

Introduction

The *Polis* as a Citizen-State

MOGENS HERMAN HANSEN

In the title of this volume I have preferred the modern term city-state to the ancient word *polis*, because I do not share the prevailing view that “city-state” (Stadtstaat, cité-Etat) is a mistranslation of “*polis*”. I have to admit that for this book an even better term would have been “citizen-state”, a word coined only a few years ago by the British sociologist W.G. Runciman.¹ It is an excellent description of the *polis* as a political community; on the other hand, it does not do justice to *polis* in the sense of an urban community. So the time for abandoning the term city-state has not yet come.

In recent years it has become fashionable to criticize the rendering city-state on two counts: first, the *polis* was not a state but a fusion of state and society; and second, the centre of a *polis* was not necessarily a city.² In my opinion, both objections miss the point: first, in the sense of political community the *polis* was a state rather than a fusion of state and society, see below pages 16-8; and second, every *polis* we know about was in fact centred on a conurbation (though far from always on a *walled city*), see below pages 13-6.

My criticism of the rendering city-state takes another turn. There seems to be general agreement that three elements are involved in the concept of a state: a territory, a people, and a government.³ A state is therefore a government with the sole right to exercise a given legal order within a given area over a given population. We nowadays tend to equate a state with its territory – a state is a country; whereas the Greeks identified the state primarily with its people – a state is a people.⁴ Of course the Greeks knew all about the territory of a state: frontiers between city-states are mentioned in numerous sources,⁵ and the frequently-used penalty of exile consisted precisely in the right of anyone to kill the outlaw if found within the territorial bounds;⁶ so the Greeks were perfectly capable of saying “the *polis* stretches to this-and-this point and not beyond”. But territory was not nearly as important for them as for us:⁷ in all the sources, from documents and historical accounts to poetry and legend, it is the people who are stressed and not the territory,⁸ a

habit of thought that can be traced right back to the poet Alkaios round about 600 B.C.⁹ It was never Athens and Sparta that went to war but always “the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians”.¹⁰

One of the corollaries of this difference between *polis* and state is that a high proportion of the population of a *polis* were liable to be not citizens of the *polis* but either free foreigners (often called metics) or slaves.¹¹ In a European state from the late Middle Ages onwards virtually all the inhabitants were also citizens, so that one could identify the state with those domiciled in the territory and, consequently, with the territory. In a Greek *polis* it was not possible to identify the state with those domiciled in the territory and so with the territory: it was necessary to identify the state with the citizens (the *politai*)¹² who had in principle the exclusive right to own and use the territory. Louis XIV of France is supposed to have said “l'état, c'est moi”: a Greek citizen could, with even greater justice, have said “The *polis* is us”.¹³ This view of the *polis* is abundantly attested in the sources,¹⁴ and it is most clearly formulated by Aristotle in the third Book of the *Politics* where he says that “a *polis* is a community (*koinonia*) of citizens (*politai*) with regard to the constitution (*politeia*)”,¹⁵ and *politeia* is further defined as the “organization of political institutions, in particular the highest political institution”.¹⁶ It is at once apparent that Aristotle only picks up two of the three elements that comprise the modern juristic idea of a state, the people and the political system: the territory is left out altogether, and that is not by chance. For Aristotle asserts that no one is a citizen by mere domicile in a particular place,¹⁷ and thus hits upon one fundamental difference between the *polis* and the modern state: it was a people rather than a place, and this difference would be duly emphasized if we adopted the term citizen-state instead of city-state.

To the modern mind a state must be identified, if not with the country, then with its government. Again there is a noticeable difference between ancient and modern priorities, which is most obvious if we compare ancient and modern democracies. A state can be looked at from two standpoints, either as a community of citizens manifesting itself in a set of organs with a government at the head,¹⁸ or as a set of organs, typically a government, exercising rule over its citizens.¹⁹ In modern states, even democracies, there is a tendency to identify the state with the executive and the government rather than with the people,²⁰ but in a democratic *polis*, especially Athens, government and citizens largely coincided,²¹ primarily through the institution of the Assembly of the People,²² and the dominant ideology was that the *polis* was the people (*demos*). This mani-

feats itself, for example, in all the surviving treaties, where the state of Athens is called *ho demos ho Athenaion*, “the People of the Athenians”;²³ and similarly the state of Chios is called *ho demos ho ton Chion*,²⁴ etc.

In conclusion: of the three elements of a state, a modern democrat will rank both the territory and the government over the people, whereas, to a citizen in an ancient democratic *polis* the order of priority was the reverse: first the body of citizens, then the political institutions and last the territory.

The Origin of the *Polis*

For the origin of the Greek city-state we have three different types of evidence: (a) the physical remains of early settlements, (b) the literary and epigraphical evidence of the 8th to 6th centuries and (c) the linguistic evidence obtained by a comparative study of related words in other Indo-European languages.

The linguistic evidence. In this volume the archaeological evidence is treated by Anthony Snodgrass and the written sources by Kurt Raaflaub; but there is no separate treatment of the linguistic evidence. A full paper of twenty or more pages would have been excessive. On the other hand, the study of the etymology of the term *polis* is extremely important, since by extrapolation it takes us back to a period before the earliest written sources we have. I will fill the gap by a short presentation of the problem.

First it should be noted that the early variant form of *polis*, namely *ptolis*, is probably attested in the Mycenaean Linear-B tablets in the form *po-to-ri-jo*. But, alas, *po-to-ri-jo* is not attested as a noun, only as (part of) a proper name,²⁵ and we have no clue to what *po-to-ri-jo* can have meant in Mycenaean Greek.

A comparison with other Indo-European languages yields better results. The Greek word *polis* is related etymologically to Old Indian *púr* (stronghold, fortress, city), Lithuanian *pilis* and Lettish *pils* (stronghold, castle).²⁶ But in both the Baltic languages the word means neither “city” nor “state” but only “stronghold”.²⁷ Thus it is reasonable to infer that the original meaning of *polis* in Greek too must have been “stronghold”. The epigraphical evidence strongly supports this assumption. In many archaic and classical Attic inscriptions *polis* occurs in the sense of *akro-polis*,²⁸ and a similar usage is found in inscriptions from other places e. g. Mykenai²⁹ and Rhodes.³⁰ In the literary sources, on the other hand, *polis* is hardly ever used in this sense. In Homer there are just two (possible)

attestations of *polis* referring to the akropolis of Troy.³¹ In all other cases it is the addition of the adjective ἀκρόη *vel. sim.* that changes the meaning of *polis* from “city” to “citadel”. There is another example in the hymn to Demeter, but the use in the literary sources of *polis* in the sense of stronghold is much more restricted than usually believed.³² This meaning of the word, already rare in the archaic period, died out in the classical and Hellenistic periods, and in the Roman period only men of learning would know that *polis* had once been used synonymously with *akropolis*.³³

From the sense of stronghold *polis* developed three other meanings: (1) city (or town), (2) city plus hinterland, and (3) political community (or state). The meanings “city” and “political community” are frequently attested in all sources from Homer onwards. But the sense of city plus surrounding territory, though sometimes stated by modern historians as the essential meaning of *polis*,³⁴ is not common in classical sources,³⁵ and, in my opinion, unattested in Homer and other early sources.

To sum up: the Indo-European etymology strongly suggests that the original meaning of *polis* was neither city (or town) nor state (or political community) but stronghold (or citadel), and perhaps a fortified *akropolis* of the type found before 800 B.C. in Emborio on Chios, in Koukounaries on Paros, in Agios Andreas on Siphnos, in Vrokastro on eastern Crete and in several other sites of the Geometric period.³⁶

The earliest written and archaeological evidence. When we turn from the linguistic to the literary and archaeological evidence we have to address two much-debated but still unsolved problems: (1) what is the relation between the *polis* as an urban and as a political community? (2) when and where did the Greek *polis* arise (a) in the sense of city; and (b) in the sense of state? How we answer these questions depends upon how we date the Homeric poems and how we interpret the type of society they describe. Today the prevailing opinion – shared by Raaflaub in his paper – is that the Homeric poems reflect a “historical Homeric society” which should be dated to the 8th century B.C.³⁷ In Chapter 1 Anthony Snodgrass has drawn one picture and in Chapter 2 Kurt Raaflaub has drawn another. What happens if we compare the two different types of evidence?

