

Politeia in Greek Federal States

Chiara Lasagni

1 Part I—Framing Federal *sympoliteia*: General Remarks on Citizenship in Greek Federal States

1.1 *The Question of politeia in Federal States*

The question of *politeia* (here meant as the body of prerogatives related to citizenship within a state community) represents a central topic in the institutional history of the Greek federal states.¹ We can credibly argue that not only the creation of a central polity of the *ethnos* but, above all, the acknowledgment of civil rights shared in common by all member communities were the underlying reasons behind the birth of federal states in Greece. In other words, the causes for the extraordinary expansive force and attractiveness of Greek federal states in the fourth and third centuries should not only be sought in their ethnic cohesion or in their military power, but first and foremost in the codification of a federal *politeia*, which fostered economic and social mobility as much as it guaranteed equality of political rights within the territory of the whole *ethnos*.

Actually, one can find several overlapping elements between the federal states and the other ‘interstate’ political organizations, such as amphictyonies and symmachies. On one side, in many respects, federal states behaved as ‘leagues of neighbours’, that is, as political organizations built upon a community of cults.² On the other side, the military impact of the later-born fed-

1 Beck (2001) 370. On this topic, see Beck (1997) 174–179; Freitag (2012) 83–95; Rizakis (2012) 23–38 (with further references to the previous literature, see in particular Freitag [2012] 83–85). This article was written and delivered for publication a few months after the Conference at Urbino, and long before the publication of the fundamental volume edited by Beck and Funke, *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, whose content might not, as a consequence, have been taken into account for the present analysis.

2 See Morgan (2003) 108, who sustains the need for a ‘reappraisal of the long argued view that cult centres in the *ethne* served as regional meeting places before the development of city centres, with the *ethnos* thus primarily a religious league with a shared sanctuary and its festival as a national meeting.’ For the role of communal cults in the development of *ethne* as federal states, see: Antonetti (1990); McInerney (2001); Corsten (2006); Graninger (2011); Mackil (2013) 147–236.

eral states within the traditional polis world meant that the former might be perceived as entities comparable to hegemonial symmachies. So it was, for instance, in the case of the Chalkidian *koinon*, described as a *συμμαχία* both by Xenophon and Diodorus, due to the preeminent role and aggressive behaviour of Olynthos upon the other cities of Thrace and Makedonia.³ It is worth noting that even though Xenophon in *HG* 5.2.24 speaks about the Chalkidian *koinon* in terms of a hegemonial symmarchy, in *ibid.* 12–19 (speech of Kleigenes of Akanthos to the Spartan authorities), he gives us one of the most significant pieces of evidence about the attractiveness and, at the same time, the danger of federal *sympoliteia* to the polis world.⁴ Here Kleigenes recalls the striking novelty of Olynthos' *Machtpolitik*,⁵ and focuses on the fact that, in the absence of any military help from the Spartans, the annexation of Akanthos by the Chalkidian *koinon* would have been inevitable.⁶ Moreover, Kleigenes calls for the fastest possible help: in fact, once the *poleis* of Thrace are bound together by *epigamia* and *enktesis*—in other words, by federal *politeia*—a military intervention aimed at making them secede would be altogether vain.⁷ Summing up, the qualitative leap forward of federal states towards other forms of super-polis organization seems to have been enabled by the presence of a common *politeia*.

In addition to the above aspects, a further reason behind the relevance of this topic in the institutional history of the Greek federal states lies in the fact that the existence of a common *politeia*, superposed to the local *politeiai* of the member states, seems to be the only concrete element differentiating polis and *ethnos* as forms of state.⁸ We must note that the expression 'federal state', employed by scholars for describing those political communities the

3 Xen. *HG*. 5.2.25: Ποτείδαιαν ... σύμμαχον ἤδη ἐκείνων (*scil.* of the Olynthians) οὖσαν; see also 5.2.19, where the *poleis* that had joined the Chalkidian *koinon* are compared to the member states of the Peloponnesian League (in this case, the Arcadians). Diod. 15.21.2: τῶν δὲ Ὀλυνθίων μετὰ τῶν συμμαχῶν. On the relation between *symmachia* and *sympoliteia* in the Classical and Hellenistic ages, see Dreher (2003) 27–38; Buraselis (2003) 39–50.

4 Bearzot (2004) 45–56.

5 Xen. *HG*. 5.2.12: Ὡ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι τε καὶ σύμμαχοι, οἰόμεθα λανθάνει ὑμᾶς πρᾶγμα μέγα φυόμενον ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι.

6 *Ibid.* 14: Ἡμεῖς δέ, ὦ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, βουλόμεθα μὲν τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις χρῆσθαι καὶ αὐτοπολίται εἶναι· εἰ μέντοι μὴ βοηθήσει τις, ἀνάγκη καὶ ἡμῖν μετ' ἐκείνων γίνεσθαι.

7 *Ibid.* 18–19: αἱ γὰρ ἄκουσαι τῶν πόλεων τῆς πολιτείας κοινωνοῦσαι, αὐταὶ, ἂν τι ἴδωσιν ἀντίπαλον, ταχὺ ἀποστήσονται· εἰ μέντοι συγκλεισθήσονται ταῖς τε ἐπιγαμίαις, καὶ ἐγκτήσεσι παρ' ἀλλήλοισι, [...], ἴσως οὐκέθ' ὁμοίως εὐλυτα ἔσται.

8 I have already discussed this matter in Lasagni (2011), esp. 151ff., to which I refer for a wider treatment.

Greeks referred to, alternatively, with the terms *ethnos*, *koinon*, or *sympoliteia* (in rare cases: *systema*), is in many respects misleading. In fact, in strictly institutional terms, one can observe that the differences between *ethnos* / federal state and polis / city-state are mostly imagined. Or, using the words of Kostas Vlassopoulos, ‘the distinction between polis and *ethnos* as forms of political and social organization is a mirage of modern scholarship.’⁹ In particular, the relationships between local political communities and central government seem to have been shaped in both cases in a comparable way, so that it is possible to state that the Greek *ethne* behaved mainly as unitary states rather than federal states.¹⁰ There can actually be little doubt, I think, that the degree of internal autonomy and external dependency observable, for instance, in an Attic deme or in a polis of the Aetolian *koinon* is altogether comparable. However, the similarity cannot be stretched any further. In Greek federal states, the so-called double citizenship does not find strict correspondences with the polis organizational model: local citizenship was something different from deme or city-tribe affiliation, and its juridical connections with the common citizenship (*sympoliteia*) seem to have been more complex and various than those involving the polis and its civic subdivisions. These are precisely the connections that I am going to investigate in this article, through an analysis of the epigraphic evidence.

1.2 *Methodological Questions*

Before proceeding further, I would like to add some preliminary considerations about methodological matters. As is well known, the Greek world has not provided us with a freestanding political reflection on federal states. Even the locution ‘federal state’ itself is nothing but an anachronistic label used by modern scholars for indicating a kind of political community for which the Greeks employed a manifold and non-univocal terminology.¹¹ This state of things has led us rather often to over-systematize such entities, through an anxious search for constants. Systematization may be advantageous insofar as it helps create interpretative tools or conceptual frameworks; however, a similar approach is to be avoided when it ends up forcing the ancient evidence into a normalizing frame. In particular, we may assume that the double *politeia* mechanism has developed gradually, in parallel with the formation of federal institutions

9 Vlassopoulos (2007) 194.

10 Giovannini (1971), Giovannini (2007).

11 In any case, I prefer referring to the Greek federal states as *ethne*, rather than *koina* or even *sympoliteiai* (a use unquestionably non-Greek!), since the word *ethnos* was the only one indicating the state form, thus opposed to the polis as city-state.

themselves. As a consequence, in analysing the epigraphic sources related to federal *politeia*, we should search for peculiarities rather than for general rules, since the relationships between federal government and member states were peculiar, various, and stratified. Therefore, in approaching the question of federal *politeia*, it is important that our exegetic tools are as minimal as possible; it is important, in other words, that we rid ourselves of a number of general definitions that, though widely accepted, are at close sight excessively theoretical and substantially misleading. In particular, I would like to focus on two points, the first pertains to the concept of *sympoliteia*, the second to the relationships between federal government and member states regarding citizenship.

1.3 *Sympoliteia*

In the specialized literature, the notion of *sympoliteia* corresponds mostly to a modern theoretical construct used by scholars more often than is actually needed, both in defining the Greek federal polity as a whole (as *bundesstaatliche Sympolitie*, Szanto), and the federal citizenship (*sympoliteia* as double citizenship, defined by the double *ethnikon* in the ‘sympolitic formula’, and thus often opposed to *isopoliteia*). In many respects, such a notion is quite distant from the Greek *sympoliteia*, which, at close scrutiny, results in a generic term, devoid of any precise juridical contents.¹² As a consequence, I wonder how methodologically correct it is to refer to *συμπολιτεία* / *συμπολιτεύειν* as technical-juridical words to be connected to federal citizenship, even within the construction of a theoretical model of Greek federalism. In this regard, I essentially agree with Adalberto Giovannini, who assumes that the term *sympoliteia* was used in Greek sources to indicate an activity (i.e. the act of sharing a common polity in all its political, military, and religious aspects), rather than a political institution (in our case, the federal state as such with its double citizenship).¹³

Considering the literary evidence, one can first notice that the use of the verb *συμπολιτεύω* is decisively the most prevalent, whereas, among the classical authors, the corresponding noun *συμπολιτεία* occurs only (and significantly) in the work of the Achaean historian Polybius.¹⁴ Although Polybius draws upon

12 I agree with Repka (2002), when he wryly observes that *sympoliteia* “is an imprecise term, and as such it is very convenient and widely accepted.”

13 Giovannini (1971) 20–24; see also Giovannini (2003) 161–166; Giovannini (2007) 347–356, 365–368, 403–409. For discussion, see Lasagni (2011) 89–91; 189 ff.

