

Ethnos and Koinon

Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism

Edited by Hans Beck,
Kostas Buraselis and Alex McAuley



Franz Steiner Verlag

Umschlagabbildung:

Foundations of the so-called Treasury of the Boiotians in Delphi, Photo: Hans Beck

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist unzulässig und strafbar.

© Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2019

Druck: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-515-12217-7 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-515-12245-0 (E-Book)

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations.....	7
<i>Hans Beck, Kostas Buraselis, & Alex McAuley</i>	
Preface	9
<i>Emily Mackil</i>	
Ethnic Arguments	11
<i>Giovanna Daverio Rocchi</i>	
Lokrian Federal and Local Proxies in Interstate Relations: A Case Study	29
<i>Nikolaos Petrochilos</i>	
The Archaeological and Epigraphic Testimonies for the <i>ethnos</i> of the Western Lokrians	45
<i>Albert Schachter</i>	
The Boiotians: Between <i>ethnos</i> and <i>koina</i>	65
<i>Angela Ganter</i>	
Federalism Based on Emotions? Pamboiotian Festivals in Hellenistic and Roman Times	83
<i>Ruben Post</i>	
Integration and Coercion: Non-Boiotians in the Hellenistic Boiotian League	99
<i>Nikos Giannakopoulos</i>	
Euboian Unity in the 2 nd Century BCE and the Chalkidian Embassy at Amarynthos: The Limits of Roman-Sponsored Greek Federalism.....	113
<i>Alex McAuley</i>	
<i>Sans la lettre</i> : Ethnicity, Politics, and Religion in the Argive <i>theōria</i>	131
<i>Claudia Antonetti</i>	
Spearhead and Boar Jawbone – An Invitation to Hunt in Aitolia: 'Foreign Policy' within the Aitolian League	149

<i>Jacek Rzepka</i> Federal Imperialism: Aitolian Expansion between Protectorate, Merger, and Partition.....	167
<i>Sheila Ager</i> The Limits of Ethnicity: Sparta and the Achaian League.....	175
<i>Catherine Grandjean</i> Internal Mechanisms, External Relationships of the Achaians: A Numismatic Approach	193
<i>Kostas Buraselis</i> Dissimilar Brothers: Similarities versus Differences of the Achaian and Aitolian Leagues.....	205
<i>Athanassios Rizakis</i> Achaians and Lykians: A Comparison of Federal Institutions.....	219
<i>James Roy</i> The Dynamics of the Arkadian <i>ethnos</i> , or <i>poleis</i> versus <i>koinon</i>	243
<i>Cinzia Bearzot</i> The Foreign Policy of the Arkadian League: From Lykomedes of Mantinea to <i>staseis</i> among <i>homoethneis</i>	257
<i>Maria Mili</i> Ἄπιστα τὰ τῶν Θεσσαλῶν: The Dubious Thessalian State	271
<i>Margriet Haagsma, Laura Surtees & C. Myles Chykerda</i> Ethnic Constructs from Inside and Out: External Policy and the <i>ethnos</i> of Achaia Phthiotis.....	285
<i>Selene E. Psoma</i> The League of the <i>Chalkideis</i> : Development of its External and Internal Relations and Organization	321
<i>Adolfo J. Domínguez</i> The <i>ethnos</i> of the Thesprotians: Internal Organization and External Relations ..	339
<i>Katerina Panagopoulou</i> Between Federal and Ethnic: The <i>koinon Makedonōn</i> and the <i>Makedones</i> Revisited	363
<i>Hans Beck</i> The Aiolians – A Phantom <i>ethnos</i> ?	385
Index	405

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- 1) Grandjean, Figure 1: LHS Numismatik AG. Auction 96, 376, 2016 May 8. © With permission. p. 200
- 2) Grandjean, Figure 2: CNG Electronic Auction 375, 341 2016 June 1. 16,18g. Price 736. Argos silver tetradrachm of attic standard. © With permission. p. 201
- 3) Grandjean, Figure 3: LHS Numismatik AG. Auction 96, 376, 2016 May 8. 5,31g, Pagai/Achaian; ΧΑΡΜΙΔΑΣ, ΑΧΑΙΩΝ ΠΑΓΑΙΩΝ; bronze coin. © With permission. p. 201
- 4) Grandjean, Figure 4: Dr Busso Pius Nachfolger Auction 378, 177, 2004 April 28. 2,21g. Elis/Achaian – silver tribal of reduced aeginetic (= symmachic) standard. © With permission. p. 201
- 5) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 1: Map of Achaia Phthiotis. © the authors. p. 307
- 6) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 2: Plan of Classical settlement at Grintja (possibly Karandai). © the authors. p. 308
- 7) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 3: Plan of Classical settlement at Kastro Kallithea. © the authors. p. 308
- 8) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 4: Plan of Classical settlement at Magoula Plataniotiki (Old Halos). © the authors. p. 309
- 9) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 5: Plan of Classical settlement of Karatsagdali (unknown settlement). © the authors. p. 309
- 10) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 6: Map of Hellenistic Settlements in Achaia Phthiotis. © the authors. p. 310
- 11) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 7: Plan of the Hellenistic City of New Halos. © With permission of H. R. Reinders. p. 310
- 12) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 8: Plan of the city of Kastro Kallithea in the Hellenistic Period. © the authors. p. 311
- 13) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 9: The region of Achaia Phthiotis with cities minting coins with monogram AX. © the authors. p. 311
- 14) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 10: Coin from Larisa Kremaste with the image of Thetis on a hippocamp holding a shield with the monogram AX (Axaion) found at Halos. © With permission of H. R. Reinders. p. 312
- 15) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 11: Coin from Peuma with the AX monogram (Axaion) on the reverse and a male head on the obverse. Found at Kastro Kallithea. © the authors. p. 312
- 16) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 12: Terracotta figurine depicting Phrixos or Helle on a ram. From the House of the Coroplast at New Halos. © With permission of H. R. Reinders. p. 312
- 17) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 13: Figure of ΑΘΑΜΑΣ on a mould made bowl from the Southeast Gate at New Halos. Published in: Zoī Malakasioti, Reinder Reinders [Halos, SE gate, *ArchDelt* 56–59 (2001–2004) [2011], *Chronika* II. 2, p. 467f and 489f (fig. 27)]. © With permission from the authors. p. 313
- 18) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 14: Mouldmade jug with labeled images of Sisyphos and Autolykos from Building 10 at Kastro Kallithea. © the authors. p. 313
- 19) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 15: Stone block with protrusions found in Building 10 at Kastro Kallithea. © authors' photo. p. 314
- 20) Haagsma, Surtees, & Chykerda, Figure 16: Terracotta bread stamps with images of a leaf, lighting bolt and barley found in Building 10 at Kastro Kallithea. © the authors. p. 314
- 21) Domínguez, Figure 1: Map of Thesprotia. © the author. p. 358

- 22) Panagopoulou, Plate 1: Early Antigonid coins and their monograms. © With permission. p. 379
- 23) Beck, Figure 1: Aiolian migrations from Central Greece to Asia Minor: the orthodox picture. © With permission. p. 386
- 24) Beck, Figure 2: The corridor from the Lelantine plain into Boiotia according to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Map after Schachter 2016: xxi. © With permission of A. Schachter. p. 393
- 25) Beck, Figure 3: Suggested direction of Aiolian migration movements, 8th to 6th centuries BCE. © With permission. p. 395

PREFACE

The traditional view of Greek history has long held that the *polis* was the fundamental unit and institution around which other social and political structures revolved. The Greek world was seen as a mosaic of these citizen-communities interacting with one another in war and peace, and it was the autonomous community of the *polis* that made the Greek world unique. While the importance of the *polis* to communal life in the Greek world cannot be overlooked, various research projects over the past decades have shown that it was not the only source of identity and community in Greek antiquity. The ‘ethnic turn’ that has developed since the 1990s demonstrates more and more the important role played by ethnic allegiance as a tie that suffuses *polis* structures and connects communities that were otherwise politically separate. Recent advances in the study of federalism have shown how these perceived ethnic relationships contributed to – and were in turn influenced by – the elaboration of federal structures comprising many *poleis* in a given region. The editors of this volume along with many of its contributors were involved in the recent project *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* published by Cambridge University Press in 2015, whose various systematic and case studies demonstrated in striking detail how these latent ethnic attachments produced vastly different forms of federal collaboration, though all were united by their foundation on a sense of common descent. These new avenues of inquiry have produced as many questions as they have answered regarding this fascinating interplay between ethnicity and politics, and much work remains to be done.

An aspect of this that has been relatively neglected so far, however, is an examination of the interior composition of Greek *ethne* and the ways in which they managed to relate – and often synthesize – with one another. The process of negotiation and inclusion played out in response to social and environmental factors unique to each particular region and *ethnos*, and some of these aggregative trends – but not all – gradually morphed into confederate structures. Neither did these processes occur in isolation: the influence one *ethnos* had on another and the mutual awareness of various *ethne* and the federal structures with which they organised themselves has likewise been under-explored. The world of a given community, region, or federation was never a vacuum. The interplay between and mutual consciousness of parallel developments throughout the Greek world is equal parts fascinating and underexplored.

More than perhaps anywhere else in the Greek World, Delphi embodies the overlap among these various tiers of Greek history, as it was a place of devotion to ethnic groups, cities, and federations alike. All of these quite literally met together in the sanctuary of Apollo in the hills above the village. The place thus provided the ideal location for an international colloquium aimed at filling some of the gaps

ACHAIANS AND LYKIANS: A COMPARISON OF FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS

Athanassios Rizakis
National Hellenic Research Foundation

I. INTRODUCTION: IN SEARCH OF THE BEST FEDERAL CONSTITUTION*

Although the system of the *polis* remained at the centre of Greek political philosophy during the Classical and Hellenistic eras, federalist ideas gained widespread distribution, especially by the end of the former and the beginning of the latter period. This reorientation of political thought led to various experiences, as it became increasingly evident that the *polis*-system could no longer confront the new political realities created after the death of Alexander. As this new political structure generally copied the tripartite organization of the *polis* (primary assembly, *i.e.* *ekklēsia*, representative assembly, *i.e.* *boulē*, and the body of magistrates, *i.e.* *archontes*), it is hardly surprising to find titles for various functions that remind us of their equivalents at the urban level.¹

The various experiences of federalism through the Greek world create, *mutatis mutandis*, a federal culture which became a new weapon in the arsenal of Greek political ideas, although it did not have the same intellectual impact as the *polis* model which preceded it. The majority of the Hellenistic *koina* are symmetrical federations, that is to say, political unions in which the activities of the government are divided between regional and central levels in such a way that each tier of government has specific arenas in which it has the final say.² One remarkable example of these Hellenistic federal experiences is the Achaian League, if one believes Polybios – although he gives no information regarding the operation of institutions and does not outline how member states were represented in federal bodies. As a

* Thanks are due to Elke Klose who read and improved a first draft of this paper. I am grateful to Professors Ralf Behrwald and Hans Beck for helpful criticism and comments, errors of course remain my own.

