

# *Poleis, Choras* and spaces, from Civic to Royal. Spaces in the cities over Macedonian rule from Alexander the Great to Seleucus I

*Poleis, Choras* y espacios, de cívicos a reales.  
Territorios en las ciudades bajo dominio macedonio de Alejandro Magno a Seleuco I

BORJA ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ

Departament de Ciències de l'Antiguitat i l'Edat Mitjana. Facultat de Lletres. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
Edifici B. Carrer de la Fortuna, E-08193 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès)  
borja.antela@uab.cat

The conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great led the Macedonian tradition to a new challenge in order to control and manage the landscape and its resources in the new territories. As far as these territories were spear-won lands, the usual perspective of the Argead Kingdom, itself a result of conquests, still had validity. Nevertheless, this Macedonian tradition must also conceal the Greek cities founded within the new Hellenistic Kingdoms, and also the native population. In order to understand the construction of relationships between royal and city spaces during Alexander's rule and in the very early configuration of the Hellenistic Monarchies, the break between the Classical *Poleis* and the Hellenistic ones must be described, paying attention to the difference between the classical *chora* as city space and the new Hellenistic reality of the shared *politiké* and *basiliké chora*.

## KEY WORDS

HELLENISTIC LANDSCAPES, SPEAR-WON LAND, *CHORA POLITIKÉ*, *CHORA BASILIKÉ*, *LAOI*, ARGEAD TERRITORIAL TRADITION

La conquista de Asia por Alejandro Magno representó un reto para la tradición macedonia en relación con el control y la gestión del territorio y sus recursos en los nuevos territorios. Puesto que estos territorios habían sido ganados por la lanza, la perspectiva habitual del reino de los Argéadas, en tanto que resultado en sí mismo de una serie de conquistas, mantuvo todavía su validez. No obstante, esta tradición macedonia hubo además de adaptarse a las relaciones con las ciudades griegas que se encontraban en los nuevos territorios helenísticos, así como a la población nativa. Con el objetivo de comprender la construcción de las relaciones entre espacio cívico y espacio regio durante el gobierno de Alejandro y en la configuración incipiente de las monarquías helenísticas, la ruptura entre las formas clásica y helenística de las *poleis* griegas puede ser descrita partiendo de la diferencia entre la *chora* clásica como un espacio cívico y la nueva realidad helenística de una *chora* compartida entre *politiké* y *basiliké*.

### **PALABRAS CLAVE**

PAISAJES HELENÍSTICOS, «TIERRA CONQUISTADA POR LA LANZA», *CHORA POLITIKÉ*, *CHORA BASILIKÉ*, *LAOI*, TRADICIÓN TERRITORIAL ARGEADA

One of the main topics related with the usual perspective about the Hellenistic world assures that the Macedonian conquest and the beginning of the Hellenism meant the end of the ancient Greek city-states and the *poleis* model. Nevertheless, as modern claims has tried to stress, the Greek world after Alexander was, in fact, a result of the expansion and widespread development of the model of Greek *poleis* around the whole territories of Alexander's Empire (Strootman, 2011). Nevertheless, this historical process also caused some changes within the *polis* model. In fact, we can observe a deep transformation and a new perspective about the idea of the polis in its relationship within the territory. From the Classical point of view, we define *polis* as a town (*asty*) with a hinterland (*chora*) (Hansen, 2000: 19).<sup>1</sup> Of course, the Hellenistic urban realities did not lose the close links between town and hinterland, but from the perspective of the ownership, some questions must be observed.

First, we should consider the Macedonian Kingdom and its relationship with its territories. In this way, Macedon was not easy to fit within the usual vision of the Classical period, as far as Macedon is a realm in the land of the *poleis*. This nature allows to expect a different kind of relationship with the landscape. Although the sources and documents to analyse and understand Macedonia before Philip and Alexander are scant (cf. Rhodes, 2010) and in some way a little dark, we can observe some aspects of the concept of Macedon as kingdom and in its organization related with its territory at the light of some information. First, then, we know by the myth of the three Temenid brothers founders of the kingdom that Macedon become a result of the salary paid to them by the king of

1. A useful definition of the Greek *poleis* can be found in Murray, 1996<sup>3</sup>: 1205, s.v. *polis*: "an urban community or state, disposing of its own geographically delimited territory, and characterised by small size, political autonomy, social homogeneity, sense of community ('citizenship') and respect for (civic) law"; cf. Stroorman, 2011: 143. Also, an interesting review of the meaning the scholars have given to the concept of *poleis* has been made by Sakellariou, 1989: 27-151.

