

Communal interests and polis identify under negotiation

Mack, William

DOI:

[10.3406/topoi.2013.2461](https://doi.org/10.3406/topoi.2013.2461)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Mack, W 2014, 'Communal interests and polis identify under negotiation: documents depicting symplities between cities great and small', *Topoi Orient Occident*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 87-116.
<https://doi.org/10.3406/topoi.2013.2461>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Communal Interests and Polis Identity under Negotiation : Documents Depicting Sympolities between Cities Great and Small

William Joseph Behm Garner Mack

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Mack William Joseph Behm Garner. Communal Interests and Polis Identity under Negotiation : Documents Depicting Sympolities between Cities Great and Small. In: Topoi, volume 18/1, 2013. pp. 87-116;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/topoi.2013.2461>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/topoi_1161-9473_2013_num_18_1_2461

Fichier pdf généré le 27/10/2018

**COMMUNAL INTERESTS AND POLIS IDENTITY
UNDER NEGOTIATION:
Documents Depicting Sympolities
between Cities Great and Small***

In very few epigraphical contexts are distinctions drawn between cities great and small. In most cases, unsurprisingly given the function which epigraphic monuments tended to perform, they purposefully elide the difference between *poleis*. Our epigraphic record depicts cities forging treaties, sending, receiving, and responding to inter-*polis* delegations, and enacting authoritative decrees – a picture of *polis*-homogeneity, of equipollent *polis*-actors exercising internal autonomy and possessing a similar institutional capacity to engage in interactions with each other as equals regardless of differences in size¹. This is particularly clear in the proxeny catalogues of, for example, Karthaia or Eresos, which reveal the ability of even small *poleis* to possess large and wide-ranging *polis*-networks, connecting themselves to a large number of other *polis*-communities².

However, one particular epigraphic genre does deal explicitly with the difference between large *poleis* and small *poleis*. These are texts which describe the incorporation of one city within another, to use H. Schmitt's terminology,

* I would like to thank Christoph Schuler and Rudolf Haensch, the directors of the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik, as well as the Henkel and Jacobi foundations, for the studentship which enabled me to research and write this article in ideal conditions. I would also like to thank Charles Crowther, John Ma, Naomi Garner Mack, and Ivana Savalli-Lestrade for reading and commenting on drafts.

1. MA 2003 and this volume.
2. On the proxeny catalogue of Karthaia, *IG* XII 5 542, and the reconstruction of the network which it reveals, see MACK 2011; on that of Eresos, *IG* XII suppl. 127, see MACK 2012.

‘Eingemeindungs-Sympolitie’³. Unlike other texts illustrating inter-*polis* relations, these necessarily construct a hierarchical relation between two communities, the ‘small’ city absorbed and the ‘large’ city absorbing. This has lead these texts to be read primarily in relation to issues of communal volition, with emphasis on the coercion of the smaller city by the larger. The present paper, conversely, suggests that, by setting these issues to one side, these texts may be more profitably read with the grain, as representations intended to be persuasive, or at least plausible, of processes of inter-communal negotiation between cities of unequal size. I argue that these texts are constructed to present a particular version of events in which the interests of each city, large and small, are presented as legitimate and distinct, and as being accommodated, as the result of negotiation, within the sympolity settlement. This means that, without committing ourselves to accepting these representations as historical reality, we can use them to explore the communal interests which both types of city were thought to have in this context and the ways in which they could be presented as being reconciled. This study suggests that, while the forms which these solutions took or were represented as taking were both diverse and locally specific, they responded to a recurrent set of shared concerns. Above all this approach emphasises the value attached to the continued expression of communal identity by small *poleis*, even at the moment of entering a relationship with large *poleis* which was understood to fundamentally undermine it in important ways; but also the need of the larger *polis* to assert its control and the primacy of its own communal identity. At the same time, by interpreting texts in this light, with sensitivity to their rhetoric of negotiation, I argue it is possible to gain a better understanding of how they were meant to be read and their nuances and that these readings may, in turn, affect our interpretations of the events to which our texts correspond.

I. Questions of Communal Volition

The history of communal relations in the ancient world is littered with examples of failed sympolities. In no fewer than three of the four cases which I will consider in detail the smaller community, despite apparently being absorbed into a larger city, is attested sometime after the sympolity acting as an independent *polis* in its own right again⁴. This has understandably made the question of communal volition the lens through which texts relating to sympolities have most

3. SCHMITT 1993, p.37. On these sympolities in general see ROBERT 1962, p.55-65; for a list of the extant examples of texts describing sympolities, see RIELE 1987 (with the addition of RC 3-4 and the new Latmos-Pidasa text, SEG 53, 1198); see also the remarks in GAUTHIER 1989, p.195-196 and now REGER 2004 and WALSER 2009.

4. The three *poleis* are Helisson (NIELSEN 2002, p.295, collects the material), Pidasa (subsequently attested as a *polis* entering into a sympolity with the Milesians, *Milet I*

often been read. Was a particular small city a willing participant in the first place, or was it coerced, either by the other party in the sympolity or by an external power (especially a Hellenistic king)? In asking these questions modern scholars have been influenced by the prevalence of violence between neighbouring *poleis* and particular, vicious histories of micro-imperialism, and especially by examples of the resistance of individual *poleis* to dissolution – the most vivid being the desperate, futile opposition of the Kolophonians to being transplanted and incorporated within Lysimachus' re-foundation of Ephesus⁵. Of course, not all sympolities have been judged involuntary. In some cases, especially those where the actual difference in size between two communities was less substantial and where the influence of no higher, co-ordinating power can be discerned, these sorts of narrative of coercion have been thought less appropriate – the sympolity between Stiris and Medeon, two fairly minor and insignificant *poleis* in Phokis, is one example. As a result a sort of binary distinction has come to be drawn between good sympolities, in which both cities were willing or even eager, and bad sympolities, in which at least one was not.

There are, however, a number of difficulties with this method of explanation relating to both the complexity of communal volition and the difficulties for us in assessing it. Firstly it is important to be aware that within political communities as potentially divided as *poleis* could be, few decisions are likely to have been unanimous, especially in relation to those as fundamental to communal identity and divisive as whether or not to enter into a sympolity. Within *poleis* different groups and individuals will have had very different interests and conflicting views in relation to a proposed sympolity. Even if we could be confident that a community, as a whole, did feel that it was in its collective interests to co-operate with the establishment of a sympolity, how we understood it would depend very much on the particular pressures acting on it: for example, whether the alternative perceived by or even offered to a *polis* was annihilation, and of course it would matter whether the intended sympolity was with the aggressor *polis* or another capable of providing defence against it. Furthermore, as the detailed and complex provisions contained by sympolity texts make clear, the process of merging two political communities was always fraught and difficult. It almost invariably involved an obviously junior and vulnerable party, which left ample scope for derailment even after the union had formally taken place because of disagreement or the suspicion of foul play. Thus even the subsequent failure of a sympolity is not particularly good evidence for contemporary attitudes to it.

The most fundamental problem, however, is that all of the inscribed texts on which we are reliant for knowledge of sympolities emphasise the willingness of both parties, especially the smaller *polis*. This is particularly obvious in the

3, 149, on which see GAUTHIER 2001) and Lebedos (on the complex history of the communal identity of the Lebedeians, see AGER 1998).

5. Paus. 1.9.7; 7.3.5.

case of the texts regulating the sympolities between Mantinea and Helisson, Miletus and Pidasa, and Stiris and Medeon, which are described, internally, as treaties or agreements (the cognate terms *synthesis*, *syntheke*, and *homologia* are all used). Indeed recent doubts have been raised concerning the extent to which certain sympolities were the result of coercion, based on more sympathetic reading of individual texts⁶. Even the *sympoliteia* of Lebedos with Teos, assumed since Welles to have been forced by Antigonos Monophthalmos on at least one unwilling partner⁷, has been read in a way which gives much more credence to its own emphasis on communal volition⁸.

These issues of communal volition are not unimportant. It matters if one community was or felt forcibly dissolved and absorbed into another. However, such reassessments highlight how insecure these sorts of historical interpretation are and illustrate the dangers of reading inscribed texts in isolation, either with or against the grain, without examining how they seek to present the events they describe and the functions they thereby served as monuments. Detailed consideration of how sympolity texts represent themselves, as the products of negotiation between the interests of large and small cities, offers the potential of a better understanding of them and a means of interpreting the apparent contradictions and inconsistencies which they contain. Moreover, by approaching these texts comparatively in this way, even if we cannot be sure how a particular sympolity was perceived by its participants (especially the smaller *polis*), we can explore what they are in fact keen to tell us about the interests of small cities and large cities, how they differed, and how the conflicts both between these interests and those involved in merging the two communities together could be presented as being resolved.

In the first part of this paper I therefore re-examine four particularly interesting and complex sympolity-texts in this light, which describe the incorporation by Mantinea of Helisson, by Latmos of Pidasa, by Teos of Lebedos, and by Teos of Kyrbissos. These case studies illustrate how central the same rhetoric of negotiation was to the function of texts relating to sympolities, even where they were formally described in very different terms – whether as a treaty between two *poleis* (the Mantinea-Helisson text), the decree of only one *polis* (as in the case of the Latmos-Pidasa and Teos-Kyrbissos texts), or by taking the form of a royal letter (Teos and Lebedos). Analysis of the provisions of these texts and the way in which they are presented reveal strong similarities, in particular a desire to assert that they are the

6. In particular both of Pidasa's two sympolities have received recent analysis – with Latmos in the late fourth century (LABUFF 2010) and Miletus in the early third (GAUTHIER 2001).