1 This is the *communis opinio*: see Busolt 1926, 1318; Ehrenberg 1976, 208f; Larsen 1955, 66; Beck, Funke 2015, 14f. Especially, for Achaia, see Polyb. 2.37: 'Nor is there any difference between the entire Peloponnese and a single city, except in the fact that its inhabitants are not included within the same wall; in other respects, both as a whole and in their individual cities, there is a nearly absolute assimilation of institutions' (*Histories*. Polybios. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, translator. London, New York. Macmillan. 1889. Reprint Bloomington 1962); cf. Walbank 1957, 217f.

2 This corresponds to the modern definition of federalism: see Watts 1999, 121; Bednar 2011, 4.

result of this, fundamental issues such as the nature of the assemblies or the composition, election and functions of different magistracies remain either unknown or unclear.³ Unlike Polybios' silence on the internal organisation of the Achaian League, however, a passage of Strabo (14.3.3) better illustrates certain processes and institutions within the Lykian League, especially in how federal delegates in the deliberative bodies or magistrates are selected, and how judges are chosen and taxes levied. This text contributed enormously to the perception of the superiority of the Lykian League during the Age of Enlightenment as well as in the rebirth of the study of ancient federalism in modern times. Subsequently, many scholars believe that it was an original federal model that could serve as a basis for modern federal experiences.

In the sixteenth century, the philosopher Jean Bodin,⁴ inspired by this famous passage of Strabo's *Geography*, presented the organization of Lykian cities, and was the first to assume, mostly by intuition, the similarity of the Lykian constitution with the Achaian League. A century later, Charles-Louis de Montesquieu expressed, in a more obvious way, his admiration for the 'Republic of the Lykians' which he describes as the ideal model of federalism,⁵ although he shares Polybios' admiration for the structure and constitution of the Achaians, itself a 'belle République fédérative'.⁶ Unlike Montesquieu, L'Abbé de Mably⁷ finds that the Achaian *koinon*, as presented by Polybios, offers many points for reflection in spite of – or perhaps simply because of – its dramatic fate. The fathers of the American Constitution discussed both these and other ideas about ancient federations during

3 See Walbank 1957, 218–221; *Id.*, 1979, 406–414. In fact Polyb. 24.8.4 and 9.14 (cf. Walbank 1979, 261f) refers to 'the oaths, laws and inscribed pillars, which hold together our common federation' (*sympoliteia*) but, as F.W. Walbank 1977–1978, 51 observed, we do not know how far these defined the existence of a written constitution, which has been assumed by Swoboda 1912, 23; on this question, see also Mendels 1979–1980, 85–93. As has also been pointed out by Walbank, a written constitution was not absolutely necessary and 'it is not the first nor the only example of a political institution which is fully operative for a considerable time before political theorists get round to telling us what it is'.

4 'Nous pouvons dire le semblable des XXIII villes de Lycie, qui établirent une république aristocratique, semblable à celle des Achéens': see Bodin 1986, chap. VII, p. 171 cited by Knoepfler 2013, 117 and n.22.

5 'S'il fallait donner un modèle d'une belle république fédérative, je prendrais la république de Lycie' (Montesquieu 1961, Book IX). Montesquieu 1961, chapt. III of book IX, p. 371f compared the institutions of ancient and contemporary federations, specifically the Republic of Holland, which he held in great esteem; cf. Knoepfler 2013, 113 and n.9.

6 'La société des Achéens l'emporte sur les autres associations du même type par la liberté qu'elle laissait à ses membres'... 'Lorsque l'Union est démocratique,' écrit-il, 'chaque état particulier peut la rompre, parce qu'il a toujours gardé son indépendance. C'est ainsi qu'était la société des Achéens' (Montesquieu 1951, vol. II, 1005. On Polybios and Montesquieu, see Guelfucci 2006, 125–136; cf. Knoepfler 2013, 123–125).

7 1766–1767.

the heated debates in Philadelphia's convention of 1787, as reported by James Madison.⁸ Despite their knowledge of Polybios' work and their esteem for Achaian institutions,⁹ it was the clarity of Strabo's text that led them to adopt the Lykian model of proportional representation of the member-states in the national legislative assembly of the future constitution of the United States on June 30, 1787.¹⁰

This predominance of the Federal Republic of Lykia was challenged from the beginning of the nineteenth century when "scholars began to direct their interest more to ancient history than to political philosophy."¹¹ Although by the end of the same century Edward Freeman¹² recognised the great importance of the historical role of the Achaian *koinon*, Lykian institutions continued to impress him as well as other scholars¹³ who considered them the model of an advanced federal state. The prevalence of the Lykian governing system eventually ended in the 20th century when new discoveries suggested quite strongly that the Achaian League served as the prototype for some Lykian institutions.¹⁴

II. THE REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM IN THE GREEK FEDERATIONS: LYKIA AND ACHAIA, TWO PARALLEL EXAMPLES

One of the principal questions concerning the leagues of the Hellenistic period is to what extent member cities were subordinate to the central government. Giovannini's theory¹⁵ that the Greek *koina* were neither federal states (*Bundesstaat*) nor confederacies (*Staatenbund*) but rather unitary states did not resonate favourably among other scholars.¹⁶ What is important to know at this point is rather how power was distributed between central and regional authorities: how were member-states represented in various federal bodies, or even more pressingly, how were responsibilities divided between member states and the central government?¹⁷ The best literary description concerning the internal balance of power in a federal state is offered by Strabo who informs us, following Artemidorus of Ephesos (whose floruit is placed around 100 BCE), that in Lykia 23 cities had the right to vote in federal

8 Madison 1984, 223f resumed in Knoepfler 2013, 136 and n.99.

9 On Polybios and the American constitution, see Chinard 1940; Lehmann 1985 and 2015.

10 See Madison 1984, 381. For hesitation or misunderstanding of these discussions see Giovannini 2003, 147f cited by Knoepfler 2013, 136 n.99.

11 Knoepfler 2013, 137f.

12 'Lykia too, beyond all doubt, had a federal constitution which was in some respects more perfect than that of Achaia itself. But then Lykia has nothing which can be called a history' Freeman 1863, 6.

13 See Larsen 1968, 240–263 and Moretti 1962, 186–195.

14 On the similarities between Achaian and Lykian institutions, see Larsen 1956, 151–169; *id.*, 1957, 5–26 and especially p. 5 with n.1.

15 Giovannini 1971, 31.

16 See Walbank 1976–1977, 39–45.

17 On the assemblies of the Achaians and Aitolians, their composition, and their role in the *koinon*, see especially the contribution of Buraselis to this volume.

affairs. These votes were then allocated according to each city's importance or population, with large cities having three votes, mid-sized, two, and the less important cities, one.¹⁸ According to Strabo, the principle of proportional representation affected every body of the Lykian State, not only the constitution of the common council, the Κοινόν Συνέδριον, which itself should be identified with the ἀρχαιρεσιακὴ ἐκκλησία.¹⁹ The other deliberative assembly, the *boulē*, is not mentioned by Strabo and this omission, if we exclude a misunderstanding about it from the geographer,²⁰ led some scholars to think that it was a post-Augustan innovation. If it did not really exist in the Hellenistic period, the *koinon* would function only with a representative assembly, i.e. the *archairesiakē ekklēsia*. The *boulē*, whenever it was actually functional, was certainly not as large as the ἀρχαιρεσιακὴ ἐκκλησία.²¹ That these two assemblies were distinct is indicated by the fact that ἀρχοστάται and βουλευταὶ are two distinct categories in the various lists of donations (*dianomai*).²²

18 Εἰσὶ δὲ τρεῖς καὶ εἴκοσι αἱ τῆς ψήφου μετέχουσαι. Συνέρχονται δὲ ἐξ ἐκάστης πόλεως εἰς κοινὸν συνέδριον, ἣν ἂν δοκιμάσωσι πόλιν ἐλόμενοι. Τῶν δὲ πόλεων αἱ μέγιστα τριῶν ψήφον ἔστιν ἐκάστη κυρία, αἱ δὲ μέσαι δυεῖν, αἱ δ' ἄλλαι μιᾶς (Str. 14.3.3); cf. Troxell 1982; Behrwald 2000 and the contribution of the same author in Beck and Funke 2015, 403–418.

19 This *ekklēsia* is attested, for the first time in 100 BCE, when Artemidorus of Ephesus analysed the federal institutions of Lykia (see Str. 14.3.3; cf. Jameson 1979, 842f). Larsen 1945, 76 supposes that the use of this term means that the Lykian *ekklēsia* had once been a mass meeting opened to all of its citizens. Unfortunately, we do not know at what time it was transformed into a representative body but we do know that this model existed well into imperial times (Behrwald 2015, 409). This assembly met three times a year in the late Hellenistic period or once a year in three sessions (see *TAM* II 583). This organization reminds us of the meetings of the *synodos*, which are, according to Polybios, four per year in fixed dates (see Aymard 1938, 275f).

20 Larsen 1945, 81f thought that the Geographer simply forgot to mention it and he considered this absence abnormal, giving the fact that this body was a structural element of government in several federations. This conviction led him to hastily date Pinara's decree (referring to the two representative bodies) to the first century BCE (*TAM* II 508; cf. Larsen 1943, 177–190 and 246–255; *id.*, 1945, 93–95). Such a dating allowed him to assume that there was a continuity in governing practices among the Republican and Imperial Period and therefore that the *boulē* had always existed in Lykia. This interpretation has been criticized by several scholars (Magie 1950 II, 1381f; Jameson 1980, 842f) who observe that an earlier dating of the decree of Pinara is in fact difficult. The presence in the text of a δικαιοδότης, indicating, according to L. Robert *REG* 57, 1944, 230f, a provincial governor, would place the decree automatically after 43 CE. In contrast, Larsen 1945, 93–97; *id.* 1956, 188–190 followed by Behrwald 2015, 409 thinks that maybe the *boulē* existed in the Hellenistic period because the text in *TAM* II 508 referring to *boulēutai* and *archostatai* 'seems to reflect a situation prior to the loss of Lykian independence' (provided by Claudius in 43 CE, when Lykia became a Roman province: see Suet. *Claud.* 25.3; Dio Cassius 60.17, 3).

21 Larsen 1945, 83f; Behrwald 2000, 188–209; *id.*, 2015, 409. Larsen [1968, 250] thought that the main representative body was the *boulē*, the *archairesiake ekklēsia* simply being 'an expansion of or an appendix to a meeting of the *boulē*'.

22 See Larsen 1945, 81–83 and 91–93; Balland 1981, 183f. With the exception of the foundation of Licinius Longinus (Larsen 1945, 91f), all the donations concern three groups of dignitaries: *archostatai*, *boulēutai* and magistrates. It is unclear whether the members of the latter two categories were directly involved in the elections; it is nevertheless certain that they were closely

The geographer gives the names of the six *megistai poleis* of the Lykian League, but the names of medium and small size cities remain unknown.²³ This fact does not allow us to know the number of votes dispensed individually and consequently we remain unaware of the ratio between the three groups of cities. On this point, we can only suppose that the number of votes held by the two latter groups should be superior to that of the large cities. It is highly probable that the scale 3, 2, 1 was established according to the population of cities, so it would likely be this simple distribution principle that was applied both to the allocation of taxes and the appointment of the federal councillors, magistrates, and judges: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δικασταὶ καὶ ἄρχοντες ἀνάλογον ταῖς ψήφοις ἐξ ἑκάστης προχειρίζονται πόλεως (Strabo 14.3.3).²⁴ If the ratio is similar to that of Achaia, we can propose the following distribution: $3 \times 6 = 18 + 2 \times 9 = 18 + 1 \times 8 = 8$ (that means a total of 44 votes) or a less balanced one: $3 \times 6 = 18 + 2 \times 6 = 12 + 1 \times 11 = 11$ (a total of 41 votes).

