

## BEYOND THE POLIS : ISLAND *KOINA* AND OTHER NON-POLIS ENTITIES IN THE AEGEAN\*

Christy CONSTANTAKOPOULOU\*\*

*Résumé.* – Nous analysons quelques attestations de *koina* dans les îles de la mer Égée, en particulier un décret d'Héraclée (*IG XII, 7 509*) et deux décrets de Syme (*IG Suppl. XII, 3 1269 & 1270*). Nous soutenons que les *koina* dans ces décrets représentent des communautés politiques de citoyens et de résidents, c'est-à-dire de non-citoyens, engagés dans le processus de décision politique. Ces *koina* illustrent la complexité de la participation politique dans les communautés du monde grec. Autrement dit, au lieu de considérer le monde grec comme essentiellement le monde de la *polis* grecque, les *koina* nous montrent qu'il a existé des formes alternatives de formations politiques, qui dépassaient l'opposition binaire entre citoyens et non-citoyens.

*Abstract.* – I examine some attestations of *koina* in the islands of the Aegean in the Hellenistic period, with particular emphasis on a decree from Heracleia (*IG XII, 7, 509*) and two decrees from Syme (*IG Suppl. XII, 3, 1269 & 1270*). I argue that the *koina* in these decrees represent political communities of citizens and residents, that is non-citizens, engaged in political decision-making processes. Such *koina* illustrate the complexity of participation in political communities of the Greek world ; in other words, rather than understanding the Greek world as essentially the world of the Greek polis, *koina* show us that there existed alternative forms of political formations which transcended the conceptual binary opposition between citizens and non-citizens.

*Mots-clés.* – *Koina*, Heracleia, Syme, political communities, foreign residents.

---

\* I would like to thank Peter Liddel, Claire Taylor and the two anonymous referees for incredibly helpful and constructive criticism.

\*\* Birkbeck College, c.constantakopoulou@bbk.ac.uk

When we study the history of the Greek world, one of the first claims that we make is that this was essentially the world of the city-state, the polis. The history of the archaic and classical periods, in particular, is viewed as the history of the dominant poleis. The Greek city-state is also considered one of the « great » achievements of the classical Greek world ; it is the form of political organization that gave us democracy, theatre, great art etc. (even though this statement mostly refers to a single, and particularly exceptional, city-state, Athens). This is very much the emphasis of the curriculum of ancient Greek history taught in schools and universities in the UK<sup>1</sup>. Such an emphasis on the polis as the most important formation is the underlying assumption of excellent scholarship being produced such as the *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis* by the Copenhagen Polis Centre<sup>2</sup>. Yet, alongside the polis, there existed in the Greek world a plethora of other social and communal formations, which may or may not in specific contexts have had an overtly political character. These formations may have provided an alternative focus of communal organization for the ancient Greek world. Recent scholarship has done much to break down some of the boundaries between a « political » community and the rest of the population of a territory at any given time<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, network theory has provided a methodological tool with which to examine connections between individuals, groups of people and larger communities in a new light<sup>4</sup>.

In the increasingly interconnected and multicultural world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it is perhaps inevitable that we want to look at the complexities of social formation and identity beyond the strict political group of citizenship of the ancient Greek polis. I would like to take as a case study the case of community formation found in the various attestations of *koina* throughout the Greek world. Most of the evidence I shall be using dates from the Hellenistic period, but some attestations of *koina*, as we shall see, have their origins in the classical period, perhaps classical Athens<sup>5</sup>. A *koinon* can be loosely described as a term signifying a variety of forms of communal organization. In its primary meaning, a *koinon* refers to the collective unity of the people. But interestingly, in some cases, it may also imply an active community of citizens and non-citizens being engaged in political decisions together. This reveals a form of social relations and networks of power beyond our usual dual opposition between citizens and non-citizens in the Greek polis, which, in turn, implies a certain degree of access to political participation and therefore power for the non-citizens. This is particularly significant, as most modern research on politics in the Classical Greek world focuses (understandably so, given the state of the evidence) on the power and complex relations within the citizen body. The

---

1. Similar comments in K. VLASSOPOULOS, *Unthinking the Greek Polis : Ancient Greek History Beyond Eurocentrism*, Cambridge 2007 and « Beyond and Below the Polis : Networks, Associations and the Writing of Greek History » in I. MALKIN *et al.* eds., *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*, London 2009, p. 11-22.

2. M.H. HANSEN, T.H. NIELSEN eds., *An Inventory of the Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis*, Oxford 2004.

3. K. VLASSOPOULOS, *Unthinking the Greek Polis : Ancient Greek History Beyond Eurocentrism*, Cambridge 2007.

4. There has been a recent surge of interest in network theory and ancient history : see for example I. MALKIN *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, and *Id.*, *A Small Greek World. Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Oxford 2011.

5. See below n. 30.

*koina* I shall be discussing here, however, show that certain forms of political performance, and therefore a certain degree of political power, existed in groups and communities that were not strictly confined by citizenship. My purpose therefore here is to examine some attestations of *koina* in the island world of the Aegean world in the Hellenistic period, in order to argue that they should be viewed as an expression of an alternative form of political community of citizens and non-citizens.

Before we can proceed, however, I believe that it may be useful to have here a short and, by necessity, simplified overview of different forms of *koina* in the ancient sources.

Let us start with the most familiar form of *koina* to students of ancient Greek history : that is the *koinon* in the form of federal organization or state. These *koina* are sometimes translated as « leagues » : famous such *koina* were the hellenistic Aitolian and Achaian *koina*<sup>6</sup>. But beyond Achaia and Aitolia, *koinon* in the sense of federal organization had many other attestations : in the sources, this use of the term *koinon* is normally followed by the genitive of the ethnic<sup>7</sup>. These *koina*, or federal states, were a relatively loose coalition of communities, which could be either poleis in the more urbanized areas, or villages – though it is very difficult to establish whether it was indeed villages or poleis that formed some *koina*, as the discussion on the Lycian *koinon* shows<sup>8</sup>.

In the Aegean world, which is the main focus of this article, we come across the Islanders' League, or κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν<sup>9</sup>. This was a league which was formed during the Antigonids' reign of the Aegean at the end of the fourth century and continued under the control of the Ptolemies in the third century. In the second half of the third century the *koinon* disappears from the epigraphic record, together with the control of the Ptolemies in

6. Achaian league *IG* V, 2, 344 = C. MICHEL, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1900-1937 (hereafter MICHEL), 199 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 490, MICHEL, 200 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 519 and many references in Polybios ; Aitolian *koinon* : *IG* IX<sup>2</sup>, 1, 5-49 for proxeny decrees.

7. Acarnanian *koinon* : *IG* IX<sup>2</sup>, 1, 208 = MICHEL, 313 ; Phocian *koinon* : *IG* IX,1, 97 = MICHEL, 278 ; Boeotian *koinon* : *SEG* 27, 60 (proxeny decree of late 4<sup>th</sup> century) ; Arcadian *koinon* : MICHEL, 443 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 209, MICHEL, 193 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 183, (but no attestation of the word *koinon* found on these decrees) ; Ainianian *koinon* : *IG* IX,2, 3 ; Thessalian *koinon* : *SEG* 36, 483 ; Molossian *koinon* : *SEG* 23, 472 with 24,446 ; Lycian *koinon* : *SEG* 30, 1534. The sources for most of these *koina* come from the Hellenistic period, but some date from the late fifth or fourth century. See also P.J. RHODES, D.M. LEWIS, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford 1997, p. 442-446 (hereafter RHODES with LEWIS). See J.A.O. LARSEN, *Greek Federal States : Their Institutions and History*, Oxford 1968 ; J.D. GAUGER, « s.v. *koinon* » in H.H. SCHMITT, E. VOGT eds., *Kleines Lexikon des Hellenismus*, Wiesbaden 1993, p. 376-381 ; H. BECK, *Polis und Koinon : Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart 1997. For the various forms of ethnic differentiations in *koina* see P.M. FRASER, *Greek Ethnic Terminology*, Oxford 2009, p. 122 ff.

8. P. DEBORD, « Essai sur la géographie historique de la région de Stratonice » in M.-M. MACTOUX, E. GENY eds., *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque* 8, Besançon 1994, p. 107-121.