Lebea.<sup>2</sup> Herodotus explains the story of how Perdicas gained the landscapes latter under his royal authority, and how also the gods (by the reference in this episode to the sun and the eclipse) sanctify this cession of territories (Hdt. 8, 137-138. Also, cf. Christesen and Murray, 2010: esp. 440-441). But this was not the unique source to know how the first Temenid kings to obtain the landscapes that configured the new realm of Macedon. Thus, beyond the first idea of a land conceded by the Gods to the Temenids, Macedon was, in fact, a consequence from the conquest of territories (Thuc. 2, 99, 1; Arist. *Pol.* 1310b39). In this sense, ancient authors consider Macedon, in itself, as is, in and of itself, the *doriktetos chora* of the Argeads (Ar. *An.* 2, 14.7; D.S. 13, 49, 2; 17, 17, 2; 19, 105, 4. Cf. Mehl, 1980-1981; Antela-Bernárdez, 2009, 2011). This, of course, conditioned the relationship between the king and the land,<sup>3</sup> but also between the king and the cities (Hatzopoulos, 2004). As a kind of booty (*doriktetos chora*) and a gift of the gods to the Macedonian kings, the kingdom is a kind of property of the rulers, maybe not personal, as far as the realm was maybe also linked with the idea of a collective, the Macedonians, but in fact directed personally by the royal authority (Hammond, 1988). The idea of Macedon as a kind of a dual entity belonged to the Macedonian kings and the Macedonians (*Makedones*). Likewise, this formula, “The king and the Macedonians”, was the usual system for referring to the realm in the diplomatic documents (Cf. Hammond, 1992: 58, 166; *contra*, King, 2010: 379, with bibliography), which denotes a clear intention to stress the implication of these people, the Macedonians (*Makedones*) (cf. Hatzopoulos, 2011: 53) in the kingdom, as an equal entity, in some way, to the crown (Hammond, 1995). Despite the fact that the identification of these *Makedones* is, sometimes, difficult to assure, the perspective of Macedon as a kingdom with a clear division among its population, with what we argued that would be the subjects with rights (the *Makedones*?), the people living within the Macedonian realm or under the authority of the Macedonian kings (with some kind of rights, like the citizens of Greek cities within Macedonia), and the people subdued to the Macedonian kings by conquest or as booty, seems a fact.

In this context, the situation of the civic communities of the Greek *poleis* that lived in Macedonia seems to be that of allied entities with diplomatic relationships with the Macedonian crown. These cities are, usually, a part of Macedon, but maybe they are not exactly “Macedonians”. Of course, we can probably find some different types of urban communities within the territory of the Argeads. In this sense, the information provided by Aristotle seems useful:

Therefore, as we said, royalty is ranged in correspondence with aristocracy, for it goes by merit, either by private virtue or by family or by services or by a combination of these things and ability. For in every instance this honour fell to men after they had conferred benefit or because

2. The traditionally basic bibliography about the origins of the Argead House still are the works of Hammond, 1972: 433-434; Borza, 1982; Greenwalt, 1986; Borza, 1990: 80-82; Greenwalt, 1994; Sprawski, 2010; Antela-Bernárdez, 2016a.
3. Millet, 2010: 480: “Although Philip added appreciably to the urban built environment, it seems realistic to think of Macedonia through antiquity as housing most of its population in thousands of *komai* or village-like, nucleated settlements”.

they had the ability to confer benefit on their cities or their nations, some having prevented their enslavement in war, for instance Codrus, others having set them free, for instance Cyrus, or having settled or acquired territory, for instance the kings of Sparta and Macedon and the Molossians (Arist. *Pol.* 1310b; cf. Rackman, 1944).

As the text stresses, the Macedonians were kings by conquest, but maybe also as founders of cities. Then, Macedonian cities, i.e. those founded by the Macedonian kings, and which residents, or at least a part of them, could possibly be “Macedonians” (*Makedones*), existed in Macedon. This seems to be, in fact, the idea underlined by Alexander to his Macedonians in his speech at Opis:

When Philip took you on, you were a pack of indigent drifters. Most of you were dressed in skins and grazed on the hills a few sheep, for which you fought—and fought badly—against Illyrians, Triballians and the Thracians on your borders. Philip gave you cloaks to wear in place of the skins and he brought you down from the hills to the plains (Ar. *An.* 7, 9, 2; Heckel and Yardley, 2004: 268).