Polis or *ptolis* occurs some 250 times in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.³⁸ The meaning is either “city” or “political community” but often the word carries both meanings at the same time.³⁹ Now, what did the Homeric *polis* look like and how was it organized?

The Homeric *polis* has broad streets⁴⁰ and is enclosed with steep walls⁴¹ and beautiful towers.⁴² Inside the city there is an assembly

place,⁴³ and sanctuaries,⁴⁴ in which (sometimes) temples are erected.⁴⁵ We do not hear much about houses,⁴⁶ but the Homeric *polis* includes one or more mansions, which in some cases are so magnificent that the traditional designation of them as palaces seems well deserved.⁴⁷ The *poleis* about which Homer gives most information are Troy,⁴⁸ Scheria⁴⁹ and the two cities depicted on the shield of Achilles,⁵⁰ but Argos, Sparta, Mykenai and many other settlements are also called *polis* by Homer, and again the epithet “with broad streets” is used.⁵¹ The poet conveys the impression that a *polis* is, if not a city, then a town, and not just a village or a stronghold. The urban character of the *polis* is further emphasized by the fact that the term *asty* is used synonymously with *polis* about all the settlements mentioned above.⁵²

If we ask about physical remains of cities before 700 B.C. there are, to the best of my knowledge, only three sites to be listed, namely Zagora on Andros, Old Smyrna and Megara Hyblaia. But Zagora, though probably a walled 8th-century conurbation, is too small to match the Homeric *poleis*;⁵³ Megara Hyblaia had no walls until a century and a half after its foundation in 728;⁵⁴ and the date of old Smyrna is still in dispute.⁵⁵ There is an astonishing gap between the “Homeric *polis*” as the basic social unit of an 8th-century society and the absence of physical remains of walled conurbations older than the second half of the 7th century.⁵⁶ Archaeologically, the *polis* as a town or city does not belong in the 8th century, but rather in the 7th century (the colonies) or in the 6th century (mainland Greece).⁵⁷

How is this gap to be explained? I can think of at least three possible explanations. (a) We may hope that future excavations will lead to the discovery of 8th-century Greek towns that match the Homeric picture of a *polis*. Only a few decades ago very few would have imagined what was actually found during the excavations of Lefkandi.⁵⁸ Alternatively (b) we may have to down-date by a century or so the final version of the Homeric poems, and consequently Homeric society must be moved to the 7th century.⁵⁹ Or (c) we may give up the idea of a “historical Homeric Society” altogether and assume that the Homeric *polis* is a mixture of reminiscences of walled Bronze-age palaces, a vague knowledge about the great urban centres in the neighbouring near-eastern empires, and a city in a wonderland imagined by the Greek singers of tales.

Pace Finley and others, who held that no trace of the *polis* could be found in the Homeric poems,⁶⁰ it is now generally believed and convincingly argued that *polis* in the sense of political community is amply

attested both in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey*.⁶¹ A 6th-century Greek audience listening to a performance of the poems would have had no difficulty in recognizing Scheria as a typical colony founded by Nausithoos, and the two *poleis* depicted on the shield of Achilles as contemporary walled cities. But to establish that *polis* in the sense of political community is well attested in Homer is different from saying that *polis* was the prevailing form of political organization when the poems took their final form.

In the catalogue of ships as well as elsewhere in the *Iliad* most of the individuals are not identified by their *polis* but by the region to which they belong. Agapenor, for example, is the leader of the Arkadians and it is nowhere stated in which of the localities in Arkadia he lived. Nor is any person in Homer identified as coming from Mantinea or Tegea etc. Similarly, in Crete there are a hundred *poleis* but they are all ruled by Idomeneus.⁶² The Boiotians have five leaders. After naming them Homer lists different localities in Boiotia, but never says which leader belongs to which locality.⁶³ According to the catalogue of ships in *Iliad* 2 and many other passages in the *Iliad* as well, the political unit of early Greece was not the *polis* but the region, and this observation forces us to face a much-neglected problem in the study of the emergence of the *polis*: the relation between *polis* and region.

It is a remarkable fact that the federal states formed in the classical and Hellenistic periods almost always follow the regional pattern, i.e. the Arkadian Confederacy, the Boiotian Confederacy etc.⁶⁴ The division into regions can be traced back to the archaic period and even earlier (Geometric pottery styles seem to follow regional lines).⁶⁵ The relation between *polis* and region in the archaic and early classical period is a aspect of Greek history that for some time has not attracted the attention of students of ancient Greek society. Admittedly, German historians have had a tradition for seeing what they call “*der Stammstaat*” as the political community that preceded the *polis*, and in this context they have discussed the region as the principal political entity in the Dark Age.⁶⁶ Among French and Anglophone scholars, on the other hand, the trend is to focus on the city-state and connect all evidence of early social and political structure with the emergence of the *polis*, without paying much attention to the regions or other, larger political units.⁶⁷ This volume was originally planned to include a contribution about *polis* and region but due to lack of sufficient funds we had to cut it out. I hope that these brief remarks are enough at least to draw attention to the problem.

Polis as a city and as a state

When discussing the origin of the *polis* we tend to forget that in early sources and especially in the *Iliad*, *asty* occurs frequently (though not as frequently as *p(t)olis*).⁶⁸ Admittedly, the sense “city” is much more common than the sense “political community”, but there are passages in archaic sources where *asty* denotes the community and not just the urban centre.⁶⁹ In the classical period this sense of *asty* seems to disappear, but the derivative *astos* continues to have the meaning “citizen” and not just “city-dweller”.⁷⁰ Perikles’ citizenship law, for example, prescribed that citizen rights in Athens be restricted to those whose parents were both *astoi*.⁷¹ The synonymous use of *asty* and *polis* in archaic sources, and the synonymous use of *astos* and *polites* even in classical sources suggest that a conurbation was an essential element of the archaic and classical Greek *polis*, and that the modern and fashionable dissociation of the two senses “city” and “state” has been taken too far.

In support of the dissociation of the two senses, historians often claim (a) that there are many examples of *poleis* without an urban centre and, conversely, (b) that many urban centres were not the political, religious and economic centre of a *polis*.⁷²

Re (a): Sparta is the example almost inevitably adduced by historians who hold that a *polis* did not necessarily have an urban centre.⁷³ It is true that Sparta had no walls before the Hellenistic period and that it consisted of four *komai*: Limnai, Kynossoura, Messoa and Pitane. But the four *komai* were so close together that they must have formed a single nucleated settlement. They occupied an area of some 3 square km., and in the early fifth century they must have been inhabited by, sometimes, as many as 8,000 *Spartiatatai* and probably by their families as well.⁷⁴ A population density of several thousand adult male citizens per square kilometre is quite enough to reveal that Sparta must have been a conurbation, in spite of the absence of walls and monumental temples. Thus it is not surprising that, for example, Herodotos uses the term *polis* (in the sense of city) about Sparta.⁷⁵ Similarly, in the famous oracle given to the Spartans during the Persian Wars Sparta is described as an *asty*.⁷⁶ I conclude that Sparta is an ill-chosen example of a *polis* without an urban centre.