7. WELLES *RC*, p.8, 25-26; GAUTHIER 1989, p.196; BENCIVENNI 2003, p.201; REGER 2004, p.178; an alternative account is given by LANDUCCI GATTINONI 1994 which reads this incident in terms of Teian expansionalist aims.

8. BILLOWS 1993, p.213-5.

products of voluntary agreement, the result of processes of negotiation between the two cities, and stress the existence of guarantees put in place to protect the interests of the smaller community particularly. In the second part of this article I then draw together these readings of individual texts by considering the functions which they performed, and use this as the basis for exploring how sympolity texts more generally represent, and can be used to approach, the distinct interests which small and large communities had, in particular in relation to communal status and identity.

II. Texts Describing Sympolities : Case Studies

1. Mantinea and Helisson (RHODES and OSBORNE 2003, no. 14)⁹

The first case, a text describing the sympolity between Helisson and Mantinea, is the earliest considered here, inscribed at some point during the early fourth century. Of the four texts considered in these case studies, it is also the one which most explicitly describes itself as an inter-communal agreement. In the heading, it describes itself as a treaty (the term used is *synthesis*) between the two communities, and the active and voluntary engagement of both parties is further underlined by the decretic formula with which the main provisions of the text begin – ‘it was decided by the Mantineans and the Heliswasians...’ (ἔδοξε τοῖς Μαντινεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλισφασίοις[ς]). By taking our cue from this emphasis on agreement and hence processes of negotiation between the two parties, we can better understand not only how this text was structured but also how its apparently contradictory provisions should be understood.

According to the terms of this *synthesis*, the Heliswasians are to be transformed into citizens of Mantinea, becoming, for administrative purposes, a village (a *kome*) within the overall *polis* structure of Mantinea, and exchanging their earlier, distinctly Heliswasian laws and ordinances for those of Mantinea¹⁰. Much of the text is taken up with regulations concerning how this is to happen – including explicit directions for the settlement of different sorts of legal dispute (to cope with the new changes in legal systems) and the mechanisms by which the Heliswasians were to be enrolled as Mantinean citizens. There is, however, one difficulty which has caused significant problems of interpretation. This is that the text makes two different, apparently contradictory, assertions. As well as stating that Helisson is to be a *kome* of Mantinea, it also declares, very emphatically, that Helisson will remain a *polis* for all time. I give the first part of the text in full and translate it:

[θεός]ς· τύχα [ἀγα]θά.
[σύ]νθεσις Μ[αν]τινεῦσ[ιν] καὶ Ἑλισφασίοις [ι]ν ἄμ[α]τα]

9. Ed. pr. TE RIELE 1987; cf. Dubois, *Bull. ép.* 1988, 621; THÜR AND TAEUBER 1994, no. 6.

10. So NIELSEN 2002, p. 361-2; contra HANSEN 1995, p. 39.

[πά]ντα. ἔδοξε τοῖς Μαντινεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλισφασίοι[ς]· τὸς [Ἐ]λ[ι]-
[σ]φάσιος Μαντινέας ἦναι ἴσος καὶ ὁμοῖος, κ[ο]ινάζοντα[ς πάν]-
των ὅσων καὶ οἱ Μαντινῆς, φέρ[ο]ντας τὰν χώραν καὶ τὰν π[όλιν]
ἰμ Μαντιν[έ]αν ἰν τὸς νομὸς τὸς Μαντινέων, μινόνσας τὰς [πό]-
λιος τῶν Ἑλισφασίων ὥσπερ ἔχε[ι] ἰν πάντα χρόνον, κώμα[ν] ἔα-
σαν τὸς Ἑλισφάσιος τῶν Μαντινέων — θεαρὸν ἦναι ἐξ Ἑλισφά[ν]-
τι κατάπερ ἐς ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλιν — τὰς θυσίας θύεσθαι τὰς ἰν Ἑ-
λισόντι καὶ τὰς θεαρίας δέκεσθαι καὶ τὰ πάτρια¹¹.

Agreement between the Mantineans and Heliswasians, for all days. It seemed good to the Mantineans and the Heliswasians: The Heliswasians are to be Mantineans, equal and the same, sharing in all things even as the Mantineans, bringing their territory and *polis* to Mantinea to the laws of the Mantineans, and, while the *polis* of the Heliswasians is to remain as it is for all time, they are to be a *kome* of the Mantineans. There shall be a *theoros* from Helisson as from the other *poleis*; they are to make sacrifices in Helisson and receive *theoria* as before/as is their ancestral custom.

Mogens Herman Hansen took this as evidence that there was no contradiction between these two states – of being a *polis* and being a *kome* within another *polis* – and thus that there was no difficulty in the idea that a *polis* might be dependent in this way¹². Peter Rhodes, by contrast, argued that the word *polis* was being used with different, distinct meanings within the same passage:

I take this to mean that the *polis* = political unit of Helisson is to be absorbed into the *polis* = political unit of Mantinea, and to become a *kome* of Mantinea, but the *polis* = urban centre of Helisson is to remain as it was, i.e. that the word *polis* denotes a political unit at its first occurrence but not at its second¹³.

Neither of these explanations is particularly satisfactory. In particular, in relation to the latter, it is difficult to believe that the drafters of this text could really have used *polis* to refer to two distinct concepts in consecutive clauses, especially as the word *kome* on its own already implied that Helisson would continue as an urbanized community¹⁴. More importantly, the problem with both of these approaches is that they attempt to explain away the tension between these two

11. RHODES and OSBORNE 2003, no. 14 l. 1-10.

12. HANSEN 1995a, p. 39.

13. RHODES 1995, p. 96-7.

14. HANSEN 1995b, p. 61-2.

terms, which were frequently used to express something like a binary distinction¹⁵. It is in fact striking here that great care was taken within the framing of this text to juxtapose these two statuses, by inserting the genitive absolute phrase: *μινόνσας τᾶς [πό]λιος τῶν Ἑλισφασίων ὥσπερ ἔχε[ι] ἰν πάντα χρόνον*.

To explain why this was, it is necessary to understand the way in which this text is structured – as a negotiated settlement. In particular, the structuring of clauses in the first part of this document clearly expresses an alternation of interests, a sort of rhetoric of reciprocal compromise¹⁶. The agreement begins by naming the Heliswasians equal citizens of Mantinea (something which is in the interests of Heliswasians if this sympolity is to go ahead – they certainly don't want to be citizens of a lesser kind); in return the Heliswasian territory is to belong to the Mantineans, and the Heliswasians are to lose the use of their own laws (something the Mantineans clearly want); the rejoinder is that Helisson is to remain for all time a *polis* (clearly something the Heliswasians were keen on); however it is then further concretely stated that Helisson is to be a *kome* of Mantinea. This dual *polis/kome* status thus emerges as a compromise between the two communities.

But what was the shape of this compromise status? How Helisson was to function as a *kome* had already been made reasonably clear. Helisson was to become part of Mantinean territory and take on the laws of the Mantineans and thus be subject to its authority, but how that permitted the Heliswasians to continue to be a *polis* had to be more explicitly stated, precisely because it was counter-intuitive that a community which was a *kome* could simultaneously be a *polis*. This particular compromise status is defined in two clauses which follow on from the same pattern of alternation. Immediately after the clause stating that Helisson is to be a *kome* of Mantineia, the sense in which it was to nonetheless remain a *polis* is set out: 'There shall be a *theoros* from Helisson as from the other *poleis*; they are to make sacrifices in Helisson and receive *theoria* as before/as is their ancestral custom.' This clause gives a very particular definition of what it was to be a *polis* – to send a *theoros* like 'the other *poleis*' and to make certain traditional sacrifices and receive *theoria* from other communities. In the latter case, we should probably understand the sacrifices and the reference to the reception of *theoria* together, as referring to the continuation of Helisson's festivals, to which delegations from other cities (*theoriai*) had hitherto come. In other words, the Heliswasians were to

15. HANSEN 1995b, p.62, on the consistent distinction made to the end of the classical period between *polis* and *kome*. He states that the use of these terms in both the Hellenistic and Roman periods the use of terminology was much more fluid, but the only examples given are Roman (p.69-71, when this development can be very plausibly explained in relation to Roman administrative organisation). For the terms being used to express an opposition, see the material collected by HANSEN 1995b, p.52-53 and 61-63.

16. I am indebted to John Ma for this point.

be allowed to continue with these festivals which were crucial to the construction of their identity as a community both internally and externally in relation to other *poleis* which sent these delegations (including, perhaps, delegations to announce their own festivals).

The precise nature of the *theoros* which the Heliswasians are to send like ‘the other *poleis*’ has been disputed. The most influential explanation has been that the *theoros* in question should be identified with a board of magistrate-*theoroi* attested at a number of *poleis* including Mantinea –and that the Heliswasians, along with a wider group of other dependent ‘*poleis*’ in a similar situation, were to be represented in this magistracy¹⁷. The most common reference of *theoros*, however, was to a delegate sent out by a *polis* to visit other cities’ festivals and to announce their own. Juxtaposed as the *theoros* in this text is with a reference to *theoria*, it is difficult to believe that this term had a narrowly specialised meaning and was completely dissociated from this sort of theoric function. It may, of course, be that this Mantinean board of *theoroi* had developed out of *theoria*, and, in some sense, replaced the *ad hoc* appointment of *theoroi* at other states (a reasonable course of action given how regularly, and predictably, *theoroi* would have been required) which as a result of this role, as external representatives of the *polis*, accumulated additional administrative functions and importance. However, it would be bizarre for this qualification for *polis* status to be contributing a magistrate to a Mantinean board and to interpret this clause in this way we do have to accept that a number of other *poleis* were in exactly the same situation in relation to Mantinea, which does not sit well with the strong sense the text as a whole conveys of being a specific settlement negotiated between Mantinea and Helisson. It seems better, therefore, following Thür and Taeuber, to interpret this right to send a *theoros*, and the description ‘κατάπερ ἐς ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλινι’, as a reference to the general tendency of *poleis* to send *theoroi*, and the specific ability of the Heliswasians to continue to do this, in the same way that they are permitted to receive *theoroi* from other cities, especially as we have good parallels for other communities being allowed to continue to send *theoroi* in certain circumstances after they ceased to be *poleis*¹⁸.