Surely, the settlement of these Macedonians in “the plains” indicates that they were settled in cities or urban communities of some kind (Polyaen. *Strat* 4.2.1-2, 4.2.15; Frontin. *Strat* 4.1.6; cf. Lane Fox, 2011: 374). This practice, nevertheless, seems to be particularly old, and our sources grant for sure that at least is previous to Philip or Alexander. Thus, we know how Archelaus I moved Macedonian peoples to the plains, in order to manage the foundation of Pella (Borza, 1990: 166–71, 296; Greenwalt, 1999; cf. Roisman, 2010: 156). In fact, Macedonian kings were usually city founders. We know well the activities of Alexander as founder, but his father Philip managed also this kind of practices, of which the city of Philippi or the refoundation of Stageira are clear examples.

Apart from that of the Macedonians, or at least inhabited by Macedonians (first in Macedonia itself, later in the conquered lands of Asia), we also know other kind of cities, like those Greek poleis included within the territories under jurisdiction of the Argeads, and founded in a landscape that, as we have seen, belonged to the Macedonian kings. In this way, these cities, which are clearly different from those of the Macedonians, can be considered as communities who have acquired from the kings the right to inhabit their urban centre and to take profit of their hinterland. Surely, this right was also linked with the maintenance of good relations with the Macedonian crown, which cession of the authority over its own territories allowed these poleis to live in the realm. Nevertheless, we must not forget that Macedonian kings, especially Philip and Alexander, considered themselves with the right to erase the special treatment of cities under what they can observe as their own territories, like in the case of Olynthus or even Thebes, by the right of conquest, a custom law very well defined in Greek thought (X. *Cyr.* 7, 5, 73; Arist. *Pol.* 1255a6).

In fact, the relationships of Philip and Alexander with the Greek cities during their lifetime seems to stress our point. First, as a result of the victory in Chaeroneia, Philip II,

and Alexander after him, received the charge of *Strategos* of the Corinthian League, which was translated in the authority to manage and order recruitments in these Greek cities allied by the foundational treaties of the League.<sup>4</sup> Of course, this authority meant a kind of political control, at least in a middle-time term. But also, we find some troops, both from Greece or from the Greek cities in Macedonia, who answered the requirements of recruitment with hoplite forces, who fought, for example, within the army of Alexander during the conquest of Asia side by side with the Macedonian army post-Philip, i.e., the Macedonian phalanges. If we considered the Macedonians as the people linked with the kings, and who furnishes the forces of the Macedonian phalanx, then, we must consider carefully about the place this Greek-style hoplites occupied in the political system of Macedon and even in their own cities. Probably, this kind of integration of these troops within the whole Macedonian army has to do with the mechanisms of integration of these Greek cities in the Macedonian *politeia*.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, we must not forget, in fact, that the Greek cities within the conquered territories were not always ascribed to the kingdom as allies, as happened with the *poleis* members of the Corinthian League. Indeed, there seems to be a clear difference between the Greek *poleis* of the mainland, allies and members of the Corinthian League, and the *poleis* in Asia Minor and the East, who were usually treated as subjects, and had to pay a tribute, like they had to pay to the Persians before the Macedonian conquest, and were not included in the treaties of the Corinthian League nor had even authority to manage their own territory, as seems to be confirmed by the many examples we know during the campaign of Alexander (Badian, 1966; Domínguez Monedero, 2016).

Then, civic spaces under Argead authority were the result of some kind of diplomatic tradition between the Greek, non-Macedonian cities within the realm and the king, by which the crown allowed these Greek communities to enjoy the civic autonomy within their walls and to utilise their hinterlands around their urban centres. In this sense, we must consider the impact that Alexander's conquest of Asia could have over this governing scheme as deep, although some structures also were probably maintained in the new Macedonian landscapes fruit of the victory over the Achaemenids. First, the territorial conception of the realm and the right to rule these landscapes as a result of the *dorchtetos chora* was clearly maintained. Also, the relationship with the cities, as we shall see later, seems to have been developed within the same conceptual perspective that those who worked in Macedon, although sometimes with clear and interesting changes, usually fruit of the way in which the city became to be included within the Macedonian king's dominions. In this sense, for example, the most of the cities in Asia Minor who peacefully surrendered to Alexander had obtained a diplomatic status of respect of their traditions and institutions, and also their territories, in front of those who had resisted to

4. About the problems, definition and probable juridical capacities of the Corinthian League in the times of Philip and Alexander, cf. Antela-Bernárdez, 2010b.