One must assume that the internal balance of power, i.e. the ratio between the three groups of cities, needed to change when there were departures or additions of new members to the league, as well as when cities were merged in a *sympoliteia*. In fact, the four different lists of Lykian cities show that the composition of the League and the balance of internal power knew some changes during Hellenistic and imperial times. A decree from the Lētōn, erected in honour of the great benefactor Opramoas of Rhodiapolis, shows that in the middle of the second century the composition of the League had changed either by accepting new members or by replacing old ones. The same decree reveals first that this tripartite structure for the distribution of votes within the Lykian League survived into the Empire, and second that the group of six *πρωτεύουσαι πόλεις* remained, at that time, the same. But this last figure would subsequently change with the addition of new members under the Antonines.²⁵ Accordingly, the number of *megistai*, medium size or small *poleis* had

associated with the *archairesiaké ekklēsia*'s meeting and that the term *Koinoboulion* covers at least *boulē* and *ekklēsia* and it presumably includes the magistrates in office (Balland 1981, 183f). There is a debate about the meaning of the term *koinobouloi* (it also appears in a number of inscriptions [e.g. Balland, 1981, 173–185 no.66, ll. 14–19] also of Prusias of Hypios and Nicomedia) that concerns the beneficiaries of the foundation of Opramoas of Rhodiapolis (see Kokkinia 2000) who apparently are members of the federal *koinoboulion*, a term more frequently attested meaning the annual meeting of a kind of elective parliament on which the *archostatai* played the principal role as electors (voters), see Balland, 1981, 182–185; cf. Behwald 2000, 188–209.

- 23 "Ἐξ δὲ τὰς μεγίστας ἔφη Ἀρτεμίδωρος. Ξάνθον Πάταρα Ὀλυμπον Μύρα Τλῶν κατὰ τὴν ὑπέρθεσιν τὴν εἰς Κίβυραν κειμένην (Str. 14.3.3). It seems that this list it is correct for Artemidoros but not in Strabo's time (see Larsen 1945, 76f and n.61).
- 24 Knoepfler 2013, 133–135, rightly observed a misinterpretation by Montesquieu of Strabo's formula ἐξ ἑκάστης πόλεως, due to the Latin translation, *pro singulis urbibus* (Knoepfler 2013, 134 and n.92): 'en Lycie, les juges et les magistrats des villes étaient élus par le Conseil commun, et selon la proportion que nous avons dites'.
- 25 In fact, the list of thirty one (31) *poleis* (in the decree of the Lētōn) to which Opramoas of Rhodiapolis demonstrated his generosity (mid 2nd century CE), shows changes in the number of the League's members as well as that of the six *πρωτεύουσαι πόλεις* (Myra, Patara, Xanthos,

not been fixed *in aeternum* by either a constitutional law or long-term use, but rather that some law or decree of the *ekklēsia* necessary determined it. In fact, a letter of Commodus found at Boubon on the southern borders of Lykia informs us that Boubon was admitted among the cities with three votes, ἐν τοῖς τριῶν πόλεων. This promotion was not made at the expense of one of the *poleis* with three votes, but following Schindler and Kokkinia we must believe that their number would have been increased toward the end of the Antonine era.²⁶

In spite of some obscurities, Strabo's text offers a clear and satisfactory picture of the structure and functionality of the Lykian institutions, but this is not also the case for Polybios and the equivalent Achaian institutions. Polybios famously (2.37.8–11) praised the Achaian constitution, its political principles and particularly the advantages of federalism in this specific regional manifestation. One of the arguments used by the Historian to demonstrate how the League succeeded in unifying the entire Peloponnese (σύμπασαν Πελοπόννησον) was the democratic and egalitarian nature of Achaian institutions,²⁷ which permitted the member-states to have the same laws, weights, measures, and currency, as well as the same magistrates, councillors, and judges: Ἄρχουσι, βουλευταῖς, δικασταῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς.²⁸ This division of power among these governing bodies reminds us, as has been pointed by Walbank²⁹, of the triple distinction between magistrates, the deliberative, and

Tlos, Telmessos et Limyra; see the comments in Balland 1981, 176f). Pinara and Olympos had given in the imperial period (mid 2nd century CE) their place to Telmessos in the West and Limyra in the East respectively (see Jameson 1979, 842; Balland 1981, 173–185 no.66 especially p. 176f; cf. Knoepfler 2013, 130, fig. 5a). It is worth noting that Pliny cites in his *Historia Naturalis* 5.28 [100] 36 *oppida* in Lykia.

- 26 See Schindler 1972 II, p. 9–11, no.2 (cf. L. Robert, *BE* 1973, 451) and the new edition of Kokkinia 2008, 32–34 no.5; cf. also Knoepfler 2013, 128f.
- 27 Polybios himself defines the πολιτεῦμα τῶν Ἀχαιῶν as a democracy whose main principles are ἰσηγορία and παρρησία (2.38.6; cf. Walbank 1957, 221f; see also Polyb. 6.8.3–5; 6. 8.5; 6.9.4–5; cf. Walbank 1957 *ad loc*; Rémy 2008, 105f; Tuci 2003). This regime is in contrast to the extreme democracy (ὀχλοκρατία) condemned by the historian (see Polyb. 6.9.9; 6.57.9; cf. Welwei 1969; Mendels 1979–1980; Braun 1983, 6–8; Eckstein 1995, 129f). This form of government (*i.e.* pure democracy) regarded as normal for federal states by Polybios 31.2.12 would have been called 'oligarchic' in the late fifth century (see Larsen, 1945, 66f and especially, p. 87–91).
- 28 Ἄρχοντες in Polyb. 5.1.6 and 9; 22.10.10–13 and 12.7 is more technical in meaning and indicates a general term for magistrates. Elsewhere they are called οἱ προσετώτες τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πολιτεύματος (2.46.4), αἱ συναρχαίαι (27.2.11; 38.13.4–5) and οἱ συνάρχοντες (23.16.6). The term συναρχαίαι, suggestive of a collegiate organization (Aymard 1938, 322f), is perhaps the official title. A board was formed consisting of the στρατηγός and the ten δαμιουργοί (23.5.16; cf. Bingen, 1954, no.18 ll. 3–4, Rizakis 2008, 176–178 no.120). For the number of the *damiourgoi*, see Livy 32.22.2. Additionally, there were inferior magistrates such as the *hipparch* and the *navarch* (Polyb. 5.94.7; 95.11). See generally Freeman 1863, 219–222.; Aymard 1938, 180–186; Walbank 1957, 219. The precise responsibilities of the *dikastai* remain unknown however: see Cole 1964, 4–7.
- 29 Walbank 1957, 219f.

judiciary bodies going all the way back to Aristotle.³⁰ It does not, however, correspond exactly with the modern division popularized by Montesquieu of legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

It seems that in Achaia, as well as in other states, the balance of power between governing bodies or member-states did not remain fixed but changed according to contemporary trends or the necessity of efficiency. This happened when the League's ambitions began exceeding the framework of the ancient union of the twelve small *poleis* in the north-western Peloponnese that was the heartland of old Achaia – all of whom, in Plutarch's words, were quite equal in their mediocrity.³¹ The larger cities, which were included in its frontiers since the middle of the third century BCE,³² would barely tolerate representation in the federal boards with a number of delegates equal to that of the smaller cities. As has been assumed by Ferrabino, the critical moment for an institutional change was the end of the social war (217 BCE), but the precise nature and motives of these reforms remain unknown. Aldo Ferrabino presumes that the introduced institutional reform dealt with the army and the financial system on the one hand and the decision-making process on the other hand.³³

According to Aymard³⁴ this reform which took place later (i.e. by the end of the third century), did not change the composition of the *synodos* but removed the most important realms of Achaian foreign policy from its competence. Larsen agreed with the French scholar about the dating but not on the meaning of this reform. He thought that the leaders of Achaia decided to transfer important powers from the primary assembly to the council, either because they followed the general trend of this period or better understood the advantages of a representative *boulē* in a large federal state.³⁵

This reform gave the *boulē* greater prominence; an organ, which in its composition, was now more flexible and effective. Proportional participation in this body was based therefore on the size of the population of the cities and was a response

30 Arist. *Pol.* 4.11 [1298a]: ἔν μὲν τί τὸ βουλευόμενον περὶ τῶν κοινῶν, δεύτερον δὲ τὸ περὶ τὰς ἀρχάς...τρίτον δὲ τί τὸ δικάζον. See against (Aymard 1938, 158f) Newman 1902, commenting on Aristotle, Polybios 4.236. The comparison with Aristotle shows that under 'deliberative' several functions are included which could today be classified as legislative (see Walbank 1957, 219). On the conception of the federal states by Aristotle and Polybios, see Lehmann 2001.

31 *Aratos* 9.6 and 7; cf. also *loc. cit.*, 11.1.

32 See Urban 1979.

33 Ferrabino 1921, 217–222 and 297–301. Larsen 1955, 92f thinks that this reform was probably initiated by Aratus. Bastini 1987, 29–30 thought that the reform took place before the death of Aratus.

34 Aymard 1938, 418–420.

35 The *terminus ante quem* of this reform is the year 200 BCE as it was already in force then (Livy 31.25.2–10); see Larsen 1955, 85; *id.*, 1968, 223. On the introduction in the Achaian league after 217 BCE of a representative assembly see Larsen 1968, 284 and Lehmann 1983, 237–261 as well as Giovannini 1969, 1–17 (cf. the critical remarks of Larsen 1972, 178–185). On the introduction of a *pro rata* basis system in Achaian league, see also Beck 1997, 168f; Rizakis 2003, 97–109; Sisov 2016, 101–109.

to the challenge posed by the predominance of the local citizens in the assemblies. Thus, the representation of the various cities of the League in the federal assemblies and particularly in the *synodos* was more equitable and satisfied the demands and expectations of large cities such as Corinth, Argos or Megalopolis. This assumption is suggested by two epigraphic discoveries confirming the parallelism between the Achaian and the Lykian institutions.