9. See R. BAGNALL, *The Administration of Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden 1976 ; P. BRUNEAU, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris 1970, p. 515-583 ; K. BURASELIS, *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis : Forschungen zur Politik des Kassandros und der drei ersten Antigoniden im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien*, München 1982, p. 60-87 and 180-187 ; R. ÉTIENNE, *Ténos II : Ténos et les Cyclades*,

the Aegean, only to resurface in the second century under the control of the new naval power of the region : Rhodes. The headquarters of this *koinon* were at Delos under Antigonids and Ptolemies, but at Tenos under the Rhodians<sup>10</sup>. We know of the existence of this *koinon* from epigraphic evidence alone. It is certainly beyond the scope of this article to go into any detail in the history of this network of islands<sup>11</sup>. As far as we know, it functioned in similar ways to other federal states : part of the powers of the participating communities were given to the assembly of the *koinon*, which had the authority to issue decrees, regulate festivals, arrange payments and award *proxenia* to all participating member-states<sup>12</sup>.

If we move from the larger networks of interaction to the micro-geography of singular insular entities, we can see that here too there existed *koina*. *Koina* on islands with more than one polis are valuable in that they show active cooperation on an inter-polis level. We encounter *koina* on Euboea<sup>13</sup>, not a proper insular island, but an island of some sort, nonetheless, and similarly on the large island of Crete<sup>14</sup>. There is also a *koinon* on the island of Lesbos, which had five poleis in the classical period<sup>15</sup>. Three Hellenistic inscriptions refer to a Lesbian *koinon*, which used the Messa sanctuary as its headquarters and allowed considerable individual freedom for the participating cities<sup>16</sup>. These pan-island *koina* are one of the expressions of quite a dominant trend throughout classical and Hellenistic history of political communities on islands with more than one polis co-operating and viewing in many cases themselves as having essentially a single identity or indeed as functioning as a single political community ; this is also true for islands with more than one polis that never created a *koinon* as such : I am thinking primarily of Ceos, a relatively small island which supported four poleis in the classical period and showed strong trends of cooperation throughout its history, with two, or even possibly three, attempts at synoecism<sup>17</sup>. In this context, I should also mention Rhodes,

---

Paris 1990, p. 106-124 ; G. REGER, « The Political History of the Kyklades 260-200 BC », *Historia* 43, 1994, p. 32-69 ; K.A. SHEEDY, « The Origins of the Second Nesiotic League and the Defence of Kythnos », *Historia* 45, 1996, p. 423-449.

10. R. ÉTIENNE, *op. cit.*, p. 106-124.

11. I address the question of the identity of the Islanders' League as a form of resistance to outside pressure in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, « Identity and Resistance : The Islanders' League, the Aegean Islands and the Hellenistic Kings », *MHR* 27, 2012, p. 49-70.

12. See for example the Nicouria decree IG XII, 7, 506 = H. KOTSIDU, *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ : Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*, Berlin 2000, 131.

13. RHODES with LEWIS, p. 248-249.

14. RHODES with LEWIS, p. 308 and 312 ; S. AGER, « Hellenistic Crete and κοινοδίκιον », *JHS* 114, 1994, p. 1-18 ; A. CHANIOTIS, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*, Stuttgart 1996, p. 6-7 and p. 99-100.

15. See C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, « Proud to be an Islander : Island Identity in Multi-Polis Islands in the Classical and Hellenistic Aegean », *MHR* 20, 2005, p. 15. On what constitutes an island in ancient Greek thought see C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands : Insularity, Networks, the Athenian Empire and the Aegean World*, Oxford 2007, p. 10-19 : large sized island are less « insular » than small islands.

16. RHODES with LEWIS, p. 258-259 : IG XII, Suppl. 9, 120 and 136 with L. ROBERT, « Décrets de Méthymna et d'Érésos », *Opera Minora Selecta* 2, Amsterdam 1969, p. 721-735.

17. C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, « Proud to be an Islander », *MHR* 20, 2005, p. 13-15.

with its three separate poleis until 408 BC ; Rhodes synoecised in order to create a single polis, controlling the entire island, as well as substantial parts of the mainland coast, as well as a number of neighbouring islands, as we shall see below<sup>18</sup>.

In all the above cases, whether we are looking into a large-scale network of interaction, such as the Islanders' League, or the *koina* of islands with more than one polis, or indeed the attempts at synoecism at Ceos and the successful synoecism at Rhodes, what we encounter is the move beyond the strict political boundaries of citizenship in the political decisions of the communities. In the case of leagues, or federal states, we see communities interacting and creating new political entities, which assume some of the powers of the participating poleis. In the case of island *koina*, we see cooperation between the communities for the creation of a new state with a range of powers. If indeed we view the Greek world as essentially a conglomeration of poleis, then we tend to miss the many variations that existed in the form of participation and organization of political power. In this sense, the polis proves to be a restrictive tool of historical explanation.

On the other end of the spectrum of political power associated with « state » practices, we have the *koina* as private or voluntary associations of individuals<sup>19</sup>. Members of such associations could be citizens or non-citizens, that is foreigners<sup>20</sup>, both metics and aliens and

18. For the Rhodian *synoecism* see Diod. 13.75.1, Strabo 14.2.11 c655, Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1, and Aristides 43.552 (Dindorf). See M. MOGGI, *I sinecismi interstatali greci*, Pisa 1976, p. 214-220 ; N. DEMAND, *Urban Relocation in Classical in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Norman 1990, p. 89-94, and V. GABRIELSEN, « The Synoecized Polis of Rhodes » in P. FLENSTED-JANSEN *et al.* eds., *Polis and Politics : Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen*, Copenhagen 2000, p. 199-205. For the Rhodian *peraia* see P.M. FRASER, G. BEAN, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands*, Oxford 1954 and C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 243-245.

19. Emphasis on voluntary : N.F. JONES, *The Associations of Classical Athens*, New York 1999, p. 221. *Koina* as associations of individuals : N. RAUH, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*, Amsterdam 1993 ; I. ARNAOUTOGLU, « Between *koinon* and *idion* : Legal and Social Dimensions of Religious Associations in Ancient Athens » in P. CARTLEDGE, P. MILLETT and S. VON REDEN eds., *Kosmos : Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1997, p. 68-83, and *Thusias heneka kai sunousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*, Athens 2003 ; M.-F. BASLEZ, « Place et rôle des associations dans la cité d'Athènes au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle » in P. CARLIER ed., *Le IV<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. Approches historiographiques*, Nancy 1996, p. 281-292 and *EAD.*, « Les associations dans la cité grecque et l'apprentissage du collectif », *Ktéma* 23, 1998, p. 431-439 ; V. SUYS, « Les associations culturelles dans la cité aux époques hellénistique et impériale » in V. DASEN, M. PIÉRART eds., *Ἰδιὰ καὶ δημοσίᾳ. Les cadres « privés » et « publics » de la religion grecque antique*, Liège 2005, p. 203-218 ; Y. USTINOVA, « Lege et consuetudine : voluntary cult associations in the Greek law » in V. DASEN, M. PIÉRART eds., *op. cit.*, p. 177-190 ; V. GABRIELSEN, « Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning : The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World » in I. MALKIN *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, p. 176-203. F. POLAND, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig 1909 is still the « classic » book on the subject.

20. Non-citizen members in the Athenian associations : M. LEIWO, « Religion, or other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens » in J. FRÖSÉN ed., *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*, Helsinki 1997, p. 103-117. On the importance of foreign members in Rhodian *koina* and their economic activities see V. GABRIELSEN, « The Rhodian Associations and Economic Activity » in Z. ARCHIBALD *et al.* eds., *Hellenistic Economies*, London 2001, p. 228-229 and 236.

sometimes even slaves, as well as male and female members<sup>21</sup>, though in Athens at least, membership seems to have been predominantly male and citizen-centered<sup>22</sup>. These may be associations of people linked by profession, or ethnic origin. There are many examples from all over the Greek world, mostly dating from the Hellenistic period : one of the most visible associations of professionals is the associations of the so-called Dionysiac artists (διονυσιασταί), who, as it is obvious from their name, had Dionysus as their patron deity<sup>23</sup>. We also know of associations of many other professions : sailors or people engaged in military naval activities, such as the various branches of the Panathenaistai *koinon* of Rhodes, who could be either crews (στρατευόμενοι) or engaged in fighting (δέκας)<sup>24</sup> ; merchants of olive oil (έλαιοπώλαι or olearii in Delos : *ID* 1713 and 1714, with Heracles as their patron deity)<sup>25</sup> ; merchants of wine (οἶνοπώλαι in Delos : *ID* 1711)<sup>26</sup>, and so on. Some associations were loosely centered around a common ethnicity, or sometimes around the cult of a foreign to the residents of the polis deity, such as the *orgeones* of Thracians worshipping Bendis at Athens (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1283)<sup>27</sup>. The Italians at Delos formed associations around the cult of specific deities, such as the Apolloniastai, the Hermaistai and Poseidoniastai<sup>28</sup>.