In any case these clauses also stress how this sort of participation at festivals as a *polis* alongside other *poleis* was nonetheless compatible with status as a *kome* within Mantinea. In particular, it is striking that in these clauses, for all that they

17. TE RIELE 1986, p. 176; see also MOGGI 2001, p. 334 and NIELSEN 2002, p. 360–361, esp. n. 251 collecting the Arkadian evidence for this magistracy. The Mantinean board of *theoroi* is attested in Thucydides administering an oath, Thuc. 5.47.

18. THÜR and TAEUBER 1994, p. 103. Other examples include *theoroi* attested from Kalymna after its sympolity with Kos (ID 1432 B, col. 2, l. 9–10); for a particularly nuanced example illustrating the conflicting desires of small and large *poleis* within sympolities, see below on Teos and Lebedos. For these and other issues relating to *theoria* and *theoroi* (in all their guises), RUTHERFORD forthcoming is fundamental.

stress that Helisson will be able to continue to act as a *polis* in what is represented as the crucial context, in describing this future arrangement the community of the Heliswasians is designated not using the ethnic plural *Heliswasioi*, which would be normal for a *polis*, but with the toponym, which is much more appropriate for a *kome*¹⁹.

The dual status which this text constructs for Helisson is a particularly striking example of how the competing interests of the two communities in question could be represented as being resolved through a process of negotiation. In the context of this inscription, even what it meant to be a *polis* could be redefined in order to make visible concessions to both the desire of the Heliswasians to continue as a *polis*-community, and to the Mantineans to assert their own dominance as a *polis* over its own *kome*. It is important, however, to note that this inscription deals most explicitly with the interests which the different communities wished to protect within the sympolity rather than those which motivated them to undertake it in the first place. Within the sympolity the Heliswasians are represented as desiring to preserve their own communal identity, as requiring assurance that they would be full citizens of Mantinea and as seeking guarantees that pre-existing contracts between Heliswasians would not be invalidated by the imposition of the Mantinean legal system (l. 13-16). The Mantineans, conversely are represented as stressing the primacy of their own communal identity (especially through the imposition of their system of laws), but also as needing to control the extension of their own citizenship to outsiders (a need which the careful regulations for registering new citizens and detecting fraudulent applicants makes clear, occupying l. 16-25). By contrast the reasons why the sympolity was undertaken at all are not made explicit. For Mantinea we can infer the extension of Mantinean territory as the primary motive, but it is striking that, for the Heliswasians, this text advertises no motivation beyond the, for us perhaps dubious, desire to become Mantinean.

2. *Latmos and Pidas* (SEG 53, 1198)

In 1997 Walter Blümel published the first edition of a newly discovered stone which preserved a large fragment of a text setting out in detail the terms of a sympolity between the Latmians and Pidasans to be dated to the period 323-313 BC²⁰. The stone itself is broken at the top and bottom and so we do not have, as in the case of the text relating to the sympolity between Mantinea and Helisson, the heading describing the text. However, within the parts of this inscription which

19. Θεαρὸν ἦναι ἐξ Ἑλισό[ν]τι... τὰς θυσίας θύεσθαι τὰς ἐν Ἑλισόντι... (l. 8-10). On the significance of the precise designation used to refer to a community (by using a civic ethnic which indicated *polis* status and legitimacy or using an alternative mode of reference which denied it), the classic work is CHANIOTIS 1993.

20. BLÜMEL 1997; the edition of reference is now WÖRRLE 2003a who provides a full text (which incorporates a number of new readings) and an apparatus criticus of previous work on it.

survive it does describe itself as a *psephisma* (l.32) and a *dogma* (l.33; both meaning a public decree) and, in the context of the former, also makes reference to a *politeuma* (l.32), which was probably the political settlement regulated by this *psephisma/dogma*²¹. As a result of this, and because this text appears to dictate to the officers of one city (instructing *timouchoi* to make a sacrifice, l.3, and *archontes* to see to the publication of the text, l.36-7), this text has usually been taken as the decree of only one of the two *poleis* involved, namely Latmos, the larger *polis*²². On the face of it, this should invite a very different interpretation of the sympolity between Latmos and Pidasas than those attested by texts which call themselves treaties – as a unilateral act of communal imposition, not unlike the dictatorial decrees which the Cretan *polis* of Gortyn issued to dependent communities, by which it informed them, autocratically, of the status and privileges they would be permitted²³. However, with its emphasis on reciprocity, integration, and the protection of the rights of the smaller city, this text insists on a very different kind of reading.

This text is, in fact, closest in formal structure to the interstate treaty and emphasises the mutual accommodation of interests and especially fairness. Many of the key provisions, indeed, are strictly symmetrical: the public property of both cities and their revenues are to be common after the sympolity (l.13-17), and both are ordered to settle their public debts beforehand (l.17-19), to ensure that the future community is not unfairly burdened by the debt of one or other *polis*. Similarly, in order to facilitate the merging of these two cities, all marriages arranged during a period of six years following the sympolity must involve one family from each community (l.20-25)²⁴, and all magistracies within the *polis* are to be common to

-
21. The representatives of the Latmians and Pidasans are to swear an oath ‘ἐμμενῖν ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι καὶ τῷ πολιτεύματι τῷιδε’ (l.32-33). Two different potential meanings of *politeuma* in this context were suggested as possible by GAUTHIER, *Bull. Ép.* 1999, 462 – ‘la (nouvelle) organisation civique’ and ‘le nouveau corps civique’. *Contra* WÖRRLE 2003a, p.136-137, it seems best, given the way in which the words *psephisma* and *politeuma* appear to be connected, to understand *politeuma* in this context as the political settlement enacted by the *psephisma*, in which meaning it would have also encompassed the sense of the civic body which this settlement constructed.
 22. JONES 1999, p.1; WÖRRLE 2003a, p.124 and p.136, n.73; 2003b, p.1373, n.51; BENCIVENNI 2003, p.164.
 23. *StVII*² 216, and CHANIOTIS 1996, no. 69 (though note CHANIOTIS’ description, ‘Vertrag’ does not do justice to the introductory description of the text – τάδε ἐπεχώρησαν οἱ Γορτύνιοι τοῖς τὰν Κα[ῦ]δον φοικίονσι); for another example, see CHANIOTIS 1996, no. 64 -5.
 24. On this section of the text, see VAN BREMEN 2003, p.313-317. For the reality of the need for Milesian citizenship to be extended to the wives of Pidasans who were not themselves Pidasans by birth, see *Milet I* 3, 77, l.1-9 (the first woman, a woman from Euomos, is said to have been made a Pidasan by her husband; the second,

both communities (that is to say, formally capable of being held by individuals from both; 1.25-26). The majority of the other provisions also seems explicitly intended to appear advantageous to the Pidasans, who are to be provided with sufficient housing for a year (1.19-20) and the right to build a house for themselves on public land, should they decide to migrate to Latmos (1.27-28)²⁵. The method by which the Pidasans are integrated into the larger *polis* – and particularly the way in which it is described – seems explicitly intended to stress the advantages to them in the arrangement. It involved the creation of a new tribe, composed of some of the former citizens of Pidasa chosen by lot as well as a number of Latmians belonging to the other tribes, with the remaining Pidasans distributed, again by lot, among the other pre-existing tribes (1.6-10). This arrangement seems to have been designed to visibly accommodate the new citizens within the Latmian body politic while at the same time, by mixing Latmians and Pidasans in the same tribes, clearly demonstrating that it did not imply that the Pidasans were to be second-class citizens. This point is underlined by the explicit statement that Pidasans were to have full participation in the religious rituals of any of the tribes and phratries into which they were placed by lot which were particularly important for establishing a sense of membership (1.10-13)²⁶. The text as a whole is concluded with oaths which, to judge from the way in which they are described, were strictly symmetrical²⁷. The number of delegates chosen on each side to swear the oath – 100 Pidasans and 200 Latmians – neatly emphasises the relative parity between the two parties, the not too great disparity in size between the two cities in this case, but it also underscores the greater obligation of the Latmians to observe the provisions of this settlement.

The name of this new tribe – Asandris – has understandably been taken as an indication of the role of the satrap, Asandros, in bringing about this sympolity by working behind the scenes for strategic reasons of his own²⁸. Naturally this possibility cannot be excluded, but it is worth asking what the function is of this reference to Asandros, otherwise entirely passed over in this text, in the context of the document as it stands. Given the way in which the rest of this document

named a Milesian alongside her husband, a Pidasan, is simply given her ethnic of origin, marking her as from Herakleia).

