

Peliganes:
the state of the question and some other thoughts

Vojislav SARAKINSKI

Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Faculty of Philosophy
Skopje, Macedonia

1. Contrary to the wealth of evidence for some problems concerning the history of the ancient Macedonian state, the office of *peliganes* is barely mentioned in the ancient sources, and modern scholars rarely touch upon the problem. It is usually assumed that the name of the office is associated with the Greek word for “grey-haired”, “old”, so the *peliganes* are therefore translated as a “council of elders”, although, as we shall see, this interpretation is hardly based on solid ground. From all that has been written by the scholars – both foreign and domestic¹ – one could conclude that the term *peliganes* signifies local officials, members of the city council, especially in the Macedonian cities in Asia. Yet, there are scholars who doubt that these officials had any real powers and, on the basis of the possible etymology of the

¹ In all honesty, one would struggle to find anything more than a few scarce lines. The only scholarly works in Macedonian historiography that mention this problem are ΠΡΟΕΒΑ, 1997: 74, 166; in somewhat more detail ΕΑΔΕΜ, 2004: 337; as well as a recently published note by ΠΟΠΟΒСКА, 2005. As for scholarly works on the subject abroad, one should note HAMMOND & GRIFFITH, 1979: 384, 399, 648. In addition, there are several works that make brief and passing mentions of the *peliganes* as a “council of elders” without further treatment of the issue, among them WALBANK, 1992: 135-136; ROUSSEL, 1942-3; RHODES & LEWIS, 1997: 460; VAN DER SPEK, 2009: 109; MUSTI, 1984; COHEN, 2006: 112, 114; GRAINGER, 1990: 66, 152-153; HATZOPOULOS, 1996: 323, 326, 465, 482; BERNARD, 1998: 1208-1210 (*non vidi*). BORZA, 1990 and ERRINGTON, 1990, make no mention whatsoever of the *peliganes*, the work of Errington being a particularly striking example, as he also deals with the period of the Hellenistic monarchies.

term, assume that the *peliganes* held a public office that was, for the most part, a sign of recognition and honour that the community bestowed upon older citizens.² These are the main points that I will attempt to clarify in this paper.

2. The naming of the *peliganes* as “elders” and, hence, of their council as a “(honorary) council of elders”, is based on a single fragment by the geographer Strabo. Since this fragment is of the utmost importance for the further development of the argument, it would be wise to examine it in full detail:

“Among the Thesprotians and the Molossians, old women are called *peliai* and old men *pelioi*, as is also the case among the Macedonians; at any rate, those people call their dignitaries *peligones* (compare the *gerontes* among the Laconians and the Massaliotes). And this, it is said, is the origin of the myth about the pigeons in the Dodonaean oak-tree.”³

However, is it possible to work out a clear-cut connection *pelioi* = *peligones* = *gerontes*, i.e. *peliganes* = *elders*, on the basis of this one solitary fragment? For a number of reasons, it would be superficial to claim that it is.

The first thing that induces us to approach this fragment with scepticism is the very way Strabo composed his work, as well as the origin and the nature of the information he provides. Scholars have often pointed out that the bits of information found in Strabo are too generalised and chronologically uncertain;⁴ furthermore, that Strabo compiled large portions of the *The*

² HAMMOND & GRIFFITH, 1979: 339 sqq.; same ПОПОВСКА, 2005: *passim*. In fact, few authors argue that the *peliganes* had no powers at all; however, all of them seem to go along with the information in Strabo and claim that this body consisted of elderly citizens.

³ Strabo, *Geogr.* VII, fr. 2 (*E. Vat.* 1, 2, 3). The translation is by H. L. JONES from the Loeb edition: Strabo, *The Geography* (1924), vol. 3, Harvard. This translation differs from the one found in Поповска, who links the first two sentences with the words “those people”, thus creating the illusion that the *pelioi* are, in fact, the *peligones*. Actually, the term “these” or “those people” refers to the Thesprotians and the Molossians.

⁴ As noted by ПОПОВСКА, 2005: 9.

