

## 1. SETTING AND SOURCES<sup>1</sup>

Today democracy is a celebrated feature of society, which our Western world claims to be the instigator of. Attempts are currently made to export our model of democracy to other parts of the world, or impose it on them. In this context it is worth remembering that both a certain degree of freedom from external restraint and a certain degree of material welfare are agreed upon as essential prerequisites for the emergence of democracy. Another factor which promotes democratic development is a negotiated assumption of power and not violent political changes. These requirements were valid also for ancient societies. Democracy, however, is not a state which can be achieved once and for all or be taken for granted; even in countries like Sweden with a relatively long tradition of democratic government, democracy is a state which constantly must be fought for and recaptured. Worth considering is also that the Greeks participated actively in political life, whereas the ordinary modern citizen may confine his or her participation to going to the polls every fourth year. The time dimension also differs; the period in which democracy was practised in ancient Greece was far more prolonged than the period in which the modern world has hitherto practised popular government.

The focus of this thesis is on the existence and working of democracy in hellenistic western Asia Minor and the nearby islands in general and in some of the Greek city-states within this area in particular. This has necessitated a closer look at the concepts of and factual existence of autonomy, *autonomia*, and freedom, *eleutheria*. The present study is mainly based on decrees cut in stone enacted by the councils and the assemblies of the city-states. These decrees opened with democratic formulas, commonly ἔδοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ, ‘resolved by the council and the demos’. However, before presenting the nature of the sources, approaches to historical writing, methods, hypotheses and the outline of the thesis, something should be said about the scholarly outlook on the hellenistic period and hellenistic democracy.

### 1.1 HELLENISTIC DEMOCRACY – FACT OR FICTION?

In his *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (1836–1843), Johan-Gustaf Droysen labelled the period between 323 and 30 BC ‘Hellenismus’.<sup>2</sup> He saw this period as a Graeco-Oriental cultural fusion, which was a forerunner of and a requirement for the spread of Christianity, and he therefore viewed it in a positive light. Due to ‘Hellenism’ the

1 I am grateful to Prof. Christian Habicht, Prof. Klaus Hallof and not the least to Prof. Peter J. Rhodes, who all generously have contributed with comments on different details.

2 J.G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, vol.1, 1836, vol. 2 1843, and a second edition including vol. 3 in 1877.

Greek language became the *lingua franca*, and the New Testament was written in *koine* in order to facilitate the spread of its religious message. Subsequent classical scholars, however, used the word ‘Hellenismus’ with another import. They considered the classical period as the Golden Age, and the period that followed was viewed as a period of decline. According to this reasoning, the conquest of the Greek world by Rome was a natural consequence of this decline.<sup>3</sup> Certainly, eventually the Romans did annex Asia Minor, but the ‘conquest’ was a matter of gradual, and in the beginning reluctant, involvement and expansion over a long period of time – the last two centuries BC.

The negative view on the hellenistic period included also the opinions on political life. Traditionally, scholars have mainly associated ancient Greek democracy with Athens and the classical period (c. 480–330). Generally it is also assumed that the Greek city-states lost their independence and political importance in connection with, or even before, the Macedonian conquest in the 330s. Thereby one of the essential conditions for democracy was lost. This reasoning depends heavily on which outlook on the hellenistic period one has. Was the Greek world of city-states conquered and subordinated to the hellenistic kings? Or was self-government still within the range of possibility? As we shall see, opinions among scholars of Greek history differ.

