and recalls the ornamental elaboration of late-Classical Ionic.[726] Stählin identified two sculpted fragments of a lion and a deer, typical of Anatolian funerary architecture. The palace of this period already employed marble along its long east-west façade, and the yet more elaborate use in this structure on the same axis is significant, especially given its rarity. Elsewhere in Dēmētrias it only appears in the proedrion of the theatre and on tomb buildings. It overbuilds an earlier construction and thus likely belong to the monumental reworking of this area.[727]

Although here communicating with palace more than the coastline, the monument and surrounding district resemble the Mausoleion of Halikarnassos, but such edifices are unattested in mainland Greece.[728] It has been interpreted plausibly as a sanctuary for the founding generation of the city. A related inscription identifies several officials responsible for expenditures on a ritual involving oxen, a sacrifice and public feasting, to be duly recorded in public records. It specifies this event as a commemoration of the piety of the *archegetai* and *ktistai*, in whose sanctuary the stele was meant to be erected.[729]

The second phase of building activity in the city is connected with the reigns of Philip V and Perseus (after 200 BC) and contemporary with the reconstruction of the palace, including a new defensive wall on its northern and western perimeter (facing the commercial agora). The wall

726 Including a lesbian *kymation* typical of the last quarter of fourth century or later (Marzolff, 1975, 54, n. 14 citing Weickert 1913, 79).
727 A ceramic deposit from the second phase was dated by Fürtwangler 1974 to ca. 200 BC.
728 Marzolff, 1975, 53–4.
729 Boehm 2011, 104–6; Kravaritou 2012.

connected with the urban enceinte to enclose a space of 10 ha, a royal city within a city, and the palace complex now extended to an east-west width of 195 metres. This is the best-known phase of the palace, when it consisted of a four-winged complex with external dimensions of ca. 59.8 x 61.3 metres. The main square courtyard had a width of 27.1 metres with Doric columns on three sides and pillars at the north. Progression through this part consisted of axially-ordered sequence, characteristic of Macedonian palaces and the elite houses at Pella, both discussed above. Beyond this, there were subtle but intriguing dissimilarities, starting with the four symmetrical and imposing quadrilateral towers, each ca. 12.6–8 metres wide. The columns of the peristyle itself were approximately 2.45 metres than the rest of the complex. The stuccoed and coloured spaces of the interior, combined with the height of the columns, now makes this space the almost-exclusive focus of adornment, completing a shift from the exterior to the interior of monumental buildings represented by Macedonian palace architecture. In the east-wing, an open-air space is probable, doubling the width of the built west-wing complex.[730]

Its new architectonic unity, vast terraces, palatial courtyards, Rhodian peristyle and complex, rhythmic circulation between rooms now approximate more closely an Anatolian palace.[731] Like other Macedonian palaces, it presented a unified Doric façade with distinct four-angled rooflines signifying each wing (and resembling domestic architecture on a monumental scale). The massive towers were rebuilt, and including a series of dining halls with the characteristic evidence of couches. As at

730 Marzolff 1975, 49–50. See also Batziou-Efstathiou Kopsacheili 2013, 84–94.
731 Marzolff 1975, 50–1

Pella, there is evidence for domestic workshops within the palace, notably in this case for the casting of bronze statuary. Domestic districts were also reworked during this period, and generally the architecture is distinguishable by the coloured mortar on stonework, which created a marble sheen.[732] The best evidence for (possibly reworked/embellished?) bronze statuary comes from the same period. With this new complex, the association of the Sacred agora and the palace are distinguished physically from the commercial agora and the rest of the city.

After the Roman settlement of Greece, Dēmētrias remained a centre of regional administration and an important military and commercial hub. As in the Macedonian cities studied, there is little sign of its continued independent political vitality. Large bath complexes were constructed in various parts of the city and there were also dispersed farmsteads and field perches, perhaps an indication of 'internal colonization' and autocratic control of daily life. Ca. 120 BC, Dēmētrias was struck by a disastrous earthquake (Strabo IX, 5.2).[733] The main evidence for the succeeding period is the strengthening of fortifications with several bastions featuring auxiliary towers constructed along the southern façade. This shows both a new conception of defence rather than an offensive posture toward Thessaly, with the threat now coming from the Aegean. According to Helly's influential hypothesis, this may belong to the period of the Mithradatic Wars (i.e. 88/87). Substantial destruction is evident throughout the city from the earthquake and this conflict, around the time of Pella's final abandonment, and it seems to have led to a progressive

732 Marzolff 1996, 58.
733 *Ibid*.

decline. A revival of building activity occurred in the first and second centuries AD, but by this point Dēmētrias had become a minor provincial town, more of a military and commercial crossroads than centre.[734] Nevertheless, the harbour contributed to maintaining Dēmētrias as a major port city in the region.

The striking contrast between the archaeological record of Dēmētrias and traditional interpretations of the nexus of royal power and civic foundation is underscored in the work of Raynor and Boehm. Both take a rather limited view of material culture, with Boehm focusing on the burials and small finds and Raynor instead highlighting the palace. The result is an overly optimistic view of civic prerogatives and then of royal power dominating everything, in both cases overlooking the important ongoing historical debate on the relationship of kings and cities.[735]

For Boehm in particular, this leads to strange interpretations of written sources and epigraphical evidence as well. He suggests that Macedonian "domination" of Thessaly began with Philip II, and the foundation of Dēmētrias only dramatically confirmed the redrawing of the region. This, however, ignores the long-standing connections of Magnesia and Macedonia and also fails to acknowledge rethinking of the *tageia* (Helly[736] is not even cited), and thus regards Philip as taking over the hegemony of the *tagos* and reconstituting the tetrarchy, with himself as sole ruler. The evidence adduced is mainly from Demosthenes' politically charged speeches, but even these are taken out of context. As a

734 Marzolff 1996, 62.

735 The mistaken inferences are numerous, and will be addressed alongside my specific conclusions below.

736 2005.

representative example, where Demosthenes (1.22) claims that the Thessalians have demanded the return of Pagasai, will prevent the fortification of Magnesia and hinder Philip from receiving harbour revenues, Boehm reads that Philip had cleaved Pagasai and the whole Pagasistic Gulf. This runs against the clear meaning of the passage, an invective against the "faithless" Thessalians, who will contravene the terms of their alliance with Philip, and the defensive posture of Goritsa. In the circumstance Demosthenes describes, Philip would hardly be in a position to conscript Thessalian cavalry for Macedonian campaigns, as Boehm suggests.

We should instead take our departure from Marzolff's interpretation of Dēmētrias as a capital city, which Boehm and Raynor do not appear to have read, and subsequent publication of the city's public spaces. Marzolff demonstrated that the character of fortifications most distinguished federal capitals. In this respect neither large-scale synoikisms such as Rhodes (408), Messene (369) or Megalopolis (368) nor federal centres such as Elis (471), Mantinea (460) or Kassope (348) could match the *technological* innovations of Macedonian royal administrative centres (*basileia*).[737] It follows from this analysis that it was such innovations, rather than differences in local policy that allowed Macedonian centres to succeed in controlling their spheres of influence.

The most important difference, as Marzolff understood, was urban-architectural rather than political. Nevertheless, it is significant that from the earliest phase when public architecture can be traced (i.e. after 276

737 Marzolff 1975, 43–4.

BC), he identifies a circulation system where commercial traffic is controlled from the south port, through either defensive strongpoints or the palace fortifications themselves. The effect of the separations of space achieved after 200 BC would then be to redirect such traffic instead of simply controlling it.[738] The interaction of fortifications and public building created two organizational points, the Acropolis and the palace complex. The former was typical of a late Classical or Hellenistic city, situated at the periphery of the defensive system, with a cut-out plateau (ca. 0.1 square kilometres) delimited by steep cliffs favouring the collection of potable water and inner part fortified with slightly lower and weaker walls than the enceinte.[739] The Acropolis walls nonetheless form a proteichisma, the so-called “Great Bastion” of Dēmētrias with an additional tower and bastion.[740]

Boehm’s misunderstanding is magnified in the case of the Hellenistic city, especially in the case of the Sacred Agora, where he strangely interprets the temple of Artemis Iolkia as ‘diminutive’ and of ‘modest size’ even though it is typical of the period and its surviving foundations are characteristic of Hellenistic monumental architecture.[741]

The palace complex, in turn, stood at the centre of the city and resembling no other building, looming over each part and their communication as a second, opposing “citadel”. The almost monotonous uniformity of its peristyle courts likewise distinguished it from the variability of public spaces. A third point of organization in fact dates to

738 Marzolff 1975, 47–8.
739 *N.b.* the atypicality of Athens in this respect.
740 Marzolff 1975, 49–50.
741 Marzolff 1975, 53; Boehm 2011, 123-4.

the earliest phase of the synoikism but is significantly mediated by the palace at the point when other public building in the city gets launched. It consists of the Heroön and theatre, in connection with the commercial agora and the southern port, as well as the great bulwark of the Acropolis, especially its southwestern front.[742]

Within the ring created by these three organizational points, the public life of the city unfolded in the flatlands and gentle hillslopes below. In these sections, building strategies are distinct from the palace and fortifications.

I finish by mentioning a question perhaps hanging in the background that unfortunately cannot be addressed on present evidence. Within Thessaly, Larissa and Pherai have produced evidence for agorai, which would be well worth considering in connection with Dēmētrias. Our present fragementary knowledge of these spaces and later overbuilding make them especially difficult to assess. Major interpretative supposition would be required, which would detract from their ability to serve as fixed points of comparison for the new evidence presented above. Hopefully, further research into the urbanism of Thessaly can be undertaken, in order to better contextualize Dēmētrias within this important, and increasingly interesting, region.

742 Marzolff 1975, 51–2.

Conclusions

The development of Amphipolis as a royal centre, probably focussed on its commercial capacity (precious metal resources and trade links) and athletic traditions, was not a dramatic volte-face but rather an epiphenomenon of long-term change in the Strymon valley. Although it is difficult to draw firm conclusions based on the lack of evidence for Classical domestic architecture on the Acropolis, it appears that substantial redevelopment occurred in Amphipolis perhaps beginning in the mid-fourth century. Nevertheless, it is difficult on present evidence to definitively assign changes to the reign or influence of a particular king much less a coherent building policy. Changes reflect Macedonian tastes, particularly for court architecture, but do not seem aimed at a single purpose, at least that is identifiable in the record. Even if it is an accident of history or the result of other factors, the Macedonians seem to have chosen cities, like Amphipolis and Poteidaia, that had played a prominent yet independent role in their recent history. In this respect the policy of Cassander and later kings seems a continuation rather than an inversion of Philip's, but the chronology of changes is difficult to trace with this fine of a grain.

The nature of public building at these sites, moreover, recognises and affirms their individual character. At Amphipolis, construction of the gymnasion as the main new element of public infrastructure, probably developed along with a sanctuary and theatre as at Aigai, was a nod to the athletic heritage of Amphipolis, known to be important from the cult of Artemis Tauropolos. The pre-existence of a sanctuary where athletic

dedications may have been appropriate is a further nod to the history of Amphipolis. Archaeological evidence increasingly shows a policy of integration with respect for existing traditions, in agreement with the epigraphic evidence studied by Hatzopoulos and Errington,[743] which roughly followed the historical trends noted above. The gymnasion shows, as much as any other Macedonian building, the function of peristyle architecture to focalise and internalise civic space. It is the defining aspect of elite Macedonian urban development, which of course cannot be attested everywhere, but without it, we find ourselves rudderless in a sea of disparate material. The very difference is a virtue, however, for it shows that the "Hellenizing" historical moment of Macedonia, when a strong push for urbanization with an appeal to elite self-understanding, occurred, it was limited to a select range of centres, not all of which we understand archaeologically. The study of civic buildings and the surrounding space they created is thus an invaluable tool to access the unique built environment of this region and period. The gymnasion at Amphipolis is a smaller version of the interiorisation of public space that we find in the agora at Pella, where the public square becomes, in effect, a peristyle building.

Without question, the limited excavation that has taken place in Poteidaia/Kassandreia gives us a distorted picture of what happened there. Nonetheless, we can see that–in this case–there is little evidence for a physical enlargement of the area enclosed by the walls during the Hellenistic period. Instead the focus was on redeveloping a main public

743 Hatzopoulos 1991; Errington 2007.

area of the city, making it a base for the civic water supply and then adding new development in the elevated inland area. Ultimately, it was a civic complex, now with a more sophisticated arrangement of rooms around a central courtyard, that helped to redefine a public area of Kassandreia, in the middle of the third century BC. This is to be connected with the Antigonid interest in coastal cities–together with Amphipolis and Thessalonikē–which began to establish a network of regional capitals, enshrined in the urban reforms of Philip V and ultimately the Roman settlement.

Kassandreia, on present evidence, had the same amount of territory enclosed within its walls as Poteidaia did in the first half of the fourth century BC. No doubt it controlled vastly more territory including that of Olynthos and the former cities of the Pallenē peninsula. The amphora workshop at Mendē probably began its life shortly before the synoikism of Kassandreia, but the production of wine likely increased and became associated with Kassandreia. Building in the sanctuary of Zeus Ammon in Aphytis may likewise predate the synoikism, but this cannot be settled on available data. We need to think past the propaganda of Antigonos and consider that the highly productive region of the Chalkidikē might have regenerated without Cassander's help. In this case, we should view the foundation of Kassandreia not as resuscitation of the Olynthians but as preventing another Olynthos from rising. Nevertheless, Kassandreia initially had its own administration, and it is precisely at the time when it was incorporated into the Macedonian state that public space articulated around courtyards emerged. That was true even though another aspect

of Macedonian identity, the marble burial couches, already made their appearance at the end of the 4th century.[744]

When Poteidaia was rechristened Kassandreia in 316, the city was already accustomed to monumental building. In the first half of the fourth century BC, there was already a monumental (and possibly peripteral) temple, probably of the city's patron Poseidon, near the city's Isthmus, just as at its mother city of Corinth. What would become the peristyle complex in sector 129 was already two sets of rooms on either side of a paved street, one of which was already a place of elite display of public or sacred character. The most visible change of the early Hellenistic period was developing that space into a single complex. The water infrastructure built between the southern part of the city and this area may indicate that it is the location of the Hellenistic agora, but it also may have already had a similar function in late Classical times. What the range of Hellenistic building shows–especially in the southern part of the site–is a more thorough mastery of the rolling topography there, building on a large scale across the sweeping hills and in places without evidence for Classical development. The only other evidence for Hellenistic development is the construction of a sea wall addressing the vulnerability that had been shown by Athens' successful siege of Poteidaia at the beginning of the Peloponessian War. If this was an aim, Kassandreia should be thought of alongside Thessalonikē, which would have helped to control the eastern part of the Thermaic gulf and provide access to vital land resources.

744 Sismanides 1997; on the marble couches in the new tomb at Amphipolis, see now Palagia 2018.

Just as Dēmētrias stood at a crossroads of Thessaly, it represents an importanct historical transition as well. Recent epigraphic study has established the *polis* functions of Dēmētrias alongside royal ones,[745] so comparing the organization of space in the city to the Macedonian centres discussed above affords a convenient test of how far their built space reflects the institutions of a Greek *polis*. Demetrias' location was meant to take advantage of land routes to Pherai and beyond, as well as to provide a ready portage in Central Greece. The palace's relationship to the grid plan of the city and the principal known ('Sacred') agora along with a second royal district near the theatre, perhaps with a Heroön and second ('commercial') agora inserts royal ritual (with likely processions) would have overshadowed the overall life of the city. It is difficult, in fact, to discuss any aspect of life in Dēmētrias without reference to the royal presence. This may be due to the fact that so much of the city's development happened under the Antigonids. Especially after the loss of Phthiotic Achaia, one understand most readily in the context of the late third century how Dēmētrias increasingly came to be viewed as a 'fetter'.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

Introduction

In the previous chapters, we have seen that at major Macedonian centres including royal centres (e.g. Aigai and Pella) and second-order sites (e.g.

745 Daux 1959; Helly 1971; Marzolff 1978; Kravaritou 2011.

Mieza and Amphipolis), a significant development or redevelopment occurred by the end of the fourth century. The changes reflected the unique character and identity of each city, (e.g. Aigai as a royal centre but no longer political 'capital', or the athletic traditions of Amphipolis). Expansion is a theme running throughout most of the case studies considered, and nowhere was it more dramatic than at Pella. This seems to support the idea of Papadopopoulos (p. 14, above) that Hellenistic mega-cities replaced the Greek *polis* model based on a new political order. Nevertheless, as we have seen, it is more complicated because of the centrality of buildings typically identified with the Greek *polis* (agora, theatre, gymnasium).

The placement and form of these buildings sometimes reflects something new, particularly in the recurrence of the building complex redeveloping an entire area. The peristyle form common shared by public buildings residences seems to be a particular Macedonian innovation, rather than an inspiration (see above, p. 129). The presence of palaces themselves is also rare in Greek cities but is known from Larisa am Hermos,[746] and possibly Athens in the Archaic period.[747] As in this case/these cases, a renewed contact with the East may have provided the inspiration for using the form in Macedonia. As the chronological *comparanda* introduced by Kottaridē indicated, and I have argued, the architecture of palaces relied upon earlier Greek buildings, both for façade architecture and elite dining spaces (p. 75–77). The difference in Macedonia is the spatial association of palaces and

746 Lauter 1975.

747 Thompson 1940, 15-33; interpretation as a potter's workshop instead: Papadopoulos, 2002, 295–6 (esp. n. 142).

indeed royal processions. Nevertheless, there remain important distinctions, as even at Pella the palace is separate from the urban grid.

Even more at a site like Amphipolis, where redevelopment is based on an iconically civic building, the *gymnasion*. Could the presence of royal authority nevertheless be sensed, as in this case, by the particular importance of Macedonian *gymnasia* for the training of troops. This takes us back to the very nature of Macedonian authority and its connection to the cult of Asklepios. The eponymous priests of Asklepios were city-based political actors with annual terms, but they also could act as functionaries of the king.[748] The Homeric idea of kingship is quite apposite, as it helps us think of overlapping levels of authority in a society where civic institutions are just beginning to develop.[749] We can appreciate how a political warrior kingship integrated with still new concepts of city life, with its urban elites. I find the idea of royal progress between cities, as developed by Chaniotes and Strootman,[750] particularly apt for accounting for the phenomena of Macedonian cities. In this context, it was important above all for the king to be seen, and these factors help to explain the significance of palaces and theatral spaces within Macedonian cities, along with the conspicuous exception of some institutions expected in Greek cities. The key to all of this, as I suggested in the Introduction, is function. Namely, cities provided a convenient vehicle for kings to communicate their prerogatives with the national community, where leading citizens could affirm their status and the management of changing economic realities might occur.

748 Hatzopoulos 1996, I.383–5; Errington 2007, 278–82; Raynor 2015, 256–7.
749 Lévy 1983; Haubold 2005.
750 Chaniotes 2005, esp. 57–77; Strootman 2014.