Geography using records of older authors⁵ rather freely, without being discriminating enough, and, particularly important in this case, solely in accordance with his own views and needs. It is thus impossible to ascertain whether the three sentences cited above were already organically bound in the work where Strabo took them over from, as he has undoubtedly done precisely that, since he does not speak from personal experience, but describes how things were more than a century before his own time. Finally, one should also have in mind that what we have before us in this case is a fragment preserved in the so-called “Vatican epitome”, an excerpt that was already detached from the main body of the text and, thus, from the original context.

Even on their own, these facts should be enough to cause us to doubt the information found in Strabo. However, were we to also include the testimony of the lexicographer Hesychius of Alexandria, then the state of things becomes even more complicated, for Hesychius describes the curious term *peliganes* in the following way:

“*peliganes*: those who hold honour; among the Syrians, councillors (*boulenta*).”⁶

It is common knowledge that Hesychius had the self-imposed task to collect curious and unknown words, and to try to explain them through known ones. Why is it, then, that he has not taken the opportunity to explain the *peliganes* through the association with the word “elders”, especially if the term was an obvious allusion to their grey hair? In all probability, because he knew the terminology of his time much better than we do. In interpreting Strabo’s fragment, there is one simple, yet continuously overlooked fact, namely, that the word *pelios/polios*, to which we should allegedly call on regarding these “elders”, does not mean “grey” or “white” at all. The entry that precedes the *peliganes* in Hesychius is “*pelianon*: similar to lead, lead-like, with lead paint”; the one that precedes it is even more telling: “*pe-*

⁵ On the methods of Strabo, see DUECK, 1999: 476-478. On the older primary sources Strabo used, see the contributions of ROSEMAN, C. H., DUECK, D. and LITINAS, N. in DUECK *et al.*, 2005; see also DUECK, 2000: 180-186.

⁶ Hesych. Lexicogr., *s.v.* *peliganes*. If we correlate the explanation “those who hold honour” with the next one, it becomes clear that “honour” = “power”; the term “Syrians” is a common designation for the state of the Seleucids, see ИПОЕВА, 1997: 166 n. 67.

liai: black (for pigeons wild and tame)”. Even the etymological inquiry of the root of this word indicates that *peleia*, *pelia*, *peleios*, *pelias* can stand for every colour in the spectre of shades from black, through dark-grey, to greyish white.⁷ These examples clearly show that the allusion to the elderly, white hair, and, more significantly, the attempt at linking the office and the age of its holder, are unsubstantiated. The link between the office of the *peliganes* and their age, while seemingly reasonable, lacks a sound organic correlation and is obviously based on nothing but the phonetic similarity of the words.

If this is how things are, we are bound to clarify the reason why then, Strabo explained the term *peliganes* through the word *gerontes*, “elders”. The answer is much simpler than it seems at first sight. It is a simple fact that an author writes for the readers of his own time and social context; he uses and explains the terms in a way that would, primarily, be clear and comprehensible to his contemporaries. Strabo wrote in the transitional period between the first century BC and the first century AD⁸; how could he ever explain the term *peliganes* to his readers? Well, only by making a comparison with another similar collective body. The Roman Senate was probably out of the question: first of all, the function and the specific position of the senators (*hoi hypatoi*) within the Roman constitution were still not sufficiently known by everyone in the eastern Mediterranean; moreover, the Senate was the highest political body in the state, not a local council. Nor was the comparison with classical Athens suitable, again due to the peculiarity of the constitution: indeed, the Athenian Areopagos was comprised of elders, but they had no factual power; the Council (*boule*) was, on the other hand, a sort of commission of the Assembly (*ekklesia*), so essentially, quite different from a city council.⁹ The only real instance of advisory powers, without a separation of power or interference of responsibilities with another collective body, was to be found in classical Sparta, and, in case this example was still difficult to pin down, Strabo added the councillors from Massalia, once an important client city of Gnaeus Pompey, but still sporting a lively political spirit. Using the word *gerontes* as a means to illustrate the word *peliganes*, Strabo must have had in mind the powers and the position of this body

⁷ CHANTRAINE, *DELG*, s.v. *peleia*.

⁸ There is ongoing discussion whether the *The Geography* is a work spanning many decades of effort, or whether Strabo actually compiled it rather quickly in his old age; see DUECK, 2000: 145-154, with extensive references.