To substantiate his claim that “many [*poleis*] were not cities at all, though they all possessed civic centres”, Moses Finley adduces the

dioikismos of Mantinea in 385 B.C. and writes: “the inhabitants of the ”city“ of Mantinea were the owners of landed estates, who preferred to live together in the centre, away from their farms, in a style visible as far back as the Homeric poems and which had nothing to do with city-life”.⁷⁷ Finley’s description is essentially correct, but that does not change the fact that, down to 385 B.C., a four-digit number of Mantinean citizens lived together in a nucleated settlement protected by walls and that, by the *dioikismos*, they were forced to dismantle their houses and move to one of the surrounding *komai*.

Re (b): it is admittedly easier to find attestations of conurbations which were not the political, religious and economic centre of a *polis*. One example is Thorikos in Attika,⁷⁸ which in the classical period was not a *polis*, but considerably larger and more affluent than, for example, any of the four small *poleis* on the neighbouring island of Keos. Other examples of towns that were not *polis*-centres can indeed be found, e.g. Kasmenai in Sicily,⁷⁹ but outside Attika they are, I think, not so numerous as some historians would like to believe. In support of this view I will adduce the fourth-century *Periplus* erroneously attributed to Skylax. He lists some 500 localities which are either explicitly called *polis* or their status as *polis* is secured implicitly by the context. Of these some 430 are Hellenic *poleis*. Since his purpose is to draw a geographical and not a political picture of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, one would expect him to list the important cities and to use *polis* in the sense of conurbation rather than political community. Nevertheless, the localities he singles out as *poleis* are almost invariably some which modern historians take to be *poleis* in the political sense of the term as well.⁸⁰ To conclude, I side with those historians who state that a *polis* “was usually confined to one city and its immediate countryside”.⁸¹

A further objection to be made against the traditional translation “city-state” is that the typical ancient Greek *polis* was much too small to be called a city. Today the term “city” denotes a conurbation with at least a five-digit number of inhabitants, but in the ancient world many conurbations could not even muster a four-digit number, and nucleated settlements inhabited by a five-digit number of persons were very rare even in the Roman period. It is, of course, true that “city” in its modern sense is a misleading rendering of *polis* in the sense of conurbation. In this respect “town” would be a preferable translation,⁸² and we have to admit that many ancient *poleis* were smaller than a large modern village.⁸³ But if, in a historical context, we allow the term “city” to denote even a small nucleated settlement – as all historians do when they speak of “cities” in

medieval and early modern Europe⁸⁴ – I can see nothing wrong about describing the ancient Greek *polis* as a “city”.

The close connection between city and state in the ancient Greek world is further emphasized by a very simple linguistic observation. In most Indo-European languages the words for conurbation and countryside form a pair of antonyms, e.g. city/country (English), Stadt/Land (German), by/land (Danish), cité/pays (French) and *polis/chora* (Greek). In ancient Greek it was the word for city which came to denote the political community, whereas in modern European languages it is invariably the word for country which is also used synonymously with state. In ancient Greece a war was always waged between two *poleis*, never between *chorai*, and it was also the *polis* not the *chora* that defrayed expenses, made peace, had frontiers with other *poleis*, etc.⁸⁵ In the modern world, on the other hand, it is invariably the term country which is used in all such cases, never the city. The most likely explanation of this phenomenon is that a *polis* had a conurbation as its political centre, whereas in the Middle Ages, when the modern European nations emerged, a state had no political centre and no capital. The king and his court moved from castle to castle. Consequently it was impossible to connect the political institutions with any particular locality, and the nation could only be identified with the country as such. Similarly, as has often been noted, all the Greek *poleis* were named after their urban centre, e.g. *Athenaioi*, *Korinthioi*, *Argeioi*, etc., whereas no European nation is named after its capital or major city.⁸⁶

To conclude this section, I venture the following statements: there is no attested *polis* which was not centred on a conurbation and, conversely, almost every conurbation of any consequence was the centre of a *polis*. In spite of the modern fashion, we must not be too eager to dissociate the *polis* as a city from the *polis* as a state. Admittedly, “city” and “state” are two different aspects of the ancient *polis*, but they both refer to the same physical object and often an author uses the term twice in the same period but switches, almost imperceptibly, from one sense to the other.⁸⁷ So – against the prevailing trend among ancient historians – I would like to defend the traditional view that “city-state” is an essentially correct rendering of the ancient term *polis*, and conveys a good understanding of the concept, provided that we remember the very small size of the *polis* both as a city and as a state. Just as the *polis* (in the sense of state) was a political community which often had a few hundred adult male citizens only, and accordingly was much smaller than any modern state, so the *polis* (in the sense of city) was a conurbation which was sometimes inha-

bited by less than a thousand persons and, accordingly, was much smaller than any modern city.⁸⁸

The *Polis* as a State and as a Society

Discussion of the word *polis* in the senses of (a) a political community and (b) a conurbation leads to the question whether the *polis* is best described as a form of state or rather as a form of society.⁸⁹ Since, as explained above, the Greeks took the *polis* to be a people rather than a territory or a government, the best way of addressing this problem is to ask: which persons did a *polis* consist of? Modern historians have two very different answers to this question. According to George Forrest, for example, the *polis* “was a community of citizens (adult males), citizens without political rights (women and children), and non-citizens (resident foreigners and slaves), a defined body, occupying a defined area, living under a defined or definable constitution, ...”⁹⁰ Ernst Meyer, however, offers the following description: “die “Polis” ist also die Gesamtheit seiner Bürger, nämlich aller derjenigen, immer nur männlichen Angehörigen des Volkes, die die politischen Rechte besitzen, “am Staat Anteil haben”.”⁹¹

Both Forrest and Meyer (and their followers) can find support for their view in the sources, for example in Aristotle’s *Politics*. In Books 1 and 3 Aristotle offers two very different accounts of what a *polis* is. In Book 1 he gives a socio-economic analysis of the *polis*. Its atom is the household (*oikia*),⁹² the purpose of which is production of the necessities of life and reproduction of its own members;⁹³ there is no discussion whatsoever of the concepts of citizen (*polites*) and constitution (*politeia*),⁹⁴ and all inhabitants of the *polis* are also members of the *polis*: men, women, children and slaves.⁹⁵ In Book 3 Aristotle represents the *polis* as a political community. Its atom is the citizen,⁹⁶ not the household, and *politai* (matter) and *politeia* (form) are seen as the two essential aspects of the *polis*.⁹⁷ There is no discussion any longer of production (*ktesis*) which, ideally, ought to be left to non-citizens,⁹⁸ and the household (*oikia*) is only mentioned in passing. Accordingly, women, foreigners and slaves are outsiders.⁹⁹

Aristotle’s two conflicting but complementary views of the *polis* match the two related but different meanings of the term *polis*. In Book 1 he treats the *polis* in the sense of “city”, and describes how it developed out of the village (*kome*) which again developed out of the household (*oikia*).¹⁰⁰ In Book 3 the *polis* is seen as a political community, and the

purpose of life is no longer production and reproduction (*to zen*),¹⁰¹ but the citizens' participation in politics (*politike koinonia*) which for a true human being is what life is all about (*to eu zen*).¹⁰²

Thus the two definitions of a *polis* offered by Forrest and Meyer are both correct, but apply in different contexts. As a setting for human production and reproduction the *polis* is a society, not a state; the term *polis* designates a conurbation (sometimes including the hinterland) rather than a political community, and all inhabitants are members of the *polis*. But as a political community the *polis* is a state rather than a society, and the term *polis* designates the adult male citizens only, united by their political institutions, in which the citizens participate completely isolated from women, metics foreigners and slaves.

