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

Abstract. – I examine some attestations of koina in the islands of the Aegean in the Hellenistic period, with particular emphasis on a decree from Heracleia (IG XII, 7, 509) and two decrees from Syme (IG Suppl. XII, 3, 1269 & 1270). I argue that the koina in these decrees represent political communities of citizens and residents, that is non-citizens, engaged in political decision-making processes. Such koina illustrate the complexity of participation in political communities of the Greek world; in other words, rather than understanding the Greek world as essentially the world of the Greek polis, koina show us that there existed alternative forms of political formations which transcended the conceptual binary opposition between citizens and non-citizens.
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When we study the history of the Greek world, one of the first claims that we make is that this was essentially the world of the city-state, the polis. The history of the archaic and classical periods, in particular, is viewed as the history of the dominant poleis. The Greek city-state is also considered one of the « great » achievements of the classical Greek world; it is the form of political organization that gave us democracy, theatre, great art etc. (even though this statement mostly refers to a single, and particularly exceptional, city-state, Athens). This is very much the emphasis of the curriculum of ancient Greek history taught in schools and universities in the UK. Such an emphasis on the polis as the most important formation is the underlying assumption of excellent scholarship being produced such as the Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis by the Copenhagen Polis Centre. Yet, alongside the polis, there existed in the Greek world a plethora of other social and communal formations, which may or may not in specific contexts have had an overtly political character. These formations may have provided an alternative focus of communal organization for the ancient Greek world. Recent scholarship has done much to break down some of the boundaries between a « political » community and the rest of the population of a territory at any given time. Similarly, network theory has provided a methodological tool with which to examine connections between individuals, groups of people and larger communities in a new light.

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

4. There has been a recent surge of interest in network theory and ancient history: see for example I. Malkin et al. eds., op. cit., and Io., A Small Greek World. Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean, Oxford 2011.
5. See below n. 30.
koina I shall be discussing here, however, show that certain forms of political performance, and therefore a certain degree of political power, existed in groups and communities that were not strictly confined by citizenship. My purpose therefore here is to examine some attestations of koina in the island world of the Aegean world in the Hellenistic period, in order to argue that they should be viewed as an expression of an alternative form of political community of citizens and non-citizens.

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

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

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

6. Achaian league IG V, 2, 344 = C. MICHEL, Recueil d’inscriptions grecques, Paris 1900-1937 (hereafter MICHEL), 199 = Syll.4 490, MICHEL, 200 = Syll.5 519 and many references in Polybios: Aitolian koinon: IG IX2, 1, 5-49 for proxeny decrees.
7. Acarnanian koinon: IG IX2, 1, 208 = MICHEL, 313; Phocian koinon: IG IX, 1, 97 = MICHEL, 278; Boeotian koinon: SEG 27, 60 (proxeny decree of late 4th century); Arcadian koinon: MICHEL, 443 = Syll.3 209, MICHEL, 193 = Syll.3 183, (but no attestation of the word koinon found on these decrees); Aiginian koinon: IG IX, 2, 3; Thessalian koinon: SEG 36, 483; Molossian koinon: SEG 23, 472 with 24,446; Lycian koinon: SEG 30, 1534. The sources for most of these koina come from the Hellenistic period, but some date from the late fifth or fourth century. See also P.J. RHODES, D.M. LEWIS, The Decrees of the Greek States, Oxford 1997, p. 442-446 (hereafter RHODES with LEWIS). See J.A.O. LARSEN, Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History, Oxford 1968; J.D. GAUGER, « s.v. koinon » in H.H. SCHMITT, E. VOGT eds., Kleines Lexikon des Hellenismus, Wiesbaden 1993, p. 376-381; H. BECK, Polis und Koinon: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr., Stuttgart 1997. For the various forms of ethnic differentiations in koina see P.M. FRASER, Greek Ethnic Terminology, Oxford 2009, p. 122 ff.
the Aegean, only to resurface in the second century under the control of the new naval power of the region: Rhodes. The headquarters of this koinon were at Delos under Antigonids and Ptolemies, but at Tenos under the Rhodians\textsuperscript{10}. We know of the existence of this koinon from epigraphic evidence alone. It is certainly beyond the scope of this article to go into any detail in the history of this network of islands\textsuperscript{11}. As far as we know, it functioned in similar ways to other federal states: part of the powers of the participating communities were given to the assembly of the koinon, which had the authority to issue decrees, regulate festivals, arrange payments and award proxenia to all participating member-states\textsuperscript{12}.

