

The Dependent *Polis*: Further Considerations, in Response to Pierre Fröhlich

Mogens Herman Hansen

IN 2010 Pierre Fröhlich published a very long and important assessment of the work of the Copenhagen Polis Centre,¹ and specifically of its principal publication, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford 1994).² It is the most thorough and in-depth analysis of our project I have seen, and there are several of his perspicacious observations I would like to take up; but here I focus on his critique of the concept of the dependent *polis* (645 and 660–667) which is absolutely central to the whole *polis* project.

Fröhlich opens his account with an agreement: “Un des mérites des travaux du Centre est d’avoir montré que l’association systématique de la notion de cité avec celle d’indépendance au sens moderne du mot aboutissait à des apories, dans la mesure où un très grand nombre de cités devraient alors perdre ce statut, ainsi celles qui étaient incluses dans la Ligue de Délos, celles qui vivaient sous la domination perse, etc. ... Hansen a englobé tous ces exemples sous un même concept et en a tiré une typologie de 15 différents types de *poleis* dépendantes. Mais il reconnaît que ce concept est ‘très complexe’ et qu’il y a de grandes différences entre les cas recensés” (660–661).

Fröhlich’s inference, however, from the many different types

¹ *RHist* 655 (2010) 637–677.

² Hereafter abbreviated *Inventory*. A number in parentheses after a named *polis* refers to its number in the *Inventory*.

of dependent *polis* is to question the concept itself: “Une telle variété de cas particuliers, si différent les uns des autres, suscite le doute sur la validité même du concept. Il me semble plus créer de confusion qu’apporter de clarté” (661).

I am inclined to disagree with such a view. Compare, for example, various types of the *autonomos polis*. (1) Small communities grew to become *autonomoi poleis*. That is probably how most *poleis* originated.³ (2) As far as we know the majority of colonies were politically independent of their *metropolis*.⁴ (3) There are examples of *autonomoi poleis* that were also *emporion*, e.g. Tauric Chersonesos (no. 695).⁵ (4) Some *autonomoi poleis* were created by a synoecism of *poleis*, e.g. Messene (no. 318).⁶ (5) Members of an egalitarian federation were *autonomoi*.⁷ (6) In a hegemonic federation only the leading member was *autonomos* (e.g. Thebes).⁸ (7) After the Persian War the Ionian *poleis* were *autonomoi*, until the Delian League developed into an Athenian empire (Thuc. 1.97.1). They became *autonomoi* once again after the end of the Peloponnesian War until the Kings Peace in 386 (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31, quoted 869 below), and again after Alexander’s conquest of Asia Minor (Diod. 17.24.1). (8) Members of the Second Athenian Naval League were *autonomoi* (*IG* II² 43.20–25). (9) In a region dominated by a large *polis* (e.g.

³ E.g. the Achaian communities which fairly late grew to become *poleis*: see C. Morgan and J. M. Hall, in *Inventory* 473–474.

⁴ E.g. the large Sicilian colonies, cf. Thuc. 6.20.2 quoted 867 below.

⁵ Ἐμπόριον (Ps.-Skylax 68; *IOSPE* I² 401.5–6 ὑπὲρ ... ἐλευθερίας πόλεος): M. H. Hansen, “*Emporion*: A Study of the Use and Meaning of the Term in the Archaic and Classical Periods,” in G. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas* (Leiden 2006) 1–39 (revised and updated version of *CPCPapers* IV 83–105).

⁶ De facto independent of Sparta, although the Spartans refused to give up their claim to supremacy over Messene: Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.36 and 7.4.9.

⁷ Y. Löbel, *Die Poleis der bundesstaatlichen Gemeinwesen im antiken Griechenland: Untersuchungen zum Machtverhältnis zwischen Poleis und Zentralgewalten bis 167 v. Chr.* (Alessandria 2014) 80–88, see 872 below.

⁸ M. H. Hansen, in *Inventory* 92–93.

Argolis dominated by Argos) some of the other *poleis* were subdued and annihilated by Argos, e.g. Tiryns (no. 356) and Mykenai (no. 353), but others survived, apparently as *autonomoi poleis*, e.g. Epidauros (no. 348), Halieis (no. 349), Phleious (no. 356), and Troizen (no. 357).⁹ So, *autonomoi poleis* existed in many different shapes and sizes, and certain types of *autonomoi poleis* were common in some regions but virtually nonexistent in others.

Must we believe that such a variety of particular instances, so different from one another, throws doubt on the validity of the concept itself, *viz.* the concept of the *autonomos polis*? I think not. Both in our sources and in modern scholarship the concept of the *autonomos polis* is correctly applied to *poleis* of very different types. Similarly, the many different types of dependent *poleis* are in no way incompatible with the overarching concept of the dependent *polis*.

What makes Fröhlich suspicious of the concept of the dependent *polis* is, I think, that my chapter in *Inventory* (87–94) is entitled “a typology of dependent *poleis*.” I list and briefly describe 15 different types with overlaps between the types, but I do not discuss the concept itself. True, in the first note I refer to six articles¹⁰ in which I do treat the concept, its various aspects, and its relation to the concept of the *autonomos polis*; but a reference was obviously not enough. In the *Inventory* I ought to have added an introduction summarising the essence of the argument in my previous articles.

Furthermore, the concept of the dependent *polis* is a hybrid just like the concept of the independent *polis*. Dependence and independence are modern concepts, *polis* is an ancient one. So here, as in my articles, I will replace ‘dependent’ and ‘independent’ with the ancient Greek equivalents of these adjectives,

⁹ M. Piérart, in *Inventory* 599–600.