⁹ Cf. BLACKWELL, 2009.

within the political life of the community,¹⁰ and not the age of its members.¹¹

3. As things stand, it appears that there is not a single piece of tangible evidence that the office of *peliganes* and the age of its holders were in any correlation; therefore, it would be quite unwarranted, and even incorrect, to assert that *peliganes* is a title which the Macedonians bestowed exclusively to elderly persons. However, it was precisely this assumption that was the basis for the claim that the *peliganes* were some kind of “honorary officials”, perhaps in charge of the religious and spiritual issues of the community;¹² this warrants special attention, as it is not quite clear why, in the first place, the *peliganes* could not have had any real powers within the city. At first sight, this seems to be a non-issue, so no explanation should be required. On the other hand, the problem might lie in the fact that the definition of the Hellenistic monarchies as “absolutistic” is still taken too literally. It seems that some scholars still have difficulties accepting that, in this “absolute” monarchy, a political life may still have existed at a local level.¹³ It seems difficult for them to discern royal domain and state policy from cities and local policy; to make a distinction between the phases of development and the fluidity of the states under the first Diadochi, and the centralised state control in their fully developed phase; but these very details are of utmost importance for an accurate understanding of the position of the *peliganes* within the po-

¹⁰ Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that “guardians of the Spartan oligarchical constitution”, a kind of a “Supreme Court” in the modern sense of the term, were the five ephors – not the *gerousia*, as Popovska claims (2005: 10); cf. LÉVY, 2003, and especially RICHER, 1998.

¹¹ Concerning the problematic choices of terms in sources writing about their distant past, while aiming their work at their contemporary audience, one can find an excellent parallel in the problem of the titles of Philip and Alexander as *hegemones* of the *Koine eirene*; there, F. Papazoglu has shown in a decisive manner that the actual titles of the kings would have no meaning at the time the later accounts were compiled, so the authors chose to use a title from their own time in order to make things clear for their readers. See PAPA-ZOGLU, 1974: 47-64.

¹² An assumption given in the form of a question by ПОПОВСКА, 2005: 10.

¹³ ПОПОВСКА (2005: 10) argues that the *peliganes* could not have had unlimited powers, which is quite understandable in itself. No one expects the local officials to have supreme powers; the question is what exactly their legislative and/or executive powers were.

litical structure of the Seleucid kingdom. Accordingly, and since there are few works by Macedonian scholars dealing with this subject, we shall briefly depart from the main topic of our research and turn our attention to the constitutional arrangement of the Hellenistic kingdoms, but only for the time span that is of particular interest for our subject, namely, during the period of the Macedonian colonisation of the East and the creation of the kingdoms of the Diadochi.

4. In the eastern Mediterranean, and especially the Aegean area, one of the major political and legal consequences of Alexander's campaigns was the renewed promotion of the monarchy as a type of positive system of government. The concept of the monarchy was traditional and quite common for the Macedonians, but until the time of Philip II, this concept was often criticised, and therefore was rather marginal in the broad "European" cultural sphere. While promoting absolutism as a key political concept, Alexander III, at the same time, established the model of government that the Diadochi tried to pursue.

Yet, even though they aspired to the royal position and took royal titles, the Diadochi were rather different from Alexander, and such were the historical conditions at the time of their undertakings. Alexander set out on his path as a unanimously recognised and accepted sovereign of a united and compact kingdom; the Diadochi, on the other hand, were bound to create and build up their power gradually, while at the same time fighting other equally well-skilled and prepared Diadochi, who had matching abilities and armies.¹⁴ The Diadochi acted in a world virtually created and defined by the conquests of Alexander, a world that was in a state of major political, social and cultural reshaping. In Asia, for example, there were officially autonomous Greek *poleis*, dynasts with uncertain obedience ruling over larger or smaller areas,¹⁵ and even satraps who ruled almost independently.¹⁶

¹⁴ Detailed analysis in BILLOWS, 1997: 185 sqq.

¹⁵ E.g. Zipoites of Bithynia, Dionysios of Herakleia Pontike, Mithridates of Kios. Information on these dynasts can be easily obtained in every major encyclopaedic work on the history of the ancient world; details for Zipoites and his relations with the Diadochi in ΓΑΒΕΛΑΚΟ, 2005: 128-166.