21. V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*, Aarhus 1997, p. 123 ; *Id.* « Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning : The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World » in I. MALKIN *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, p. 179. Women members to the *orgeones* of the Mother of Gods : see I. ARNAOUTOGLOU, *Thusias heneka kai sunousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*, Athens 2003, p. 100. N.F. JONES, *op. cit.*, p. 264-266, however, argues against membership of women, despite the fact that we have honorific decrees of the *orgeones* in honour of a priestess : see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316, honouring the priestess Zeuxion.

22. I. ARNAOUTOGLOU, *Thusias heneka kai sunousias...*, p. 160.

23. See B. LE GUEN, *Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l' époque hellénistique*, Paris 2001, and S. ANEZIRI, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organization und Wirkung der Hellenistischen Technitenvereine*, Stuttgart 2003.

24. V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 124 with n. 55 in p. 203. See also V. PETRAKOS, *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος, II : οι επιγραφές*, Athens 1999, 31 (hereafter *Rhamnous*) which is a decree, dated to 225/4, issued by the « Rhamnousians and the citizens living at Rhamnous » ; at the corona at the end of the decree, however, the « Athenian fellow sailors (συνπλευσαντες) » are the ones responsible for the honours given to Menandros, and there is also a reference to a *koinon* which will carry the expense (l. 30). This is not an established *koinon* as the one in Rhodes, but a group of people sailing together involved in an act of collective honouring of an individual. See discussion in R. OSBORNE, « The *demos* and its Divisions in Classical Athens » in O. MURRAY, S. PRICE eds., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, p. 282.

25. P. BRUNEAU, *op. cit.*, p. 408-409.

26. N. RAUH, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*, Amsterdam 1993, p. 94.

27. The Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis co-existed with the citizens' *orgeones* of Bendis, for which see *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1324 and 1361. See also N.F. JONES, *op. cit.*, p. 256-262 ; C.O. PACHE, « Barbarian Bond : Thracian Bendis among the Athenians » in S.R. AVRATHAM, C.O. PACHE, J. WATROUS eds., *Between Magic and Religion : Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society*, Lanham Md 2001, p. 3-11. Similarly, as R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion : A History*, Oxford 1996, p. 337, observed : the Kitian merchants asking for permission from the Athenian *demos* in order to purchase a plot of land and to establish a sanctuary for Aphrodite in *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 337, « must have constituted a *koinon* or *thiasos* of some kind ».

28. See P. BRUNEAU, *op. cit.*, p. 585-589, and N. RAUH, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*, Amsterdam 1993.

But in most cases, as we can see from the example of the *orgeones* for the goddess Bendis in Athens or the various groups in Delos, the dominant connection between the members of an association was a cultic one, in the sense that the association worshipped the same deity, as the patron deity of the « profession », so to speak, or of the ethnic group<sup>29</sup>.

These private or cult associations were numerous throughout the Greek world and they seem to have flourished during the Hellenistic period, when most of our evidence is dated, with fourth-century Athens being perhaps the place of origin of such associations<sup>30</sup>. We should highlight some of the important features of such associations : a) membership was not necessarily restricted to citizens ; in fact, such *koina* were a unique form of communal organization that blend together citizens and non-citizens, thus creating networks of associations and power that often transcended political boundaries and political-social hierarchies<sup>31</sup> ; b) they had a strong religious character. In fact, religion seems to have been the dominant framework within which relationships between members were shaped<sup>32</sup> ; c) in Athens and Rhodes, many associations had ownership of burial grounds, which gave them an important spatial centre<sup>33</sup> ; d) associations were not necessarily in conflict with the polis<sup>34</sup> ; in fact, they had strong political overtones : they adopted the language and structure of political bodies and political

29. M. LEIWO, « Religion, or other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens » in J. FRÖSÉN ed., *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*, Helsinki 1997, p. 103-117, rightly argues that religious factors were only one of many that brought members of the associations together.

30. Suggested by V. GABRIELSEN, « Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning : The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World » in I. MALKIN *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, p. 176-203. I. ARNAOUTOGLU, « Between *koinon* and *idion* : Legal and Social Dimensions of Religious Associations in Ancient Athens » in P. CARTLEDGE, P. MILLETT, S. VON REDEN eds., *op. cit.*, p. 68-83 and *Id.*, *Thusias heneka kai sunousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*, Athens 2003, p. 28-29, makes the point that even though the cult associations of Athens appear in the evidence in the 4<sup>th</sup> century or later, this is mostly related to the epigraphic habit. It is likely that associations existed in the period before the fifth century. P. ISMARD, *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations, VI<sup>e</sup>-I<sup>er</sup> siècle ac. J.-C.*, Paris 2010, argues that the origins of associations in Athens can be found in the pre-Cleisthenic period.

31. This is certainly the case with many such *koina* in Rhodes : see V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 125-129 ; *Id.*, « The Rhodian Associations... » in Z. ARCHIBALD *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, p. 215-244, and A. BRESSON, *Recueil des Inscriptions de la péree Rhodienne (péree intégrée)*, Paris 1991, 202, commentary in p. 175. Similar point for Athens in P. ISMARD, *op. cit.*, p. 348-352.

32. V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 124. See also as R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion : A History*, Oxford 1996, p. 333-342.

33. P.M. FRASER, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*, Oxford 1977, p. 58-70. See also V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 123-124, and *Id.*, « The Rhodian Associations... » in Z. ARCHIBALD *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 229-230, with reference to such *koina* in Rhodes, and I.C. PAPACHRISTODOULOU, *Oi arxaioi rodiakoi dhmoi : istorikē episkōpēsi – H Ialvsiā*, Athens 1989, p. 199-200. Dem. LVII.67 elusively refers to an organization dedicated to « common burial » (ὁμόταφοι), but see N.F. JONES, *op. cit.*, p. 266 : there is no clear reference to such an association before the Hellenistic period. M.-F. BASLEZ, « Les associations dans la cité grecque et l'apprentissage du collectif », *Ktēma* 23, 1998, p. 431-439, argues that the ownership of common space was one of the most important elements of private or voluntary associations in general.

34. See I. ARNAOUTOGLU, « Between *koinon* and *idion* : Legal and Social Dimensions of Religious Associations in Ancient Athens » in P. CARTLEDGE, P. MILLETT, S. VON REDEN eds., *op. cit.*, p. 74-76, and also *Thusias heneka kai sunousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*, Athens 2003, p. 160-162, where he dismisses the

power ; their main body was normally the assembly, ἐκκλησία, they honoured members, they passed decrees, they elected officials, using a similar nomenclature to that of the polis (ie. ταμίας, γραμματεὺς, ἐπιστάτης etc)<sup>35</sup>.

Keeping these points in mind, I would like to turn our attention to the attestations of *koinon* as essentially a form of political, in the sense of the polis, organization. It has long been noted that the word *koinon* could be used as the direct equivalent of polis or *demos*, the people<sup>36</sup>. Such usage of the term *koinon* can be found in the period from fifth-century down to the late Hellenistic times. In this sense, the word *koinon* has the primary meaning of a community, which may then be further determined by the addition of the genitive plural of the ethnic or other noun<sup>37</sup>. Robert in his list of examples added a decree from the island of Heracleia, regulating the judicial procedures for crimes committed during the illegal entrance

concept of marginality as a useful category to explain the relationship between the association and the polis. Similar comments in V. SUYS, « Les associations culturelles dans la cité aux époques hellénistique et impériale » in V. DASEN, M. PIÉRART eds., *op. cit.*, p. 214.