Whether it is the processional route in Aigai, the Askelpieion at Mieza, or the monumental *agora* at Pella (with simulataneous evidence of royal civic authority) it is the public space of the city, not palaces *pace* Hatzopoulos,[751] where king and city meet. Finally, it is where we see such close palatial overshadowing of the agora at Demetrias that we may have a spatial manifestation of the transition from national to personal, international kingship under the Antigonids (*cf*. above, p. 34–35).

Why did the Macedonians begin to live in cities? Here it may be more of a question of the Macedonian interaction with southern Greece and Asia Minor than with the East, especially considering the main influences of, and functions, of Macedonian public buildings. The presence of Aristotle in Macedonia, tutoring the young Alexander III would have also helped this along. For Aristotle believed that after Periander had attempted to keep people from gathering, Kypselos rather encouraged citizens to live in the city, *e.g*. by the construction of fountains.[752] According to the philosopher, this will make them less like *tyrannoi* and more like managers, less appropropriators of wealth than trustees (1315b). Aristotle goes on to point up that this fundamentally entails understanding what is the most fundamental choiceworthy way of life (1323a), and whether this is same for individuals and communities. After answering affirmatively, he goes on to articulate the corresponding arrangement of space, which takes up the majority of Book VII.

As we have seen, Plato and Aristotle were intensely concerned about the layout and organization of cities, even with the mechanics of synoikism as it relates to an idealized specialization of industry (above, p. 186–7). Unfortunately, there has not been an appropriate degree of philosophical attention corresponding to the amount of material in fourth-century philosophy. In what is still the definitive treatment of Plato's Laws in English,

751 2001.
752 Robinson 2011, 123–33, with earlier references.

Plato's discussion of urban organization is turned into a metaphor for moral legislation.[753] Others have honed in on particular historical details, for example question about how well Aristotle knew the career of Hippodamos.[754] Of course, space is not metaphorical in these philosophers. It also needs to be stressed that Greek sources do not have our sense of chronological periodization, and Aristotle himself stood at the beginning of a new rethinking of political spaces.

As is becoming increasingly clear, the *polis* as a political institution and an urban structure bloomed during the Hellenistic period. The multiplication of new cities featured an acceleration of urbanization and the formation of a new bourgeois self-image. Political and cultural institutions such as councils, popular assemblies, gymnasia and theatres and their associated are increasingly visible.[755] In addition to individual buildings, new architectural ensembles reflected or ignited social change.[756] Amidst a strong sense of mobility, migration and international networks cities such as Miletos still featured old civic elites. Likewise at Priene, local dignitaries shaped cult practice and a vibrant local tradition survived despite the constancy of change.[757]

The traditional understanding of Hellenistic cities included an admiration of the diffusion of Greek culture and knowledge transfer across the oikoumenē with regrets about *polis* decline and the static adaptation of building types. This is confounded by the lack of pre-Hellenistic examples of gymnasia and theatres, as well as the unique adaptation of grid-planning to unique civic environments. In response, the German seminar *Die Hellenistiche Polis als Lebensform* has set out to understand the socio-political changes and urban

753 Morrow 2022 [1960], 103–112.
754 Gorman 1995, Shipley 2004.
755 Zimmermann 2015, 7.
756 Zimmermann 2014, 7.
757 Zimmermann 2015, 9–10.

structures underlying the Hellenistic city.[758] The change in approach is typified by a dynamic vision of Hellenistic cities as centres of movement, interaction and communication along the lines of Henri Lefebvre's idea of spaces continually reciprocally recreated through human interaction. This entails a simultaneously physical and mental idea formed by the relationship of space and vision, the *epiphania tēs poleōs* of inscriptions from Miletos, Kalymna and Kos[759] which Hölscher regards as both the result and the prerequisite for social life.[760]

Kings and other elites emphasize by their presence but also by public monuments that they are enabling other citizens to participate in public life, implying an unspoken, functional consensus, but also social divisions through forms of visual and political communication. Architecturally closed spaces, however, need not imply only exclusion but also intimacy for those included. [761] This is especially important for the *agora* of Pella, which featured varied architectural markers of space unlike the monotonous shapes that came in the course of the Hellenistic period. Finally, two additional considerations of relevance to Macedonia are the increasing emphasis on understanding the peculiarities of microregions and seeing a division in architectural development around the middle of the 3rd century BC and this is especially marked in theatre and gymnasion buildings.[762]

Because the *polis* is seen as a given in the Greek world by the fourth century BC, our sources do not ever explain its motivation. It is notable, however that the word has a wide range of meanings for an entity that is both political and spatial, e.g. 'polis of the Persians' (Aesch. *Pers.* 213), etc. so it does not help us to identify the specific layout of a city.

---

758 Note 745.
759 *Tit. Calymni* 52; *Milet* I, 3.139; *SEG* XXXVI, 1046; *IK Kyme* 13.
760 Lefebvre 1991 [1974]; Hölscher 1998, 12; Zimmermann 2009b, 23–4, 35.
761 Zimmerman 2009b, 31–2, 39–40.
762 Zimmerman 2009a, 17.

Something like what Terrenato[763] has proposed for early Rome: the political activation of elites is possible. It is quite probable that civic elites in Macedonia were synonymous included those in the circle of the king,[764] and we can imagine them gathering for dinner in the palace at Aigai. Again here, though, scale is important. For it is conceivable that the king did not know all of the people dining at Aigai or especially conducting business in the agora of Pella. The consensus of the people in embracing the vision of urban space as a vision of their society was likely important here too.

It remains to discuss the development of the major Macedonian centres in the context of Hellenistic urbanism in Northern Greece and the wider *oikoumenē*, the significance of changes over time within Macedonia and to define the relationship between Architecture and Political History there. Within Northern Greece, four particularly interesting *comparanda* present themselves in the movement of the Thesprotian 'capital'[765] from Elea to Gitana, and the continuity of function at Phonikē in Chaōnia, Kassopē in the Kassopeia and Stratos in Akarnania.[766] This provides the context for revisiting the particular social meaning of Macedonian public space.

---

763 2019

764 This is true of those involved in early euergetism and in the study of the (admittedly limited) prosopographical evidence: *e.g.* Hatzopoulos 1996, II, nos. 39, 49, 53 (*SEG* XXXIX, 606), 54 (*SEG* XXXIX, 605) Paschidis 2006 264 n. 105. See further Hatzopoulos and Loukoupoulou 1989, 17–23; Hatzopoulos 1996 I, 51–72; Paschidis 2006, 263–4; Ellis-Evans 2013; Raynor, 2015, 123–9. The comparability of the mosaics in the elite houses of Pella to royal art may also show affinity of the residents to king at the entrypoint for the *agora* area.

765 The word 'capital' is still used for convenience, but see on its anachronism ch. 3, above.

766 Discussion of the wider geography and history of these regions, as found in the previous chapters, cannot be included here but thankfully the present state of research is well-presented, as indicated in the brief synopses below.

The Epeirote cities, with architecture mostly dated to the latter third and first half of the second century BC, allow us to see the reflection of Greek civic institutions after the collapse of the Molossian monarchy at the end of our period. The format of these sections differs from the evidence chapters (II–IV) above, presenting the development of public spaces in roughly chronological order. Also, the detailed descriptions characteristic of the evidence chapters were neither suitable or practical to this discussion. Limited and uneven publication and (in some cases) ongoing re-evaluation does not allow for full descriptions of the evidence. Chronologically, most of the evidence falls at the end of our period and is dated more relatively. This is not to deny that intriguing questions remain, but it is beyond the scope of this study to address them fully.

In the wider Greek world, cities long thought to be paradigmatic for Late Classical and Hellenistic public space, such as Miletos, Priene, Pergamon and indeed Athens were redeveloped under the influence of Hellenistic kings.[767] The downdating of some changes at Priene helps to complete the picture of mid- to high-Hellenistic development, suggesting that even with most examples Macedonian urbanism only documentable after the death of Alexander, it must have been hugely influential.[768] This has to complicate the view of early Hellenistic Greece as a period of decline and the re-shifting of focus outside of the mainland. The specific details revealed in Macedonia suggest the centrality of ritual feasting, and the thorough ordering and delineation of space but the ultimate

767 *Cf.* §3, below. Miletos and Priene: Patronos 2002; Pergamon: Athens: Camp 2001, 161–182;
768 See below ‘the Aegean context’, p. 224.

interdependence of political, commercial and religious space. Here again, I am able to rely on more robust publication, more secure chronology and consideration of questions of urban development to discuss relationships to the evidence presented above, without the need to articulate it for the first time.

Northwest Greece

Recent uncovery of small to medium-sized centres in Thesprotia, combined with earlier excavations in Southern Epirus and Akarnania, allow us to assess how far these regions in close contact with Macedonia reflect similar political values in their spatial organization. As noted in chapter three, Hatzopoulos has suggested that the political organization in federal regions, especially Epeiros, should inform our understanding of the Macedonian monarchy, but how far is that born out in the material record? Consideration of these cities also raises the question of Greek civic ideals may have changed under Macedonian influence.

The Macedonian monarchy had long-standing connections with northwest Greece. Ethnographically, the Molossian royal family shared kinship with the Temenids through a belief in Hellenic descent through the Heraklids.[769] Despite the division of the Pindos range, the spine of Northern Greece, Western Macedonia (i.e. the upper Haliakmon), was the most consistent transitional zone between Macedonia and Epeiros (fig. 6). A second century BC inscription refers to the Orestos Molossos and it is

769 Hammond 1967, 370–95.

likely that Tymphaia was allied to the Molossians.[770] Border forts have been identified in the passes between Tymphaia and Southern Epirus, and a significant border town has been identified at the Kastro of Polyneri from the end of the fourth century.[771] Early in his reign, Philip II concluded a marriage alliance with Arybbas, involving the daughter of Neoptolemos I, Philip's erstwhile rival, Olympias gave birth to Alexander the Great (Justin, VII, 6). After the death of Neoptolemos, Philip helped secure the throne for Olympias' brother Alexander Molossos, who declined war with Philip after he had betrayed Olympias (Ibid.). When Philip married Olympias, his kingdom was roughly the size of Neoptolemos', but as Philip secured Western Macedonia, alliance with the Molossians became less valuable and a source of annoyance. Nevertheless, the Pindos passes and political relations with Epeiros continued to have strategic importance.

This state of affairs continued in the Hellenistic period. When Antipater and then Cassander battled Olympias for control of Macedonia, she was aided by Aeacides I of Epeiros (king, 331–316 BC). Cassander's troops occupied the Pindos passes, and Aeacides was deposed, followed by a period of Macedonian control, when Cassander's lieutenant Lysiskos was appointed 'general and administrator' (Diod. XIX, 36.5) of the region. Cassander faced both a threat to the south from the Aetolians, and in the north from the Illyrians (in essence fighting the same battles Philip II had a generation earlier). In the south, he convinced the Akarnanians to consolidate their resources in the leading cities of Sauria, Agrinion and (chiefly) Stratos in 314/3 BC (Diod. XIX, 67.3–4). Cassander restored

770 *Ep. Chron.* 1935, 248 (Dodona, 164 BC)
771 Drougou 2011, with earlier references.

independence to Epeiros, and around the same period, the common bronze coinage of the Ἀπειρῶται began to appear.[772] A growth in the Molossian state's central organization was accompanied by increasing reliance on cities, *e.g.* as places to raise troops and offer refuge to the king (Diod. XIX, 88.3–4).

Urbanization continued during Antigonid control of Macedonia, notably with the foundation of Antigoneia to protect the Drinos valley. Though the Epeirotes and Macedonians were often at odds in the early Hellenistic period, mutual relations are shown by during the reign of Pyrrhos (297–272) by the Molossian's dedication of Illyrian spoils to Antigonos at the sanctuary of Artemis Itonia. After Pyrrhus' death at Argos, Antigonos mourned and offered him a royal burial (Plut., *Pyrrhus* 34.4–5).[773] At the beginning of his reign, Philip V established a new alliance with Epirus, which was motivated and held as a bulwark against Macedon's old foes in Aetolia and the new Roman threat in the Adriatic. In the south, the Aetolians controlled the centres established under Cassander, but Philip was able to wrest away the strategic harbour of Oiniadai, effectively reclaiming Sauria as part of a bid for the Ambrakian Gulf (Polyb. IV, 65.5–11).

Politically, Epeiros seems to have functioned differently from Macedonia in the king's relationship to constituent *ethnē*. Although Aiakidēs was able to muster his forces against Cassander, the bulk subsequently deserted and he was deposed by a κοινὸν δόγμα (Diodoros

772 Franke 1961, 88–91; Meyer 2013, 75–77, with intervening references.
773 Hammond 1967, 588.

XIX, 36.3–4). In this narrative, Diodoros describes the deserters as returning to their separate homes whence they secured the decree. Hammond, and, at greater length, Cabanes refer to this political situation as constituting a political *koinon* before the establishment of the formal League after the collapse of the Molossian monarchy in 233/2 BC. That view has recently been challenged based on new dating and reading of key inscriptions, along with a reading of literary sources to suggest a loss patchwork of allies. Rather than a single Epeirote *koinon*, the Molossian *koinon* was joined with other, independent *koine* such as the Thesprotians, the Chaonians and myriad others, forming less a state than a shared sense of identity as Epeirotes.[774]

This intriguing new hypothesis could be an overcorrection, as Mackil has suggested, since we find the Molossians undertaking various state-like actions.[775] This is also a major period for the development of Dodona, and particularly its political architecture.[776] What needs particular attention from the perspective of this study is Meyer's assertion of tribal primitivism, excluding the possibility of political centres. The renewed debate should fuel a rethinking of the relationship between built public spaces and the political institutions behind them, which is unfortunately missing from the robust recent literature on the dynamics of federal states.[777] Archaeological evidence from Epeiros suggests substantial development of fortified centres at the end of the fourth century BC.

774 Meyer 2013, esp. 46–60.
775 Mackil 2016.
776 Chapinal-Heras 2021, 52–100.
777 Some of the most interesting contributions include Beck 1997; Corsten 1999; Mackil 2003; Funke and Haake 2013; Mackil 2013; Beck and Funke 2015.

Unfortunately, the evidence is most difficult for Molossos itself. Recent archaeological work has suggested that the Molossian centre of Passaron should perhaps be sought underneath modern Ioannina and not as previously thought at Gardiki to the northwest. Gardiki has mainly revealed evidence of public building dating to the late third and second centuries BC, well after the collapse of Molossos. It has been argued that the site under Ioannina, flourished from the fourth to second century BC, and that its settlement history is comparable to Aigai.[778] We are in a better position with regard to the new excavations in Thesprotia along the waterfront of the Thyamis (now Kalamas) river. The completion of the Thessalonikē-Ēgoumenitsa motorway cutting a direct path through the mountains, has afforded the discovery of multiple sites. Substantial portions of several towns have been uncovered by the Archaeological Service, but systematic excavation is lacking.

Nevertheless, the revelation of iconic *polis* buildings, mostly dating to the second century BC, shows an important elaboration of public architecture and town-planning. Of greatest interest to the discussion are the political centres of Elea and Gitana. Ps.-Scylax and Ps.-Scymnos 40 records that Elea (fig. 7) was a Thesprotian harbour, situated inland high above the Kokytos river (nearly 500 masl) to the south of the Skyamis. Elea is the only Thesprotian town mentioned by Ps.-Scylax and Ps.-Skymnos, and its significance is further underscored by the coin emissions lasting from 360 to 330 BC, and a manumission decree of the Elataians, a subtribe of Thesprotia. Its stout pseudo-isodomic walls with square towers

778 Pliakou 2011.

and axial entrances have been dated the mid-fourth century. Elea has a rough grid-plan anchored by two wide avenues with an agora on the northeast corner with numerous freestanding stoas and room complexes. A three-room temple (16 x 6 metres) was located adjacent to the northwest corner of this intersection.[779]

A solidification of Molossian power around 330 may have led to the coalescence of Thesprotian political organization to the north (along the Skyamis). The centre of Gitana is built on the elongated hill of Vrysella (fig. 8), where the river circumnavigates it on three sides (west, south, and partially east), with a consequent precipitous drop. On the northeast is a large massif, so the site could only be practically accessed from the north. The city was surrounded by a strong polygonal wall (2.5–4 metres thick), which enclosed an area of 28.7 hectares, with well-built architecture throughout the city. Gitana had a more regular grid-plan, with several sections of the city marked by peristyle buildings, stoas, and other public edifices. On the most interesting features is a partition wall which protects a smaller western district (5.1 hectares) from the rest of the city. Just to the northeast of it is the area identified as the city's agora, with a row of two-deep shops opposite an oblong stoa (approximately 76 x 13 metres). It had 26 exterior Doric columns and 14 interior Ionic columns, and its style is reminiscent of Magna Graecia. Within the partition, at the southwest corner of the city is a large public archive and *prytaneion* (1500 square metres with a peristyle and two paved *androne*s with mosaics. Numerous clay sealings are stamped ΘΕΣΠΡΩΤΩΝ, ΑΠΕΙΡΩΤΩΝ, ΕΛΑΙΩΝ, ΒΟΥΛΑΣ

779 Rēginos and Lazarē 2007.

showing the confluence of different levels of administration. A theatre is located at an unusual location outside the south city wall with hundreds of inscribed seats for leading citizens.[780]

Kassope (fig. 9) was another new city, founded as a synoikism shortly before the mid-4th c. amidst the towering sheer mountains of Thesprotia. In the beginning it was nevertheless an open settlement organized *kata komas* ('according to villages').[781] A barrel-vaulted non-monumental "Macedonian tomb" has been interpreted as a founding hero (*ktises*) cult, a phenomenon often associated with settlement abroad. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the community never had a monumental temple, but soon featured several urban amenities, They were focussed around an *agora* framed on three sides with stone buildings, and on the fourth with one of the precipitous cliffs that dominate the settlement. Although extensively excavated, publication is rather bare, and unfortunately sometimes over-determined by conjectural reconstruction.[782]

The town layout was not insular but followed the Archaic pattern of *stenopoi* known from Western Greece, and probably dates to the late fourth century, but its isodomic fortifications could be as early as mid-century. My own view is the consolidation should date ca. 340–20, based on comparisons to Priene, Abdera, and Western centres. Streets were laid out as at Pella with careful provisioning for water channeling and drainage. The so-called "Prytaneion" is entered through an attached *stoa* and follows the basic format of the site's *herdraum* houses, with rooms, including one (E) for banqueting centred around a colonnaded courtyard. It is not a peristyle since one side is engaged to the wall, and likewise

780 Kanta-Kitsou 2008.

781 Schwandner (2002) 109.

782 Hoepfner & Schwander (1994[1986]) 114–84, Dakaris 1984. The following is based on personal observations and the short sections of the former.

rooms are only on three sides. The North stoa is comparable in scale to examples at Olympia (Echo) and Thasos (NW) discussed above, and combined a Doric exterior with an Ionic interior colonnade. Further confirmation of the Western connection comes from the semi-circular shape of the *bouleuterion,* which is not known outside of Sicily and South Italy until Late Hellenistic times.