If we move from the larger networks of interaction to the micro-geography of singular insular entities, we can see that here too there existed koina. Koina on islands with more than one polis are valuable in that they show active cooperation on an inter-polis level. We encounter koina on Euboea\textsuperscript{13}, not a proper insular island, but an island of some sort, nonetheless, and similarly on the large island of Crete\textsuperscript{14}. There is also a koinon on the island of Lesbos, which had five poleis in the classical period\textsuperscript{15}. Three Hellenistic inscriptions refer to a Lesbian koinon, which used the Messa sanctuary as its headquarters and allowed considerable individual freedom for the participating cities\textsuperscript{16}. These pan-island koina are one of the expressions of quite a dominant trend throughout classical and Hellenistic history of political communities on islands with more than one polis co-operating and viewing in many cases themselves as having essentially a single identity or indeed as functioning as a single political community; this is also true for islands with more than one polis that never created a koinon as such: I am thinking primarily of Ceos, a relatively small island which supported four poleis in the classical period and showed strong trends of cooperation throughout its history, with two, or even possibly three, attempts at synoecism\textsuperscript{17}. In this context, I should also mention Rhodes,
with its three separate poleis until 408 BC; Rhodes synoecised in order to create a single polis, controlling the entire island, as well as substantial parts of the mainland coast, as well as a number of neighbouring islands, as we shall see below. In all the above cases, whether we are looking into a large-scale network of interaction, such as the Islanders’ League, or the koina of islands with more than one polis, or indeed the attempts at synoecism at Ceos and the successful synoecism at Rhodes, what we encounter is the move beyond the strict political boundaries of citizenship in the political decisions of the communities. In the case of leagues, or federal states, we see communities interacting and creating new political entities, which assume some of the powers of the participating poleis. In the case of island koina, we see cooperation between the communities for the creation of a new state with a range of powers. If indeed we view the Greek world as essentially a conglomeration of poleis, then we tend to miss the many variations that existed in the form of participation and organization of political power. In this sense, the polis proves to be a restrictive tool of historical explanation.

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

---


sometimes even slaves, as well as male and female members, though in Athens at least, membership seems to have been predominantly male and citizen-centered. These may be associations of people linked by profession, or ethnic origin. There are many examples from all over the Greek world, mostly dating from the Hellenistic period: one of the most visible associations of professionals is the associations of the so-called Dionysiac artists (διονυσιασταί), who, as it is obvious from their name, had Dionysus as their patron deity. We also know of associations of many other professions: sailors or people engaged in military naval activities, such as the various branches of the Panathenaistai koinon of Rhodes, who could be either crews (στρατευόμενοι) or engaged in fighting (δέκας); merchants of olive oil (ἐλαιοπωλεῖς) or olearii in Delos (ID 1713 and 1714, with Heracles as their patron deity); merchants of wine (οἰνοπωλεῖς in Delos: ID 1711); and so on. Some associations were loosely centered around a common ethnicity, or sometimes around the cult of a foreign to the residents of the polis deity, such as the orgoeones of Thracians worshipping Bendis at Athens (IG II², 1283). The Italians at Delos formed associations around the cult of specific deities, such as the Apolloniastai, the Hermaistai and Poseidoniastai.


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


27. The Thracian orgoeones of Bendis co-existed with the citizens’ orgoeones of Bendis, for which see IG II², 1324 and 1361. See also N.F. Jones, op. cit., p. 256-262; C.O. Paché, « Barbarian Bond : Thracian Bendis among the Athenians » in S.R. Avraham, C.O. Paché, J. W atomas eds., Between Magic and Religion : Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society, Lanham Md 2001, p. 3-11. Similarly, as R. Parker, Athenian Religion : A History, Oxford 1996, p. 337, observed: the Kitian merchants asking for permission from the Athenian demos in order to purchase a plot of land and to establish a sanctuary for Aphrodite in IG II², 337, « must have constituted a koinon or thiasos of some kind ».

But in most cases, as we can see from the example of the *orgeones* for the goddess Bendis in Athens or the various groups in Delos, the dominant connection between the members of an association was a cultic one, in the sense that the association worshipped the same deity, as the patron deity of the « profession », so to speak, or of the ethnic group²⁹.

These private or cult associations were numerous throughout the Greek world and they seem to have flourished during the Hellenistic period, when most of our evidence is dated, with fourth-century Athens being perhaps the place of origin of such associations³⁰. We should highlight some of the important features of such associations: a) membership was not necessarily restricted to citizens; in fact, such *koina* were a unique form of communal organization that blend together citizens and non-citizens, thus creating networks of associations and power that often transcended political boundaries and political-social hierarchies³¹; b) they had a strong religious character. In fact, religion seems to have been the dominant framework within which relationships between members were shaped³²; c) in Athens and Rhodes, many associations had ownership of burial grounds, which gave them an important spatial centre³³; d) associations were not necessarily in conflict with the polis³⁴; in fact, they had strong political overtones: they adopted the language and structure of political bodies and political

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


power; their main body was normally the assembly, ἐκκλησία, they honoured members, they passed decrees, they elected officials, using a similar nomenclature to that of the polis (ie. τομὶς, γραμματεὺς, ἐπιστάτης etc)\textsuperscript{35}.