¹⁰ The most important in this context is “The ‘Autonomous City-State’. Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?” in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 1995 = *CPCPapers* II) 21–43.

hypokoos and *autonomos*. I will briefly list the evidence we have for the concept of the *hypokoos polis* and start with the sources in which the concept of the *hypokoos polis* is juxtaposed with that of the *autonomos polis*.

In Perikles' third speech he warns the Athenians that just to mind one's own business is impossible for an imperial *polis* but might do for an *hypokoos polis* in which people can live safely but as slaves (Thuc. 2.63.3):

τάχιστ' ἄν τε πόλιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἐτέρους τε πείσαντες ἀπολέσειαν καὶ εἴ που ἐπὶ σφῶν αὐτῶν αὐτόνομοι οἰκήσειαν. τὸ γὰρ ἄπραγμον οὐ σφύζεται μὴ μετὰ τοῦ δραστηρίου τεταγμένον, οὐδὲ ἐν ἀρχούσῃ πόλει ζυμφέρει, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑπηκόῳ, ἀσφαλῶς δουλεύειν.

The Lakedaimonians marched into Arkadia and invaded the Parrhasians who were under Mantinean domination. The Mantineans could not save the Parrhasian *poleis*, and the Lakedaimonians made them independent of Mantinea (Thuc. 5.33.1–3):

Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θέρους πανδημεὶ ἐστράτευσαν ... τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ἐς Παρρασίους, Μαντινέων (no. 281) ὑπηκόους ὄντας ... οἱ δὲ Μαντινῆς ... ἀδύνατοι δ' ὄντες διασῶσαι ... τὰς ἐν Παρρασίῳ πόλεις ἀπῆλθον. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τοὺς τε Παρρασίους αὐτονόμους ποιήσαντες ... ἀνεχώρησαν ἐπ' οἴκου.

The allies who joined the Athenians' attack on Syracuse are subdivided into those who are *autonomoi* and those who are *hypokooi* (Thuc. 6.69.3): Ἀργεῖοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ζυμμάχων οἱ αὐτόνομοι ... τὸ δ' ὑπήκοον τῶν ζυμμάχων.

A little later the Sikels are subdivided into those who are ruled by Syracuse and those who are *autonomoi* (Thuc. 6.88.4):

οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὰ πεδία μᾶλλον τῶν Σικελῶν ὑπήκοοι ὄντες τῶν Συρακοσίων (no. 47) οἱ πολλοὶ ἀφειστήκεσαν. τῶν δὲ τὴν μεσόγειαν ἐχόντων αὐτόνομοι οὖσαι ... πλὴν ὀλίγοι μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἦσαν.

Before he describes the final battle in the harbour of Syracuse Thucydides lists all who fought on the Athenian side and here again they are subdivided into the *hypokooi* and the *autonomoi*. The Chians (no. 840) are the only *autonomoi* allies who

have furnished ships. Here all the *hypokoioi* allies are members of the Delian League who have payed tribute (7.57.3):

τῶν δ' ἄλλων οἱ μὲν ὑπήκοοι, οἱ δ' ἀπὸ ξυμμαχίας αὐτόνομοι,
εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ μισθοφόροι ξυνεστράτευον.

In *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (24.1, ed. Chambers) we are told that most of the Mysians are independent and not subjects of the Persian King: εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν Μυσῶν αὐτόνομοι καὶ βασιλέως οὐχ ὑπακούοντες. Here οὐχ ὑπακούοντες is used synonymously with αὐτόνομοι.

A similar identification of οὐχ ὑπακούοντες πόλεις with αὐτόνομοι πόλεις is implied in Thucydides and in Xenophon's *Hellenika*.

Planning the Sicilian campaign the Athenians are aware that they will be up against *poleis* that are large and not subject to one another. ἐπὶ γὰρ πόλεις ... μέλλομεν ἰέναι μεγάλας καὶ οὔθ' ὑπηκόους ἀλλήλων (Thuc. 6.20.2).

In Aiolis Pharnabazos allowed Mania, the widow of Zenis, to take over the satrapy and she served him well (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.13):

ἅς τε παρέλαβε πόλεις διεφύλαττεν αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν οὐχ ὑπηκόων προσέλαβεν ἐπιθαλαττιδίας Λάρισάν (no. 784) τε καὶ Ἀμαξιτὸν (no. 778) καὶ Κολωνάς (no. 782).

Temnos (no. 832), a small *polis*, and Aigai (no. 801),¹¹ both in Aiolis, are described as communities independent of the Persian King (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.5):

ὅσοι αὖ ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῇ Εὐρώπῃ πόλεων ἀρμοστοὶ ἐξέπιπτον, καὶ τούτους ἐδέχετο, λέγων ὅτι οὐδ' ἐκείνους ἀθυμεῖν δεῖ, ἐννοουμένους ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ἣ ἐξ ἀρχῆς βασιλέως ἐστί, καὶ Τῆμος, οὗ μεγάλη πόλις, καὶ Αἰγαιεῖς καὶ ἄλλα γε χωρία δύνανται οἰκεῖν οὐχ ὑπήκοοι ὄντες βασιλέως.

In other sources one or more *poleis* are described as *hypokoioi poleis*. Every *polis* depends on some import and export, which

¹¹ Attested as a *polis* in the urban sense at Hdt. 1.149.1 and in the political sense at Hdt. 1.150.2.

presupposes that it is dependent on those who rule the sea (Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 2.3):

ὀπόσαι δ' ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ εἰσὶ πόλεις ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀρχόμεναι, αἱ μὲν μεγάλαι διὰ δέος ἄρχονται αἱ δὲ μικραὶ πάνυ διὰ χρείαν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πόλις οὐδεμία ἣτις οὐ δεῖται εἰσάγεσθαι τι ἢ ἐξάγεσθαι. ταῦτα τοίνυν οὐκ ἔσται αὐτῇ, ἐὰν μὴ ὑπήκοος ᾖ τῶν ἀρχόντων τῆς θαλάττης.