The so-called “Katagogion”, now interpreted as a “Marktbau” by Hoepfner & Schwander is the most impressive building at Kassope.[783] It had a continuous series of rooms on all four sides each with a central column to support the roof radiating around a monumental pillared peristyle. I have been able to see market weights in the regional archaeological museum, which confirm this identification, but these are to my knowledge unpublished. Also characteristic of its Western connection is the placement of the theatre at the highest point of the site, which makes the whole city into a kind of theatral space.[784] The houses are interpreted according to Hoepfner & Schwander’s standard typology, the problems of which are discussed below, showing progressive expansion from the fourth to first centuries and the introduction of peristyles only from the second century. The hard evidence from Macedonia discussed above thoroughly problematizes this supposititious model.

Discussions of Macedonian architecture concentrate on the tombs and small sanctuaries. The discovery of tomb painting transformed our understanding of Greek painting by offering the first preserved large-scale examples.[785] In the end, Macedonia could prove as important for the history of monumental civic architecture as it has been for Greek painting. It is unsurprising that in both these fields an Adriatic connection, which

783 Hoepfner et al. 1994 [1986] 368–83.
784 Marconi 2012, 189.
785 Brecoulaki 2006.

becomes stronger in Epirus. The cities of northwest Greece, together with the sanctuary of Dodona, may have been an important mediating force between the cultures of Northern (Macedonia, Thrace, Epirus) and Western (Sicily, Southern Italy) Greece. Western Greece (including the Corinthian colonies of Epirus and Illyria) differed from Macedonia in having a long tradition monumentally developed urban centres[786]. Nevertheless, these were substantially redeveloped from the fourth century, often with entirely new populations, as at Akragas.

It is now clear that Northern Greece features a number of the innovative new building types characteristic of the Hellenistic period, often attested earlier than expected. There are also sites where and emergent rapport between architecture and urbanism, and indeed a holistic sense of the built environment, come together. Nevertheless, much work remains to be done in synthesizing the evidence. Few monumental temples have yet been discovered, although some sanctuaries were extensively developed, such as the Macedonian religious centre at Dion[787] and the Sanctuary of the Great gods Samothrace.[788] In the *chōra* of Aphytis (see above, p. 187), a Doric peristyle temple was built in the third quarter of the fourth century. Unfortunately, its architecture has not been carefully studied, but evidence of engaged half-columns, and free-standing Doric and Ionic suggests an innovative structure, which will perhaps be informative for the Vergina “palace” and the study of Macedonian architecture as a whole.

Nevertheless, the overall pattern is of a strong emphasis on civic construction. Over the past generation, new work on the Hellenistic Sicily has demonstrated a similar trend there, with similarly only a handful of

786 Mertens 2006.
787 Pandermalis 1999
788 *Samothrace* I–XII.

new monumental temples, such as that of Apollo Aleo in Punto Alice (near Kroton).[789] A more specific connection may come from the sanctuary of Zeus *Agoraios* at Thasos, used to divide the *agora*, as at Segesta where a close association with the *bouleterion* is likewise evident.[790] Apart from the particularity of the tetragonal *agora*, Pella was overall taking the from of an axial plan, known especially from Western centres such as Agrigento, Metaponto & Paestum beginning in the mid sixth century, creating sight lines punctuated by large monumental zones. Critically, the latter were also being reformulated and rebuilt at the same time.

The Aegean Context

.

The urban layout of Miletus (fig. 10) especially the stoas surrounding its *agorai* probably took definitive shape around the end of the third century.[791] This accompanied a major reorganization of the harbour area. A focus on public political architecture is characteristic from the beginning, accompanied by near contemporaneous attestation of the city as πολιτεία ('civil polity', sometimes synonomous with republicanism as in Aristotle, esp. *Pol.* 1293b22), and possibly 'citizens' (π[ο]λ[ί]τα[ς]), ca. 330-320.[792] A large prytaneion is the earliest public building known, dating from around the mid-fourth century, and dominated an entire *insula* in the southwest corner of the North agora. Its groundplan, though insecure, seems to rely on a large

789 Mertens 1984, Ossana & Torelli 2006, Neudecker 2011.
790 *BCH* 1950: 333–6; Cecilia Parra 2006 107–113.
791 Coulton 1976: 64–65.
792 *SEG* XXXVIII (1988) 1193.

central courtyard, with axial communication provided by two narrow passageways on the east and west ends. As the prytaneion traditionally housed the eternal flame representing the establishment and continuity of civic life, it is natural to see this building as a core priority in the development of Miletos. It marked the beginning of a new emphasis on large, conspicuous well-constructed public spaces, especially where compared to Classical prytaneia.[793] However, much unlike the strictly controlled access visible in Macedonian buildings, circulation is mostly open, with various rooms connecting with one another, with passage possible from the east to the west side.

Within the second half of the fourth-century, the area between the prytaneion and the city's securest and most official harbour was significantly redefined (fig. 11). This was accomplished through the construction of a long L-shaped stoa, stretching out along the southern inlet of the harbour, with a single-aisled Doric colonnade in front of a single row of square-like rooms. A second-L shaped stoa was articulated to the back side of the harbour stoa, and peristyle market court was probably constructed at the same time, with a row of double rooms closing off the east side.[794] This redevelopment was accompanied by a symbolic definition of topography, and the two colossal lions, sacred to Apollo, which also appear as emblems on the city's coins.[795] There is an indication of embracing the future whilst looking to the past. The distinction of formally unified space, the use of building complexes and

793 *Milet* I.6.89–90, Miller (1978) 13–14,23,231, Müller-Wiener (1986) 121, Patronos (2002) 60–1, noting that a predecessor of the second century bouleterion may also have been constructed at this time. On Classical prytaneia, see Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994, 36, 81–5.

794 *Milet* I.6.4–19; Coulton (1976) 63, 259; Patronos (2002) 61.

795 Graeve (1996) 317–21; *Miletos* I.6.84–5, II.3.112–4. Coins: Deppert-Lipitz (1984) 18–9.

the general scale of construction was entirely new, but occurred within the grid-plan of the city, completed in 480. This combination was also marked symbolically, in the stylistic treatment of the lions, one archaizing and the other more modern.[796] As Patronos notes, these very functional buildings would have begun to create a scenic backdrop for visitors particularly as they entered the city. Further, in connection with the reconstruction of the monumental Temple of Apollo at Didyma,[797] the *Delphinion*, which was crucial to the early layout of the city was doubled in size, with a pi-shaped double-aisled stoa marking the north, east and south sides and a wall enclosing the west.[798] The sacred way between Miletus and Didyma was a major feature of Miletus' urban orientation and now it was being further monumentalized. From the end of the fourth-century, also comes the earliest evidence for a theatre in Miletos, on the southwest slope between the Lion harbour and another harbour to the west. The fourth-century plan is not well-known, but surviving remains indicate a stone proskenion (of unknown dimensions) and scene building (15 x 7 metres, articulated to the city wall). Within the first half of the third-century, the scene building was doubled in length and the proskenion extended the same distance. It was doubled again before the mid-second century, with considerable expansion of the auditorium in each period.[799]

The third century was marked by the vicissitudes of the ongoing battles of successors, including for recognition in civic contexts. Antiochus, son of Seleukos I, was the first to donate a *stadion* length single-storied and aisled Doric stoa, situated at a major crossroads.[800]

796 Patronos (2002) 64.

797 Voigtländer (1975) esp. 14–28.

798 *Milet* I.3.125–141; Coulton (1976) 169, 258; Patronos (2002) 65; Herda 2005; Id., 2006; Id., 2011

799 Krauss 1964; Patronos 2002, 67–8.

800 *Milet* I.7.31–47, Coulton (1976) 63, 145, 261, Schaff (1992) 26–36, Patronos (2002) 68–76, including extensive historical background.

This area, however, was still largely not built out, and the building marked a new attention to the Southern area of the city. It was also a new landmark along the Sacred Way from Miletus to Didyma. Within a generation it was joined by an L-shaped counterpart with Doric exterior and Ionic interior columns, but not until the end of the century did another join to created a fully a square complex of buildings surrounding the area.[801]

Miletos is unique in providing a clear chronology of buildings from the fourth to second centuries, culminating in the multiple *agorai* literally surrounded with building complexes we know from the end of the period. However, it is not until the second century that we can begin to speak about civic buildings such as the multiple gymnasia or the *bouleterion*, which unlike Kassope, took the form known from Athens rather than the more circular western model.

The remains from Priene (fig. 12) feature a uniform initial development of space according to certain specifications along with an architectural ensemble representing a patch work of archaeological periods and the endpoint of a 200 year development of space.[802] In recent years, German archaeologists have been working to unravel the earlier assumption that the city had always appeared as the first excavators found it.[803] For example, recent restudy has focused on the area to the west of the agora, which shows development throughout the Hellenistic period, and the area around the Athena temple, which is late Hellenistic.[804] The plan of the fourth century is based on the simplest of Pythagorean

801 *Milet* I.7.15–29, Coulton (1976) 63,259, Müller-Wiener (1986) 121, Schaaf (1992) 30, Patronos (2002) 76–77.
802 Rumscheid 2015.
803 Raeck 2009, 311.
804 *Ibid.*, 306–7.

triples, reducible to 3:4:5.[805] As at Miletos, architectural and epigraphic remains testify to clear emphasis on public political life in the early period. As at Priene, both the πολιτεία and πολίτες are mentioned in early inscriptions, but there is strikingly little evidence for the fourth century, apart from the Temple of Athena Polias, donated, if only nominally, by Alexander the Great.[806] Otherwise, one has to look to the development of residential spaces, which is more complex than once believed and as presented in Hoepfner's overviews, especially when differences in terrain and proximity to public space is considered.[807] As today, a smaller house on optimal land near the centre may well be worth more than a larger house on less favourable land in the periphery of town. Houses at Priene have received detailed treatment elsewhere and are outside the bounds of the present study, as there is no evidentiary based for regarding any of those known as "official" or "quasi-public" as was the case with those discussed from Pella above (p. 122-128).

It is a striking contrast not only with Miletos, but also with Pergamon (below), a town that had been ruled by tyrants in the Archaic period (perhaps as a city-state), but more recently was given as a unit of landscape consisting of land and cities to Demaratos by the Persian king in 486. Nevertheless, Pergamon was walled as early as the seventh century, and had a circuit enclosing 18 ha built in the fifth. The city struck civic coinage in the late fifth and early fourth century, but again it was a Persian satrap Orontes who allowed the resettlement occurring between 362 and 354. We have the name of an early prytanis called Archias, and as in Macedonian cities an important role was played by Asklepios. Foundational cults date to around 330-325, and the southeastern part of

805 Rumscheid 2014, 192–4.
806 Patronos 2002, 141–6, Carter 1983.
807 Note 795.

the city was regularly planned with long rectangular insulae similar to Western Greek foundations and those known from Pella. The plan included the area immediately south of the Upper Agora and near the South Gate, with traces of streets uncovered in the eastern part. In the 320s, a new Ionizing temple of Athena with a facing theatre to the west. Under Philetairos (282-263) a diagonal arrangement with more squarish units to accommodate the constructions of peristyle houses. These houses adjoined the agora though due to the landscape variation, they would not have been as directly connected as at Pella. South of the Athena temple and extending to the east was a building with a chambered floor plan, including the possibility of dining rooms. The relationship of the temple and theatre have been suitably and usefully compared to the palace and theatre of Aigai. Foundations underneath the Great Altar of Pergamon are dated to the late fourth or early third century and include the construction of a Prytaneion, perhaps also under Philetairos.[808]

According to prevailing opinion, Pergamon was a ‘dynastic’ city and the plan and houses of Priene represented, as Radt puts it ‘the idea of a free and autonomous polis’ that ‘had not yet been overlain with the autocratic and centralist ideas of Hellenism’. Given the lack of evidence for public building in fourth century Priene, and finer grained development history now emerging for Pergamon, such conceits are becoming more difficult to sustain.[809] In the third century (probably under Philetairos), a massive reorganization of the Acropolis of Pergamon took place, including the construction of a wide ceremonial street, the only road in the upper city which accommodated vehicle traffic. The street headed upwards from the south gate along the slope of the citadel along the southwest side of

808 Raedt 2009.
809 Radt 1993, 203.

the palace quarter toward the arsenal. A limited revision of the course of the Archaic and Classical walls must have been undertaken to accommodate the Athena temple. The earlier course of the fortification was maintained, except in the southeast corner and north side of the citadel, areas expanded to accommodate a much enlarged monumental space. It is clear that the plan of the early Hellenistic period was followed subsequently, as deep drainage ditches channeled to a larger drain underneath the main streets could not have been dug out in subsequent rebuilding, which reused earlier foundations. Third-century Pergamon began to take a public shape resembling its leaders' increasingly imperial ambitions, but this included a major expansion of the agora (probably also under Philetairos). Initially, a relatively open space with small individual buildings on different axes, notably an apsidal building perhaps housing the hero cult of Telephos laid on the east side of the main street on ground later occupied by the Great Altar. Under Philetairos a major market stoa was constructed to the north of the apsidal buiding. Its position, near the fortress gate, follows Anatolian tradition. Later in the third century, probably in the reign of Philetairos' successor Attalos I, a massive multi-story market stoa was built, overlooking and dominating the slope of the Acropolis. It resembled a better-preserved example at Aigai. Around the same time, the area was finally enclosed by the construction of the Sanctuary of Zeus. Much of the third century agora was covered by Great Altar, Attalos' stoa was removed to improve the view, and the functions of the agora moved to temenos of Zeus and its stoa. The increasingly centralized, royal image of the city was overlaid upon what, from Early Hellenistic times, had the appearance of a Greek city-state. As such, it is an important signifier of the transformation between the traditional ideal

of a Greek city and the impact of the physical imposition of the institutions of personal monarchy.[810]

From this perspective, we can return more sharply to the political architecture of Priene. Nothing can be definitively assigned to areas of the third-century theatre and second century gymnasion before those buildings.[811] This period also featured major building in sanctuaries, including the Sanctuary of Egyptian deities Isis, Serapis, and Anubis entered through a Doric *propylon* east of the Upper Gymnasium. Here foundations of a small temple are preserved, which matches the dimensions and orientation of a building of unclear function (treasury) in the Sanctuary of Athena *Polias*.[812] Work on the pi-shaped agglomeration of Doric stoai, the central south one divided by an interior Ionic colonnade probably began at some point in the third century, but poses major chronological problems.[813] Whether it was constructed piecemeal throughout the third and second centuries[814] or the extant remains belong chiefly to a single phase in the second century[815] is unclear. For a long time, Miletos, Olynthos, and Priene have seemed the paradigms of Greek urbanism, and their plans still appear side by side in the pages of handbooks. The lack of identifiable public buildings at Olynthos, chronological problems at Priene, and the late development of civic architecture apart from apart from market stoas at Miletus highlights the need to expand our understanding of this period. What is more, in the light of sharper comparison between Pergamon and Priene now possible,

---

810 *Ibid*., 203–6.
811 Rumscheid 2014, 196: nothing can be definitively assigned to this area before the theatre in the 4th century. *Priene* 275–84, Crowther (1996), Patronos (2002) 151–2.
812 *Priene* 133–5,164–70, Patronos (2002) 152–3.
813 Patronos (2002) 153–4.
814 Koenigs (1993), Kienlin (1998/9) esp. 254–6.
815 Hoepfner & Schwander (1994[1986]) 222.

the differences between them over time have less to do with the putative presence or lack of democratic ideals than with the peculiar circumstance of Pergamon's rise as the centre of the Attalid kingdom. Priene is unique as a small city that largely preserves the physical imprint of *polis* institutions. At Miletos, Priene and Pergamon, it is possible to separate dynastic intervention, especially in its most intensive periods, from the everyday functions of the cities.

We should now turn to three *polis* institutions well-testified in Macedonia and in the Hellenistic Aegean (gymnasia and theatres), to better situate the structure and function of the complexes discussed above. The gymnasium is clearly attested as a *polis* institution from Classical times, but examples from the fifth and first half of the fourth century are not well-preserved. In Greek culture, cult, athletic education and training, and musical education are very closely intertwined. Specific features of the gymnasium allow us to recognize it as a distinctively Greek cultural institution. Building inscriptions are useful in identified the history and political administration of gymnasium construction, but unfortunately say little about the physical process of construction. This, and the functions of gymnasia must be established by the archaeological analysis of rooms. Texts, as well as inscriptions from Delphi and Delos, helped to establish the traditional names for rooms. Naming can be controversial, due to the range of functions played and sometimes modern expectations. An *apodyterion*, *e.g.*, is room for undressing but should not be understood as a 'locker room'.[816]

Particular locations of gymnasia show their relative importance and evolving function over time. In the late fourth and third centuries, they tended to be in the middle of cities, as is known well from Priene and

816 Von den Hoff 2009, 245–7.

Athens. Over time, gymnasia seem to function as public space in addition to the primary role of training athletes, already from the third century at royal centres like Alexandria and Pergamon. In later examples, the primary choice of site seems to have moved toward to the edge of cities, such as the second century example from Delos and, within Macedonia, Beroia.[817] It is also possible to observe evolutions in plans, as the loose and diverse designs as seen at Olympia and Sikyon offer a sharp contrast to the more symmetrical ensembles known from Priene and Miletos. In the second-first centuries BC, individual rooms seemed to have been reworked with greater ornamentation added. Despite these changes, locations on slopes seem to have preferred throughout, granting the effect of overlooking the city but the structures were not stylistically ornate. However, unlike the closed spaces of palaces there was greater human traffic between gymnasia and the city and more vantage points to see out across the landscape. Even in cases where a downslope position in the city limited visibility, an attempt was made to elevate its position. Conversely, gymnasia were more closed than theatres or even temples, as they primarily served one class of people, young men (*ephebes*). This makes the wide staircase described above at Amphipolis particularly striking: most gymnasia had small, undistinguished entrances. They become more ornate over time, but are hardly ever in an axial position so that the structures had marked visibility but were no so public as to be part of a processional routes, as temples or theatres could be. Key considerations in the choice of site include the available of water for ritual wash basins (*loutra*) and appropriate for a stadion-length xystos.[818]

817 Von den Hoff 2009, 254–256. Kottaridē has suggested a location on the outskirts on Aigai in the mid-fourth century. She has not published any of the details, so this claim remains difficult to assess, but if this is true, its location would presumably follow a Classical model, such as the epigraphically known gymnasion of Athens.