¹⁶ Sibyrtios, the satrap of Arakhosia, as well as Peithon, the satrap of Babylonia.

From the time of the death of Alexander to the battle of Ipsos,¹⁷ the states of the Diadochi were agglomerations of joint and adhesive territories, as different from the traditional Macedonian kingdom, as from the latter fully developed Hellenistic monarchies.

The control and management of such vast and divergent territories, with meagre or no cohesion at all, was an intricate and painstaking endeavour. For the most part, the administrative and commercial activities were not, nor could have been controlled by the ruler in a straightforward way: they functioned on a regional or local basis, left in the hands of the local governors and their subordinate officials.¹⁸ In Asia, the general administrative arrangement was based on the division of the kingdom into satrapies; nevertheless, within the satrapies, which often did not have firmly fixed borders, it was impossible to distinguish a strict structure or hierarchy.

For that reason, but also because they had almost no autochthonous basis to hold on to,¹⁹ the Macedonian rulers in Asia (Alexander, followed by Antigonus, and lastly, the Seleucids) felt that it was crucial to initiate the foundation of colonies, as well as transfers of Macedonians and Greeks (or, broadly speaking, Europeans) to Asia.²⁰ Apart from clearly economic motives, these colonies were to serve as permanent garrisons, a safeguard of sorts on the conquered territories, and at the same time, a pool enabling the

¹⁷ *See* the detailed analysis in Macedonian in ΠΑΠΑΖΟΓΛΥ, 1995: 190-242. Also, *see* WILL, 1979: 19-83; ERRINGTON, 2008: 13-50; GREEN, 1990: 1-35; GRAINGER, 2007: 92-132.

¹⁸ An account with convenient examples can be found in BILLOWS, 1997: 268 sqq. There were similar examples in the Ptolemaic kingdom, although with a centralised administration that was incomparably stronger; *cf.* GRENFELL, 1896: 195 sqq., as well as MUHS, 2005: 1-28. *Cf.* the general description in EHRENBERG, 1960: 178-190.

¹⁹ BILLOWS, 1997: 292 calls them “foreign conquerors”. One could argue that Antigonus was already a satrap of Phrygia for thirteen years and, therefore, that this definition might be too harsh. However, it would be very hard to prove that this amount of time was enough to provide an autochthonous basis for the undertakings of the authorities, as shown by the example of Persia; furthermore, other Hellenistic monarchs had not had the chance to enjoy a position similar to that of Antigonus; so admittedly, Billows’ definition remains in perfect shape.

²⁰ On this colonisation, *see* BILLOWS, 1995: 146-182; *cf.* ERRINGTON, 2008: 68-75.

continuous enlistment of men in the army and the administrative apparatus in Asia. True, Alexander went to great lengths to incorporate the Iranian aristocracy in the administration of the state,²¹ and similar intentions are attributed to Antigonos Monophthalmos;²² yet, it is quite clear that the Macedonian rulers in Asia had to rely first and foremost on Macedonians and Greeks, the only citizens whose interests, as new residents of Asia, depended on the wholehearted support of the Macedonian rulers.²³ Seleucus maintained the same course, although he did not colonise in the real sense of the word, for he had neither the opportunity, nor the means to gather recruits from Macedonia and Greece; he only transferred Macedonians and Greeks who were already in Asia, soldiers and colonists since the times of Alexander, and to a greater extent, the time of Antigonos.²⁴

5. This last digression brings us to a crucial question: if most of these settlements were established in the time of Antigonos, or in any case before 301 BC, can we expect them to have a new constitution of sorts, one contrived by Antigonos, Seleucus or any of their successors? Surely not. These settlements, oftentimes established in a hurry and under the pressure of necessity, could have been organized only in a manner familiar to the colonists. The constitution of the new cities, regardless of the fact whether they had external autonomy or not, was a copy of the constitutions of the European cities, Macedonian or Greek, depending on whence most of the colonists in the city came. Thus, the fact that the *peliganes* are attested in both of

²¹ Although the precise intentions of Alexander concerning the status of the Iranian aristocracy are still a matter of discussion, the contemporary sources clearly show that its integration was already afoot; cf. SEIBERT, 1972: 186-192, with a thorough review of the contemporary scholarly works.