The documents in question are two lists of Achaian *nomographoi* one from Epidauros between 210 and 207/206 BCE, and the other from Aigion between 182 and 146 BCE.³⁶ These lists show that the distribution scale of votes between large, medium, and small cities is the same as in the Lykian League. In the Achaian League there are also three categories of member-states supplying three, two and one votes respectively in the college of *nomographoi*. However, we do not really know the criteria for classification in the three groups: it seems, for example, that population is not the only element that defines classification. In the earliest list three cities, Dyme, Aigion, and Sikyon, each possessed two votes, although their demographic importance is not equivalent.³⁷ On the other hand certain large cities (e.g. Aigina, Corinth, Megara) as well as some that were less important (e.g. cities of central and south Arkadia, except Megalopolis) are not represented at all. Gschnitzer³⁸ argues that while small member-states would not necessarily be represented, larger cities would be, and therefore that it is possible to draw conclusions about the League's membership by their absence at the time of the text.³⁹

The idea that small cities could be represented alternately is a plausible hypothesis, in the sense that similar situations are attested in other confederations. For example, in Lykia and Boiotia neighbouring small cities could be represented 'à tour de rôle' in the federal bodies.⁴⁰ Furthermore, some small cities might have been admitted to the Lykian *Koinon* without a vote in the *synedrion*⁴¹ and, perhaps more importantly, smaller *poleis* could be joined into one *sympoliteia*. This would explain the absence of so many smaller *poleis* in texts from the Imperial period: they had

36 *IG IV.I².73*. Gschnitzer 1985 proposed the period 210–207 BCE while Swoboda 1922, 520–522 and Lehmann 1983, 245–251; 2001, 82–89 thought to an earlier date before or after the social war (220–217 BCE). Finally Sizov thinks 2016, 108 that the *terminus post quem* should be the year 229 BCE, when Argos, Hermione and Phleius joined the league and the *terminus ante quem* the year 197 BCE when Corinth return to the Achaian Κοινόν. The second is SEG 58.417, dated to 182–146.

37 See Lehmann 1983, 249; Gschnitzer 1985; Rizakis 2003.

38 Gschnitzer 1985.

39 This is probably true for the three large cities of Aigina, Corinth or Megara, which were not at that time members of the League (for the cities of Megaris and their relations with the Achaian league, see Freitag 2015, 56–67). Lehmann 1983 challenges this view, arguing in particular that Mantinea (Antigoneia on the list), though absent from the list, must have been a full member with a significant citizen population during the period when the text was drawn up; see on this point the interesting comment of Sizov 2016, 104f.

40 Gschnitzer 1985, 103–116; Lehmann's theory on the rotation of all cities (even the large ones) did not find a favorable echo with other the scholars; see Sizov 2016, 101–107.

41 According to Moretti 1962, 206f such cities could make in the Lykian League their contributions in the form of money or dispatching their troops.

been absorbed by, or joined together with, neighbouring *poleis* that sometimes would have been of equal size.⁴² We can also suppose that a similar situation existed in Achaia, although we lack specific examples. But, interestingly, some minor and mostly insignificant (e.g. Ascheion, Kallistai),⁴³ Achaian cities are represented in the lists of the federal *nomographoi*. This weakens Gschnitzer's theory, unless we suppose that these cities had a peculiar status giving them some special rights not possessed by 'ordinary' small cities.⁴⁴

Literary, numismatic, and epigraphical documents show that the Achaian *Koinon*, like the Lykian League, was updated periodically according to the demographic changes and political vicissitudes created by the departure of old or the addition of new members. The great extension of Achaia's borders, especially after Aratos' generalship, resulted in a permanent revision of the list of city-members, as well as the continuous adjustment of the balance of power between old and new members. In the list from Epidauros (210–207 BCE), 17 cities (or 18 with that of the secretary of the *collegium* of *nomographoi* which was probably not counted) send representatives.⁴⁵ They had a total number of 24 votes⁴⁶ distributed among the three city types: the *megistai poleis* (Argos and Megalopolis) were represented by three delegates ($2 \times 3 = 6$),⁴⁷ the medium size cities (Dyme, Aigion Sikyon) by two ($3 \times 2 = 6$), and finally the twelve small cities ($12 \times 1 = 12$) only by one. It is clear that the ratio between the three groups of cities is rather balanced, as the number of votes of the large and medium size cities is equivalent to that of the small ones ($6 + 6 + 12 = 24$: votes).⁴⁸ This ratio reveals a desire to eliminate differences or even conflicts between the members of the League by establishing a balance between the three groups. It is clearly a product of compromise, since some of the old cities that had a role in the foundation of the League (Dyme and Aigion) possessed two votes, which was not fully justified by their demographic standing.

As major and middle-size cities did not have an absolute majority ($6 + 6 = 12$ votes), any decision required the agreement of, or a compromise with, the smaller

42 I owe this last precision to the kindness of Ralf Behrwald.

43 These cities are totally absent on any list of Achaian cities (Hdt. 1.145; Polyb. 2.41.6–8; Str. 8.7.4 and Paus. 7.6.1) although their citizens bear the ethnic *Achaios* and their ethnic appears in their coins: see Rizakis 1995, nos. 597, 598, 605, 659, 668II; id. 2016; cf. Löbel 2014, 45f and 48; Rizakis 2016.

44 For this question, see Rizakis 2016.

45 See Knoepfler 2002, 148 (for the case of Boiotia; cf. Rizakis 2003, 99 n.11: bibliography).

46 Achaia sent ten representatives: the Argolis was represented by five cities with a total of seven votes (Argos having three); Sikyon had two votes; and finally, Arkadia was represented by three cities and had five votes in total since Megalopolis had three.

47 Megalopolis was still by the end of the third century an important town because, according to Polyb. 5.91.7, it furnished 1/6th of all the Achaians in arms in 217 BCE. Argos, although it was no longer at the forefront of the Greek cities its glory and its resources offered still it some importance.

48 Lehmann 1983, 247; Gschnitzer 1985, 112; Rizakis 2003, 101–104; id. 2008, 168–170, no.116. Sizov 2016, 106 n.30. Although this symmetry between large, medium and small cities can not be confirmed by the list of Aigion, it does not mean, as Sizov 2016, 106 n.30 thinks, that the equal numbers in the catalogue from Epidauros 'must have just been a coincidence'.

member states. We can assume that this principle did not change when, a few years later, the League enjoyed massive expansion and spread to encompass virtually the entire Peloponnese. This restructuring of the League necessitated changes regarding both the number of cities represented in the collegium of *nomographoi* as well as the distribution of votes among its member states. This new situation is illustrated by the list of Aigion (between 182 and 146 BCE) in which all new acquisitions of the League appear in Arkadia, Lakonia, and Messenia.

The list of Aigion mentions, at the current state of conservation, only representatives of 16 cities (17 including the secretary's home city) which sent 21 delegates originating from four regions: nine Arkadian and two Triphyllian cities send 12 delegates (the only city with two votes being Megalopolis). Lakonia is represented only by one city (i.e. Sparta) which sent three delegates⁴⁹, Messenia by four cities sending five delegates (only Messene has two votes). The name of only one Achaian city (i.e. Ascheion) is preserved in the list. It remains unknown how many cities (from Elis, Corinthia, Megaris and finally from Achaia, Sikyon, and Argolis) do not appear in the list and how many votes they would have had in total. As the cities of the three later areas appear in the older list of Epidauros, we can presume that they continued to be represented and sent the same number of delegates. And if we add the cities of Elis, Corinth and the Megaris which are not mentioned in the two lists (the cities of the Megaris have been integrated later, around 170 BCE),⁵⁰ we can say that the approximate number of cities should be around 35.

The radical increase in the number of the member-states of the League after 191 BCE would impose a change in the distribution of votes, so that the ratio known from the previous list and the balance in representation between the three groups of cities could be restored. There are some clues to support this statement. For example, Megalopolis is no longer represented by three votes like in the list of Epidauros, but now only by two.⁵¹ This fact as well as the growth of the League with the addition of many new members resulted in a redistribution of the seats in the college of *nomographoi*, as indicated by the list of Aigion. Pheneos, present in the list of Epidauros, no longer appears in the document from Aigion. However, it is surprising that small cities such as Lousoi in Arkadia and especially Ascheion (close to the Arkadian border with Achaia) appear on both lists. We can presume that, besides Sparta, which appears on the list of Aigion, and Argos and Megalopolis (which appear in the list of Epidauros), three votes could also be given to large cities like Argos, Corinth and Megara which are missing from the two lists. Besides Megalopolis and Messene, among the cities sending two delegates we can count Aigion, Dyme and Sikyon (which are present on the list of Epidauros), and probably Aigina or Elis. If this schema of delegate distribution were correct, the ratio would be the

49 Lakonian cities are not represented because they have a special status in the League; see Livy 38.32.9–10; cf. Rizakis 2003, 107 n.42.

50 See note 72 below.

51 This change may possibly be linked (see Sizov 2016, 103 n.15) to the decrease of its importance as a result of the separation of some small communities (193 BCE), which became full members of the Achaian *Koinon*. Plutarch (*Philop.* 13.8) lets us know that this reform was done at the instigation of Philopoimen: cf. Errington 1969, 90f; Bastini 1987, 88f.

following: 12 delegates for the large cities (Sparta, Argos, Corinth and Megara), 12 delegates for the mid-size cities and 24 for the small. This means that the balance between the three groups first established in the list of Epidauros is maintained.

The *nomographoi* documents lead us to believe that it was the individual cities of Achaia rather than the administrative districts (*συντέλειαι*)⁵² – as for example in Boiotia⁵³ – that selected and sent delegates to various federal bodies. Aldo Ferrabino's⁵⁴ idea that the Achaian *Koinon* was subdivided into three administrative districts during the military reform of Aratos in 217 BCE is based on a Polybian passage (5.92.7–10). But Thomas Corsten thought that the League was divided, during this period, into five districts, and only later in 207 BCE into three as a consequence of the military reforms of Philopoimen.⁵⁵ According to the latter scholar the distribution of the civic delegates in the list of Epidauros illustrates the division of the League into five districts, each of which sent five *nomographoi* with the exception of Patrai which sent four ($4 \times 5 + 4 = 24$). This theory did not find much support.⁵⁶ The Polybian passage (5.92.7–10) implies that this artificial structure in western Achaia was closely related to the defence of the area, entrusted to the *poleis* included in this *synteleia*. There is no other evidence for the existence of such artificial units in Achaia or that they were used “for the mechanics of the representative government”, as was the case in some other leagues. Unfortunately, what we know of the *synteleiai* in Lykia is of little help. The two administrative subdivisions are attested there only in the first century BCE and are associated with the minting activity of the Lykian cities. The real dates of their introduction as well as their role remain unknown.⁵⁷

52 The term *meros* (a standard term used to denote such subdivisions, while in the Hellenistic period the term *synteleia* was used which is best translated by ‘district’. On the terms *meros-meria* (see Helly 1997 [Achaia] and generally Beck and Funke 2015, 15f with n.27: bibliography) which was used by Herodotus 1.145 to designate the twelve Achaian subdivisions, disappears from the sources of the Hellenistic period (only exception in Polyb. 5.92.7–10) when the new term *synteleia* (see Beck and Funke 2015, 15f and 26), in the sense of district, comes into use containing the cities of the western Achaia.

53 For the role of districts in the Boiotian League, see Salmon 1956, 51–70; Müller 2011, 261–282 with the previous bibliography in n. 1 (cf. *BE* 2012, 181).

54 This reform would provide three military units each tasked with assuring the defence of Spartan, Eleian, and Aitolian borders (cf. Aymard 1938, 302–307; Errington 1969, 63f; Anderson 1967, 104f). In addition to the district of Patrai (Polyb. 5.94.1 and 38.16.4: Πατρεις δὲ καὶ τὸ μετὰ τούτων συντελικόν; on the *synteleia* of the western cities see Larsen 1971, 84–86), Ferrabino 1921, 297–301 recognised a second district, that of Megalopolis, attested in an inscription of Magnesia on the Meander (*IVM* 39) dated c. 208 BCE; for the problems of interpretation of this text see Roy 2003, 123–130.

