

THE IDEA  
OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY  
IN HISTORY

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME II

Aspects of connecting *poleis* and *ethne*  
in Ancient Greece

edited  
by

KOSTAS BURASELIS  
and  
KLEANTHIS ZOUMBOULAKIS

*ATHENS 2003*

NATIONAL AND CAPODISTRIAN UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS  
GREEK MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS

## CONTENTS

### *Foreword*

KOSTAS BURASELIS

9

### *The Delian League Fighting on behalf of the Hellenes*

ANNE RAMOU-HAPSIADI

II

### *The Peloponnesian League as a Political Organization*

NIKOS BIRGALIAS

19

### *Symmachia und Sympoliteia in der griechischen Welt bis 323 v. Chr.*

MARTIN DREHER

27

### *Considerations on Symmachia and Sympoliteia in the Hellenistic Period*

KOSTAS BURASELIS

39

### *Polis, Ethnos and Kingship in Northern Greece*

MILTADIS HATZOPOULOS

51

### *The Internal Structure of the Aitolian Union: A Case-study in Ancient Greek Sympoliteia*

JOSEPH SCHOLTEN

65

### *The Achaian League*

JIM ROY

81

### *Le collège des nomographes et le système de représentation dans le Koinon Achéen*

A. D. RIZAKIS

97

*Monnaie commune et États Fédéraux*  
*La circulation des monnayages frappés par*  
*les états fédéraux du monde grec*  
SÉLÈNÈ PSOMA – DEMETRA TSANGARI

III

*Genèse et accomplissement de l'État fédéral de la Grèce antique*  
*à la Constitution américaine de 1787-1789*

ADALBERTO GIOVANNINI

I43

*New Approaches to Federalism in Ancient Greece:*  
*Perceptions and Perspectives*

HANS BECK

I77

*Die antiken Griechen: Integration durch Kultur*

ANDREAS MEHL

I91

*Distant Cousins and International Relations:*  
*Syngeneia in the Hellenistic World*

ANDREW ERSKINE

205

*L'Empire romain et ses communautés:*  
*le cas du monde grec*

MAURICE SARTRE

217

*Indices*

227

## NEW APPROACHES TO FEDERALISM IN ANCIENT GREECE

PERCEPTIONS AND PERSPECTIVES\*

HANS BECK

*Universität Köln*

THE LEGACY of ancient Greek federalism is more alive than ever. It was only eleven years ago that two major conferences on union and integration in antiquity were held, both of which were the first international gatherings dedicated to these topics exclusively. The first was entitled *Enotēta kai Enotētes tēs Archaïotitas* ('Unity and Units of Antiquity'), sponsored by the European Cultural Centre of Delphi and organized by KOSTAS BURASELIS.<sup>1</sup> The second, *Federazioni e federalismo nell'Europa antica* ('Federations and federalism in ancient Europe'), was explicitly devoted to the discussion of 'the roots of the common European house' and the beginnings of 'an integrated European culture'<sup>2</sup> — academic aspects that were clearly influenced by the signing of the Maastricht treaty earlier that year.

To some degree, both conferences anticipated future research. The following decade witnessed a permanent rise of interest in, and publications of monographs on, many Greek federal states, large and small.<sup>3</sup> Beyond such

---

\* The aim of this paper is not so much to review individual scholarly achievements nor to present a systematic, let alone comprehensive, research report. Instead, it seeks to survey the intellectual and methodological landmarks of an on-going debate. In doing so, I am still using the term «federalism» (and «federal states», etc.), simply because there is no alternative (especially in English) to address the political phenomenon in question.

1. Unity and Units in Antiquity. Papers from a Colloquium held in Delphi, ed. by K. Buraselis, Athens 1994.

2. *Federazioni e federalismo nell'Europa antica*. Alle radici della casa comune europea, ed. by L. Aigner Foresti et alii, Milan 1994, pp. IX-XI. Cf. now K.M. Girardet, 'Bundesstaaten im antiken Griechenland und das römische Imperium als "supranationale" Ordnung. Modelle für ein vereintes Europa von morgen?', in: R. Marti (ed.), *Europa*. Traditionen — Werte — Perspektiven, St. Ingbert 2000, 7-48.