35. See comments in R. OSBORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 272-273 ; M.-F. BASLEZ, « Place et rôle des associations... », p. 291 ; I. ARNAOUTOGLU, « Between *koinon* and *idion* : Legal and Social Dimensions of Religious Associations in Ancient Athens » in P. CARTLEDGE, P. MILLETT, S. VON REDEN eds., *op. cit.*, p. 75-76 ; V. SUYS, « Les associations culturelles dans la cité aux époques hellénistique et impériale » in V. DASEN, M. PIÉRART eds., *op. cit.*, p. 205 ; Y. USTINOVA, « Lege et consuetudine : voluntary cult associations in the Greek law » in V. DASEN, M. PIÉRART eds., *op. cit.*, p. 176-177 ; V. GABRIELSEN, « Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning : The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World » in I. MALKIN *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, p. 182.

36. *Koinon* in its primary use as « community », ie. meaning polis or *demos* : Thuc. IV.78.3 : ἄνευ τοῦ πάντων κοινού ; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 355 (decree of Plion in honour of the sons of Aristoxenos, c.300 BC) : τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Ἰλιέων ; *IG XI*, 4, 1055 (decree of Histiaia set up on Delos, c.230-220 BC) : τόπον αἰτησάμενος τὸ κοινὸν Δηλίων ; *IG V*, 1, 1226 (second-first century BC) : τῶι κοινῶι τῶν Λακε[δαιμονίων ; *IG IX*, 1, 78 (208 BC) : βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος Ἀβαιῶν τῶι κοινῶι χαίρειν ; *IG IX*, 2, 460 and 461 (decrees of Crannon, Thessaly, second century BC) : τὸ κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως ; O. KERN, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900, 7 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 941 (Magnesia on the Maeander, 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC) : ἔφοδον ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν πρότοις μετὰ τὰ ἱερά ; *IG XII*, 3, 30 (honorary decree from Telos, second century BC) : πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας [χρεία]ς τῶι κοινῶι παρεχόμενος ; *IG I*<sup>3</sup>, 118 = R. MEIGGS, D.M. LEWIS, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, revised edition, Oxford 1988, 87 (fifth-century BC Athenian settlement at Selymbria) : τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Ση[λυμβριανῶν] ; *Ibid.*, 130 (early fifth-century BC decree from Teos : ἐπὶ Τηίοισιν τὸ ξυνόν=κοινόν) ; *IG I*<sup>3</sup>, 394 (Cythnos, c. 420 BC) : παρὰ] Κυθνίω[ν τὸ κοινῶ, for which see recently CH. MITSOPOULOU, « Το ἱερό της Δήμητρας στην Κύθνο και η μίσθωση του Ελευσινιακού τεμένους » in I. LEVENTI, CH. MITSOPOULOU eds., *Ιερά και λατρείες της Δήμητρας στον αρχαίο κόσμο*, Volos 2010, p. 43-90. For this use of the term *koinon* see M. HOLLEAUX, « Textes Gréco-Romains », *RA*, 1917, p. 342-347 ; L. ROBERT, *Monnaies antiques en Troade*, Geneva 1966, p. 89-90 ; P. CHARNEUX, « Phratries et komai d'Argos », *BCH* 108, 1984, p. 210-211 ; J. TREHEUX, « Koinon », *REA* 89, 1987, p. 39-46. For the use of the term *koinon* as designation of a variety of forms of communal organisation see also M.-F. BASLEZ, « Place et rôle des associations... », p. 282-283 and « Les associations dans la cité grecque et l'apprentissage du collectif », *Ktema* 23, 1998, p. 435-436. Baslez also cites examples of the use of the term *koinon* designating the « common » fund for a variety of organizations in p. 435, n. 49.

37. In some cases we have the *koinon* followed by the name of the tribe, as in Tenos (*IG XII*, 5, 863-6 : ἔδοξε τῶ κοινῶ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς ...). In Methymna, we have the format of *koinon* followed by the name of the χέλληστυς, as, for example, in *IG XII*, 2, 498 : ἔδοξε τῶ κοινῶ τῶν Πρωτέων.

of goats onto the island (*IG XII, 7, 509*, third century)<sup>38</sup>. Roussel first noted that the *koinon* in this inscription could not be the Islanders' League discussed above, but rather a local *koinon* of the people of Heracleia<sup>39</sup> : the main reasoning for this was that the place of publication was not Delos, as is normally the case with decrees issued by the Islanders' League, but rather the otherwise unknown Metroon building which must have been located on the island of Heracleia itself<sup>40</sup>.

What was this *koinon*? In order to make some suggestions, we should first look at the background of this decree : the local community of inhabitants had to unite against what seems to be the acts of foreign agents, forcibly introducing goats into the fragile ecosystem of a small island<sup>41</sup>. The introduction of a large number of goats could have had absolutely devastating results for agricultural production on the island. Against such a threat it seems that it was not enough to invoke the authority of the citizens of the island : the entire population had to unite for survival. Indeed, the wording of the decree is indicative of the threat experienced by the population as a whole : « all this is decided for the safety and security of the Heracleans and the inhabitants of the island » (my emphasis)<sup>42</sup>. I would like to suggest that the issuing authority here, the κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν, is not simply the citizens of the Heracleians but rather something different : the *koinon* here is the sum of Heracleian citizens and foreign residents, who are alluded to in the last line of the decree (τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ).

Who could these foreign residents be? I believe that we should look to the neighbouring island of Amorgos for an answer. Two late fourth – or early third – century inscriptions from Arcesine, one of the three poleis on Amorgos, regulate the terms of the loans according to which the Arcesinians borrowed money from private individuals : a certain Praxicles from Naxos and a certain Alexander (*IG XII, 7, 67b* ll. 7-9 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 955 = MIGEOTTE<sup>43</sup>, 49 and *IG XII, 7 69* ll. 8-11 = MIGEOTTE, 50). The conditions of the loans are not at all unusual, but the guarantee used as security for the loans is quite unique. We read « all the public property of the city and the private property belonging to the Arcesinians and those dwelling in Arcesine is mortgaged to Praxicles, that which is ἔγγαια and ὑπερπόντια »<sup>44</sup>. There has been a long debate over the

38. L. ROBERT, *Monnaies antiques...*, p. 90.

39. *IG XII, 7, 509*, ll. 9-10 : καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν ἅπαν.

40. P. ROUSSEL, « La confédération des Nésiotes », *BCH* 35, 1911, p. 441-455. I have discussed this decree in great detail in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 200-214. See also G. ALFARO GINER, « Lo spazio destinato al pascolo sulle coste del Mediterraneo : il caso delle 'isole delle capre' », *L'Africa Romana* 12.2, 1998, p. 863-877 ; C. CHANDEZON, *L'élevage en Grèce (fin V<sup>e</sup> – fin I<sup>er</sup> s. a.C.) : l'apport des sources épigraphiques*, Bordeaux 2003, n.35, p. 147-149.

41. L. ROBERT, « Les chèvres d'Héracléia... », p. 170.

42. ll. 16-8 : ταῦτα δ' εἶναι εἷς τε φυλακῆν καὶ σωτηρίαν Ἡρακλειωτῶν πάντων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ.]

43. L. MIGEOTTE, *L'emprunt dans les cités grecques*, Québec 1984.

44. *IG XII, 7, 67b*, 7-9 : ὑπέθετο δὲ Πραξικλῆς τὰ τε κοινὰ τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἅπαντα καὶ τὰ ἴδια τὰ Ἀρκεσινέων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν Ἀρκεσίνῃ, ὑπάρχοντα ἔγγαια καὶ ὑπερπόντια. *IG XII, 7, 69* 8-11 : ὑπέθετο δὲ Ἀλέξιανδρος τὰ τε κοινὰ τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἅπαντα καὶ τὰ ἴδια τὰ Ἀρκεσινέων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν Ἀρκεσίνῃ, μετοίκων ἅπαντα καὶ ἔγγαια καὶ ὑπερπόντια.]

interpretation of ὑπερπόντια in these two inscriptions : Dittenberger understood the term to mean « overseas » and compared it to ὑπερόρια which can be found in Attic texts<sup>45</sup>. However, Gauthier argued that the reference to ὑπερπόντια as opposed to ἔγγαια should be interpreted as non-land items, that is ships and cargo ; therefore this expression can be seen as an alternative to ἔγγαια καὶ ναυτικά, which is found in Attic oratory<sup>46</sup>. I think that such an interpretation is linguistically very strained and we should accept Dittenberger's original understanding of ὑπερπόντια as overseas : we should then look at what kind of overseas possessions Arcesine could have had. Arcesine owned a small island off its coast called Gramboussa ; it is possible that Arcesine also considered Heracleia as its own territory. What I am arguing is that the « outside » power that tried to colonise Heracleia at the time of the decree was in fact the Arcesinians ; therefore the *koinon* of our Heracleian inscription may have included the citizens of Heracleia in addition to Arcesinian residents.