The literature dealing with Athenian democracy is plentiful, but literature that treats ancient Greek political systems outside Athens is scarce. This is partly due to a methodological problem. The sources concerning classical Athens are outstanding in their abundance, and Athens is the only city-state for which the sources are sufficient enough to allow us to make a more comprehensive (re)construction of the constitution. Roger Brock and Stephen Hodkinson call this wealth of material “the tyranny of the evidence” because it offers “a more secure niche for academic specialization”.<sup>4</sup> This is certainly true, but considering the concentration on the classical period it may also be a matter of attitude towards the different kinds of sources. It seems to me that we are more ready to accept the sources that treat the classical period, which are mostly literary, than those concerning the hellenistic, which are dominated by the epigraphic material as evidence. The interest in ancient Athenian democracy is also due to the political and cultural discourse of the twentieth century when democratic Athens came to be regarded as an ancestor and a source of inspiration for modern political thought. During the early modern periods, however, the attitudes towards democratic government were negative. Even the democratic movements one hundred years ago were anxious to avoid the excess of direct democracy, and one may suppose that in this context representative bodies were constructed.<sup>5</sup> The height of the scholarly interest during the last decades was reached at

3 Cartledge *et al.* 1997, 2f., sets out this theme thoroughly in the ‘Introduction’ with valuable references. Chester Starr 1991, has in *A history of the ancient world* devoted a chapter to ‘The end of the golden age’, i. e., the end of the classical period. Striking is the title of the English translation of Christian Meier’s book *Athens. A portrait of the city in its Golden Age*, Berlin & London 2000, first published in 1993 as *Ein Neubeginn der Weltgeschichte*.

4 Brock & Hodkinson 2000, 4.

5 Brock & Hodkinson 2000, 6.

the beginning of the 1990s, when the 2500th anniversary of the supposed foundation of the Athenian *demokratia* was celebrated in Western Europe and North America.<sup>6</sup> But to be fair, already in antiquity there was a great interest among authors, even from outside Athens, in Athens and Athenian matters.

Except for scattered articles and brief treatments, there are only two monographs which are devoted to non-Athenian democracies and periods other than the classical: *The Origins and Development of Ancient Greek Democracy* by James O’Neil,<sup>7</sup> and *The First Democracies. Early Popular Government Outside Athens* by Eric Robinson.<sup>8</sup> O’Neil briefly examines the origins of democracy and its various forms in ancient Greece including Athens, and its development from the archaic to the hellenistic period. Robinson traces the earliest examples of democratic government. According to him, eighteen states with convincing evidence had popular government before 480, some of them antedating the Athenian *demokratia*. One important volume when studying Greek democracy is *The Decrees of the Greek States* by Peter Rhodes (with the late David Lewis).<sup>9</sup> He has collected evidence for decree-making language and procedures from all the Greek states, covering the period from the seventh century BC to the third century AD. In the third part of the book, which deals with the Greek world outside Athens, Rhodes summarizes and analyses the contents of the decrees from that vast area. It is true that Rhodes treats all sorts of constitutions, but as the main thread of the book he regards democracy as the norm for many of the Greek city-states.

Besides presenting a generally Athenocentric view of ancient Greek democracy, many modern scholars also assert that Greek democracy began to decline with the beginning of the hellenistic period.<sup>10</sup> One representative of this opinion is

6 Brock & Hodkinson 2000, 6.

7 O’Neil 1995.

8 Robinson 1997.

9 Rhodes 1997.

10 E. g., de Ste. Croix 1981, 300–326, *passim*, although he is not completely Athenocentric in his approach; Jones, 1940, 168, 170; Finley 1985, 140; Gruen 1984, 132–142. According to Austin 1981 53, n. 1, and Burstein, 1985 16, n. 5, the word ‘democracy’ had lost its meaning in the hellenistic period; Green 1990, 632, on the late Hellenistic period: “Democracy once taken for granted as an inalienable civic right ..., now seemed little more than a quaint historical memory amid the universal bureaucratic rule of autocratic monarch, oligarchic group, or business consortium.” See page 746, n. 19 for references to a dissimilar view; Morris 1992, 148 “...in Athens by growing popular power, ... Such democratization may have been less important elsewhere.”; O’Neil 1995, 103–120, e. g., p. 114: “Hellenistic politics were usually dominated by a small number well-to-dos families and their friends, a revision to the earliest pattern of democratic political life in the sixth century”; Hahn 2000, 457, maintains that one of the changing political conditions in the hellenistic period was the disappearance of the distinction between democracy, aristocracy and oligarchy. He claims that democracy remained as a political institution in some city-states, which nevertheless was dominated by a rich elite. The positions on democracy presented in general encyclopaedias of ancient history have an impact on scholars within the academic field who are not specialised in the hellenistic period, and should thus be mentioned: In *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996), Hansen holds the opinion that Athenian democracy was almost forgotten between 322 BC and c. AD 1850. On non-Athenian and post-classical democracy, however, Hornblower & Spawforth writes in the same volume that:

O’Neil. In his brief discussion on hellenistic democracy, he claims that democracy did not survive in its proper sense after the death of Alexander. According to him, even if democracy was occasionally formally revived, popular participation was low and the politics were dominated by a rich elite.<sup>11</sup> One problem when we consider these claims by O’Neil is his unfortunate lack of references, above all to ancient sources. Another, general, question is how we define democracy. Is it possible to reach an agreement on this, when some people think that not even well-documented Athens was a real democracy, mainly because of the exclusion of the major part of the population, namely women, resident foreigners and slaves, from political life?

Even though the traditional negative image of the hellenistic period is persistent, there is a wealth of old and new research that depicts a much more nuanced and different image. Various scholars on epigraphy have long since been conscious of the complex political institutions and processes in the hellenistic city-states, but their results are to a large extent directed to specialists and are difficult to grasp for people outside their profession. During the last fifteen years, however, increasing scholarly interest in the hellenistic period has resulted in a large amount of more easily comprehensible publications, presenting new research on various aspects of the period.<sup>12</sup>

The allocation of historical time into specific periods is, needless to say, a modern invention. The limits between the periods are often attached to political events, such as change of power, which are considered decisive. As for the border between the classical and hellenistic periods, that is, the takeover by Alexander in the 330s, it may not necessarily have involved a radical change of life within the poleis. This is shown by Franz G. Maier, Philippe Gauthier, Leopold Migeotte and Peter Rhodes, each of whom has studied a special kind of topic from inscriptions. All four concluded that there was no break in the pattern of actions of the poleis between the two periods, but rather continuity.<sup>13</sup> Gauthier and Rhodes point out that there was no particular distinction in political life in Greece between the classical and the

“Democracy or people’s power was not an Athenian monopoly or even invention. ... Even in the Hellenistic period ... there was ... more democratic life in Greece (Athens included) than often is realized.”; *Der Neue Pauly* (3, 1997), shows a somewhat indecisive position: “In hell. Zeit behielt der Begriff *d.* zuweilen, aber nicht immer, seine eigentliche Bedeutung. ... Einige Texte bezeichnen mit dem Wort *d.* einfach eine verfassungsmäßige, nicht notwendigerweise demokratische Regierungsform ...”. Lately, some scholars have drawn attention to not only the Athenocentric view, but also the prevailing Hellenocentric view on the emergence and existence of democracy, see Hornblower 1993, 2; Robinson 1997, 16–25; Schemel 1999, 2000.

11 O’Neil 1995, 103–120, e. g., 105, 114, 116, 117.

12 Disregarding articles, some examples of new research are those presented in the two series *Hellenistic culture and society*, Berkeley & London 1990–, hitherto 45 volumes, and *Studies in hellenistic civilization*, Aarhus 1990–, hitherto nine volumes. Some other important contributions are Habicht 1995b; Ma 1999; Bremen 1996; Buraselis 2000; Bresson & Descat 2001; Bosworth 2002; Ogden 2002; Dignas 2002; Erskine 2003.