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

case concept of marginality as a useful category to explain the relationship between the association and the polis. Similar comments in V. Suys, « Les associations cultuelles dans la cité aux époques hellénistique et impériale » in V. Dasen, M. Piérart eds., op. cit, p. 214.


37. In some cases we have the koinon followed by the name of the tribe, as in Tenos (IG XII, 5, 863-6 : ἔποιηκε τῷ κοινῷ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς...). In Methymna, we have the format of koinon followed by the name of the χέλληστυς, as, for example, in IG XII, 2, 498 : ἔποιηκε τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Πιοτέων.
of goats onto the island (IG XII, 7, 509, third century). Roussel first noted that the koinon in this inscription could not be the Islanders’ League discussed above, but rather a local koinon of the people of Heracleia: the main reasoning for this was that the place of publication was not Delos, as is normally the case with decrees issued by the Islanders’ League, but rather the otherwise unknown Metroon building which must have been located on the island of Heracleia itself.

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

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

38. L. Robert, Monnaies antiques..., p. 90.
39. IG XII, 7, 509, ll. 9-10: καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν νησιωτῶν ἅπαν.
42. ll. 16-18: ταῦτα δ’ εἶναι εἰς τῇ φυλακὴ γαία καὶ σιωπήμαν Ἡρακλειωτῶν πάντων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ.
43. L. Migeotte, L’emprunt dans les cités grecques, Québec 1984.
44. IG XII, 7, 67b, 7-9: ὑπέθετο δὲ Πραξικλῆς τὰ τῇ κοινᾷ τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἅπαντα καὶ τῶν ἴδια τὰ Ἀρκεσινέων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν Ἀρκεσίνη ὑπάρχοντα ἔγγακα καὶ ὑπερπόντια. IG XII, 7, 69 8-11: ὑπέθετο δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος τὰ τῇ κοινᾷ τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἅπαντα καὶ τὰ ἴδια τὰ Ἀρκεσινέων καὶ τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν Ἀρκεσίνῃ μετοίκων ἅπασαντα καὶ ἔγγακα καὶ ὑπερπόντια. IG XII, 7, 69 8-11:
interpretation of ὑπερπόντια in these two inscriptions: Dittenberger understood the term to mean « overseas » and compared it to ὑπερόρια which can be found in Attic texts. However, Gauthier argued that the reference to ὑπερπόντια as opposed to ἔγγαια should be interpreted as non-land items, that is ships and cargo; therefore this expression can be seen as an alternative to ἔγγαια καὶ ναυτικά, which is found in Attic oratory. I think that such an interpretation is linguistically very strained and we should accept Dittenberger’s original understanding of ὑπερπόντια as overseas: we should then look at what kind of overseas possessions Arcesine could have had. Arcesine owned a small island off its coast called Gramboussa; it is possible that Arcesine also considered Heracleia as its own territory. What I am arguing is that the « outside » power that tried to colonise Heracleia at the time of the decree was in fact the Arcesinians; therefore the koinon of our Heracleian inscription may have included the citizens of Heracleia in addition to Arcesinian residents.

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

Let us start with Syme. The evidence suggests that there, too, was a community of citizens and foreign residents engaged in political action. Syme was one the islands in the Dorian archipelago of Rhodes. The island is not particularly large (58 km²), but has good harbours. It appears in the Athenian tribute lists in 434/433, under the rubric πόλες ἃς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρεν, which means either Symian or Athenian individuals proposed to

47. See above n. 36.
48. Pliny NH V.133 : eight harbours.
pay the tribute (IG I, 278, VI, 3, 28). The inclusion of Syme in the tribute quota lists implies that the island was independent in the course of the fifth century. Its status, however, was linked with that of Rhodes. We know that Rhodes in the Hellenistic period controlled a number of islands, forming its own small archipelago: Carpathos, Casos, Chalce, Syme, Telos, Nisyros and Megiste were all at one point or another incorporated in the Rhodian state. Rhodes, of course, also famously controlled a peraia, a considerable area of land on the opposite shore of Caria. Fraser and Bean who have written the classic book on the Rhodian peraia made a distinction between incorporated peraia and subject peraia, which is largely followed in modern scholarship: the incorporated peraia formed an integral part of the Rhodian state and participated in the Rhodian demes system, and its inhabitants were politically equal to Rhodian citizens; the citizens of the subject peraia, on the other hand, had no such status: hence Rhodians in the incorporated peraia are normally designated by their demotic, while in the subject territory by the ethnic Rhodios, though the distinction in our sources is not always clear.