Thus the Greeks saw the *polis* both as a society comprising all inhabitants and as a political community restricted to adult male citizens. But the sources show that they were perfectly capable of distinguishing the two different meanings of *polis* and the two different spheres. Again, Aristotle's *Politics* may serve as an example. In Book 1 he says that *polis* consists of households (*oikiai*) and that women, children and slaves are members of the household. Thus slaves are members of the *polis*.¹⁰³ But in Book 3 and 7 Aristotle says explicitly that (foreigners and) slaves are *not* members of the *polis*.¹⁰⁴ The apparent contradiction disappears when we remember that the *polis* referred to in Book 1 consists of *oikiai*, whereas the *polis* referred to in the later books consists of *politai*. Similarly, viewed as a society the members of a *polis* are unequal, but viewed as a state all members are equal.¹⁰⁵ Another example is Plato. In *Republic* Book 2 Plato describes the emergence of the *polis* in the sense of a nucleated settlement intended to facilitate production by division of labour;¹⁰⁶ *polites* is used in the (rare) sense of "inhabitant"¹⁰⁷ and the *polis* includes artisans and traders. But in the *Laws* Plato describes the foundation of a *polis* which is to have 5,040 citizens,¹⁰⁸ and here *polites* is used in the sense of an adult male citizen.¹⁰⁹ It is worth noticing that Plato's account of the *polis* in *Republic* Book 2 matches Aristotle's in his *Politics* Book 1, whereas the *polis* described in Plato's *Laws* is a political community, as is the *polis* described in the other books of Aristotle's *Politics*.

There were, however, two spheres of life in which the two different aspects of the *polis* tended to overlap: religion and war.

Every city-state had one or more civic deities symbolically connected with the *polis* as a state; the common hearth in the *prytaneion* was the symbolic centre of the *polis*; and all the major festivals were organized by the *polis* and run by its officials who were also entrusted with the ad-

ministration of the sanctuaries.¹¹⁰ On the other hand, the cults of goddesses, even of Athena Polias, were almost invariably in the hands of priestesses,¹¹¹ and some festivals, e.g. the Thesmophoria, were attended by women only.¹¹² So, seen as a religious community the *polis* was *not* exclusively a male society as it certainly was as a political community.¹¹³ Nor was *polis* religion restricted to citizens; metics, women and even slaves were allowed to participate in many of the other festivals.¹¹⁴ They did so undoubtedly as inferiors, but nevertheless, in the religious sphere they were insiders,¹¹⁵ whereas in the political sphere they were invariably outsiders.

Similarly in the military sphere. For its defence a *polis* relied on its phalanx of hoplites, who were mostly of citizen status, and many historians have seen the hoplite phalanx as the essence of the *polis* and one of the important factors in its emergence.¹¹⁶ But the phalanx was not isomorphic with the city. Only upper- and middle-class citizens could afford the equipment. Poor citizens were excluded, so the citizens were not united by being hoplites.¹¹⁷ Conversely, metics served in the phalanx with the citizens,¹¹⁸ and the citizens did not isolate themselves from the foreigners as they did in the political sphere.

The Autonomous *Polis*

It is still a widely accepted view that the *polis* was by definition *autonomos*,¹¹⁹ so that by losing its *autonomia* a political community lost its identity as a *polis*. This has been stated so often and with such a force that for many years I believed it too. The problem is that it has no support in the sources.

(a) No ancient discussion of the nature of the *polis* mentions *autonomia* as a defining characteristic. Plato, for example, treats the concept and nature of the *polis* in the *Republic*, especially in Book 2, and in the *Laws*, especially in Books 3 and 4, but has not a word to say about *autonomia*; he does not even use the word. Similarly, in Aristotle's *Politics* there is no occurrence of the noun *autonomia*, and the adjective *autonomos* is used only once, in a passage in which autonomous citizens are opposed to citizens ruled by a tyrant.¹²⁰ For Aristotle it is the concept of *autarkeia*, not of *autonomia*, that is inseparably connected with the concept of the *polis*.¹²¹

(b) The opposite of *autonomia* is being *hypekoos*. If *autonomia* had been an essential characteristic of the *polis*, the term *hypekoos polis* would have been either a nonsense or an oxymoron. But quite a few sources speak

about *hypokeoi poleis* in a straightforward manner.¹²² Every city-state would of course have preferred to be autonomous, but obviously a city-state did not lose its identity as a *polis* by being subjected to another city-state or, for example, to the king of Persia, or Macedon, or a Hellenistic ruler, or Rome.

(c) Many dependent political communities are called *poleis* and treated as *poleis* in our sources. The most obvious example are the perioikic communities ruled by Sparta,¹²³ but there are innumerable other examples of *poleis* being dependencies rather than independent states (cf. page 20 below and Peter Rhodes' discussion in Chapter 5).

(d) The sources in which the concept of *autonomia* is indeed linked with the term *polis* are the treaties between city-states and alliances of city-states, beginning with the peace of Nikias in 422/1.¹²⁴ But again these treaties show not only that all *poleis* strove for autonomy but also that city-states deprived of their autonomy nevertheless counted as *poleis*. One example will suffice. The King's Peace of 387/6 stipulated that all *poleis*, great and small, be autonomous, apart from those in Asia Minor and a few others.¹²⁵ One result of the peace was that the Thebans had to set the other Boiotian *poleis* free and respect their *autonomia*.¹²⁶ If *autonomia* had been a prerequisite for being a *polis* the Boiotian city-states, apart from Thebes, would not have been *poleis* in the period before 387/6. But the description we have of the Boiotian confederacy in the *Hell. Oxy.* shows that, although they were not *autonomous* in the period before the King's Peace, they were nevertheless *poleis*.¹²⁷

It has not passed unnoticed, of course, that the concept of the autonomous *polis* is hard to reconcile with the fact that so many of the city-states were dependencies. In his count of *poleis*, for example, Ruschenbusch includes only those that were "selbständige *poleis*".¹²⁸ A different line is taken by Ostwald.¹²⁹ He shares the view that a real *polis* must be autonomous, but then prefers to stretch the concept of *autonomia*. He writes, for example, about Aigina in the late fifth century: "By itself neither the razing of her walls, nor the loss of her fleet, nor the payment of tribute constitute a loss of *autonomia* ... We may conclude that a state is *autonomous* when it is left free to exercise on its own the most rudimentary powers necessary for its survival."¹³⁰ But on this interpretation of *autonomia* the Boiotian cities would have been *autonomous* in the period before 387/6. I prefer to believe that *autonomia* meant independence, but to point out as well that the connection between the concepts of *polis* and *autonomia* has been invented by modern historians. To the Greeks the *polis* was a (small) community of citizens united in having common political institu-

tions. Whether or not decisions about e.g. foreign policy and defence were made by the citizens themselves or by a dominating neighbour was, of course, a matter of great importance; every *polis* wanted to be free (*eleutheros*) and independent (*autonomos*); but losing its autonomy did not affect a community's identity as a *polis* as long as its political institutions (housed in a *bouleuterion* and a *prytaneion* etc) were allowed to survive and work. Let me adduce two sources in support of this view. After the sack of Sardis by Kyros in ca. 547/6 the Ionian cities convened a meeting in which, according to Herodotos, Thales the philosopher made the following proposal: the Ionians should set up a common *bouleuterion* for all the Ionian *poleis* in Teos, whereby all the other *poleis*, though kept as urban centres just as before, would change their status and become demes instead of *poleis*.¹³¹ Similarly, according to Thucydides, it was by setting up a common *bouleuterion* and *prytaneion* in Athens that Theseus created the Athenian *polis* out of the many earlier *poleis* in Attica, each with its own *bouleuterion*.¹³²

From the above considerations it follows that *polis*, in the sense of political community, designates not only the small independent city-state but also a whole range of other state forms, namely: (a) dependencies such as the perioikic communities in Lakedaimon,¹³³ the Athenian klerouchies,¹³⁴ *poleis* ruled by other *poleis*,¹³⁵ or small states located within the borders of a federal state but without any representation in the federal organs of government;¹³⁶ (b) constituent states which were members of a federation and represented in the federal organs of government;¹³⁷ (c) members of an alliance, even members deprived of their autonomy;¹³⁸ (d) the two oversized hegemonic city-states, Athens¹³⁹ and Sparta,¹⁴⁰ both coextensive with an entire region. Finally, by an extension of the use of the term *polis* it could be used about (e) the federal state itself which covered a whole region and consisted of a number of *poleis*,¹⁴¹ and (f) a whole barbarian nation such as, for example, the Persian State.¹⁴² In senses (e) and (f) *polis* is used synonymously with the more common term *ethnos* in the sense of "state", and here "city-state" would indeed be a mistranslation.