14 The only other occurrence of the term in Diod. 29.18.1 is arguably derived from Polybius himself.

the word *sympoliteia* in an extensive and thus self-conscious manner, I believe that, even in this case, it is still not sound to assign to it the value of a *terminus technicus*. In fact, every time Polybius decides to use the expression—for instance—ἡ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν συμπολιτεία, instead of ἡ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πολιτεία, this is not due to a concrete juridical distinction between the respective contents (either expression refers to the same political entity), but actually to the author's aim to emphasize the nature of the *foedus* of such unions, that is their intrinsic negotiability.¹⁵ For that matter, as an interstate pact, *sympoliteia* seems to have been mostly intended as a sort of unequal agreement by Polybius: a local community can join the *sympoliteia* of an *ethnos* (μετέχω τῆς συμπολιτείας, 2.41, 44; 4.25; 18.2), whereas the latter can hold a polis within its *sympoliteia* (ἔχω ἐν τῇ συμπολιτείας, 21.30). Moreover, it is worth noting that, whenever Polybius aims to emphasize the aspect of political cohesion of a federal state—and not only its nature as a *foedus*—he attaches further adjectives to the word συμπολιτεία, such as κοινή and ἐθνική.¹⁶

What we have observed about Polybius' treatment of the word *sympoliteia* may find *comparanda* in the epigraphic evidence, where, within a federal context in the strict sense, the use of συμπολιτεύω implies the presence of an interstate arrangement. This can be an arrangement to be enforced in the future, as in the case of the oracular enquiry from Dodona *SGDI* II 1590, or an already existing provision as in the case of the treaty between Demetrius Poliorketes and the Aetolian *koinon* *SEG* 48, 588.¹⁷ It must also be noted that

15 This becomes particularly clear if one considers the occurrences of *sympoliteia* together with the verbs associated with it in Polybius; *sympoliteia* is in fact not only a political union in which to partake (the verb μετέχω is equally associated with *politeia*), but also a kind of interstate treaty (κατάστασις τῆς συμπολιτείας, Polyb. 23.17) that can be agreed to (προσλαμβάνω εἰς τὴν συμπολιτείαν, *ibid.*), or abandoned (ἀφίστημι, 3.5), or maintained in force over the years (συντηρέω, 27.2). In this same respect, it is also worth noting that in three different passages Polybius speaks about the presence (or lack thereof) of *stelai* recording agreements of *sympoliteia* (2.41; 23.17; see also 24.8).

16 Such use closely resembles Aristotle's distinction between *politeia* and *koine politeia* in the *Constitutions*; here the adjective κοινή seems to be employed for differentiating a kind of constitution that was customary among a population (*e.g.*, fr. 611 Rose: ἡ Κρητικὴ πολιτεία) from the constitution of a federal state (ἡ κοινὴ Θεσσαλῶν πολιτεία, fr. 498 Rose; Ἀρκάδων, fr. 483 Rose). On federalism in the thought of Aristoteles and Polybius, Lehmann (2001); see also Vimercati (2005) 61–65.

17 *SGDI* 1590 (= Cabanes (1976) n° 21; Lhôte (2006) n° 9), Dodona 170–68 BC: ἐπερωτῶντι τὸ κοινὸν τῶν [...]ων Δία Νάον καὶ Διώναν ἢ α[ὐ]τὶ αὐτοῖς συμπολιτεύουσι | μετὰ Μολοσσῶν ἀσφαλῆ ἦι. *SEG* 48, 588 (= Lefèvre (1998) 109–141), Delphi ca. 289 BC: [Συνθήκαι βασιλεῖ Δημητρίω καὶ Αἰτωλοῖς κυρίαν εἶναι τὴν εἰρήνην] ν κα[ι] τὴν φιλιαν ν βασιλεῖ Δημητρίω[ι] | [καὶ

in both the above-cited inscriptions, *sympoliteia* appears to have taken the form of an unequal agreement between minor local communities and major *ethne* organized as federal states (respectively, the Molossian *koinon* and the Aetolian *koinon*). Moreover, neither inscription allows us to infer that the relation between the communities involved in the agreement was based on the acknowledgment of full citizenship rights within a federal *politeia*. The evidence provided by the oracular enquiry *SGDI* 1590 is indeed rather meagre, considering that the name of the minor *koinon* is restored in *lacuna*, and that the text itself is no official public document. As for *SEG* 48, 588, we must first note that, besides drawing a parallel between “Demetrius and his *symmachoi*”, and “the Aetolians and their *sympoliteuomenoi*” in ll. 15–16, the treaty’s text cites king Demetrius alone, and keeps the Aetolians separated from their *sympoliteuomenoi* in the clause prohibiting the agreeing parties from concluding any sort of alliance with subjects hostile to the other party (ll. 23–24). As a consequence, we may infer that the *sympoliteuomenoi* not only did not enjoy full citizenship rights (otherwise they would have been named simply as ‘Aetolians’), but they were also capable of independent actions of foreign policy. For these reasons, it could be more plausible that the *sympoliteuomenoi* in *SEG* 48, 588 were not local communities, members of the Aetolian federal state—as the first editor Lefèvre maintained¹⁸—but rather Aetolia’s allies, who were bonded with the Aetolian *ethnos* by virtue of a grant of *isopoliteia*.¹⁹

On the basis of these observations, it seems to me reasonable to conclude that, with reference to federal states, the verb *συμπολιτεύω* and the deverbal noun *συμπολιτεία* were used by the ancient sources for emphasizing the presence of an ‘interstate’ agreement that included not only a relation of friendship and alliance, but also the acknowledgment of *some* civil and political rights common to all the parties. Nonetheless, beyond that, it is not possible

τοῖς συμμάχοις αὐτοῦ καὶ Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ τοῖς συμπολιτευομένοις με]τ’ Αἰτωλῶν ἕτη πέντε (for the restoration on l. 16, see l. 23).

18 Lefèvre (1998) 124 (‘Les *συμπολιτευομένοι* ne peuvent désigner que les populations intégrées au *koinon* étolien.’). On the institute of *isopoliteia* in general, see the forthcoming monograph of S. SABA, *Isopolity in the Hellenistic Time*, which updates Gawantka’s work, challenging some of his conclusions of this subject.

19 See, for comparison, the treaty between Aetolia and Akarnania *IG IX.1² 3A* (262 BC), whose text is titled *συνθήκα καὶ συμμαχία Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ Ἀκαρνανοῖς* (ll. 1–2), and includes a mutual grant of *epigamia*, *enktesis*, and *isopoliteia* (ll. 11–13): εἴμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγαμίαν ποτ’ ἀλλήλους καὶ γῆας ἔγκτησιν τῷ τε Αἰτωλῷ ἐν Ἀκαρνανίαι καὶ τῷ Ἀκαρνανῷ ἐν Αἰτωλίαι καὶ πολίταν εἴμε|ν τὸν Αἰτωλὸν ἐν Ἀκαρνανίαι καὶ τὸν Ἀκαρνανᾶ ἐν Ἀἰτωλίαι ἴσοι καὶ ὅμοιοι.

to attribute to *sympoliteia* any more technical valence than that. It was not provided with technical-juridical content, and thus did not express in ancient documents either the constitution of a federal state as such, or its double-level citizenship.

Regarding this latter point, we must return for a while to Polybius, who, as it has already been noticed by Walbank, 'generally chose to neglect *isopoliteia* and to include examples of it under the more general term *sympoliteia*.'²⁰ Actually, I do not think that this shows that the two terms, *sympoliteia* and *isopoliteia*, were to some extent interchangeable. The difference in their meaning was quite possibly a slight one, but nonetheless sufficient to justify Polybius' choice. The notion of *sympoliteia* expresses a type of relationship between political communities; generally speaking, it was a *συμμαχική και φιλική κοινωνία πραγμάτων* (so Polyb. 2.37 on Achaean *koinon*) involving matters of civil and political rights. *Isopoliteia* was instead a right to be granted; it occurs in inscriptions as a technical term indicating a bestowing of 'potential citizenship'. When *isopoliteia* is given to individuals, it corresponds to an honorary bestowal of civic rights; when it is mutually acknowledged by state communities, it amounts to an interstate agreement. The sole occurrence of the word *isopoliteia* in Polybius' *Histories* is perfectly in line with this frame: in fact, in a passage related to the events of the Cretan War, it is told that the Athenians had passed an honorific decree for the Rhodians, awarding them the crown for valour and the grant of *isopoliteia*.²¹ If Polybius had wanted to describe the kind of relationship established between Athens and Rhodes by that decree, he probably would have used the word *sympoliteia*, as in other similar cases.

1.4 *Federal Government and Member States*

The second field of investigation, in which a less theoretical and more empirical approach is required, pertains to the respective prerogatives of the federal state and of its member communities within the institutional mechanism of the double *politeia*.

It must first be considered that the Greek *ethne*, being sorts of 'federal states', were by their very nature characterized by a sovereignty shared between the central government of the *ethnos* and the federated local communities, and, more particularly, that this arrangement must have also involved issues related

²⁰ Walbank (1976–1977) 33.

²¹ Polyb. 16.26 (= Cost. VII Porph. *De Legat.* 39.15): ἀπεδέξαντο (*scil.* the Athenians) δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ῥοδίους μεγαλομερῶς καὶ τὸν τε δῆμον ἑστεφάνωσαν ἀριστείων στεφάνῳ καὶ πᾶσι Ῥοδίοις ἰσοπολιτείαν ἐψηφίσαντο.

to the granting of citizenship. How so? If we think in strictly abstract terms, we can make the following statements of general import: 1) an *ethnos* does not grant its federal *politeia* to individuals belonging to one-member *poleis*—this would be illogical, since the enjoyment of local citizenship rights is the necessary and sufficient condition for the enjoyment of federal citizenship rights; 2) conversely, an *ethnos* cannot bestow upon foreigners the *politeia* of a member polis, since such a provision would amount to an illicit interference in the internal sovereignty of the federated communities; 3) an *ethnos*, in conclusion, can exclusively grant federal citizenship rights to individuals (or communities) outside the federal state; 4) a member polis can confer to foreigners neither the federal *politeia* nor its own local *politeia*; in both cases, in fact, individuals external to the *ethnos* would become federal citizens bypassing the central government's approval; 5) within the limits of its sovereignty, a polis member of a federal state can only bestow its *politeia* upon citizens of other federated *poleis*.

Such a scheme is provided with its own internal logic, based on the idea that the Greek federal states were characterized by a clear division of powers between their central and local levels. Nonetheless, as we shall see below, the reality of the political practice emerging from epigraphical evidence is much more varied and complex than the rules sketched above. In other words, shifting from the field of federal theory to the analysis of ancient public inscriptions, the 'spheres of sovereignty' model and the 'double citizenship' model do not overlap as consistently as one might expect.

I hope that what has been said here shows how a descriptive and not-prescriptive approach is indeed the most effective way to analyse the problem of citizenship in Greek *ethne*. Some of the most widely accepted theoretical models that have been formulated by modern scholars to explain the puzzling problem of Greek federalism (the notion of *sympoliteia* as *bundesstaatliche Sympolitie*, whereby sovereignty is shared between the *ethnos* and its member states, and the issue of double *politeia*) should be abandoned, or at least left apart, in favour of a more document-rooted and empiricist approach. In my opinion, we should stick to only two points with regard to federal *politeia*: these two permanent features represent nonetheless a sufficiently solid ground (or a sufficiently accurate and useful exegetic tool) for comprehending the phenomenon of *politeia* in Greek federal states in its different contexts.

1. The first point pertains to what can be defined as the *content* of federal *politeia*. In this respect, it is possible to observe that the Greek federal citizenship can actually, as it were, be broken down into the following elements: a) common civil rights, viz. *epigamia* and *enktesis*; b) *isopoliteia* or potential

citizenship; and c) local *politeia*, which entailed the full enjoyment of federal political rights.