13 Maier 1959–61, the evidence for the building of fortifications; Migeotte 1984, 1992, subscriptions for common purposes; Gauthier 1985, the benefactors of the Greek cities; Rhodes 1997, the decrees of the Greek states.

early hellenistic period. According to them, the change in domestic politics came later, about 150, due to the expansion of the Romans.<sup>14</sup> Christian Habicht puts the line of change even further ahead. He stresses that the difference between the classical and the *late* hellenistic period was not as clear-cut as is usually proposed. He claims that even in classical democracy, politics were dominated by an elite and that education and property played an important role in the opportunities for active participation.<sup>15</sup> A similar approach was taken by the late David Lewis who discussed the epigraphic evidence for democracy in the hellenistic period. He agreed with the opinion that the Greek states in the hellenistic period maintained to be democratic and began their decrees with democratic formulas, but that these decrees were formulated by a limited number of persons to which the demos only gave its consent. Lewis admitted, however, that there had been no closer analysis of this matter. In his work he raised a very important question which I consider central to the issue of democracy in hellenistic Greece: *if the democratic formulas in the hellenistic period concealed the domination of the few, how can we know that this was not also the case in earlier periods?*<sup>16</sup> It is, however, not an exceptional idea to imagine that people born into wealthy and influential families have much greater opportunities and capacity to reach important positions and convey issues in the political institutions. In my opinion this does not imply opposition to a democratic constitution per se. One can also turn the question the other way round: *if the democratic formulas in the classical period revealed democratic government, how can we know that this was not also the case in later periods?*

My hypothesis is that democracy was a customary form of political organization in many of the Greek poleis of the hellenistic period. As for the cities in western Asia Minor, democracy seems both to have arisen and flourished particularly in this era.

## 1.2 THE EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES

The criteria of selection and the methods I have used will be discussed continually throughout the thesis when called for, but something should be said in general about the nature of and the problems and advantages connected with this source material. In contrast to ancient literary sources which are often written many years after the course of events they describe and which are known only from medieval manuscripts, inscriptions are original texts and thus constitute not only sources, but also archaeological artefacts. Inscriptions reflect certain events or resolutions, usually recorded in direct connection. They may also constitute accounts, lists or dedications and the like, which for some reason were considered worth documenting on stone and displaying in public. One disadvantage when depending heavily on epigraphic material is that decrees reflect only decisions that were agreed upon, seem-

14 Gauthier 1993, 211–231; Rhodes 1993, 173f.; Rhodes 1997, 533, 542.

15 Habicht 1995a, 87–92.

16 Lewis 1997, 57f.; For a discussion concerning the existence of a ruling elite in Athens, see Ober 1989, 14–17, 334f.; Habicht 1995a, 87–92.

ingly in consensus. Possible debates which preceded the passing of a decree or disagreement about the decision are not traceable, nor are issues brought to discussion which were not passed.

Decrees and other documents were recorded on non-durable material in the first hand. A decree cut in stone is just a copy of an original document recorded on such a perishable medium. One may presuppose that all issues decided on by the polis were documented and filed. Some of those records were set up temporarily for public display and some were stored directly in the state archives. Peter Rhodes has studied epigraphic and literary evidence for archives, and found a number of media, some more perishable than others. He suggests that certain kinds of media were used for certain kinds of records.<sup>17</sup> Thus, there is great uncertainty as to how representative the preserved inscriptions are with regard to both the number of inscriptions produced and the number of decrees that were issued. Nevertheless, they provide almost the only information available on constitutional and political matters in the hellenistic poleis.

As for the representativeness of different kinds of inscriptions, Angelos Chaniotis has made a survey of the epigraphic documents of Krete. From the late eighth to the late fifth century the inscriptions contain mainly texts of laws and decrees. During the subsequent period lasting to the end of the fourth century, the number of surviving inscriptions is extremely small. A totally different pattern is attested from around 300 and continues during the last three centuries BC. The number of inscriptions increases dramatically; the laws disappear and are replaced by treaties, both between Kretan cities and between Krete and other Greek states.<sup>18</sup> In the Kretan case a change in the epigraphic habit is beyond doubt. We do have enough inscriptions from both the period before the late fifth century and the period after 300 to be able to perceive a pattern, and the topics differ clearly. It is likely that in Krete the surviving record comes close to what was considered worth inscribing on stone in the different periods, namely, laws in the early time and treaties in the hellenistic period.