The *Polis* in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods

It is still a common view that the independent Greek *polis* flourished in the archaic and classical periods, but was crushed by the Macedonians and disappeared in the second half of the 4th century.¹⁴³ The turning

point is often pinned down to the battle of Chaironeia, and from some accounts one gets the impression that the city-state perished on 2 August 338 B.C. For my own part, however, I have always preferred to believe that the independent city-state declined at least a century before Chaironeia,¹⁴⁴ whereas the *polis*, i.e. the political community of citizens united in the running of their city's institutions, continued to exist throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods.¹⁴⁵ Apart from those under Persian rule, most *poleis* were probably autonomous at the beginning of the 5th century before the Persian Wars, and most of the *poleis* along the coast of Asia Minor became autonomous in the wake of the battles of Salamis, Mykale and Plataiai. But at that time the concept of *autonomia* had not yet emerged,¹⁴⁶ and when *autonomia* became a crucial concept in interstate relations, i.e. from the mid-fifth century on,¹⁴⁷ more and more *poleis* lost their independence. During the second half of the fifth century many *poleis* were deprived of their autonomy by becoming members of the Delian or the Peloponnesian league; and during the late fifth and fourth centuries hundreds of *poleis* changed their status from being independent states to being constituent states of a confederacy that regularly comprised all the *poleis* within a region. By the mid fourth century we find federal states in Boiotia, Phokis, Lokris, Euboia, Thessaly, Epeiros, Aitolia, Akarnania, Achaia and Arkadia. Furthermore, many *poleis* along the coast of Asia Minor had once again become subject to the King of Persia, as they had been in the period before the Persian Wars. There is no historical atlas which includes a map of Greece ca. 350 B.C. showing which *poleis* were still independent and which had become dependencies, either by being dominated by one of the hegemonic cities or the King of Persia or by being a member of a confederation. Such a map would reveal that when Macedon under Philip II began to manifest itself as a great power, the independent city-state was no longer the typical form of *polis*. What disappeared with the rise of Macedon in the second half of the 4th century was not the *polis* but the hegemonic *polis* such as Athens, Sparta or Thebes. The other *poleis* could not necessarily tell the difference between being dominated by Athens or the king of Persia and being dominated by the king of Macedon or some other Hellenistic monarch. Thus the *polis* (i.e. the small political community of citizens living in or around an urban centre and united in running its political institutions) survived the end of the classical period, and though the independent city-state had declined long before the defeat at Chaironeia, the *polis* in the true sense of the word existed and prospered throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Accordingly this volume concludes

with two major contributions: Philippe Gauthier's about the Hellenistic *polis* and Fergus Millar's about the Greek *polis* in the Roman world.

By why have so many historians taken the independent city-state to be the typical form of *polis* in the 4th century B.C.? And why do they tend to ignore the large number of *poleis* which, by ca. 350, had been transformed into constituent states or dependencies? I believe that Aristotle is to be held responsible. For better or worse his *Politics*, more than any other source, has shaped modern historians' understanding of the Greek *polis*. Aristotle took the formation of societies to be a natural development, and the formation of the *polis* to be the completion (*telos*) of that development.¹⁴⁸ He describes how many *oikiai* form a *kome* and many *komai* form a *polis*.¹⁴⁹ We can add that, in the classical period, many *poleis* tended to form a federal state (an *ethnos* or *koinon*), but in the *Politics* there is no discussion and no mention of federal states, and Aristotle never says that the *koinon* is a further development of the *polis*. Why not? First, he describes the development of societies in Book I where he treats the *polis* as a society and not as a political community; and a discussion of federal states does not belong in that context. Second, his belief in a natural development of societies led him to see the *kome* as a dwarf and the *koinon* as a giant, whereas the *polis* was the grown-up human being.¹⁵⁰ To maintain this view he had to close his eyes to contemporary developments and, in most of his analysis, to ignore both the federal states in Hellas itself and the big monarchies north and east of Hellas. He could do that because the members of the Hellenic federal states were still essentially *poleis*,¹⁵¹ and because the big monarchies were barbarian and accordingly communities of inferior human beings. His treatise has had an enormous impact on all later political philosophy. It is more surprising that Aristotle's view of the Hellenic *polis* as the summit of the development of human society has also succeeded in shaping modern historians' understanding of the nature of the Greek *polis* in the later classical period.

Notes

1 'Doomed to Extinction' in *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* ed. O. Murray & S. Price (Oxford 1990) 348.

2 M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Greeks* (London 1963) 45; F. Kolb, *Die Stadt im Altertum* (München 1984) 59; R. Osborne, *Demos: the Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) 8; A. Snodgrass, 'Interaction by Design: the Greek City-State,' in *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* ed. C. Renfrew & J. Cherry (Cambridge 1986) 47; *idem*, *Archaeology and*

the Study of the Greek City,' in *City and Country in the Ancient World* ed. J. Rich & A. Wallace Hadrill (London 1991); Runciman (*supra* n. 1) 348; I. Morris, 'The Early Polis as City and State,' in *City and Country in the Ancient World* ed. J. Rich & A. Wallace-Hadrill (London 1991) 25; W. Schuller, *Griechische Geschichte* (München 1991) 104.

3 H. Kelsen, *General Theory of Law and State* (Cambridge Mass. 1946) 207: "Traditional doctrine distinguishes three "elements" of the State: its territory, its people, and its power". cf. 189: "The State as "politically" organized Society (The State as Power)." cf. J.G. Starkie, *Introduction to International Law* (10th ed. London 1989) 95 referring inter alia to Article I of the Montevideo Convention of 1933 which defines a state as follows: "The State as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications: – (a) a permanent population; (b) a defined territory; (c) a Government; (d) a capacity to enter into relations with other States." Starkie points out that in international law (d) is especially important.

4 Acknowledged by all historians since the beginning of the last century cf. F. Gschnitzer, 'Stammes- und Ortsgemeinden im alten Griechenland,' *WS* 68 (1955) 121-2.

5 Philoch. (*FGrHist* 328) fr. 155. See R. Osborne, *Classical Landscape with Figures* (London 1987) 50-2, 119-20; G. Audring, *Zur Struktur des Territoriums griechischer Poleis in archaischer Zeit (nach den schriftlichen Quellen)* (Berlin 1989).

6 Dem. 23.37, 39ff; Philoch. (*FGrHist* 328) fr. 30.

7 Gschnitzer (*supra* n. 4). Following F. Hampl, 'Poleis ohne Territorium,' *Klio* 32 (1939) 1-60 most historians seem to believe that a *polis* could be completely deprived of its territory but nevertheless persist as a self-governing community of citizens, i.e. as a *polis*. In my opinion none of the examples adduced by Hampl carries conviction, not even his first (and best), i.e. Mytilene after 427. I have no quarrel with Hampl's view (1-2) that Mytilene persisted as a *polis* although the land was shared out to Athenian clerouchs; but it does not follow that Mytilene, then, was a "Polis ohne Territorium". There is no indication that the city itself became Athenian property; thus Mytilene may for some years have been a *polis* without hinterland, but not a *polis* completely deprived of its territory. Next, in 446 when the Athenians installed clerouchs in Chalkis they did not deprive the Chalkidians of (some of) their territory only but also of many other rights (7-10). Chalkis became a *hypekoos polis*, not a "Polis ohne Territorium". Both these and Hampl's other examples, which are less convincing, testify to the existence of *hypekooi poleis*, and he points out quite correctly (16-7) that a city which lost its *autonomia* could persist as a *polis*. But that does not amount to evidence of "Poleis ohne territorium".