55 Corsten 1999, 166–177.

56 Larsen 1971, 86, does not believe that the League was divided into districts and considered that of Patrai as unique. For my own reservations regarding such a role of the districts in Achaia of the Hellenistic period, see Rizakis 2003, 202–206 and more recently Sizov 2016, 102–104.

57 *OGIS* 565; *JGR* 488; cf. Troxell 1982, 112–117 thought that this organization underlines the reaction to Roman demands after Mithridates' war but this opinion was criticized by Ashton and Meadows 2008, 113–116.

III. *ARCHAIRESIAKĒ EKKLĒSIA* OR *SYNODOS* AND THE GOVERNING PRACTICES IN LYKIA AND ACHAIA

Except for the distribution of power between the constituent parts of a league (symmetrical or asymmetrical federation), the main difference between the various leagues concerns the internal organization that regulates the relationship and balance between the three constituent bodies of power (*ekklēsia*, *boulē* and magistrates). We know that the majority of Hellenistic leagues had a primary assembly, *i.e.* *ekklēsia*, and a representative assembly called *boulē* or *synedrion*.⁵⁸ The *boulē* or *synedrion* was generally by its very nature a deliberating body composed, in various confederations, of delegates from member-states, which were represented either directly or in proportion to their population. The representative council was then regarded “as normal machinery in federal states” (Polybios 31.2.12)⁵⁹ which offered speed and efficiency in decision-making.⁶⁰ The Romans certainly encouraged this tendency, thereby accelerating an already existing trend either by creating or encouraging the creation of new leagues. Councils of proportional representation are already attested in the Hellenistic period in Aitolia, Boiotia, and possibly Arkadia, and after the beginning of the 2nd century BCE in Thessaly, Phokis, Magnesia, Crete, and Lykia, which were governed by representative *synedria* (or *boulē*) then becoming the chief law-making body.⁶¹

The leading political class in Achaia understood, especially after the traumatic experience of the wars of the second half of the third century BCE, the difficulties of the mechanisms of government in making rapid and prudent decisions, and accordingly adapted it to the expansion of the political boundaries of the League throughout the Peloponnese and Central Greece. As the new League surpassed its ethnic boundaries and integrated great and powerful cities with a glorious history into its organisation, its political unity and stability could be achieved by a fairer

58 Larsen 1968, 281–295.; cf. also Martin 1975, 531–536 thinks that this corresponds to the general evolution and trend of the period, although there are some exceptions corresponding to particular cases. The model of the reforms introduced in Achaia and particularly that of a representative assembly could be that of Phokis; see Martin 1975, 160f; Behwald 2000, 188 n.118; Daverio Rocchi 2015.

59 Larsen 1945, 65–97. This view was challenged by Aymard 1950 as exaggerated but Larsen 1955, 75–105 did a new, full analysis of Polybios’ terminology and has produced a theory, which has the merit of simplicity and seems to cover all the evidence.

60 This is not certainly the only reason: by the creation of some leagues (e.g. Thessalian or Eleutherolaconian) Rome wanted strong states to withstand either Makedonian or Spartan pressure, see Martin 1975, 545f and 580–583.

61 Larsen 1945, 65–68 and 87f; *id.* 1955, 68–75; Martin 1975, 57f (Thessaly), 160f (Phokis) 91–93 (Magnesia), 504f (Kreta); cf. also, *loc.cit.* 533–555. Knoepfler 1990, 497 and Müller 2005, 114f showed that the *synedrion* replaced the *boulē* in the cities of Central Greece after 167 BCE (see also Funke 2015, 111f and 116 [Aitolia] and Beck and Funke 2015, 604 *s.v.* *Synedrion*.) In contrast, some scholars think that asymmetric federal states (e.g. Boiotian *Koinon* at the time of Pelopidas and Epameinondas as well as the Chalkidician one) were highly centralized states dominated by the main *polis* and had no federal council, but this point of view is based either on controversial sources (Xen., *Hell.* 7.3.5) or on the wrong use of an *argumentum ex silentio*.

distribution of power and influence in the institutions among its member-states. This reform followed a generally pronounced tendency towards representative government in the federal states and cities of this period.⁶²

Except for this detail, many other questions remain controversial despite the effort of many generations of scholars. This is the case for the composition and function of the federal assemblies, especially for the *synodos*. A crucial point is the federal *boulē* and its role in the system are clearly attested in the first Achaian *Koinon* by an inscription dated at the end of the fourth century BCE.⁶³ It is less clear in Polybios' text, however, if this is also the case for the Hellenistic period, and the lack of inscriptions does not help in resolving this problem. The majority of scholars before the Great War thought that the *boulē* was a representative body, and that it was possible to maintain that the Achaian League essentially had a representative government with a proviso for referendum on questions of war and peace and alliance.⁶⁴ Aymard⁶⁵ argued that *boulē* in Polybios simply means 'a deliberative assembly' and could apply to a primary assembly like the *synodos* but his theory did not receive any support because, as has been pointed out by Mendels following Larsen, "boulē never referred to a primary assembly, but always to a deliberative council". For him and his followers the *boulē* was identical to the *synodos*, which was itself a representative assembly.⁶⁶

Swoboda⁶⁷, at the beginning of the 20th century, stated that the same principle of proportional representation, already known for the *nomographoi*, would have applied to other federal bodies such as the *boulē*.⁶⁸ In this case the scale 3:2:1 would be, as in Lykia, a simple distribution key applied to the relative share of federal burdens and for the selection of the *boulēutai* or other federal officials. The number of the *boulēutai* thus varied from one city to another and from one period to another. It reached its peak in the second century BCE, when the League comprised the entire Peloponnese and some cities in Central Greece. It is highly probable that the appointment of the federal councillors did not take place at the federal level, but rather in their respective cities.

The precise size of the Achaian *boulē* is unknown despite the efforts of some scholars to calculate the number of the federal delegates from Polybios' report of

62 Larsen 1945, 68f; *id.* 1955, 83f (examples). It is noteworthy that there is no evidence for a primary assembly in some of the new federal states of the second century BCE (i.e. Lykia, Makedonia, Thessaly), see Larsen 1945, 69f. For the enhanced role of the *boulē* in the cities of this period, see Hamon 2001, XVI-XXI and *id.*, 2005, 121-144; *id.* 2007, 77-98.

63 Bingen 1954, 402-407 no.18; Rizakis 2008a, 176-178 no.120. Although any direct evidence on the composition of this *boulē* is missing, it can be supposed that the twelve Achaian member-states of the first League have an equal representation in this body: see Löbel 2014, 85-88 who highlights the oligarchic character of the first League's institutions.

64 Larsen 1945, 66 n.5 refers to Tarn 1928, 738.

65 Aymard 1938, 150-164.

66 Larsen 1955, 75-85 and 165-188; *id.* 1972, 178-185; Walbank 1957, 219f where other views on this question are also briefly exposed; Mendels 1979-1980, 91 and n.34.

67 Swoboda 1922, 519f; Lehmann 1983, 249; *id.*, 1999, 171; Rizakis 2003, 97f; Sizov 2016, 101f; Löbel 2014, 91 considers this question as still open.

68 See the reserves of Aymard 1938, 383-385 on this point.

Eumenes' offer of money during the *synodos* of 185 BCE. The king offered 720 talents to the Achaians to be used so "that they might lend it and spend the interest paying the members of the Achaian assembly during its session" (Polyb. 22.7.3).⁶⁹ Larsen is right when he says that this passage does not give adequate information to calculate the exact number of the *boulēutai* but the estimations made by various scholars⁷⁰ could give us a general idea of the numerical order of the members of the federal *boulē*.⁷¹ Given the large number of new member-states integrated by 170 BCE,⁷² we can only presume by means of comparison that the federal council should likely be more extensive than its Aitolian counterpart, which counted over 550 members, or than the *synedrion* of the Thessalian League, which numbered 33 members.⁷³

We can suppose, thanks to Polybios, that the *boulē* was an administrative board, which received embassies and coordinated the meetings of the *synodoi*. The latter arbitrated conflicts between contending cities and in some particular cases exercised penal jurisdiction on offenders against the constitution.⁷⁴ Although there is no passage in Polybios indicating that there were preliminary discussions in the council before the popular meetings, as was the practice in Aitolia and Acarnania, Walbank considers it highly probable given the existence of an extensive agenda in the *synodoi*.⁷⁵ Such a power is maybe suggested in Plutarch's formula οἱ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ (*sc.* Ἀχαιοί) μετὰ τῶν προβούλων referring to the Achaians who elected the federal *stratēgos* in the meeting of Megalopolis (182 BCE) and then invaded Messenia in

69 Polyb. 22.7.3: ἐξαπαστάληκε δὲ <καὶ> βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης πρεσβευτάς, ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι τάλαντα δώσειν τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς, ἐφ' ᾧ, δανειζομένων τούτων, ἐκ τῶν τόκων μισθοδοτεῖσθαι τὴν βουλὴν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς κοιναῖς συνόδοις: 'King Eumenes had also sent envoys promising to give the Achaians one hundred and twenty talents which they might lend and spend the interest paying the members of the Achaian parliament during its session'. 120 talents (720.000 drachmas) is a huge sum for such purposes (in comparison to similar donations to the Lykian Confederacy at a later date consisting of 55.000 and another of 110.000 denarii; see Larsen 1955, 96 n.21). On this question see also Polyb. 22.8.8 and 12 and the detailed comments of Aymard 1938, 102–120.; 154–161; 332–337 and 391–394.

70 Larsen 1955, 226; De Sanctis 1908, 257 n.1; Tarn 1928, 737; Schwahn 1931, 1256.

71 Aymard 1938, 81–83; Larsen 1968, 226; Walbank 1979, 187; Rizakis 2015, 128 n.59.

72 See Rizakis 2011; for the admission of Megara, Pagai and Aigosthena, see Freitag 2016. The number of member states in the period of the highest *acme* of the League has been evaluated as between 60 and 70 members: see Warren 2007, 152–154; Löbel 2014, 405–408.

73 Livy 45.28.7 (Aitolia). *IG IX.2 261* (Thessaly). The *synedrion* of the Thessalian *Koionon* (property qualifications for holding offices: see Livy 34.51.6; cf. Larsen 1955, 102; Bouchon, Helly 2015, 240f has at the time of Tiberius, 334 members [*IG IX.2 261*]). We do not know the number of the members in the Lykian *synedrion* (Jameson 1980, 842f). The recently excavated assembly hall possibly used for federal assemblies in Patara could host some 1000–1400 people which gives an approximate idea towards the size of the federal assemblies (see Korkut and Grosche 2007).