2. The second point pertains to the *institutional mechanism* of federal *politeia*. To be *polites* of a federal state (e.g. Αἰτωλός), it was strictly necessary to be a citizen of one of its member *poleis* (e.g. Καλλιπολίτας); in fact, member states represented the basic institutional interface, linking the individual citizens to the central government of an *ethnos*, in the same way as the deme affiliation was the primal requisite for being an Athenian citizen.²² Hence it follows that, whenever a federal state passed a decree granting citizenship rights, these were bestowed in the form of an *isopoliteia* (or potential citizenship) that could eventually be implemented through permanent residence in one of the member *poleis*, and the acquisition of a local *politeia*.²³

In reference to the above statements, I wonder if the concept of ‘double *politeia*’ can also be interpreted differently from what is normally done.²⁴ On one side, as is well known, the double *politeia* consists of simultaneous membership in two state communities, i.e. in the federal state as a whole (Αἰτωλός) and in one of its member states (Ναυπάκτιος). It therefore corresponds to the full enjoyment of citizenship rights. On the other, it seems possible to

22 The most striking evidence for this is probably the inscription IG IX.1² 188 (= Ager [1996] n° 56 = Magnetto [1997] n° 55, 213/2BC), an arbitration, supervised by the Aetolian *koinon*, between two member *poleis*, Melitaia and Pereia (in Achaea Phthiotis), which were involved in a common agreement of *sympoliteia*. The text shows at ll. 16–21 that the rights and duties within the Aetolian federation were shared proportionally among all members, no matter how small: in case of a split (εἰ δέ κα ἀποπολιτεύωντι Πηρεῖς ἀπὸ Μελ[ι]ταέων), the Pereians would have retained one representative (ἔχοντες ... βουλευτᾶν ἓνα), and would have paid their debts and federal taxes in proportion to that one (καὶ τὰ δάνεια συναποτινόντω, ὅσα κα ἄ πόλις ὀφείλη, κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τοῦ βουλευτᾶ καὶ ἐμπερόντω τὰ ἐ[ν] τοῦς Αἰτωλοῦς γινόμε[ν]α κατὰ τὸν βουλευτᾶν).

23 As is well known, according to Louis Robert and Philippe Gauthier, every grant of *politeia* attested in honorific decrees was in reality a grant of potential citizenship; in other words, the *politeia* remained a purely honorific attribute, unless made effective by residing in the hosting state and by being inscribed in its civic subdivisions. Actually, this is not exactly the same as in federal states, where the ‘isopolitic features’ of *politeia* can be understood in a slightly different way. In their case, it is in fact possible to hypothesize three different stages of citizenship: 1. a pure potential and honorific citizenship; 2. a lower level citizenship, enacted by residence in the federal territory; 3. full citizenship, obtained through the acquisition of a local *politeia* (on points 2 and 3, see further in the text).

24 On the concept of double *politeia* in federal states, see Larsen (1953) 809–810; Beck (1997) 55–56, 174–175; Freitag (2009) 17–18; Rizakis (2012) 23–38.

hypothesize the existence of a twofold degree of *politeia*: besides a first-degree citizenship—that was enjoyed by the citizens of the member states, and that enabled them to participate in the political life of the *ethnos* both at the central and the local level—there may have also been a lower-degree citizenship that granted some basic civil rights, such as *epigamia* and *enktesis*, within a status of *isopoliteia*. This may have entailed the possibility of acquiring citizenship rights in any member states.

We can suppose that this secondary degree of citizenship, in its turn, affected two typologies of individuals: those who were citizens of the *ethnos*, but were residing in a member polis different from the one to which they belonged, and those who came from outside the *ethnos*, but were living within the federal territory in a status of *isopoliteia*. As citizens of the European Union, we are all well acquainted with such a multi-levelled notion of citizenship: we know, for instance, that a European citizen living in a member state different from his own is endowed only with a non-full citizenship status (in fact, he or she is a resident alien). In this same respect, we can recall the evidence provided by a list of casualties from Epidaurus (146 BC), whose text lists two groups of individuals separately, according to their political status: the Epidaurians on one side, arranged by their three Doric tribes, and a group made of Achaeans and *synoikoi* (Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ σύνοικοι, l. 59) on the other side.²⁵ According to Larsen, this evidence would disprove the idea, at least for the Achaean context, ‘that the citizens possessed something like *isopoliteia* in all cities of their confederacy so that they were able to move from one city to another and assume local citizenship by registering in their new home.’²⁶ The Epidaurian inscription, nonetheless, does not force us to rule out the possibility, as it were, of a ‘political mobility’ of federal citizens. Indeed, it proves that the acquisition of a local *politeia* was not as automatic as usually intended. We can suppose that the grant of local citizenship always required *ad hoc* decrees to be passed at a local level.

It is worth noting that the distinction between soldiers who were citizens of Epidaurus and those who were not was a matter of exclusive interest for the Epidaurians, as they lumped together their fellow federal citizens and the *synoikoi* in the second half of the list of casualties. In fact, if we shift from a local to a central level, we shall find a different kind of categorization. In a number of treaties of *philia* or *symmachia* passed by the Aetolian *koinon*, in the context of clauses granting mutual safety between the parts,

25 IG IV².1 28, see comments in Larsen (1971) 83–84; Rizakis (2012) 37.

26 Larsen (1971) 83.

the couple μηθεῖς Αἰτωλῶν μηδὲ τῶν ἐν Αἰτωλίαι πολιτευόντων is attested. This expression clearly distinguishes federal citizens, οἱ Αἰτωλοί, from those who, coming from outside, resided within the Aetolian territory where they possessed a lower degree of citizenship. In this case, the distinction between these two groups of individuals was a matter of interest to the Aetolian federal state.²⁷

2 Part II—The Evidence: Inscriptions as a Source for the Praxis of Citizenship in Greek Federal States

The second part of this article collects a number of epigraphic examples that are particularly significant for describing recurring patterns and exceptions to the rules described above regarding federal citizenship, without aiming at exhaustiveness.

2.1 *Koinon of the Achaeans, Dyme: Polis Decree Regulating the Enrolment of New Citizens, Third Century BC*

This decree sets up the rules for the bestowal of citizenship upon a specific group of individuals, defined as *epoikoi* (i.e. people who were living in the polis of Dyme: [ἐπι τ]οῖσδε εἶμεν τὰν πολιτ[εῖαν] τοῖς ἐποί[χοις] ---- ἐν τᾷ π[ό]λι, ll. 1–2).²⁸ Any of the *epoikoi* (of free status and the son of free parents) who wanted to obtain the citizenship of Dyme could get it through the payment of a sum of money (ll. 3–8). Therefore, we are not dealing here with a grant of *politeia* for honorific purposes, but with the sale of local citizenship rights, whose precise amount, lost in lacuna, should have been quite relevant indeed, since it was split into two instalments.²⁹ The following text (ll. 8–25) provides some regulations concerning the extension of citizenship rights to underage offspring and unmarried daughters, and the request for *politeia* by widows. Finally, the last part of the inscribed text (ll. 25 ff.) contains provisions dealing with the admission of new citizens to the civic body of Dyme and the actions accompanying their official membership (registration, oath, payment of fees, tribal affiliation, etc.).

The text of the decree contains references to the Achaean *koinon*: the first two mentions concern the official chronology and calendar of the federal state

²⁷ Freitag (2012) 92 (see here below, Part II.3).

²⁸ Rizakis, *Achaïe* III n° 3, ll. 1–2.

²⁹ On the sale of citizenship in the epigraphical evidence from Dyme, see Saba (2010) 402–404.

(Achaean *grammateus* as eponymous official, l. 4; Achaean months, l. 6);³⁰ the third one was much more significant, but it is very controversial:

[και κοινω]νεόντω θεοκολιάν, ἄν ἄ πόλις καθιστᾶι ἐν
[τᾶι φυλαί τᾶι] ἑαυτῶν, καὶ ἀρχείων τῶν τε εἰς τὸ Κοινὸν
[καὶ τὰν πόλιν^{c.7} ...]ας τὰς τε εἰς τὸ Κοινὸν ΚΑΙΓ⁻ [.]

It must be observed at the outset that the limestone stele, now lost, was extremely poorly preserved at its discovery, and it became even more effaced over the course of time. As a consequence, the edition of Rizakis (whose ll. 32–34 are quoted above) is necessarily based on Martha’s diplomatic transcription of 1878 (from a squeeze and an apograph), without a direct examination of the stone.³¹ According to the editor, the last lines of the decree dealt with rights and, possibly, the fiscal obligations of new citizens. The latter were allowed to hold both religious roles, according to their tribal affiliation, and political offices at either the local or federal level: εἰς τὸ Κοινὸν καὶ τὰν πόλιν, according to Rizakis’ restoration.³² Based on his reading, the decree from Dyme has thus become an exemplary case study for double *politeia*.³³ In the 1990 edition of the Dyme decree, Rizakis wrote: ‘les restitutions de la dernière ligne du texte étant douteuses nous éviterons de faire un commentaire’.³⁴ At a later stage, however, he confirmed the earlier hypothesis, suggesting a full restoration of the last line:

30 The fragmentary text in ll. 3–4 (δόντα [– – – ἐπὶ γρα]μματέος τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς Μενανδρίδα) is generally misinterpreted as a reference to the fact that the payment should have been submitted to the Achaean secretary (so Mackil [2013] 261; more nuanced Rizakis [1990] 112, 122). But Ockham’s razor, I think, rather suggests that we are dealing with an eponymous formula; such reading is confirmed by the second reference to the Achaean *grammateus* Menandridas on l. 9: εἰ δὲ μὴ δοίη | [τὸ ἔλον ἐν τῷ ἐνι]αυτῷ τῷ ἐπὶ Μενανδρίδα, ἀλλὰ | [καθυστερῖζοι], μὴ ἔστω αὐτῷ ἄ πολιτεία (ll. 8–10). The general sense is thus as follows: the sale of citizenship of Dyme was not a permanent provision, but was established for the current year (ll. 3–4); moreover, the entire sum had to be paid within the same year; otherwise, the purchaser would have been debarred from the grant of citizenship (ll. 8–10).

31 Rizakis (1990) 110–123; slight revisions in Rizakis, *Achaïe* 111 n° 3 (see further). *Ed. princ.* Martha (1878) 94–96 n° 2; for further references about the inscription’s history and editions, see also Bingen (1954) 86–87; Mackil (2013) 455–458.