The powerful and wealthy reduced the smaller *poleis* to dependencies (Thuc. 1.8.4):

οἱ τε ἥσους ὑπέμενον τὴν τῶν κρεισσόνων δουλείαν, οἱ τε δυνατώτεροι περιουσίας ἔχοντες προσεποιούντο ὑπηκόους τὰς ἐλάσσους πόλεις.

In this passage Thucydides assumes—anachronistically—that there were *poleis* in Greece in the period before the Trojan War. There is no indication that the smaller *poleis* lost their status as *poleis* by being dominated by the more powerful.

The Greeks had not yet joined together as *hypokeoi* to the largest *poleis* (Thuc. 1.15.2):

καὶ ἐκδήμους στρατείας πολὺ ἀπὸ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐπ' ἄλλων καταστροφῇ οὐκ ἐξῆσαν οἱ Ἕλληνας. οὐ γὰρ ξυνειστήκεσαν πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας πόλεις ὑπήκοοι.

The Byzantines (no. 674) had joined Samos (no. 865) in its revolt against Athens but agreed afterwards to being *hypokeoi* as before (Thuc. 1.117.3): ξυνέβησαν δὲ καὶ Βυζάντιοι ὡσπερ καὶ πρότερον ὑπήκοοι εἶναι.

The Athenians took over the *polismata* on the mainland which the Mytileneans (no. 798) had ruled and afterwards they were subject to the Athenians (*hypokeoi*) (Thuc. 3.50.3):

παρέλαβον δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ πολίσματα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὅσων Μυτιληναῖοι ἐκράτουν, καὶ ὑπήκουον ὕστερον Ἀθηναίων.

When the Athenians' *hypokeoi poleis* in Thrace heard about the conquest of Amphipolis (no. 553) they planned to revolt and approached Brasidas in secret (Thuc. 4.108.3):

καὶ αἱ πόλεις πυνθανόμεναι αἱ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπήκοοι τῆς τε Ἀμφιπόλεως τὴν ἄλωσιν καὶ ἃ παρέχεται, τὴν τε ἐκείνου πραότητα, μάλιστα δὴ ἐπήρθησαν ἐς τὸ νεωτερίζειν, καὶ ἐπεκηρυκεύοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν κρύφα.

In 411 Athenian envoys were sent to the *hypokeoi poleis* with instructions to turn them into oligarchies (Thuc. 8.64.1, cf. 5):

καὶ εἴρητο αὐτοῖς τῶν ὑπηκόων πόλεων αἷς ἂν προσσχῶσιν ὀλιγαρχίαν καθιστάναι.

Tissaphernes claimed that all the Ionian *poleis* were *hypokeoi* under him (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.3):

Τισσαφέρνης ... εὐθὺς ἤξιου τὰς Ἴωνικὰς πόλεις ἀπάσας ἑαυτῷ ὑπηκόους εἶναι. αἱ δὲ ἅμα μὲν ἐλεύθεραι βουλόμεναι εἶναι, ἅμα δὲ φοβούμεναι τὸν Τισσαφέρνην ... εἰς μὲν τὰς πόλεις οὐκ ἐδέχοντο αὐτόν.

The Akanthians and Apollonians tell the Spartans that the Olynthians possess Poteidaia (no. 598) on the isthmus of Pallene and the Spartans must take into account that the other *poleis* on Pallene will be *hypokeoi* as well (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.15):

ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ Ποτεΐδαιαν ἔχουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ἰσθμῷ τῆς Παλλήνης οὖσαν, νομίζετε καὶ τὰς ἐντὸς ταύτης πόλεις ὑπηκόους ἔσεσθαι αὐτῶν.

The Phokians and the Euboians from all the *poleis* had become *hypokeoi* under the Boiotians (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.23):

ἠκολούθουν δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ Φωκεῖς ὑπήκοοι γεγεννημένοι καὶ Εὐβοεῖς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων.

An alternative to calling a *polis* as *hypokeos* is to use the possessive genitive about the *polis* or the ruler that has deprived a *polis* of its *autonomia*. So for example the King's Peace of 386 (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31):

Ἀρταξέρξης βασιλεὺς νομίζει δίκαιον τὰς μὲν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πόλεις ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι καὶ τῶν νήσων Κλαζομενάς (no. 847) καὶ Κύπρον, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις καὶ μικρὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀυτονόμους ἀφεῖναι πλὴν Λήμνου (nos. 502–503) καὶ Ἰμβρου (no. 483) καὶ Σκύρου (no. 521). ταύτας δὲ ὥσπερ τὸ ἀρχαῖον εἶναι Ἀθηναίων.

or Thucydides' reference (3.34.1) to Νότιον (no. 858) τὸ Κολοφωνίων (no. 848), or Xenophon's (*Hell.* 6.5.2) to the Elean perioikic communities:

Ἡλεῖοι δὲ ἀντέλεγον ὡς οὐ δέοι αὐτονόμους ποιεῖν οὔτε Μαργανέας (no. 259) οὔτε Σκιλλουντίους (no. 311) οὔτε Τριφυλῖους (nos. 304–311), σφετέρως γὰρ εἶναι ταύτας τὰς πόλεις.

In my opinion the above evidence leaves no doubt that alongside the *autonomos polis* the *hypekoos polis* existed not only as a common type of *polis*, ‘the dependent *polis*’, but also as an important concept which many ancient historians have passed over in silence or even denied by taking independence,¹² in Greek *autonomia*,¹³ to be the indispensable and crucial aspect of the *polis*. The problem is how to define the *hypekoos polis* and how to establish the difference between an *autonomos* and a *hypekoos polis*.