818 Von den Hoff 2009, 252–4

Both the archaeology of physicial forms and written sources (particularly with the inclusion of inscriptions) have an important role to play, but how can we focus on individual details without an overlay of textual determinism? Moreover, how can we appreciate multifunctionality in rooms that emerges at an individual site or group of sites? These questions becomes especially striking, because only a limited number of gymnasia provide evidence. Answering them requires close analysis of room forms and syntax where these features are observable. Evidence for architectural syntax and different functional possibilities does not allow for a single model of gymnasium design, whether following Vitruvius or otherwise. Nevertheless, the palaistra anchors most gymnasia often with an adjacent paradromos. The xystos too was often adjacent or in close proximity to this space, and its absence or separation can usually be explained by the lack of available space for its length. Another factor is the wide variety in the land area of xystos structures, from the common footprint of 1000 m^2 to over 4500 m^2 in Olympia and Pergamon. Besides these three main spaces, the number of rooms multiplied in the late third and second centuries BC. Datable to a similar period, and perhaps related, is the transfer of public functions to gymnasia.[819]

From the beginning loutra and other washbasins are architecturally marked. It is clear as well that gymnasia were used for public feasts, as is shown possibly by Room E at Delphi and definitely by the clearly distinguished *androne*s at Eretria, Olympia, Delos, and (from the first century BC) Pergamon. However, these spaces could only have accommodated 9-15 symposiasts. Cult acts (beyond ritual washing) are also known, though normally without a reserved place, except for the temple and altar in the gymnasion at Pergamon. This gymnasion,

819 Ibid., 248–51.

however, may have had a special local role, as it was visually integrated with the temples above it, even though physically separate from them. The role of gymnasia as educational space is known especially from the Platonic dialogues; this function probably occurred in specially constructed *exedrai* around the *palaistra*, and the presence of libraries within gymnasia is also likely. Though mostly hypothetical, such *exedrai* are known from the gymnasion at Priene. Vitruvius (V, 11) describes 'exedrae spatiosae habentes sedes', and they are also known epigraphically in rooms designated as *apodyteria*, showing the depth of function this term can imply. The giving of lessons as well as conversation watching can be well-imagined in these spaces.[820]

No elaborate marble is known in the interior of gymnasia before the second century. Stone walls were often supported by wood beams. A more open and communicative architecture is characteristic of the second century, as gymnasia became more public. The importance of pre-second century gymnsia is rather emphasized by the extraordinary demand for water they imposed. This expenditure for sports and education shows the centrality of these pursuits in Hellenistic Greek culture, and the related emphasis on hygiene and the upbringing of young citizens.[821]

Theatres were venues for certain kinds of political communication, not only drama but equally the drama of Greek politics, defining political society, social stratification.[822] The koilon usually extended beyond the orchestra, and society had its own drama of moving about the theatre.[823] Priene's theatre provides a useful example for understanding social change over time. Unlike in the deme theatres in Attika, a fence restricted

820 Ibid., 254–6.
821 Ibid. 258–262,
822 Von Hesberg 2009, 276, 279; Paga 2010.
823 Von Hesberg 2009, 280.

access to the orchestra and had a standard hemicycle of seats with five seats of honour within a trapezoidal cavea from the mid-third century. From there a new bench of honorary seats was added and the theatre was monumentalized, dividing and controlling access in several ways. The seats of honour were especially recognizable and procession to them probably became part of the play. Finally, from ca. 300–150 BC, there was a simple scene building with two floors and dividing rooms mostly closed off with doors, but after 160 BC these rooms werely largely opening, leading the theatre's excavators to conclude that its main function was for games.[824]

Architecture, Space and Political History

On the central question with which we began this thesis, to what extent Macedonian urbanism constituted a continuation of the polis tradition (as Hatzopoulos suggests) or a radical break from it, the answer must be mixed and nuanced. The research in its early stages across the Aegean, but particularly for sites in Asia Minor much better known and documented than those in Macedonia, suggests a division between activities characteristic of the earlier and later periods. Early on, scholars have noted an orientation to activities of state formation based on political participation of citizens. Throughout the course of the Hellenistic period, however, that transformed to incorporate the influence of supranational, dynastic forces such as euergetism and the expansion of cult. These trends seem roughly to be followed in Macedonia, even if

824 Ibid., 280–2.

evidence for the later period is lacking, and it is more difficult to trace broader political participation.

As suggested in the introductory chapter, Hölscher's powerful analysis of the monumental character of Athens implies a new dynamic in Greek urbanism developed there in the fifth century BC. Unfortunately, the lack of similarly robust detail for public space in contemporary cities and the reliance on key monuments from the fourth-century and later to discuss Greek urbanism make the accomplishment of Athens difficult to contextualize in Classical times. It is thus incumbent on archaeologists of the Hellenistic period to help sort out influences deriving from earlier times and innovations in the better-surviving cities of their period to explain the diachronic development of Greek urban forms and their social significance. Alcock has suggested the need to 'break up the Hellenistic World', by which she means revoking the ideology surrounding its study by way of geographical segmentation.[825] Although her evidence exclusively comes from intensive surveys, I think that such an injunction is equally suited to regional accumulation of site-based data.

I noted in Ch. 1 the existence of impasse between scholars who emphasise the existence of apparently civic institutions in Macedonia reminiscent of the Classical Greek polis tradition and those who instead cite the scale of Hellenistic cities as a departure from that tradition. From a Weberian standpoint that looks for the physical homes of polis institutions, the evidence from Macedonian lacks many of the buildings associated with Classical Greek poleis. There is not yet evidence of the

825 Alcock 1994.

characteristic places of public assembly in Macedonia (*prytaneia, ekklesiasteria, bouleteria*). While theatres are present in Macedonia, they may have served as an ideal venue for the performance of royal ritual more than public assembly. No doubt plays were performed, even put on by Athenian playwrights, but there is no suggestion of the political role for the dramatic festivals as happened at Athens. Macedonians may have been more the spectators than the actors in the kingdom's drama of political ritual. There is likewise no attestation of any Macedonian city acting independently of the king as the cities of Asia Minor, for instance, may have done.

So if we look alone to Weberian traits, we must answer the question of polis vitality in Macedonian decidedly negatively. If an Athenian or a Milesian were to visit Pella, he would not recognize the characteristic buildings of the city as equivalent to those of his home city. If by contrast we were to attend to the social function of institutions in the public space, especially guided by Plato's preoccupations with the division of labour, allowing citizens to fulfil their social roles and live in a well-ordered city so they could flourish a human beings, we might well have a more positive reply. If evidence from Macedonia does not conform to our long-standing notions of *polis* life, it is as much an opportunity for us to revisit our conceits as to judge Macedonians outside of the established model. Indeed, we may find the Greek penchant for localism strikingly confirmed in the very individual functions of Macedonian cities.

Dynastic and civic elements work together to create the social meaning of space in Hellenistic Macedonia, as they did throughout the

oikoumenē. Determining the particular way they interact toward communicating particular functions and ideals of interaction helps to identify to particular character of public building and its impact upon a given community. In Dēmētrias, we have seen that the two elements are negotiated that at once make a firm statement of royal power, but also of civic identity and in fact the merger of the two. Hellenistic Epirus shows a revival of political architecture that is not popular in Macedonia: the free-standing stoa, bouleterion, prytaneion, but with the use of porticoes to control space in ways that show the influence of Macedonian royal architecture. The wider Aegean tells a similar story, which developed over the course of the third and second centuries. Macedonian architecture and the organization of space it afforded likewise developed over the course of the Hellenistic period, even if the state of the evidence does not offer a full picture.

The evidence from Macedonia thus contributes to ongoing reappraisal of long-standing ideas about Hellenistic development, in line with new research and approaches in other regions. The overriding point is the importance of local prerogatives in assessing the material record. This should not be seen as an outright reversal of older suggestions, but a contribution to the discussions from an explicitly archaeological point of view. There are various directions for future enquiry that might be indicated, but taking our directions from Hellenistic Macedonia, several points stand out. These include the view that civic benefactions and new foundations expressed royal power and that social institutions preserved

(and sometimes embellished) or diminished and the supposed decline in religious architecture in our period.

Interaction of dynastic and civic prerogatives leads us into the problem of the relationship of the palace and the agora. I have noted that at Aigai, the presumed agora stands in special physical relationship with the palace and theatre complex, and links the social rituals that occurred in each. At Pella, the monumental agora with its sundry collection of exotic products marks the city as a market for the Macedonian kingdom. At the same time, the civic officials who are attested there and who may well have lived in the monumental houses immediately to the south, are distinguished physically and politically from the activities of the palace. Although the evidence from Amphipolis and Kassandreia remains difficult, we can see the wholesale expansion and orthogonal planning based on Macedonian architectural forms there. Despite local differences arising from their specific history and strategic value, little distinction can be shown in the manner of development between older possessions such as Mieza, Aigai and Pella and cities conquered by Philip II such as Poteidaia/Kassandreia or Amphipolis. Political space in the latter cities reflected civic identity at the same time as Macedonian power, just as their political leaders were the figureheads of royal administration, even where they are not formally integrated into the Macedonian state. What is instead emphasized is the specific value, function and history of the city in question.

Some general comments about the physical form of buildings in the cities studied are in order. The similarity of the agora at Pella to the plans

of the palace courtyards at both Pella and Dēmētrias is striking. The central peristyle of the palace at Dēmētrias went even further than the main peristyles at Aigai and Pella, which I have mentioned were already notable for the use of the largest columns throughout the complexes. This was enhanced in its main phase by making the peristyle taller than the exterior façades of the building so that its internal architecture would be visible throughout the city. Its coloured adornment combined with this complete the shift of interest to interior spaces. This was already a trend in late-fifth and fourth century temple, but it was taken to its logical conclusion in Macedonian palaces. Although formally sacred space is rare in Dēmētrias, the spatial significance of the temple of Artemis Iolkia somewhat mirrors the close association of sanctuaries and public space in Macedonia proper. The patterning of royal, civic and religious space in similar building formats, employed to similar effects (more rigidly controlling the movement of people), signals a new idea of political space unique to the Macedonian state, and indicative of Macedonian presence abroad.

Bibliography (text)

Adam, J.P. 1982. *L'Architecture militaire grecque*. Paris: Paris : Picard.

Adam-Velenē, P. 1992. "Ελληνιστικά στοιχεία από ανασκαφές στη Θεσσαλονίκη." *ΑΕΜΘ* 3 (1989):227–39.
———. 2013. The Hellenistic Balaneion at the Roman Forum of Thessaloniki. In *Greek baths and bathing culture : new discoveries and approaches*, edited by S.K. Lucore and M. Trümper. Leuven: Peeters.
Adams, W.L. 2007. The frontier policy of Philip II. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία. VII, Η Μακεδονία από την Εποχή του Σιδήρου εως το θάνατο του Φιλίππου Β': ανακοινώσεις κατά το Έβδομο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 14-19 Οκτωβρίου 2002*, edited by D. Kaplanidou and E. Chiōtē 280. Thessalonikē.
Adrymi-Simane, B. 2012. Μαγνησία. In *Αρχαίες πόλεις Θεσσαλίας και περίοικων περιοχών*, edited by E. Nikolaou and S. Kravaritou. Larisa.
Akamatēs, G.M. 1989. "Πρόσθετα ανασκαφικά για τη χρονολόγηση της καταστροφής της αγοράς της Πέλλας." *Εγνατία* 1:171–91, 403–28.
———. 1990. "Αγορά Πέλλας, 1989." *Εγνατία* 2:423–34.
———. 1991. "Η αγορά της Πέλλας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 2 (1988):75–83.
———. 1992. "Η αγορά της Πέλλας κατά το 1989." *ΑΕΜΘ* 3 (1989):75–84.
———. 1993. "Η αγορά της Πέλλας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 4 (1990):143–54.
———. 1995. "Η αγορά της Πέλλας κατά το 1991 - 1992." *ΑΕΜΘ* 6 (1992):111–25.
———. 1997. "Αγορά Πέλλας, 1990 - 1993." *Εγνατία* 4 (1993-4):231–47.
———. 1997. "Η αγορά της Πέλλας κατά το 1993." *ΑΕΜΘ* 7 (1993):183–94.
———. 1998. "Αγορά Πέλλας 1994." *ΑΕΜΘ* 8 (1994):47–52.
———. 1998. "Αγορά Πέλλας 1995." *ΑΕΜΘ* 9 (1995):95–104.
———. 1999. "Αγορά Πέλλας 1997." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 11 (1997):205–13.
———. 2001. "Η ανασκαφή της αγοράς της Πέλλας κατά το 1998 και 1999." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 13 (1999):473–90.
———. 2004. "Αγορά Πέλλας. Ανασκαφική περίοδος 2002." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 16 (2002):437–46.
———. 2005. "Πέλλα 2003 : Νέα δεδομένα για την αγορά της." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 17 (2003):485–96.
———. 2007. "Πανεπιστημιακή ανασκαφή Αγοράς Πέλλας 2005." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 19 (2005):407–26.
———. 2011. Pella. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
Alcock, S.E. 1994. Breaking up the hellenistic world. Survey and society. In *Classical Greece : ancient histories and modern archaeologies*, edited by I. Morris. Cambridge.
Alexander, J.A. 1963. *Potidaea : its history and remains*. Athens, Ga. (USA): University of Georgia Press.
Allamani-Souri, V., and E. Voutyras. 1995. New documents from the sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas at Beroia. In *Inscriptions of Macedonia. Third International Symposium on Macedonia, Thessaloniki 8 - 12 December 1993*.
Allamanē, V., and A. Koukouvou. 2000. "Μίεζα: Ανασκαφικές έρευνας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 12 (1998):371–81.
Allamanē, V., A. Koukouvou, and E. Psarra. 2009. "Μίεζα: πόλη Ημαθίας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 χρόνια:17–29.

Allamanē, V., and A. Koukouvou. 1998. "Μίεζα 1995: ανασκαφές έρευνες." *ΑΕΜΘ* 9 (1995):79–94.
Allamanē, V., A. Koukouvou, and E. Psarra. 2004. "Το κτηριακό συγκρότημα της Μίεζας: ερμηνευτικές προσεγγίσεις και προοπτικές της έρευνας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 16 (2002):571–83.
Allamanē, V., and B. Misaelidou. 1995. "Ανασκαφές έρευνες στη Αρχαία «Μίεζα»." *ΑΕΜΘ* 6 (1992):203–15.
Ameling, W., K. Bringmann, H.v. Steuben, and B. Schmidt-Dounas. 1995. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
Andreou, S., and K. Kotsakis. 1994. Prehistoric rural communities in perspective. The Langadas survey project. In *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques : actes du colloque de Corfou (14-16 mai 1992)*, edited by L.G. Mendōnē and P. Doukellēs. Paris.
Andronikos, M. 1984. "Ανασκαφές στη Βεργίνα." *Prakt* 1982:52–6.
———. 1984. *Vergina : the royal tombs and the ancient city*. Athens: Ekdotike Athenon.
———. 1985. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *Prakt*: 55–68, pl. 13–8.
———. 1988. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *Prakt* 1984:66–70, pl. 4–81.
———. 1988a. "Βεργίνα. Ανασκαφή 1987." *ΑΕΜΘ* 1 (1987): 81–8.
Andronikos, M., S. Drougou, and C. Paliadele. 1994. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας, 1990 - 1991." *Prakt* 1991:235–55, pl. 112–18.
Andronikos, M., S. Drougou, and P. Phaklarēs. 1992. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *Prakt* 1989:185–98, pl. 26–35.
Andronikos, M., S. Drougou, P. Phaklarēs, C. Saatsoglou-Paliadelē, and A. Kottaridē. 1990. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *Prakt* 1993:170–84, pl. 16–23.
Andronikos, M., et al. 1986. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας 1982-83." *Prakt* 1983:42–54, pl. 6–69.
———. 1991. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *Prakt* 1990:126–48, pl. 95–99.
Andronikos, M., and A. Kottaridē. 1990. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *Prakt* 1986:103–11, pl. 30–3.
Archibald, Z.H. 2013. *Ancient economies of the northern Aegean : fifth to first centuries BC*. Oxford.
Aymard, A. 1950. "Sur l'assemblée macédonienne." *REA* 52:115–37.
Baziou-Efstathiou, A. 2002. *Demetrias*. Athens : Ministry of Culture.
Bakhuizen, S.C. 1992. *A Greek city of the fourth century B.C*, Bibliotheca archaeologica. Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider.
———. 1996. "Neleia. A contribution to a debate." *Orbis terrarum* 2:85–120.
Beck, H., and P. Funke. 2015. *Federalism in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Beck, H.-G. 1997. *Polis und Koinon : Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhunder v. Chr.*, Historia Einzelschriften 114. Stuttgart: Granz Steiner Verlag.
Bergquist, B. 1990. Sympotic space. A functional aspect of Greek dining-rooms. In *Sympotica. A symposium on the symposion. First Symposium on the Greek Symposion, Oxford 4 - 8 September 1984.*, edited by O. Murray. Oxford.
Besios, M. 2010. *Πιερίδων Στέφανος : Πύδνα, Μεθώνη και οι αρχαιότητες της βόρειας Πιερίας*. Katerinē: Ekdóseis A.PH.E.
Besios, M., and G.Z. Tziphopoulos. 2010. *Pieridōn Stephanos : Pydna, Methōnē kai hoi archaiotētes tēs voreias Pierias*. 1. ekd. ed. Katerinē [Greece: A.Ph.E.
Billows, R.A. 1990. *Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Hellenistic culture and society 4. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Bintliff, J. 1997. "Regional survey, demography, and the rise of complex societies in the ancient Aegean : core-periphery, neo-Malthusian, and other interpretative models." *Journal of Field Archaeology*:1–38.

Bintliff, J.L. 2010. Classical Greek Urbanism : A Social Darwinian View. In *Valuing others in classical antiquity*, edited by R.M. Rosen and I. Sluiter. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Boehm, R. 2018. *City and empire in the age of the successors : urbanization and social response in the making of the Hellenistic kingdoms*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Boehm, R.A. 2011. Synoikism, urbanization, and empire in the early hellenistic period. PhD, California.

Bogdani, J. 2012. Genesi urbana e organizzazione del territorio nella Caonia In *Il territorio di Phoinike in Caonia : archeologia del paesaggio in Albania meridionale*, edited by E. Giorgi and J. Bogdani. Bologna: Ante Quem.

Borza, E.N. 1990. *In the shadow of Olympus : the emergence of Macedon*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 2000. *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge, tr. Richard Nice: Polity Press.

Braund, D.C. 1980. "Artemis Eukleia and Euripides' Hippolytus." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100:184–5.

Braunert, H., and T. Petersen. 1972. "Megalopolis, Anspruch und Wirklichkeit." *Chiron* 2:57–90.

Briant, P. 1973. *Antigone le Borgne: les débuts de sa carrière et les problèmes de l'Assemblée macédonienne*, Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne (Series). Paris: Belles Lettres.

Brocas-Deflassieux, L. 1999. *Béroia, cité de Macédoine : étude de topographie antique*. Béroia: Municipalité de Béroia.