74 See Rizakis 2008b, 278–282.

75 Walbank 1979, 187. For preliminary discussions in the Aitolian or the Akarnanian *boulē*, see Funke 2015, 110f (Aitolia) and *IG IX.2.208–209*, 582–583, 588 and *SEG 43.227* (Akarnania).

order to avenge Philopoimen's death.⁷⁶ In conclusion, we can say that the record of the vote and its secrecy shows that members of the Achaian *boulē* voted as individuals and not by delegations, as they did in case of primary assemblies (*i.e.* *synklētoi*).⁷⁷

The question concerning the composition of the *synodos* is more complicated, and none of the theories proposed are satisfactory. Nonetheless, the similarity between the institutions of the Achaian and the Lykian leagues in connection to their representation practices has been definitely established. This could support the idea that the composition of the Achaian *synodos*⁷⁸ in its normal form, could be analogous to that of the *arhairesiakē ekklēsia* of the Lykian *koinon* (ongoing magistrates with members of the *boulē* or big electors or both).⁷⁹ In any case, this assembly – which was the main governing body – was generally composed of wealthy citizens

- 76 Plut. *Phil.* 21.1. The precise meaning of πρόβουλοι is not clear but from the various solutions proposed I agree with that of Larsen 1955, 178 and Walbank 1979, 408 and 410 who suppose that it indicates the members of the council (federal officials according to Schwahn 1931, 1257; Aymard 1938, 213 n.5).
- 77 The authority on voting by cities in the *synklētoi* is not Polybios but Livy: 32.22.8–11; 32.19.6 (*Sikyone datum est iis concilium*) and 23.1 (198 BCE); 32.20.7 and 22.2; 38.32.1 (Briscoe 1973 and 2008 *adloc.*); such a practice is not unknown in other federations: Livy 33.2.6; cf. Beck, Ganter 2015, 154 with bibliography (Boiotia); Livy 33.16.3 (Akarnania); cf. Aymard 1938, 377–394; Larsen 1955, 83f; O'Neil 1980, 46 n.57. Walbank 1976–1977, 40 and n.66a where he observes that voting by cities is not a Roman practice.
- 78 On the combinations proposed on the composition of the *synodoi*, see Walbank 1970, 129–143; *id.* 1979, 406–414; who withdrew his earlier views and, following Giovannini's idea 1969, 1–17 (a summary of this theory is given by Walbank in his introductory paragraphs and by Larsen 1972, 179f), argued that the *synodos* was composed of the members of the *boulē*, the magistrates and the primary assembly (cf. Mendels 1979–1980, 88); for a critical approach to Giovannini's theory see Larsen 1972, 178–185. Rémy's theory 2008, 110f that the council consisted of city officials is a speculation based on a confusing passage of Pausanias who, speaking of a meeting which was not a *synodos*, affirms that it was attended by the magistrates of the Achaian cities (7.14.1: τοῖς ἐν ἐκάστη πόλει ἔχοντες τὰς ἀρχάς).
- 79 The political decisions then were taken by the elites of the member states which made up the various federal bodies: see Aymard 1938, 56, 137, 335f, 380, 405; Tarn 1928, 739; Musti 1967, 163; *id.*, 1995, 307; Errington 1969, 6–8.; Walbank 1979, 406–408.; O'Neil 1984, 33–44; who 1984, 42 speaks about a 'self-perpetuated elite' in Achaia (a similar situation can be found in some of the other leagues: Rzepka 2006, 111–135; Funke 2015, 112f [Boiotia]; Daverio Rocchi 2015, 184f [Lokris]). The fact that the *boulēutai* and other officials were unpaid in Achaia (Polyb. 22.7.8; cf. Aymard 1938, 331–337. Larsen 1968, 232) suggests that the participation of the lower classes in political life would be limited (Welwei 1966, 282–301; Mendels 1979–1980, 88–93). The magistrates and other major officials played a main role 'in the decision-making'. In the case of Eumenes' offer successful speakers such as Apollonidas of Sikyon and Kassandros of Aigina are not known to have held any magistracy although the former was a prominent politician (Polyb. 22.8.1–13; cf. O'Neil 1984, 41). Even though the Achaian constitution gave all citizens the equal right of taking part in politics, not all citizens had an equal chance to exercise this right. Nevertheless, in some critical circumstances common people show that they were not deprived of any power (O'Neil 1984, 43). Many passages in Polybios suggest the existence of a socio-economic tension between the rich and poor classes which reached its summit during the Achaian war (Polyb. 38.10.1–13; cf. Fuks 1970, 78f.; Mendels 1979–1980, 88–93. See also note 80 below

from various cities, as in Aitolia, who were members of the most prominent families and had, by these means, held political power and enjoyed the possibility of influencing governing decisions since the end of the third century BCE.⁸⁰

IV. THE ACHAIAIAN INSTITUTIONAL MODEL

What is the role of Achaia and Achaian institutions in this process of the ‘politici-zation’ of other federal states such as the Italiote League⁸¹ and the Lykian *Koinon*? Similarities and differences can be better detected and contrasted in the case of the latter, which took shape gradually and acquired a precise institutional form in the first half of the second century during Lykian conflicts after the Peace of Apamea (188 BCE).⁸² This federalist evolution of the Lykians was sponsored by Rome⁸³ and some Polybian passages let us presume that the Lykians were inspired by the Achaian model in the establishment of their new federal constitution. We really have no idea when exactly the relations between the two leagues began, but we can suppose that these contacts became closer after Apamea (188 BCE) when the conflicts with Rhodes pushed the Lykian cities to send several embassies to Rome.⁸⁴ The long stay of the largest of these embassies in Achaia in 178/177 BCE,⁸⁵ probably allowed the Lykians to acquire intimate knowledge of the Achaian institutions, and maybe of that of other contemporary leagues. This would have then served as the basis for the creation – eventually with the help of Rome – of a new form of federal organization of the cities, i.e. the Κοινὸν τῶν Λυκίων, which liberated them from dependence on the Rhodians in a lasting manner.⁸⁶

Strabo’s text concerning Lykia along with the Achaian inscriptions on federal *nomographoi* suggest that the selection of the members of the respective representative federal bodies were in both cases identical. This thus betrays a very close relationship between the Λυκιακὸν σύστημα and the Achaian model. One could multi-

80 It is not unreasonable to assume that members of this privileged ‘classe politique’ would be the 1000 Achaians hostages required by Rome after the third Makedonian war (167 BCE), see Tagliafico 1995, 215–223.

81 For this league, see Fronda 2015, 386–402 (with the previous bibliography).

82 Polyb. 21.24.7–8; *loc. cit.* 45.8; 22.5.1–2; Appian *Syr.* 44; Livy 37.55.5–6; Briscoe 1981, 385. As has been said by Larsen 1945, 71–73 the Lykian League knew a real development after the liberation from Rhodian control, although ‘some approaches to unity it at an earlier date are recognised’.

83 For other Roman initiatives, see Giannakopoulos in this volume.

84 See Jameson 1979, 833 with n.5. Polybios, then young politician of the Achaian League but especially historian, describes these embassies.

85 This episode is reported in different chronological contexts in Polybios and Livy, cf. Lehmann 1983, 239; 1979, 833 with n.5; Behrwald 2000, 181 n.86; cf. also Canali de Rossi 1997, 216f no.260.

86 An Achaian mediation in order to gain the support of Rome is not alleged in the sources; see Behrwald 2000, 164 n.12 and 89 n.290; see also the previous note. For the foundation of the Lykian League and the related problems, see Behrwald 2000, 161–169; *id.* 2015.

ply the examples of similarities between the two leagues in regards to several aspects: first, Artemidorus says that the *koinon synedrion* of the Lykian League did not meet in a city that was considered as the capital but εἰς κοινὸν συνέδριον, ἣν ἄν δοκιμάσωσι πόλιν ἐλόμενοι (Strabo 14.3.3).⁸⁷ This formula recalls the decision made by the Achaian federal authorities in 189/8 BCE under the leadership of Philopoimen,⁸⁸ which put an end to Aigion's claims as the exclusive meeting place of the League; the federal 'capital' lost its monopoly on federal assemblies in favour of a rotating schedule in various cities.

Some inscriptions reveal in Lykia the presence of the same federal magistrates known in Achaia and other Greek leagues. They were designated by either the *synodos* or the *archairesiakē ekklēsia* respectively as well the general courts of justice.⁸⁹ The commander in chief of the federal troops⁹⁰ was the *stratēgos* assisted by the hipparch.⁹¹ From the Orthagoras Decree in Lykia, which mentions the federal rank of *apoteleios* also known in Achaia,⁹² it seems that the member states in both cases sent contingents under their own officers and paid contributions to the central government.⁹³ Other minor officials called (e.g. *hypostratēgoi* or *hagemones*) could undertake regional tasks,⁹⁴ while the regional army group of mobilized free citizens

87 See Knoepfler 2013, 153.

88 Livy 38.30.1–6: 'The consul having arranged matters in Kephallenia and stationed a garrison at Same crossed to the Peloponnesus, whither the Aigians especially and the Lakedaemonians had long been summoning him. From the beginning of the Achaian League the members of the assembly had all been called for Aigium, whether this was a tribute to the importance of the city or the convenience of the place. This custom Philopoimen, in this year for the first time, was trying to break down and was preparing to propose a law that the meetings should be held in all cities which belonged to the Achaian League in rotation. And at the approach of the consul, when the *damiurgoi* of the cities (they are chief magistrates) called the meeting at Aigium, Philopoimen – he was then praetor – summoned it at Argos'; cf. Aymard 1938, 292–307; Rizakis 1995, 131 no.175.

89 For Achaia, see Polyb. 23.4.5 and 4.14; 24.9.13; Livy 39.35.8 and 36.2 (cf. Paus. 7.9.2); *id.* 42.51.8; *Syll.*³ 490.4–5 and the comments of Walbank 1957, 120; for Lykia, Str. 14.3.3: Δικαστήριά τε ἀποδείκνυται κοινῆ; cf. Mitchell 2005 and Schuller 2007.

90 Cassius Dio 47.33.1 speaks of the κοινὸν τῶν Λυκίων στράτευμα but in an honorary inscription it is used (for their commander) in the formula Λυκίων οἱ συστρατευσάμενοι: *SEG* 45.1825.

91 The hipparch was the second of the federal magistrates, see Larsen 1971, 84. The charge of navarch, which is not-mentioned by Polybios, is known by one inscription: *Syll.*³ 490, ll. 6–7 (admission in the League of Orchomenos, in 234/233 BCE). For the homonymous magistrates in Lykia, see Larsen 1945, 95f; *id.* 1956, 179, 183, 248f; Jameson 1979, 835f with n.10; Behrwald 2015, 409f.

92 The local military commander of the contingent of a city, in the rank of ἀποτέλειος is attested once in Lykia (*SEG* 18.570; cf. Larsen 1956, 152 and 167) but more in Achaian *Koinon* (*Syll.*³ 600; Polyb. 10.23.9; 16.36.3); see also *Suidas s.v. ἀποτέλειοι*. Another parallelism between the two leagues is, according to Larsen 1956, 166f, the fact that in both leagues the civic authorities of the member states communicated with the central government through 'ambassadors'.