8 Aeschyl. *Pers.* 348-9; Soph. *O.T.* 56-7; Eur. Fr 828 (Nauck); Hdt. 8.61.2; Thuc. 7.77.7; Pl. *Definitiones.* 415C.

9 Alc. fr. 426. C.F.Smith, 'What Constitutes a State,' *CJ* 2 (1907) 299-302.

10 Thuc. 5.25.1.

11 Arist. *Pol.* 1326a16-20.

12 Arist. *Pol.* 1274b41; 1275b20; Pl. *Definitiones.* 415C; Andoc. 2.1.

13 *SEG* 27.631.1 (inscription from Lyttos on Crete, ca. 500 B.C.); Thuc. 7.77.4; Dem. 43.72.

14 Hdt. 4.15.1; Thuc. 1.132.1; 3.82.2; Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.35.

15 Arist. *Pol.* 1276b1, the motto of the symposion cf. pages 3 and 7. I have to plead guilty to Oswyn Murray's charge (*infra* page 197) that the phrase [ἡ πόλις] ἐστὶν .. κοινωνία πολιτῶν πολιτείας is quoted out of context. And it is fine that he puts it back where it belongs. But my reason for choosing this particular passage from Aristotle's *Politics* Book 3 as the motto for the symposion is that it is the shortest and most elegant formulation of what

Aristotle says again and again in this part of the *Politics*. In a number of passages, for example, πόλις is defined as a number of citizens, πολῖται (1274b41; 1275b20-1); next, a citizen is defined as one who participates in jurisdiction and government (1275a22-3; 1275b18-20); πολιτεία is defined as the organization (τάξις) of those who live in the πόλις (1274b38) and more specifically as the organization (τάξις) of the political institutions (ἄρχαί), in particular the highest political institution (1278b8-10, cf. 1279a25ff). So *polis* is constantly defined by two other terms: *polites* and *politeia*. An Aristotelian *polis*, of course, like any other substance, is a compound of form and matter, and in case of the *polis*, the matter is the *politai* and the form is the *politeia*. Since for Aristotle the form is always more important than the matter, it is no surprise that Aristotle takes a change in the form (*politeia*) of a *polis* to be more important than a change of its matter (πλήθος πολιτῶν). As to the textual problem: κοινωνία πολιτῶν πολιτείας is a combination of a subjective and an objective genitive cf. e.g. 1280b40-81a1: πόλις δὲ ἡ γενῶν καὶ κωμῶν κοινωνία ζωῆς τελείας καὶ αὐτάρχους. The *polis* is the citizens' participation (*koinonia*) in the *politeia*, i.e. in the political institutions. To have both a subjective and an objective genitive depending on κοινωνία is a problem of translation, not of grammar or interpretation. κοινωνία means "participation" as well as "community". It is only in our translation we have to make a choice. If we prefer "participation" we have no difficulty in saying the participation of A in B. but then we miss the connotation "community". If we translate "community" we run into difficulties (in English) with the two genitives, cf. M.B. Sakellariou, *The Polis-State. Definitions and Origin* (Athens 1989) 215 & 227. Incidentally there is no problem in Danish since the word "fællesskab" is the equivalent of "community" but can easily convey the meaning of the objective and subjective genitives in the idiom "borgernes fællesskab om forfatningen". In conclusion, I follow most editors in finding Congreve's conjecture unconvincing and unnecessary.

16 Arist. *Pol.* 1278b8-10.

17 Arist. *Pol.* 1275a7.

18 E. Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory* (Oxford 1951) 91.

19 A. Vincent, *Theories of the State* (Oxford 1987) 29-32.

20 B. Holden, *Understanding Liberal Democracy* (Oxford 1988) 22.

21 As in *IG*. I³ 101.49 & 53 = *M&L* 89.

22 Dem. 3.31.

23 *IG* II² 96.9 = Tod 126; Dem. 9.42. Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia* (Copenhagen 1983) 142 n. 12.

24 Tod 118.16.

25 KN As 1517,12, cf. A. Thumb & A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* II (Heidelberg 1959) 335 §337 13a; A. Morpurgo, *Mycenaeae Graecitatis Lexicon* (Rom 1963) 262.

26 Cf. H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* II (Heidelberg 1970) 576-7; M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford 1899) 635. K. Strunk, 'Verkannte Spuren eines weiteren Tiefstufentyps im Griechischen,' *Glotta* 47 (1970) 2.

27 In contemporary Lettish, however, *pils* is used in names of cities, e.g. Daugapils = Dynaburg. – It is misleading when E. Benveniste claims: "we have thus here an old Indo-European term, which in Greek, and only in Greek, has taken on the sense of 'town, city', then 'state'." *Indo-European Language and Society* (London 1973) 298. In Sanskrit *pūr* certainly developed the meaning "town", "city" and since many of these cities were actually states I would not preclude that the word may take on the sense of "state" or "political community" as well.

- 28 IG I³ 4 B.3; 40.60 (= *M&L* 52); cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1093; *Lys.* 245; Andoc. 1.132; Is. 5.44 with Wyse's note *ad loc.*
- 29 IG IV 492.3.
- 30 IG XII,1 677.19.
- 31 In two cases *polis* probably denotes the citadel of Troy, *viz.* *Il.* 4.514: ὡς φάτ' ἀπὸ πτόλιος δεινὸς θεός; *Il.* 7.370: νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἔλεσθε κατὰ πτόλιν. But E. Lévy, 'Asty et polis dans l'Iliade,' *Ktéma* 8 (1983) 59-60 is prepared to question even these two occurrences and holds that *polis* in the sense of *akropolis* is unattested in the Iliad.
- 32 *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 271. Sakkeliariou (*supra* n. 15) 156 adduces two attestations in Pindar: *Pyth.* 4.8 and fr. 119.2. But in the first case the epithet εὐάροματος militates against taking πτόλις to mean citadel, and in the second case it is the addition of the adjective ὑψηλός that creates the meaning "citadel" instead of "city".
- 33 Plut. *Pelop.* 18.1.
- 34 S. Humphreys, *Anthropology and the Greeks* (London 1978) 130: "In normal usage, *polis* meant a city-state, both territory (*chora*) and the conurbation at its centre (sometimes also called *asty*) where one could find the basic Greek political institutions ..."
- 35 Pl. *Lg.* 746A; Ps. Arist. *Oec.* 1343a10.
- 36 A. Snodgrass, 'Archaeology and the Study of the Greek City,' in *City and Country* (*supra* n. 2) 8.
- 37 S. Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca and London 1990) 3; K. Raaflaub, 'Homer und die Geschichte des 8 Jh.s v. Chr.,' in *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung* ed. J. Latacz (Leipzig 1991) 207-15; Raaflaub *infra* 46-59.
- 38 Lévy (*supra* n. 31) 55.
- 39 *Il.* 16.69-70: Τρώων δὲ πόλις ἐπὶ πᾶσα βέβηκε θάροσνος (political community); *Il.* 11.711-2: ἔστι δὲ τις Θρουόεσσα πόλις, αἰπεῖα κολώνη (city); *Il.* 18.490-1: ἐν δὲ δύο πόιησε πόλεις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων καλᾶς (both meanings at the same time).
- 40 νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν *Il.* 2.12, 29, 68 etc.
- 41 *Od.* 14.472; *Il.* 1.129 (Troy); *Il.* 18.514 (shield of Achilles); *Od.* 6.9 (Scheria).
- 42 *Il.* 3.153 (Troy); *Od.* 6.262-3 (Scheria).
- 43 *Il.* 18.497 (shield of Achilles); *Od.* 6.266 (Scheria)
- 44 *Od.* 6.10, 266 (Scheria);
- 45 *Il.* 1.39; 5.446; 7.83 (Temple of Apollo); *Il.* 6.297-300 (temple of Athena).
- 46 *Od.* 6.9 (Scheria).
- 47 *Il.* 6.242ff (palace of Priam); *Od.* 4.20ff (palace of Menelaos); *Od.* 7.81ff (palace of Alkinoos). Cf. C. Rider, *The Greek House* (Cambridge 1965), Chapter xiv: 'Homeric Palaces' 166-209.
- 48 See Raaflaub's description *infra* 46-7.
- 49 *Od.* 6.7-10, 262-72.
- 50 *Il.* 18.490-540.
- 51 *Il.* 4.52.
- 52 *Od.* 14.473 (Troy); *Il.* 18.493 (shield of Achilles); *Od.* 6.194 (Scheria); cf. *Od.* 1.3.
- 53 A. Cambitoglou *et alii*, *Zagora I* (Sydney 1971).
- 54 F.E. Winter, *Greek Fortifications* (Toronto 1971) 107 n. 17.
- 55 See Snodgrass (*supra* n. 2, 1991) 9-10.
- 56 The earliest attestations of other walled cities are Iasos, Leontinoi and Kasmenai, all of the 7th century, For Iasos and Leontinoi cf. Winter (*supra* n. 54) 103, 128; for Kasmenai cf. A. Di Vita, 'L'urbanistica più antica delle colonie di Magna Grecia e di Sicilia: problemi e riflessioni,' *ASAtene* 59 (1981) 64-5.