Syme, like Carpathos and Chalke, seemed to have had a similar status as that of the incorporated peraia. This is argued on the basis of the existence of a peculiar institution called ktoina which is attested on these islands: ktoina seemed to have been territorial divisions on the old poleis of Rhodes before its synoecism in 408 BC. If therefore we come across ktoina on an island in the period after 408, it is because the island was attached to Rhodes in the period before the synoecism, and therefore attached to one of the three poleis of the island rather than the unified polis of Rhodes in the period after 408. Syme appears to have had a system of ktoina, as attested in one decree from the second century (IG XII, 3, Supp. 1270) and another one from the first-century BC (IG XII, 3, 6). It is likely, then, that Syme was attached to Rhodes at some point before 408, and possibly in the early fifth century, before becoming again independent under the Athenian empire. The appearance of Rhodian demotics on Syme shows that the island was incorporated to Rhodes after the short period of independence during the fifth century.

49. See discussion in C. Constantakopoulou, The Dance of the Islands..., p. 189.
51. P. M. Fraser, G. Bean, op. cit., p. 53.
54. See I.C. Papachristodoulou, Οι αρχαίοι γονατσοί..., p. 44 and IG XII, 3, 11, Suppl. 1272-1274.
We know of three decrees from Syme. The first two honorific decrees are issued by the community of the Symians and the third one by a local private koinon. The first honorific decree, which cannot be dated with any certainty but may possibly belong to the second or first century BC\(^5\), reads (\textit{IG} XII, 3, Suppl. 1269)\(^6\):

\[\text{ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἐπιχάρμου καὶ δαμι-}\\[\text{oγοῦ Ἡπποχράτευς, [μη]νὸς Ἀγαθω-}\\[\text{νος Ἀγαθοδώρος Ἄμιος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ἄν-
δα Κασαρεὺς ἔπει: ἑπειδή Ἀγαθοδώρος Ἀγα-}\\[\text{θωνὸς Ἀβιανός ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς διατεῖ εἰς τὸ κοι-}\\[\text{νὸν τῶν ἐν [Σ]ύμαι κατοικεύντων, ἐπαινέσει αὐ-
τὸν καὶ στεφάνωσε θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι, ἃν ἔχων}\\[\text{διατεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σύμαι κατοικεύ-
ντων: ὁ δὲ ἀγωνοθέτας ὁ αἱρεθεὶς εἰς τὰ Ἡρα-}\\[\text{κλεῖα ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ ὅς καὶ γένηται μετὰ Ἡρ-}\\[\text{ακλεία ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ ὅς καὶ γένηται μετὰ Ἡπ-}\\[\text{ρείδεις} (\text{τοῦ} ἔπει: ἑπειδή Ἀγαθοδώρος Ἀγα-}\\[\text{θωνὸς Ἀβιανός ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς διατεῖ εἰς τὸ κοι-}\\[\text{νὸν τῶν ἐν [Σ]ύμαι κατοικεύντων, ἐπαινέσει αὐ-
τὸν καὶ στεφάνωσε θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι, ἃν ἔχων}\\[\text{διατεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σύμαι κατοικεύ-
ντων: ὁ δὲ ἀγωνοθέτας ὁ αἱρεθεὶς εἰς τὰ Ἡρα-}\\[\text{κλεῖα ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ ὅς καὶ γένηται μετὰ Ἡρ-}\\[\text{ακλεία ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ ὅς καὶ γένηται μετὰ Ἡπ-}\\[\text{ρείδεις} (\text{τοῦ} ἔπει: ἑπειδή Ἀγαθοδώρος Ἀγα-}\\[\text{θωνὸς Ἀβιανός ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς διατεῖ εἰς τὸ κοι-}\\[\text{νὸν τῶν ἐν [Σ]ύμαι κατοικεύντων, ἐπαινέσει αὐ-
τὸν καὶ στεφάνωσε θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι, ἃν ἔχων}\\[\text{διατεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σύμαι κατοικεύ-
ντων: ὁ δὲ ἀγωνοθέτας ὁ αἱρεθεὶς εἰς τὰ Ἡρα-}\\[\text{κλεία ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ ὅς καὶ γένηται μετὰ Ἡρ-}\\[\text{ακλεία ἐπὶ δαμιοργοῦ ὅς καὶ γένηται μετὰ Ἡπ-}

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

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

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

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

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

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

56. First publication by D. CHAVARAS, « Inschriften aus Syme », \textit{JÖAI} 5, 1902, p. 13-20, inscription 5 at p. 17 ; subsequently published by F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, in \textit{IG} XII, 3, Suppl. 1269. I use here the \textit{IG} text.
who will be elected for the Heraclieia during the [office of the] damiorgos elected after Hippocrates proclaim [ ]
the crown [ ---- ]

The second honorific decree is dated to the second century BC57; it reads (IG XII, 3, Suppl. 1270)58:

Α. ἐπὶ ἱερέως Σωσικλεύς καὶ δαμιουργοῦ Κησία, Πα-
ναίμου [δ]ιουμνία, ἐδοξεὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ, ἱεροθετάν γνώ-
μα: ἐπεὶ Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀριστοφάνευς Πολίτας
άνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὃν διατελεῖ περὶ τοῦ κοινὸν τὸν ἐν Σύμαι
κατοικούντων, τόν πάσαν αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλοτιμίαν πα-
ρεχόμενος καὶ ἀεὶ τίνος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτος γνώμονος
τοῦ κοινοῦ, πονέσαντος τοῦ τοῦ ναοῦ τού ἐν ταῖς ἀκραῖς τοῦ
τάς Αθάνας καὶ ἐγγίζοντος συντετείνα διὰ τὸ ἐξωθαί
τοίχου [δ]ύο, τόν το ἱερό συντελεῖ ποτὲ ἄνατολάς καὶ τοῦ
πο-
tί μεσαμβριάν, καὶ εἰς τάς ἑπισκεφήναν αὐτοῦ γενόμεναν
ἐπαγγελθαν ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ καὶ ἱδωτῶν, τάς δὲ ἐπισυναγω-
γάς τοῦ διαφόρου γνωμένας πολυχρόνων, παρασκεύαις
ἐν τάς ἐκλησίας ὑπὸ τῶν κτοροντῶν συντελέσαν [δ]ίαι τά
ἐργα ἐπαγγεῖλατο καὶ συνετέλεσε, ποτεπαγγεῖλατο
δὲ καὶ ἐξο[λ]ωσεῖν τάς στέγας τὰ ποτ[η]εόμενα καὶ κερα-
μωσεῖν τελέσματο τοῖς αὑτοῦ· καὶ συνετέλεσε ἀναγογός
τοῦ κοινοῦ παρεπιδαμοῦντας τῶν Πολιτῶν ἐπέδειξε τά
ἐργα καὶ[λ]ῶς γεγονότα· ὅπως σὺν καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ φαίνη-
tαι εὐχάριστον τοῖς ἐν καὶ τιμῶν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν
[ἀν]δρῶν, τύχη ἀγαθῆς, δε[δ]όχθαι [τῷ] κοινοῦ, κυρω-
[θέντος] τοῦ τοῦ ψαφίσματος, ἐπαινέσαι καὶ στεφα-
[νό]ις Αριστοφάνης Ἀριστοφάνες Πολίτας
[χρυσέωι] στεφάνωι ἀρετάς ἐνεκα καὶ
[φιλοδοξίας ὃν ἐξον] διατελεί εἰς [τῷ] κοινῷ τῶν
[ἐν Σύμαι κατοικούντων καὶ τάς ποτ[ής] τοῦ θεοῦ]
[εὐσεβείας: --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---]
B. [— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — ἐπὶ δὲ]
[τὰν αἴτησιν τοῦ στεφάνου ἑλέσθαι παραχρῆμα]
[ἀνδρα· ὁ δὲ αἰφεθεὶς διαπλέυσάτω εἰς Ῥόδον αἴτη]-
[σούμεν]ος τ[ἀν] βο[υλὰν καὶ τὸν δᾶμον· ὁ δὲ ἄγιονο]-
[θήτας ὁ ἐν τοῖς πράτοις Ὅ[κλείοις τ]ὰν [κύ]-
[ρωσιν τοῦδε τοῦ ψαφίσματος ἀναγορεύσατω ἐν
tῶι σταδίωι, ἐπεί κα θῇ τὸν ἀγῶνα, καὶ ἀνακαρ-

gάτω ὃ[τι· τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σύμαι κατοικοῦντων
ἐπανει καὶ στεφάνοι χρυσέωι στεφάνωι Ἀριστοφάνη
Ἀριστοφάνευς Πολίταν ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ φιλο-
δοξίας ἃν ἔχων διατελεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Σύ-
μαι κατοικοῦντων καὶ τάς ποτὶ τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείας.

A. During the priesthood of Sosicles and while Ctesias was damiourgos,
during the full moon of the month Panaimos, it was decided by the koinon, according to
the proposal of the hierothytai; because Aristophanes, son of Aristophanes, from Polita
continues to be a good man with regards to the koinon
of the residents in Syme, and displayed every effort and zeal
and was always responsible for every good thing
for the koinon, and when the temple of Athana on the edge suffered damages
and was on the point of falling in because of the two walls collapsing outwards,
the one which is on the east side and the other on the
south side, and when there came a pledge for the repair of it
both by the members of the koinon and by individuals, and when the collection of money for the
expenses took a long time, he was implored
in the assembly by the members of the ktoina to contribute personally
for the works, and he pledged and contributed, and promised in addition
to also provide the necessary wood for the roof and to roof with tiles
at his expense. And he contributed both to bring
the foreign residents of Polita and to show that
the works have been completed well. And so that the koinon appears
both grateful and honouring the good men,
with good fortune, the koinon resolves,
once this degree is validated, to honour and crown
Aristophanes, son of Aristophanes of Polita
with a [golden] crown because of his virtue and
his [love of fame which] he continues [to show] towards the koinon
[of the residents in Syme and towards the honouring] of the gods [-----]