²² BILLOWS, 1997: 47, 293, with a review of the sources.

²³ Their position is analysed by COHEN, 1978: 1-14.

²⁴ The cities founded by Antigonos Monophthalmos (e.g. Antigoneia in Troas, Antigoneia in Bithynia, Antigoneia on Orontes) were reconstituted with new names after his death (in this case, Alexandria in Troas, Nikaia and, arguably, Antiochia, although there are reasons to believe that the last one was genuinely founded by Seleucus). It is to be assumed that many of the Seleucid colonies were actually settlements established by Antigonos; the same goes for the Macedonian settlements in Asia, whose founder is not mentioned in the sources. See TSCHERIKOWER, 1927: 154-155; GOUKOWSKY, 1979: 15, n. 27. *Contra* COHEN, 1978: 79.

the Macedonian settlements (*katoikiai*) indisputably reflects their existence in Macedonia. However, what was their jurisdiction? Were they only “honorary officials”, or did they have real powers? Or, to phrase it more broadly – in a context where the Hellenistic kings were undisputed political and military overlords of all their subjects, including the cities, was there still room for civic institutions and civic political life?

The answer is definitively affirmative. The key is that the kings were not trying to impose positive regulations on the cities on a purely internal level: just like the first Roman Emperors, they represented a powerful and ultimate, yet essentially inert factor, primarily concerned with their own hegemony. Save for issues concerning the management of the state, the Hellenistic kings did not interfere in the internal goings-on in the cities, nor did they impose direct orders concerning issues that were not of state importance. The conduct of the city, the decision-making concerning purely local problems, as well as the work of the city authorities were left mostly to the political outlook of the citizens and the city officials.²⁵

There are numerous examples that show that vitality and liveliness were still common features of the internal autonomy of the cities, which even enabled the continuation of political struggles within the city, first and foremost during city elections.²⁶ The authority of the political bodies of the cities could even go beyond their own administrative borders; for example, a major political recognition that a city could obtain was to become an arbitrator, i.e. that its local political bodies be engaged in a dispute between two

²⁵ For example, the citizens of Antiochia in the Persian Gulf agreed to participate in the games held in Magnesia on Maeander (which was an entirely apolitical decision), while at the same time abstained from giving a direct answer to the request of Magnesia for a special diplomatic status of a sacred and inviolate city. The council of Antiochia was well aware that this would be a political act, something that was reserved for the king only.

²⁶ To be completely fair, one could argue whether this gives us the right to call them city-states, *poleis* in the classical meaning of the word; the classical *polis* had external, as well as internal sovereignty. JONES, 1940 remains one of the most respected works on the cities in the Hellenistic period; *cf.* also the accounts in EHRENBERG, 1960: 191-205, as well as SHIPLEY & HANSEN, 2006. Although limited in geographic scope, one must not forget the remarkable piece of work by MA, 1999, with an excellent analysis of the dynamism in the relations between the ruler and the *polis*.

other cities.²⁷ In some instances, the city could obtain complete financial,²⁸ and even political²⁹ exemption from the royal administrative control, but certainly only as a political gesture, which never conflicted with the interests of the monarchy.

6. It was in this sort of political and social framework that the *peliganes* held their office. The structure of the early Hellenistic monarchies, the role of the cities in the establishment of the new political system, the comparatively high degree of internal autonomy, and, finally, the need for local administration were such that there is no room for the claim that the *peliganes* had no real powers and held an honorary title. As a final confirmation of this assumption, it remains for the *peliganes* to be seen at work. This is supplied by the inscription *IGLS* IV 1261 from Laodicea-on-Sea:³⁰

Year 138, the 30th of the month of Audnaios (= January 174 BC). Proposal of Asclepiades, the *epistates* and the magistrates. Since Horus, Apollodorus and Antiochus, the priests of Sarapis and Isis, have submitted that the plot housing the sanctuary of these gods belongs to them and to the sons of Apollodorus, their cousins, as their private property; and (since) a decree has been passed that those who request from the city a spot for raising a statue should pay a fixed sum, and

²⁷ See, for example, DITTENBERGER, *OGIS* no. 7, the first known decree of this sort; cf. ROBERT, 1973: 765–782; AGER, 1996: 3–33.