25. SABA 2007 takes this obligation of the Latmians to provide housing as a sign that they too were unwilling participants in a sympolity imposed by Asandros; *contra* LABUFF 2010, p. 119-120.
26. On this, see EICH 2004, esp. p. 100-104.
27. The same description (ἐμμενεῖν ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι καὶ τῷ πολιτεύματι τῷιδε, 1.32-33) characterises the oaths to be taken by both sets of delegates. HABICHT 1998 reconstructs the fragmentary oath of the Latmians.
28. JONES 1999, p. 1; WÖRRLE 2003b, p. 1372-9; REGER 2004, p. 151-2; *contra* LABUFF 2010, p. 116-8.

emphasises the rights of the Pidasans within this sympolity settlement, invoking Asandros as a local independent power-holder in this way looks like it is meant to be understood as an attempt to use his power to underscore the new constitutional arrangements embodied in the creation of a new tribe. The publication clause is arguably intended to be interpreted along similar lines. This clause orders the publication of the *dogma* in the official shrine of Latmos and the shrine of Zeus at Labraundos, but not in a shrine at Pidasas²⁹. This is probably represented as a positive benefit to the Pidasans who were inevitably the more vulnerable party within this sympolity given the way in which they were outnumbered within the new *polis*. A copy placed in the official shrine of the Pidasans, under the control of the new *polis*, would have been, functionally, no different from the erection of the original copy – both would be potentially vulnerable to destruction or alteration at the behest of the dominant party in the new *polis*. By contrast, a copy placed in an independent shrine, particularly of the importance of Zeus at Labraunda, where the Latmians could not simply destroy the inscription, was a potent additional guarantee that the more powerful element within the sympolity would abide by its terms. This inscription would thus perform the same function as the frequently attested deposition of contracts between individuals with a third party and is well paralleled in other instate agreements – especially the sympolity-settlement between Stiris and Medeon which is to be deposited with a citizen of a third *polis* and is witnessed by three other individuals from different cities³⁰. It is also significant that this shrine was also associated with Asandros, whose satrapal powerbase was centred on the *polis*, Mylasa, which controlled this shrine, and he is probably similarly implicated here as a guarantor of the rights of the smaller city in this sympolity.

In all these respects this text looks so like a treaty that, barring its internal description as a *psephisma* or a *dogma*, that is how it would surely be read (in fact it was originally published as a treaty³¹). Understanding why, therefore, it is designated as a decree within the text is difficult, given how far at odds this is with the other elements of its self-presentation. Within the epigraphic record we do often find individual cities inscribing their decrees concerning particular treaties

29. JONES 1999, p.7; on the identification of the shrine, see GAUTHIER *Bull. ép.* 1999, 462.

30. *IG IX 1, 32 B*, l. 70-76; *Milet I 3*, 148, the late third-century treaty between Miletus and Magnesia on the Maiander, similarly provides for a sealed copy of its text to be deposited with the Rhodians responsible for arbitrating the agreement, to be inscribed on stone at Rhodes. In *AGER 1996* no 56, copies of the Meliteia-Pereia sympolity text are to be inscribed in no fewer than four different sanctuaries (at least two survive) and the text concludes with a very impressive list of witnesses (l. 31-37).

31. BLÜMEL 1997 'Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasas'; so LABUFF 2010, p.117, ignoring the implications of these internal descriptive terms.

instead of the actual text of the treaty in question. This was presumably because, functionally, a treaty was brought in to force by the decrees of two separate *poleis* enacting its terms. This is clear in the preamble to the sympolity *synthesis* of Mantinea and Helisson: ἔδοξε τοῖς Μαντινεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλισφασίοι[ς]. What we have in this text, however, is not simply the Latmian decree relating to the sympolity. It is a decree which purports to be the actual settlement underlying the sympolity as the fact that this text was to be inscribed not just at Latmos but at Labraunda clearly implies – and yet the formal distinction between a treaty and a decree was always observed and crucial in epigraphic contexts³². So what is going on?

To understand what is going on it is important to consider some of the other oddities of this text. It speaks of magistrates sacrificing to insure that the *polis* be *homonoie* (harmonious) – a clear reference to the strains involved in incorporating a new population within an existing political community, and the ideal state to be sought after a sympolity (1.2-4). In the next breath, however, it refers to Latmos and Pidasa as separate *poleis* in the context of stating that they will hold all public property and revenues in common (1.13-19). This has been taken to imply that both communities would continue to be thought of as *poleis*, with a reference to the situation of Helisson as a parallel (though this was obviously an exceptional case)³³. However, it is probably better to understand this apparent contradiction in relation to the complex things this document is doing. It seeks to establish a single *polis* as an end result (with prayers that it be harmonious naturally, given their importance, foregrounded in the text), but it also has to deal with the reality of fusing two distinct cities³⁴. The function of this clause, which identifies the distinction between the two communities, is to stress that no distinction will be made between them in the future in the context in which they are mentioned (i.e. as bodies capable of separately owning public property), and it is therefore hazardous, to take it as evidence that the two communities were envisaged as remaining distinct *poleis*. The Latmians and Pidasans are separately identified in

32. This distinction, though not always observed in modern descriptions of texts, is made with absolute regularity in the ancient epigraphic material in terms of their formal characteristics and the manner in which they are described in the publication clause (e.g. as a *psephisma*, or equivalent, in the case of the decree of a single city or *syntheke* in the case of a treaty). This distinction is particularly clear when both the treaty and the civic decree relating to it are juxtaposed, as in the case of the treaty between Athens and Sparta inscribed beneath the relevant Athenian decree proposed by Chremonides, *StV* III 476.

33. JONES 1999, p. 1; LABUFF 2010, p. 119; *contra* WÖRRLE 2003a, p. 129-130.

34. On the complexities of this, see BENCIVENNI 2003, p. 163-165; see also WÖRRLE 2003a, p. 129-130, rightly emphasising the fact that this description, of both cities as *poleis*, is of the reality before the union took place and the difficulty for the drafter of this text, given its conciseness, of expressing this clause in any other way.

other parts of this text for the same reason – because they have to be in order to enforce intermarriage between these two previously distinct communities or distribute them evenly within the civic structures of the new *polis*. The aim, however, of both of these measures, within the context of this text, was surely that these distinctions would cease to be able to be drawn.

I would argue that this is probably why this text describes itself as a *dogma* or *psephisma* – it is being presented as the decree by which a new *polis* (hence the reference to *politeuma*) brought itself into being out of two previous *poleis*. It is careful to highlight and allude to processes of negotiation and visibly represent the accommodation of the two communities' interests (and highlight the protections offered to the weaker partner), but it is not a treaty or an agreement because, in its enactment, the two contracting parties are to be fused into one.

3. *Teos and Lebedos (RC 3-4)*

The texts we possess describing the terms of the proposed sympolity between Teos and Lebedos are very different in form and apparent function again. They consist of two letters, sent by king Antigonos during the period 306-2 BC (between his assumption of this title and loss of control over this region³⁵), in which the king set out his vision of the terms under which Lebedos should be absorbed into Teos. It is hardly surprising, given the enormous disparity in power between the king and these actors, as well as Antigonos' attested involvement in other sympolities and the apparent failure of the attempt in this case, that these letters have tended to be read as a particularly clear case of communal coercion, a union ordered by Antigonos on at least one and possibly two unwilling cities³⁶. However, although the fact that these documents are royal communiques must be taken into account in interpreting them and their function as an inscribed monument, they invite a reading very similar to that of the other sympolity texts. In particular, these letters stress the accommodation of the interests of both parties within the proposed settlement and deliberately draw attention to the processes of negotiation underlying it.

These processes of negotiation and accommodation are clearly signalled from the very start of the document, as we have it (the first part of the stone is lost), which begins with a provision concerning the future participation of the Lebedeans in the festival of the Panionion (*RC* 3, 1.2-4). Only the twelve Ionian *poleis* were permitted to send official delegations to this festival and it thus played a very important role for these communities in the construction of their identity in relation to each other. By participating and by being seen to participate alongside the other cities they were able to express their identity as legitimate *polis* actors (in much the same way that, in the sympolity *synthesis* of Mantinea

35. AGER 1998, p.9.

36. See above, n.7.

with Helisson, participation in regional networks of *theoria* is represented as the essential expression of *polis* identity). According to the terms of the sympolity Lebedos ceased to be a *polis* in its own right, but here an ingenious compromise is described between the desire of the Lebedians to continue to assert their identity as a distinct community and the demands of the Teians that their identity predominate: the Lebedians were to continue to send a delegate to the festival, but he was to bivouac with the Teian delegation (signalling the union of the two) and be known as a Teian. We see a similar process of compromise in the suggestion that a new law-code was to be written for the new *polis* by delegates drawn from both cities and that, in the meantime, the law-code of Kos was to be adopted for use by the citizens to avoid the use of one city's code (I.43-66). Elsewhere, the interests of the different *poleis* are represented in particular clauses: the Lebedians are to be provided with housing in the short term and sites on which to build their houses subsequently (I.4-17); they are to be allotted an area for the burial of their dead (I.17-18); their debts are to be taken on by the new *polis* (rather than having to be settled beforehand, as in the case of Latmos and Pidasa; I.18-20); Lebedian honorific grants are to be recognised as valid by the new *polis*, with the result that Lebedian *proxenoi* and *euergetai* are to be incorporated into and inscribed among the existing *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of Teos (I.21-4); Lebedians who emigrate to Teos are to be exempt from various sorts of liturgies for the first three years, presumably because of the expenses involved in the move (I.67-70); and, finally, Lebedians are to receive compensation for the houses they were leaving from the Teians (RC 4, I.1-11). The Teians, by contrast, in addition to gaining the territory of Lebedos, and asserting the primacy of their own identity within the new *polis*, see their interests clearly represented in the stipulation imposed, in relation to the grant of public land made out to the Lebedians for the purpose of constructing new houses, that if a plot of land is not built on within three years it reverts to public ownership (RC 3, I.14-15); similarly, in response to the three-year exemption from liturgies argued for by the Lebedians, a reciprocal exemption is made for Teians who move as a result of the sympolity to 'the Chersonese'³⁷.