B. [--- and with regards
to the request of the crown to elect straightaway
a man ; and let the man elected sail across to Rhodes to petition]
the Bo[ule and the damos ; and let the agono]thetas (who is in office) during the first Heracleia announce the ratification of this decree in the stadium, when he establishes the contest, and let him proclaim that the koinon of the residents in Syme honours and crowns with a golden crown Aristophanes, son of Aristophanes of Polita because of his virtue and his love of fame with which he continues to show to the koinon of the residents in Syme and [because of his] piety towards the gods.

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

Διδύμους μετοίκου [εύ]εργέτα
[τ]ὸν κοινού· ἐπαίν[ει] καὶ στεφανο[ῖ] χρ[όνιον]
[εὐ]νοίας ἃν ἔχων διετέλεις[ε] [Ć ἁμὲ τὸν]

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

Διδύμους μετοίκου [εύ]εργέτα
[τ]ὸν κοινού· ἐπαίν[ει] καὶ στεφανο[ῖ] χρ[όνιον]
[εὐ]νοίας ἃν ἔχων διετέλεις[ε] [Ć ἁμὲ τὸν]

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

59. First published by F. Hiller von Gaertringen in IG XII, 3, 6, following the transcription provided by D. Chaviaras; this is the text I am using here.
The first two honorific decrees are dated using the double dating system of the local official of Syme, the damiourgos and the Rhodian priest of Helios\(^{60}\). It is indeed the issuing body of the first two decrees that is most interesting. They are both issued by a koinon of the residents in Syme for various benefactions provided to the community of the Symians. The first one is a typical honorific decree and does not provide us with much detail. The second one is an honorific decree for a certain Aristophanes, son of Aristophaneus, from the deme Polita of Ialyssos on Rhodes, who responded to an appeal made in the assembly by the kτοινάται to cover expenses for the repair of the temple of Athana\(^{61}\). The koinon of residents (κατοικεύντες) as an issuing authority is quite peculiar. The fact that the decree was issued by the koinon of the residents in Syme seems to imply that the issuing authority was not the citizens of Syme, but a different body, which also included free foreign residents. These residents could be other Rhodian citizens, not of the deme in which Syme belonged\(^{62}\), but perhaps even other non-Rhodian residents.

« Residents » (κατοικεύντες) in official decrees appear also in Physkos in the Rhodian peraia\(^{63}\). Although we lack any additional information in the Physkian decree, this too seems to imply a different issuing body than simply the Physkian citizens. Similarly, we have

\(^{60}\) J.M. Cook, « Cnidian Peraea and Spartan Coins », JHS 81, 1961, p. 59 and P.M. Fraser, G. Bean, op. cit., p. 140. This form of double dating was also used in Minoa in Amorgos, where the priest of Rhodes appeared alongside the δῆμου γραμματέας, who was probably a Samian : this for Cook, p. 59, indicates a form of « protectorate or condominium of some sort », as the Samians had control of Minoa in the Hellenistic period : see C. Constantakopoulou, The Dance of the Islands..., p. 183-184.

\(^{61}\) V. Gabrielsen, The Naval Aristocracy..., p. 216, n.92, following N.F. Jones, Public Organization in Ancient Greece : A Documentary Study, Philadelphia 1987, p. 251 and 264 with n.2, is surely right to argue that the decree is not issued by the kτοινατα (as argued by M. Guarducci, « Note di antichità rodie, I : le kτοιναται, II, le synnomai », Historia 9, 1935, p. 423, n.7), but rather by the koinon : « the clear distinction between a kτοινα and a body of kατοικεύντες attested in A. Bresson, op. cit., 132 for Thyssanous reinforces the likelihood that in the present document a similar distinction ought to be drawn between the kτοινα and the issuing authority, ie. the koinon ». 

\(^{62}\) This was argued by P.M. Fraser, G. Bean, op. cit., p. 140 with n. 4. It is unclear to which deme of the Rhodian state the island of Syme belonged : it is possible that it was part of the deme of Kasareis, which belonged to Cameiros, but was located on the Rhodian peraia : see I.C. Papachristodoulou, Οι αρχαίοι ροδιακοί..., p. 44, followed by C. Habicht, op. cit., p. 562, with n. 118. Both are following S. Saridakis, F. Hiller von Gaertringen, op. cit., p. 83-86.