32 Rizakis (1990) 123.

33 See Mackil (2013) 387–388, with the discussion here below.

34 Rizakis (1990) 123.

L'acquisition de l'identité fédérale donnait au bénéficiaire des droits et des devoirs aussi bien dans le cadre de sa cité particulière que dans celui du *koinon*. Ce principe est illustré dans un décret dyméen, attribuant le droit de cité local à des étrangères: [I will come back to this point later] 'qu' ils participent (i.e. les nouveaux citoyens) aux magistratures religieuses qui la cité établit dans le cadre de leur tribu et aux magistratures civiles concernant la confédération et la cité et qu' ils participent également aux taxes et aux impositions concernant aussi bien le *koinon* etc.'.³⁵

I shall challenge the now-canonical interpretation by pointing at two key features, the first related to the *epoikoi*, the second to the use of the term *κοινόν* in ll. 33 and 34. As for the former, I wonder if we can be confident enough to claim that 'the *epoikoi* referred to in this decree were certainly non-Achaean'.³⁶ In fact, I believe that this statement is not sufficiently buttressed by the evidence. No positive clues exist that these 'supplementary settlers', whose sole prerequisite was to be of a free condition, were in fact coming from outside the Achaean federation, and not simply from outside the polis of Dyme, which seems preferable. One might suppose that we are dealing here with individuals who were already deeply integrated into the Dymaeon community, along with their wives and offspring. Nothing prevents us from surmising that they were already endowed with isopolitic status and with specific economic rights (*enktesis*). Moreover, they were able to pay money to become citizens of Dyme. In all probability, the real issue at stake, in this respect, was not to become eligible for religious and political offices (this does not seem to have been the main interest for widows), but to be provided with full juridical guarantees for themselves, their families, and their properties, like every other *politai* of Dyme. Actually, I cannot see the reason why the Dyme decree, which had the effect of considerably increasing the revenues of the polis for the current year, should have been applied only to non-Achaean residents, while excluding fellow federal citizens. Moreover, it is definitely not possible to ascertain the precise nature of the Dymaeon *epoikoi*. Nonetheless, it seems plausible to put forth the hypothesis that their group was largely composed of Achaean citizens, coming from

35 Rizakis (2012) 33 and n. 58: [καὶ κοινῶ]νεόντω θεοκολιάν, ἀν ἅ πόλις καθιστάι | [ἐν ταῖ φυλαί ταῖ] ἑαυτῶν, καὶ ἀρχείων τῶν τε εἰς τὸ κοινόν | [καὶ τὰν πόλιν φόρον καὶ τὰς εἰσφορ]ὰς τὰς [τε] εἰς τὸ κοινὸν κα(γ)γ[ραφὰς]. I am yet afraid that the supplement in the first part of l. 34 is extremely dubious, since the restored text clearly exceeds the foreseeable width of the lacuna.

36 Mackil (2013) 262.

other member *poleis*, and, secondly, of possible resident aliens, bestowed of some basic rights in the Achaean territory.³⁷

Let us mention a further point. I believe that the supposed reference to the Achaean federal state—identified in the occurrences of the term κοινόν in ll. 33 and 34, and in the arguably dubious restoration [καὶ τὰν πόλιν] in l. 34—results from a biased reading of the inscription, itself a product of modern concepts about Greek federalism. In fact, the last fragmentary lines of the Dyme decree have been interpreted in the light of the ‘double citizenship’ model, and they have become exemplar evidence for the ‘vertical diversion of powers’ (Beck) in Greek federal states: though in fact, this might not be the preferable solution. Its main weakness lies in the interpretation of the word κοινόν. Modern scholars, as a matter of fact, often use *koinon* (and *koina*) as a term indicating the Greek federal state as such. However, this usage does not conform with that found in Greek public documents, where τὸ κοινόν—when it pertains to federations in the sense of ‘state community’ or ‘government’—does not occur if not accompanied by the genitive plural of the *ethnos* concerned (i.e. τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, τῶν Αἰτωλῶν, τῶν Βοιωτῶν, etc.). An expression such as εἰς τὸ Κοινὸν καὶ τὰν πόλιν has no strict parallel in inscriptions, and it raises all sorts of doubts.³⁸ To the best of my knowledge, the only comparable evidence comes from two honorific decrees of the Thessalian *koinon*, SEG 51, 723 and SEG 26, 688, which give the following formulaic expression: ἐν τῷ κοινῷ καὶ ἐν ἐκάσῃτι πόλει.³⁹

However, the overall context of those documents is quite different from the decree of Dyme. The main difference lies in the fact that the former were, as said above, decrees issued by the Thessalian federal state. They ensured that the honourands would be regarded as *euergetes* by the federal state and by each member polis. This may find parallels in several decrees of the Thessalian *koinon*, where the clause about the conferral of federal citizenship is coupled with the formula ἐμ πάσαις ταῖς ἐν Θεσσαλίαι / κατὰ Θεσσαλίαν πόλεσιν. Further-

37 This evidence seems coherent with the preceding remarks on the Naupaktian casualty list IG IV².1 28, where Achaeans and *synoikoi* were gathered together under a joint title. On the *epoikoi* of Dyme decree, see discussion in Rizakis (1990) 112; Mackil (2013) 261.

38 See, for comparison, Peek, *Asklepion* n° 80 (ca. 182 BC): ἁ πόλις τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων Ἀριστόδαμον Νικοχράτο[υς] ἀρετὰς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας, ἂν ἔχων διατελεῖ | εἷς τε τὰν πόλιν (*scil.* τῶν Ἐπιδαυρίων) καὶ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν [Ἀ]χαιῶ[ν].

39 SEG 51, 723 = Helly (2001) 265–266 (second century BC), ll. 4–5: μετέχειν δὲ αὐτοὺς [τῶν] | ἐν [τῷ κοινῷ] καὶ (ἐν ἐκάσῃ)τι πόλει [τιμίω]. SEG 26, 688 = Habicht (1976) (= Habicht [2006] 124–133, ca. 179–65 BC), ll. 15–18: καὶ εἶναι αὐτοὺς [προ|ξένου]ς τοῦ κοινοῦ Θεσσαλῶν καὶ ὑπάρχ[ειν | ὄσα καὶ] τοῖς ἄλλοις εὐεργέταις τίμια καὶ ἐ[ν] | τῷ κ[οι]νῷ καὶ ἐν ἐκάσῃτι πόλει.

more, one of those inscriptions mentioned above contains provisions about the proclamation of the crown in each Thessalian polis.⁴⁰ Finally, it is worth noting that, in the formula ἐν τῷ κοινῷ καὶ ἐν ἐκάστη πόλει, the opposition seems to lie between the adjectives κοινός and ἕκαστος rather than between τὸ κοινόν and ἡ πόλις. In *SEG* 51, 723 and *SEG* 26, 688 the Thessalian federal state exerts its authority over the member cities, demanding that the honours bestowed by the central political power be acknowledged and approved in each polis. This provision can be seen as a further guarantee for the honourands. Conversely, the reason why the decree from Dyme should have mentioned the dispatch of representatives and fiscal contributions to the Achaean *koinon* does not seem equally clear, since this matter falls outside the domain of the polis' internal sovereignty, and belongs eminently to the sympolitic relationship between the member *poleis* and the Achaean federal state.

Rizakis' interpretation seems rather problematic. It is not necessary to read the occurrences of κοινόν in the Dyme decree as a reference to the Achaean federal state. This term can easily refer to the polis of Dyme, i.e. to the political community and to the full set of polis institutions, into which the new citizens would have been admitted. As a consequence, it seems preferable to think that the Dyme decree was referring to τὸ κοινὸν τᾶς πόλεως (i.e. the political community of the Dymaeans), rather than τὸ Κοινὸν καὶ τὰν πόλιν (i.e. the federal and the local level).⁴¹ Given the impossibility of ascertaining Martha's reading of the last lines preserved on the stele, I shall refrain from suggesting here any restorations. Nonetheless, I believe that the interpretation of *koinon* in ll. 33 and 34 as a term referring to the city's government is preferable. In fact, besides finding parallels in epigraphic documents, this interpretation does not run into contradictions with the division of powers between the federal state and the member *poleis*. Moreover, it does not necessarily rule out the possibility that the *epoikoi* who obtained Dymaeian citizenship might have been Achaeans as well.

40 *SEG* 51, 723, ll. 5–7: ἀνακηρυχθῆ|ναι δὲ τὸν στέφανον ἐμ πάσαις ταῖς | κατὰ Θεσσαλίαν πόλεσιν.

41 See, for parallels, *IG* IX.1² 460, 461a, 461b, *BCH* 59, 1935: 37 face A (from Krannon, attesting the formulas ἔδοξε τοῦ κοινοῦ τᾶς πόλιος and εὐεργετὲς τὸ κοινὸν τᾶς πόλιος); references to τὸ κοινὸν τᾶς πόλεως occur, significantly, in the oath of Alexander's *diagramma* for the Tegean exiles (*Syll.*³ 306, 324 BC, see l. 62); compare also the oath in the *sympoliteia* treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos (McCabe, *Smyrna* n^o 14, 245–3 BC?, see ll. 77–78: καὶ μετουσίαν αὐτοῖς δώσω τῶν τε ἀρχαίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων | τῶν κοινῶν τῆς πόλεως, ὧν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πολῖται μετέχουσιν).

2.2 *Koinon of the Achaeans, Epidauros: Agreement between the Epidaurians and the Achaeans (Epidauros Joins the Achaean Koinon), 243 BC*

With this second example, we are dealing again with an extremely fragmentary inscription, whose general content can only be sketched out in broad terms, but whose surviving text nonetheless provides us with some interesting clues.⁴² This stele, of which two non-joining fragments on the left edge are today preserved, must have originally contained an agreement (*homologia*) between the Achaeans and the city of Epidauros, regulating the voluntary joining of the latter to the Achaean federal state.⁴³ Since Epidauros became a member of the Achaean *koinon*, and the Epidaurians were thus integrated into the Achaean *politeia*, it is possible to say that the Epidaurians drew up a pact of *sympoliteia* with the Achaeans, or, better, using the words of Polybius, that they προσελήφθησαν εἰς τὴν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν συμπολιτείαν. This remark, nonetheless, must not lead us to do what Peek did in his 1969 re-publication of the Epidaurian inscription, that is to say, to use our modern notion of *sympoliteia* when restoring an ancient epigraphic text. In *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros* n° 25, Peek suggested the following restoration, which would have been rightly rejected by the later editors: ἀγαθὰί τύχαι. [ἐ]πι τοῖσδε [ἐπόησ]αν? [ὁμολογίαν τοῖ Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ τοῖ Ἐπιδαύριοι· συμπολιτεῖαν εἶμεν τοῖς Ἐπιδαυ]οῖς καὶ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐψαφίσι[θ]α[ι -----] (lines 1–2). Such a formula containing the term συμπολιτεῖα does not find any exact correspondence in inscriptions, in particular in those dealing with a federal context. Moreover, the same epigraphic document attests the deverbal noun deriving from συμπολιτεῖω through the wholly unusual form συμπολιτευσῖς.⁴⁴ This epigraphic *hapax* makes even less acceptable the restoration of a variant συμπολιτεῖα in the sanction clause, all the while stressing how non-strictly technical and quasi extemporaneous the use of the notion of common citizenship in the inscriptions of the Greek federal states was. But what

42 *IG IV².1 70* (= *SEG* II, 401 [Mitsos (1937) 708–714] = *Staatsvertr.* III.489) + *IG IV².1 59*; the two fragments were joined by Peek, *Asklepieion* n° 25 (Ager [1996] n° 38.1; Magnetto [1997] n° 36.1, on ll. 1–24; Mackil [2013] 459–461 T37). See Freitag (2012) 87.