²⁸ For example, when Antiokhos III took over Teos from the Attalids, “... and seen our weakness in matters both public and private, on account of the continuous wars and the size of the contributions which we paid... and personally granted that the city and the territory be sacred and inviolate and free from tribute, and, as for other contributions which we paid to King Attalos, promised that we would be freed through his agency...”. Text and translation in MA, 1999: no. 17.

²⁹ The king could bestow “freedom and autonomy” upon a city, i.e. give the city the freedom to pursue its own internal, as well as external policy. Although the king could revoke this privilege at any given moment, the cities still took this quite seriously; for example, when the citizens of Kolophon received the privilege towards the end of the IV century BC, they decided to build city walls – a token of their independence, yet still within the limits set by the king.

³⁰ For Laodicea-on-Sea, see COHEN, 2006: *s.n.*, with a thorough review of the sources and modern works on the subject.

some persons are requesting a place in the sanctuary; (the petitioners) fear that in this way their property will be reduced to nothing and have asked that care should be taken over this matter. It is appropriate (to do this) so that the property they have acquired is not run down in this way. Resolved by the *peliganes*: those who wish to raise a statue in this same place should pay the money that has been decreed, not for the place, but for the statue.³¹

Since the inscription has already been minutely analysed,³² a short clarification on the subject will suffice. The three brothers mentioned in the inscription, along with their cousins, owned an estate with edifices (*amphodon*) in the city; on this private estate, there was a shrine dedicated to Sarapis and Isis, whose priests these brothers were.³³ Previously, the city of Laodicea (probably through these same *peliganes*) passed a regulation that any citizen who wished to raise a statue of a god on state-owned land must pay a one-time tax on the use of state property; but the pious citizens found a way to outwit this regulation, for they began to bring and raise statues in the aforesaid shrine, which was private and thus not covered by the legislation. The brothers were afraid that the site might crumble (*anaskenazetai*) due to the enormous number of statues, so they pleaded to the city council to protect their interests and end the rampant mass piling of statues on their property. The *peliganes* agreed to protect the property rights of the owners; they did not impose a new tax for the private shrines (over which they had no jurisdiction anyway, for it was a matter of private property), but altered the existing regulation, and decreed that a tax must be paid for both the act of dedication and the statue, and not for the land on which it was set.

One would say that the *peliganes* did remarkably well: they did not infringe upon the property rights of the private owners, nor did they perform a fiscal violation (i.e. they did not damage the revenue of the city), while at the same time they did not deprive the citizens of practicing their religious freedom. In other words, the *peliganes* showed how a legal issue, one that

³¹ JALABERT & MOUTERDE, 1955; AUSTIN, 2006: no. 210.

³² The latest work on this subject is SOSIN, 2005, with a review of the literature.

³³ One could probably compare this complex to the private complex of the Dionysiai in Piraeus, owned by Dionysios, son of Agathokles; cf. IG II² 1325; 1326; 2948.

concerned the entire community, could be solved with efficient and, above all, adept legislation.

7. The time has come to summarise the conclusions from all that has been said hitherto. This inquiry of ours has shown that the local administrative office of the *peliganes* does indeed date from the time of the Argeadai, but also that, based on the current state of things, nothing more tangible can be said about the etymology and the meaning of this term. As we were able to see, after the campaigns of Alexander this office was transferred to Asia, i.e. to the purposely-established cities settled with Macedonian colonists. In terms of state legislative policy and global state politics, these cities were entirely reliant on the will of the king; at the same time, however, they were a micro-political nucleus, in some areas even pillars of political life, and surely communities with active internal politics. Their local officials, including the *peliganes*, were most certainly not bearers of ceremonial and honorary functions, but local, city officials in the proper sense of the word – people who, on the king's behalf and with his consent, governed and administered the political life in the city.