The terms *autonomos* and *hypekoos* are antonyms, which means that each of them can be defined as the opposite of the other. In modern scholarship it is usually *autonomia* that is defined, but “it is largely defined by its negative. Autonomy may be elusive, but lack of autonomy is often easy to define.”¹⁴ That is in my opinion too pessimistic an approach. *Autonomia* can be defined both positively and negatively. It is after all being *autonomos* that is the desired condition, and being *hypekoos* that is the unwanted but often realistic condition for a *polis*.

In the Greek world in the Classical period *autonomia* implied: to have one’s own constitution (*politeia*) not interfered with by other *poleis* (*IG* II² 43.20–21), to give oneself one’s own laws (*nomoi*) (*IG* I³ 127.15–16), including the right to decide about taxes (*autoteleis*) (Thuc. 5.18.2), to be in control of one’s own territory (*I.Priene* 1.2–5), to have sole jurisdiction within the territory (*autodikoi*) (Thuc. 5.18.2), to admit (*I.Priene* 2.1–9) or expel (Dem. 17.4, 8) whom one wishes to, and to have freedom of action in foreign affairs (Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.7–9). The loss of some or all of these characteristics would transform an *autonomos* into

¹² Hansen, in *Studies* 22 n.4, with references to nine prominent scholars.

¹³ Hansen, in *Studies* 21 n.1, with references to thirteen prominent scholars.

¹⁴ A. B. Bosworth, “Autonomia: The Use and Abuse of Political Terminology,” *StIt* SER. III 10 (1992) 122–152, at 123.

a *hypekoos polis*.¹⁵

When defined *e contrario* and negatively *autonomia* has the following characteristics: everybody seems to agree that it is incompatible with being ruled by a tyrant (Hdt. 1.96.1), with being a tribute-paying member of the Delian League in its developed form (Thuc. 7.57.3–4), with being under Persian rule (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31), with being a member of the Peloponnesian League (Thuc. 1.144.2), with having a harmost and a Spartan garrison (*IG II²* 43.9–12), with being a member of a hegemonic federation (Isoc. 14.10, 17), with being a klerouchy (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.15), with being a perioikic community (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23).¹⁶

So much for the concept of the *hypekoos polis*. Fröhlich (662–666) selected for discussion a number of what I have classified as examples of dependent *poleis*, i.e. communities called *poleis* in sources of the Archaic and Classical periods or known for one or more of the institutions characteristic of a *polis*, but also attested as being politically dependent on other *poleis* and thereby deprived of *autonomia*. His examples are (1) *poleis* that were members of a federation, (2) the perioikic *poleis* of Lakedaïmon and Messenia, (3) Notion, the port of the *polis* of Kolophon, but itself with the status of dependent *polis*, (4) Helisson in Arkadia and Koresia on Keos as examples of *poleis* transformed into civic subdivisions of their larger neighbours without losing the status of *polis*.

Re (1), federations composed of members which were dependent *poleis*. As an example I refer to the Boiotian federation dominated by Thebes (no. 221) and to Orchomenos (no. 213) as one of the dependent members of the federation (*Inventory* p. 87 no. 7). Fröhlich objects: “faut-il pour autant, à partir de cet exemple extrême, considérer que toute cité membre d’une confédération est une cité dépendante?” (661) No, and I do not do that. On p.88 I mention the Boiotian and the Chalkidic federations as the two prominent examples of hegemonic federations:

¹⁵ Hansen, in *Studies* 27–28.

¹⁶ Hansen, in *Studies* 35, with further references.

“The relation between the *poleis* and the federal institutions may have been different in, e.g., the Phokian and the Arkadian federation, neither of which seems to have been dominated by one of the constituent *poleis*.¹⁷ In these two cases, and in others as well, the member states may have retained their *autonomia* unimpaired.” But there were other examples too of hegemonic federations, e.g. the East Lokrian federation which seems to have been dominated by Opous (no. 386) as argued by Nielsen.¹⁸

Re (2). The Lakedaimonian¹⁹ and Messenian perioikic communities are collectively classified as *poleis* in Classical sources, mostly in the urban sense,²⁰ but sometimes in the political sense as well.²¹ In Thucydides, Xenophon, Androtion, and Ps.-Skylax twelve named perioikic communities are described as *poleis* in the urban sense,²² but some of them performed functions that were the prerogative of *poleis* in the political sense, such as serving as *proxenoi* for other *poleis*²³ and having ethnics

¹⁷ Even better examples of egalitarian federations are the first Achaian and the first Akarnanian federations, see now Löbel, *Die Poleis* 80–88 and 179–187.

¹⁸ T. H. Nielsen, “Epiknemidian, Hypoknemidian and Opountian Lokrians: A Note on the Political Organisation of East Lokris in the Classical Period,” in P. Flensted-Jensen (ed.), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 2000 = *CPCPapers* V) 91–120.

¹⁹ M. H. Hansen, “The Perioikic *Poleis* of Lakedaimon,” in T. H. Nielsen (ed.), *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart 2004 = *CPCPapers* VII) 149–164.

²⁰ Hdt. 7.234.1–2; Thuc. 5.54.1; Xen. *Lac.* 15.3, *Hell.* 6.5.21, 32, *Ages.* 2.24; Isoc. 12.178; Androtion *FGrHist* 324 F 63; Ps.-Skylax 46.

²¹ Thuc. 5.54.1; Xen. *Ages.* 2.24; Isoc. 12.178–179.

