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ΠΟΛΕΙΣ AND ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΙ IN UPPER MACEDONIA UNDER THE PRINCIPATE: A NEW INSCRIPTION FROM LYKE IN ORESTIS

Although new inscriptions and archaeological data have tended to refute earlier views that there were no urban centres in Upper Macedonia under the Principate and that the main form of civic organisation in the region was the komai,¹ the degree of urbanisation — i.e. the number of cities — in the region is still a matter for debate. Modern scholars’ estimates vary on this point, and this is partly due to the different interpretations that have been given at various times of the nature of the communities in Upper Macedonia, which in three different inscriptions are referred to as politeiai: i.e. the politeiai of Orestis (Battyna and Lyke) and Elimia (Oblastai). Thus, chiefly on the basis of the famous decree of Battyna, some scholars refer to these politeiai as cities, others doubt that they really were proper cities, and yet others believe that they were tribal communities.²

It is symptomatic of the general puzzlement that two eminent experts in

---


² For the opinions that have been ventured from time to time regarding the nature of these communities, see F. Papazoglou, “Encore une fois sur une signification tardive du mot politeia”, ZA 45, 1995, 239–40. Regarding Lyke, we must also add the views of Ph. Petsas, “Χρονικά Αρχαιολογικά 1968-70”, Μακεδονικά 15 (1975), 311, and D. Samsaris, Ιστορική Γεωγραφία της Ρωμαϊκής Επαρχίας της Μακεδονίας: Thessalonike 1989, p. 153, who both call it a city. As far as we know, no special study has been devoted to the term politeiai, for the various meanings of the term in the inscriptions, see P. Herrmann’s brief but comprehensive article, “Epigraphische Notizen 10–2”, EA 21, 1993, 71–2 (10 πολιτεία).
the study of the Macedonian institutions have argued this particular issue from diametrically opposed positions in recent works. M. B. Hatzopoulos believes that the politeiai were simply komai — communities with rudimentary civic organisation and limited autonomy as regards their external relations and consequently their dealings with the Roman authorities.³ This theory has been criticised by Ph. Papazoglou, who argues that in Upper Macedonia the term meant a ‘small civic community’ (petite communauté civique), apparently meaning a city and standing by her theory about the origin of the word in the Macedonian inscriptions — i.e. that it is the Greek rendering of the Latin term civitas.⁴

We believe that fresh light is shed on the problem by the epigraphical find published here. It is a dedicatory inscription that was found in the summer of 1995 during an excavation conducted by Professor Nikolaos Moutsoopoulos in the little basilica of St Demetrius on the islet of Ayos Ahillios on the smaller of the Prespa Lakes.⁵

Parallelepipedic slab of soft limestone damaged at the left edge. Re-used as the lintel over the door from the narthex into the naos. Dimensions 1.04 x 0.34 x 0.34 m. Height of letters 0.030–0.050 m. Now in its finding place, the narthex of the church. The script is carefully executed. Characteristic letters are the reverse sigma, found eight times (ll. 1, 2 and 3), and the upsilon, which is considerably taller than the other letters (ll. 3 and 4).⁶ Ligatures : TH in ll. 1 and 4 (Plate 1).

---

4. Papazoglou (n. 2), 243.
5. We should like to thank Professor N. Moutsoopoulos both for his permission to study and publish the inscription and for his information about the circumstances of its discovery.
6. The reverse sigma does not appear in the published inscriptions from Upper Macedonia, though it is seen in a few inscriptions from Thessalonike from the mid-first century AD onwards: see IG X 2, 1, 70 (AD 66/7), 34 (AD 89), 69 (late 1st c. AD), 304 (2nd c. AD), 744, 749, and 812 (2nd/3rd c. AD). The distinctive tall upsilon is also seen in two inscriptions from Thessalonike: see IG X 2, 1, 57 (2nd c. AD; cf. D. Diamantourou-Papakonstantinou, “Επιγραφαί Μυγδονίας, Κρηστονίας, Άνθεμούντος, Χαλκιδικῆς”, Ποιήμα, Athens 1990 (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ, 10), p. 243, for a photograph and the improved text of the inscription), and 208 (2nd or 3rd c. AD; cf. P. Adam-Veleni, Μακεδονικοί Βουμοί, unpublished diss., Thessalonike 1996, p. 181-82, No. 65, with photograph and the inscription dated on the basis of the form of the monument in the late 2nd c. AD).
[Θε] φίς & Σεβαστοίς καὶ τῇ Λυκαιῶν
[πό] λει & Α. Φλαουίος Φαβρικιανός &
[Ἀντ] Ἰπατρὸς διὰ τοῦ ἱδίου πατρὸς Λευκίου
[Φι] λοιίου Φαβρικιανοῦ τῇ πατρίδι ἑρέπτηριον