3. Aitolia: J.D. Grainger, *The League of the Aitolians*, Leiden 1999; J. Scholten, *The Politics of Plunder*. Aitolians and their *Koinon* in the early Hellenistic Era, 279-217 B.C., Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 2000; Achaia: A. Rizakis, *Achaie I*. Sources textuelles et histoire régionale, Athens 1995; Akarnania: O. Dany, *Akarnanien im Hellenismus*. Geschichte und Völkerrecht in Nordwestgriechenland, Munich 1999; Phokis: P. Ellinger, *La légende nationale phocidienne*. Artemis, les situations extrêmes et les récits de guerre d'anéantissement, Paris 1993; J. McInerney, *The Folds of Parnassos*. Land and Ethnicity in Ancient

regional studies, a fair amount of comparative research has been done that elucidates both the mechanics of ancient Greek federalism as well as its intellectual background in Greek political thought and theory: studies on the organization of federal states, on the interaction between the *polis* and integrated super-structures, and on the perception of such a federal grammar between *polis* and *ethnos*.<sup>4</sup> The last decade has thus become a most fruitful period for the study of union and integration in ancient Greece — even more so, since several scholars have contributed to the development, and permanent improvement, of the methodological instruments for shaping categories as well as concepts. The mere narrative exposition of political structures will not do any longer, and this is also true for the intellectually towering, but on the whole rather uninspiring, approach of *Staatsrecht*.

Instead, ancient historians started to travel interdisciplinary avenues of inquiry, applying patterns of neighbouring cultural disciplines such as Political Science, Ethnology, and, of course, Archaeology, to name but a few. Whatever the roles of fundraising and strategic organization of research behind this: There is more to be said when it comes to political integration. As Adalberto Giovannini has demonstrated, America's Founding Fathers were not only inspired by Greek federalism when it came to define — and to find a consensus on — a federal polity for the United States, but how the discourse on an historical paradigm encouraged them to leave the beaten track of traditional (colonial) constitutionalism.<sup>5</sup> Historic patterns of integra-

---

Phokis, Austin 2000; Thessaly: B. Helly *L'état thessalien*. Aleuas le Roux, les tétrades et les *tagoi*, Lyon 1995; Arkadia: T.H. Nielsen, *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Göttingen 2002; Epeiros: S. Funke, *Aiakidenmythos und epeirotisches Königtum*. Der Weg einer hellenischen Monarchie, Stuttgart 2000; Chalkidike: S. Psoma, *Olynthe et les Chalcidiens de Thrace*. Études de numismatique et d'histoire, Stuttgart 2001; Lycia: R. Behrwald, *Der Lykische Bund*. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung, Bonn 2000. Interestingly enough, an up-to-date synthesis on the Boiotian League remains one of the *desperata*, which would be even more desirable, since this well attested *ethnos* in many ways might be expected to provide a role model for other areas (G. Mafodda, *Il koinon beotico in età arcaica e classica*. Storia ed istituzioni, Rome 2000, cannot fill this gap).

4. H. Beck, *Polis und Koinon*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jhdt. v.Chr., Stuttgart 1997; T. Corsten, *Vom Stamm zum Bund*. Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten, Würzburg 1999; also, K. Freitag, *Der Golf von Korinth*. Historisch-topographische Untersuchungen von der Archaik bis in das 1. Jhdt. v. Chr., Munich 2000; cf. M. Sordi, *Il federalismo greco nell'età classica*, in: *Federazioni e federalismo nell'Europa antica* (n. 2), 3-22. For research on integration and federal thought and theory see below.

5. Cf. the article of A. Giovannini in this volume.

tion and the present discourse on federalism at times overlap. Having said this, this conference on *The Idea of European Community in History* provides us with a good opportunity — and in fact provokes us — to ask for the results of the study of Greek federalism throughout the last decade; to shed light on new perceptions; and to point out future perspectives. Let us try to review the interim results of an on-going debate.

(1) The first and foremost conceptual advance is certainly the current debate on Greek ethnicity. As Frank Walbank, one of the most distinguished experts on ancient federalism, once put it: ‘Clearly ethnicity ... has taken the place of nationality as a historian’s tool for interpreting Greek history and trying to understand how Greeks saw themselves.’<sup>6</sup> In short, scholars have argued convincingly that the identities of the branches of the Greek community, such as the Boiotians, Arkadians, or Aitolians, are to be regarded as essentially changing, flexible and negotiable, and at times even as relatively late constructs rather than as relicts of a tribal past. Recent *ethnos*-studies have thus focused on the process by which tribes such as the Achaians or Arkadians were establishing a regional identity through the creation of common identity and alterity towards other *ethnē*. This tribal commonness as reflected in regional myths, heroic genealogies, and material culture has been detected as major tool of integration.<sup>7</sup>

The implications are far-reaching. For decades, the emergence of federalism and federal states in the Greek world was explained by the means of a genetic model. According to the orthodox view, *ethnē* such as the Boiotians, Arkadians, or Phokians, were conceived as (more or less) unified tribal groups from as early on as the Submycenaen Period. As time went on, their tribal organization was gradually strengthened through the emergence of

6. F.W. Walbank, *Hellenes and Achaians: Greek Nationality revisited*, in: P. Flensted-Jensen (ed.), *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (CPC Papers 5), Stuttgart 2000, 19-33 (quote p. 19).