²² Aitolia (p.574), Anthana (no. 324), Boia (no. 327), Epidauros Limera (no. 329), Gytheion (no. 333), Kythera (no. 336), Las (no. 337), Mothone (no. 319), Prasiai (no. 342), Side (no. 344), Skandeia (no. 336), Thyrea (no. 346); cf. M. H. Hansen, “Was Every *Polis* Town the Centre of a *Polis* State?” in M. H. Hansen (ed.), *The Return of the Polis: The Use and Meanings of the Word Polis in Archaic and Classical Sources* (Stuttgart 2007 = *CPCPapers* VIII) 13–51, at 35 n.50.

²³ Hansen, in *Once Again* 160–161.

derived from the name of an urban centre and used externally.²⁴ Fröhlich has the following comment: “Incontestablement, elles subissent une domination, mais il est vraiment malaisé de saisir la nature même de ces établissements pour la plupart desquels on peut nourrir de sérieux doutes sur le fait qu’ils aient pu constituer de véritables cités à l’époque où ils étaient englobés dans le territoire d’une autre cité” (662). If “véritable cités” is used synonymously with *autonomoi poleis* I agree. In my view, by being “subject to domination” the perioikic *poleis* were *hypekooi poleis*. It is revealing that Spartan envoys who were sent to neighbouring Elis ca. 400 demanded that the Elean perioikic *poleis* be set free and permitted to be *autonomoi*, which the Eleans initially refused but in the end were forced to do.²⁵

Re (3), a major port of an inland *polis*. As an example I refer to Notion (no. 858), the port of Kolophon (no. 848). After a short survey of the complicated relationship between Notion and Kolophon, Fröhlich concludes: “Il s’agit donc d’un cas extrêmement particulier dont on ne voit pas en quoi il pourrait présenter le modèle de la cité dépendante. Certes, les habitants de Notion, originaires citoyens de Colophon, ont manifestement voulu faire sécession et se constituer en cité, mais cela signifie-t-il qu’ils constituaient *ab ovo* une cité, donc dès l’origine une cité dépendante?” (662). No and I do not say that. We have no information about the status of Notion in the Archaic period. In the Classical period Notion and Kolophon were sometimes united sometimes separate communities, and sometimes Notion had an intermediate status. Thucydides refers to Notion in unambiguous terms as a Kolophonian possession in 428/7;²⁶ but in the Athenian tribute lists Notion is recorded separately from Kolophon in all the years from 454/3

²⁴ E.g. Νέων ὁ Ἀσινάϊος, one of the leaders of the 10,000: Xen. *An.* 5.3.4, 5.6.36, 6.4.11.

²⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23, 3.2.30, cf. 6.5.2 quoted 869 above.

²⁶ Thuc. 3.34.1, quoted 870 above.

to 416/5, and in the Athenian decree for the Samians of 403/2 the Notieis are honoured by Athens along with the people of Ephesos for having given asylum to Samian refugees (*IG* II² 1.48). This points to Notion as a community in its own right (in that case a dependent *polis*). Similarly, Aristotle writes that the Kolophonioi and the Notieis (note the different ethnics) lived in a territory that was ill suited for being one *polis*, and often suffered from *stasis*.²⁷

Also Notion is not a “cas extrêmement particulier.” There are half a score of similar “problematical *poleis*.” Some are explicitly called *polis* in Classical sources, *viz.* Skandeia (no. 336), the port of Kythera; Kyllene (no. 254), the port of Elis; Nauplia (p.602), the port of Argos (Ps.-Skylax 49); Naulochon (no. 857), the port of Priene; Harmene (p.929), the port of Sinope (Ps.-Skylax 89). Others are known for a number of activities characteristic of a *polis* in the political sense, *viz.* Pagai (no. 226) and Aigosthena (no. 224), both ports of Megara towards the Corinthian Gulf; Gytheion (no. 333), the port of Sparta; Pagasai (no. 407), the port of Pherai; and Sollion (no. 137), the port of Palairos. In so far as these ports were *poleis* they were, of course, dependent *poleis*:²⁸ each was a dependency of the larger inland *polis* for which it served as the harbour.

Re (4). Another group of dependent *poleis* that have a double status are communities that are classified both as *poleis* and as civic subdivisions, some as *phylai*, others as *komai*. Attested both as *phylai* and as *poleis* are Ialysos (no. 995), Kamiros (no. 996), and Lindos (no. 997), all three on Rhodes, and Koresia on Keos (no. 493).

In the late Classical and Hellenistic periods Ialysos, Kamiros, and Lindos were *phylai* of Rhodes (no. 1000),²⁹ but they were also *poleis*, *viz.* dependent *poleis* of Rhodes. The *polis* status of the

²⁷ Arist. *Pol.* 1303b7–10. For a fuller account see Rubinstein’s entry in the *Inventory* no. 858.

²⁸ Hansen, in *The Return of the Polis* 38–39, with further references.

²⁹ N. F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (Philadelphia 1987) 243–244.

three communities is indicated by the following features: they are all three referred to as *poleis* (in the urban sense) in sources of the fourth century (Xen. *Hell.* 4.8.25, Ps.-Skylax 99). All three had a probouleutic council: Ialysos (*Syll.*³ 338, ca. 300), Kamiros (*Tit. Cam.* 105, first half of the fourth century), and Lindos (*Syll.*³ 340, second half fourth century). Athens awarded *proxenia* to citizens of Ialysos (*Agora XVI* 37, early fourth century), and at least Kamiros seems to have had a mint even after the synoecism of 408 (Babelon, *Traité* II.2 1008, *ad no.* 1681).³⁰