5. I want to give thanks here to the anonymous referee who with aims me to introduce these reflexions.

the Macedonians, which suffered intervention, submission, and sometimes a harsh treat, like Miletus or Halicarnassus. In the end, the Macedonian king became, as in Macedon, the unique source of authority over the territory and the entities living in there. Again, as owner of the landscapes and its resources, the king could give up the territories and their use as he wished.

Nevertheless, this royal authority over the conquered spaces, either rural or civic, should be observed in relation also with the Achaemenid practices. In this sense, we know of some curious cases of cession of use of rural resources by the Achaemenid kings to private individuals. This is the case, for example, of the well-known Greek exiles to the Achaemenid court, like Themistocles or Alcibiades, among others, who received from the Great King some villages as gifts in order to secure their subsistence, as the sources clearly show.<sup>6</sup> First, we must bear in mind the strong influence Persia had in the development of the systems of government and administration of Macedon, a question that scholars usually seems to avoid (Olbrycht, 2010). In this sense, the idea that the kings, either Macedonians or Persians, were in fact not only the rulers of their country's landscapes, but also the owners, at a legal level, of these landscapes, maybe is related with the close links between the definitive formation of the Macedonian Kingdom as an organized entity under the influence, and during the time of servitude, of Macedon to the Achaemenids. Second, we know that the authority of the Macedonian rulers over the territories was well established in two main factors: the support and approval of the gods and the right of conquest; and these two factors probably were also working in the conceptual perspective of rule of the Achaemenids.

If, then, the Macedonian kings had the right of ownership, both in Macedonia and in the new conquered countries of Asia by Alexander, we must observe how the new cities founded within these new lands were expected to work, both in relation with the surrounding territory, the native population living there and, of course, the royal authority over the spaces. Founding cities was, in fact, a main aspect of Alexander's organization of the territories gained by the spear. We know that the classical tradition recorded a high number of new cities founded by Alexander, and although many were, actually, resulted of mistakes and fake attributions, the role of Alexander as founder<sup>7</sup> was very celebrated during Antiquity, and this image conditioned the practices of legitimation and propaganda of Diadochs and Epigons (i.e., Bringmann 1993; Bringmann, 2001), as well as that of the leaders of the Roman Republic during the late Hellenistic age (Purcell, 1995: 133). At the light of our sources, we must first ask who build these new cities. A text of Appian explains how Seleucus directed the initial building for the foundation of Seleucia on the Tigris:

They say, also, that when the Magians were ordered to indicate the propitious day and hour for beginning the foundations of Seleucia-on-the-Tigris they falsified as to the hour because they

6. The best example is that of Themistocles: Plu. *Them.* 29,7. Also, Alexander offered to Phocion some cities: Plu. *Phoc.* 18; cf. Dandamaev and Lukonin, 1989: 140.

7. Plu. *Mor.* 328e attributes him 70 foundations; on this matter: Fraser, 2003.

did not want to have such a stronghold built against themselves. While the king was waiting in his tent for the appointed hour, and the army, in readiness to begin the work, stood quietly till Seleucus should give the signal, suddenly, at the true hour of destiny, they seemed to hear a voice ordering them on. So they sprang to their work with such alacrity that the heralds who tried to stop them were not able to do so (App. *Syr.* 58; cf. White, 1912).