The island of Heracleia and the fascinating background to the decree prohibiting the entrance of goats on the island seems to indicate that the *koinon* in the decree was a political community that transgressed the citizen body. Robert's understanding of the reference to the *koinon*, however, was that it was simply a synonym for the word polis or *demos*, as it was used in a number of cases in the Greek world<sup>47</sup>. The separate reference to the residents on the island in addition to the Heracleian citizens seems to contradict such an interpretation. Furthermore, the choice of the word « islanders » (νησιωτῶν) to designate this particular *koinon* indicates that this was not simply a decision of the citizens of Heracleia on behalf of the citizens and residents of the island ; if this was the case, we would expect the word *koinon* to be followed by the genitive of the ethnic Heracleians. The choice of wording in this particular decree reveals, I believe, that there were two groups of people engaged in the decision-making process : citizens and residents. Indeed, such a dual reference in decrees to citizens *and* residents engaged in political decision processes seems to have parallels in other Aegean islands. We shall examine some other *koina*, which I believe are the expression of collectivities of citizens and non-citizens engaged in political decisions.

Let us start with Syme. The evidence suggests that there, too, was a community of citizens and foreign residents engaged in political action. Syme was one the islands in the Dorian archipelago of Rhodes. The island is not particularly large (58 km<sup>2</sup>), but has good harbours<sup>48</sup>. It appears in the Athenian tribute lists in 434/433, under the rubric πόλεις ἃς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρον, which means either Symian or Athenian individuals proposed to

---

45. W. DITTENBERGER in *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 955 : « Atqui *hyperpontios* non est marinus vel navalis, sed transmarinus, ita ut in insula exigua fere ad idem redeat atque *hyperorios* ». See Xen. *Symp.* IV.31 : νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ τῶν ὑπερορίων στέρομαι καὶ τὰ ἔγγαια οὐ καρποῦμαι.

46. P. GAUTHIER, « Études sur les inscriptions d'Amorgos », *BCH* 104, 1980, p. 197-205 : ἔγγαια καὶ ναυτικά is found in [Dem.] XXXV.12.

47. See above n. 36.

48. Pliny *NH* V.133 : eight harbours.

pay the tribute (*IG* I<sup>3</sup>, 278, VI, 3, 28). The inclusion of Syme in the tribute quota lists implies that the island was independent in the course of the fifth century<sup>49</sup>. Its status, however, was linked with that of Rhodes. We know that Rhodes in the Hellenistic period controlled a number of islands, forming its own small archipelago : Carpathos, Casos, Chalce, Syme, Telos, Nisyros and Megiste were all at one point or another incorporated in the Rhodian state<sup>50</sup>. Rhodes, of course, also famously controlled a *peraia*, a considerable area of land on the opposite shore of Caria. Fraser and Bean who have written the classic book on the Rhodian *peraia* made a distinction between incorporated *peraia* and subject *peraia*, which is largely followed in modern scholarship : the incorporated *peraia* formed an integral part of the Rhodian state and participated in the Rhodian *demes* system, and its inhabitants were politically equal to Rhodian citizens ; the citizens of the subject *peraia*, on the other hand, had no such status : hence Rhodians in the incorporated *peraia* are normally designated by their demotic, while in the subject territory by the ethnic Rhodios, though the distinction in our sources is not always clear<sup>51</sup>. Syme, like Carpathos and Chalce, seemed to have had a similar status as that of the incorporated *peraia*<sup>52</sup>. This is argued on the basis of the existence of a peculiar institution called *ktoina* which is attested on these islands : *ktoina* seemed to have been territorial divisions on the old poleis of Rhodes before its synoecism in 408 BC<sup>53</sup>. If therefore we come across *ktoina* on an island in the period after 408, it is because the island was attached to Rhodes in the period before the synoecism, and therefore attached to one of the three poleis of the island rather than the unified polis of Rhodes in the period after 408. Syme appears to have had a system of *ktoina*, as attested in one decree from the second century (*IG* XII, 3, Supp. 1270) and another one from the first-century BC (*IG* XII, 3, 6). It is likely, then, that Syme was attached to Rhodes at some point before 408, and possibly in the early fifth century, before becoming again independent under the Athenian empire. The appearance of Rhodian demotics on Syme shows that the island was incorporated to Rhodes after the short period of independence during the fifth century<sup>54</sup>.

---

49. See discussion in C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 189.

50. Pliny *NH* V.133, with C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 187-195.

51. P.M. FRASER, G. BEAN, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

52. C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 191, following I.C. PAPACHRISTODOULOU, « The Rhodian Demes within the Framework of the Function of the Rhodian State » in V. GABRIELSEN *et al.* eds., *Hellenistic Rhodes : Politics, Culture and Society*, Aarhus 1999, p. 38.

53. See V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 151-154.

54. See I.C. PAPACHRISTODOULOU, *Οι αρχαίοι ροδιακοί...*, p. 44 and *IG* XII, 3, 11, Suppl. 1272-1274.

We know of three decrees from Syme. The first two honorific decrees are issued by the community of the Symians and the third one by a local private *koinon*. The first honorific decree, which cannot be dated with any certainty but may possibly belong to the second or first century BC<sup>55</sup>, reads (*IG* XII, 3, Suppl. 1269)<sup>56</sup> :

ἐ[π]ὶ ἱερέως Ἐπιχάρμου καὶ δαμ-  
 [ο]ργοῦ Ἴπποκρά[τ]ευς, [μη]νὸς Ἀγρ[ια]-  
 [νί]ο[υ] τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα, [ἔ]δοξε [τῶι]  
 [κ]οινῶι· Λυκομήδης Λυκ[ιά]δα Κ[ασα]-  
 ρεὺς εἶπε· ἐπειδὴ Ἀγαθόδωρος [Ἀγά]- 5  
 [θ]ω[ν]ος Ἄμος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς [ὦ]ν δ[ια]-  
 [τ]ελεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν [Σ]ύμαι [κα]-  
 [τοι]κεύντων, ἐπαινέσαι αὐτὸν καὶ  
 [σ]τεφανῶσαι [θ]αλλοῦ στεφάνωι, [ἀ]-  
 [ρ]ετᾶς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας, ἂν ἔ[χων] 10  
 [δι]ατελεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σ[ύ]-  
 [μ]αι κατοικεύντων· ὁ δὲ ἀγωνοθ[έ]-  
 τας ὁ αἰρεθεὶς εἰς τὰ Ἡρακλεία ἐ[πὶ]  
 [δ]αμοργοῦ ὅς κα γένηται μετὰ Ἴπ- 15  
 [ποκρά]τη ἀναγορε[υσάτω αὐτῶι τὸν]  
 [σ]τέφα[νον — — — — — — — — — — ]

During the priesthood of Epicharmos and while Hippocrates was the *damiorgos*, during the month Agrinios, on the fourteenth, it was decided by the *koinon*. Lykomedes, son of Lykias, from Kasara proposed ; because Agathodoros, son of Agathon from Amos is a good man 5  
 towards the *koinon* of the residents in Syme, [it was decided] to honour him and crown him with an (olive) crown because of his virtue and benefaction, which he 10  
 showed to the *koinon* of the residents in Syme ; let the *agonothetas*

55. The decree cannot be dated with any certainty. The name of the Rhodian priest Epicharmos in this decree is most probably not the same Epicharmos known from amphora stamps for the period 260-247, according to the new chronology of Rhodian amphora stamps suggested by G. FINKIELSZTEJN, *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ*, Oxford 2001, p. 188. See comments in C. HABICHT, « Rhodian Amphora Stamps and Rhodian Eponyms », *REA* 105, 2003, p. 562 : the Epicharmos in the decree is much later than the Epicharmos found on amphora stamps.