The history of Koresia on the island of Keos provides a similar example of a polity that in the mid-fourth century may have been both a *polis* and a *phyle*, in this case of Ioulis (no. 491). A stele found in Ioulis³¹ records the names of, apparently, citizens listed under four headings: Leodai (1), Ylichidai (102), Thyssidai (141), and Koresioi (175). But the stele is poorly preserved and large parts are missing. In a meticulous study of the stele and the inscribed names Ruschenbusch³² suggests that originally the citizens recorded were listed under seven headings of which only four are preserved, *viz.* nos. 1 and 5–7; headings and names of 2–4 are missing. Of the four preserved headings the first three are names of civic subdivisions of Ioulis, presumably *phylai*;³³ the fourth heading introduces names of

³⁰ See P. Flensted Jensen, M. H. Hansen, and T. H. Nielsen, "Inscriptions," in *The Return of the Polis* 73–91, at 81. For a full discussion of the *polis* status of Ialysos, Kamiros, and Lindos see V. Gabrielsen, "The Synoikized *Polis* of Rhodes," in P. Flensted-Jensen et al. (eds.), *Polis and Politics* (Copenhagen 2000) 177–205, at 192–195. In this case Fröhlich (661) takes a positive view of the Polis Centre's interpretation.

³¹ *IG XII.5* 609, dated prosopographically by comparing the names on the stele with those mentioned in Rhodes-Osborne, *GHI* 39 and 40: see P. Brun, "L'île de Kéos et ses cités au IV^e siècle av. J.C.," *ZPE* 76 (1989) 121–138.

³² E. Ruschenbusch, "Eine Bürgerliste von Iulis und Koresia auf Keos," *ZPE* 48 (1982) 175–188.

³³ Suggested by Jones, *Public Organization* 205.

citizens of Koresia. Now, an Athenian decree (*IG* II² 404)—also mid-fourth century³⁴—instructs the Keians to uphold their political organisation into *poleis* and refers back to the treaty between Athens and the Keian *poleis* of 363/2. The Athenian command to respect the organisation of Keos into *poleis* indicates that the Keians—or at least some of them—had tampered with—or at least had tried to tamper with—the traditional *tetrapolis* structure. So in the mid-fourth century Koresia was still a *polis* but its citizens are recorded as a separate group side by side with citizens of Ioulis, who are organised into, probably, seven *phylai* of which the seventh comprises the citizens of Koresia. Brun (128)—followed by Fröhlich (665 with n.64)—prefers to associate the list of citizens with the federation in 364 of all the Keian *poleis*, broken up by the Athenians the following year, but admits that such a reconstruction presupposes that a second stele with all the names of citizens from Kartheia and Poiessa has been lost. I adhere to Ruschenbusch's interpretation.

The crucial example of double status as both *polis* and *kome* is Helisson in Arkadia (no. 273). A treaty between Mantinea and Helisson (early fourth cent.) stipulates that Helisson becomes a *kome* of Mantinea and in future shall live by the laws of Mantinea.³⁵ The main clause of the treaty reads (*GHI* 14.3–9):

τὸς [Ἐ]λ[ι]σ[φ]ασίος Μαντινέας ἦναι φίσος καὶ ὁμοῖος, κ[ο]ινά-
ζοντα[ς πάν]των ὅσων καὶ οἱ Μαντινῆς, φέρ[ο]ντας τὰν χώραν
καὶ τὰν π[όλιν] ἰμ Μαντιν[έ]αν ἰν τὸς νόμος τὸς Μαντινέων,
μινόνσας τᾶς [πό]λιος τῶν Ἐλισφασίων ὡσπερ ἔχε[ι] ἰν πάντα

³⁴ Sometimes dated to the 350s or 360s, e.g. by S. D. Lambert, *ZPE* 161 (2007) 79, but the dating of the decree by the festival calendar points to a date not earlier than the 340s, see M. H. Hansen "Was the Athenian *Ekklesia* Convened according to the Festival Calendar or the Bouleutic Calendar?" *AJP* 114 (1993) 99–113, at 102.

³⁵ For the status of Helisson in consequence of the treaty see T. H. Nielsen, *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Göttingen 2002) 359–363. Other possible examples of double status as *polis* and *kome* are Oios in Lakadaimon (no. 339), Alponos in East Lokris (no. 379), and Anthele in Oiteia (no. 427), see Hansen, in *The Return of the Polis* 40–41.

χρόνον, κῶμα[ν] ἔασαν τὸς Ἑλισφασίος τῶν Μαντινέων. θεαρόν
ἦναι ἐξ Ἑλισό[ν]τι κατὰπερ ἐς ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλισι.

The term *polis* occurs three times. In the first the juxtaposition with *chora* indicates that *polis* is used principally in the urban sense,³⁶ but with the political sense as a connotation, since the reference is to the status of Helisson before the treaty. The second instance is specifically in the urban sense as the stipulation is that Helisson is not to be synoecised with Mantinea but shall persist as an urban centre. The third, in “the other *poleis*,” thus implicitly includes Helisson.³⁷ Furthermore, here *polis* refers to institutions, not to urban centres. Who are the *thearoi* sent to Mantinea by Helisson and the other *poleis*? Following Rhodes and Osborne, Fröhlich (663) takes them to be “religious delegates,” but in the light of what we know about *thearoi* in Arkadian *poleis*, they must have had far greater powers than to announce or arrange religious festivals. In Tegea the board of *thearoi* seems to have been the most important organ of state. In Orchomenos too the board of *thearoi* must have been important. And in the treaty between Mantinea, Elis, Argos, and Athens of 420, the Mantinean *theoroi* appear together with the *polemarchoi* and alongside important officials from the other contracting *poleis*.³⁸ The presumption is that the Helissonian *thearoi* are important officials and that Helisson in some respects is still a *polis* in the political sense, like the other *poleis*. Moreover the *sympoliteia* agreement between Helisson and Mantinea is not the only relevant source for the relation between *polis* and *kome* in fourth-century Mantinea. The treaty must be analysed in the light of what we know about the dioecism of Mantinea in the period 385–370.