The reference to the θεοὶ Σεβαστοί does not constitute firm evidence for
dating the inscription to a period when there were more than one emperor —
i.e. after AD 161 — because the phrase could equally well refer to the living
Emperor and his deified predecessors. Thus, apart from the gentiliciūm Flavius
borne by the individuals mentioned, which dates the inscription to after
the third quarter of the first century AD, there is no further internal evidence
for its dating. However, the overall impression given by the writing suggests
that the text probably belongs to the second, if not the early third, century AD.

The individuals mentioned in the inscription are not known from
elsewhere. Their cognomen is found once more in Upper Macedonia. In an
inscription from Herakleia in Lynkos, the koinon of the Macedonians
honours the daughter of a Roman, one of whose cognomina is Fabricianus. The
same cognomen also appears in an inscription from Beroia, which
preserves a very fragmentary letter to the city from a Roman official or
emperor. The name Antipatros borne as a second cognomen by the first
person mentioned in the inscription is met occasionally in Upper Macedonia
and attests that, under the Principate, inhabitants of the region used the names
of figures from Macedonian history.

8. M. Demitsas, Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθωσι φθεγγομένοις καὶ ἐν μνημείοις σωζόμενοις,
Athens 1896, p. 258, No. 218; cf. Papazoglou (n. 1), 263.
10. See A. Rizakis and I. Touratsoglou, 'Επιγραφές Ἀνω Μακεδονίας, Athens 1985, vol. 1
(hereafter EAM), 20 (Elimia, 2nd–3rd c. AD, where mention is made of a freedman named
Βάσος Ἀν [γ]υπάτρου ἐ[λ]ευθερωθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀντιπάτρος[υ] τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου, 164
(Lynkos, 2nd–3rd c. AD, Ἀντιπάτρος Ῥιγητάλκου), 204 (Orestis, undated, ἩΡΑΚΛΕΙ Ἀντιπάτρου).
The precise nature of Antipatros’ donation, which, we are told, is made to his homeland in gratitude for his upbringing, is not specified. Judging by other dedicatory inscriptions in which the same formula, ἰδεῖναι καὶ τὴν πόλει, is used, it was most likely a building, with the inscription built into the façade.¹¹ Nor do we know why it is his father who is executing the donation, as the text of the inscription specifically states. The most likely reason is that the donor was absent from the city either temporarily or perhaps even permanently. One cannot exclude also the possibility that he was a child.

The use of the word θηροτήνων in this little city in Upper Macedonia is an interesting aspect of this brief dedicatory inscription. It is found already in Homer and the tragic poets, and as far as we know it is met in a small number of inscriptions of the late Empire relating to individuals making donation or offering other services to their homeland, with the intention of thus repaying it for having reared them, as children might repay their parents.¹² It is used in this sense equally rarely by writers under the Principate.¹³ The fact that the word is used so rarely and above all poetically suggests that the author of the inscription, who may well have been the donor himself, L. Flavius Fabricianus Antipatros, was one of the educated members of this little community.

Even more interesting is the fact that the inscription uses the term polis, which touches on the question of the status of Lyke. Lyke, which is on the islet of Ayos Ahillios on Little Prespa,¹⁴ was hitherto known to us chiefly from two

---

¹¹. See, e.g., the inscription of the 2nd century AD from Thessalonike, IG X 2, 1 102 ll. 1–9 (θεοῖς Ἐβοστοῖς καὶ τῇ πόλει.....τὸν νείναι τὴν στοάν τὴν Εἰνίδος Μέμφις [τ] ἱδος καὶ τὸ πρόπύλων ἐν χώρᾳ τοῦ νεανίτης τοῦ πατρὸς τῆς Μεγαλοπόλεως), or the inscription of the 1st–2nd century AD from Lakonia, E. Kouroumou and G. A. Pikoussas, “Ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀρσινοῦ (Ἀθήνας) Λεκκονικής”, Hesperia 7 (1989), 126 (= SEG 39, 1989, 372), ll. 1–3 (θεοῖς Ἐβοστοῖς [τ] καὶ ταῖς ταῖς ἀντιπέτους πόλις [τ] ἡ δείξα ἡ βαλανείαν ἐν τῇ θεμελίων....). All the same, it would seem that the donation is not always specified; see, e.g., the inscription from Selge in Asia Minor (Principate), IVSelge (IK 37), 1.