As the text clearly shows, the responsibility of the works during the founding of cities by Macedonian kings, at least under the Diadochs, seems to be in the hands of the Macedonian army. Thus, this role of the soldiers as builders seems especially useful to consider them essential habitants of the some of the new Hellenistic cities. Nevertheless, the continued violent struggle of the Successors and Epigons during the Early Hellenistic age had a clear impact in the number of Macedonians in Asia. At the time that the Macedonians decay in the new territories of the Macedonian Empire (Edson, 1958), the number of Greek settlers also probably were highly increasing, giving civic bodies to the new cities and providing them of citizens and habitants, and creating, in fact, the urban realities that defined, in a strong way, the Hellenistic world. These settlements of Greek population was, likewise, a reality since Alexander's times, who had also received the advice to do so as a solution to the critical situation of IVth Century BC Greece by some intellectuals, who follows a tradition closely related to the ideals of Panhellenism and *Koiné Eiréné* (Antela-Bernárdez, 2007). This is not the place to treat these questions, well stated by the scholarship, but it is interesting to remember, for example, the case of Bactria, where some revolts by the Greeks settled by Alexander occurred during his travel to India.

The case of Bactria (Antela-Bernárdez, 2014) allows us to know the third kind of habitants that occupied the space of the Greek cities founded by the Macedonians in Asia. Thus, Curtius (Curt. 5, 3, 15; 7, 11, 28) explains how the local population of the conquered territories were attached to the land of the cities, as workers that could guaranty the subsistence and prosperity of the Greek citizens. In fact, F. Papazoglou had discussed the question of the status of these native populations and concluded that maybe these peoples were what the Hellenistic documents named, for the Eastern landscapes of Asia, with the term *laoi*.<sup>8</sup> The assessment, probably a subject of further discussion, is actually an interesting solution to have in mind in relation with the local population and their status once they were conquered by the Macedonians. Nevertheless, their day-by-day realities probably did not changed so much, as far as the practices we can trace by the Macedonian rulers seems to had been very similar to those of the Achaemenids. A proof of this can be seen in some passages of Plutarch (Plu. *Alex.* 15, 3; 31, 5), who explains how Alexander conceded the use and profit of some villages as gifts for granting subsistence.

Which kind of relationship had had these three collectives (Macedonians, Greeks and native population with the royal authorities? And how the ideal of autonomy of the Greek cities adapted to the presence and rule of the Macedonian kings? We have some ideas, but

8. Papazoglou, 1997: 77. On the question of the *laoi*, see also Briant, 1973; Briant, 2002: 459-460; Archivald, 2001: 186.

the documents are, in fact, sometimes problematic and subject of discussion. First, we can still consider the Macedonians as subjects, and in this sense, they maintained the traditional close ties with the king, as far as they have been, also, responsible of the conquest and a main part in the division and exploitation of the profits of the conquest.<sup>9</sup> They take part in the rule by occupying charges in the royal administration and by their preeminent presence in the army of the Diadochs and Epigons. The native population had also a clear position, as subjects subdue to the kings and the Macedonians. So, they are part of the booty, a profit of war that can be moved, by cession or as a gift, as workforce, by the rulers. In fact, they can be translated and even deported in order to benefit royal plans about take advantage of the conquered spaces (Ellis, 1969). Thus, clear clues for these practices of transferring population can be found in the case of Philip<sup>10</sup> or Alexander,<sup>11</sup> and were probably a usual practice among the Hellenistic kings. Nevertheless, they can hardly be considered slaves, as far as they were a property of the state, the ultimate responsible of them. We have notices of other kind of peoples subdue to the Macedonian state collectively. This is the case, for example, of the Athenian prisoners captured in Granicus by Alexander, who were sent to Macedonia to forced labour.<sup>12</sup> Even before Alexander, we know by the time of his father Philip II that a big amount of prisoners were done among the Scitians, during the fight against king Ateas: they were driven to Macedonia, but they could escape thanks to an attack of the enemy (Justin 9, 2; cf. Oller and Alemany, 2016).

In front of the situation of both Macedonians, as subjects, and natives, as subdue, in front of the Macedonian crown, the Greek cities had a different relation with the kings. First, the traditional perspective of the kings as founders, which we have explained before, shows that the Hellenistic rulers needed to gain Greek inhabitants within their territories. If Alexander was the model to follow as founder, Seleucus can be considered by his own merits the authentic, even advanced, continuer of Alexander's policy in matter of city founding. Appian, again, is one of our best sources to know the huge task of founding Greek cities within Seleucus' territories:<sup>13</sup>

He built cities throughout the entire length of his dominions and named sixteen of them Antioch after his father, five Laodicea after his mother, nine after himself, and four after his wives, that is, three Apamea and one Stratonicea. Of these the two most renowned at the

9. Nevertheless, the way how, although the Macedonian soldiers gained access to a lot of booty during the conquest of Alexander, they also suffered a hard impoverishment (Curt 9, 3, 11; 10, 2; Ar. An. 7, 5, 3-4; Plu. *Alex.* 70, 3), is still a question to be analysed in deep by modern scholarship.