Throughout the text Antigonus self-consciously presents the position he occupies in relation to the sympolity as that of a mostly disinterested arbitrator in negotiations between two willing cities who had sought his aid. The way in which his pronouncements are framed – introduced by phrases like 'we thought it necessary

37. Precisely what was meant by this has been disputed – there are a number of peninsulae nearby which could qualify. One of the most plausible possibilities was raised by FELDMANN 1885, p. 135-6, a peninsula to the west of Teos which in fact was the site of subsequent Teian habitation. However, given how non-specific this reference to 'the Chersonese' is, another, perhaps more likely, possibility in the context of this text is that what was meant was the peninsula on which Lebedos was situated (a classic peninsula *polis* – see BEAN 1949, p. 149-53) – which would make the liturgy exemption truly reciprocal and also correspond with other material in this text which suggests that this site was not necessarily expected to be completely abandoned.

that...' (ὠϊόμεθα δεῖν) and 'since we thought it fairer that... we have judged...' ([ἐπεὶ δὲ δικαί]ότερον ὑπολαμβάνομεν... ἐπικεκρίκαμεν ..., 1.57-60) – presents them as authoritative but not necessarily binding judgements³⁸. Functionally, this is paralleled closely by a text describing a sympolity between Melitaia and Peraia, dated to 213/212 BC, in which a panel of arbitrators appointed by the Aitolian league (to which both *poleis* belonged) set out the terms on which the sympolity was to take place³⁹. Such neutral arbitrations could clearly be represented as performing a useful function in the context of a sympolity, especially given how contentious the issues involved could be – but what is striking is that the language used in the Melitaia-Peraia document is, in its way, much more forceful than that which Antigonos employs. Appointed by the federation, which technically had authority over Melitaia and Peraia, the judges from Kalydon simply inform the two cities what the terms are to be.

There is no doubt that Antigonos expects that most of these judgements will be accepted but the important point is that, in these texts, authority in establishing the sympolity is represented as deriving from the two partners – Teos and Lebedos – and ultimately residing with them, for all that they are presented as having delegated it partially to Antigonos as an external arbitrator. Antigonos also stresses the very active role which both parties had in shaping his judgements by making frequent reference to the delegations sent by both cities and representations made by them on particular points⁴⁰. But if Antigonos is presented as a neutral arbitrator, it is striking that in this context he is also apparently keen to stress his protection of the rights of the Lebedians, the weaker, more vulnerable party in the merger. In particular, in the first document he notes on two occasions when conflicting representations have been made to him by the two parties, and on both occasions he sides with the Lebedians: first in relation to the temporary law code to be used, before a new code can be written, where the Teians wished to use their own pre-existing code and the Lebedians expressed a preference for that of a third *polis* (1.56-58); second in relation to a fund for securing a reliable corn supply for the new *polis*, proposed by the Lebedians to be primed with an initial sum of 1,400 gold darics, and, by the Teians, with a larger sum (1.78-81). This is all the more marked as both of these texts are framed as letters to the Teians.

Antigonos, as well as deciding in favour of the Lebedians on both of these points, also emphasises the role of agreement between the two cities and decisions made jointly by them throughout this text. The Teians and Lebedians are explicitly said to have agreed on a city – in this case Miletus – to serve as an *ekkletos polis*, a neutral judge of disputes between citizens of the two cities (1.29-30), and to have agreed on another city whose legal code is to be used while they draw up their own,

38. C.B.WELLES, *RC*, p.26; BILLOWS 1990, p.213.

39. AGER 1996, no. 56.

40. *RC* 3, 1.56-7; 1.67-9; 1.71-80; 1.101-103. *RC* 4, 1.4-6.

in this case Kos (l.59-60). They are also left the task of devising an agreement (*syntheke*) concerning disputes between themselves, as well as of devising an entirely new system of laws (though Antigonos does define the parameters: a panel of six law-givers, involving equal representation by both cities despite their disparate size) and jointly propose a panel composed of representatives of both to agree any additional regulations that may be necessary (l.101-103). Throughout, there is an emphasis on their voluntary involvement, on a lack of coercion. For instance, although the series of terms set out here presupposes that most Lebedians will migrate to Teos, the fact that specific provision is made for the reversion of the grant of land for individuals who don't within a fixed period clearly indicates that this resettlement was not to be forced, and, indeed, if my interpretation of the reference to 'the Chersonese' as the site of Lebedos is correct (see fn.37 above), then it seems likely that this prime site was not intended to be abandoned and this movement of populations was conceived of as potentially reciprocal.

In one place, however, it has been argued that Antigonos' 'mask of restraint' slips, and the king appears behind it, when he proposes that the agreed law-code be submitted to him for him to check over, to ensure that everything incorporated in it is for the best 'so that if anyone appears to have written a law which is not for the best or is inappropriate, we may rebuke them for it and punish them' (l.53-55)⁴¹. It is true that this potential assumption of judicial power is a departure from what we would expect for an arbitrator – and looks, on the surface more like the sort of arbitrary power of the king. It is striking, however, that this clause, like the others, is dependent on a verbal phrase which presents it simply as the opinion of the king. In other words, it, like the other recommendations of Antigonos, is nominally dependent on the authority of Teos and Lebedos for enactment, and the potential power of oversight (and punishment) is thus represented as being theirs to formally delegate to him, in the same way that they might delegate judicial authority to a panel of foreign judges⁴². But it is also important to note the context in which this potential threat of punishment is raised – as a deterrent to individuals proposing self-interested or partisan laws in the new code. It was thus surely intended to be read not as a thinly veiled reference to royal coercion and control but as a guarantee that the impartiality of those involved (where partisanship or the fear of it could derail the whole process) would be scrutinised independently and enforced⁴³.

41. C.B.WELLES, *RC*, p.28; BEVAN 1902, p.114; see also GAUTHIER 1998, p.320, rejecting Ager's inclusion of this as an arbitration in her collection on this basis.

42. As such it did not call into question the assertion of Antigonos elsewhere in this letter that he had been responsible for making the Teians free and autonomous (*RC* 3, l.88-9).

43. BILLOWS 1990, p.214, as elsewhere, assumes the more flattering motive ('to assure fair play'); this is certainly the construction which the text encourages.

There is, however, a fundamental, structural issue which has not been adequately addressed before. Why was this document relating to the sympolity between Teos and Lebedos – a letter which, formally, only gave a series of recommendations on different points? One possibility that needs to be considered, since we cannot date the text on palaeographic grounds, is that it was inscribed subsequently, like other letters between cities and kings. These letters from Antigonos, however, would be odd as candidates for this sort of subsequent inscription. They do not record any particular privileges granted by Antigonos to Teos (the reason why the vast majority of royal letters are subsequently inscribed). In fact, as I have argued, they avoid making authoritative declarations at all. They could perhaps have been inscribed to emphasise the close relations between Teos and Antigonos, but in this text Antigonos seems to make a point of not favouring the Teians and it is unclear, anyway, in what subsequent historical context it would have seemed beneficial to the Teians to emphasise their ties with Antigonos. It seems much more likely that these letters were inscribed at the time of the sympolity to which they relate, and that they were inscribed because their detailed provisions – Antigonos' arbitration – were represented as being formally accepted by the Teians and Lebedeians as regulating their union⁴⁴. In terms of the symbolic rhetoric of inscription, the primary purpose for the Teians and perhaps the Lebedeians in using the document produced by the king would thus not have been so much emphasising Antigonos' power to dictate to the two communities. Rather, it would have been, at least ostensibly, to co-opt his power as king, and the position constructed for him within this text as a neutral, independent arbitrator, in making the settlement authoritative and guaranteeing it. It is, however, remarkable that the document inscribed was a letter sent to only one of the two parties between whom this arbitration was held – did Lebedos not receive a copy, or was there no neutral version which could be used? Again this interesting peculiarity is probably explained by the fact that, as a result of the sympolity, the two contracting parties were to become one and the letter to the Teians, whether or not it was the only one sent by Antigonos, would continue to speak to the new *polis* of Teos which resulted from the actions it described.

4. Teos and Kyrbissos (SEG 26, 1306)

This sympolity, which took place in the third century BC, is attested by a document published by Jeanne and Louis Robert in 1976⁴⁵. Although much of the text has been lost and the majority of what we have concerns the oaths which different groups and individuals in this sympolity were to swear, because the provisions of these oaths are very detailed we can clearly see what the main issues

44. See AGER 1998 on the possibility that the sympolity between Teos and Lebedos initially went ahead.

45. *Ed. pr.* J. and L. ROBERT 1976.

were – what interests the Teians and especially the inhabitants of Kyrbissos are represented as seeking and seeking to protect.

The text as we have it begins with a description of the oaths to be sworn by both sides. The Teians, for their part, were to swear that they would not destroy Kyrbissos, nor, insofar as it lay within their power, hand it over to another power, nor abandon – presumably militarily – any of the inhabitants of Kyrbissos (l. 2-5). These were exercises of arbitrary authority and treachery which the inhabitants of Kyrbissos obviously felt at risk of, as the small city within this sympolity⁴⁶. Guarantees against these abuses were obviously important but they were not, however, the principal benefit represented as motivating the inhabitants of Kyrbissos to enter into a sympolity with the Teians, as the junior, absorbed *polis*. Within the text, the point, for the inhabitants of Kyrbissos, is clearly communicated – it is the Teian garrison force, consisting of no fewer than twenty men and three dogs, capable of defending Kyrbissos against attack, which its inhabitants could certainly not have afforded out of their own civic resources⁴⁷. This involved a further set of regulations, which, as well as defining in precise terms the minimum number of the garrison and its equipment, were designed to prevent the garrison commander establishing himself as an independent dynast – which posed a threat to both the inhabitants of Kyrbissos and the Teians themselves⁴⁸. The inhabitants of Kyrbissos, for their part, were expected to swear an exacting oath to maintain Teian control of Kyrbissos and this clearly communicates the principal motivation for the Teians in entering into this, like other large *poleis* within sympolities – the extension of its territory (perhaps more specifically the acquisition of a strategically useful fortress). The inhabitants of Kyrbissos are to swear to not betray the garrison commander sent by the Teians but defend Kyrbissos for them, to not betray it to another power and to denounce anyone plotting to do so to the garrison commander, and to follow the commander's orders for the defence of Kyrbissos and the territory of Teos more generally⁴⁹.