- 57 F. Kolb, *Die Stadt im Altertum* (München 1984) 111.
- 58 *Lefkandi I. The Iron Age*, ed. M.R. Popham *et alii* (London 1980).
- 59 For the view that the Homeric poems reflect Greek society in the 7th century cf. now J.G.B. van Wees, *Status Warriors* (Amsterdam 1992).
- 60 M.I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (London 1956) 35; M.M. Austin & P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece* (London 1977) 40.
- 61 O. Murray, *Early Greece* (London 1980) 64; I. Morris, 'The Use and Abuse of Homer,' *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986) 100-4; K. Raaflaub (*supra* n. 37) 239 with n. 115, cf. *infra* 43-6, 46-59.
- 62 H. *Il.* 2.645-52.
- 63 H. *Il.* 2.494-510.
- 64 J.A.O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States* (Oxford 1968) xvi.
- 65 J.N. Coldstream, 'The Meaning of the Regional Styles in the 8th Century B.C.,' in *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation* ed. R. Hägg (Stockholm 1983) 17-25.
- 66 G. Busolt, *Griechische Staatskunde I* (Munich 1920) 128-35; Gschnitzer (*supra* n. 4) *passim*; K.W. Welwei, *Die griechische Polis* (Cologne 1983) 16f; 30ff.
- 67 Cf. e.g. F. de Polignac, *La naissance de la cité grecque* (Paris 1984) 41-92; I. Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society* (Cambridge 1987) 171-210; *Idem*, 'The Early Polis as City and State,' in *City and Country* (*supra* n. 2) 25-57. Cf., however, C. Morgan, 'Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives,' *PCPS* 37 (1991) 131-63.
- 68 Lévy (*supra* n. 31) 55.
- 69 E.g. Hom. *Il.* 6.95: αἶ κ' ἔλεῖσῃ / ἄστῦ τε καὶ Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νῆπια τέκνα. Tyrnt. fr. 12 (West) line 24: αὐτὸς δ' ἐν προμάχοισι πεσὼν φίλον ὤλεσε θυμόν,/ ἄστῦ τε καὶ λαοὺς καὶ πατέρ' εὐκλείσας. Cf. e.g. *IG XII* 7.108: πόλει πένθος ἔθηκε θανῶν, where *polis* is used in the same sense.
- 70 Cf. e.g. Dem. 57.30, 43, 46; 59.107.
- 71 Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 26.4: μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἄστοῖν ἢ γεγωνός.
- 72 Kolb (*supra* n. 57) 59, 66.
- 73 Runciman (*supra* n. 1) 348, Welwei (*supra* n. 66) 16.
- 74 Hdt. 7.234.2.
- 75 Hdt. 6.58.1.
- 76 Hdt. 7.220, cf. J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1978) 319: Q152.
- 77 M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Greeks* (London 1963) 45, interpreting Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.7.
- 78 Osborne (*supra* n. 2) 29.
- 79 Thuc. 6.5.2. Cf. A. Di Vita, 'Town Planning in the Greek Colonies of Sicily from the Time of their Foundations to the Punic Wars,' in *Greek Colonies and Native Populations* ed. J.-P. Descœudres (Oxford 1990) 350.
- 80 The exceptions include e.g. Pagai in Megaris (39) and the island of Salamis (58).
- 81 Murray (*supra* n. 61) 64; Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (5th ed. Munich 1977) 80; Forrest in *The Oxford History of the Classical World* ed. J. Boardman, J. Griffin and O. Murray (Oxford 1986) 19.
- 82 But then we would lose the derivative "citizen" which is indeed the obvious translation of *polites*.
- 83 E.J. Owens, *The City in the Greek and Roman World* (London 1991) 17; Gschnitzer s.v. *polis* in *Lexikon der Alten Welt* (Zürich 1965) 2389.

- 84** On the size and growth of towns and cities in early modern Europe cf. J. de Vries, 'Patterns of Urbanization in Pre-industrial Europe 1500-1800,' in *Patterns of European Urbanization since 1500* ed. H. Schmal (London 1981) 77-109.
- 85** Aeschin. 3.122 (war); Thuc. 2.70.2 (public expenditure); Thuc. 5.18.1 (peace); Aeschin. 3.133 (frontiers).
- 86** Gschnitzer (*supra* n. 4) 121-5. The exception is Luxembourg.
- 87** Aeneas Tacticus 11.4: ἔτι δὲ συνεβούλευε καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τὴν πόλιν φυλασσόντων ἀπόμισθον ποιῆσαι, ἵν' ὡς ἐλάχιστον δῆθεν ἀνάλωμα τῇ πόλει ᾗ.
- 88** It is worth noting Isokrates' view (12.179) that Athens was the only *polis* in Hellas in the true sense of the word, whereas all the other conurbations were just *komai*.
- 89** For the (traditional) distinction between state and society cf. Barker (*supra* n. 18) 3: "By 'society' we mean the whole sum of voluntary bodies, or associations, contained in the nation ... with all their various purposes and with all their institutions". — "By 'the State' we mean a particular and special association, existing for the special purpose of maintaining a compulsory scheme of legal order, and acting therefore through laws enforced by prescribed and definite sanctions". See Ober *infra* 129.
- 90** Forrest (*supra* n. 81) 19 followed by e.g. Ober (*infra* p. 131-2) and Murray (*infra* page 199ff).
- 91** *Einführung in die antike Staatskunde* (Darmstadt 1968) 68. See also: Welwei (*supra* n. 66) 10; Owens (*supra* n. 83) 1, Morris (*supra* n. 2) 26.
- 92** Arist. *Pol.* 1253b1-3; 1260b13.
- 93** Arist. *Pol.* 1353b8-10; 1253b23ff (production); 1259a37ff (reproduction).
- 94** In Book One there is not a single occurrence of the term *polites*, and *politeia* is only mentioned in the last section (1260b15), which is not an integral part of Book One but serves as an introduction to the following books.
- 95** Arist. *Pol.* 1253b6-7.
- 96** Arist. *Pol.* 1274b41; 1275b20.
- 97** Arist. *Pol.* 1276b1-2.
- 98** Arist. *Pol.* 1278a8-11; cf. 1328a34.
- 99** Arist. *Pol.* 1275a7-8; 1326a18-20.
- 100** In Book I the *polis* is seen as a city, created by a form of *synoikismos*: *Pol.* 1252b20 (*synelthon*), 27-8. See N.H. Demand, *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Bristol 1990) 26-7: "synoikisms were frequent in the 5th and 4th centuries ... Aristotle's acquaintance with this form of *polis* creation through power-building synoikisms may well have misled him to apply the concept anachronistically to the problem of the origins of the *polis*".
- 101** Arist. *Pol.* 1278b15-30.
- 102** Arist. *Pol.* 1326b7-9.
- 103** Arist. *Pol.* 1253b1-8.
- 104** Arist. *Pol.* 1275a7-8; 1326a18-20.
- 105** Arist. *Pol.* 1261a24: οὐ γὰρ γίνεται πόλις ἐξ ὁμοίων; 1277a5: ἐξ ἀνομοίων ἢ πόλις; 1287a12: ἐξ ὁμοίων ἢ πόλις; 1328a36: ἢ δὲ πόλις κοινωνία τίς ἐστὶν τῶν ὁμοίων.
- 106** Pl. *Resp.* 369Bff. See Schofield's discussion *infra* 186ff.
- 107** Pl. *Resp.* 370C etc.
- 108** Pl. *Lg.* 737E.
- 109** Pl. *Lg.* 740C etc.
- 110** C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'What is *Polis* religion?' in Murray & Price (*supra* n. 1) 295-322; A. Giovannini, 'Symbols and Rituals in Classical Athens,' in *City-States in Classical*