The custom of the poleis to set up decrees cut in stone in public places such as in the agora and at the theatre is strongly connected with democratic government; oligarchic regimes are not presumed to have had this habit.<sup>19</sup> One may, however, question the usefulness of written records in a mainly oral society with a presumed

17 Rhodes, 2001.

18 Chaniotis 1999, 287–88.

19 See for instance Harvey 1966; Finley 1977; Thomas 1989; Hedrick, 1994, 1999, 2000. He has in one case study found that during the reign of Demetrios from Phaleron 317–307, there are extremely few inscriptions from Athens preserved and that this should reflect the anti-democratic regime. Democracy was restored 307 and from that time and until 301 the assembly was very active, and as much as one hundred decrees are preserved from the period; Tracy 2000, has studied the same phenomenon, but concludes that the lack of inscriptions from Demetrios' reign had economic and not ideological reasons. He points out that Demetrios even restricted private expensive funeral monuments. We know that decrees of democratic Athens were put down in connection with oligarchic rebellions, and thus 'oligarchic' inscriptions may also have been exposed to some sort of *damnatio memoriae* by a subsequent democratic regime (proposed by Dr. H. Lejdegård).

low degree of literacy. The degree of literacy has been disputed, but even if far from everyone could read, there were those who could mediate the contents to the illiterate. The existence of a decree set up in a public space had also significance in itself, not only concretely, but also from a psychological perspective: the visibility meant that decisions taken in the assembly were made common knowledge and thus the actions by the state were not concealed. In addition, this openness prevented violations of the laws. Some inscriptions were monumental in character, both with regard to their size and to their relief ornamentation. The visible monuments contributed to the collective memory and identity of the polis and its members, and they sent messages to the inhabitants of the polis and to observers from outside.<sup>20</sup>

Many inscriptions are incomplete and fragmentary, and they are also often difficult to date more than roughly. When approaching this source material the historian is usually dependent on the epigraphist, and the printed edition of an inscription as well as the commentary is crucial. In the schools of editing inscriptions there are two extremes. These are humorously labelled by Sterling Dow as ‘The Kirchner Principle’, which has small restorations of occasional letters without any need of defence, and the ‘Principle of Extreme Freedom’ where attention is focused not on the exact wording but on what one thought was the original substance.<sup>21</sup> I will stress the importance of distinguishing between what actually can be read on the stone and what someone has restored.

Regardless of the problems, inscriptions are of great value. Inscriptions have some advantages over written sources since they usually are contemporaneous with the event they record and thus considerably more direct. When they can be firmly dated and the provenience is certain, the decrees give us, among other things, information on institutions, officials and procedures in the states, and they are sources for various cults and interstate relations. Moreover, personal names may provide information on the status and roles of individuals in society and genealogical relationships may be established.

The most common form of inscription which will turn up in the present investigation is the honorific. This is not surprising as publicity was part of the honour. As a category it may seem unimportant, but the underlying reasons for granting the honours reveal the political praxis, the situation within a state, relations between states, and *vis-à-vis* hegemony. In this material a number of dichotomies are present – conflict-consensus, egoism-altruism, power-dependence – revealing the omnipresent tensions in human societies. Certain features, reflecting these tensions, turn out to be more typical for the hellenistic than for the earlier period and reflect the city-states’ concern for the relations to their neighbours. One of these is the sending of judges to cities that were unable to settle pending law cases. Another important element was the institution of arbitration; citizens of a city were invited as judges to mediate and arbitrate between other cities in conflict, or between cities and hegemony.

20 For other aspects of inscriptions on display other than the technical or literary see for instance Osborne 1999; Davies 2003.