This text thus clearly communicates its basis in negotiation between two distinct communities – it represents itself as an agreement, an accommodation between the interests of each. At the same time, however, like the text relating to the sympolity between Latmos and Pidasa, it describes itself as a *psephisma*, the decree of only one community (l. 59). It goes much further, however, than the Latmos-Pidasa text, in that the identity of the second community – the community of Kyrbissos – is comprehensively suppressed throughout. The two parties involved are both consistently referred to as citizens of a single *polis* – 'the

46. SEG 26, 1306, l. 2-5; on the reality of these fears, see J. and L. ROBERT 1976, p. 190-2.

47. SEG 26, 1306, l. 8-40.

48. J. and L. ROBERT 1976, p. 196-216 on these regulations and their importance.

49. SEG 26, 1306, l. 5-7 (the description of the oath); l. 46-54 (the oath itself).

citizens in the *polis*' and 'the citizens living in Kyrbissos'⁵⁰. Even more than in the other texts considered, this inscription blurs the boundary between the agreement to merge (which it rhetorically presupposes) and the unified community which resulted (represented as issuing this decree). Moreover, this text appears to both describe the settlement and enact it – as we see when the inhabitants of Kyrbissos (the Kyrbisseis as they surely thought of themselves before this event, using the standard, evocative *polis*-ethnic), are obliged to swear to protect Kyrbissos for the *demos* to which they now belong by using a form of words, by referring to Kyrbissos as a *chorion*, which denies its former status and identity: 'I will not abandon the phrourarch sent out from the *polis* by the *demos* and I will defend the *chorion* for the *polis*... and whatever the phrourarch orders I will do inasmuch as it pertains to the defence of the *chorion* and the territory (sc. of Teos)...'⁵¹.

This was a sort of speech act, transforming the status of this community, from independent *polis* to part of the wider *polis* of Teos. Its significance is underlined by the fact that those swearing the oath were to have their names noted down and published at the Bouleuterion in Teos, as the names of new citizens often were⁵². This may well have been the act by which the inhabitants of Kyrbissos formally became citizens of Teos⁵³, although in this temporally complex text which, as I have said, blurs the distinctions of before and after, the inhabitants of Kyrbissos have already been referred to as citizens.

III. Representation and Function

Other texts relating to sympolities could be explored in the same way, as representations of negotiation – especially the *homologia* between Stiris and Medeon (*IG IX 1, 32*) and the text describing the sympolity between Miletus and Pidasa in the early second century BC, with its particularly emphatic insistence on the fact that it was the product of voluntary agreement between the two parties (and the initiative of the smaller city) which has been brought out recently by

50. Contrast [τ]οὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει [πολίτας] (l. 2-3) with τῶν πολιτῶν τῶν ἐγ Κυρβισσῶ[ι] (l. 4) or even τοὺς ἐγ Κυρβισσῶι κατοικοῦντας.

51. οὐ[κ ἐγ]καταλί[ψω τ]ὸν φρούραρχο[ν] τὸν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἀ[ποστελ]λόμενον καὶ διαφυλάξω [τ]ὸ χω[ρί]ον τῇ πόλει... καὶ ὅ τι ἂν ὁ φρούραρχος παραγ[γέ]ιλη ποιήσω ὅσα εἰς φυλ[ακ]ή[ν] τοῦ χω[ρί]ου καὶ τῆς χώρας, *SEG 26, 1306, 1.46-52*.

52. *SEG 26, 1306, 1.57-59*; at l. 7-8 the alternative to swearing this oath is mentioned. The text is fragmentary but it seems to involve the individual being treated like one who wronged the sovereign *demos* – giving this oath sharp teeth.

53. On this possibility, see J. and L. ROBERT 1976, p. 230-231.

Philippe Gauthier⁵⁴. The Melitaia-Pereia sympolity text goes even further – it makes specific provision for the potential dissolution of the sympolity in case of disagreement⁵⁵. These individual case studies reveal how important it was for documents describing sympolities to stress the active participation of both parties in shaping their provisions, and emphasise their status as inter-communal agreements even when, for reasons relating to the function which they present themselves as performing in terms of creating a new *polis*, they do not formally characterise themselves as treaties. They provide a view of the sympolities they describe in which the interests of the two communities, larger and smaller, are represented as both legitimate and distinct, but also as reconciled through a process of mutual accommodation. The question remains, however, of how we should interpret the picture of events which they present – in what sense do they correspond with the historical events they purport to describe?

This paper has already highlighted the difficulties of interpreting these texts, either with or against their grain, to reveal the historical realities underpinning the sympolities which they described and contemporary attitudes to them. However, we can make progress by approaching this question from a different angle and confronting more directly the issue of what the function of these documents was – why it was important that they present the particular view of these events which they did. According to some treatments, casting the events which they portray as acts of communal coercion, these texts, or at least some of them, would need to be viewed as Orwellian re-writings of recent events, as authoritative monuments presenting counter-factual historical narratives. However, what function this sort of monument would have performed, and for whom it would have been erected, is less clear: it would not have over-written the memories of the members of a community forcibly absorbed, making them eager and compliant citizens of the new state; nor does it seem likely that the citizens of the larger *polis* stood to gain very much by presenting a patently untrue account of contemporary history, of the voluntary participation by a smaller *polis* in their incorporation – either in terms of their reputation with other communities or in their conception of themselves. Put simply, if communal volition was irrelevant before the fact, there seems little reason to stress it subsequently, especially when we have examples of domineering *poleis* simply dictating terms to dependent communities⁵⁶.

It seems probable, therefore, that these representations of negotiation had some sort of basis in fact. Moreover, even if the smaller community was not entirely happy with the idea of incorporation or the sympolity settlement itself (something we will probably never know), the stress placed on their active involvement in the negotiations underpinning it and the accommodation of

54. *Milet* I 3, 149; GAUTHIER 2001, p. 120-122.

55. AGER 1996, no. 56, l. 16-21.

56. See above, n. 21.

their interests within it need not have been cynical. It is possible to interpret the function of these texts, and their rhetoric of negotiation, on analogy with the euergetical language used to frame relations between Hellenistic kings and cities. Representing the relationship between dominant kings and subordinate cities in terms of benefaction and reciprocation was not a sham, instead it offered the two parties a way of interrelating which allowed each scope for promoting their own interests: the cities were to be grateful and thus morally obligated to the king, but this required that the king do things for the cities to be grateful for⁵⁷. In the same way, these sympolity texts, whether they were formally described as treaties or unilateral decrees, projected a model for the two parties to use to understand their relations with each other – as a voluntary union accommodating the interests of both. This intended function is expressed particularly clearly where these texts were framed as internal decrees, explicitly addressed to the *polis* which was created as a result. The negotiation which these texts implied, of course, was in the past, and thus to a certain extent the terms of the relationship were technically fixed. However, to be effective in encouraging both parties to continue to participate in the sympolity, and to act as members of a single *polis*, it needed to persuasively argue that the interests of both communities (and particularly the smaller) had been taken adequately into account. The frequent attested failures of sympolities reflect not just the difficulties which undergoing and maintaining this sort of union involved, but also the agency which the minor communities somehow retained – and thus the need for these persuasive representations.

IV. Communal Interests and Identity

In order for these texts to function effectively in this way, the interests which they represented, particularly in relation to the smaller *polis*, and which were visibly accommodated within it, needed, in some sense, to correspond to things which mattered to the cities involved. We can thus use them to get at some of the things which were important to these communities in coming together.

In particular, from the provisions of some of these texts we can infer the communal interests and motivations which were particularly important in prompting *poleis* to enter into a union with a larger community as the junior, absorbed partner. In the case of the Teos-Kyrbissos text, for instance, the detailed stipulations concerning the garrison force which was to be supplied by the Teians strongly imply that defence was the important factor in this case. The treaty (*syntheke*) regulating the sympolity between Miletus and Pidasa similarly makes prominent provision for a garrison for Pidasa and its defence more generally

57. On this, see BRINGMANN 1993, p. 17-23; MA 1999, p. 202-6.

(including the repair of its city wall)⁵⁸. As Philippe Gauthier has argued, however, this should probably be understood in the context of another clause in this text, by which the Milesians committed themselves to upholding the territorial claims of Pidasas in relation to a particular parcel of land – by implication, against the claims of a neighbouring community⁵⁹. In other words, defence in the context of these sympolity texts did not just mean the protection of the community and its urban centre from attack and destruction, but defence of its territory and, particularly, its territorial identity against neighbouring *poleis*, and these concerns were probably also important in motivating other sympolities (common defence was clearly implied by shared citizenship – it is only when a specific commitment to garrison was required that that element would need to be made explicit within the sympolity text).