7. See (henceforth as ‘ethnicity-school’) C. Morgan, ‘Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives’, *PCPS* 37 (1991), pp. 131-161; C. Morgan, J.M. Hall, ‘Achaian Poleis and Achaian Colonisation’, in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis* (CPC Acts 3), Copenhagen 1996, 164-232; J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 1997; idem, *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago and London 2002; McInerney (n.3); cf. also I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, Washington, D.C. 2001; for further literature see K. Freitag, ‘Identitätsfragen im antiken Griechenland’, in: *Ethnizität, Identität und Nationalität in Südosteuropa*, ed. by C. Lienau, L. Steindorff, Munich 2000, 207-217.

(proto-)political structures; these consolidated, and finally transformed into federal arrangements. The *ethnos* genetically evolved throughout this process from a tribal organization to a sophisticated federal polity of a *koinon* or *sympoliteia*. In what one might call the intellectual backbone of this view, the genetic model thus conceives the emergence of a *koinon* in a linear ascent from old (and backward) tribalism to new (and modern) federalism.<sup>8</sup>

The deficits — and in fact dangers — of this oversimplification have been recognized long before ethnicity gained its present prominence. As early as 1976, Denis Roussel and Felix Bourriot presented innovative studies that shed some light on the formation of socio-political groupings in the Archaic Age.<sup>9</sup> As a result, no one nowadays any longer subscribes to the belief that the tribal groups of Greece were ultimately linguistic — let alone racial — entities. Thus, the scholars that were to form the ‘ethnicity-school’ started not only from a position of healthy scepticism, but had at their disposal a good deal of international research that had already paved the way for their work.<sup>10</sup>

What followed was a thorough deconstruction of the genetic model. Thanks to the efforts of scholars such as Catherine Morgan, this model to a certain degree has been even turned upside down. To be sure, the *ethnos* was — and still is considered to have been so — the platform for the emergence of various Greek federal states. Yet the character of this platform has been re-defined: When federalism emerged, the *ethnos* did not provide

8. Cf., e.g., J.A.O. Larsen, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1955, pp. 22-46; G. Daverio Rocchi, *Città-stato e stati federali della Grecia classica*. Lineamenti di storia delle istituzioni politiche, Milan 1993. On the genetic model see also Beck, Review of T. Corsten, *Vom Stamm zum Bund*, *Gnomon* 73 (2001), 525-531.

9. F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la nature du genos*, Lille 1976; D. Roussel, *Tribu et cité*, Paris 1976.

10. See already R. Wenskus, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung*. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes, Cologne and Graz 1961 (widely ignored in Anglo-American research); also, e.g., K.-W. Welwei, Ursprünge genossenschaftlicher Organisationsformen in der archaischen Polis, *Saeculum* 39 (1988), 12-23 (reprinted in: idem, *Polis und Arché*. Kleine Schriften zu Gesellschafts- und Herrschaftsstrukturen in der griechischen Welt, ed. by M. Meier, Stuttgart 2000, 11-21); P. Funke, ‘Stamm und Polis. Überlegungen zur Entstehung der griechischen Staatenwelt in den Dunklen Jahrhunderten’, in: *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstages von A. Heuss*, ed. by J. Bleicken, Kallmünz 1993, 29-48; C. Ulf (ed.), *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität. Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit*, Berlin 1996; cf. also H.-J. Gehrke, ‘Ethnos, Phyle, Polis. Gemäßigt unorthodoxe Vermutungen’, in: *Polis and Politics*. Studies in Ancient Greek History, presented to M.H. Hansen, Copenhagen 2000, 159-176.

proto-political structures that were simply modernized or ‘politicized’. Rather, the *ethnos* was the fiction which made the creation of a political organism possible. The important implication is that federalism, when finally brought about in the late Archaic and Classical Periods, was not — at least not in the first instance — a modern or even trend-setting phenomenon, but rather a cognitive response to the awakening of tribal commonness in the Archaic Age. As I have mentioned earlier, this tribal commonness as reflected in regional myths and heroic genealogies has been detected as medium of integration also in developed federal states. Consequently, a sharp distinction between tribal state (*ethnos*) and federal state (*koinon*) seems to have become problematic.<sup>11</sup>