93 Cf. Behrwald 2015, 410 with n.23 (Lykia).

94 On *hypostratēgoi*, see Polyb. 4.59.2; 5.94.1 and 38.18.2; 38.16.4; 40.3.4 (cf. Walbank, *adloc.*) and Paus. 7.11.3 and 15.2; cf. Rizakis 1995, no.444, 457 and 466 with comments, *loc. cit.* 261 no 430 no.2a. Polybios 38.18.2 presented the *hypostratēgos* as president of a council (διαβούλιον) whose role is unknown. The function of *hypohipparchos* is attested in the Lykian

or mercenaries was under the command of a *hypostratēgos*.⁹⁵ The *nomographoi* equally attested in the two leagues are probably officers who codified the laws without a regular function but were elected occasionally to regulate internal conflicts or vote federal laws.⁹⁶

Although the various testimonies concerning the tax system in Lykia,⁹⁷ as well as in Achaia, lack precision, we can suppose that with the exception of regular obligations or various indirect taxes⁹⁸ the federal government could ask, at critical moments, for an extra contribution (*eisphora* or *telos*), from the cities, in order to respond to the situation.⁹⁹ This is confirmed by a passage of Polybios in which the historian (4.60.5; cf. also 4.60.9–10) reproaches the decision of some Achaian cities, which in a critical moment of the Social War refused to pay their contributions to the central government.¹⁰⁰ The idea that contributions of any kind would be calculated in proportion to the respective population of a member city, probably following the scale 3:2:1, is an exciting hypothesis.¹⁰¹ In both leagues, the *tamias* was charged with the management of direct or indirect taxes, and, especially in Lykia,

League (Behrwald 2015, 409f). The term *hagemones*, denoting the Federal magistrates, is mentioned in the inscription from Messene (*SEG* 58.370, l. 17) and maybe the Latin term *principum* used by Livy 41.24.19 is its equivalent. Behrwald 2015, 411 and n.23 underlines the singular mention of a *hegemon* in a Hellenistic inscription from Myra (Petersen and von Luschan 1889 no.67) supposing that it might refer 'to an allied commander or to a Lykian officer'. The *stratēgos*, is attested in Lykia too, as well in other leagues in the Hellenistic period and later on. We do not know if in Lykia this high charge was identical with that of the Lykiarch (Jameson 1979, 835f with n.14; Behrwald 2015, 410 with n.22).

- 95 Polyb. 4.59.1; 5.94.1; 38.16.4; 40.3.4; cf. Walbank, *ad loc.* and Paus. 7.11.3 and 15.2; Rizakis 1995, no.444, 457 and 466 with comments, *loc. cit.* 261 no.430 no.2a.
- 96 Lykia: *TAM* II 420 (*nomographoi*); it was the same according to Reitzenstein 2001, 30 cited by Behrwald 2015, 410 n.27 who assumes that the *μετάπεμπα δικάστηρα*, also attested in the second century CE (*TAM* II 905), were also irregular institutions (cf. also Larsen 1956, 249–253).
- 97 Behrwald 2015, 410 with n. 25.
- 98 See Mackil 2013, 289–304. The indirect taxes were associated with land use or customs, imposts or duties levied on the import and export of goods through harbors within the territory of the *Koinon*. This question is better known for the Lykian *Koinon*, especially during the Empire, thanks to new epigraphic testimonies; see Takmer 2007, 165–188 (*SEG* 57.1666); cf. Behrwald 2015, 426.
- 99 Every city of the *koinon* should raise troops serving the common cause: Polyb. 4.7.10; 5.91.4 and 6–7; it was the *stratēgos en cours* who fixed the importance of cities' contribution in armed citizens (Polyb. 4.7.10). It seems that some cities had financial problems and could not pay their contributions (Polyb. 5.30.5–7) but as noted by Mendels 1979–1980, 90 and n.29, based on Polyb. 5.94.9, they were relieved later (cf. also Griffith 1935, 102).
- 100 See Walbank 1957, 514 who highlights our ignorance about Achaian finance; see also Mackil 2013, 290 and 299–302 (where other interesting examples of such non-regular contributions are cited).
- 101 See Rizakis 2003, 99 n.12. It is highly probable that at the beginning (the first *Koinon*) the twelve small Achaian cities contributed equally to the federal army; see Helly 1997; Löbel 2014, 87 and 93.

with the funds for military needs as well as the quadrennial festival celebrated in honor of Apollo.¹⁰²

Perhaps Achaia was not the only model for the Lykian League, as the federal experiences of the Hellenistic period created a common federal culture that could inspire further attempts at similar organizations that were in turn developed and adapted according to local traditions and realities. But there is no doubt that the Lykians were inspired by the Achaians in some points concerning their external¹⁰³ as well internal organisation. The Achaian representative system was the model, between 188 and 167 BCE¹⁰⁴ for the creation of the Lykian system, especially in the selection of delegates to the deliberative assemblies or the selection of various magistracies, judges and taxes.¹⁰⁵ And as has been said by Knoepfler,¹⁰⁶ the Achaians deserved to be included in Book IX of the *Esprit des lois*, as a model of that ‘belle République fédérative’, if Montesquieu had guessed that these people were the creators of the representative system mentioned in Strabo (14.3.3).¹⁰⁷

102 See Jameson 1979, 836 with n.12–13; cf. also Behrwald 2015, 410 with n.24.

103 The Convention of the Létôon concluded between the Lykian confederacy and the city of the Termessians near Oinoanda, probably after 167 BCE, shows that the League negotiated and concluded agreements with the city of Termessos, the city of Tlos and probably that of Kadyanda, which were represented by the Confederation itself. Rousset 2010, 76f and n.278 points out that the same procedure was followed by the Achaian Confederation in the early second century. In a territorial dispute between Megara-Pagai, members of the Achaian League, and Aigosthena, a member of the Boiotian Confederation, the Achaian League sent its court judges (*IG* VII.187; Cf. Harter-Uibopuu 1998, 110f).

104 This point was highlighted particularly by Behrwald 2000, 89 and n.290, 164 n.12 and 165 with n.14. On the contacts between Lykians and Achaians, on the occasion of the travels of the former during this period to Rome, see notes 85–86 *supra*. According to Larsen 1956, 151–159; Jameson 1979, 835 and n.9, the decree of Araxa, voted in honour of Orthagoras around 180 BCE for his services to the city and the Lykians, reveals that the Lykian League existed from early in the second century BCE but the dating of the inscription of Araxa and the events it narrates are the subject of a long scientific controversy. In a recent paper Denis Rousset 2010, 98 prefers a lower date both for the document itself and for the events it recounts, some of which may actually be placed before 167 BCE: ‘after 167 and probably in the second half of the second century and also to admit that the events he narrates, maybe in chronological order, some may have put in the first half of the second century and even before 167 BC’; see especially Rousset 2010, 127–133 (with much discussion on the date); cf. the detailed discussion on this problem and relevant bibliography in Knoepfler 2013, 147–151.

105 Lehmann 1983, 250. Although the recently published treaties between Lykia and Rome regulate competences of Roman and Lykian courts, the latter’s structure ‘remain silent’: see Mitchell 2005; Schuler 2007b cited by Behrwald 2015, 410 n.28.

106 Knoepfler 2013, 153f thinks that the pioneers and the real inventors in this domain were the Boiotians, since the mid of the fifth century BCE.

107 Similarly, Larsen 1956, 166f, after examining the parallelisms between the two leagues, concluded that ‘the strong position of the federalism in Greece might argue that Achaia should be ‘the more likely pioneer’.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, J.K. (1967) Philopoemen's Reform in the Achaian Army, *Classical Philology* 62, 104–105.
- Ashton, R.H.J. and A.R. Meadows (2008) The Letoon Deposit: Lykian League Coinage, Rhodian Plinthophori, and Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms from Haliartos (yet again) and Asia Minor, *The Numismatic Chronicle* 168, 111–134.
- Aymard, A. (1938) *Les assemblées de la confédération achaienne: Étude critique d'institutions et d'histoire*. Bordeaux.
- Aymard, A. (1950) L'organisation de la Macédoine en 167 et le régime représentatif dans le monde grec, *Classical Philology* 45, 96–107.
- Baland, A. (1981) *Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Létôon*, Paris.
- Bastini, A. (1987) *Der Achäische Bund als hellenische Mittelmacht. Geschichte des Achäischen Koinon in der Symmachie mit Rom*, Frankfurt.
- Beck, H. (1997) *Polis und Koinon: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart.
- Beck, H. and A. Ganter (2015) Boiotia and the Boiotian League, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 132–157.
- Bednar, J. (2009) *The Political Science of Federalism*, Department of Political Science University of Michigan, Mzay 25, 2011, 1–51.
- Behrwald, R. (2000) *Der Lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*, Bonn.
- Behrwald, R. (2015) The Lykian league, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in the Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 403–418.
- Bingen J. (1954) Inscriptions d'Achaïe, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 78, 402–407.
- Bodin J. (1986) *Six Livres de la République*, Paris.
- Bouchon, R. and B. Helly (2015) The Thessalian League, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 231–249.
- Brawn E. (1983) Die extreme Demokratie bei Polybios und bei Aristoteles, *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 54, 1–39.
- Briscoe J. (1973) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 31–33*, Oxford.
- Briscoe J. (1981) *A Commentary on Livy. Books 34–37*, Oxford.
- Briscoe J. (2008) *A Commentary on Livy. Books 38–40*, Oxford.
- Buraselis, K. and K. Zoumboulakis (eds.) (2003) *The Idea of European Community in History vol. II*, Athens.
- Busolt, G. (1926) *Griechische Staatskunde II*, Munich.
- Canali de Rossi, F. (1997) *Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma in età repubblicana*, Roma.
- Chinard, G. (1940) Polybios and the American constitution, *Journal of the History of Ideas* I, 38–58.
- Cole, T. (1961) The Source and Composition of Polybios VI, *Historia* 13, 444–486.
- Corsten, T. (1999) *Vom Stamm zum Bund: Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten*, München.
- Daverio Rocchi, G. (2015) The Lokrians and their Federal Leagues, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 179–198.
- Eckstein, A. (1995) *Moral visions in the Histories of Polybios*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Ehrenberg, V. (1976) *L'état grec: La cité – l'état fédéral – la monarchie hellénistique*, Paris.
- Errington, R.M. (1969) *Philopoemen*, Oxford.
- Ferrabino, A. (1921) *Il Problema dell'unità nazionale nella Grecia antica, I, Arato di Sicione e l'idea nazionale*, Florence.
- Freeman, E.A. (1893) *History of the Federal Government from the Foundation of the Achaian League to the Disruption of the United States*, London/Cambridge.