¹³. See Plutarch, Arat. 25, 1, ἀρχὴ τῆς πόλεως θηροτήνων τῶν ἑλεομερῶν ἀποδοθέων χρηματομονήσεως; Ασκιασάνων, Oniokr. ll. 66, διὸ ἔδηθη ἐγγίζομεν πατρίδο τυχόν συνέχειάς ταύτα ἀποδόωσιν αὐτή.

¹⁴. See Papazoglou (n. 1), 242, and Samsaris (n. 2), 153.
inscriptions from the Principate. One of them preserves the name intact;\textsuperscript{15} in the other there is only the genitive plural ending of the ethnic, the correct restoration of which [Αυ]χαίων, as had already been proposed,\textsuperscript{16} is now confirmed by the inscription published here. In the second inscription, which is dated to between the middle and the end of the second century AD, the Lykeans, as a politeia, honour the high priest K. Julius Crispus, who is probably the same person as the ambassador of the ethnos of the Orestai mentioned in the decree of Battyna.\textsuperscript{17}

The expression τῇ Λυκαίων [πό]λει which appears in the new inscription, resolves the doubts about the urban nature of the community\textsuperscript{18} and firmly establishes that, in the period to which the inscription belongs, there was a, probably small, urban centre on the islet of Ayos Ahillios.

But what was the status of Lyke? Hitherto, scholars have produced various answers to this question, based on the term politeia in the inscription of Julius Crispus, which, in the absence of other data, they have interpreted in the same way as the same term in the decree of Battyna. The appearance of the

\textsuperscript{15} EAM 147, 1. 1, πολιταρχοῦντος ἐν Λύκῃ Φιλίππων.

\textsuperscript{16} EAM 149, [Αυ]χαίων ἡ πολιτεία / Κ. Ἰουλίου Κρίσπον/ τὸν ἐν / εὐγένεια τειχῆς καὶ νεῖ/ δὲ ἐπιμελητῶν Νειχάχου τοῦ Δημητρίου / οὔ καί Τ. Φλαούνιου / Διονυσίου, incl. older bibliography. The islet of Ayos Ahillios has also yielded the following epigraphical finds: i) fragments of clay roof-tiles bearing stamped names and dated (on the basis of the letter shapes) to the Hellenistic period (EAM 179); ii) the 'Macedonian' grave of the physician K. Julius Niketes (EAM 163); and iii) a four-sided slab of the second half of the third century AD, the text of which survives in very fragmentary condition (EAM 183). For the various excavations carried out on the island and their findings, see Ph. Petsas, ArchDelt (1961–2), Chron. B 2 219–26 and A. Andreoiomenou, ArchDelt 22 (1967) Chron. B 2, 416.

\textsuperscript{17} EAM 186, II. 32–4, ὀίη τὸν πρεσβευτὸν τὸν <ὁ> ἔθνους Ἰουλίου Κρίσπον καὶ Φιλάγγου καὶ Κλειτοῦ τῶν / Πολεμαῖων. For the discussion about this identification, see Papazoglou (n. 1), 242 n. 41. The identification makes it likely that Lyke and the Little Prespa area came under the ethnos of the Orestai. Samsaris (n. 2), 52–3, supports this on the basis of the area's geomorphology. The editors of the Corpus of the inscriptions of Upper Macedonia (see EAM 149) leave the subject open, though on the map at the end of their work they include Lyke and the Little Prespa area in Orestis. At all events, wherever Lyke belonged administratively, the importance of the new inscription for the problem of the civic organisation of Upper Macedonia remains the same.

\textsuperscript{18} See Hatzopoulos (n. 4), 156 n. 28, who disagrees with Papazoglou that Lyke had the status of a polis and himself believes that, like Battyna, it was a kome. This is in line with his general theory that the only poleis of the koma of Upper Macedonia were their capitals: see Hatzopoulos, "Epigraphie et villages..."(n. 3), 160.
term *polis* in the new inscription gives us a new datum, which, if we consider it together with the already known term *politeia*, may shed some light on the question of the status of Lyke, as long as we can establish the relationship between the two terms. At first sight, one might say that they relate to two different points in time and reflect a change in the legal status of Lyke from a *polis* to a *politeia* or *vice versa*. However, this presents the drawback that no literary or epigraphical source gives any indication that *politeia* means a form of civic organisation different from that of a *polis*. It seems much more likely that both terms were in use at the same point in time in the inscriptions of Lyke; which means that *polis* in the new inscription denotes either the urban centre of the whole of the autonomous community of the Lykeans, which is called a *politeia*, or, more probably, the city of Lyke itself, as a term equivalent to, and indiscriminately used for, *politeia*.