56. First publication by D. CHAVIARAS, « Inschriften aus Syme », *JÖAI* 5, 1902, p. 13-20, inscription 5 at p. 17 ; subsequently published by F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, in *IG* XII, 3, Suppl. 1269. I use here the *IG* text.

who will be elected for the Heracleia during  
the [office of the] *damiorgos* elected after  
Hippocrates proclaim [] 15  
the crown [----]

The second honorific decree is dated to the second century BC<sup>57</sup> ; it reads (*IG* XII, 3, Suppl. 1270)<sup>58</sup> :

Α. ἐπ' ἱερέως Σωσικλεῦς καὶ δαμουργοῦ Κτησία, Πα-  
ναίμου [δ]ιχομηνίαι, ἔδοξε τῷ κοινῷ, ἱεροθυτᾶν γνώ-  
μα· ἐπειδὴ Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀριστοφάνευσ Πολίτας  
ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὦν διατελεῖ περὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σύμαι  
κατοικούντων, τὰν πᾶσαν σπου[δ]ὰν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν πα- 5  
ρεχόμενος καὶ ἀεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιος γινόμενος  
τῷ κοινῷ, πονέσαντός τε τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν ταῖ ἄκραι τοῦ  
τᾶς Ἀθήνας καὶ ἐγγί[ζ]οντος συνπετεῖν διὰ τὸ ἐξῶσθαι  
τοίχους [δ]ύο, τὸν τε κείμενον ποτ' ἀνατολὰς καὶ τὸν πο-  
τὶ μεσαμβροίαν, καὶ εἰς τὰν ἐπισκευὰν αὐτοῦ γενομένην 10  
ἐπαγγελίαν ὑπὸ τε κοινῶν καὶ ιδιωτᾶν, τᾶς δὲ ἐπισυναγω-  
γὰς τοῦ διαφόρου γινομένης πολυχρονίου, παρακληθεὶς  
ἐν ταῖ ἐκκλησίαι ὑπὸ τῶν κοινοτᾶν συντελέσαι ἰ[δ]ίαι τὰ  
ἔργα ἐπαγγεῖλατο καὶ συνετέλεσε, ποτεπαγγεῖλατο  
δὲ καὶ ξυ[λ]ῶσειν τὰς στέγας τὰ ποτι[δ]εόμενα καὶ κερα- 15  
μῶσειν τελέσμασι τοῖς αὐτοῦ· καὶ συνετέλεσε ἀναγαγὼν  
τε τοὺς παρεπιδαμοῦντας τῶν Πολιτᾶν ἐπέδειξε τὰ  
ἔργα κα[λ]ῶς γεγονότα· ὅπως οὖν καὶ τὸ κοινὸν φαίνη-  
ται εὐχάριστόν <τ>ε ἐὸν καὶ τιμοῦν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν  
[ἀν]δρῶν, τύχαι ἀγαθαί, δε[δ]όχθαι [τ]ῷ κοινῷ, κυρω- 20  
[θέντο]ς τοῦδε τοῦ ψαφίσματος, ἐπαινέσαι καὶ στεφα-  
[νῶσαι] Ἀρι[σ]τοφάνη Ἀριστοφά[ν]ευσ Πολίταν  
[χρυσέωι σ]τεφ[ά]νωι ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ  
[φιλοδοξίας ἀν ἔχων] διατ[ε]λεῖ εἰς [τ]ὸ κοινὸν τῶν  
[ἐν Σύμαι κατοικούντων καὶ τᾶς ποτ]ῖ τοὺς θεοὺς 25  
[εὐσεβείας· — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — ]

57. There are Rhodian amphora stamps bearing the name of the priest of Helios Sosicles, dated according to G. FINKIELSZTEJN, *op. cit.*, p. 193, to the period between 160-152 BC ; but see C. HABICHT, *op. cit.*, p. 562 : the Sosicles on the amphora stamps « is in all probability earlier than the eponym on record on Syme ».

58. First publication of the decree by S. SARIDAKIS, F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, « Inschriften von Syme, Teutlussa und Rhodos », *JÖAI* 7, 1904, p. 81-86, subsequently published by F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, in *IG* XII, 3, Suppl. 1270. I use here the *IG* text.



the *Bo[ule]* and the *damos* ; and let the *agono[thetas]*  
 (who is in office) during the first Heracleia 5  
 announce the ratification of this decree  
 in the stadium, when he establishes the contest, and let him proclaim  
 that the *koinon* of the residents in Syme  
 honours and crowns with a golden crown Aristophanes,  
 son of Aristophanes of Polita because of his virtue 10  
 and his love of fame with which he continues to show to the *koinon*  
 of the residents in Syme and [because of his] piety towards the gods.

The third honorific decree is dated to the end of the first century BC. It reads (*IG XII, 3, 6*)<sup>59</sup> :

[τ]ὸ κοινὸν Σαμοθρακι[α]στᾶν Ἀ[φ]ρο[δισιασ]-  
 [τ]ᾶν Βορβοριτᾶν ὑπὲρ Ε[ὐ]φροσύνο[υ]  
 Ἰδυμέως μετοίκου [εὐ]εργέτα  
 [τ]οῦ κοινοῦ· ἐπαιν[εῖ] καὶ στεφανοὶ χρ[υ]-  
 [σέ]φ στεφάνω [ἀ]ρε[τ]ᾶς ἔνεκα καὶ 5  
 [εὐ]νοίας ἃν ἔχων διετέλ[ε]ι ᾗς ἀμὲ τὸ[ν]  
 [ἄ]π[αν]τα χρόνον· καὶ ἐστεφανωμένο[ν]  
 [χ]ρυσέοις [σ]τεφάνοις ὑπ' ἀμῶν τὸ τρίτον (τέταρτον?)  
 [καὶ] ἐστεφανωμένον ὑπο Ἀ[δ]ωνιαστᾶν Ἀφροδισιασ]-  
 [τᾶν(?) Ἀσκληπιαστᾶν Σύρων [χρ]υσ[έ]φ στεφάνω] 10  
 [καὶ] ὑπὸ τᾶς κτοίνας τᾶς — — —  
 χρυσέφ στεφάνω καὶ ὑπο τᾶς κτοί[ν]-  
 [ν]ας τᾶς Ἐπι[β]ωμοῦς(?) χρυσέφ στε-  
 [φ]άνω καλοκάγαθίας ἔνεκα ἃν ἔ-  
 [χ]ων [δ]ι[ε]τέλ[ει] ᾗς [τὸ κ]οινὸ[ν] 15  
 θεοῖς.

The *koinon* the Samothraciasts, Aphrodisiasts  
 and Borboritai for Euphrosynos  
 son of Idymeus, *metic*, benefactor  
 of the *koinon* ; [the *koinon*] honours and crowns  
 with a golden crown because of his virtue 5  
 and his benefaction which he shows to us at  
 all times ; and he is crowned  
 with golden crowns by us on the third {fourth?}  
 and his is crowned by the Adoniasts and Aphrodisiasts  
 and Asklapiasts of the Syrians with a golden [crown] 10

59. First published by F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN in *IG XII, 3, 6*, following the transcription provided by D. Chavíaras ; this is the text I am using here.

[and] by the *ktoina* of ---  
 with a golden crown and by the *ktoina*  
 of the Epibomos (?) with a golden crown  
 because of his goodness which he  
 showed to the *koinon*.  
 To the gods.

15

The first two honorific decrees are dated using the double dating system of the local official of Syme, the *damiourgos* and the Rhodian priest of Helios<sup>60</sup>. It is indeed the issuing body of the first two decrees that is most interesting. They are both issued by a *koinon* of the residents in Syme for various benefactions provided to the community of the Symians. The first one is a typical honorific decree and does not provide us with much detail. The second one is an honorific decree for a certain Aristophanes, son of Aristophaneus, from the deme Polita of Ialysos on Rhodes, who responded to an appeal made in the assembly by the *κτοινᾶται* to cover expenses for the repair of the temple of Athana<sup>61</sup>. The *koinon* of residents (*κατοικεῦντες*) as an issuing authority is quite peculiar. The fact that the decree was issued by the *koinon* of the residents in Syme seems to imply that the issuing authority was not the citizens of Syme, but a different body, which also included free foreign residents. These residents could be other Rhodian citizens, not of the *deme* in which Syme belonged<sup>62</sup>, but perhaps even other non-Rhodian residents.