43 According to Mitsos (1937) 708–714, followed by the later scholars. The agreement, in its turn, may have been ratified by a decree of the Achaean *koinon*, see for comparison *IG V.2 334* = *Syll.*³ 490 (Orchomenos' entrance into the Achaean *koinon*, 235–229 BC), ll. 8–10: ὁ[μ]νύω Δία Ἀμάριον, Ἀθάναν Ἀμαρίαν, Ἀφρ[οδ]ίτην καὶ τοῦ[ς] θε[ο]ὺς πάντας, ἧ μὴν ἐν | πᾶσι· ἐμμε[ν]εῖν ἐν ταῖς στάλαι καὶ ταῖς ὁμολογίαι καὶ τῶι ψαφίσματι [τῶι γεγονότι τῶι | κοί]ν[ω]ι τῶι τ[ῶ]ν Ἀχαιῶν. On the integration of new member states into the Achaean federation, see Rizakis (2008), 274–278; Freitag (2012) 86–88.

44 Peek, *Asklepieion* n° 25 ll. 38–39.

is the precise context in which ἡ συμπολίτευσις is used? The term belongs to the second fragment of the stele (ll. 27–41). This was originally published as a separate entry by Hiller (*IG IV².1 59*), and it was successively attached with *IG IV².1 70* by Peek (see above). Whereas the lines 1–26 of the stele deal with the relationships between Epidauros and the Achaean *koinon*, regulating the rights and duties of the new member polis within the federal state, the text of the second fragment concerns a different class of subjects. I reproduce below, for the reader's ease, ll. 27–42 of Peek's edition:

[...⁹...]δε[-----
-----]
[..⁶...]ι?αν ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι [-----
-----]
[...]ει καὶ ὑπέχετ[αι-----
-----]
30 [...]α καὶ ἄ γενεὰ αὐ[-----
-----]
κάτ ταῦτὰ ποιείτω [----- εἰ δέ κα-----
-----εἰς]
Ἐπίδαυρον γαμήται, δι[-----
-----]
τῶν ἐν Ἀχαιαίαι συναλ[λαγμάτων-----
----- κάτ]
τοὺς τὰς πόλιος νόμους [-----
-----τῶν]
35 συναλλαγμάτων ἄ κάτ τ[-----
----- ὦι]-
κησε ἐν Ἐπιδαύρωι, ὅστε[ρον δέ-----
-----]
ἐν ταῖ βουλᾶι τῶν Ἐπιδα[υρίων-----
----- τάν]
μὲν συμπολίτευσιν μὴ σ[υγχωρήσαι-----
-----εἴ κα ἐμ]-
πολιτεύσῃται κατὰ χρέος [-----
-----]
40 [...]ει ἔστε κα παύσητ[α]ι [-----
-----]
[-----
-----]

It is worth noting that the general context, although extremely fragmentary, seems to have had many points of contact with what we have observed about the decree of Dyme. In fact, it is possible to assume that this part of the stele contained some provisions concerning the other Achaeans who would eventually come to live in Epidauros. This hypothesis can find support in a parallel piece of evidence, viz. the agreement for the entrance of Arkadian Orchomenos into the Achaean federation,⁴⁵ which includes the following provision (ll. 11–13): τῶν δὲ λαβόντων ἐν Ὀρχομενῶν κλᾶρον ἢ οἰκίαν, ἀφ' οὗ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐγένοντο, μὴ ἐξέστω μῆθηνὶ ἀπαλλοτριῶν[σα]ι ἐτέων εἴχοσι. That is to say: everyone who, by virtue of having gotten the Achaean federal *politeia*, buys an estate or a house in Orchomenos (the latter, in its turn, now a member of the Achaean *koinon*) is bound not to alienate it before twenty years have elapsed. It is easy to understand that, when a new member polis was entering into the federal state, a major goal of the Achaeans was to safeguard the general cohesion of their union and the enduring loyalty of all their members through ensuring the mobility of the federal citizens within the integrated territories. Therefore, it is not surprising that the agreement from Epidauros also included some provisions regarding the Achaeans who would come to live in the city.

In l. 28 the surviving text refers to something (in the accusative case) that was 'in Epidauros'. I wonder if an expression such as [γὰρ? / κλᾶρον? ἢ οἰκίαν]ῶν ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ could be hypothesized here, on the base of the Orchomenos inscription IG V.2 334, ll. 11–13. The verb ὑπέχω in the following line (the present imperative ὑπέχετ[ω ----] seems to me preferable to the mid-passive indicative ὑπέχετ[αι ----], see l. 31: ποιεῖτω) could belong to a legal context, maybe to the clauses regarding a sort of judiciary convention between the federal state and the polis that granted legal protection for the rights to ownership, or it could give procedural rules for disputes over property rights between the Achaean settlers and citizens of Epidauros. In particular, ὑπέχω might have referred to someone liable to be arraigned, tried, or punished (ὑπέχω δίκαν) for some kind of noncompliance. The expression κατὰ ταῦτά ποιεῖτω in l. 31 could imply a clause of reciprocity in the law, which is a proper element of a judicial agreement. The otherwise unknown conditions set up here were extended to the descendants of the persons concerned (l. 30). This detail, reminiscent of some aspects of the decree of Dyme, may reinforce the hypothesis that this paragraph concerned the right of the Achaeans to *enktesis*.

45 IG V.2 334 = Syll.³ 490 = IPArk n°16 (Ager [1996] n° 43; Mackil [2013] 462–466 n° 39), see above, n. 43.

The other basic right of the federal *politeia*, the *epigamia*, is evoked in line 32 by the verb *γαμῆται*, and it goes without saying that the union referred to here was more precisely an intermarriage between Epidaurian and Achaean individuals. The passive diathesis of the verb tells us that this line dealt with women's status. Perhaps, provisions about widows (see, again, the decree from Dyme) and their properties can be hypothesized here with a certain degree of credibility. The following lines concerned the stipulation of contracts (*συν-αλλάγματα*), of which the decree probably specified the normative framework and the competent court in case of controversies. Since in line 33 contracts 'in Achaea' are mentioned, whereas in the two following lines the surviving text refers respectively to 'the laws of the polis' and to a second kind of contracts, it is possible to hypothesize that the decree distinguished between transactions to be concluded on the basis of local regulations and transactions to be concluded on the basis of federal regulations. The words [---- ὡ]κησε ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ, ὅστε[ρον δὲ ----] may suggest the presence of a clause, whose content was analogous to that in the Orchomenos inscription *IG* v.2 334 (ll. 11–13). The settlers were bound to live in Epidauros (οἰκέω ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ) until a certain number of years had elapsed. Thereafter (ἄστερον δὲ), certain matters related to the settlers' status in Epidauros should have been submitted to the polis' approval (ἐν τᾷ βουλᾷ τῶν Ἐπιδα[υρίων ----]). The case of a lack of approval seems to be envisaged in line 38, whereas the following line might deal with the possibility of being integrated into the Epidaurian *politeia* (ἐμπολιτεύω, or else πολιτεύω) with a fee (*κατὰ χρέος*). This detail is very interesting, since it presents again the issue of the sale of local citizenship to fellow federal citizens, like the one we observed in the decree from Dyme. As for the last sentence, ἔστε κα παύσηται ('until he would stop doing sth.?',) we cannot find any satisfying explanation. The possible interpretation suggested by Hiller in the footnotes (*'videtur homo aliquid peccasse' ...: ἔστε κα παύσητ[α]ι [εἰργέσθαι δὲ τὰς πόλιος ----]*) does not seem to me suited to this context. These words might refer instead to the settlement of an amount due, or to the conclusion of some other sort of action, such as the ending of outstanding litigations.⁴⁶

46 The use of the verb *παύω* in public inscriptions is largely uncommon; for instance, it appears in the *dossier* of laws about the Athenian *boule IG* I³ 105 (ca. 409 BC), where it refers to the term of office of the Councillors (see l. 45: *πρὶν παύεσθαι τῆς ἀρχῆ[ς]*). More significantly in respect to the present case, the same verb occurs twice in the judicial agreement between the Arkadian Stymphalos and Demetrias (Sikyon), *IPArk* n°17 (303–300 BC), where it refers to the ending of the courts' work (see ll. 17–18: "and the members of the courts on the tenth day after full moon ... shall stop mediating"; ll. 33–34: "and

Unfortunately, this inscription is too poorly preserved to allow something more secure than mere hypotheses.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, the observations above should not be taken as an exercise of imagination. In fact, the scant elements that are deducible from the surviving text can be interpreted as a coherent whole, consistent with other epigraphic evidence in Achaëa.

2.3 *Koinon of the Triphylians, Makistos: Two Federal Decrees Granting Citizenship (ca. 400–369 BC)*

Further information on the issue of federal citizenship is provided by two inscriptions on bronze plaques pertaining to the ephemeral and scarcely known Tryphilian federal state.⁴⁸ These two documents, although both issued by the Triphylians, seem to attest to two opposing types of *politeia*.

The first document was engraved on a bronze disk of uncertain provenance, now preserved in the Louvre Museum. It has been dated slightly later than the second one on palaeographic and linguistic grounds,⁴⁹ but it belongs plainly to the period of the existence of the Triphylian state.

θ[εο]ί : ἔδωκαν : τοί : Τριφύλιοι : Πυλάδαι : καὶ Γνάθωνι : καὶ Π[ύ]ρωι :
πολιτήϊαν : καὶ ἀτέλειαν : πάντων , αὐτοῖς : καὶ γένει . : δαμιουργοί : τοί ἀμφί
Ὀλυμπιόδωρον.

This inscription reports the abridged text of a citizenship decree issued by the Triphylians and dated through the eponymous *damiourgos* Olympiodoros.⁵⁰ Due to the nature of the object itself, and to the elliptical formulation of the engraved text, it is not unlikely that the *diskos* had been made at the honou- rands' expense for their own prestige and safeguard. But was it more for prestige or for safeguard that the decree was published? It depends on how we interpret the grant of citizenship in this text. Some scholars suggest that the *politeia* here granted was merely honorific, that is to say that it was detached from any real participation in Triphylian political life, and did not imply residence in one

the registered (conciliators?) shall arbitrate before the court stops judging", transl. by Arnautoglou [1998] 100 n°106).

47 Any restoration is made difficult by the complete uncertainty about the original length of the lines. If the gap's width suggested by Hiller von Gaertringen seems really too narrow, the one determined in Peek's edition is based only on the restoration of line 1.