Antiquity and Medieval Italy ed. A. Molho, K. Raaflaub and J. Emlen (Stuttgart 1991) 459-78; L. Bruit Zaidman & P. Schmitt-Pantel, *Religion in the Ancient Greek City* (revised English ed. Cambridge 1992).

- 111** H. McClees, *A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions* (Diss. Columbia, N.Y. 1920); J. Gould, 'Law, Custom and Myth: Aspects of the Social Position of Women in Classical Athens,' *JHS* 100 (1980) 50.
- 112** L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (2nd ed. Berlin 1966) 50-60.
- 113** P. Vidal-Naquet, 'Recipes for Greek Adolescence,' in *Myth, Religion & Society*, ed. R.L. Gordon (Cambridge 1981) 188.
- 114** *IG* I³ 82.23 (metics); *Ar. Ach.* 253ff.; *Is* 8.19-20 (women); *Philoch.* fr. 97 (slaves). Cf. Deubner (*supra* n. 112) 94, 96, 118, 135, 152.
- 115** W. Schuller, *Frauen in der griechischen Geschichte* (Konstanz 1985) 25-6, 28, 41, 55; R. Just, *Women in Athenian Law and Life* (London 1989) 23.
- 116** Snodgrass (*supra* n. 2, 1986) 51: "The hoplite phalanx was the embodiment of the polis idea translated into action"; (*Supra* n. 2, 1991) 19: "The existence of hoplites is the clearest a posteriori proof of the existence of the polis."
- 117** Morris (*supra* n. 67) 196-7.
- 118** *Thuc.* 2.13.7; *Xen. Vect.* 2.2; D. Whitehead, *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* (Cambridge 1977) 82-6.
- 119** E. Will, *Le monde grec et l'orient* (Paris 1972) 416; Bengtson (*supra* n. 81) 286 Welwei (*supra* n. 66) 10; A. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece* (London 1980) 28. L.B. Zaidman & P. Schmitt-Pantel, (*supra* n. 110) 7; Morris (*supra* n. 2) 27. For a preferable and more balanced view cf. Hampl (*supra* n. 7) 16-7; Raaflaub (*supra* n. 37) 241 n. 122: "Autonomia keine Bedingung", and Rhodes *infra* 161-77.
- 120** *Arist. Pol.* 1315a4-8.
- 121** *Arist. Pol.* 1252b27-53a1; 1261b10-4; 1275b20-1; 1291a9-10; 1326b2-8; 1328b16-8.
- 122** *Ps. Xen. Ath. Pol.* 2.3; *Thuc.* 4.108.3; 8.64.1; *Xen. Hell.* 5.2.15.
- 123** *Hdt.* 7.234.2; *Thuc.* 5.54.1 (*pace* the note in Gomme/Andrewes/Dover); *Xen. Ages.* 2.24; *Lac. Pol.* 15.3; *Skylax* 46.
- 124** *Thuc.* 5.18-9.
- 125** *Xen. Hell.* 5.1.31.
- 126** *Xen. Hell.* 5.1.33.
- 127** *Hell. Oxy.* 16.3.
- 128** E. Ruschenbusch, *Untersuchungen zu Staat und Politik in Griechenland vom 7. - 4. Jh. v. Chr.* (Bamberg 1978) 3-7, revised and updated in 'Die Zahl der griechischen Staaten und Arealgrösse und Bürgerzahl der 'Normalpolis,'" *ZPE* 59 (1985) 253-63.
- 129** M. Ostwald, *Autonomia: Its Genesis and Early History.* (Philadelphia 1982).
- 130** Ostwald (*supra* n. 129) 28-9.
- 131** *Hdt.* 1.170.3.
- 132** *Thuc.* 2.15.2.
- 133** See *supra* n. 123.
- 134** E.g. Skyros (*Skylax* 58); Imbros (*Skylax* 67); Lemnos (Μυρινᾶιοι, Ἐφαισιτῆς *IG* I³ 267 IV.29-30, cf. 259 *postscriptum* 5-6).
- 135** Cf. e.g. Χαλκίδα Κορινθίων πόλιν (*Thuc.* 1.108.5) or Ἐνακτόριον Κορινθίων πόλιν (*Thuc.* 4.49).
- 136** E.g. Siphai (*Thuc.* 4.89.2 cf. 4.76.2-3; *Skylax* 38); Korsiai (*Theop.* fr. 167; *Skylax* 38).
- 137** E.g. the Boiotian poleis listed in *Hell. Oxy.* 16.3.

- 138** Thuc. 1.144.2, cf. E.J. Bickerman, 'Autonomia. Sur un passage de Thucydide (I.144.2),' *RIDA* 5 (1958) 313-44.
- 139** *Athenaioi* (Thuc. 5.23.1); *Athenai* (Hdt. 5.91.2).
- 140** *Lakedaimonioi* (Thuc. 5.23.1); *Lakedaimon* (Pl. *Resp.* 599D); *Spartiatiai* (Thuc. 1.132.1); *Sparta* (Hdt. 7.234.2).
- 141** E.g. The Boiotians (Thuc. 2.9.1-4); the Akarnanians (*IG II²* 43 A 70-2 & B 10) Tod 144.36.
- 142** A. *Pers.* 213; Xen. *Cyrop.* 1.3.18; 1.4.25; 1.5.7.
- 143** Cf. e.g. C.G. Thomas, 'The Greek Polis' in *The City-State in Five Cultures* (Santa Barbara 1981) 40; Bengtson (*supra* n. 81) 286, 295; P. Green, *Alexander to Actium. The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1990) 53, 56, 80, 220 etc.; Runciman (*supra* n. 1) 348.
- 144** M.H. Hansen, 'Den Græske Bystat og Aristoteles,' *Museum Tusulanum* 24 (1974) 53-4.
- 145** E. g. J.K. Davies in *Cambridge Ancient History* VII,1 (2nd ed. Cambridge 1984) 304-20; S. Price in *The Oxford History* (*supra* n. 81) 334-6. Cf. Gauthier and Millar *infra* 211-31 and 232-60.
- 146** Ostwald (*supra* n. 129) 14-22.
- 147** Ostwald (*supra* n. 129) 22-6.
- 148** Arist. *Pol.* 1252a1-7; 1252b27-53a1.
- 149** Arist. *Pol.* 1252b9-30.
- 150** Arist. *Pol.* 1326a35-b25.
- 151** Arist. *Pol.* 1261a29. The only reference in *Politics* to a federal state!