³⁶ See Hansen, in *Inventory* 44.

³⁷ A possible interpretation of this phrase is, admittedly, that Helisson is granted the right to send a *theoros* like the other communities (which are *poleis*). But this use of the pronoun ἄλλος, though attested (Pl. *Grig.* 473D), is extremely rare in Classical prose, and the rendering “the other *poleis*” (Rhodes-Osborne) is much more common and straightforward.

³⁸ Thuc. 5.47.9. See Nielsen, *Arkadia* 360–361 with n.251.

In 385 Sparta inflicted on Mantinea a dioecism (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.7). The town of Mantinea was dismantled, its walls pulled down, the population dispersed and resettled in four or five separate villages (*komai*). What was the political status of these *komai*? Xenophon says that when the Spartans had to mobilize, a recruiting officer was sent to each of the *komai* and the former Mantineans joined the army with greater enthusiasm than before when the army had to be recruited from democratic Mantinea (5.2.7). So each of the *komai* performed a task that formerly had been discharged centrally by the *polis* of Mantinea. Again, after the battle of Leuktra before the new synoecism of Mantinea the Mantineans from the *komai* joined the Spartan army, because they were governed aristocratically (6.5.18). So the Mantinean *polis* persisted after the dioecism in 385 but now organised into separate *komai*. Polybios puts it differently (4.27.6): the Spartans dioecised the Mantineans “from a single *polis* into several” (ἐκ μίας πόλεως εἰς πλείους αὐτοὺς διοκίσαντες). If he is right the four or five *komai* were tiny *poleis*. No matter whether the *sympoliteia* between Helisson and Mantinea occurred before or after the period 385–370 during which Mantinea was dioecised, the two incidents throw light on each other and must be analysed together.

Summing up the three examples selected for discussion, Fröhlich criticises the method used by the Polis Centre for being static and unhistorical: “Les usages que fait Hansen des exemples de Notion, de Korèsia et d’Hélisson sont assez semblables: des cas particuliers sont érigés en paradigmes; des sources disparates et minces, s’étalant sur deux siècles, sont utilisées pour décrire une situation perçue comme statique. Ces petites communautés on eu, lorsque nous les percevons, un destin mouvementé, tantôt s’émancipant, tantôt étant absorbées. C’est seulement en faisant fi de cette histoire comme des lacunes de la documentation que l’on peut les ériger en idéal type de cités dépendantes. Il s’agit simplement du sort commun des petites cités, toujours menacées d’être non seulement placées sous la coupe d’une plus puissante, mais plus encore d’être absorbées et donc de disparaître en tant que cité” (666).

That is a misleading description of the method used by me

and the other scholars associated with the Copenhagen Polis Centre. Let me review the three examples selected by Fröhlich for discussion. (1) In the 420s Notion was a dependency of Kolophon but in the same period Notion paid its *phoros* to the Delian League independently of Kolophon. (2) In the mid-fourth century the *tetrapolis* structure of Keos was enforced by the Athenians or at least upheld with Athenian support, but in the same period the citizens of Koresia were listed side-by-side with the citizens from the *phylai* of Ioulis. (3) In 385–370 Mantinea was broken up into *komai* that separately or in collaboration discharged the *polis* functions of former Mantinea. In the same period—before or after the dioecism—the Mainalian *polis* of Helisson merged with Mantinea and was demoted to the status of *kome*, but had the right to send a *theoros* to Mantinea, “like the other *poleis*.” The two incidents from the same period testify to the intertwinement of *polis* and *kome* in Arkadia in the first half of the fourth century. So in all three cases the sources on which I have based my analysis are contemporary with each other and I cannot understand how Fröhlich can hold that I have treated sources spanning two centuries as contemporaneous.

Furthermore, it not true that “des cas particuliers sont érigés en paradigms.” Alongside Notion there are half a score of ports of inland *poleis* that were or at least may have been dependent *poleis*. Alongside Koresia there is the even better attested example of Ialysos, Kamiros, and Lindos, not discussed by Fröhlich, but only mentioned in passing (661); and the *sympoliteia* between Helisson and Mantinea must be analysed together with the dioecism of Mantinea in 385.

In our sources many of the communities described as dependencies are attested as *poleis* in the urban sense. Is it possible from the classification of a community as a *polis* in the urban sense to infer anything about its status as a *polis* in the sense of political community? Not according to Fröhlich as well as other critics of the work of the Copenhagen Polis Centre. In connection with Helisson he writes: “On ne peut le considérer comme le paradigme d’une cité dépendante qu’à condition que deux

observations du Centre soient des lois ne souffrant d'aucune exception, d'une part celle qui veut que tout emploi de *polis* (dans ce contexte) fasse allusion à une communauté politique de ce genre, l'autre qui veut que la réception de théores soit l'attribut exclusif d'une cité. Dans les deux cas, non seulement les passages en question me paraissent pouvoir être interprétés autrement, mais je croirais encore que, comme on l'observe souvent même dans les texts officiels grecs, à ces 'lois' on peut opposer bien de exceptions ou, du moins, une certaine souplesse" (664–665).