21 Dow 1969.

ons.<sup>22</sup> The honouring of foreign judges or other foreigners who had assisted in different ways was often manifested in grants of *proxenia* or citizenship. Many cities tried also to ensure the inviolability of their sanctuaries or of their territories, so-called *asylia*.<sup>23</sup> Treaties between states, a common feature in the classical period, continued to be concluded in the hellenistic period. In these, exchange of collective citizenship between cities, *isopoliteia*, was frequently established,<sup>24</sup> and *homonoia*, concord between cities, or within a city, was another feature common to treaties and official oaths.<sup>25</sup> The most comprehensive of treaties between poleis concerns that of *symmachia*, an offensive and defensive alliance. The royal letter to the cities, and their answers, is another important category of inscriptions, which reflects the diplomatic language and the relation between the Greek cities and the kings.<sup>26</sup> It has been suggested that the increase in these different categories of decrees in the hellenistic period, was a consequence of the politically unsettled times, and an ambition for peace.<sup>27</sup> Certainly, the obvious actions taken to avoid and solve conflicts are in themselves an indication that it was called for. However, the state of war amongst the Greeks had ‘always’ been a normality, and measures taken to establish alliances and settle conflicts were certainly no new phenomena, although the evidence for them are mainly from the hellenistic period.<sup>28</sup>

### 1.3 THE LAYOUT

#### Methods and hypotheses

This thesis, except for chapter 2, is hard-core empirical in nature and heavily based on epigraphic material. The temporal focus is of course the hellenistic period; polis decrees of the classical and Roman imperial periods occur in a few cases, however, and since they are of interest for comparison I have included them as well. Inscriptions are selected on the basis of certain chosen criteria to establish both the presence of certain phenomena and to prove possible chronological changes (to be presented shortly in brief and more closely in the respective chapters). The method of systematically selecting relevant inscriptions, presented and discussed in above all chapters 3, 4, 5, and 7 (collected in appendices A1–4) and in appendix C, has primarily been performed by searching for certain keywords and formulas in the data-

22 Arbitrations collected by Piccirilli 1973; Ager 1996; Magnetto 1997. Earlier collections but with access to a poorer source material by Raeder 1912 and Tod 1913. For Greek arbitration in conflicts including a hegemon, see chapter 5.2.

23 Collected by Rigsby 1996.

24 See for instance Gawantka 1975.

25 The widespread cult of Homonia shows the Greeks’ concern for this state, Thériault 1996.

26 Welles 1934.

27 Giovannini 1993, 256–286, who interprets these features as an expression of the social relations among the poleis, and that the dominant characteristic is solidarity and readiness to help each other.

28 See ch. 5.1.



base of ‘Greek documentary texts’ on the CD-ROM PHI#7.<sup>29</sup> This edition from 1996 covers at least 75 percent of the recovered inscriptions.<sup>30</sup> The great advantage of this method is that it results in a good overview of a rather large area in a safe and relatively fast way. The electronic search has been supplemented by manually searching through foremost the more recent editions of the periodicals *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG)*, *Chiron, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik (ZPE)*, *Bulletin Épigraphique (BE)*, and *L’Année Philologique*. Checks against the catalogue in *The Decrees by the Greek States* have also been made.<sup>31</sup> Thus, even if not succeeding in finding all relevant inscriptions, I have tried to minimize the falling off.<sup>32</sup> I have refrained from using inscriptions which I find too fragmentary in the decisive parts. Some of these restored inscriptions, however, have been accepted by scholars as evidence for different phenomena. Many inscriptions are edited and re-edited in a large number of different publications, but for lucidity I have chosen to give references to regional corpora, to *IG* or to *SEG*. When appropriate, I occasionally also give the PHI reference. The selection of inscriptions in chapter 7 (appendices A1–4) has been given its own numbering system, referred to as **IASOS 1–62**, **KALYMNA 1–42**, **KOS 1–90**, **MILETOS 1–46**.

To integrate empiricism and theory is crucial but difficult, and my point of departure and approach are different for different parts of the thesis. The present text begins with general issues and concluding with specific ones. The aim is to create a framework as well as a comprehension of the context and prerequisites for hellenistic democracy. To do so I overhaul and examine certain central definitions, that is, those of democracy, independence and sovereignty, and how they were used in antiquity and today in general. Modern definitions of both ancient and modern democracy are variable and sometimes blurred. Thus, one aim is to make visible some of these definitions and to approach the most fundamental of them. Among the ancient authors Aristotle is our most important source for political thinking and theory. He discusses not only Athens but also many other Greek city-states and other forms of constitutions than democracy, and a considerable part is devoted to his political theories. A certain degree of freedom from external control is considered a prerequisite for democratic government, and the Greeks did in fact associate the concepts of freedom and democracy with each other. To establish the existence of the Greek nouns *autonomia*, ‘independence’ (in part *eleutheria*, ‘freedom’) and *demokratia* in the epigraphic material from the Greek cities of Asia Minor and the adjacent islands, I have collected and listed them separately in chronological order. Further, to