A fundamental prerequisite for ethnicity is identity, which is both the expression of, and engine for, tribal commonness. In ancient Greece, ethnic identity — and alterity towards other *ethnē* — was ‘predicated on notions of ethnic belonging and common descent’.<sup>12</sup> To uncover the process of ethno-genesis, scholars increasingly turn to heroic genealogies, religious traditions, and (at times competitive) foundation myths. A new reading of these myths — or ‘modules’ of what was later to become a myth — can indeed reveal the early proliferation of ideas of immemorial ethnic roots. More than that, it has been demonstrated how these myths coalesced into what Hans-Joachim Gehrke called ‘intentionale Geschichte’ (*intentional history*),<sup>13</sup> that means: how they became authoritative traditions on a common tribal past, which helped to define (and to defend) political interests of the present. As a result of this, the development of a pan-Phokian, pan-Achaian, pan-Arkadian, and other regional or ‘intra-hellenic’ identities have become clearer. And it has become clear that these identities not only greatly contributed to the political unification of these *ethnē*, but also played an active role in their political life.

It is, of course, difficult to see the origins and early stages of these processes of (self-)identification. Like so often, there is hardly a methodological knife that cuts before Homer. Also, there are the problems of regional variety and lack of simultaneity. A recent study sets out to show how the Messenians became Messenians, arguing mainly on the grounds of archaeology and topography that Messenian collective identity was a manifestation of

11. Cf. Morgan (n. 7); McInerney (n. 3), 154-157 and passim.

12. Hall, *Hellenicity* (n. 7), XVII.

13. H.-J. Gehrke, ‘Mythos, Politik, Geschichte’, *Saeculum* 45 (1994), 239-264; see also idem, ‘Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond’, in: N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian’s Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford 2001, 286-313.

the desire of certain groups to be independent from Sparta.<sup>14</sup> Be that as it may: The crucial question is not any longer, *if* identity and integration interacted, but rather *how* they did.

To put it in other words: Studies on regional integration have greatly benefitted from research on ethnicity, first, because this approach provided a fresh perspective beyond the analysis of political structures. Ethnicity thus helps to widen the focus on integration. Second, since the ‘ethnicity-school’ seeks to understand how Greek *ethnē* saw themselves (and vis-à-vis others), it avoids a notorious terminological and conceptual problem, that is: how far and to what degree modern concepts such as federalism can be applied to Greek antiquity.<sup>15</sup> This point is even more crucial, since modern definitions of federalism lack unanimity and acceptance.<sup>16</sup>

It is easy to see these particular strengths of the ethnicity-approach. What is not quite as easy, is to determine the nature, modes and means of the interaction between collective identity and political integration. How did ideas of common descent and tribal union develop into integrated political structures, precisely? Where is the interface between ethnicity and federalism? How did ethnogenesis and ethnic identity act *in politicis*? And since we have come to conclude that ‘intra-hellenic’ identities were largely based on primordial fictions, to what degree did federal political structures and practices of integration such as federal cults and rituals in turn stimulate — and reinforce — those identities?<sup>17</sup> It is surprising that these aspects have been widely left out of the debate so far. In fact, political integration and federalism are often hardly touched upon in studies on ethnicity.

---

14. N. Luraghi, *Becoming Messenian*, *JHS* 122 (2002), 45-69, strangely ignoring the important book by M. Meier, *Aristokraten und Damoden. Untersuchungen zur inneren Entwicklung Spartas im 7. Jhd. v.Chr. und zur politischen Funktion der Dichtung des Tyrtaios*, Stuttgart 1998.

15. Note the debate triggered many years ago by A. Giovannini, *Untersuchungen über die Natur und die Anfänge der bundesstaatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland*, Göttingen 1971; in response: F.W. Walbank, *Were there Greek Federal States?*, *SCI* 3 (1976-1977), 27-51.

16. See, e.g., S.R. Davis, *The federal Principle. A Journey through Time in Quest for a Meaning*, Berkeley 1978; D. Elazar, *Exploring Federalism*, Alabama 1987.