Bruno, V.J. 1969. "Antecedents of the Pompeian First Style." *American Journal of Archaeology* 73:705–17.

Cahill, N. 2002. *Household and city organization at Olynthus*. New Haven, Conn. & London: Yale University Press.

Callataÿ, F.d. 2005. A quantitative survey of Hellenistic coinages : recent achievements. In *Making, moving and managing : the new world of ancient economies, 323–31 BC*, edited by Z.H. Archibald, J.K. Davies and V. Gabrielsen. Oxford: Oxbow.

Camp, J.M. 2001. *The archaeology of Athens*. New Haven, Conn. & London: Yale University Press.

Carlier, P. 2000. Homeric and Macedonian kingship. In *Alternatives to Athens : varieties of political organization and community in Ancient Greece*, edited by R. Brock and S. Hodkinson.

Carney, E.D. 2000. *Women and monarchy in Macedonia*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Casson, S. 1968. *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria : their relations to Greece from the earliest times down to the time of Philip son of Amyntas*. Groningen [repr. of Oxford, 1926 ed.]: Bouma's Boekhuis.

Cawkwell, G. 1996. The end of Greek liberty. In *Transitions to empire : essays in Greco-Roman history, 360-146 B.C. in honor of E. Badian*, edited by R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris. Norman & London: University of Oklahoma Press.

Chaniotes, A. 2005. *War in the Hellenistic world : a social and cultural history*. Malden, Mass.

Christaras, B. 2009. P-wave velocity and quality of building materials. In *Recent Advances in Geology and Seismology*, edited by L. Trilling. Cambridge.
Christesen, P., and S.C. Murray. 2010. Macedonian Religion. In *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, edited by J. Roisman and I. Worthington. Oxford.
Chrysostomou, A. 1988. "Το τείχος της Έδεσσας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 1 (1987):161–72.
———. 2013. *Αρχαία Έδεσσα : τα νεκροταφεία*, Μελέτες 5. Volos.
Chrysostomou, P. 1987. Η τοπογραφία της Βόρειας Βοττιαίας : Η Πέλλα, η αποικία της Πέλλας και οι χώρες της. In *Πόλις και χώρα στην αρχαία Μακεδονία και Θράκη. Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη : Πρακτικά Αρχαιολογικού Συνεδρίου, Καβάλα 9-11 Μαΐου 1986*. Thessalonikē: Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού, Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης.
———. 1991. "Λουτρά στο ανάκτορο της Πέλλας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 2 (1988):113–26.
———. 1997. "Το ανάκτορο της Πέλλας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 10A (1996):105–42.
———. 2004. "Ανάκτορο Πέλλας 2002. Βασίλειος κάραβος." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 16 (2002):447–56.
———. 2005. "Ανάκτορο Πέλλας 2001. Βασίλειος κάραβος." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 15 (2001):441–50.
———. 2011. "Πέλλης Βασίλειον." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 22 (2008):129–40.
Clarke, D.L., ed. 1977. *Spatial archaeology*. London & New York.
Clay, J.S. 2016. The Justice of Zeus in the Theogony ? In *The gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry : from the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by J.J. Clauss, M. Cuypers and A. Kahane. Stuttgart: Steiner.
Cole, J.W. 1975. "Peisistratus on the Strymon." *Greece & Rome* 22 (1):42-4.
Cole, S.G. 1984. *Theoi Megaloi : the cult of the great gods at Samothrace*, Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain. Leiden: Brill.
Corsten, T. 1999. Vom Stamm zum Bund : Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer BundesstaatenHabilitationsschrift, Oberhummer Gesellschaft, Universität Heidelberg.
Corvisier, J.-N. 1991. *Aux origines du miracle grec : peuplement et population en Grèce du nord*. Paris.
Crowther, C. 1995. "Iasos in the second century B.C., 3. Foreign judges from Priene." *BICS* 40:91–138.
Crowther, C.V. 1993. "Foreign judges in Seleucid cities (GIBM 421)." *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8.
———. 1996. "I.Priene 8 and the history of Priene in the Early Hellenistic Period." *Chiron* 26:195–250.
———. 2006. A Judicial Fragment from Chios. In *Chiakon Symposion eis mnēmēn W. G. Forrest*, edited by G.E. Malouchou and A.P. Matthaiou. Athēna: Hellenikē Epigraphikē Hetaireia.
———. 2006. Foreign judges in Thessaly in the Hellenistic Period: A second century phenomenon? In *Inscriptions and history of Thessaly : new evidence*, edited by C. Habicht and G.A. Pikoulas. Volos.
Dakarēs, S. 1971. *Cassopaia and the Elean colonies*. 1 vols, Archaies Hellēnikes poleis 4. Athens: Athens Center of Ekistics.

———. 1972. *Θεσπρωτία*. 1 vols, Archaies Hellēnikes poleis 4. Athens: Athens Center of Ekistics.
Daux, G. 1959. "Sur les décrets de Démétrias relatifs au sanctuaire d'Apollon Coropaios." *BCH* 83:285–7.
Delacoulonche, M. 1858. *Mémoire sur le berceau de la puissance Macédonienne, des bords de L'Haliacmon à ceux de L'Axius*. Paris.
Dickenson, C.P. 2012. On the agora: power and public space in Hellenistic and Roman Greece. PhD, Groningen, Rijksuniversiteit.
Chapinal-Heras, D. 2021. *Experiencing Dodona : The Development of the Epirote Sanctuary from Archaic to Hellenistic Times*. Berlin & Boston.
Dodds, E.R. 1960. *Euripides, Bacchae*. 2nd ed. ed. Oxford: Oxford : Clarendon Press.
Donati, J.C. 2010. Towards an agora: the spatial and architectural development of civic space in the Peloponnese. PhD, New York University.
———. 2015. The city in the Greek and Roman world. In *The Oxford handbook of Greek and Roman art and architecture*, edited by C. Marconi. New York: Oxford University Press.
Drougou, S. 1992. "Το αρχαίο θέατρο της Βεργίνας και ο περιβάλλων χώρος του." *ΑΕΜΘ* 3 (1989):13–20.
———. 1993. "Βεργίνα. Ιερό Μητέρας των Θεών-Κυβέλης." *ΑΕΜΘ* 4 (1990):5–20.
———. 1997. "Βεργίνα 1990 - 1997. Το ιερό της Μητέρας των θεών." *ΑΕΜΘ* 10Α (1996):41–54.
———. 2002. "Βεργίνα 2000. Το αρχαίο θέατρο." *ΑΕΜΘ 14 (2000)*:519–26.
———. 2003. "Βεργίνα. Η πόλη των Αιγών. Συμβολή στην ερμηνεία των αρχαιολογικών ευρημάτων." *Εγνατία* 7:129–61.
———. 2011. Das Metroon von Aigai : der chthonische Charakter der Göttermutter - archäologische Befunde, edited by O. Pilz and M. Vonderstein. Boston & Berlin: de Gruyter.
———. 2011. Vergina––The ancient city of Aegae. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
———. 2011. "Η Ακρόπολη της αρχαίας πόλης στο Καστρί Πολυνερίου του Ν. Γρεβενών : Τα ιχνη των αρχαίων Τυμφαίων." *Το Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στήν Άνω Μακεδονία* 1 (2009):57–63.
Durkheim, É. 1938. *The rules of sociological method*. 8th ed., S A Solovay & J H Mueller, tr.; G E G Catlin, ed. ed. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
———. 1984. *The division of labour in society*, Contemporary social theory (London, England). W. D. Halls, tr., Basingstoke: Macmillan.
Edson, C. 1955. "Strepsa (Thucydides 1. 61. 4)." *Classical Philology* 50 (3):169-90.
Edson, C.F. 1934. "The Antigonids, Heracles, and Beroea." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 45:213-46.
Ellis-Evans, A. 2013. “The Ideology of Public Subscriptions”, in *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, edited by P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas. Oxford, 107-21
Emme, B. 2013. *Peristyl und Polis : Entwicklung und Funktionen öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*, Urban spaces 1. Berlin & Boston: W. de Gruyter.
Erlin, M. 2012. "Schiller's Island: "Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen" as Robinsonade." *Colloquia Germanica* 45 (3/4):263-79.

Errington, R.M. 2007. The Importance of the capture of Amphipolis for the devlopment of the Macedonian city. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία. VII, Η Μακεδονία από την Εποχή του Σιδήρου εως το θάνατο του Φιλίππου Β': ανακοινώσεις κατά το Έβδομο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 14-19 Οκτωβρίου 2002*. Thesalonikē.

———. 2008. *A history of the Hellenistic World*, Blackwell history of the ancient world. Malden, Mass. & Oxford: Blackwell Pub. Ltd.

Faugeres, L. 1981. Travertines quaternaires en Naoussa (Macedoine, Grèce). In *Formations Carbonatées Externes*. Paris.

Fiechter, E. 1931. *Das Theater in Megalopolis*, Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig. Forschungsinstitut für klassische Philologie und Archäologie. Antike griechische Theaterbauten, Hft. 4. Stuttgart: Stuttgart : W. Kohlhammer.

———. 1937. *Das Theater in Eretria*, Antike griechische Theaterbauten, Hft. 8. Stuttgart: Stuttgart : W. Kohlhammer.

Franke, P.R. 1961. *Die antiken Münzen von Epirus*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Franks, H.M. 2012. *Hunters, heroes, kings : the frieze of tomb II at Vergina*, Ancient art and architecture in context ; 3. Princeton, N. J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Friedrich, C. 1905. "Demetrias." *MDAI(A)* 30:221–44.

Funke, P. 2001. Acheloos' homeland. New historical-archaeological research on the ancient polis Stratos. In *Foundation and destruction. Nikopolis and northwestern Greece. The archaeological evidence for the city destructions, the foundation of Nikopolis and the synoecism*, edited by J. Isager. Athens.

———. 2007. Die staatliche Neuformierung Griechenlands. : Staatenbünde und Bundesstaaten. In *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus : von Alexander dem Großen bis Kleopatra*, edited by G. Weber. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Funke, P., and M. Haake, eds. 2013. *Greek federal states and their sanctuaries : identity and integration : proceedings of an international conference of the cluster of excellence "Religion and Politics" held in Münster, 17.06.-19.06.2010*. Stuttgart.

Funke, P., N. Moustakis, and B. Hochschulz. 2004. Epeiros. In *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*, edited by M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gaebler, H. 1906. *Die antiken Münzen von Makedonia und Paionia*, Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.

Gauthier, P. 1982. Les cités hellénistiques. Épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des régimes politiques. In *Actes du VIIIe Congrès International d'Épigraphie grecque et latine*. Athens.

———. 1987. "Grandes et petites cités. Hégémonie et autarcie." *Opus. Rivista internazionale per la storia economica e sociale dell'antichità.* 6:187–202.

———. 1993. Les cités hellénistiques. In *The Ancient Greek City-State : Symposium on the occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, July 1-4 1992*, edited by M.H. Hansen 67. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Gauthier, P., and M.V. Hatzopoulos. 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*, Meletēmata 16. Athens: Kentron Hellēnikēs kai Rōmaïkēs Archaiotētos, Ethnikon Hidryma Ereunōn.

Gauthier, P., and D. Rousset. 2011. *Études d'histoire et d'institutions grecques : choix d'écrits*, Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 47. Genève: Droz.

Gauthier, P., D. Rousset, and École pratique des hautes études (France). Section des sciences historiques et philologiques. 2011. *Études d'histoire et d'institutions grecques : choix d'écrits*, III--Hautes études du monde gréco-romain, 47. Genève: Librairie Droz.

Ghilardi, M. 2007. Dynamiques spatiales et reconstitutions paléogeographiques de la plaine de Thessalonique (Grèce) à l'holocène récent. Doctorat, CNRS.

Ginouvès, R. 1959. *L'établissement thermal de Gortys d'Arcadie*, Études péloponnésiennes. Paris: J. Vrin.

Gorman, Vanessa B. 1995. "Aristotle's Hippodamos ('Politics' 2.1267b22-30)." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 44, 385–95.

Gounaropoulou, L., and M.V. Hatzopoulos. 1998. *Επιγραφές κάτω Μακεδονίας (μεταξύ του Βερμίου όρους και του Αξιού ποταμού)*. Athens & Paris: Upourgeio Politismou ; Diffusion de Boccard.

Graikos, I. 2008. "Ταφικά ευρήματα κλασικών χρόνων από το νότιο νεκροταφείο της Βέροιας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 20 (2006):821-32.

Grammenos, D.V., P. Adam-Velenē, D. Aktseli, V. Allamani-Souri, C. Gatzolis, K. Tzanavari, and D. Hardy. 2003. *Roman Thessaloniki*. Edited by D.V. Grammenos, P. Adam-Velenē, D. Aktseli, V. Allamani-Souri, C. Gatzolis, K. Tzanavari and D. Hardy, Thessaloniki Archaeological Museum publications 1. Thessalonikē: Archaeological Museum.

Granier, F. 1931. *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung : ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht*, Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte. München: Beck.

Green, P. 2007. *Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Age : a short history*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Greenwalt, W. 1999. "Why Pella?" *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 48 (2):158-83.

Grotta, C. 2009. *Zeus Meilichios a Selinunte*, Historica. Rome.: Giorgio Bretschneider.

Gruen, E.S. 1984. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*. Berkeley & London: University of California Press.

———. 1993. The Polis in the Hellenistic World. In *Nomodeiktes : Greek studies in honor of Martin Ostwald*, edited by R.M. Rosen and J. Farrell. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Haggis, D.C. 2015. The Archaeology of Urbanization : Research Design and the Excavation of an Archaic Greek City on Crete. In *Classical archaeology in context : theory and practice in excavation in the Greek world*, edited by D.C. Haggis and C.M. Antonaccio. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hall, J. M. *A history of the archaic Greek* world. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Hamilton, J.R. 1971. Introduction. In *Arrian. The Campaigns of Alexander*, edited by A. De Sélincourt and J.R. Hamilton. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hammond, N.G.L. 1967. *Epirus : the geography, the ancient remains, the history and topography of Epirus and adjacent areas*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

———. 1972. *A history of Macedonia, 1. Historical geography and prehistory*. Oxford.

———. 1980. "Some Passages in Arrian concerning Alexander." *CQ* 30 (2):455-76.

———. 1989. *The Macedonian State : origins, institutions, and history*. Oxford: Clarendon.

———. 1991. "The koina of Epirus and Macedonia." *Illinois Classical Studies* 16:183–92.

Hammond, N.G.L., and G.T. Griffith. 1979. *A history of Macedonia, 2. 550 - 336 B.C*. Oxford.

Hammond, N.G.L., and M. Hatzopoulos. 1982. "The Via Egnatia in western Macedonia, 1. The routes through Lyncus and Eordaea in western Macedonia." *AJAH* 7:128–49.

Hammond, N.G.L., and F.W. Walbank. 1988. *A history of Macedonia, 3. 336-167 B.C*. Oxford.
Hansen, M.H. 1997. The polis as an urban centre. The literary and epigraphic evidence. In *The polis as an urban centre and as a political community : symposium, August, 29–31, 1996*, edited by M.H. Hansen 4. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
———. 2004. Boiotia. In *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis : an investigation conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, edited by M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hansen, M.H., and T. Fischer-Hansen. 1994. Monumental political architecture in archaic and classical Greek poleis. Evidence and historical significance. In *From political architecture to Stephanus Byzantius. Sources for the ancient Greek polis*, edited by D. Whitehead. Stuttgart.
Hansen, M.H., and T.H. Nielsen. 2004. *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis : an investigation conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Haseley, A. 2004. Vorbericht zu den Untersuchungen am Südwestgebäude von Olympia. In *Bericht über die 42. Tagung für Ausgrabungswissenschaft und Bauforschung : vom 8. bis 12. Mai 2002 in München*.
Haubold, J. 2005. The Homeric Polis
Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1991. *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis*, [Greek] 14. Athens & Paris: Centre de Rech.
———. 1996. *Macedonian institutions under the kings*. 2 vols, Meletēmata 22. Athens: Research Centre for Greek and Roman antiquity.
———. 1997. "L'état macédonien antique. Un nouveau visage." *CR Acad. Inscr.*:7–25.
———. 2001. Macedonian palaces. Where king and city meet. In *The royal palace institution in the first millennium B.C. Regional development and cultural interchange between East and West*, edited by I. Nielsen. Århus.
———. 2011. Cities. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston.
———. 2011. Macedonians and other Greeks. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
———. 2013. Was Dion Macedonia's relgious centre? In *Greek federal states and their sanctuaries : identity and integration : proceedings of an international conference of the cluster of excellence "Religion and Politics" held in Münster, 17.06.-19.06.2010*, edited by P. Funke and M. Haake.
———. 2015. Federal Makedonia. In *Federalism in Greek antiquity*, edited by H. Beck and P. Funke. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
Hatzopoulos, M.B., and L.D. Loukopoulou. 1987. *Two studies in ancient Macedonian topography*, Meletēmata 3. Athens and Paris: Kentron Hellenikes kai Romaikes Archaiotetos ; Diffusion De Boccard.
Hatzopoulos, M.B., and P. Paschidēs. 2004. Makedonia. In *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*, edited by M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hawkins, M. 2014. "Why Begin with Aristotle? Durkheim on Solidarity and Social Morphology." *Durkheimian Studies* 10:21–37.