At this point, one might well wonder whether and when the term *politeia* is anywhere specifically defined as an autonomous city. There is epigraphical evidence to show that the term did in fact acquire this meaning as early as the Hellenistic period: in a well known Larisean decree of 217 BC, for instance, are mentioned at the same time the equivalent formulas *ψεφισμένης τῆς πόλεως* and *ἐν ψφαίμου τῇ πολιτείᾳ*. But even if one denies that the

19. However, attempts have been made to interpret it in this way. Thus, for instance, according to Hatzopoulos, “Épigraphie et villages” (n. 3), 158–9, in the inscriptions of Upper Macedonia the term *politeia* means *kome*. Furthermore, in the dedication from Bragylai in Krestonia (SEG 12, 1955, 349: Βραγυλίων ἡ βουλή καὶ ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ πολιτεία) to Hadrian and his wife Sabina, the term *politeia* is interpreted by M. B. Hatzopoulos and L. D. Loukopoulos, *Morystos, cité de la Chrestonie*, Athens 1989 (Μητρήματα 7), pp. 61ff., as neighbouring *komai* forming a ‘sympolity’ with the nearest urban centre; and by Papazoglou ("Encore une fois" [n. 2], partic. p. 238) as the rural population of the *politeia/civitas* of Bragylai, as she had already proposed in an earlier study, “Une signification tardive du mot ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ”, *REG* 52 (1959), 100–5 (cf. *Bull. épigr.* 1960, 202).

20. It goes without saying that, apart from the population of the city, the *politeia* of the Lykeans would have included the inhabitants of the lakeside *komai* (or settlements), archaeological traces of at least one of which have been located in the village of Pyle, southwest of Little Prespa: see Papazoglou (n. 1), 242, and Samsaris (n. 2), 167. On the basis of the remains of a wall he has located, Samsaris also mentions a ‘fortress settlement’ under the Principate on Kale Hill between the villages of Lefkonas and Karyes, 200m west of Little Prespa. With the evidence available, it is not possible to determine the administrative connection between these *komai* and the *polis* of Lyke.

21. See IG IX 2, 517, II. 9 and 17 respectively, cf. 1. 41; for the date of the decree see Chr. Habicht, “Epigraphische Zeugnisse zur Geschichte Thessaliens unter der makedonischen
use of the term could date back to the Hellenistic period in the case of the Lyke inscription (and the Upper Macedonian inscriptions in general) on the grounds that all the available evidence from the same area dates to the Principate, it is by no means difficult to understand the term as signifying a city. In this case, as has already been suggested, the usage would be a Latinism, because Greek translations of Roman administrative documents frequently use the term politeia for the Latin civitas.

From what has been said above, it is clear that the two inscriptions from Lyke, taken together, give us no choice but to accept that its politeia and, likewise, the other two communities attested by the same term (Battyna and Oblostai) were indeed cities — i.e. civic communities — regardless of whether the use of the term in the relevant inscriptions is a Latinism (which it very probably is, at least in the light of the existing data) or part of the Hellenistic tradition.

This finding changes the picture we have had hitherto of the degree of urbanisation and the civic organisation of the Orestis area: to the unidentified city mentioned in the list of epheboi (of AD 146/7) from Sisani we may now add the civic community (politeia) of Lyke; and, equally, of Battyna, because, thanks to this new inscription, we now have strong grounds for believing that

Herrnschaft”, Ancient Macedonia 1, Thessalonike 1970, 273 - 279. The formula ἐφαύρωτει τὰ πολιτεῖαι also appears in the decree SEG 27, 1977, 202, 1. 15 (of 220-210 BC), with which Larisa honours Philip V’s son Chrysogonos.

22. To the examples collected by Papazoglou (“Encore une fois” [n. 3], 327–8), who was the first to moot this hypothesis, should be added such interesting epigraphical texts as an excerpt from the copy of the Lex de provincis praetoris (of 100 BC) found at Knidos; see I1Knidos (IK 41) 1, 31 III 1. 31 πρὸς τοῖς δῆμοις πολιτείαις τε (which corresponds to the Latin gentes civitatesque: see comments on the inscription), and a provision from the Monumentum Ephe- sianum: see H. Engelmann and D. Knibbe, “Das Zollgesetz der Provincia Asia”, EAA 14, 1989, 103 Λ 39 αἰτίνες πολιτείαι [ι καὶ ἀτίνα ἔ] ν καὶ αἰτίνες δήμοι εἰς ἐξω διοικήσεως Ἔφεσίας, etc. (see comments on the inscription). See also P. Herrmann, “Rom und die Asylie griechischer Heiligtümer, Chiron 19 (1989) 113 ll. 33 - 4 τ [...] ν / πο [λ] ιτείαν τῶν Σταρ- διανών.