Given that territorial contiguity seems to have been important for these sorts of sympolity, it also seems plausible that one of the functions which they performed was to resolve territorial disputes between *poleis* which joined together in this way. In particular this seems to be an important factor in the Stiris-Medeon sympolity⁶⁰. The text begins ‘the Stirians and Medeonians entered into a sympolity, sharing shrines, a *polis*, a territory, ports, all unburdened by debt, on the following conditions...’ – a striking formulation which seems to make the sharing of territory the crucial fact of the sympolity⁶¹. The emphasis of this framing statement on territory is further reinforced by a clause within the text which asserts ‘and the whole *chora* of the Medeonians is to be Stirian and the whole Stirian *chora* is to be the common possession of the Medeonians’ as well as an interesting clause which occurs at the very end of the text in a prominent position following even the publication clause: ‘the Stirians giving the phratry of the Medeonians within four years five *mnai* of silver and the place known as [D]a[ma]treia’⁶². There is a curious contradiction here – the two communities are

58. *Milet I* 3, 149, l.15-18 – the position of this clause (in second place, immediately following the stipulations concerning the grant of citizenship to the Pidasans) underlines its importance.

59. *Milet I* 3, 149, l.37-39; for the full reconstruction of this sequence of events, see Ph. GAUTHIER 2001; see also REGER 2004, p.156-8.

60. On the dating of this text to 180-170 or 140-130 BC see MIGEOTTE 1984, p.102, n.312; see also MCINERNEY 1999, p.253-4.

61. συ[νε]πολίτευσαν Στείριοι κα[ὶ] Μ]εδεώνιοι ἔχοντες ἱερά, πό[λι]ν, χώραν, λιμένας, πάντα [ἐ]λεύθερα, ἐπὶ τοῖσδε, *IG IX* 1, 32, side A, l.6-10. On the meaning of *eleuthera* here as unmortgaged, see MIGEOTTE 1984, p.102-3.

62. Καὶ τὰν χ[ώ]ραν τὰν Μεδεωνίαν εἶμεν [π]ᾶσαν Στιρίαν καὶ τὰν Στιρίαν Μεδεωνίαν κοινὰν π[ᾶ]σαν, *IG IX*, 32, l.47-51; δόντων δὲ τοῖ Στίριοι τᾷ φατρίᾳ τῶν Μεδεωνίων ἐν ἐτέοις τετάρτοις ἀργυρίου μνᾶς πέντε κα[ὶ] τ]όπον τὰν καλειμένην [Δ]α[μα]τρείαν, side B, l.76-81 (the final restoration is Pomtow's, *Syll.*³ 647).

to share a territory as one, but the Stirians grant the phratry of the Medeonians 'the place known as [D]a[ma]treia.' This looks like an ingenious solution to a territorial dispute. The Medeonians were to become a phratry within the new state of Stiris, and territory was to be held in common, except that, within Stiris, the Medeonians were to have possession of the [D]a[ma]treia, which had clearly been a particular bone of contention. In this new arrangement the Medeonians had a subordinate status, but this allowed both communities to maintain otherwise contradictory territorial claims to the same lands, and provided a mechanism through which the Medeonians could be given the [D]a[ma]treia without Stirian territorial identity being thereby diminished. In the Melitaia-Pereia sympolity text, this motivation is even more explicit. The sympolity is presented as almost arising out of a boundary arbitration, prefigured as the provisions concerning it are by the judgement of arbitrators from the Aitolian league which defines the territory of each community and common (presumably previously disputed) land which they are to share within the sympolity⁶³. The idiosyncratic settlements presented by these texts make the theme of territorial dispute-resolution particularly visible, but it is also likely to have been a significant factor in motivating minor communities to participate in sympolities as junior partners in other cases as well.

Other motives can be inferred in the case of other texts – the paper by Christophe Chandezon in this volume, for instance, explores how it could be desirable for particularly small communities to join forces with larger cities in order to avoid or share the fixed institutional costs (maintaining a market; regulating the use of territorial resources) which being a *polis* entailed. We can also probably detect the influence of specific groups within the *polis*, and their interests in shaping the precise terms. In particular, provisions made for tax exemption and especially exemption from the performance of liturgies for a fixed period seem to communicate the influence of the wealthy elite within the smaller community, and their interest in seeking a wider civic stage for greater economic opportunities and political competition seems likely to have been an important force in promoting sympolities more generally⁶⁴.

It is striking, however, that in general comparatively little stress is placed on the principal factors which motivated the *poleis* involved (and particularly the

63. AGER 1996, no.56.

64. Clauses exempting members of the smaller *polis* from liturgies for a period after the sympolity are found in the Teos-Lebedos (*RC* 3, l.66-72 – three years) and Miletus-Pidasa (*Milet* I 3, 149, l.35-7 – for ten years; but note l.45-47) sympolity texts. In the case of Miletus and Pidasa the attractiveness of Miletus is visible in the Pidasans preserved in lists of new citizens there, enfranchised before the sympolity (see *Milet* I 3, 41 III, l.3; 64, l.9-11; 74 a, l.4; 75, l.2-4; 77, l.3-5; 79, l.1-2; 86, l.7-8) who were apparently sufficiently numerous for specific provision to be made for them in the sympolity treaty (they were excluded from the benefit of the ten-year liturgy exemption, *Milet* I 3, 149, l.45-7, which suggests that they are likely to have done rather well...).

smaller *poleis*) to join together in the first place⁶⁵. What tends to preoccupy these texts more is the issue of resolving the tension between the communal identities of the two parties – the desire of the smaller *polis*, in particular, to maintain its communal identity and the need of the larger, absorbing, community to insist on the primary importance of its own *polis* identity. In the sympolity-texts which we possess, it is possible to identify a range of different approaches taken to managing this tension: the creation of a new, united identity; the retention of a pre-existing civic identity which was either qualified in particular ways or redefined; and acquiescence in an apparently total over-writing of communal identity. These approaches were not necessarily mutually exclusive (indeed they overlapped) and in the texts which we have it is possible to see more than one used.

I would argue that we should identify, with the first of these approaches – the creation of a new unified identity – the provisions relating to the creation of a wholly new legal code in the Teos-Lebedos text by a commission on which both parties were equally represented. The laws of a *polis*, not easily separable from its *politeia*, its constitution, were one of the central markers of its identity and inextricably bound up with ideas of what it meant to be both a *polis* and *autonomos*. Any sympolity, the union of two cities, inevitably meant that at least one set of laws would cease to be used and, potentially, that one of the two communities would formally cease to be *autonomos*. In providing for the establishment of a wholly new law code, the Teos-Lebedos text, in at least one crucial respect, represented the result of the sympolity as a newly founded *polis* – undermining symbolically the structural asymmetry between the fate of the smaller *polis* absorbed (and for the most part losing its identity in these terms) and the larger *polis* absorbing. The explicit provision that the *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of Lebedos be formally recognised and inscribed alongside the *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of Teos in the new city arguably functioned in a similar way. These represented debts of honour which, if they ceased to be observed, would dishonour the members of the smaller, former *polis* (hence the situation of this clause next to a clause dealing with the financial debts of the Lebedians). These friends and benefactors were also, however, central to Lebedos' earlier identity as a *polis*, and the combination, of Lebedean *proxenoi* and *euergetai* with Teian, was a potent means of signalling, to outsiders, the union of these two *poleis*. The new tribe provided for in the Latmos-Pidasas text performed a similar function. Changing the number or names of a city's tribes was also a way of signalling constitutional change – it was something which both Cleisthenes of Athens and his maternal grandfather, Cleisthenes of Sikyon, were credited with doing. By altering the formal political structure of the *polis* of Latmos in this way (which involved the redistribution of Latmians as well as Pidasans), this sympolity was constructed not simply as an incorporation or absorption, but something which was to fundamentally change Latmos as well

65. So GAUTHIER 1989, p. 195.

as Pidasa⁶⁶. In fact, the union between Latmos and Pidasa may even have been presented as the foundation of a new city, if the possibility raised by Michael Wörle is correct and the *polis* which resulted was named Herakleia rather than Latmos⁶⁷.

Other texts stress the ways in which minor *poleis* are to be permitted to retain their former communal identity, albeit in a qualified or redefined form. This was most clearly marked in the case of united *poleis* which retained so-called ‘double ethnics,’ as in the case of the *polis* known as ‘the *demoi* of the Plarasians and Aphrodisians,’ which retained the formal markers of *polis* status of both constituent communities rather than only one (although the difference between large and small cities – the more and less important partners – was still communicated albeit through the order in which they were named)⁶⁸. In other cases, the identity of a community was represented as remaining intact, and the *polis* was incorporated as an integral unit within a larger *polis*. This is what seems to have happened when Medeon became a phratry of Stiris (as I have said, the sense in which the Medeonian phratry continued to possess a strong territorial identity, despite the emphasis of the rest of the text on the fact that their territories were shared, is particularly striking). The Mantinea-Helisson text is another excellent example: Helisson was to continue as a self-contained community, becoming a Mantinean *kome*. At the same time, as I argued, in response to a desire attributed to the political community of the Heliswasians to remain a *polis*, they were simultaneously granted this status – but in this document, what it was to be a *polis* was re-defined in such a way as to iron out the actual conflicts which existed between the status of *polis* and *kome*-within-a-*polis*. The crucial defining elements were presented as being not the retention of a *polis* ethnic (the Heliswasians were to become Mantineans) nor the loss of their own laws and autonomy (they were to use the Mantinean laws, even amongst themselves after the sympolity), but the ability to continue to perform the same sacrifices and festivals, and continue to perform, as a community, on the inter-*polis* communal stage of *theoria*. The Teos-Lebedos text similarly granted the Lebedians, even while absorbed, to continue to participate in at least one particularly important inter-*polis* theoric context, that of the festival of the Panionion – but required that they do so in a way which also expressed their new identity as Teians.