10. Justin 8, 5, 7-6, 2.

11. Ar. An. 4, 24, 7; D.S. 17, 83, 2; Curt. 7, 11, 28. On these and other matters concerning the impact of Alexander's conquest over the civilians and the slaving of populations during the conquest of the Persian Empire, see Antela-Bernárdez, 2015.

12. Ar. An. 1, 16, 6; 1, 29, 5; 3, 6, 2; Plu. *Alex.* 16, 17.

13. The task of Seleucus and the Seleucid kings in matter of city founding has also other aspect of importance, like the transformation of the territories in Asia in a kind of New Macedonia. At the light of the policies of toponomy, we can trace the will of Seleucus to build a new Macedonian kingdom in image and likeness of the Old Macedonian Kingdom: Frezouls, 1977; Antela-Bernárdez, 2010a; Borja Antela-Bernárdez, 2016b.



present time are the two Seleucias, one on the sea and the other on the river Tigris, Laodicea in Phoenicia, Antioch under Mount Lebanon, and Apamea in Syria. To others he gave names from Greece or Macedonia, or from his own exploits, or in honour of Alexander; whence it comes to pass that in Syria and among the barbarous regions of upper Asia many of the towns bear Greek and Macedonian names, such as Berrhœa, Edessa, Perinthus, Maronea, Callipolis, Achaia, Pella, Orophus, Amphipolis, Arethusia, Astacus, Tegea, Chalcis, Larissa, Heræa, and Apollonia; in Parthia also Sotera, Calliope, Charis, Hecatompylos, Achaia; in India Alexandropolis; in Scythia Alexandreschata. From the victories of Seleucus come the names of Nicephorium in Mesopotamia and of Nicopolis in Armenia very near Cappadocia (App. Sy. 57; cf. White 1912).<sup>14</sup>

The founding of a city, a Greek polis in its full meaning, surely had to imply also the concession of territories, as far as we have seen that by definition polis have to include both an urban centre and its hinterland, i.e. some landscapes for the city to be used. At the light of the presence of some collectives of native population related to the authority of the cities, and conceded as goods for working to the Greek (and Macedonian) communities, we must have in mind that there could be different kinds of utilisation of the territories and the native populations attached to them within the landscapes of the cities: although maybe some of them could be settled strictly in some specific spaces to utilise them, maybe the most usual type of utilisation and profit of those peoples subdued to the cities would be the payment by them of the *phoros*, the tribute, to the civic authorities,<sup>15</sup> a tax that probably was more in specie than in cash, and which provided the city of a security stock of means.

Likewise, some definition would have been needed between the spaces that are under direct jurisdiction of the city, which have been obtained by a concession of the kings related with the founding of the city as a *polis*, and the rest of the territories of the region, administrated by the king through his administrative agents and officers. This difference of spaces, civic and royal, was in fact sometimes of a probable and difficult definition, and just the custom and the day-by-day practices would surely situate the limits between one and the other. We know, also, that these opposite, but correlative spaces, can be named *chora basiliké* or royal landscapes and *chora politiké* or civic landscapes. The difference with the preceding experience in the Greek world was, nevertheless, clear, as far as the *chora politiké* or civic landscape resulted from the donation or concession by the king of territories for the Greek cities within their kingdoms to survive and be prosperous, as far as the kingdom can also gain profit from the cities by tax policies, for example; but the civic landscapes were not a full property of the cities, just a concession that can be applied, reduced or even cessed, although the usual practices and diplomatic uses of the Hellenistic world considered the relationships between royal and civic entities as a way to gain both

14. It is interesting to note that Appian writes “he built”, and not actually “he founded”, as we shall see later. Also, the founding of cities by Seleucus is also recorded by Strabo (11, 13, 6; 14, 2, 6; 14, 2, 10).

15. Briant, 1982: 68.

common prosperity. In fact, the right of the king to interact within the cities, and with the cities, is based in the idea of the rulers as the protectors and guarantors of the common good (*eunoia*) (O'Neil, 2000: 425ff.; cf. also Romilly, 1958).