In this context I focus on the first law, which, for the fun of it, we have called the *lex Hafniensis de civitate*. First of all I want to correct a widespread misunderstanding, shared by Fröhlich. The *Lex Hafniensis* is not meant to be a law to which there is no exception. It is neither a law like Kepler's three laws, nor is it a law in the legal sense of a rule, the breaking of which is forbidden and penalised. It is rather an observation of how the Greeks of the late Archaic and Classical periods understood and used the word *polis*. But, as every linguist has to admit, in semantics there is no such thing as a law in the strict sense. Nevertheless it is quite common in linguistics and related disciplines to speak about 'laws', such as Wheeler's law in phonetics, Porson's law in metrics, and Blass's law in rhetoric, to mention three examples from the study of ancient Greek. Similarly the *lex Hafniensis* is an observation about how the term *polis* was used, and it is not a law without exceptions. There is at least one unquestionable exception, *viz.* Xen. *Vect.* 4.50 (see below).³⁹

The law, i.e. the observation of how the Greeks used the term *polis*, runs as follows. "In Archaic and Classical sources *polis* used in the sense of town to denote a named urban centre is applied not just to any urban centre but only to a town which was also the centre of a *polis* in the sense of political community. Thus, the term *polis* has two different meanings: town

³⁹ Hansen, in *The Return of the Polis* 45–46.

and state; with ‘territory’ as a much less frequently attested third meaning. But even when it is used in the sense of town its reference, its denotation, seems almost invariably to be what the Greeks called *polis* in the sense of a *koinonia politon politeias* and what we call a city-state.⁴⁰

This observation about the meaning and uses of *polis* in the sense of town must be supplemented with the inverted proposition: in Archaic and Classical sources the term *polis* used in the sense of state to denote a named political community is applied not just to any political community but only to a political community centred on an urban settlement called *polis* in the sense of town.⁴¹

The Polis Centre’s examination of the validity of the *lex Hafniensis* and the reversed *lex* has led to the following results. In the extant sources of the Archaic and Classical periods there are 456 Hellenic communities called *polis* in the urban sense. Of these 48 must be left out of consideration because there is no other source antedating ca. 300 B.C. or referring to the Archaic and/or Classical periods. Consequently there is no way of having the *lex Hafniensis* either confirmed or disproved. Of the remaining 408 attestations only 24 are problematic.⁴² If, in each of these cases, we prefer an interpretation which contradicts our rule, it still applies in 94% of all cases, and Xenophon’s reference in *Poroi* 4.50 to a *polis* of slaves in the mine district is the only case in which the rule is demonstrably contradicted.⁴³

Of altogether 305 communities called *polis* in the political sense in Archaic and/or Classical sources, 216 are known to

⁴⁰ Hansen, in *The Return of the Polis* 13. The *lex Hafniensis* applies to Greek *poleis* only; for the use of *polis* in relation to barbarian communities see *The Return of the Polis* 20–22.

⁴¹ M. H. Hansen, “Was Every *polis* State Centred on a *polis* Town?” in *The Return of the Polis* 52–66, at 53.

⁴² They are listed and discussed at Hansen, in *The Return of the Polis* 38–45.

⁴³ Hansen, in *The Return of the Polis* 44–45.

have had a walled urban centre attested not later than the late fourth century. For a further 24 *poleis* an urban centre is attested either archaeologically (e.g. Elis [no. 251]) or in literary sources (e.g. Aitna [no. 8]) or in both types of source (e.g. Sparta⁴⁴ [no. 345]). Of the remaining 65 *poleis*, 23 are unlocated and 40 unexplored. Thus, of communities called *polis* in the political sense there are only two for which no urban centre has been found in spite of being fairly thoroughly investigated: Epitalion in Triphylia (no. 305) and Delphoi in Phokis (no. 177). A different approach leads to a similar result: of the 305 communities called *polis* in the political sense, no less than 264 (including Delphoi) are attested in written sources of the Archaic and Classical periods as a *polis* in the urban sense as well. Of the remaining 41 *poleis* so far attested in the political sense only, 22 had a walled urban centre, and for six others an urban centre is attested. Of the remaining 12 *poleis*, six are unlocated and six uninvestigated.⁴⁵

From all the evidence assembled in the Polis Centre the overall conclusion seems to be that in Archaic and Classical Greece the urban and the political aspects of the *polis* were inextricably interlinked,⁴⁶ and it follows that—with a few possible exceptions—a community attested as a *polis* in the urban sense was a *polis* in the political sense as well, but not necessarily an independent polity, in Greek an *autonomos polis*. In the second half of the fifth century almost all the ca. 330 members of the Delian League were *hypekooi*, dependent *poleis*. By the King's Peace of 386 close to 150 *poleis* in Asia Minor came under Persian rule. According to Hdt. 7.234 there were many Lakedaimonian *poleis*, and the *Inventory* includes 30 perioikic

⁴⁴ For Sparta as an urban centre see M. H. Hansen, "The Concept of the Consumption City Applied to the Greek *Polis*," in *Once Again* 9–47, at 22.

⁴⁵ Hansen, *The Return of the Polis* 53–54.

⁴⁶ Hansen, *The Return of the Polis* 56. *Contra*: J. Davies, "The Origins of the Greek *Polis*. Where Should We Be Looking?" in L. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London 1997) 24–38, at 29.

communities in Lakeldaimon and Messenia; and there were perioikic communities in Elis as well. The Athenian klerouchies were dependencies, and Skyros, Lemnos, and Imbros were exempted from the *autonomia* clause in the King's Peace. A number of Korinthian and Milesian colonies were politically dependent of their metropolis. The Boiotian federation (446–386) consisted of the hegemonic *polis* Thebes and ca. 25 dependent *poleis*. In its heyday the Chalkidic federation had over 50 members, in important respects ruled from Olynthos. Under Dionysios I many Sicilian and some Italian *poleis* were dependencies of Syracuse. Finally, in addition to the types discussed by Fröhlich in his article and in my reply I can add communities that combined the status of *polis* with that of *emporion*⁴⁷ or with that of *phourion* or *teichos*.⁴⁸

August, 2015

SAXO-instituttet
Njalsgade 80
2300 Copenhagen S
Denmark
mhh@hum.ku.dk

⁴⁷ Hansen, in *Greek Colonisation* 14–20.

⁴⁸ Hansen, *The Return of the Polis* 42.