- Freitag, K. (2015) Poleis in *Koina*. Zu den Auswirkungen von bundesstaatlichen Organisationsformen auf Strukturen in griechischen *Poleis* der hellenistischen Zeit unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Polis* Megara, in A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann (eds.), *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*, Heidelberg, 56–67.
- Fronza, M.P. (2015) The Italiote League and Southern Italy, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 386–402.
- Fuks, A. (1970) The *Bellum Achaicum* and its Social Aspect, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 90, 78–89.
- Ghinatti, F. (1961–1962) Ricerche sulla lega italiota, *Atti e Memorie della Accademia Patavina di Scienze Lettere ed Arti* 74, 117–133.
- Giovannini, A. (1969) Polybe et les assemblées achéennes, *Museum Helveticum* 26, 1–17.
- Giovannini, A. (1971) *Untersuchungen über die Natur und die Anfänge der bundesstaatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland*, Göttingen.
- Giovannini, A. (2003) Genèse et accomplissement de l'Etat fédéral (de la Grèce antique à la Constitution américaine de 1787–1789), in K. Buraselis et K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History, Vol. II*, Athens, 143–176.
- Griffith, G.T. (1935) *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge.
- Gschntzer, F. (1985) Die Nomographenliste von Epidauros (IG IV 12, 73) und des Achäische Bund im späten 3. Jh. v. Chr., *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 58, 103–107.
- Guelfucci, M.-R. (2006) Polybe et Montesquieu: aspects d'une réflexion commune, *Anabases* 4, 125–136.
- Hamon, P. (2001) A propos de l'institution du Conseil dans les cités grecques de l'époque hellénistique, *Revue des Études Grecques* 114/2, XVI–XXI.
- Hamon, P. (2005) Le conseil et la participation des citoyens: la mutation de la basse époque hellénistique, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller (eds.), *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique: actes de la table ronde des 22 et 23 mai 2004*, Paris, 121–144.
- Hamon, P. (2007) Elites dirigeantes et processus d'aristocratisation à l'époque hellénistique, in H.-L. Fernoux and C. Stein (eds.), *Aristocratie antique: modèles et exemplarité sociale*, Dijon, 77–98.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. (1998) *Die zwischenstaatliche Schiedsverfahren im achäischen Koinon. Zur friedliche Streitbeilegung nach den epigraphischen Quellen*, Köln.
- Helly, B. (1997) Arithmétique et histoire. L'organisation militaire et politique des Ioniens en Achaïe à l'époque archaïque, *Topoi* 7, 207–262.
- Jameson, S. (1980) The Lycian League: Some Problems of its Administration, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 7, 832–855.
- Knoepfler, D. (1990) Contributions à l'épigraphie de Chalcis III. Décrets fédéraux et décrets municipaux au IIe siècle av. J.-C., *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 114, 473–498.
- Knoepfler, D. (2002) Oropos et la confédération béotienne à la lumière de quelques inscriptions 'révisitées', *Chiron* 32, 119–155.
- Knoepfler, D. (2013) 'Un modèle de belle république fédérative'? Montesquieu et le système politique des Lyciens, de la genèse de l'*Esprit des Lois* aux découvertes épigraphiques les plus récentes en Asie Mineure méridionale, *Journal des savants*, 115–154.
- Kokkinia, C. (2000) *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis. Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien*, Bonn.
- Kokkinia, C. (2008) *Boubon. The inscriptions and archeological remains. A survey 2004–2006*, Athens.
- Korkut, T. and G. Grosche (ed.) (2007) *Das Boulēuterion von Patara. Versammlungsgebäude des lykischen Bundes*, Istanbul.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1943) Tituli Asiae Minoris II, 508 Part I. Introduction, Text, and Commentary, *Classical Philology* 38, 177–190.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1945) Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism, *Classical Philology* 40, 65–97.

- Larsen, J.A.O. (1955) *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, London.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1956) The Araxa Inscription and the Lykian Confederacy, *Classical Philology* 51, 151–169.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1957) Lykia and the Greek Federal Citizenship, *Symbolae Osloenses* 33, 5–26.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1968) *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*, Oxford.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1971) The Rights of Cities within the Achaean Confederacy, *Classical Philology* 66, 81–86.
- Larsen, J.A.O. (1972) A Recent Interpretation of the Achaian Assemblies, *Classical Philology* 67, 178–185.
- Lehmann, G.A. (1981) Ansätze zur bundesstaatlichen Ordnung und repräsentativen Verfassung in der Antike und ihre Rückwirkungen auf die Neuzeit, *Geschichte in Köln* 9, 54–88.
- Lehmann, G.A. (1983) Erwägungen zur Struktur des achäischen Bundesstaates, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 51, 237–261.
- Lehmann, G.A. (1985) Die Rezeption der achäischen Bundesverfassung in der Verfassung der USA, *Xenia* 15, 171–182.
- Lehmann, G. A. (2001) *Ansätze zu einer Theorie des griechischen Bundesstaates bei Aristoteles und Polybios*, Göttingen.
- Lehmann, G.A. (2015) Greek Federalism and the Rediscovery of Polybios, and the Framing of the American Constitution, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in the Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge, 512–523.
- Löbel Y. (2014) *Die Poleis der bundesstaatlichen Gemeinwesen im antiken Griechenland. Untersuchungen zum Machtverhältnis zwischen Poleis und Zentralgewalten bis 167 v. Chr.*, Alessandria.
- Mably, Abbé de (1766–1767) *Observations sur l'histoire de la Grèce ou des causes de la prospérité et des malheurs des Grecs*, Geneva/Zurich.
- Mackil, E. (2013) *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon. Hellenistic Culture and Society*, Berkeley.
- Madison, J. (1984) *Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787, reported by James Madison with an Introduction by Adr. Koch*, 2nd edition, Athens.
- Magie, D. S. (1950) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, Princeton.
- Martin, D.G. (1975) *Greek Leagues in the later Second and first Centuries B.C.* (PhD Thesis), Princeton.
- Mendels, D. (1979–1980) Polybios and the constitution of the Achaian League: a note, *Scripta classica israelica* 5, 85–93.
- Montesquieu, C.-L. (1748) *L'esprit des lois*, Geneva. New edition in *La Bibliothèque de la Pleiade*, Paris 1951; and by Gonsague Truc, Paris 1961 [Livre IX].
- Moretti, L. (1962) Le federazione dei Lici, in L. Moretti, *Ricerche sulle leghe greche*, Roma, 171–218.
- Müller, C. (2005) La procédure d'adoption des décrets en Béotie de la fin du IIIe siècle av. J.–C au Ier s. apr. J.–C., in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller (eds.), *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique: actes de la table ronde des 22 et 23 mai 2004*, Paris, 95–119.
- Müller, C. (2011) Quelques réflexions autour des districts de la confédération béotienne à l'époque hellénistique, in N. Badoud (ed.), *Philologos Dionysios, Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler*, Geneva, 261–282.
- Musti, D. (1967) Polibio e la democrazia, *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa* 36, 155–207.
- Musti, D. (1995) *Demokratia: Origini di un'idea*, Roma.
- Newman, W. L. (1902) *Politics of Aristotle*, Oxford.
- O'Neil, J.L. (1980) Who Attended Achaian Assemblies?, *Museum Helveticum* 37, 41–49.
- O'Neil, J.L. (1984–1986) The Political Elites of the Achaian and Aitolian Leagues, *Ancient Society* 15–17, 33–61.

- Petersen, E. and F. von Luschan (1889) *Reisen in Lykien. Milyas und Kibyrtien*, Vienna.
- Rémy, A. (2008) Polybe et les institutions de la confédération achéenne, *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* I, 101–125.
- Rizakis, A. (1995) *Achaïe I. Sources textuelles et histoire régionale*, Athènes.
- Rizakis, A. (2003) Le collège des nomographes et le système de représentation dans le *Koinon* achéen, in K. Buraselis and K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), *The Idea of European Community in History II*, Athens, 97–109.
- Rizakis, A. (2008a) *Achaïe III. Les cités achéennes: Épigraphie et histoire*, Athens/Paris.
- Rizakis, A. (2008b) L'expérience de l'organisation inter civique et supra civique dans la confédération achéenne, in M. Lombardo and F. Frisone (eds.), *Forme sovrapoleiche e interpoleiche di organizzazione nel mondo greco antico*, Galatina, 274–292.
- Rizakis, A. (2011) Real-Politik της Ρώμης και η θλιβερή τύχη της Μεσσήνης μετά τον Β' Μακεδονικό πόλεμο (196–182 π.Χ.), in P. Valavanis (ed.), *Ταξιδεύοντας στην κλασσική Ελλάδα. Τόμος προς τιμήν του καθηγητού Πέτρου Θέμελη*, Athens, 271–281.
- Rizakis, A. (2016) Territorio e riorganizzazione delle *poleis* nell'Achaia orientale da Omero a Strabone, in A. Pontradolfo (ed.), *Egialea, Ricerche nella valle del Krios*, Monografie della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in oriente XXIV, Athens, 19–30.
- Robinson, C.A. (1941) *The Greek Political Experience. Studies in Honor of W.K. Prentice*, Princeton.
- Roesch, P. (1982) *Études béotiennes*, Paris.
- Rousset, D. (2010) *De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lycéens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda*, Geneva.
- Roy, J. (2003) The Arcadians in Inschriften von Magnesia, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145, 123–130.
- Rzepka, J. (2006) *The Rights of Cities within the Aitolian Confederacy*, Valencia.
- Salmon, P. (1956) Les districts béotiens, *Revue des études anciennes* 58, 51–70.
- Schindler, F. (1972) *Die Inschriften von Boubon (NordLykien)*, Vienne.
- Schuler, C. (2007) Ein Vertrag zwischen Rom und die Lykiern aus Tyberissos, in C. Schuler (ed.), *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien*, Vienna, 51–79.
- Schwahn, W. (1931) Das Bürgerrecht der sympolitischen Bundesstaaten bei den Griechen, *Hermes* 66, 97–118.
- Sizov, S.K. (2016) Two Lists of Achaïan *nomographoi*, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 198, 101–109.
- Swoboda, H. (1912) Studien zu den griechischen Bünden: 3. Die Städte im achäischen Bunde, *Klio*, 12, 17–50.
- Swoboda, H. (1922) Die neue Urkunden von Epidauros, *Hermes* 57, 518–534.
- Tagliafico, M. (1995) Le deportazioni degli Achei a Roma nel 167 a.C., in M. Sordi (ed.), *Coercizione e mobilità umana nel mondo antico*, Milano, 215–223.
- Takmer, B. (2007) Lex portorii provinciae Lykia. Ein Vorbericht über die Zollinschrift aus Adriaque aus neronischer Zeit, *Gephyra* 4, 165–188.
- Tarn, W. (1928) The Greek leagues and Macedonia, *Cambridge Ancient History* 7, 732–768.
- Thornton, J. (2000) Une regione vista da lontano: la Licia di Strabone dai dati geografici al mito dell'*Eunomia*, in A.M. Biraschi and G. Salmeri (eds.), *Strabone e l'Asia Minore*, Naples, 401–459.
- Troxell, H. A. (1982) *The Coinage of the Lycian League*, New York.
- Tuci, P. (2003) La democrazia di Polibio tra eredità classica e federalismo, in C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, and G. Zecchini (eds.), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico. Contributi di storia antica*, Milano, 45–86.
- Urban, K. (1979) *Wachstum und Krise des Achäischen Bundes*, Wiesbaden.
- Walbank, F.W. (1957–1979) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 volumes, Oxford.
- Walbank, F.W. (1970) The Achaean Assemblies Again, *Museum Helveticum* 27, 129–143.

- Walbank, F.W. (1985) Were there Greek federal states?, in F.W. Walbank, *Selected Papers: Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography*, Cambridge, 2–37.
- Warren, J.A. (2007) *The Bronze Coinage of the Achaian Koinon: The Currency of a Federal Ideal*, London.
- Watts, R. (1999) *Comparing Federal Systems*, 2nd ed. Montreal.
- Welwei, W. (1966) Demokratie und Masse bei Polybios, *Historia* 15, 282–301.