To sum up, the Macedonian conquest means a new conception of territories for the Greek world, with spaces under royal authority and the condition for civic spaces of the concession of them by the kings. Nevertheless, these are not exactly as new as the Greeks seems to consider, as far as the Hellenistic realities were, in fact, a result of the combination of the preceding Macedonian tradition and, as it seems, the Persian influence not only over the conquered lands of the Macedonian conquest of Asia, but also of the previous ties between the Achaemenid models and the incipient Macedonian systems of administrating their own spaces as a kingdom in the times before the Persian Wars. After all, civic and royal spaces during the Hellenism were correlative entities that interacted fluidly, providing the *poleis* and the kings in the new lands of huge profits, frequently resulted from the exploitation of native people, and driving the Greeks to an age of outstanding economies.

## Bibliography

- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2007, Panhelenismo y hegemonía. Conceptos políticos en tiempos de Filipo II y Alejandro, *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 33, 1-21.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2009, Sucesión y victoria. Una aproximación a la guerra helenística, *Gerión* 27, 161-177.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2010a, Ciudad y territorio en la Siria selúcida, in B. ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ and T. ÑACO (eds.), *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empires*, Oxford, 119-130.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2010b, El día después de Queronea, in E. MUÑIZ *et al.* (eds.), *Grecia ante los imperios*, Sevilla, 2010, 187-196.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2011, Simply the Best. Alexander's last words and the Macedonian Kingship, *Eirene* 47, 118-126.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2014, World is not enough: Alexander the Great in Bactria-Sogdiana. A Study in Historiography, in B. ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ and J. VIDAL (eds.), *Central Asia in Antiquity*, Oxford, 77-84.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2015, La campaña de Alejandro: Esclavismo y dependencia en el espacio de conquista, in M. VALDÉS *et al.* (eds.), *Los espacios de la esclavitud y la dependencia en la Antigüedad*, Madrid, 281-296.
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2016a, Like Gods among Men. The Use of Religious and Mythical issues during Alexander's campaign, in N. SEKUNDA *et al.* (eds.), *Religious Aspects of War*, Leiden [in print].
- ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ, B., 2016b, Macedonia-Seleucia. La tierra de los Macedonios, in J. PÀMIAS *et al.* (eds.), *Tierra, territorio y población en la Grecia antigua*, Barcelona [in print].
- ARCHIBALD, Z.H., 2001, Making the most of one's friends: Western Asia Minor in the early Hellenistic age, in Z.H. ARCHIBALD (ed.), *Hellenistic Economies*, London, 185-203.