66. See EICH 2004, p.101-102, explicitly making a comparison in this case with Cleisthenic *anamixis*.

67. See WÖRLE 2003a, p. 140; WÖRLE rightly notes, however, that the Latmos-Pidasa text is to be inscribed ἐν Λάτμῳ (l. 35) which may make this hypothesis difficult to uphold.

68. *IAphrodisias* 1, 1.2-3; REGER 2004, p.162-163. For other examples, see ROBERT 1962, p.55-65.

These different sympolities illustrate the range of different approaches used to reach – and communicate – a compromise between the desire of the smaller city to maintain its communal identity on the one hand and, on the other, the desire of the larger city to firmly impose its own identity on the new community as the source of future communal cohesion. The Teos-Kyrbissos text, by contrast, illustrates a more apparently one-sided resolution of this tension on the side of the dominant *polis* Teos. The settlement involved the, apparently complete, overwriting of the communal identity of the Kyrbisseis, to which the members of the smaller *polis* were obliged to personally commit. It is perhaps for this reason that what the inhabitants of Kyrbissos gained in practical terms as a result of this sympolity is more specifically laid out in this case – a minutely described garrison and specific guarantees regarding the way in which they would be treated.

Conclusion

In his article on sympolities in Hellenistic Asia Minor, Gary Reger draws a distinction between ‘*sympoliteiai* promoted by kings or their agents’ and ‘*sympoliteiai* driven by local concerns’. The former, he argued, ‘seem to aim at obliterating previously existing cities’ and were ‘marked by a violence no less real for being merely ideological, directed as it was against civic identity’ while, in the latter, ‘the predominant power in local *sympoliteiai* ... had some sympathy for the weaker partner’s urgency in preserving at least some of its identity once the union was established’⁶⁹. Certainly there were cases, attested in the literary rather than the epigraphic record, where higher powers displayed, at the least, a lack of concern for the effects of their actions in relation to *poleis*’ communal identities. However, these instances of a lack of regard for civic identity are eclipsed by brutal episodes of *polis* on *polis* history – where violence directed against civic identity was both extreme and personal because of its importance to the perpetrator as well as the victim. (The best example of this is perhaps the Cretan treaty between Gortyn and Knossos in which the two Cretan *poleis*, in sharing out the territory of a third, Rhaukos, which they had co-operated to conquer, heaped insult upon destruction by symbolically cleaving the urban centre of the fallen *polis* in two⁷⁰).

As I have argued in this article, the picture presented by the sympolity texts which we have, even where they explicitly involve kings or their officers, is of a different kind, for reasons relating to the function which these texts perform. In any case, violent events or episodes of coercion, at least where it was stoutly resisted, are unlikely to have resulted in the creation of these sorts of texts because

69. REGER 2004, p. 178-179.

70. CHANIOTIS 1996, no. 44.

what would their function have been? Sympolity-texts depict sympolities as events underpinned and reliant on the successful negotiation of distinct interests belonging to small and large *poleis*. These are characterised less by a sympathy on the part of the larger cities for the desire of the smaller to preserve their identity (the Teos-Kyrbissos text alone shows this), than a recognition of the general importance of being seen to reach an accommodation of the tension between this desire on the part of the smaller *polis* and the need of the larger *polis* to assert its own primacy. This is surely because the success of a sympolity depended in no small part on the persuasiveness of these textual representations – the extent to which the parties, especially the smaller community, could accept and commit to the version of events and the relation between the two former *poleis* within the new community which it presented.

W.J.B.G. MACK

Bibliography

- AGER S. 1996, *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World: 337-90 B.C.*, Berkeley.
- AGER S. 1998, «Civic identity in the Hellenistic world: the case of Lebedos», *GRBS* 39, p. 5-21.
- BEAN G.E. 1949, *Aegean Turkey*, London.
- BENCIVENNI A. 2003, *Progetti di riforme costituzionali nelle epigrafi greche dei secoli IV-II a. C.*, Bologna.
- BEVAN E.R. 1902, *The House of Seleucus*, London.
- BILLOWS R.A. 1990, *Antigonos the one-eyed and the creation of the Hellenistic state*, California.
- BLÜMEL W. 1997, «Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasa», *EA* 29, p. 135-142.
- BLÜMEL W. 1998, «Addendum zu dem Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasa», *EA* 30, p. 185.
- BRINGMANN K. 1993, «The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism», in A.W. BULLOCH, E. S. GRUEN, A. A. LONG and A. STEWART (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley, p. 7-25.
- VAN BREMEN R. 2003, «Family Structures», in A. ERSKINE (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, p. 313-330.
- BURASELIS K. 2003, «Considerations on *Symmachia* and *Sympoliteia* in the Hellenistic Period», in K. BURASELIS and K. ZOUMBOULAKIS (ed.), *The Idea of European Community in History II. Aspects of Connecting Poleis and Ethne in Ancient Greece*, Athens, p. 39-50.
- CHANIOTIS A. 1993, «Ein diplomatischer Statthalter nimmt Rücksicht auf den verletzten Stolz zweier hellenistischer Kleinpoleis (Nagidos und Arsinoe)», *EA* 21, p. 33-42.
- CHANIOTIS A. 1996, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- EICH A. 2004, «Probleme der staatlichen Einheit in der griechischen Antike», *ZPE* 149, p. 83-102.

- ERRINGTON M.R. 1989, «The Peace Treaty between Miletus and Magnesia», *Chiron* 19, p.279-288.
- FELDMANN W. 1885, *Analecta epigraphica ad historiam synœcismorum et sympolitiarum*, Strasbourg.
- GAUTHIER Ph. 1989, «Grandes et petites cités: hégémonie et autarcie», *Opus* 6-8, p.187-202.
- GAUTHIER Ph. 1998, «Review of AGER 1996», *Topoi* 8, p.309-321.
- GAUTHIER Ph. 2001, «Les Pidaséens entrent en sympolitie avec les Milésiens: la procédure et les modalités institutionnelles», in A. BRESSON and R. DESCAT (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au I^{er} siècle a.C.*, Bordeaux, p.117-127.
- HABICHT Chr. 1998, «Zum Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasas», *EA* 30, p.9-10.
- HANSEN M.H. 1995a, «Beotian *Poleis* – a Test Case», in M.H. HANSEN (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, Copenhagen, p.13-63.
- HANSEN M.H. 1995b, «*Kome*: A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements which were not *Poleis*», in M.H. HANSEN and K. RAAFLAUB (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart, p.45-81.
- JONES C.P. 1999, «The Union of Latmos and Pidasas», *EA* 31, p.1-7.
- LABUFF J. 2010, «The Union of Latmos and Pidasas Reconsidered», *EA* 43, p.115-124.
- LANDUCCI GATTINONI F. 1994, «Immigrazioni ed emigrazioni nella Ionia d'Asia nella prima età ellenistica», in M. SORDI (ed.), *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico*, Milan, p.169-185.
- MCINERNEY J. 1999, *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*, Austin.
- MA J. 1999, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- MA J. 2003, «Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age», *P&P* 180, p.9-39.
- MACK W.J.B.G. 2011, «The Proxeny-lists of Karthaia», *REA* 113, p.319-344.
- MACK W.J.B.G. 2012, «The Eresian Catalogue of Proxenois (IG XII suppl. 127)», *ZPE* 180, p.217-229.
- MIGEOTTE L. 1984, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques. Recueil des documents et analyse critique*, Quebec.
- MIGEOTTE L. 2001, «Le traité entre Milet et Pidasas (*Delphinion* 149)», in A. BRESSON and R. DESCAT (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au I^{er} siècle a.C.*, Bordeaux, p.129-135.
- MOGGI M. 2001, «Pausania e la Mainalia», in D. KNOEPFLER and M. PIÉART (eds.), *Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l'an 2000*, Geneva, p.323-341.
- NIELSEN T.H. 2002, *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Göttingen.
- REGIER G. 2004, «*Sympoliteiai* in Hellenistic Asia Minor», in S. COLVIN (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East*, Cambridge, p.145-180.
- RHODES P.J. 1995, «Epigraphical Evidence: Laws and Decrees», in M.H. HANSEN (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, Copenhagen, p.91-112.
- RHODES P.J. and R. OSBORNE 2003, *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BC*, Oxford.
- TE RIELE G.J. and M.J. 1987, «Hélisson entre en sympolitie avec Mantinée: une nouvelle inscription d'Arcadie», *BCH* 111, p.167-90.
- ROBERT L. 1962, *Villes d'Asie Mineure* (2nd ed.), Paris.

- ROBERT J. and L. 1976, «Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie. L'union de Téos et de Kyrbissos», *JS*, p. 153-235.
- RUTHERFORD I. forthcoming, *State-Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece: A Study of Theōriā and Theōroi*, Cambridge.
- SABA S. 2007, «Temporary and Permanent Housing for New Citizens», *EA* 40, p. 125-134.
- SCHULER Chr. 2010, «Sympolitien in Lykien und Karien», in R. VAN BREMEN and J.-M. CARBON (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux, p. 393-413.
- THÜR G. and H. TAEUBER 1994, *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis: Arkadien*, Vienna.
- WALSER A.V. 2009, «Sympolitien und Siedlungsentwicklung», in A. MATTHAEI and M. ZIMMERMANN (eds.), *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, Frankfurt, p. 135-155.
- WÖRRLE M. 2003a, «Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos III. Der Synoikismos der Latmioi mit den Pidaseis», *Chiron* 33, p. 121-143.
- WÖRRLE M. 2003b, «Pidasa du Grion et Héraclée du Latmos: deux cités sans avenir», *CRAI*, p. 1361-1379.