« Residents » (*κατοικεῦντες*) in official decrees appear also in Physkos in the Rhodian *peraiā*<sup>63</sup>. Although we lack any additional information in the Physkian decree, this too seems to imply a different issuing body than simply the Physkian citizens. Similarly, we have

60. J.M. COOK, « Cnidian Peraea and Spartan Coins », *JHS* 81, 1961, p. 59 and P.M. FRASER, G. BEAN, *op. cit.*, p. 140. This form of double dating was also used in Minoa in Amorgos, where the priest of Rhodes appeared alongside the *δαμουργός*, who was probably a Samian : this for Cook, p. 59, indicates a form of « protectorate or condominium of some sort », as the Samians had control of Minoa in the Hellenistic period : see C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 183-184.

61. V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 216, n.92, following N.F. JONES, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece : A Documentary Study*, Philadelphia 1987, p. 251 and 264 with n.2, is surely right to argue that the decree is not issued by the *κτοινᾶται* (as argued by M. GUARDUCCI, « Note di antichità rodie, I : le *κτοινᾶι* ; II, le *synnomai* », *Historia* 9, 1935, p. 423, n.7), but rather by the *koinon* : « the clear distinction between a *ktoina* and a body of *katoikountes* attested in A. BRESSON, *op. cit.*, 132 for Thyssanous reinforces the likelihood that in the present document a similar distinction ought to be drawn between the *ktoina* and the issuing authority, ie. the *koinon* ».

62. This was argued by P.M. FRASER, G. BEAN, *op. cit.*, p. 140 with n. 4. It is unclear to which deme of the Rhodian state the island of Syme belonged : it is possible that it was part of the deme of Kasareis, which belonged to Cameiros, but was located on the Rhodian *peraiā* : see I.C. PAPACHRISTODOULOU, *Οι αρχαίοι ροδιακοί...*, p. 44, followed by C. HABICHT, *op. cit.*, p. 562, with n. 118. Both are following S. SARIDAKIS, F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, *op. cit.*, p. 83-86.

63. A. BRESSON, *op. cit.*, 32 : honorary decree from Physkos (97-150 AD) : τὸν δάμον τὸν Ῥοδίων τὸι κατοικεῦντες ἐν Φύσκῳ, εὐεργεσίας ἔνεκα, ἐπ[ὶ] ἄρχοντος Πομπηίου Αὔξωνος Μενελάου (the residents of Physkos (honour) the demos of the Rhodians, because of its benefaction, in the archonship of ...)

separate references of the « people » (demos) and the « residents » in inscriptions from two poleis of the island of Carpathos, which, like Syme, was also under Rhodian control<sup>64</sup>. In two inscriptions from Brykous on Carpathos (*IG XII*, 1, 994 and 995), the residents in Brykous are distinguished from the citizens of Brykous, but both are involved in the honouring of the emperor Domitian and his wife<sup>65</sup>. This double reference in the Brykous inscriptions reflects the inclusion of both elements of the community of Brykous, the local demesmen and the foreign residents, most of whom were probably Rhodian citizens, in the expenses for the setting up of the honorific stele. In a decree from Arcaseia, one of the poleis on the island of Carpathos (M. SEGRE 1, second century BC), the issuing authority is not explicitly stated, but we have a reference to a *koinon* of the Arcaseians together with the « residents » as recipients of the benefaction of the honoured individual<sup>66</sup>. Similarly, we have references to « residents » of Lindos (*Lindos* 249, 117-116 BC)<sup>67</sup>, but in this case they do not form part of the issuing authority of the honorific decree : rather it is the people of Lindos that decide to honour this particular person who was elected *epistatas*. The « residents » are part of the body that crowned him, we assume for his benefaction, though the reason for the crown is not revealed in this inscription. It is likely that the « residents » here are the foreign, non-Rhodian, population of Lindos<sup>68</sup>. We should also add here the « residents » in a decree from the island of Nisyros (*IG XII*, 3, 104)<sup>69</sup>. These residents were not, however, the issuing authority, but rather the recipients of the benefaction of the honoured person. Finally, similar is the case of the *παροικεῦντες* mentioned in a decree from Porthmos in Carpathos (*IG XII*, 1, 1032)<sup>70</sup>.

The *koinon* of the « residents » in Syme, however, presents us with a slightly different challenge. The « residents » in Syme in the two decrees above are not simply the recipients of the benefaction of the honoured individual, or part of the body that shared in the expenses for the honours. The *koinon* here is the collective political body that issued the decree : this,

64. C. CONSTANTAKOPOULOU, *The Dance of the Islands...*, p. 189-190.

65. *IG XII*, 1, 994 : ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Β[ρ]υκοντίων κ[α]ὶ τοὶ κατοικεῦν[τες] ἐν Βρ[υ]κοῦν[τι] πάντες ; *IG XII*, 1, 995 : ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Βρυκουντίων καὶ τοὶ κα[τοικεῦν]τες ἐν Βρυκοῦντι πάντες (the demos of the Brykountians and all the residents in Brykous). See V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 207, n. 90. For a parallel in Cos see S. SHERWIN-WHITE, *Ancient Cos : An Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*, Göttingen 1978, p. 172 with n.123, with reference to *IGRR IV*, 1087, which mentions « residents » of the deme of Halentioi.

66. M. SEGRE, « Inscrizioni di Scarpanto », *Historia* 7, 1933, p. 577, inscription 1 : τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Ἀρκασειέων καὶ τοὺς κατοικεῦντας ἐν Ἀρκασείαι (the *koinon* of the Arkaseians and the residents in Arkaseia).

67. C. BLINKENBERG, *Lindos. Fouilles de l'acropole 1901-1914, II : Inscriptions*, Berlin-Copenhagen 1941. See also *ibid.*, p. 264 (125-100 BC) [but here the residents are part of a supplement] and 425 (30-40 AD).

68. Argued by V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval Aristocracy...*, p. 129, and V. GABRIELSEN, « The Rhodian Associations... » in Z. ARCHIBALD *et al.* eds., *op. cit.*, p. 233-234.

69. *IG XII*, 3, 104 : καὶ θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον πᾶσι ἐλευθέροις καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσι ἐν Νεισύρῳ καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδαμεῦσιν ἐπὶ μήνες (and he provided the oil to all free men and the residents of Nisyros and the foreign residents for months).

70. *IG XII*, 1, 1032 : οὐ μόνον τῶν δαμπτῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν παροικεῦντων (not only for the citizens (literally, members of the demos) but also for the residents).

I believe, included citizens of Syme and non-Symian residents, most of whom were most likely Rhodian citizens. However, it is probable that non-Rhodian citizens were also part of the *koinon*, and therefore part of the « official » political authority on the island. These foreign residents engaged in one of the most visible acts of political action of a community : that of honouring the community's benefactors.

In the literary sources, the meaning of the term « residents » is similarly not unambiguous : sometimes the term « residents » means foreign residents alone, as in Diodorus' account of the siege of Rhodes in 305 BC (XX.84.2)<sup>71</sup>, and sometimes it means citizens residing in a place, as again in Diodorus' account of the Rhodian synoecism in 408 BC (XIII.75.1)<sup>72</sup>. Literary parallels, therefore, are of little help when trying to understand what are the implications of the terminology used in these decrees.

Before I attempt to draw some conclusions from this collection of evidence, I would like to briefly discuss Rhamnous, as this Athenian deme produced a series of decrees where we can document similar levels of complexity in relation to the body – or bodies – responsible for the issuing of honours to individuals<sup>73</sup>. Two decrees, in particular, refer to a variety of issuing bodies. The first one, an honorific decree for Dikaiarchos, dated to 235/4 (*Rhamnous* 17 = BIELMAN 30), mentions the *demos* of the Athenians, the *koinon* of those

71. Diod. XX, 84, 1-2 : οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι μέχρι μὲν τινος πρόσβεις ἐκπέμποντες ἤξιον μηδὲν πράξει κατὰ τῆς πόλεως ἀνήγεστον. ὡς δ' οὐδεὶς αὐτοῖς προσεῖχεν, ἀπογνόντες τὰς διαλύσεις ἐξέπεμψαν πρεσβευτὰς πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον καὶ Λυσίμαχον καὶ Κάσανδρον, ἀξιούντες βοηθεῖν, ὡς τῆς πόλεως προπολεμούσης ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. τῶν δ' ἐν τῇ πόλει κατοικοῦντων παροίκων καὶ ξένων δόντες ἐξουσίαν τοῖς βουλομένοις συναγωνίζεσθαι, τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀχρήστους ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐξέπεμψαν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τοῦ μηδένα τῇ καταστάσει δυσχεραίνοντα γίνεσθαι τῆς πόλεως προδότην. ἀριθμὸν δὲ ποιησάμενοι τῶν δυναμένων ἀγωνίζεσθαι πολιτῶν μὲν εὗρον περὶ ἑξακισχιλίους, τῶν δὲ παροίκων καὶ ξένων εἰς χιλίους (for a time the Rhodians kept sending envoys and asking him to do nothing irreparable against the city, but as no one paid any heed to these, they gave up hope of a truce and sent envoys to Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Cassander, begging them to give aid and saying that the city was fighting the war on their behalf. As to the metics and the aliens who resided in the city, to those who wished they gave permission to join them in the fighting and the others who were of no service they sent forth from the city, partly as a precaution against scarcity of supplies, and partly that there might be no one to become dissatisfied with the situation and try to betray the city. When they made a count of those who were able to fight, they found that there were about six thousand citizens and as many as a thousand metics and aliens – I have adapted the translation by Russel M. Geer, Loeb Classical Library edition).