Heermann, V. 1986. Studien zur makedonischen Palastarchitektur. PhD, Papyrus-Druck, Erlangen.
Helly, B. 1971. "Décrets de Démétrias pour des juges étrangers." *BCH* 95:543–59.
———. 1995. *L'Etat thessalien : Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les tagoi*, Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée no. 25. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen.
Herda, A. 2005. "Apollon Delphinios, das Prytaneion und die Agora von Milet. Neue Forschungen." *Archäologischer Anzeiger*:243–94.
———. 2006. *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma : ein neuer Kommentar der sog. Molpoi-Satzung*. Edited by D.A. Institut, Milesische Forschungen 4. Mainz: P. von Zabern.
———. 2011. How to run a state cult : the organization of the cult of Apollo Delphinios in Miletos. In *Current approaches to religion in ancient Greece : papers presented at a symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens 17-19 April 2008*, edited by M. Haysom and J. Wallensten. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
Heuzey, L.A. 1860. *Le mont Olympe et l'Acarnanie, exploration de ces deux régions. Ouvrage accompagné de planches*. Paris.
Heuzey, L.A., and P.G.H. Daumet. 1876. *Mission archéologique de Macédoine, par L. Heuzey et H. Daumet. Ouvrage accompagné de planches*. Par.
Hind, J.G.F. 2001. *Centaurs, Satyrs and Nymphs on the early silver coins of Thasos and the tribes of Mount Pangaion*.
Hoepfner, W. 1996. Zum Typus der Basileia und der königlichen Andrones. In *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige. Internationales Symposion in Berlin vom 16.12.1992 bis 20.12.1992*, edited by W. Hoepfner. Mainz am Rhein.
Hoepfner, W., S. Dakarēs, J. Boessneck, and E.-L. Schwandner. 1994 [1986]. *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland*. 2., stark überarbeitete Auflage ed, Wohnen in der klassischen Polis Bd 1. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag.
Horden, P., and N. Purcell. 2000. *The corrupting sea : a study of Mediterranean history*. Oxford, England ;: Malden Blackwell.
How, W.W., and J. Wells. 1928. *A commentary on Herodotus, with introduction and appendixes*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hölscher, T. 1991. The city of Athens. Space, symbol, structure. In *City states in classical antiquity and medieval Italy. Athens and Rome, Florence and Venice. Proceedings of a symposium, Providence, May 1989.*, edited by A. Molho, K.A. Raaflaub and J. Emlen.
———. 1998. Images and political identity. The case of Athens. In *Democracy, empire, and the arts in fifth-century Athens*, edited by D.D. Boedeker and K.A. Raaflaub.
———. 1998. *Öffentliche Räume in frühen griechischen Städten*. 2.Aufl. ed. Heidelberg: Winter.
———. 2010. Athen - die Polis als Raum der Erinnerung. In *Die griechische Welt : Erinnerungsorte der Antike*, edited by E. Stein-Hölkeskamp and K.-J. Hölkeskamp. München: C. H. Beck.
———. 2012 [2009]. Urban Spaces and Central Places. The Greek world. In *Classical Archaeology*, edited by S. Alcock and R. Osborne. Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology. Oxford & Malden, Mass.
Isler, H.P. 2007. *Das Theater : Grabungen 1997 und 1998*, Eretria. Gollion: Gollion : In folio.

Jameson, M.H. 1993. *A lex sacra from Selinous*. Edited by D.R. Jordan and R.D. Kotansky, Greek, Roman, and Byzantine monographs. Durham, N. C.: Duke University.
Juri, E. 1971. "Το ιερόν του Ἄμμονος Ζευς." *AAA* 4:356–7.
———. 1976. Το εν Αφύτει ιερόν τοῦ Διονύσου και το ιερόν τοῦ Ἄμμονος Διός. In *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern : Internationales Symposion in Olympia vom 10. bis 12. Oktober 1974 anlässlich der Hundertjahrfeier der Abteilung Athen und der deutschen Ausgrabungen in Olympia*, edited by U. Jantzen. Tübingen.
Kalaitzi, M. 2016. *Figured tombstones from Macedonia, fifth-first century BC*, Oxford monographs on classical archaeology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kallet, L. 1993. *Money, expense, and naval power in Thucydides' History 1-5.24*. Berkeley & Oxford: University of California Press.
Kallinē, C. 2014. "The Cult of the Mother of the Gods (Cybele) at Aegae (modern Vergina), Northern Greece." 12th International Congress of Thracology, Targoviste, Romania: 10/09/2013–14/09/2013.
Kanta-Kitsou, E.G. 2008. *Gitana Thesprotia : Achaeological Guide*. Edited by P. Greece. Hypourgeio Politismou Ephorate of and T. Classical Antiquities of. Athens: Ministry of Culture, 32. Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Thesportia.
Karadedos, G. 1986. Το ελληνιστικό θέατρο του Δίου. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία IV : ανακοινώσεις κατά το τέταρτο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 21-25 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983*.
———. 1994. "Τελευταία στοιχεία για τη σκηνή του ελληνιστικού θεάτρου του Δίου." *ΑΕΜΘ* 5 (1991):157–69.
———. 2007. "Ένα αυτοματοποιημένο θέατρο στην υπηρεσία των θεατρικών αγώνων στο Δίον, την ιερή πόλη των Μακεδώνων." *ΑΕΜΘ* 19 (2005):381–90.
Karadedos, G., and C. Karadēma. 2004. "Αρχαίο θέατρο Μαρώνειας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 16 (2002).
Karamētrou-Mentesidē, G. 2008. *Aiani : a guide to the archaeological sites and the museum* no 15. Aianē.
Kiderlen, M. 1995. *Megale Oikia : Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung aufwendiger griechischer Stadthausarchitektur von der Früharchaik bis ins 3. Jh. v. Chr*. 2 vols. Hürth: M. Lange.
Kokkinidou, D., and K. Trantalidou. 1991. "Neolithic and bronze age settlement in western Macedonia." *ABSA*:93–106.
Kopsacheili, M. 2013. Palaces and elite residences in the Hellenistic East, late fourth to early first century BC: formation and purpose. DPhil, Oxford.
———. 2015. In search of the garden-peristyle in Hellenistic palaces : a reappraisal of the evidence. In *Aegis : essays in Mediterranean archaeology : presented to Matti Egon by the scholars of the Greek Archaeological Committee UK*, edited by Z. Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, R.D.G. Evely and M. Egon. Oxford: Archaeopress.
Kopsachieli, M. 2014. Palaces and elite residences in the Hellenistic East, late fourth to early first century BC: formation and purpose. DPhil, Oxford.
Kottaridē, A. 1988. "Ανασκαφή στο ΒΔ. τμήμα της πόλης των Αιγών." *ΑΕΜΘ* 1 (1987) 109–18.
———. 1997. "Ανασκαφή Βεργίνας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 7 (1993):77–82.
———. 2004. "Η ανασκαφή της ΙΖ΄ ΕΠΚΑ στην πόλη και στη νεκρόπολη των Αιγών το 2003-2004." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 18:527–41.
———. 2008. "Η έρευνα στις Αιγές, μια πόλη κατά κώμας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 (2006):773–80.

———. 2011. The palace of Aegae. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Kottaridē, A., and T. Vakoulēs. 1995. "Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Βεργίνας-Πουρνάρι." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 6 (1992):81–4.

Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, C. 2011. Amphipolis. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Koukoulē-Chrysanthakē, C. 1993. Η Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου στη Ανατολική Μακεδονία. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία V : ανακοινώσεις κατά το Πέμπτο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 10-15 Οκτωβρίου 1989: αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη του Μανόλη Ανδρόνικου = Ancient Macedonia V: papers read at the Fifth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 10-15, 1989: Manolis Andronikos, in memoriam*. Thessaloniki.

———. 2002. Excavating classical Amphipolis. In *Excavating Classical culture : recent archaeological discoveries in Greece*, edited by M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou. Oxford.

———. 2011. Amphipolis. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Koukouvou, A.G., and E. Psarra. 2011. Η αγορά της αρχαίας Μίεζας: Η δημόσια όψη μιας σημαντικής μακεδονικής πόλης. In *Η Αγορά στη Μεσόγειο από τους ομηρικούς έως τους ρωμαϊκούς χρόνους : Διεθνές επιστημονικό συνέδριο, Κώς 14-17 Απριλίου 2011*, edited by A. Giannikourē. Athens.

Kousoulakou, N. 1997. "Ανασκαφή Ποτίδαιας 1993." *ΑΕΜΘ* 7 (1993):455–63.

———. 1998. "Ανασκαφή Ποτίδαιας 1994." *ΑΕΜΘ* 8 (1994):305–15.

———. 2002. "Ποτίδαια 2000: Κτηριακό συγκρότημα δημοσίου χαρατήρα." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 20 (2006):321–9.

Kousoulakou, N., and V. Mēsaēlidou-Despotidou. 2008. "Ανασκαφική έρευνα στην Ποτίδαια-Κασσάνδρεια." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 (2006):503–13.

Krauss, F. 1964. "Die hellenistischen Bühnen des Theaters von Milet." *MDAI(R)* 71:112–29.

Kravaritou, S. 2011. "Synoecism and religious interface in Demetrias (Thessaly)." *Kernos. Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion grecque antique* 24:111–35.

———. 2012. Thessalian Perceptions of Ruler Cult: *archegetai* and *ktistai* from Demetrias. In *Epigraphical approaches to the post-Classical polis*, edited by P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas. Oxford.

Lalonde, G.V. 2006. *Horos Dios : an Athenian shrine and cult of Zeus*, Athenian shrine and cult of Zeus. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Lane Fox, R. 1973. *Alexander the Great*. London: Allen Lane in association with Longman.

———. 2011. 399–369 BC. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

———. 2011a. 'Glorious Servitude...': The Reigns of Antigonos Gonatas and Demetrios II. In *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC – 300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston.

———. 2011c. Introduction: Dating the royal tombs at Vergina. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
———. 2011d. Philip's and Alexander's Macedon. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
———. 2011e. The 360s. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.
Larsen, J.A.O. 1968. *Greek federal states : their institutions and history*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Lauter, H. 1975. "Die beiden älteren Tyrannenpaläste in Larisa am Hermos." *Bonner Jahrbucher* 175:33-57.
———. 1986. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Lauter, H., and H. Lauter-Bufe. 2004. "Thersilion und Theater in Megalopolis. Das Bauensemble im Licht neuer Forschungen." *AA*:135–76.
Lawrence, A.W. 1950. "Review of R. E. Wycherley, How the Greeks built Cities. Pp. xxi + 228, 16 plates, 52 figs. London, 1949." *The Classical Review* 64 (3-4):159–60.
———. 1996. *Greek architecture*. 5th ed, revised by R A Tomlinson ed, Yale University Press Pelican history of art. New Haven, Conn. & London: Yale University Press.
Lazaride, K. 1987. *Το γυμνάσιο της αρχαίας Αμφίπολις*.
———. 1989. "Το γυμνάσιο της Αμφίπολης." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη*:547-50, Abb. Taf.
Lazaride, K.D. 1986. *Ανασκαφή γυμνασίου Αμφιπόλεως*.
———. 1987. *Ανασκαφή γυμνασίου αρχαίας Αμφιπόλεως*.
———. 1989. "Ανασκαφή γυμνασίου αρχαίας Αμφιπόλεως."205-15, Abb. Taf.
Lazarides, D. 1965. *Ανασκαφαί και έρευναι εις Αμφίπολιν*.
———. 1975. *Τα τείχη της Αμφιπόλεως*.
———. 1982. *Ανασκαφές και έρευνες της Αμφίπολης*.
Lazarides, K.D. 1984. *Ανασκαφές και έρευνες στην Αμφίπολη*.
———. 1985. *Ανασκαφή γυμνασίου Αμφιπόλεως*.
Lazaridē, K.D. 1990. Το γυμνάσιο της Αμφίπολης. In *Mnēmē D. Lazaridē : polis kai chōra stēn archaia Makedonia kai Thrakē : Praktika Archaiologikou Synedriou, Kavala, 9-11 Maiou 1986*. Thessalonikē.
Lazaridēs, D. 1997. *Amphipolis*. Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.
Lazaridēs, D.I. 1963. Fouilles dans la région du Pangée. Le rayonnement des civilisations grecque et romaine sur les cultures périphériques. In *VIIIe Congrès international d'archéologie classique : rapports et communications*. Paris.
———. 1964. "Ανασκαφαί και έρευναι εις Αμφίπολιν." *Prakt*:35–40, pl. 14–27.
———. 1971. *Ανασκαφαί και έρευναι εις Αμφίπολιν*.
———. 1976. "Επίγραμμα Παρίων από την Αμφίπολιν." *Arch* a:164-81, Abb. Taf.
Lazarē, K., A. Tzōrtzatou, and K. Kountourē. 2008. *Δημκάστρο Θεσπρωτίας : Αρχαιολογικός Οδηγός*. Athens.
Le Rider, G. 1991. "Trésors de statères d'or trouvés à Potidée en 1984 et à Skioné en 1985." *RN* 33:89–96.

———. 1996. *Monnayage et finances de Philippe II : un état de la question*, Meletēmata 23. Athens & Paris: Kentron Hellēnikēs kai Rōmaïkēs Archaiotētos ;
Broccard.
Leake, W.M. 1835. *Travels in northern Greece*. 4 vols., London.
Lefebvre, H. 1991 [1974]. *The production of space*. Oxford, tr. Donald Nicholson-Smith: Blackwell.
Lévy, E. 1983 “The *polis* in Homer.” *Ktema* 8: 55–73.
Liampi, K. 2005. "Iolkos and Pagasai. Two new Thessalian mints."23–40.
Lilimpakē-Akamatē, M. 1987. Ιερά της Πέλλας. In *Πόλις και χώρα στην αρχαία Μακεδονία και Θράκη. Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη : Πρακτικά Αρχαιολογικού Συνεδρίου, Καβάλα 9-11 Μαΐου 1986*.
———. 1988. "Ανασκαφική έρευνα στην περιοχή του καναλιού της Πέλλας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 1 (1987):137–45.
———. 1994. "Ανασκαφική έρευνα στην περιοχή του καναλιού της Πέλλας κατά την περίοδο 1988-1991." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 5 (1991):83–95.
———. 1996. *Το θεσμοφόριο της Πέλλας*, Dēmosieumata tou Archaiologikou deltiou 55. Αθήνα: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.
———. 1998. "Ένα νέο κτιριακό συγκρότημα στην περιοχή του καναλιού της Πέλλας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 9 (1995):105–16.
———. 2000. *Το ιερό της Μητέρας των Θεών και της Αφροδίτης στην Πέλλα*. Thessalonikē: s.n.
———. 2002. "Νέες ανασκαφικές έρευνες στην Πέλλα." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 14 (2000):407–20.
———. 2008. "Ανασκαφική έρευνα στην Πέλλα το 2006." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 (2006):591–614.
———. 2011. Λουτρικές εγκαταστάσεις στην Πέλλα. In *Νάματα : τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Δημήτριο Παντερμαλή*
Lilimpakē-Akamatē, M., and G.M. Akamatēs. 2003. *Πέλλα και η περιοχή της = Pella and its environs*. Αθήνα ; Θεσσαλονίκη: ΥΠΠΟ Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονικης.
———. 2012. Η πελλα απο την εποχη του χαλκου εως τα ελληνιστικα χρονια=Pella from the Bronze to the Hellenistic age. In *Θρεπτήρια : μελέτες για την Αρχαία Μακεδονία*, edited by Μ. Τιβεριος, Π. Νιγδελις and Π. Αδαμ-Βελενη. Thessaloniki.
———. 2013. "Ανιχνεύοντας την Πέλλα του 4ου αι. π.Χ." *ΑΕΜΘ* 23 (2009):205–12.
Lilimpakē-Akamatē, M., G.M. Akamatēs, A. Chrysostomou, and P. Chrysostomou. 2011. Στοιχεία για την Πελλα του πρώτου μισού του 4ου αι. π.Χ. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία VII : Η Μακεδονία από την Εποχή του Σιδήρου εως το θάνατο του Φιλίππου Β’: ανακοινώσεις κατά το Έβδομο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 14-19 Οκτωβρίου 2002: Ancient Macedonia VII October 14-19, 2002*. Thessalonikē.
Lilimpakē-Akamatē, M., and N. Akamatēs. 2010. "Το δεμόσιο λουτρό της Πελλας. Ανασκαφική περίοδος 2007." *ΑΕΜΘ* 21 (2007):91–113.
———. 2011. "Ένα νέο εργαστήριο κεραμικής στην Πέλλα " *ΑΕΜΘ* 22 (2008):147–58.
Lorber, C.C., W. Schwabacher, and W.E. McGovern. 1990. *Amphipolis : the civic coinage in silver and gold*. Los Angeles: Numismatic Fine Arts Intern.
Ma, J. 2000. Fighting poleis of the hellenistic world. In *War and violence in ancient Greece*, edited by H. van Wees. London.
———. 2003. Kings. In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. Erskine. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2003. "Peer polity interaction in the Hellenistic Age." *Past and Present* 180:9–39.
Mackil, E. 2016. "Review of: E. Meyer, 'The Inscriptions of Dodona and a New History of Molossia'." *CPhil*. 111:283–7.
Mackil, E.M. 2003. Koinon and koinonia : mechanisms and structures of political collectivity in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. PhD Thesis, Princeton.
———. 2013. *Creating a common polity : religion, economy, and politics in the making of the Greek koinon*, Hellenistic culture and society 55. Berkeley.
Magnetto, A. 2015 (online). Interstate Arbitration and Foreign Judges. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*, edited by E.M. Harris and M. Canevaro.
———. 2018. Interstate arbitration as a feature of the Hellenistic polis: between ideology, international law and civic memory. In *The polis in the Hellenistic world*, edited by H. Börm and N. Luraghi. Stuttgart.
Magnētos, N.I. 1860. *Περιήγησις ή τοπογραφία της Θεσσαλίας και Θετταλικής Μαγνησίας*. Athens.
Makaronas, C. 1960. "Ανασκαφαί Πέλλης 1957 - 1960." *Archaiologikon Deltion* 16 (1960):Τόμος Α. (Μελέτες).72–83, 106–7 (French summary) pl. 35–90.
———. 1970. Χρονολογικά ζητήματα της Πέλλης. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία, 1 . Ανακοινώσεις κατά το Πρώτον Διεθνές Συμπόσιον εν Θεσσαλονίκη = Ancient Macedonia, 1 . Papers read at the First International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, 20 - 29 August 1968*. Thessalonikē.
Makaronas, C., and E. Giourē. 1989. *Οι Οικίες αρπαγής της Ελένης και Διονύσου της Πέλλας*, Vivliothēkē tēs en Athēnais Archaiologikēs Hetaireias ar 109. Athens: Archaiologikē Etaireia.
Makaronas, C., and S.G. Miller. 1974. "The tomb of Lyson and Kallikles. A painted hellenistic tomb." *Archaeology, 27.1974*:249-59.
Malama, P., and A. Salonikios. 2002. *Οικιστικά κατάλοιπα από την αρχαία Αμφίπολη. Σωστική ανασκαφή στο οικόπεδο Δ. Κυπριανίδη*.
Malamidou, D. 2008. "Ανασκαφικά στοιχεία για την παρουσία των Ελλήνων στην περιοχή των εκβολών του Στρυμόνα πριν από την ίδρυση της Αμφίπολης." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 (2006):185-96.
Mango, E., P. Gex, P. André, and M. Jaccard. 2003. *Eretria XIII. Das Gymnasion*. Edited by É.s.d.a.e. Grèce, Eretria 13. Gollion: Infolio Éditions.
Maniatis, Y., H. Koukouli-Chryssanthaki, and D. Malamidou. 2010. "Radiocarbon dating of the Amphipolis bridge in Northern Greece, maintained and functioned for 2500 years." *Radiocarbon* 52.1:41–63.
Mari, M. 2007. The Ruler Cult in Amphipolis and the Strymon Valley. In *Studi ellenistici XX*, edited by B. Vergilio. Pisa & Rome: Κέντρον Ελληνικής και Ρωμαϊκής Αρχαιότητος του Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών.
———. 2012. "Amphipolis between Athens and Sparta. A Philological and Historical Commentary on Thuc. V 11, 1." *Mediterraneo antico* 15:327–53.
———. 2012. "Atene, l'impero e le apoikiai. Riflessioni sulla breve vita di Anfipoli "ateniese"." *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene* 88 (2010):391–413.
———. 2012. "La conciliazione degli opposti. Il culto e il santuario di Artemide Tauropolos ad Anfipoli." *Aristonothos* 6:119–66.
Markle , M.M. 1982. Macedonian Arms and Tactics under Alexander the Great. In *Macedonia and Greece in late classical and early Hellenistic times*, edited by E.N. Borza and B. Barr-Scharrar. Washington.