17. Note, e.g., the remarks by I. Malkin, Introduction, in: idem (n. 7): ‘By contrast, a more historically minded approach should acknowledge primordiality as a historical force that derives its essence from long-term existence as a belief widely shared and functions in molding attitudes and influencing actions. When primordial charters persist over long periods and function historically within them, they acquire the force of authentic or “objective” factors. In other words, whether or not a primordial charter once began as an “invention”,

This is even more regrettable, since recent research on federalism has emphasized the degree to which the political structures of several *koina* could be, and in fact were, determined by tribal patterns of organization. As for Lokris, Aitolia, and Arkadia, such patterns are not only well attested, but might be even regarded as formative for their polities in the late Archaic and Classical Periods.<sup>18</sup> Is there a way to argue the case for a moderately orthodox view, i.e. that federalism after all did depart from proto-political structures and that the polities of the Greek federal states could have been late reflections of a tribal past, even if the essence of this past was largely dominated by fictions and primordial beliefs? Future research on integration will have to clear up this very issue from both sides, from ethnicity and from federalism, revealing both their reciprocity and interaction.

(2) To move on from the emergence of Greek federalism to its actual functioning in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods, a second major field of interest within classical scholarship throughout the last decade must be addressed: the integration of the *polis* and its interaction with federal super-structures. In any federal state, members are obliged to delegate genuine powers to the central government, while at the same time they enjoy a certain degree of autonomy. It is well known that *autonomia* was a *Lebensprinzip* (Martin Jehne) of the Greek *polis*.<sup>19</sup> The demand for living under ‘ones own laws’ (*tois idiois nomois chrēsthai*) is so prominent in the history of the Classical Period that it needs no further exposition here. If autonomy was the life-principle in the process of (self-)perception and (self-)identification of the Greek city-state, the integration of *poleis* into any sort of federal union raises the problem of how the delegating of genuine political rights from local to central government interfered with the very nature of a *polis* and its demands for autonomy. Was the *polis* capable of integration at all?

The crucial question is: What made a Greek *polis* autonomous? The old dogma that the *polis* by definition was — and had to be — fully autonomous,

---

the longer it operates historically the better its chances of acquiring “essence” and actual force’. (p. 16 f.).

18. Lokris: H. Beck, ‘Ostlokris und die “Tausend Opuntier”’. Neue Überlegungen zum Siedlergesetz für Naupaktos’, *ZPE* 124 (1999), 53-62; T.H. Nielsen, ‘Epiknemidian, Hypoknemidian, and Opountian Lokrians. Reflections on the Political Organisation of East Lokris in the Classical Period’, in: Flensted-Jensen (n. 6), 91-120. For Arkadia see n. 3 above, for Aitolia below n. 24.

19. M. Jehne, *Koine Eirene*. Untersuchungen zu den Befriedungs- und Stabilisierungsbestrebungen in der griechischen Poliswelt des 4. Jhdts. v.Chr., Stuttgart 1994.

so that losing its *autonomia* meant the loss of its identity as *polis*, has been abandoned. Consequently, scholars have argued for a wide range of dependencies and even infringements of autonomy that were compatible with the status of *polis*. The most recent, and most systematic, research in this regard is undertaken by the Copenhagen Polis Centre (CPC), set up in 1993 and directed by Mogens Herman Hansen.<sup>20</sup> The CPC-team seeks to establish a catalogue of positive criteria in order to define the ancient Greek *polis*. In doing so, they are arguing for a formal, juridicial definition of autonomy (notably for the incompatibility of *autonomia* and certain features such as the paying of tributes), which in turn contributes to their catalogue of defining the *polis*.<sup>21</sup>

Despite the great achievements of the CPC, this view stands not unchallenged. Several scholars have raised doubts as to whether *autonomia* might be perceived as legal condition defined by a set of sharply marked criteria. Instead, they are arguing for a negative conceptualization of autonomy, i.e.: that its absence was easier to be identified than its positive definition.<sup>22</sup> The core of *autonomia* thus seems to be its prevalence and its perpetual affirmation in the political discourse within the face-to-face society of the *polis*, no matter what the arrangements beyond the *polis*. If this line of argument is correct, it becomes clear that the integration of city-states as such did not imply a breach of autonomy or even an end of the political community of the *polis*. Federalism and *polis*-autonomy were compatible.<sup>23</sup>

There is more to add to this, as research on the Arkadian and early Aitolian League indicates. Recent studies on both federal states illuminate a co-existence of tribal organizations with emerging *polis*-organizations. Both *koina* were made up by *poleis* and non-*polis* members such as smaller tribes or villages (*komai*) at the same time.<sup>24</sup> This reinforces the conclusion that a sharp distinction between tribal-state (*ethnos*) and federal-state (*koinon*) has

20. For a list of publications (so far six volumes in both the 'Acts' and 'Papers'-series) see <http://www.igl.ku.dk/POLIS/welcome.html>. Cf. also the volumes cited in this article.