72. Diod. XIII.75.1 : Οἱ δὲ τὴν Ῥόδον νῆσον κατοικοῦντες καὶ Ἰηλυσὸν καὶ Λίνδον καὶ Κάμειρον μετῴκησαν εἰς μίαν πόλιν τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Ῥόδον (the inhabitants of the island of Rhodes left Ialysos and Lindos and Cameiros and settled in one polis, which is now called Rhodes).

73. Eleusis is another Athenian deme where we see a certain overlap of groups involved in the honouring of individuals. The decrees from Eleusis, however, do not seem to include non-citizens. Normally the decrees are issued by the Athenians, and/or the demos of the Eleusinians, as well as soldiers stationed at Eleusis (Ἀθηναίων οἱ τεταγμένοι Ἐλευσίνι). Non-Athenians are included in two (?) decrees only : in a decree of Athenian soldiers and foreign mercenaries honouring Aristophanes (K. CLINTON, *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Volume IA : Text*, Athens 2005, 196 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1299), where foreign mercenaries are mentioned in connection with the raising of funds (II.21-2), and in a decree of Athenian soldiers and ὑπαίθροισι in honour of their general Demairetos (*Ibid.*, 211 = *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1304) : but see K. CLINTON, *Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone, vol. II : Commentary*, Athens 2008, p. 267,

stationed at Rhamnous, the citizens of Rhamnous, the residents at Rhamnous, the *koinon* of the residents at Rhamnous, the residents in the garrison, while in the summary provided at the end, it refers to « the citizens living at Rhamnous to Dikaiarchos »<sup>74</sup>. This, as Osborne rightly observed, is a very confusing state of affairs, resulting from the adoption of political language from a variety of forms of group organization and from the vague basis upon which groups could be formed<sup>75</sup>. The second decree, an honorific decree for the trierarch Menander, dated to 225/4 BC (*Rhamnous* 31), mentions citizens of (the deme) Rhamnous, alongside resident citizens, Athenians and Athenian fellow sailors (συμπλεύσαντες). Again here we see a certain degree of overlapping in the groups involved in the act of honouring individuals. The Rhamnousian evidence shows that the « political » decision of bestowing honours was not restricted to the citizen body (the *demos*) but included sub-groups, which, in the case of the first decree, may have included non-Athenians serving in the garrison<sup>76</sup>.

Rhamnous, therefore, points to a certain degree of blurring of boundaries between the official « political » body of the *demos* and various sub-groups and organizations. I believe that the Symian evidence implies that this blurring of boundaries between citizens and other residents (some of whom may have been non-citizens) went even further. The implications of a membership in the Symian *koinon*, which included both citizens of Syme and non-citizens, are particularly significant. A *koinon* that included citizens and foreign residents means that both citizens of Syme and non-citizens had equal access to the main political body, the assembly, ἐκκλησία, mentioned in the second decree (*IG* XII, 3, Suppl. 1270 A13). This by itself implies an altogether different form of political organization of the community : one which was not exclusive to the citizens of this particular polis. Non-citizens, therefore, had some access to mainstream political power. The implication of this is that the basic dichotomy of the classical Greek polis – the division between citizens and non-citizen – was partly, if not wholly, overcome.

I have attempted to draw similarities between the situation in Syme and the situation in Heracleia. Syme did not face an acute crisis, such as the one we can reconstruct from the Heracleian decree : the background of the Heracleian decree was one of social disturbances

---

following Y. GARLAN, « Études d'histoire militaire et diplomatique (XV-XVI) », *BCH* 102, 1978, p.106-107 : the ὑπαιθροί were probably Athenian citizens engaged in the act of patrol. The Eleusinian evidence, therefore, does not point to a community of non-citizens being engaged in political processes and decisions.

74. See discussion in R. OSBORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 279-282 and A. BIELMAN, *Retour à la liberté : libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne : recueil d'inscriptions honorant des sauveteurs et analyse critique*, Paris 1994 (hereafter BIELMAN), p. 116-119.

75. R. OSBORNE, *op. cit.*, p. 279-282. J. POUILLOUX, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris 1954, p. 132, argued that the confusion reflected in the decree is the direct result of the troubled period of war during which the decree was passed.

76. See comments in BIELMAN p. 117, with n. 5 and 6. For the legal implications of memberships in *koina* in Rhamnous see also I. ARNAOUTOGLU, « Group and Individuals in *IRhamnous* 59 (*SEG* 49, 161) » in J.-C. COUVENHES, S. MILANEZI eds., *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate*, Tours 2007, p. 315-317.

with murders and even the possibility of revenge against those who attempted to bring on the prosecution of the accused party. That is why the decree says that this is to be done for the « protection and salvation » of the inhabitants of the island. Certainly, protection against murders in a small community in Heracleia cannot be viewed as the same level as covering the expenses for the rebuilding of two walls of a temple, which is the background for the honorific decree in Syme. Yet, both communities, Heracleia and Syme, adopted similar approaches for creating authorities which issued their decrees. The *koina* in the decrees from both these islands were composed of citizens and non-citizen residents. References to such *koina* as political bodies which included citizens and non-citizens may be few and far apart, and references to « residents » as issuing authorities for decrees are equally few and problematic. What these references show us, however, is that there existed such a thing as assemblies not exclusively composed by the citizens of a place. This is implied by the Symian material – and that is in itself quite fascinating. Furthermore, it seems that such *koina* engaged in various decision processes : from resolving an acute crisis within a community (Heracleia) to honouring individuals for their benefaction (Syme). In other words, this type of political organization was not restricted to certain political behaviours, such as honouring, even if our sources are skewed towards them<sup>77</sup>.

How did such a form of political organization come to be? Here we come to the sphere of pure conjecture. Both the Symian and Heracleian *koina* were products of the third and second centuries BC. By that time, *koina* as private associations were a quite widespread phenomenon in the Greek world. Such *koina* imitated the political mechanisms of the polis in terms of structure, nomenclature and powers. They did have, however, one striking difference with the world of the polis : that of membership. Many private associations were open to non-citizens and even slaves. I would like to suggest that the existence of such associations perhaps provided a precedent for the creation of the political *koina* I have been discussing in Syme and Heracleia. If citizens and foreign residents were accustomed to meet, discuss, fund and issue honours as members of private associations, then they would be less likely to find an assembly of citizens and non-citizens a bizarre and unwanted political formation. The polis influenced the structure and language adopted by the private or voluntary associations of the Greek world, but this influence was not one way. Private or voluntary *koina* may in turn have had an impact on the ways that central « political » decisions were taken in the communities of the Aegean.

I have attempted to examine some attestations of *koina* in the island world of the Aegean. The term *koinon* was extremely versatile, being used for such diverse things as a federal organization (the Islanders' League, for example), as a synonym for the polis, or as a private or voluntary association. The epigraphic evidence allows to get glimpses of the immense complexity of political organization that existed in the Greek world. Beyond the landscape of big and small poleis, *koina* such as those at Heracleia and Syme, show that there existed

---

77. I would like to thank Claire Taylor for this particular point.

alternative political formations which transcended the conceptual binary opposition between citizen and non-citizen. And this should make us reconsider our own analytical assumptions when examining the politics and political history of the ancient Greek world.