29 The CD-ROM PHI#7 contains c.220,000 Greek inscriptions and papyri. Packard Humanities Institute (PHI), 300 Second St. Suite 200, Los Altos, CA 94022, tel. (650) 948–0150, e-mail: phi@packhum.org. PC and Mac demand different kinds of software to read the PHI and TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, i. e., Greek literary texts), see <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/~tlg/Software.html#Ibycus> (accessed February 21, 2005). I have used Musaios 2002A, <http://www.musaios.com/>.

30 Oral information at the International Summer School for Epigraphy, CSAD, Oxford July 2001.

31 Rhodes 1997, although we are not wholly in agreement.

32 Since this was written a number of Koan inscriptions have been available, they are not included in my investigation.

evaluate the nature of interstate and international relations, certain actions by the Greek poleis in the same area will be examined as possible expressions of independence.

My principal hypothesis is that democracy existed in the hellenistic period and that we can gain an understanding of it through the epigraphic material. To reiterate: *democracy was a customary form of political organization in many of the Greek poleis of the hellenistic period. In the cities of western Asia Minor, democracy seems both to have arisen and flourished particularly in this era.* To establish this, four city-states – Iasos, Kalymna, Kos and Miletos – have been chosen. A number of criteria, presented in chapter seven, have been applied to the epigraphic material of these city-states to evaluate the nature of their constitutions. The most important of these criteria is the *enactment* formula which indicates that what follows has been enacted as a decree and specifies the ratifying body. The enactment formula is essentially considered to represent a democratic procedure, and the most frequent is ἔδοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ, ‘resolved by the council and the demos’. Another important criterion is the *motion* formula which contains the wording of the resolution voted on by the council and the assembly, e. g., δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ, κτλ, ‘let it be resolved by the council and the assembly, that ...’. A third significant feature given in the decrees is information about the *proposer* or *mover* of the motion, which either is a board of officials or an individual. Decrees from the four city-states containing these and other criteria are collected and arranged chronologically. The respective account and analysis are made thematically, and will be concluded by a comparative discussion of all four city-states.

Our varying outlook on different parts of history is essential, and in the initial section of this chapter I discussed the allocation of history into periods and our different evaluation of these periods. As mentioned earlier, democratic formulas of the classical period are generally considered to represent democratic government, but the same formulas of the hellenistic period are not. Certainly, a Greek city which issues democratically formulated decrees can be considered democratic in a formal sense, but if the pressure from an external power is too severe it has a limiting effect also on the democracy; if a polis is not free to decide on important questions, including foreign matters, the polis is only a nominal democracy. Therefore, it is important to consider the degree of independence for each polis as well as the contents of the decrees.

Without anticipating the outcome of the case study, it should be mentioned that decrees of the poleis examined decrease considerably in number from around the middle of the second century and onwards. This fits the analysis made by Gauthier and others that there was a change in Greek political life in the middle of the second century.<sup>33</sup> The decrease in decrees corresponds chronologically with the growing power of Rome in Asia Minor. The province of Asia was established in 129, a matter which may have terminated the Greek cities’ independence. During the constantly shifting hellenistic hegemonies, individual poleis had been able to manoeuvre fairly well – the kings certainly seized power by violence, but they were also

33 For references, see above nn. 13–15.

dependent on loyal allies among the Greek cities. A sole hegemon did not have the same need for local collaborators, and within the Roman province one can expect that the possibilities of self-governing were reduced. Besides the infrequency in decrees one may also expect a change of the topics that were treated. However, the lack of polis decrees from this period is not only significant in itself; it also implies that it becomes even more difficult to judge the nature of the political structure in the poleis examined.