21. M.H. Hansen, The autonomous City-State. Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction, in: idem, K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the ancient Greek Polis* (CPC Papers 2), Stuttgart 1995, 21-43.

22. Jehne (n. 19), p. 272 and passim; M. Ostwald, *Autonomia. Its Genesis and early History*, New York 1982, pp. 41-46; K. Raaflaub, *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit. Zur historischen Semantik und Gesellschaftsgeschichte eines politischen Grundbegriffes der Griechen*, Munich 1985, 201 f.

23. Cf. Beck (n. 4), pp. 235-249; for a different view see M.H. Hansen, Boiotian *Poleis* — a Test-Case, in: idem (ed.), *Sources for the ancient Greek City-State* (CPC Acts 2), Copenhagen 1995, 13-63, esp. 35.

become highly questionable. An immediate implication is that the political structures of Greek federal states are being conceived as more flexible. Patterns of organization vary not only from *koinon* to *koinon*, but might also present a mixture of tribal- and federal-structures within one and the same league. How were *poleis*, *komai*, and/or other subunits, then, formally integrated?

It is well known that some *koina* operated on the basis of districts (*merē* or *telē*) — artificial subdivisions of the federal territory that provided an conversion table, as it were, for proportional representation.<sup>25</sup> Other leagues (Phokis and the League of the Chalkidians, to name but two) were run by a system of direct assemblies; yet others by both, proportional representation and primary assemblies.<sup>26</sup> It follows that districts or artificial subdivisions of the territory cannot be considered as decisive when it comes to grasp, let alone to define, Greek federalism. Even when there were districts, they were never — and according to the very core of Greek politics could never be — constitutive parts of a *koinon*. The members were always, and without exception, the citizenries of the integrated *poleis* or *komai*. When new members were added, this process was consequently determined by the means of granting them federal citizenship.<sup>27</sup>

Having said this, it must be stressed that recent research on federalism still benefits from questions on territoriality and concepts of space, especially when it comes to the emergence of federal structures in the Archaic Age. In

1. Aitolia: P. Funke, Polisgenese und Urbanisierung in Aitolien im 5. und 4. Jhdt. v.Chr., in: M.H. Hansen, *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community* (CPC Acts 4), Copenhagen 1997, 145-188; see also idem, «Zur Ausbildung städtischer Siedlungszentren in Aitolien», in: *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Geographie des Altertums II-III*, Bonn 1991, pp. 313-332; idem, «Zur Datierung befestigter Stadtanlagen in Aitolien», *Boreas* 10 (1987) 87-96. Arkadia: above n. 3.

25. Most prominently, the Boiotian League from 447 to 386: *Hell. ox.* 19 (Chambers); cf. the literature cited below n. 34; for a discussion of the continuation of the Boiotian *sunteleiai* in the League after its refoundation in 379 see H. Beck, Thebes, the Boiotian League, and the 'Rise of Federalism' in Fourth Century Greece, in: *Presenza e funzione della città di Tebe nella cultura greca*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, ed. by P.A. Bernardini, Rome 2000, 331-344; J. Buckler, 'The Phantom *Synhedrion* of the Boiotian Confederacy', in: *Polis and Politics* (n. 10), 431-446. Note also Hdt. 1,145 with Rizakis (n. 3) on Achaia in the Classical Period. For *telē* in Hellenistic Aitolia see Funke (n. 24).

26. The Arkadikon: Nielsen (n. 3), pp. 474-504. Phokis: McInerney (n. 7); the Chalkidians: M. Zahrt, *Olynth und die Chalkidier*, Munich 1971; Psoma (n. 3).

27. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4. 6. 1; Diod. 14. 17. 3. See, however, Corsten (n. 4.), who argues that a *koinon* ('Bundesstaat') only by the means of establishing federal districts became a *koinon*.

what one might call a test-case, it has been demonstrated for the League of Phokis, how a landscape was gradually perceived as focal point of regional identity, how its political penetration evolved, and how the interaction of both influenced the integration of different units — cities, villages, and subtribes — into a larger political community.<sup>28</sup> The role of space, territoriality, and liminality for an understanding of early features of federalism has thus been made clear.<sup>29</sup> And as for the integration and federal arrangement of members, this approach also helped to elucidate the heterogeneity of the member-states in this league as well as the different degrees of their dependencies.