A short appendix: the *Peliganes* in Seleucia-on-Tigris

Describing the events after the victory of Antiochus III over the usurper Molon, Polybius gives us the following piece of evidence:

After this, Antiochus rebuked the rebel troops at some length, and then giving them his right hand in sign of pardon, charged certain officers with the task of conducting them back to Media and setting the affairs there in order. He himself went down to Seleucia and restored order to the neighbouring satrapies, treating all offenders with mildness and wisdom. But Hermeias, keeping up with his character for severity, brought accusations against the people of Seleucia and fined the city a thousand talents; sent the magistrates, called *adeiganes*, into exile and destroyed many of the Seleucians by mutilation, the sword, or the rack. It was with much difficulty that the king, by talking over Hermeias, or by taking matters into his own hands, at length succeeded in quieting and pacifying the citizens, imposing a fine of only a

hundred and fifty talents in punishment for their offense. After arranging these matters, he left Diogenes in command of Media and Apollodorus of Susiana, and sent Tychon, the chief secretary of the army, to take the command of the Persian gulf province.³⁴

Roussel has argued in a very convincing manner that the term *adeiganes* should, in fact, be corrected to *peliganes*.³⁵ Furthermore, according to Walbank, both Laodicea and Seleucia-on-Tigris were founded by Seleucus I, so it is far from surprising that the office is attested in both cities.³⁶ Even later, during the time of the Parthian kingdom, some of these cities managed to maintain the existence of the old offices, dating from Seleucid times.³⁷

Thus, if Roussel is right about the aforesaid emendation, the account of Polybius brings us to two rather important conclusions. Firstly, this account gives credit to the assumption that the office of *peliganes* was not honorary: why would, then, Hermeias exile a number of elder citizens, bearers of an honorary title, who had no say in city politics? Secondly, the account clearly testifies that the office of the *peliganes* was rather important – as, from all the other city officials and members of the local governing bodies who were seemingly present in the city, Hermeias decided to send into exile precisely the *peliganes*. In all probability, Hermeias thought that the *peliganes* were those responsible for the policy of the city, which had joined forces with the usurper Molon.

³⁴ Polyb. 5.54.8-12; Loeb translation.

³⁵ ROUSSEL, 1942-3: 31-32; his view is also accepted by WALBANK, 1959: 583. On the other hand, Hammond presumes the existence of another, separate office of *adeiganes*, a claim which, in all probability, is without proper justification; see HAMMOND, 1991: 186.

³⁶ WALBANK, 1959: 583. On Laodicea-on-Sea, see COHEN, 2006: 111-116.

³⁷ Cf. Tac., *Ann.*, 6.42.

Bibliography:

- AGER, S. L. (1996): *Interstate Arbitration in the Greek World 337-90 BC*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford.
- AUSTIN, M. M. (2006): *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest², A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge.
- BERNARD, P. (1998): *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres (CRAI)*.
- BILLOWS, R. A. (1995): *Kings & Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden-New York-Köln.
- BILLOWS, R. A. (1997): *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley.
- BLACKWELL, C. (ed.) (2009): *Dēmos: Classical Athenian Democracy* [MAHONEY, A. and SCAIFE, R. (eds.): *The Stoa: A Consortium for Electronic Publication in the Humanities* <www.stoa.org>].
- BORZA, E. N. (1990): *In the Shadow of Olympus: the Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton-New Jersey.
- COHEN, G. (1978): *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization*, Wiesbaden.
- COHEN, G. (2006): *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin and North Africa*, University of California Press.
- DITTENBERGER, W. (1903-5): *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Leipzig.
- DUECK, D. (1999): "The Date and Method of Composition of Strabo's Geography", *Hermes* 127.4, 476-478.
- DUECK, D. (2000): *Strabo of Amasia*, London-New York.
- DUECK, D., LINDSAY, H. & POTHECARY, S. (eds.) (2005): *Strabo's Cultural Geography*, Cambridge.
- EHRENBERG, V. (1960): *The Greek State*, New York.
- ERRINGTON, R. M. (1990): *A History of Macedonia*, University of California Press.
- ERRINGTON, R. M. (2008): *A History of the Hellenistic World 323-30 BC*, Malden-Oxford-Carlton.
- ГАБЕЛКО, О. (2005): *История Византийского царства*, Санкт-Петербург. [GABELKO, O. (2005): *History of the Bithynian Kingdom*, Saint-Petersburg.].
- GOUKOWSKY, P. (1979): "Un Aspect de l'Administration d' Alexandre dans les Hautes-Satrapies: La Première Révolte des Colons Grecs de Bactriane en 325" [in *La Géographie administrative et politique d' Alexandre à Mahomet. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg* (14-16 juin 1979) Strasbourg, 7-19.].
- GRAINGER, J. D. (1990): *The Cities of Seleucid Syria*, Oxford.