\(^{63}\) A. Bresson, op. cit., 32 : honorary decree from Physkos (97-150 AD) : τὸν δήμον τοῦ Ῥωδίων τοῦ κατοικεύντες ἐν Φύσκῳ, εὐεργεύοντα ἐνέκα, ἐπί[...] ἔργων τοῦ Πομπηίου Αὔξωνος Μενελάου (the residents of Physkos (honour) the demos of the Rhodians, because of its benefaction, in the archonship of ...)
Beyond the Polis: Island Koina and Other Non-Polis Entities in the Aegean

separate references of the « people » (demos) and the « residents » in inscriptions from two poleis of the island of Carpathos, which, like Syme, was also under Rhodian control. In two inscriptions from Brykous on Carpathos (IG XII, 1, 994 and 995), the residents in Brykous are distinguished from the citizens of Brykous, but both are involved in the honouring of the emperor Domitian and his wife. This double reference in the Brykous inscriptions reflects the inclusion of both elements of the community of Brykous, the local demesmen and the foreign residents, most of whom were probably Rhodian citizens, in the expenses for the setting up of the honorific stele. In a decree from Arcaseia, one of the poleis on the island of Carpathos (M. Segre 1, second century BC), the issuing authority is not explicitly stated, but we have a reference to a koinon of the Arcaseians together with the « residents » as recipients of the benefaction of the honoured individual. Similarly, we have references to « residents » of Lindos (Lindos 249, 117-116 BC) and in a decree from the island of Nisyros (IG XII, 3, 104). These residents were not, however, the issuing authority, but rather the recipients of the benefaction of the honoured person. Finally, similar is the case of the παροικεῦντες mentioned in a decree from Porthmos in Carpathos (IG XII, 1, 1032).

The koinon of the « residents » in Syme, however, presents us with a slightly different challenge. The « residents » in Syme in the two decrees above are not simply the recipients of the benefaction of the honoured individual, or part of the body that shared in the expenses for the honours. The koinon here is the collective political body that issued the decree: this, 64. C. Constantakopoulou, The Dance of the Islands..., p. 189-190.
67. C. Blinkenberg, Lindos. Fouilles de l’acropole 1901-1914, II : Inscriptions, Berlin-Copenhagen 1941. See also ibid., p. 264 (125-100 BC) [but here the residents are part of a supplement] and 425 (30-40 AD).
69. IG XII, 3, 104 : καὶ ἦν τὸ ἔλαιον πᾶσι ἐλευθέροις καὶ τοῖς κατοικεῦνταιν ἐν Ἡθύρῳ καὶ τοῖς παροικεῦνταιν ἐπὶ μῆνες (and he provided the oil to all free men and the residents of Nisyros and the foreign residents for months).
70. IG XII, 1, 1032 : οὐ μόνον τῶν δαμετῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν παροικεῦντων (not only for the citizens (literally, members of the demos) but also for the residents).
I believe, included citizens of Syme and non-Symian residents, most of whom were most likely Rhodian citizens. However, it is probable that non-Rhodian citizens were also part of the ἱκάνον, and therefore part of the « official » political authority on the island. These foreign residents engaged in one of the most visible acts of political action of a community: that of honouring the community’s benefactors.

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

Before I attempt to draw some conclusions from this collection of evidence, I would like to briefly discuss Rhamnous, as this Athenian deme produced a series of decrees where we can document similar levels of complexity in relation to the body – or bodies – responsible for the issuing of honours to individuals73. Two decrees, in particular, refer to a variety of issuing bodies. The first one, an honorific decree for Dikaiarchos, dated to 235/4 (Rhamnous 17 = Bielem 30), mentions the δῆμος of the Athenians, the ἱκάνον of those...

71. Diod. XX, 84, 1-2 : οἱ δὲ ῾Ρόδιοι μέχρι μὲν τινος πρόσεβεις ἐκπέμποντες ἥξιον μηδὲν πρᾶξαι κατὰ τῆς πόλεως ἀνήκεστον. ὡς δ’ οὖρες αὐτοῖς προσέκειν, ἁπαγόντες τὰς διαλύσις ἐξέπεμψαν προσβεβευτάς πρὸς Πτολεμαίων καὶ Λυσίμαχου καὶ Κάσανδρον, ἀξιοῦντες βοηθεῖν, ὡς τῆς πόλεως προστασίας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. τῶν δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει κατοικούσιν παιδεύων καὶ ἐξόντων ὄντων ἐξούσια τοῖς βουλευόμενοι συνεγερώνθησαν, τοὺς λοιποὺς ἁχοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐξέπεμψαν, ἀμα δὲ καὶ τοῦ μηδὲν τῇ καταστάσει διαχειριστέον γίνεσθαι τῆς πόλεως προδότην. ἀριθμὸν δὲ ποιησάμενοι τῶν δυναμένων ἀγωνισθῆναι πολιτῶν μὲν εὗρον περὶ ἑξακισχιλίους, τῶν δὲ παροίκων καὶ ἐξόνων εἰς χιλίους (for a time the Rhodians kept sending envoys and asking him to do nothing irreparable against the city, but as no one paid any heed to these, they gave up hope of a truce and sent envoys to Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Cassander, begging them to give aid and saying that the city was fighting the war on their behalf. As to the metics and the aliens who resided in the city, to those who wished they gave permission to join them in the fighting and the others who were of no service they sent forth from the city, partly as a precaution against scarcity of supplies, and partly that there might be no one to become dissatisfied with the situation and try to betray the city. When they made a count of those who were able to fight, they found that there were about six thousand citizens and as many as a thousand metics and aliens – I have adapted the translation by Russel M. Geer, Loeb Classical Library edition).