48 On the Triphylian state see Nielsen (1997) 148–155; Ruggeri (2004) 64–140.

49 Ruggeri (2007) 93–94.

50 *SEG* 40, 392 = Hallof (1990) 43–44 = Minon (2007) n° 29. See also Nielsen (1997) 148–149; Ruggeri (2007) 133–136.

of the Triphylian *poleis*, nor integration into a local *politeia*.⁵¹ Certainly, we can state that it was a federal citizenship, since it was bestowed by the Triphylians, and no other specification is made. In fact, an honorific grant of *politeia* did not have any practical consequence. Therefore, I wonder to what extent the conferral of the Triphylian *politeia* together with the total exemption from public burdens could have been purely ornamental in this context. In reality, it is hardly even worth bringing up the idea of a merely honorific grant. As we have already seen above, the *politeia* bestowed by a federal state is, more or less always, a potential citizenship (*isopoliteia*), to be implemented through residence in a member polis, and the acquisition of its local citizenship. On the other hand, it brings together a series of civil rights (*enktesis, epigamia*) that are equally enjoyed by any federal citizen independently from the bestowal of citizenship from one of the member *poleis* and the consequent attainment of full political rights at both the local and federal level. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the engraving and public disclosure (maybe in a sacred place, as the typology of the support indicates) of the Triphylian decree was aimed mainly at safeguarding the rights given to the three honourands. Nonetheless, no definitive answer can be given, since the provenance of the inscription (written in a sort of local *koine* with Doric colouring, and not in the Elean dialect)⁵² is unknown.

There is also a further issue: it is doubtful whether Pyladas, Gnathon, and Pyros could have been integrated into a member polis as residing citizens. Under the word *πολιτηίαν*, two additional letters can be detected. These letters are of uncertain reading: ΓΝ, ΠΝ, ΓΛ, ΠΛ have been offered as plausible readings.⁵³ Their interpretation is controversial: the abbreviation could be related to an *ethnikon*,⁵⁴ or to the Triphylian polis where the honoured man had finally been 'registered'.⁵⁵ If the latter hypothesis holds true (the former seems to me to be quite unlikely), Pyladas, Gnathon, and Pylos would have enjoyed not only a sympolitical status, but full citizenship rights through their membership in a local polis. However, the engraving of the two additional letters under the word *πολιτηίαν* could also have been unintentional; in this case, they might not necessarily relate to citizenship, and, in particular, to the implementation of the federal *politeia* through the attainment of a local one. I wonder if an abbreviation of a proper name might be restored as well.⁵⁶

51 Hallof (1990) 44; Ruggeri (2007) 94, 136.

52 Minon (2007) 195; Ruggeri (2007) 93.

53 Ruggeri (2007) 135 n. 393.

54 Jacobsthal (1933) 30.

55 Ruggeri (2007) 135.

56 Maybe the name of the one that commissioned the inscribed *diskos* at its own expense?

While the disk of the Louvre most probably concerns the conferral of the Triphylian federal *politeia* as a 'lower degree citizenship' (see above, *Part I*), the second decree, on the contrary, attests unequivocally to the full political integration of the honourands into a local polis and, therefore, into the Triphylian state itself.⁵⁷

ἔδοξε τοῖρ Τριφυλοῖοιρ ὄσσοι ἐν τοῖ
 πίνακι ἐνηγράφενται Μακιστί-
 οῖρ ἤμεν· αἱ δέ τιρ συλαία τὰμ
 πολιτείαν αἴτε ἐκ τελέων
 5 ἀποστέλλοι δικαίωρ πο-
 λιτειομένοιρ καὶ κατ
 τὸν (νόμον), ἀσεβήτω ποτ τὰρ Ἄ-
 θάναρ. Δαιμάχῳ δαμιω-
 ργῶ, κατακόω Ἀγησιδά-
 10 μω, Δίω μῆγός· (*twelve names follow*)

This evidence is rather striking, since it attests a patent exception to the rule of the division of sovereignty (see above) between federal states and member *poleis*. In fact, contrary to normal practice in a federal citizenship decree, the Triphylian *koinon* confers here the local *politeia* of one of its member *poleis* (Makistos) to twelve individuals, thus interfering in the internal autonomy of the Makistians.⁵⁸ As far as I know, this inscription represents the only occurrence of such a phenomenon, whereas the possible further cases evoked in this respect by Nielsen cannot actually be considered a perfect parallel.⁵⁹ There-

In fact, the reading ΓΝ (Jacobstahl) could be related to the name Γνάθων, but to none of the Tryphylian *poleis*.

57 SEG 35, 389 = Siewert (1987) = Minon (2007) n° 28. See also Nielsen (1997) 149; Ruggeri (2007) 133–137; Freitag (2012) 85–86; Rizakis (2012) 30.

58 On Makistos and its membership in the Triphylian *koinon*, see Nielsen (2002) 234–237.

59 Nielsen (1997) 149, citing Rhodes (1995) 108 on some decree issued by the Nesiotic League in the third century BC (*IG XI.4* 1038, 1039, 1040, 1045, 1046), where citizenship rights are conferred ἐ[ν] πάσαις ταῖς νήσοις ὅσαι μετέχουσιν τοῦ συνεδρίου. These examples are far from being comparable to the Triphylian decree SEG 35, 389. First, one must take into account that the League of the Islanders cannot be considered a real federal state, but rather 'a superstructure over and above the individual member *poleis*, which assumes some of the sovereign powers of those states. But it does not completely absorb those states.' (Meadows [2013] 34). Second, the Triphylian decree SEG 35, 389 concerns the naturalization of individuals into a specific member polis, whereas, in the case of the Islanders' decrees (that rather recall closely the Thessalian citizenship decrees mentioned

fore, it is necessary to ask ourselves if we are dealing here with a real exception. Siewert has assumed that the Makistians were a local subdivision of the Triphylians, namely one *phyle* of the ‘Tri-phylioi’. In this way, the naturalization procedure would be far from unusual, since the Makistians would indeed be an institutional subgroup of the Triphylian state, devoid of any political autonomy in matters concerning citizenship.⁶⁰ But Siewert’s assumption is weak in many respects, and has been rejected.⁶¹ Nielsen, in particular, has stressed the fact that the Triphylians were actually a federal state, made up of *poleis*, and that Makistos was a freestanding polis during the period of operation of the Triphylian federation.⁶² Freitag has correctly noted that the presence of a double *politeia*, as is inferable from the two decrees here presented, is a sufficient reason for considering the Triphylian union a federal state.⁶³ That being the case, I think it better to admit that this decree is just one of the empirical exceptions to the theoretic rules of federal citizenship. We must take into account that the interference of the Triphylian federation in the internal autonomy of Makistos could probably find a better reason in the history of the Triphylian *koinon*. But unfortunately, we have little information about the geopolitical balance of power within this small Elean state; on the other hand, we have no idea about the concrete circumstances (perhaps of emergency?⁶⁴) in which our citizenship decree has been issued. Certainly, one should not exclude the possibility that the decree of the Triphylians was the final ratification of an initiative carried out by Makistos.⁶⁵ The terse formulation of the inscribed text, where a sacral context seems to prevail over a merely institutional one,⁶⁶ indeed leaves such a possibility open. Nonetheless, we should not overlook the fact that the main part of the text is made up of clauses aimed at pro-

above, see pp. 91–92), we are not dealing with provisions that have been issued by the central power and imposed on a single member state, but rather with provisions that have been arranged by all the federated *poleis* within the common *synedrion*, and successively implemented inside each polis (see *IG XI.4* 1038, ll. 29–37: τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα | τότε ἀναγράψαι εἰ[ς] σ]τήλην λιθίνην καὶ ἀναθεῖ[ναι] τοὺς συνέδρους εἰ[ς] τὸ ἐν Δήλῳ ἱερόν· κατὰ | ταῦτα δὲ ψ[η]φισάσθωσαν αἱ μετέχουσαι τῶν πό[λ]εων τοῦ συνεδρίου καὶ ἀναγραφάτωσαν εἰς | στήλας λιθίνας τὸ δόγμα τότε καὶ ἀναθέτω[σαν] εἰς τὰ ἱερά ἐν οἷς καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τιμαὶ παρ’ ἐ[κ]άστοις τῶν νησιωτῶν εἰσιν ἀναγεγραμ[μέναι].)

60 Siewert (1987) 276.

61 Minon (2007) 187–188; Ruggeri (2007) 134–135.

62 Nielsen (1997) 149.

63 Freitag (2012) 86.

64 Minon (2007) 189.

65 Rizakis (2012) 30.

66 Boffo (1995) 128; Ruggeri (2007) 134.

tecting new citizens: those who eventually would have disallowed them from citizenship or from public office would have been accused of impiety against Athena, and, therefore, severely condemned (perhaps through exile).⁶⁷ These clauses, indeed, may be revelatory of a conflict between the federal government and the city of Makistos. The text's features, and the extreme paucity of epigraphic evidence for the Triphylian state and its official formularies, make it impossible for us to completely rule out the possibility that the integration of the twelve new citizens had been approved also by the Makistians, through a local decree. The real institutional procedure, therefore, might have been less uneven than it appears from this inscription. Nonetheless, the situation of conflict that emerges from the measures in lines 3–8 suggests at least a 'hearty recommendation' to the Makistians by the Triphylian central government: a recommendation that brings to mind the requests made by king Philip v to the Larissaeans, in the well-known politography inscription *Syll.*³ 543.

2.4 *Koinon of the Akarnanians, Stratos: Three Proxeny and Citizenship Decrees (Third Century BC)*

The issue of the relationships between federal and local political competences in the matter of citizenship can find further evidence in some Akarnanian inscriptions. *IG IX.1*² 391, 392, and 393 are third-century honorary decrees, respectively issued by the polis of Stratos (the first two), and by the Akarnanian *koinon* (the third one). The evidence provided by these three combined documents has not received due emphasis in the studies on federal citizenship, although, as we shall see further, it attests to a case of the bestowal of citizenship that is diametrically opposed to what we have seen here above, although it is likewise tricky.⁶⁸

The decree *IG IX.1*² 393, of which the first four lines are reprinted below, has been issued by the Akarnanian *koinon*. Although the prescript and the sanction formula are lost, the nature of the federal decree of *IG IX.1*² 393 can surely be inferred from the bestowed honours. Equally unknown are the honourand's name and provenance, but, for the same reasons, he must have necessarily been a foreigner.

....^{c.8} ν πρόξενον εἶναι τῶν [Ἀκαρ]-
(νάνων) [καὶ εὐεργ]έτην καὶ πολιτείαν εἶ[ναι]

67 Ruggieri (2007) 135.

68 A brief description in Freitag (2012) 88.

[αὐτῶι τῆς Ἀ]καρνανίας ἐν ὁποῖα[ι ἄν]
[βούληται π]όλει κτλ.

The formula 'let him have the citizenship of Akarnania in whatever city he wants' is particularly significant, since it links explicitly the enjoyment of federal *politeia* with the integration into a member polis. That being said, I am not able to determine whether this clause is here referring to the enjoyment of the basic rights of federal citizenship along with the faculty of residing in any Akarnanian city, or, conversely, to the enjoyment of full federal citizenship through naturalization into one of the Akarnanian member states. In both cases, the general point remains valid that the *politeia* bestowed by a federal state was almost always a kind of 'potential citizenship'.