This brief outline indicates that previous approaches to the integration of the *polis* and its interaction with federalism depart from a factual basis — in a double sense: *polis* and federalism are not only the objects of investigation, but they themselves define the levels on which both issues are being approached (the local and the federal level). A third level is possible. In fact, it is most desirable. Current research on the expansion of the Roman Republic demonstrates that International Relations Theories provide a fresh look at the transformation of the Mediterranean world from the 3rd to the 1st centuries B.C.<sup>30</sup> This approach can be applied to Greece as well<sup>31</sup> — even more so, since Greek interstate relations, and relations within federal states in particular, were not only notoriously unstable, but on the whole incoherent.

28. McInerney (n. 3), clearly inspired by F. de Polignac, *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*, Chicago 1995 (first in French 1984).

29. Note also current research on *rites de passage* such as the Theban Daphnephoria (A. Schachter, 'The Daphnephoria of Thebes', in: *Presenza e funzione della città di Tebe nella cultura greca* [n. 25] pp. 99-123) and on the festival of the Boiotian Daidala (A. Chaniotis, 'Ritual Dynamics: The Boiotian Festival of the Daidala', in: *Kykeon. Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel*, ed. by H.F.J. Horstmanshoff et alii, Leiden 2002, 23-48). Both festivals included processions through the countryside which enhanced the ephebes' perception of the territory and instilled in them their responsibilities to the integrity of their *polis* and also of their *koinon*.

30. Cf. A. Eckstein, *From Anarchy to Hierarchy. Rome and the Mediterranean, 230-194 B.C.* (forthcoming monograph).

31. Note, e.g., previous research on Thucydides and International Relation Theories: M.W. Doyle, 'Thucydidean Realism', *Review of International Studies* 16 (1990), 223-237; R.N. Lebow, B. Strauss (eds.), *Hegemonic Rivalry. From Thucydides to the Nuclear Age*, Boulder 1991; S. Forde, 'Varieties of Realism: Thucydides and Macchiavelli', *Journal of Politics* 2 (1992), pp. 372-393; L.S. Gustafson, *Thucydides. Theory of International Relations. A Lasting Possession*, Baton Rouge 2000; D.A. Welch, 'Why IR Theorists should stop reading Thucydides', *Review of International Studies* 29 (2003, forthcoming [presently available at <http://pro.harvard.edu/papers/018/018013WelchDavid.pdf>]); cf. also H. Leppin, *Thukydides und die Verfassung der Polis. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Ideengeschichte*, Berlin 1999.

Drawing on the concept of what political scientists call ‘violent system transformation’,<sup>32</sup> the application of IR Theories provides a new methodological tool to describe the conflict-prone environment between *polis*, *ethnos*, and *koinon*. An analysis of the balances, shifts, and dynamics of federal affairs should thus not halt on the level of autonomy and integration. Rather, it should address both issues by the means of a theoretically inspired study of (the various phases of) Greek interstate relations.

(3) This leads to a third — and final — major field of scholarly efforts and achievements: Any in-depth study of cooperative interstate structures such as federalism, alliance, and common peace arrangements (*koine eirene*) must consider the intellectual background of interstate-behaviour and its embodiment in political thought and theory. Research on federalism faces a prominent dilemma in this respect: No ancient appraisal of federalism as a political principle has survived, and there is good reason to think that no such work was ever written.<sup>33</sup> No author of the Classical and Hellenistic Periods has produced a pamphlet on the federal principle. The phenomenon desperately seems to lack contemporary analysis.

The closest one can get to a discourse on federalism is famous — and anonymous — ‘P’ (‘Papyrus’, as the scholars of the *editio princeps* called him), the author of the *Hellenika Oxyrhynchia*, who offers a detailed description of the actual functioning of the Boiotian League in the early 4th century B.C. ‘P’ does not, however, provide a theoretical discussion on, or conceptualization of, federalism.<sup>34</sup> To a certain degree, this is also true for Aristotle and Polybios. Both refrain from treating federalism as an independent subject. To be sure, the Lykeion produced empirical studies on the constitutions of several federal states, which implies that Aristotle well understood the mechanics of *polis*-integration. Unfortunately, none of these treatises has been preserved, which makes it difficult to estimate his perception of federalism.<sup>35</sup> Polybios, the writer from whom an account of federalism might be most

32. R. Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge 1981; cf. J. Kugler, D. Lemke, ‘The Evolution of the Power Transition Perspective’, in: J. Kugler, D. Lemke (eds.), *Parity and War. Evaluations and Extensions of the War Ledger*, Ann Arbor 1996, 3-35.

33. Cf. F. Walbank, ‘An Experiment in Greek Union’, *PCA* 67 (1970), 13-27, esp. 14; J.A.O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States. Their Institutions and History*, Oxford 1968, XI f.