23. See already Papazoglou, (n. 1), where she uses the word cité for Lyke (p. 242) and the phrase communauté autonome for Battyna (p. 241); cf. eadem, “Encore une fois” (n. 2), 243, where the three politeiai of Upper Macedonia are collectively referred to as petites communautés civiques.

24. See EAM187. Although reservations have been expressed as to whether the inscription was found in situ (see Papazoglou [n. 1], 244), most scholars accept that it originates from the
the latter’s politeia was an civic community, like Lyke. The same must apply to the area of Elimia, where, apart from Aiane, there is an inscriptional reference to the Ὀβλοστίῳς πολιτεία. Whether there was the same degree of urbanisation and similar civic organisation in the rest of Upper Macedonia is a question to which only new epigraphical and archaeological finds can give a definite answer.

25. EAM 37. According to some scholars (see Papazoglou, “Encore une fois” [n. 3], 242, and G. Karamitrou-Mentesidi, Κοζάνη, Πόλη Ελιμιώτιδος, Thessalonike 1993, p. 28), the institutions of the boule and the [demos] mentioned in the honorary inscription EAM 34 (of the 2nd c. AD) belong to an unknown city of the Κοινόν of the Elimiotai, which was on the site of modern Kozani. This is challenged by Hatzopoulos, Institutions (n. 3), 89–90, who does not regard it as necessarily so and suggests that they are the boule and the demos of the Κοινόν of the Elimiotai. For new insessional evidence attesting the existence, at least in the 3rd century BC, of an otherwise unknown city in Elimiotis named Tela, see P. M. Nigdelis, “Μακεδονικά Σύμμεικτα”, Τεκμηρία 1 (1995) 173–9, SEG 43, 1993 [1996], 937.
ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Πόλεις καὶ Πολιτείαι στὴν Ἀνω Μακεδονία κατὰ τὴν Αὐτοκρατορικὴ ἐποχὴ: Μιὰ νέα ἐπιγραφὴ ἀπὸ τὴν Λύκη τῆς Ὀρεστίδος.

Ὁ προοδορισμὸς τοῦ νομικοῦ καθεστώτος τῶν κοινοτήτων τῆς Ἀνω Μακεδονίας ποὺ εἶναι γνωστὲς ὡς πολιτείαι, δὴ τῶν πολιτειῶν τῶν Βαττούναιῶν καὶ τῶν Λυκαῖων στὴν Ὀρεστίδα καὶ τῶν Ὀβλοστίων στὴν Ἑλίμεια ἀποτελεῖ γιὰ τὴν ἔρευνα ἕνα δυσεπίλυτο πρόβλημα. Ὁρισμένοι ἔρευνητές πιστεύουν ὅτι οἱ κοινοτήτες αὐτὲς ἦσαν πόλεις, ἐνώ ἄλλοι ὑποστηρίζουν ὅτι ἐπρόκειτο γιὰ φυλετικὲς κοινοτήτες ἢ κώμες. Νέο φῶς στὸ πρόβλημα ρίχνει ἡ σύντομη ἀναθηματικὴ ἐπιγραφὴ (τοῦ 2ου ἢ τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ 3ου αἰ. π.Χ.) ποὺ βρέθηκε πρόσφατα στὴ νησίδα τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἀχιλλείου τῆς Μυκῆς Πρέσπας καὶ δημοσιεύεται ἕδω γιὰ πρώτη φορά. Στὴν ἐπιγραφὴ αὐτὴ ἡ Λύκη, ἡ ὁποία μᾶς ἦταν γνωστὴ ἀπὸ ἄλλη ἐπιγραφικὴ μαρτυρία (EAM 149) ὡς Λυκαῖων πολιτεία, ἐμφανίζεται ὡς Λυκαῖων [πόλεις]. Τὸ νέο δεδομένο μᾶς ἐπιτρέπει νὰ ὑποστηρίξουμε ὅτι ἡ κοινότητα αὐτὴ, καθὼς ἐπίσης, ἀναλογικά, καὶ οἱ ἄλλες γνωστὲς πολιτείαι τῆς Ἀνω Μακεδονίας ἦσαν πόλεις.