The decrees IG IX.1² 391 and 392 contain a set of honours of the same typology as IG IX.1² 393, viz. *proxenia*, *politeia*, *enktesis*, *ateleia*, *enteleia*, *asylia*, and *asphaleia*. Moreover, just as in IG IX.1² 393, the two honoured individuals are both non-Akarnanians, coming respectively from Crete (Phaistos) and Euboea (Karystos). But here the problem arises, since the decrees IG IX.1² 391 and 392 are issued by the polis of Stratos (ἔδοξεν τῆι πόλει τῶν Στρατίων), and not by the Akarnanian *koinon*. Also in this case, we are dealing with a patent exception to the rule of the sharing of sovereignties. But this time, it is a member polis that intrudes upon the institutional competences of the federal state. In fact, at least in theory, the bestowal of local *politeia* on a foreigner implies that he also becomes automatically a citizen of the federal state. In order to solve such a puzzling case, we could be tempted to provide some 'normalizing' explanation, viz. that, actually, the bestowal of local *politeia* upon a non-Akarnanian did not produce any effect on a federal level, or else that the decrees IG IX.1² 391 and 392 followed a federal provision. Such hypotheses cannot be ruled out at all, but, nonetheless, they are hardly convincing.⁶⁹ Indeed, it is preferable to put aside any theoretical approach, and to consider the above inscriptions only as the historical product of a practice of citizenship within the Northwestern *ethnos* of the Akarnanians, and not within an 'ideal type' of Greek federal state. This is what Pierre Cabanes made clear in his article 'Public et privé dans le cadre de l' *ethnos* en Grèce ancienne'. Through an analysis of the three Akarnanian decrees IG IX.1² 391–393, and of other epigraphic documents from Akarnania, Epirus, and Aetolia, Cabanes highlights that, within such *ethne*, the political

69 As far as the latter is concerned, one must note the complete lack of any references to the Akarnanian federal state; if the Stratian decrees had been issued abiding by a federal initiative, this fact would have been rather striking.

and institutional practice was characterized by a much greater mixing between 'public' and 'private' activities, and, consequently, by a less clear-cut separation between central and local levels of power.⁷⁰

Alongside Cabanes' reading, it is possible to add some further observations on the particular features of Stratos and of its geopolitical role in the frame of the Akarnanian *ethnos*. Recently, I have analysed rather in detail the case of Stratos, which until 230 BC had been by far the most important city of Akarnania, and which had been able to catalyse around itself the territorial and institutional development of the Akarnanian federal state.⁷¹ Stratos, as far as it emerges from the scanty evidence available, was not only the capital city of the Akarnanians, but also a particular kind of urban settlement and political community, in which the features of the polis/city-state and of the *ethnos*/federal state were to some extent overlapping. It is therefore against this background that we must read the 'uneven' polis decrees IG IX.1² 391 and 392.

2.5 Koinon of the Aetolians, Delphi: Aetolian Decree and Letter of the kosmoi of (V)axos, Crete (200–170 BC)

In the previous pages, I have sometimes referred to the possibility that a foreign individual could be integrated into a federal state not only via the award of full citizen-rights (bestowed with the *politeia* of a member state), but also through the achievement of an 'isopolitic status', a sort of lower-level *politeia* that granted him some civil rights within the *ethnos*' territory.⁷² Significant evidence in support of this hypothesis is provided by the inscription Syll.³ 622, an epigraphic dossier from Delphi containing a decree of the Aetolians (part A) and a letter (part B) addressed to the Aetolian government by the *kosmoi* of the Cretan city of (V)axos.⁷³

70 Cabanes (1998) 441–449.

71 Lasagni (forthcoming).

72 On this issue, see in particular Freitag (2012) 92–94, who speaks about a sort of *metoikos*-status, or a special status of *isopoliteia*, whose existence can be inferred mainly from Aetolian inscriptions: 'Kontrovers diskutiert wird auch die Frage, ob es in den griechischen Bundesstaaten so etwas wie einen 'Metoiken'-Status gab oder Halb- bzw. Passivbürger existierten, d.h. Personen, die zwar in einem hellenistischen Koinon aufenthaltsberechtigt waren, aber nicht das volle Bürgerrecht besaßen. [...] Für den Aitolischen Bund lässt sich demnach mit einiger Sicherheit festhalten, dass dort ein Metoiken-Status bzw. ein Sonderstatus der Isopolitie-Aitolier existierte'.

73 Syll.³ 622A = IG IX.1² 178 (Aetolian decree); Syll.³ 622B = IC II v, 19 (letter of the Vaxian *kosmoi*). See also Gauthier (1972) 369–371; Ogden (1996) 291 (on Epikles' family status); Bursaelis (2003) 45–46; Chaniotis (2005) 493–494; Saba (forthcoming).

- A [στραταγέοντος τῶν Αἰτωλῶν τοῦ δεῖνος *ethnicum*, γραμμα]-
 [τεύοντος δ]ἔ βουλαῖς . α . δ[.^{c.6.}, τῶν δὲ Αἰτωλῶν γραμ]-
 [μ]ατεύοντος Φίλωνος τοῦ Ἀπ[----^{c.7}---- *ethnicum* ... · ἔδοξε]
 [τ]οῖς Αἰτωλοῖς· τ[ά]ν ἐ[πισ]τολ[άν] παρὰ τῶν κόσμων καὶ τὰς]
 5 [π]όλις τῶν Ὀαξίων ποτὶ τὸ κοινὸν [τῶν Αἰτωλῶν, περὶ Ἐπικλέ]-
 ρος, ὃς ἔστι μὲν Ὀάξιος, κατ[ο]ικεῖ δὲ [ἐν Ἀμφίσσαι, ἀναθέμεν]
 ἔν τε Δελφοῖς καὶ ἐν Θέρμωι τὸν [γρ]α[μματέα Φίλωνα, καὶ]
 τὰν ἀναγραφὰν δόμεν Ἐπικλεῖ· [τὰν δὲ ἐπιμέλειαν τ]ὰν
 περὶ τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ποιήσασθαι ἐν νο[μίμωι ἐκκλησί]αι.
 B Φαξίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Αἰτωλῶ[ν συνέδροις] καὶ τῷ στρα-
 ταγῷ καὶ τῷ ἱππάρχῃ χαίρειν. γινώ[σκει]τε Ἐράτωνα πολί-
 ταν ἀμὸν ἰόντα, ἐκπλεύσαντα δὲ ἐπὶ στ[ρ]ατ[ε]ῖαν εἰς Κύπρον
 καὶ λαβόντα γυναῖκα τεκνοποιήσασθαι υ[ί]ου δὺο, Ἐπικλῆν
 5 καὶ Εὐαγόραν. συνέβα δὲ ἀποθανόντος τῷ Ἐράτωνα ἐν τῇ
 Κύπρῳ, αἰχμαλώτως γενέσθαι τὸν πε[ρ]ὶ τὸν Ἐπικλῆν καὶ
 τὰμ ματέρα αὐτῶν καὶ πρᾶθῆμεν τὸν Ἐπικλῆν εἰς Ἀμφισσαν
 καταβαλῶν δὲ τὰ λύτρα ὃ Ἐπικλῆς οἴκε[ί] παρ' ἡμῶν ἐν Ἀμφίσσαι,
 πολίτας ἰὼν ἀμὸς αὐτός τε κα[ὶ] τ[ά] τέκ[να αὐ]τῷ Ἐρασ[ιφῶ]ν [καὶ]
 10 Τιμώναξ καὶ θυγάτηρ Μελίτα. [καλῶς οὖν π]οιη(σ)εῖτε φροντίδ-
 δοντες ὅπαι εἴ τις κα ἀδικῆ α[ὐ]τῶς, κω]λύηται ὑφ' ἡμῶν [καὶ κοί]-
 νάι καὶ ἰδίαι, ἡ δὲ κοινοπολι[τείας] αἰδία ὑπάρχη ἀν[αγραφά].

Both the Cretans' request and the Aetolian decree issued in response deal with protective measures in favour of a Cretan man, Epikles, and with the safeguard of his rights in Aetolia. The personal and family history of Epikles, outlined in the letter itself (B ll. 2–10), sounds to a certain extent exceptional. Son of a Cretan mercenary of (V)axos, Epikles was made prisoner in Cyprus (where his father had previously moved), and brought to Amphissa, where he paid his ransom. At the time, Epikles was still living in Amphissa, in the Aetolian territory. It is believable that such a need for additional protection measures on Epikles' behalf was determined by the special circumstances of his arrival in Aetolia, and, on the other hand, by his privileged status within the Aetolian federal state, as a Cretan and (V)axian citizen. Epikles was not a mere *xenos* residing in Aetolia, but he held specific rights within the Aetolian *koinon*. In fact, the (V)axian *kosmoi* solicited not only the Aetolians' protection for Epikles, but also demanded that his '*koinopoliteia*' be maintained in public records (B ll. 10–12). In response to this, the Aetolian *koinon* provided for the letter to be exposed in Delphi and Thermos, whereas a third copy of the document was to be given to Epikles himself (A ll. 4–8). The epigraphic *hapax κοινοπολιτεία* is nothing but a neologism, used by the (V)axians

to indicate Aetolian federal citizenship, or, better, the isopolitic status enjoyed by Epikles in Aetolia.

At that time, the polis of (V)axos and the Aetolian *koinon* were tied to each other by an agreement of *isopoliteia*, attested in a fragmentary inscription from the Cretan city, dated to the end of the third or the beginning of the second century BC.⁷⁴ The information provided by the letter is aimed at defining a legitimate line of descent, which went from Epikles' father—evidently, the first of the family to be given Aetolian isopoliteia, as a citizen of (V)axos—up to Epikles' offspring, Erasiphon, Timonax, and Melita. It is worth stressing that the grandfather Eraton, the son Epikles, and the three nephews are all 'citizens of (V)axos' (B ll. 2–3, 9–10). The same status, in relation to Epikles, is recalled in the Aetolian decree (A l. 6). In this respect, we must not forget that Epikles had come to Aetolia as a captive, and that, since the agreement with the Aetolian federation applied only to legitimate citizens of (V)axos, Epikles' position must have been redeemed, for he could enjoy in Aetolia the rights to which he was entitled.

Epikles was a citizen of (V)axos who dwelled in Amphissa (A l. 6: κατοικέω; B l. 8: οἰκέω παρά ...). From the one side, therefore, he had maintained his ancestral *politeia*, without acquiring full citizenship rights in the Aetolian federation. From the other side, nonetheless, he enjoyed some basic civil rights (*enktesis* and *epigamia*), according to the *isopoliteia* agreement signed between his polis and the Aetolian *koinon*. Perhaps, the case of Epikles seems to us more exceptional than it was in reality, inasmuch as we know his history in some detail from *Syll.*³ 622. However, it is possible to assume that, also because of the large use of potential citizenship in interstate relations ruled by the Aetolian *koinon*, Epikles was part of a social category rather widespread in Aetolia. A large number of *asylia* treaties report the formula οἱ Αἰτωλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν Αἰτωλίᾳ κατοικοῦντες, or, alternatively, οἱ Αἰτωλοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν Αἰτωλίᾳ πολιτεύοντες. The two expressions were substantially interchangeable.⁷⁵ Combined together, they describe the midway political status of a non-negligible part of the Aetolian population, in which Epikles belonged.