- GRAINGER, J. D. (2007): *Alexander the Great Failure*, London-New York.
- GREEN, P. (1990): *Alexander to Actium*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- GRENFELL, B. (1896): *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. & GRIFFITH, G. T. (1979): *A History of Macedonia II*, Oxford.
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1991): "The Koina of Epirus and Macedonia", *Illinois Classical Studies* 16.1/2, 183-191.
- HATZOPOULOS, M. B. (1996): *Macedonian Institutions Under the Kings*, vol.1, Athens.
- JALABERT, L. & MOUTERDE, R. (avec la collaboration de MONDÉSERT, C.) (1955): *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie*, t. IV, Laodicée et Apamène, no. 1261, BAH LXI.
- JONES, A. H. M. (1940): *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford.
- LÉVY, E. (2003): *Sparte: histoire politique et sociale jusqu'à la conquête romaine*, Seuil.
- MA, J. (1999): *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- MUHS, B. (2005): *Tax Receipts, Tax Payers and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, Chicago.
- MUSTI, D. (1984): "Syria and the East" [in WALBANK, F. W., ASTIN, A., FREDERIKSEN, M. W. & OGILVIE, R. M. (eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History (CAH)* VII.1, Cambridge University Press.].
- PAPAZOGLU, F. (1974): "Hegemon autokrator", *Zbornik Fil. fak. u Beogradu* XII, 47-64.
- ΠΑΠΑΖΟΓΛΟΥ, Φ. (1995): *Историја на хеленистичкиот период*, Скопје. [PAPAZOGLU, F. (1995): *History of the Hellenistic Period*, Skopje.].
- ПОПОВСКА, Н. (2005): "Институцијата на пелигоните", *Историја* 41.1-2, 9-11.
- [POPOVSKA, N. (2005): "The Institution of the Peligones", *Istorija* 41.1-2, 9-11.].
- ПРОЕВА, Н. (1997): *Студии за античките Македонци*, Скопје. [PROEVA, N. (1997): *Studies on the Ancient Macedonians*, Skopje.].
- ПРОЕВА, Н. (2004): *Историја на Аргеадите*, Скопје. [PROEVA, N. (2004): *History of the Argeadae*, Skopje.].
- RHODES, P. J. & LEWIS, D. M. (1997): *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- RICHER, N. (1998): *Les Éphores. Études sur l'histoire et sur l'image de Sparte (VIIIe–IIIe siècle avant J.-C.)*, Publications de la Sorbonne.
- ROBERT, L. (1973): "Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque", *XENION, Festschrift für Pan. J. Zepos I*, Freiburg, 765-782.
- ROUSSEL, P. (1942-3): "Décret des Péliganes de Laodicée-sur-Mer", *Syria* 23.1/2, 21-32.
- SHIPLEY, G. J. & HANSEN, M. H. (2006): "The Polis and Federalism" [in *Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge, 52-72.].
- SEIBERT, J. (1972): *Alexander der Große. Erträge der Forschung*, Darmstadt.

- SOSIN, J. (2005): "Public Law, Private Religion: The Case of Laodicea on the Sea", *APA 2005 Annual Meeting*, Boston.
- TSCHERIKOWER, V. (1927): *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Großen bis auf die Römerzeit*, *Philologus* Supplementband XIX, 1.
- VAN DER SPEK, B. (2009): "Multi-Ethnicity and Ethnic Segregation in Hellenistic Babylon" [in DERKS, T. & ROYMANS, N. (eds.), *Ethic Constructs in Antiquity*, Amsterdam, 101-115.].
- WALBANK, F. W. (1959): *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I*, Oxford.
- WALBANK, F. W. (1992): *The Hellenistic World*³, London.
- WILL, E. (1979): *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323-30 av. J.-C.)*², t.1., Nancy.