Markle, M.M. 1999. "A Shield Monument from Veria and the Chronology of Macedonian Shield Types." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 68 (2):219-54.
Martin, R. 1951. *Recherches sur l'agora Grecque : études d'histoire et d'architecture urbaines*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 174. Paris: De Boccard.
———. 1974 [1956]. *L'urbanisme dans la Grèce antique*. 2e édition augmentée ed. Paris: A. & J. Picard.
Martin, R.D. 1972. Concepts of human territoriality. In *Man, settlement and urbanism*, edited by P.J. Ucko, R. Tringham and G.W. Dimbeley. London.
———. 1978. "Thasos: quelques problemes de structure urbaine." *CRAI*:182–97.
Marzolff, P. 1975. *Demetrias. Elemente einer hellenistischen Hauptstadt*.
———. 1978. Bürgerliches und herrscherliches Wohnen im hellenistischen Demetrias. In *Wohnungsbau im Altertum : Bericht über ein Kolloquium* edited by D.A.I. Architekturreferat. Berlin.
———. 1994. Antike Städtebau und Architektur in Thessalien. In *Θεσσαλία. Δεκαπέντε χρόνια αρχαιολογικής έρευνας, 1975–1990. Αποτελέσματα και Προοπτικές = La Thessalie : quinze années de recherches archéologiques, 1975-1990, bilans et perspectives*, edited by E. Kypraiou and D. Zaphiropoulou. Athens.
———. 1994. Dévelopment Urbanistique de Démétrias. In *Θεσσαλία. Δεκαπέντε χρόνια αρχαιολογικής έρευνας, 1975–1990. Αποτελέσματα και Προοπτικές = La Thessalie : quinze années de recherches archéologiques, 1975-1990, bilans et perspectives*, edited by E. Kypraiou and D. Zaphiropoulou. Athens.
———. 1996. η Πολεοδομική εξέλιξη και τα αρχιτεκτονικά έργα της περιοχής της Δημητριάδας. In *Αρχαία Δημητριάδα : η διαδρομή της στον χρόνο: πρακτικά ημερίδας 9 Νοεμβρίου 1994*, edited by E.I. Kontaxē. Volos.
Marzolff, P., and H. Lohmann. 2006. s.v. 'Demetrias'. In *Brill's New Pauly*, edited by H. Cancik and H. Schneider.
Mathisen, R.W. 1981. "Antigonus Gonatas and the silver coinages of Macedonia circa 280 - 270 B.C." *Museum Notes. The American Numismatic Society* 26:79-124.
May, J.M.F. 1939. *The coinage of Damastion and the lesser coinages of the Illyro-Paeonian region*, Oxford classical & philosophical monographs. London: Oxford university press H. Milford.
May, N.N., and U. Steinert. 2014. Introduction: Urban topography as a reflection of soiety? In *The fabric of cities : aspects of urbanism, urban topography and society in Mesopotamia, Greece, and Rome*, edited by N.N. May and U. Steinert. Leiden & Boston.
Mazarakēs, A. 2009. "Ανασκαφή Ιερού των Αρχαϊκών-Κλασικών χρόνων στη θέση 'Σωρός' (2004-2005)." *Αρχαιολογικό έργο Θεσσαλίας και Στερεάς Ελλάδας* 2 (2006):269–94.
Mazarakēs Ainian, A. 2012. "Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στο ιερό του Απόλλωνος στο Σωρό (2006- 2008)." *Αρχαιολογικό έργο Θεσσαλίας και Στερεάς Ελλάδας : πρακτικά επιστημονικής συνάντησης Βόλος* 1:287–98.
McDonald, W.A. 1943. *The political meeting places of the Greeks*, Johns Hopkins University studies in archaeology. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
McNicoll, A., and N.P. Milner. 1997. *Hellenistic fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates*, Oxford monographs on classical archaeology. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meyer, E.A. 2013. *The inscriptions of Dodona and a new history of Molossia*, Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 54. Stuttgart: Steiner.
Mili, M. 2015. *Religion and society in ancient Thessaly*, Oxford classical monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Miller, S. 1982. Macedonian Tombs: their architecture and architectural decoration. In *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic times*, edited by E.N. Borza and B. Barr-Sharrar. Washington: National Gallery of Art.
Miller, S.G. 1971. Hellenistic Macedonian architecture : its style and painted ornamentationDPhil, Bryn Mawr College.
———. 1993. *The tomb of Lyson and Kallikles : a painted Macedonian tomb*. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern.
Miller, S.G., D.E. Birge, and L.H. Kraynak. 1991. *Excavations at Nemea*. Berkeley, Calif. & Oxford: University of California Press.
Millett, P. 2010. The political economy of Macedonia. In *A companion to ancient Macedonia*, edited by J. Roisman and I. Worthington. Oxford.
Minta, A. 2009. Planning a national Pantheon : monuments in Washington, D.C. and the creation of symbolic space. In *Public space and the ideology of place in American culture*, edited by M. Orville and J.L. Miekle. Amsterdam & New York.
Misaelidou-Despotidou, B. 1993. "Από το νεκροταφείο της αρχαίας Μίεζας " *ΑΕΜΘ* 4 (1990):127–41.
Misaelidou-Despotidou, V. 1991. "Ανασκαφή στο ανάκτορο της Πέλλας, τομέας υπόστυλου δωματίου." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 2 (1988):101–9.
———. 1992. "Ανασκαφή στο ανάκτορο της Πέλλας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 3 (1989):67–74.
———. 1993. Ενσφράγιστες κεραμίδες από το Ανάκτορο της Πέλλας. In *Archaia Makedonia, V : anakoinōseis kata to Pempto Diethnes Symposio, Thessalonikē, 10-15 Oktovriou 1989 : stē mnēmē tou Manolē Andronikou = Ancient Macedonia, V : Papers read at the Fifth International symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 10-15, 1989 : in memory of Manolis Andronikos*. Thessaloniki.
Mitrevski, D. 1996. Vadarski Rid. In *Arheološka karta na Republika Makedonija*, edited by D. Koco and C. Grozdanov. Skopje, 2 vols.: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite : Muzej na Makedonija, Arheološki oddel.
Moggi, M. 2008. Synoikismos. In *Forme sovrapoleiche e interpoleiche di organizzazione nel mondo greco antico : atti del convegno internazionale, Lecce, 17-20 settembre 2008 : progetto Interreg IIIA Sosipolis*, edited by M. Lombardo and F. Frisole. Galatina (Lecce): Congedo.
Moreno, A. 2009. 'The Attic Neighbour': The Cleruchy in the Athenian Empire. In *Interpreting the Athenian empire*, edited by J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas and R. Parker. London: Duckworth.
Moretti, J.-C. 2007. *Θέατρο και κοινωνία στην Αρχαία Ελλάδα*. 2nd ed., Athens.
———. 2014. The Evolution of Theatre Architecture Outside Athens in the Fourth Century. In *Greek theatre in the fourth century B.C*, edited by E. Csapo, H.R. Goette, J.R. Green and P. Wilson. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Morgan, C. 2003. *Early Greek states beyond the polis*. London & New York: Routledge.
Morgan, C., and J.J. Coulton. 1997. The polis as a physical entity. In *The Polis as an urban centre and as a political community : Symposium August 29-31, 1996*, edited by M.H. Hansen. Copenhagen.

Morley, N. 2011. Cities and economic development in the Roman Empire. In *Settlement, Urbanization, and Population*, edited by A. Bowman and A. Wilson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Morris, I. 1991. The early polis as city and state. In *City and country in the Ancient Greek world*, edited by J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill. New York.
Morrow, Glenn R. 2012 [1960]. *Plato's Cretan City : A Historical Interpretation of the Laws*. Princeton, NJ.
Müller, K. 1990 [1855]. *Geographi graeci minores : E codicibus recognovit prolegomenis annotatione indicibus instruxit tabulis aeri incisis illustravit Carolus Müllerus*. Hildesheim: Hildesheim : G. Olms.
Nasrallah, L.S., C. Bakirtzēs, and S.J. Friesen, eds. 2010. *From Roman to early Christian Thessalonike : studies in religion and archaeology*, Harvard theological studies ; 64. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Theological Studies, Harvard Divinity School :.
Newell, E.T. 1927. *The coinages of Demetrius Poliorcetes*. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford.
Nielsen, I. 1994. *Hellenistic palaces : tradition and renewal*, Studies in Hellenistic civilization 5. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
———. 2001. The gardens of the hellenistic palaces. In *The royal palace institution in the first millennium B.C. Regional development and cultural interchange between East and West*, edited by I. Nielsen. Århus.
Oeconomides, M. 1994. Les trésors thessaliens du Musée numismatique d'Athènes. Athens.
Oikonomos, G.P. 1915. "Πέλλα. Δευτέρα ἔκθεσις περί τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας." *Praktika tes en Athenais Archaiologikes Etaireias*:237–44 + plate.
Osborne, R. 2005. Urban sprawl: what is urbanization and why does it matter? In *Mediterranean Urbanization : 800–600 BC.*, edited by R. Osborne. Oxford and New York.
Owen, S., and L. Preston. 2009. Introduction: Inside the city in the Greek world. In *Inside the city in the Greek world : studies of urbanism from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period*, edited by S. Owen and L. Preston. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
Owens, E.J. 1991. *The city in the Greek and Roman world*. London: Routledge.
Paga, J. 2010. "Deme Theaters in Attica and the Trittys System." *Hesperia* 79 (3):351–84.
Palagia, O. 2018. "Alexander the Great, the royal throne and the funerary thrones of Macedonia." *Karanos* 1:24–38.
Panagopoulou, K. 2001. The Antigonids : patterns of a royal economy. In *Hellenistic Economies*, edited by Z. Archibald, J.K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen and G.J. Oliver. London.
Pantermalēs, D. 1987. Η κεράμωση του ανακτόρου στη Βεργίνα. In *Αμητός, τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μανόλη Ανδρόνικο*.
———. 1992. "Ανασκαφή Δίου." *ΑΕΜΘ* 4 (1990):187–94.
———. 1994. "Ανασκαφή Δίου." *ΑΕΜΘ* 5 (1991):137–44.
———. 1995. "Η ύδραυλις του Δίου." *ΑΕΜΘ* 6 (1992):217–22.
———. 1997. "Δίον. Η δεκαετία των ανασκαφών 1987 - 1997." *ΑΕΜΘ* 10Α (1996):205 –13.
———. 2009. "Δίον: Ιστορικά και λατρευτικά." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 χρόνια:261–71.
Papadopoulos, J.K. 2002. *Ceramicus Redivivus : The Early Iron Age Potters' Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora*. Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Hesperia (Princeton, N.J.) Supplement 31.
——— 2016. Komai, colonies and cities in Epirus and southern Albania : the failure of the polis and the rise of urbanism on the fringes of the Greek world. In *Of odysseys and*

oddities : scales and modes of interaction between prehistoric Aegean societies and their neighbours, edited by B. Molloy. Oxford & Philadelphia: Oxbow Books.

Papadopoulos, J.K., and S.A. Paspalas. 1999. "Mendaian as Chalkidian Wine." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 68: 161–88.

Papakōnstantinou-Diamantourou, D. 1971. *Πέλλα. 1, Ιστορική επισκόπησις και μαρτυρίαι*, Vivliothēkē tēs en Athēnais Archaiologikēs Hetaireias ar 70. Αθήναι ,.

Papazoglou, F. 1983. Sur l'organisation de la Macédoine sous les Antigonides. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία III : ανακοινώσεις κατά το τρίτο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 21-25 Σεπτεμβρίου 1977*. Thessalonikē.

———. 1988. *Les villes de Macédoine a l'époque romaine*, Bulletin de correspondance hellénique. Supplément. Athens & Paris: Ecole française d'Athènes Dépositaire, Diffusion de Boccard.

———. 1988. *Les villes de Macédoine a l'époque romaine*, Bulletin de correspondance hellénique Supplément 16. Athens & Paris: Ecole française d'Athènes ; Dépositaire, Diffusion de Boccard.

Paschidis, P. 2006. The interpenetration of civic elites and court elite in Macedonia. In *Rois, cités et nécropoles. Institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine*, edited by A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos and Y. Morizot. Athens.

Patronos, S. 2002. Public architecture and civic identity in classical and Hellenistic Ionia : the cases of Miletus and PrieneDPhil, Oxford.

Perdikatsis, V., I. Maniatis, and C. Saatsoglou-Paliadelē. 2002. Characterisation of the pigments and painting technique used on the Vergina stelae. In *Color in Ancient Greece. The Role of Color in Ancient Greek Art and Architecture (700–31 B.C.)*, edited by M.A. Tiberios and D.S. Tsiafakē. Thessalonikē.

Petsas, P.M. 1966. *Ο τάφος των Λευκαδίων*, Vivliothēkē tēs en Athēnais Archaiologikēs Hetaireias ar 57. Athens: s.n.

———. 1967. "Ανασκαφαί Ναούσης." *Prakt* 1965:36–46, pl. 3–54.

———. 1970. "Ανασκαφαί Ναούσης." *Prakt* 1968:65–71, pl. 44–9.

Phaklarēs, P. 1992. "Ανασκαφές στην ακρόπολη της Βεργίνας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 3 (1989):37–44.

———. 1993. Ο οχυρωτικός περίβολος και η ακρόπολη της Βεργίνας. Τα πρώτα ανασκαφικά δεδομένα. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία V : ανακοινώσεις κατά το Πέμπτο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 10-15 Οκτωβρίου 1989: αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη του Μανόλη Ανδρόνικου*.

———. 1995. "Βεργίνα. Ανασκαφή ακρόπολης, 1992." *ΑΕΜΘ* 6 (1992):59–66.

———. 1997. "Βεργίνα. Ανασκαφή ακρόπολης 1993." *ΑΕΜΘ* 7 (1993):61–8.

———. 1997. "Βεργίνα. Ο οχυρωτικός περίβολος και η ακρόπολη." *ΑΕΜΘ* 10Α (1996):69–78.

———. 1998. "Βεργίνα. Ανασκαφή ακρόπολης 1994." *ΑΕΜΘ* 8 (1994):119–24.

Phaklarēs, P.V., and V.G. Stamatopoulou. 2014. "Βέργινα : Η αποκάλυψη της οχύρωσης στον αγρό Μπέλα." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη, 24 (2010)*:113–20.

Pierre, C. 2008. "À propos d'un inventaire des cités grecques [An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis, M. H. Hansen et T. H. Nielsen (éd.)]." *Revue des Études Grecques* 121 (1):393-8.

Pikoulas, G.A. 2011. "Διασχίζοντας τον Όλυμπο: οδικό δίκτυο και άμυνα στην Περραιβία (2008–2010). Η έρευνα του 2008." *ΑΕΜΘ* 22 (2008):249–54.

———. 2013. "Διασχίζοντας τον Όλυμπο: όδικο δίκτυο καί αμύνα στην Περραιβία. Η έρευνα του 2009." *ΑΕΜΘ* 23 (2009):135–40.
———. 2014. "Διασχίζοντας τον Όλυμπο: οδικό δίκτυο και αμυνα στην Περραιβία. Η έρευνα του 2010." *ΑΕΜΘ* 24 (2010):121–5.
Pingiatoglou, S. 2005. "Το ιερό της Δήμητρος στο Δίον : 2002-2003." *ΑΕΜΘ* 17 (2003):425–34.
———. 2008. "Δίον 2004-2006. Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στο ιερό του Ασκληπιού και στην πόλη των ελληνιστικών χρόνων." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 (2006): 577–86.
Pingiatoglou, S., K. Vastelē, E. Paulopoulou, and D. Tsiaphēs. 2013. "Δίον 2007-2009 : Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στο οικοδομικό τετράγωνο της αρχαίας αγοράς." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη*, 23 (2009):141-8.
Pliakou, G. 2011. Cômai et ethne. L'organisation spatiale du Bassin d'Ioannina à la lumière du matériel archéologique. In *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Epire dans l'Antiquité: actes du Ve colloque international de Grenoble (8-11 octobre 2008)*, edited by J.-L. Lamboley and M.P. Castiglioni. Paris: De Boccard.
Polignac, F.d. 1999. L'installation des dieux et la genèse des cités en Grèce d'Occident. Une question résolue? Retour à Mégara Hyblaea. In *La colonisation grecque en méditerranée occidentale : actes de la Rencontre Scientifique en Hommage à Georges Vallet ; Rome - Naples, 15-18 nov. 1995*. Paris.
Pollitt, J.J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Poulakakēs, N. 2011. "Αρχαίο θέατρο Μίεζας : η ανασκαφική έρευνα των ετών 2007 και 2008." *ΑΕΜΘ* 22 (2008):159–68.
Price, M. 1991. *The coinage in the name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus : a British Museum catalogue*. 2 vols. London, 2 vols.: Swiss Numismatic Society in association with British Museum.
Pritchett, W.K. 1980. *Studies in ancient Greek topography 3 Roads*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Préaux, C. 1978. *Le monde hellénistique : la Grèce et l'Orient de la mort d'Alexandre à la conquête romaine de la Grèce (323-146 av. J.-C.)*. 1. éd ed. 2 vols, Nouvelle Clio 6, 6bis. Paris, 2 vols.: Presses universitaires de France.
Psarra, E. 2013. "Αρχαία Μίεζα: η ανασκαφή στο δημόσιο κέντρο κατά τα έτη 2004-2008." *ΑΕΜΘ* 23 (2009): 105–15.
Psoma, S. 2011. The kingdom of Macedonia and the Chalcidic League. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
Raaflaub, K. 1993. Homer to Solon. The rise of the polis. The written sources. In *The ancient Greek city-state. Symposium on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, [Copenhagen] July 1 - 4, 1992.*, edited by M.H. Hansen.
Rabadjiev, K. 2007. Mt. Pangaion. The war for its silver in myth. In *Η Θράκη στον ελληνο-ρωμαϊκό κόσμο : Thrace in the Graeco-Roman World : Πρακτικά του 10ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Θρακολογίας, Κομοτηνή-Αλεξανδρούπολη 18-23 Οκτωβρίου 2005 = Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Thracology, Komotini-Alexandroupolis 18-23 october 2005*. Athens.
Raeck, W. 2009. Urbanistische Veränderung und archäologischer Befund im Priene. In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 307–321.