74 IG IX.1² 193 = IC I v, 19. Commentary in Saba (forthcoming). On the Aetolian use of *asylia* and *isopoliteia* in its relationships with the communities of eastern Aegean, see Funke (2008) 253–267.

75 Freitag (2008) 92.

3 To Sum Up: 'De perto, ninguém é normal'

Certainly, it may seem not particularly appropriate to conclude an article on Greek institutional history quoting Caetano Veloso. Nonetheless, the idea that 'up close, nobody is normal' could be a golden rule not only for interpersonal relations, but also for an honest approach to ancient evidence, if only we translate it into our language: up close, no Greek federal state is an 'ideal type' of Greek federal state; no federal citizenship practice overlaps perfectly to a general theory of federal citizenship; none of the ancient documents relevant to federal *politeia* need to be normalized for being correctly interpreted, since they are nothing but the product of historical and geopolitical circumstances that occurred on a specific step of a long institutional development.

The epigraphic documents that have been analysed in Part II of this article are valuable, first and foremost, as evidence of the citizenship practice within the singular federal states in which they were issued. Besides this, however, such documents have been able to shed some light on all the major issues related to federal citizenship, viz. 1. the relationship between local and federal *politeia* (inscription 1 and 2); 2. the respective fields of competence of the federal state and of its member *poleis* in matters of citizenship (inscriptions 3 and 4); 3. the existence of various degrees of citizenship rights (inscription 5).

Bibliography

- Ager, S.L. 1997. *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337–90 BC*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Antonetti, C. 1990. *Les Étolieus. Images et Religion*. Paris.
- Arnaudoglou, I. 1998. *Ancient Greek Laws. A sourcebook*. London and New York.
- Bearzot, C. 2004. *Federalismo e autonomia nelle Elleniche di Senofonte*. Milano.
- Beck, H. 1997. *Polis und Koinon: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der Griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Stuttgart.
- Beck, H. 2001. "The Laws of the Fathers" versus "the Laws of the League". Xenophon of Federalism. *CPh* 96: 355–375.
- Bingen, J. 1954. Inscriptions d'Achaïe. *BCH* 78: 74–88.
- Boffo, L. 1995. Ancora una volta sugli "archivi" nel mondo greco. Conservazione e "pubblicazione" epigrafica. *Athenæum* 83: 91–130.
- Buraselis, K. 2003. Considerations on *Symmachia* and *Sympoliteia* in the Hellenistic Period. In *The Idea of European Community in History, 11. Aspects of Connecting Poleis and Ethne in Ancient Greece*, eds. K. Buraselis and K. Zoumboulakis, 39–50. Athens.

- Cabanes P. 1998. Public et privé dans le cadre de l'*ethnos* en Grèce ancienne. *Ktema* 23: 441–449.
- Chaniotis, A. 2004. Mobility of Persons during the Hellenistic Wars. State Control and Personal Relations. In *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée, de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne. Procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*, ed. C. Moatti, 481–500. Roma.
- Corsten, Th. 2006. Stammes- und Bundeskulte in Akarnanien. In *Kult-Politik-Ethnos: Überregionale Heiligtümer im Spannungsfeld von Kult und Politik. (Historia Einzelschriften, 198)*, eds. K. Freitag, P. Funke, and M. Haake, 157–167. Stuttgart.
- Dreher, M. 2003. *Symmachia* und *Sympoliteia* in der griechischen Welt bis 323 v. Chr. In *The Idea of European Community in History, 11. Aspects of Connecting Poleis and Ethne in Ancient Greece*, eds. K. Buraselis and K. Zoumboulakis, 29–38. Athens.
- Freitag, K. 2009. Achaëa and the Peloponnese in the Late Fifth—Early Fourth Centuries. In *The Politics of Ethnicity and the Crisis of the Peloponnesian League*, eds. P. Funke and N. Luraghi, 15–29. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Freitag, K. 2012. Zur Integration von Neubürgern in den griechischen Bundesstaaten in Hellenistischer Zeit—Ein Problemaufriss. In *Migration und Bürgerrecht in der Hellenistischen Welt*, ed. L.M. Günther, 83–95. Wiesbaden.
- Funke, P. 2008. Die Aitolier in der Ägäis. Untersuchungen zur sogenannten Seepolitik der Aitolier im 3. Jh. v. Chr. In *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosphorus. Kleinasien in der Antike, (Festschrift für E. Schwertheim zum 65. Geburtstag)*, ed. E. Winter, 253–267. Bonn.
- Gauthier, Ph. 1972. *Symbola. Les étrangères et la justice dans les cités grecques*. Nancy.
- Giovannini, A. 1971. *Untersuchungen über die Natur und die Anfänge der bundesstatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland*. Göttingen.
- Giovannini, A. 2003. Genèse et accomplissement de l'État fédéral de la Grèce antique à la Constitution Américaine de 1787–1789. In *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings, Vol. 11: Aspects of Connecting Poleis and Ethne in Ancient Greece*, eds. K. Buraselis and K. Zoumboulakis, 143–176. Athens.
- Giovannini, A. 2007. *Les relations entre les États dans la Grèce antique: Du Temps d'Homère à l'intervention Romaine (ca. 700–200 av. J.-C.)*, (*Historia Einzelschriften* 193). Stuttgart.
- Graninger, D. 2011. *Cult and Koinon in Hellenistic Thessaly*. Leiden.
- Habicht, Ch. 1976. Ambrakia und der Thessalische Bund zur Zeit des Perseuskrieges. In *Demetrias I*, eds. V. Milošević and D. Theodoridis, 175–180. Bonn.
- Habicht, Ch. 2006. Ambrakia and the Thessalian League at the Time of the War against Perseus. In Id., *The Hellenistic Monarchies. Selected Papers*, 134–147. Ann Arbor.
- Hallof, K. 1990. Zur Herkunft des Bronze-Diskos mit dem Beschluß der Triphylier. *APF* 36: 43–44.
- Helly, B. 2001. Un décret fédéral des Thessaliens méconnu dans une cité d'Achaïe Phthiotide (*IG IX 2, 103*). *BCH* 125: 239–287.

- Larsen, J.A.O. 1953. The Early Achaean League. In *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson*, eds. G.E. Mylonas and D. Raymond, 797–815. St. Louis.
- Larsen, J.A.O. 1971. The Rights of the Cities within the Achaean Confederacy. *CPh* 66: 81–86.
- Lasagni, C. 2011, *Il concetto di realtà locale nel mondo greco. Uno studio introduttivo nel confronto tra poleis e stati federali*. Roma.
- Lasagni, C. forthcoming. “Tribal poleis” in Northwestern Greece. *La Question de l’Espace au IV^e siècle av. J.-C.: continuités, ruptures, reprises*, eds. S. Montel and A. Pollini, (*DHA, Supplement* 15). Besançon.
- Lefèvre, F. 1998. Traité de paix entre Démétrios Poliorcète et la confédération étolienne (fin 289?). *BCH* 122: 109–141.
- Lehmann, A. 2001. *Ansätze zu einer Theorie des griechischen Bundesstaates bei Aristoteles und Polybios*. Göttingen.
- Mackil, E. 2003. *Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*, London, Berkeley, and Los Angeles.
- Magnetto, A. 1997. *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci. Introduzione, traduzione, testo critico e commento. Vol. II: Dal 337 al 196 a.C.* Pisa.
- McInerney, J. 2001. *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*. Austin.
- Meadows, A. 2013. The Ptolemaic League of Islanders. In *The Ptolemies, the Sea, and the Nile: Studies in Waterborn Power*, eds. K. Buraselis, M. Stefanou, and D.J. Thompson, 19–38. Cambridge.
- Minon, S. 2007. *Les Inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VI^e–II^e siècle avant J.-C.), Vol. 1, Textes*. Genève.
- Mitsos, M. 1937. Εἰς IG IV.2 1,170. *AEph* 111.76: 708–714.
- Morgan, C. 2003. *Early Greek States Beyond the Polis*. London and New York.
- Nielsen Th.H. 1997. Triphylia. An Experiment in Ethnic Constitution and Political Organisation. In *Yet more Studies in Ancient Greek Polis*, (*CPC* 14, *Historia Einzelschriften* 117), ed. Th.H. Nielsen, 129–162. Stuttgart.
- Nielsen Th.H. 2002. *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods (Hypomnemata, 140)*. Göttingen.
- Ogden, D. 1996. *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Period*. Oxford.
- Rizakis, A. 1990. La *politeia* dans les cités de la confédération achéenne. *Tyche* 5: 109–134.
- Rizakis, A. 2008. L’expérience de l’organisation intercivique et supracivique dans la confédération achéenne. In *Forme sovrappoleiche e interpoleiche di organizzazione nel mondo greco antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Lecce 17–20 Settembre 2008*, eds. M. Lombardo and F. Frisone, 274–289. Galatina.
- Rizakis, A. 2012. La double citoyenneté dans le cadre des *koina* grecs: l’exemple du *koinon* achéen. In *Patrie d’origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d’époque romaine, (Scripta Antiqua, 40)*, eds. A. Heller and A.V. Pont, 23–38. Bordeaux.

- Ruggeri, C. 2004. *Gli stati intorno a Olimpia. Storia e costituzione dell'Elide e degli stati formati dai perieci elei* (400–362 a.C.), (*Historia Einzelschriften* 170). Stuttgart.
- Rzepka, J. 2002. *Ethnos, Koinon, Sympoliteia* and Greek Federal States. In *Εὐεργεσίας χάριν. Studies Presented to Benedetto Bravo and Ewa Wipszyska by their Disciples*, (*The Journal of Juristic Papyrology, Suppl. 1*), eds. T. Derda, J. Urbanik, and M. Węcowski, 225–247. Warsaw.
- Saba, S. 2010. Greek Cities and Families. In *A Companion to Families in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. B. Rawson, 395–407. Chichester.
- Saba, S. forthcoming. *Isopolity in the Hellenistic Time*.
- Siewert, P. 1987. Eine neue Bürgerrechtsverleihung der Triphylier aus Mâsi bei Olympia. *Tyche* 2: 275–277.
- Vimercati, E. 2005. Plutarco e il federalismo (*Arat.* 24; *Philop.* 8). *Aevum* 79: 61–78.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2007. *Unthinking the Greek Polis. Ancient Greek History Beyond Eurocentrism*. Cambridge.
- Walbank, F.W. 1976–1977. Were There Greek Federal States? *SCI* 3: 27–51.