72. Diod. XIII.75.1 : Οἱ δὲ τὴν ῾Ρόδον νῆσον κατοικούσιν καὶ ῾Ηλυσδον καὶ Λίνδον καὶ Κάμειρον μετωρισάσθησαν εἰς μὲν πόλιν τὴν τὴν καλουμένην ῾Ρόδον (the inhabitants of the island of Rhodes left Ialysos and Lindos and Cameiros and settled in one polis, which is now called Rhodes).

73. Eleusis is another Athenian deme where we see a certain overlap of groups involved in the honouring of individuals. The decrees from Eleusis, however, do not seem to include non-citizens. Normally the decrees are issued by the Athenians, and/or the δῆμος of the Eleusinians, as well as soldiers stationed at Eleusis (Ἀθηναίων οἱ τεταγμένοι Ἐλευσίων). Non-Athenians are included in two (?) decrees only: in a decree of Athenian soldiers and foreign mercenaries honouring Aristophanes (K. CLINTON, Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone. Volume IA: Text, Athens 2005, 196 = IG II*, 1299), where foreign mercenaries are mentioned in connection with the raising of funds (II.21-2), and in a decree of Athenian soldiers and ὑπαιθροί in honour of their general Demaiætos (Ibid., 211 = IG II*, 1304) : but see K. CLINTON, Eleusis. The Inscriptions on Stone, vol. II : Commentary, Athens 2008, p. 267,
stationed at Rhamnous, the citizens of Rhamnous, the residents at Rhamnous, the koinon of
the residents at Rhamnous, the residents in the garrison, while in the summary provided at
the end, it refers to « the citizens living at Rhamnous to Dikaiarchos » 74. This, as Osborne
rightly observed, is a very confusing state of affairs, resulting from the adoption of political
language from a variety of forms of group organization and from the vague basis upon which
groups could be formed 75. The second decree, an honorific decree for the trierarch Menander,
dated to 225/4 BC (Rhamnous 31), mentions citizens of (the deme) Rhamnous, alongside
resident citizens, Athenians and Athenian fellow sailors (συμπλεύσαντες). Again here we see
a certain degree of overlapping in the groups involved in the act of honouring individuals. The
Rhamnousian evidence shows that the « political » decision of bestowing honours was not
restricted to the citizen body (the demos) but included sub-groups, which, in the case of the
first decree, may have included non-Athenians serving in the garrison 76.

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

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

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


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

76. See comments in Bielman p. 117, with n. 5 and 6. For the legal implications of memberships in koina in Rhamnous see also I. Arnaoutoglou, « Group and Individuals in IRhamnous 59 (SEG 49, 161) » in J.-C. Couvenhes, S. Milanezi eds., Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate, Tours 2007, p. 315-317.
with murders and even the possibility of revenge against those who attempted to bring on the prosecution of the accused party. That is why the decree says that this is to be done for the « protection and salvation » of the inhabitants of the island. Certainly, protection against murders in a small community in Heracleia cannot be viewed as the same level as covering the expenses for the rebuilding of two walls of a temple, which is the background for the honorific decree in Syme. Yet, both communities, Heracleia and Syme, adopted similar approaches for creating authorities which issued their decrees. The koina in the decrees from both these islands were composed of citizens and non-citizen residents. References to such koina as political bodies which included citizens and non-citizens may be few and far apart, and references to « residents » as issuing authorities for decrees are equally few and problematic. What these references show us, however, is that there existed such a thing as assemblies not exclusively composed by the citizens of a place. This is implied by the Symian material – and that is in itself quite fascinating. Furthermore, it seems that such koina engaged in various decision processes: from resolving an acute crisis within a community (Heracleia) to honouring individuals for their benefaction (Syme). In other words, this type of political organization was not restricted to certain political behaviours, such as honouring, even if our sources are skewed towards them.

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

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

77. I would like to thank Claire Taylor for this particular point.
alternative political formations which transcended the conceptual binary opposition between citizen and non-citizen. And this should make us reconsider our own analytical assumptions when examining the politics and political history of the ancient Greek world.