As the dating of inscriptions is sometimes insecure and wide, the material will be divided principally into two periods, namely before and after c. 130, and the frequency and contents of the decrees will mainly be considered according to these groupings. This synchronic approach presupposes that a period can be treated as a chronological unit. One of the disadvantages of such a model of analysis is that the society may be interpreted as static, despite possibly rapid changes.<sup>34</sup>

## Outline

The structure of the thesis is the following:<sup>35</sup>

*Chapter 2* treats political theories and related topics in ancient Greece in general and in our time. Ideas and definitions of democracy in antiquity and today are discussed. Aristotle's political theory and modern political theories that are pertinent to the issue of democracy will also be considered. Likewise are modern definitions of ancient democracy summarized, as well as modern theories on the prerequisites for the emergence of democracy.

In *chapters 3–5* the temporal and spatial focuses are set mainly on the poleis in western Asia Minor and the nearby islands during the hellenistic period. The aims are to clarify the concepts of freedom and independence and their practical significance with regard to international relations. In *chapter three* I discuss ideas of autonomy and sovereignty in antiquity, as well as different modern definitions of these concepts applied to both ancient and modern societies. Possible ancient expressions of the state of sovereignty are searched for. In *chapter four* I list in chronological order the presence of *autonomia* in hellenistic inscriptions in western Asia Minor and the adjacent islands. Autonomy is attributed to 23 different places in this area. Greek cities referred to their own or to other poleis' *autonomia* (**A1–26**); references to *autonomia* by the hellenistic kings when addressing a Greek polis are listed separately (**B27–35**). By the middle of the third century, however, the kings and later the Romans changed their preferences to the catchword *eleutheria*, freedom (**C36–47**). In *chapter five* I approach some aspects from which the nature of international relations may be considered, with certain respect to the relations between the hellenistic kingdoms and the Greek cities. Some of these aspects are international arbitration and the presence of civic built fortifications.

34 Ober 1989, 36–38, 49.

35 The chapters may be read in whatever order the reader likes, except for chapter six which ought to be read before chapter seven.

*Chapters 6–7* compose the focal point of the thesis – hellenistic democracies. In *chapter six* I approach the main subject, the mode of government in certain states, by presenting the method and criteria I have used when selecting and analysing the inscriptions. This chapter comprises a manual for *chapter seven*, which constitutes a case study of four city-states – Iasos, Kalymna, Kos, and Miletos with Didyma. Decrees enacted by the council and/or the demos constitute the primary source. The focus will be upon political institutions and procedures, but the historical context and their spread in time will also be considered.

A reflecting tailpiece, *chapter eight*, will embrace some of the essentials of the seven preceding chapters, followed by *appendices A1–4* which contain the inscriptions used for the four city-states studied in chapter seven. In *appendix B* epigraphically attested titles of officials and offices (close to one hundred) in the same four city-states are listed. In *appendix C* I have collected the occurrences of *demokratia* in hellenistic inscriptions in western Asia Minor and the nearby islands (**D1–40**); these are attributed to 31 different places from the 330s to 45 BC.

*A note on transliteration and other conventions*

I have followed the Greek language as far as I have ventured, although I am not wholly consistent, especially not when rendering well-known historical persons such as Aristotle, Alexander and Polybios. As for Greek nouns and personal names I am more consistent in following the Greek language. Greek transliterated words are according to common practice scripted in italics, but the frequently occurring words ‘polis’, ‘demos’, ‘boule’ and ‘ekklesia’ are not. As for references to inscriptions, I give the number of each inscription in bold to distinguish it from pages. Thus, *TCal* **89** means inscription no. 89, whereas *TCal* 89 means page no. 89, where comments are to be found. My own numberings of inscriptions, presented in appendices A1–4, are referred to in block letters, e. g., IASOS **1**, in order to visually distinguish them from inscriptional corpora, e. g., *IK Iasos* **1**.