Radt, W. 1993. Landscape and Greek Urban Planning: Exemplified by Pergamon and Priene. In *City and nature : changing relationships in time and space*, edited by T.M. Kristensen, S.E. Larsen, P.G. Moller and S.E. Petersen. Odense, Denmark.
Raynor, B. 2015. King, cities, and elites in Macedonia c.360-168 BC. DPhil, Oxford.
Reinders, H.R. 1988. *New Halos : a Hellenistic town in Thessalia, Greece*. Utrecht: HES.
———. 2014. *The city of New Halos and its southeast gate*, Groningen archaeological studies. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and University of Groningen Library.
Reinders, H.R., and W. Prummel. 2003. *Housing in New Halos : a Hellenistic town in Thessaly, Greece*. Exton (Pennsylv.): Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.
Rey, L. 1921. *Observations sur les premiers habitats de la Macédoine : recueillies par le service archéologique de l'armée d'Orient, 1916-1919 (Région de Salonique)*. 2 vols. Paris: E. de Boccard.
Rheidt, K. 2015. Polis und Stadtbild im 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr. In *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthei and M. Zimmerman. Mainz: Verlage Antike, 300–329.

Rhomaios, K.A. 1953/4. "Το ανάκτορον της Παλατίτσας." *AE*:141 –50.
Rhomiopoulou, A. 1974. "Επιτύμβιοι στῆλαι Αθηναίων εκ Ποτειδαίας." *AAA* 4:190–8.
Rhomiopoulou, K. 2002. *Μίεζα : νεκροταφείο υστεροαρχαϊκών - πρώιμων ελληνιστικών χρόνων*. Edited by G. Touratsoglou and P. Greece. Hypourgeio, Dēmosieumata tou Archaiologikou deltiou. Athens: Athēna : Exdosē tou Tameiou Archaiologikōn Porōn kai Apallotriōseōn.
Rhomiopoulou, K., B. Schmidt-Dounas, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. Athenische Abteilung, and H. Brecoulaki. 2010. *Das Palmettengrab in Lefkadia*, Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung Beiheft 21. Mainz: P. von Zabern.
Robert, L. 1937. *Études anatoliennes; recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure*, Études orientales; pub. par l'Institut français d'Archéologie de Stamboul, 5. Paris: E. de Boccard.
———. 1960. "Inscriptions de Lesbos." *RÉA* 62:285–316.
———. 1969. "Théophane de Mytilène à Constantinople." *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres [Paris]*:42–64.
Robinson, B. A. 2011. *Histories of Peirene : A Corinthian Fountain in Three Millennia*. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
Romano, D.G. 2016. Athletics: stadia, gymanasia, palaistrai and hippodromes. In *A companion to Greek architecture*, edited by M.M. Miles. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
Rosen, R.M., and I. Sluiter. 2006. *City, countryside, and the spatial organization of value in classical antiquity*, Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1941. *The social & economic history of the Hellenistic world*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Roy, J. 2007. "The urban layout of Megalopolis in its civic and confederate context." *Building communities*:289-95.
Rumscheid, F. 2014. Ursprünglicher Bebauungsplan, Erstbebauung und Veränderungen im hellenistischen Stadtbild Prienes als Ergebnis öffentlicher und privater Ambitionen. In *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus.*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Heidelberg.

———. 2015. Urbanistische Strukturen und Veränderungen im hellenistischen Priene : Wohnbereiche. In *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthei and M. Zimmerman. Mainz: Verlage Antike, 283–299.

Rutter, N.K. 2000. Coin types and identity. Greek cities in Sicily. In *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus. New approaches in archaeology and history*, edited by C.J. Smith and J. Serrati.

Rēginos, G., and K. Lazarē. 2007. *Ελέα Θεσπρωτίας : Αρχαιολογικός Οδηγός του χώρου & της ευρύτερης περιοχής*. Athens.

Saatsoglou-Paliadele, C. 1997. "Βεργίνα 1993. Ανασκαφή στο ιερό της Έυκλειας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 7 (1993):51–9.

Saatsoglou-Paliadelē, C. 1987. Ευρυδίκα Σίρρα Ευκλείαι. In *Αμητός: τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μανόλη Ανδρόνικο*. Thessalonikē.

———. 1992. "Βεργίνα 1989. Ανασκαφή στο ιερό της Εύκλειας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 3 (1989):25–35.

———. 1993. "Βεργίνα 1990. Ανασκαφή στο ιερό της Εύκλειας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 4 (1990):21–34.

———. 1995. "Το ιερό της Ευκλείας στη Βεργίνα. Σύντομη επισκόπηση των ανασκαφικών αποτελεσμάτων στην αγορά των Αιγών." *Εγνατία* 5:247–55.

———. 1997. "Το ιερό της Εύκλειας στη Βεργίνα." *ΑΕΜΘ* 10A (1996):55–68.

———. 1998. "Βεργίνα 1994. Ανασκαφή στο ιερό της Εύκλειας." *ΑΕΜΘ* 8 (1994):109–17.

———. 2000. "Queenly appearances at Vergina-Aegae. Old and new epigraphic and literary evidence." *Arch. Anz.*:387–403.

———. 2001. "Βεργίνα 1998 - 1999. Ανασκαφή στο ιερό της Εύκλειας και στην θόλο του ανακτόρου." *ΑΕΜΘ* 13 (1999):541–51.

———. 2004. *Βεργίνα : ο τάφος του Φιλίππου, η τοιχογραφία με το κυνήγι*, Vivliothēkē tēs en Athēnais Archaiologikēs Hetaireias ar 231. Athens: Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία.

———. 2007. Arts and politics in the Macedonian court before Alexander. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία VII : Η Μακεδονία από την Εποχή του Σιδήρου εως το θάνατο του Φιλίππου Β': ανακοινώσεις κατά το Έβδομο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 14-19 Οκτωβρίου 2002*, edited by D. Kaplanidou and E. Chiōtē. Thessalonikē.

Saeedi, H., M.J. Costello, and C. Rv. 2013. "First Report of Anterior Pallial Tentacles in Solen dactylus (Bivalvia: Solenidae) from the Northern Persian Gulf, Iran." *PLoS ONE* 8:e63487: http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0063487#s1.

Salviat, F. 1990. Vignes et cins anciens de Maronee a Mende. In *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη: Πόλις και χώρα στην Αρχαία Μακεδονία και Θράκη*. Thessalonikē, 457–76.

Salzmann, D. 1982. *Untersuchungen zu den antiken Kieselmosaiken : von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Tesseratechnik*, Archäologische Forschungen Bd 10. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.

Savage, M. 2011. The lost urban sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. In *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*, edited by G. Bridge and S. Watson. Oxford.

Scafuro, A.C. 2014. Decrees for Foreign Judges : Judging Conventions-or Epigraaphic Habits? In *Symposion 2013 : papers on Greek and Hellenistic legal history (Cambridge MA, August 26-29, 2013) : Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Cambridge MA, 26.-29. August 2013)*, edited by M. Gagarin and A. Lanni. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Schachermeyr, F. 1949. *Alexander der Grosse : Ingenium und Macht*. Graz: A. Pustet.

Schallin, A.-L. 1997. Urban centres, central places and nucleation in Greek island versus the Greek mainland. In *Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the 9th to 6th centuries BC*, edited by H. Damgard-Andersen, H.W. Hornaes, S. Houby-Nielsen and A. Rathje. Copenhagen.

Schmidt-Dounas, B. 2004. "Οι δωρεές οικοδομημάτων των Μακεδόνων βασιλέων." *Εγνατία* 8:267–302.

Schuler, C. 2015. Sympolitien und Synoikismen. Gesellschaftliche und urbanistische Implikationen von Konzentrationsprozessen in hellenistischer Zeit. In *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Mainz: Verlag Antike.

Schwabacher, W. 1943. "Illyrian-Paeonian Silver Coins." *Acta archaeologica* 14:83–91.

Schwarz, H. 2012. "Damastion in Illyrien." *Numismatisches Nachrichtenblatt* 61 [fasc 10]:425–9.

Schütz, E., and H.J. Unger. 1981. *Pangaion : Wanderungen im Pangaion. Ein Gebirge und sein Bergbau*. Landshut.

Scullion, S. 2003. "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the "Frogs"." *The Classical Quarterly* 53 (2):389-400.

Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the sacred city*, Myth and poetics. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

———. 2015. *Hesiod's Theogony : from Near Eastern creation myths to Paradise lost*, Oxford scholarship online. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shear Jr, T.L. 1994. Ισόνομους τ'Ἀθῆνας ἐποιησάτην. The Agora and the democracy. In *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the democracy : proceedings of an International conference celebrating 2500 years since the birth of democracy in Greece, held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, edited by W.D.E. Coulsen, O. Palagia and T.L. Shear Jr.

———. 1995. Bouleuterion, Metroon, and the archives at Athens. In *Studies in the ancient Greek polis*. Stuttgart.

Shipley, G. 2005. Little Boxes on a Hillside: Greek town planning, Hippodamos, and Polis Ideology. In Hansen, Mogens Herman. *The Imaginary Polis : Symposium, January 7-10, 2004*. Copenhagen: Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 335–403.

Siganidou, M. 1987. Τα τείχη της Πέλλας. Thessalonikē.

———. 1992. "Το μνημειακό πρόπυλο του ανακτόρου της Πέλλας." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη* 3 (1989):59–66.

Siganidou, M., and K. Trochidēs. 1993. "Η σχολή του Αριστοτέλους στη Μίεζα." *ΑΕΜΘ* 4 (1990:121–5.

Sismanides, K. 1997. *Κλίνες και κλινοειδείς κατασκευές των Μακεδονικών τάφων*. Athens.

———. 1998. "Ενεπίγραφικες ταφικές στήλες από την Ποτειδαία." *ΑΑΑ* 23–28:263–75.

Sismanides, K., and G. Karaiskou. 1995. "Σωστική ανασκαφή στην Ποτίδαια Χαλκιδικής." *ΑΕΜΘ* 6 (1992):485–93.

Skaltsa, S. 2008. Hellenistic gymnasia : the built space and social dynamics of a polis institutionDPhil, Oxford.

Smith, R.R.R. 2007. Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian religion*. Lanham, Md. ; Oxford: Lexington Books.

Stamatopoulou, M. 2007. Thessalian Aristocracy and Society in the Age of Epinikian, edited by S. Hornblower and C. Morgan. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
———. 2018. Demetrias : The Archaeology of a Cosmopolitan Macedonian Harbour. In *Βορειοελλαδικά : Tales from the lands of the ethne : Essays in honour of Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos : Proceedings of the International Conference held in Athens (February 2015)*, edited by M. Kalaitzi, P. Paschidis, C. Antonetti and A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute of Historical Research.
Stephanidou-Tiveriou, T. 1998. *Ανασκαφή Δίου. Τόμος Ι. Η Οχύρωση*. Thessalonikē: Aristoteleio Panepistēmio Thessalonikēs, Archaiologika Ergastēria Diou.
Stoyanov, T. 1999. New light on the relations between NE Thrace and Macedonia in the early Hellenistic times. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία VI :. ανακοινώσεις κατά το Έκτο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 15-19 Οκτωβρίου 1996: στη μνήμη της Ιουλίας Βοκοτοπούλου: Ancient Macedonia VI: papers read at the Sixth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 15-19, 1996: Julia Vokotopoulou, in memoriam*. 2 v., Thessaloniki.
Strootman, R. 2014. *Courts and elites in the Hellenistic empires : the Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*, Edinburgh studies in ancient Persia. Edinburgh.
Struck, A.H. 1908. *Makedonische Fahrten*. Vol. 2, Zur Kunde der Baikanhalbinsel. Reisen und Beobachtungen. vol. 2, Wien: Hartleben et al.
Stählin, F. 1924. *Das hellenische Thessalien : landeskundliche und geschichtliche Beschreibung Thessaliens in der hellenischen und romischen Zeit*. Stuttgart: J. Engelhorns nachf.
Tarn, W.W., and G.T. Griffith. 1961 [1927]. *Hellenistic civilisation*. 3rd ed. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing Company.
Tatcheva, M. 1999. Le mode d'établissement de la coexistence paisible entre le barbaricum balkanique et les colonies helléniques. In *Αρχαία Μακεδονία VI :. ανακοινώσεις κατά το Έκτο Διεθνές Συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη, 15-19 Οκτωβρίου 1996: στη μνήμη της Ιουλίας Βοκοτοπούλου: Ancient Macedonia VI: papers read at the Sixth International Symposium held in Thessaloniki, October 15-19, 1996: Julia Vokotopoulou, in memoriam*. 2 v., Thessaloniki.
Tauber, Z. 2006. "Aesthetic Education for Morality: Schiller and Kant." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 40 (3):22-47.
Terrenato, N. 2019. *The Early Roman Expansion into Italy : Elite Negotiation and Family Agendas*. Cambridge.
Thompson, H. A. 1940. *The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors* (Hesperia Suppl. 4), Princeton, N. J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
Thompson, M. 1981. "The Cavalla hoard." *ANSMN* 26:33–49, pl. iii–ix.
Tiverios, M.A. 2009. "Η «διπλή τράπεζα Αχγιάλου»." *ΑΕΜΘ* 20 χρόνια:397-407.
Trigger, B. 1968. The determinants of settlement patterns. In *Settlement archaeology*, edited by K.-c. Chang. Palo Alto, Calif.: National Press Books.
Tringham, R. 1972. Introduction: settlement patterns and urbanization. In *Man, settlement and urbanism : proceedings of a meeting of the Research Seminar in Archaeology and Related Subjects held at the Institute of Archaeology, London University*, edited by P.J. Ucko, R. Tringham and G.W. Dimbleby. London: Duckworth.
Troxell, H.A. 1983. Ants and eagles. Some late Alexander staters from Amphipolis. In *Coins of Macedonia and Rome : essays in honour of Charles Hersh*, edited by A. Burnett, U. Wartenberg and R. Witschonke. London.

Trümper, M. 1998. *Wohnen in Delos : eine baugeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Wandel der Wohnkulture in hellenistischer Zeit*. Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf.

Tsigarida, B. 2011. Chalkidiki. In *Brill's companion to ancient Macedon : studies in the archaeology and history of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, edited by R. Lane Fox. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

———. 2011. "The Sanctuary of Zeus Ammon at Kallithea (Chalicidice)." *Kernos. Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion grecque antique* 24:165–81.

Tsigarida, E.B. 1997. "Ανασκαφική έρευνα στην περιοχή της αρχαίας Σάνης - Ουρανούπολης 1990–1996." *ΑΕΜΘ* 10Α (1996):333–46.

Tsiolis, V. 1995. "El Thersilion de Megalópolis. Funciones y cronología." *Gerión* (13):47–68.

Tsokas, G.N., et al. 2006. "Εξερεύνηση της αρχαιολογικού χώρου της Βεργίνας με το μέθοδο της γεωηλεκτρικής χαρτογράφησης." *ΑΕΜΘ* 18 (2004):551–60.

Tziaphēs, D. 2017. *Ιερά και λατρείες της Κάτω Μακεδονίας: Πιερία, Βοττιαία, Αλμωπία* Thessalonikē.

Ucko, P.J., R. Tringham, and G.W. Dimbleby. 1972. *Man, settlement and urbanism : proceedings of a meeting of the Research Seminar in Archaeology and Related Subjects held at the Institute of Archaeology, London University*. London: Duckworth.

Unger, H.J. 1987. "Das Pangaion. Ein altes Bergbauzentrum in Ostmakedonien." *Praehistorische Zeitschrift* 62:87–112.

Unger, H.J., and E. Schütz. 1982. Pangaion. Ein Gebirge und sein Bergbau. In *Südosteuropa zwischen 1600 und 1000 v. Chr.* Berlin.

Vanderpool, E. 1965. Amphipolis, Hill 133. In *Studies in ancient Greek topography*, edited by W.K. Pritchett. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Velenēs, G. 1997. "Πολεοδομικά Θεσσαλονίκης." *ΑΕΜΘ* 10Α (1996) 491–500.

Verdon, M. 1982. "Durkheim and Aristotle: Of some incongruous congruences." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 13 (4):333-52.

Vink, M.C.V. 1997. Urbanization in Late and Sub-Geometric Greece. Abstract considerations and concrete case studies of Eretria and Zagora c. 700 B.C.

Vokotopoulou, J. 1985. La Macédoine de la protohistoire à l'époque archaïque. In *Magna Grecia, Epiro e Macedonia. Atti del ventiquattresimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto 5–10 ottobre 1979*. Taranto.

———. 1994. "Ποσείδι 1991." *ΑΕΜΘ* 5 (1991):303–18.

Von den Hoff, R. 2009. Hellenistiche Gymnasia: Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktionen. In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Berlin: Verlag Antike. 245–275

Von Hesberg, H. 2009. Hellenistiche Theater – Zur Fuktionalität der Räume und ihrer Bedeutung für die Polis. In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Berlin: Verlag Antike. 245–275.

Walter-Karydi, E. 1998. *The Greek house : the rise of noble houses in late classical times*, The Archaeological Society at Athens library no 171. Athens: The Archaeological Society at Athens.

Weickert, C. 1913. *Das lesbische Kymation : ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Ornamentik*. Leipzig: W. Schunke.

Wheatley, P. 1972. The concept of urbanism. In *Man, settlement and urbanism*, edited by P.J. Ucko, R. Tringham and G.W. Dimbeley. London.

Wilson, A. 2013. Trading across the Syrtes : Euesperides and the Punic world. In *The Hellenistic West*, edited by J.R.W. Prag and J.C. Quinn. Oxford.

Winter, E. 2006. *Stadtspuren : Zeugnisse zur Siedlungsgeschichte der Chalkidiki*, Frankfurter archäologische Schriften 3. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
Winter, F.E. 1971. *Greek fortifications*. London: London : Routledge & K. Paul.
———. 1982. "Tradition and Innovation in Doric Design IV: The Fourth Century." *AJA* 86 (3):387–400.
Wycherley, R.E. 1962 [1949]. *How the Greeks built cities*. 2. ed. London: Macmillan.
Zahrnt, M. 1971. *Olynth und die Chalkidier : Untersuchungen zur Staatenbildung auf der Chalkidischen Halbinsel im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr*, Vestigia, Bd 14. München: Beck.
———. 2006. Macedonia and Thrace in Thucydides. In *Brill's companion to Thucydides*, edited by A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis. Leiden: Brill.
Zimmermann, M. 2009a. Stadtbilder im Hellenismus - die hellenistische Polis in neuer Perspektive
———. 2009b. Stadtraum, Architektur und öffentiliche Leben in der Hellenistichen Stadt. In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 9–20
———. 2014. Stadtraum, Architecktur und öffentliches Leben. In *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Mainz: Verlag Antike, 23–40.
———. 2015. Die hellenistische Polis in neuer Perspektive. Das DFG-Schwerpunktprogramm zur hellenistischen Polis zieht Bilanz. In Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus, edited by A. Matthei and M. Zimmerman. Mainz: Verlage Antike, 7–10.