- BADIAN, E., 1966, Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia, in E. BADIAN (ed.), *Ancient Society and Institutions, Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg*, Oxford, 37-69.
- Briant, P., 1982, *Rois, Tributs et Paysans*, Paris.
- BORZA, E., 1982, Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House, *Hesperia Suppl.* 19, 7-13
- BORZA, E., 1990, *In the shadow of Olympus. The emergence of Macedon*, Princeton.
- BRIANT, P., 1973, Remarques sur 'laoi' et esclaves ruraux en Asie Mineure hellénistique, in *II Colloque de Besançon sur l'esclavage (mai 1971)*, Besançon, 93-133 [reprinted in Briant, P. 1982, *Rois, Tributs, Paysans*, Paris, 96-136].
- BRIANT, P., 2002, *From Cyrus to Alexander. A history of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake.
- BRINGMANN, K., 1993, The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism, in A. BULLOCH *et al.* (eds.), *Images and Ideologies. Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley, 7-24.
- BRINGMANN, K. 2001, Grain, timber and money: Hellenistic kings, finance, buildings and foundations in Greek cities, in Z.H. ARCHIBALD (ed.), *Hellenistic Economies*, London, 155-162.
- CHRISTESEN, P., MURRAY, S.C., 2010, Macedonian Religion, in J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 428-446.
- DANDAMAEV, M., LUKONIN, V.G., 1989, *The Cultural and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*, Cambridge.
- DOMÍNGUEZ MONEDERO, A., 2016, Alejandro Magno y las ciudades griegas de Asia Menor. Entre conquista y liberación, in F.J. GÓMEZ ESPELOSÍN and B. ANTELA-BERNÁRDEZ (eds.), *Alejandro Magno. Geografía e Historiografía*, Alcalá, [in print].
- EDSON, C.F., 1958, Imperium Macedonicum: The Seleucid Empire and the Literary Evidence, *Classical Philology* 53, 153-170.
- ELLIS, J.R., 1969, Population-transplants under Philip II, *Makedonika* 9, 9-12.
- FRASER, P.M., 2003, *The Cities of Alexander the Great*, Oxford.
- FREZOULS, E., 1977, La toponymie de l'Orient Syrien et l'apport des éléments macédoniens, in T. FAHD *et al.* (eds.), *La toponymie antique: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 12-14 Juin 1975*, Leiden, 219-248.
- GREENWALT, W., 1986, Herodotus and the Foundation of Argead Macedonia, *Ancient World* 13, 117-122.
- GREENWALT, W., 1994, A Solar Dionysus and Argead Legitimacy, *Ancient World* 25, 3-8.
- GREENWALT, W., 1999, Why Pella?, *Historia* 48, 158-183.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L., 1972, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. I, Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L., 1988, The king and the land in the Macedonian Kingdom, *Classical Quarterly* 38, 382-391.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L. 1992, *The Macedonian State*, Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N.G.L. 1995, Connotations of 'Macedonia' and 'Macedones' until 323 B.C., *Classical Quarterly* 45, 120-128.
- HANSEN, M.H., 2000, Introduction. The concepts of city-state and city-state culture, in M.H. HANSEN (ed.), *A Comparative Study of thirty city-state cultures*, Copenhagen.
- HATZOPOULOS, M.B. 2004, Macedonia, in M.H. HANSEN and T.H. NIELSEN (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 794-809.
- HATZOPOULOS, M.B., 2011, Macedonians and Other Greeks, in R. LANE FOX (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon*, Leiden, 51-78.
- HECKEL, W., YARDLEY, J., 2004, *Alexander the Great: Historical Sources in Translation*, Malden, 2004.
- KING, C.J., 2010, Macedonian Kingship and other Political Institutions, in J. ROISMAN and

- I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 373-391.
- LANE FOX, R., 2011, Philip and Alexander's Macedonia, in R. LANE FOX (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Macedon. Studies in the Archaeology and History of Macedon, 650 BC-300 AD*, Leiden, 367-391.
- MEHL, A., 1980-1981, Doriktetos Chora. Kritische Bemerkungen zum 'Speererwrb' in Politik und Völkerrecht der hellenistischen Epoche, *Ancient Society* 11/12, 172-212.
- MILLETT, P., 2010, The Political Economy of Macedonia, in J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 472-504.
- MURRAY, O., Polis, in S. HORNBLOWER and A. SPAWFORTH, (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford.
- OLBRYCHT, M.J. 2010, Macedonia and Persia, in J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 342-369.
- OLLER, M., ALEMANY, A., 2016, Contactos entre griegos y escitas en el litoral septentrional del Mar Negro durante el s. iv a.C., in J. PASCUAL *et al.* (eds.), *El siglo iv a.C. griego*, Madrid [in print].
- O'NEIL, J.L., 2000, Royal Authority and city law under Alexander and his Hellenistic successors, *Classical Quarterly* 50, 424-431.
- PAPAZOGLU, F., 1997, *Laoi et Paroikoi*, Belgrade.
- PURCELL, N., 1995, On the sacking of Carthage and Corinth, in D.C. INNES *et al.* (eds.), *Ethics and Rethoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, Oxford, 133-148.
- RACKMAN, H., 1944 (trans.), *Aristotle in 23 volumes. Vol 21: Politics*, London.
- ROISMAN, J., 2010, Classical Macedonia to Perdicas III, in J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 145-165.
- ROMILLY, J., 1958, Eunoia in Isocrates or the Political Importance of Creating Good Will, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 78, 92-101.
- SAKELLARIOU, M.B., 1989, *The Polis-State. Definition and Origin*, Athens.
- SPRAWSKI, S., 2010, The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I, in J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 127-144
- STROOTMAN, R., 2011, Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age, in O.N. VAN NIJF and R. ALSTON (eds.), *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, Leuven, 141-142.
- RHODES, P.J., 2010, The Literary and Epigraphic Evidence to the Roman Conquest, in J. ROISMAN and I. WORTHINGTON (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, Oxford, 23-40.
- WHITE, H., 1912, *Appian: The Roman History* (Vol. I: *The Foreign Wars*), Harvard.