34. *Hell. ox.* 19 (Chambers); for bibliographical information on the research of this Boiotian constitution cf. Beck (n. 4), 90, n. 38; more recently Corsten (n. 4), 27-60; Lehmann (below n. 37), 25-33; P. Cartledge, ‘Boiotian Swine F(or)ever? The Boiotian Superstate 395 B.C.’, in: *Polis and Politics* (n. 10), 397-418.

expected, focuses on the history of the Achaian League and its polity, respectively. He thus offers most valuable information on the political practice of Hellenistic federalism. However, like Aristotle, Polybios refrains from elaborating on federalism in general, which obscures his thoughts on the modes of, and obstacles towards, political integration in Greece.<sup>36</sup>

This impression is bleak. Yet, thanks to research by Gustav Adolf Lehmann, it is not quite as bleak. His most recent study on ancient federal theories addresses the issue both from the perspectives of Ancient History and Political Science (and Philology). In doing so, Lehmann is able to show that Polybios in his famous digression on the 'super-polis' Achaia embarked on a discourse on federalism with Aristotle. Polybios seems to have initiated a genuine debate on the classification of Greek *ethnē* and their polities.<sup>37</sup> The lines of argument as well as the vitality of this ancient debate remain a secret. The exciting discovery is that the topic was on the agenda of political thought and theory, which is somewhat of a quantum leap in the understanding of ancient perceptions of federalism.

These results do not only encourage further research, but they also provide a more solid basis for other approaches to federal ideas in Greek antiquity. Only recently, it has been argued that Xenophon was well familiar with the principle of vertical diversion of power in a federal state. In the *Hellenika*, the topic is addressed from two perspectives: first, that of the restriction of

1. Arist. *Pol.* 1261a 22-31; descriptions of federal constitutions: frags. 473 f.; 483; 485; 494 f.; 547 (Rose); cf. 501 f.; 553 f.; 560; 565 f.; 567 on *poleis* or (sub-)tribes which were at times members of a *koinon*. The most recent edition and commentary is *Aristoteles. Die Historischen Fragmente*. Übersetzt und erläutert von M. Hase, Berlin 2002. See also Beck (n. 4), 13-18; A. Winterling, «Polisübergreifende Politik bei Aristoteles», in: *Rom und der griechische Osten*. Festschrift für H.H. Schmitt, ed. by C. Schubert, K. Brodersen, Stuttgart 1995, 313-328; M.H. Hansen, *Polis and City-State. An ancient Concept and its modern Equivalent* (CPC Acts 5), Copenhagen 1998.

36. *Pol.* 2, 37, 9-38, 9.

37. G.A. Lehmann, *Ansätze zu einer Theorie des griechischen Bundesstaates bei Aristoteles und Polybios*, Göttingen 2001, 34-61; cf. idem, 'Ansätze zur bundesstaatlichen Ordnung und repräsentativen Verfassung in der Antike und ihre Rückwirkungen auf die Neuzeit, *Geschichte in Köln* 9 (1981), 54-88; idem, 'Die Rezeption der achäischen Bundesverfassung' in der Verfassung der USA, in: W. Schuller (ed.), *Antike in der Moderne*, Konstanz 1985 (*Xenia* 15), 171-182. Cf. also C. Bearzot, 'Un'ideologia del federalismo nel pensiero politico greco?' in: *Federazioni e federalismo nell'Europa antica* (n. 2), 161-180; P. Funke, 'Die Bedeutung der griechischen Bundesstaaten in der politischen Theorie und Praxis des 5. und 4. Jhd. v.Chr. (Auch eine Bemerkung zu Aristot. *pol.* 1261a 22-29)', in: W. Schuller (ed.), *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum*, Darmstadt 1998, 59-71.

genuine political rights of a *polis* in a federal state; and second, that of the extension of its political scope (and means) through the integration with other *poleis*. At the same time, the extrapolation of scattered statements and verdicts from Xenophon's narrative reveals his careful sense for the interaction of autonomy and federalism.<sup>38</sup> It goes without saying that this approach cannot easily be transferred from one author to another. Still, efforts in this direction might be worth considering. Despite the lack of ancient systematic appraisals, they elucidate that federalism and integration were prominent in Greek political thought and theory, and that they contributed to the intellectual framework of Greek interstate-relations.

Like every interim assessment, this attempt to trace the avenues of an ongoing inquiry halts at the crossroads of past and present. Our federal tour d'horizon thus hardly calls for a summary. Still, the directions of future research might now be (more) predictable. Any future synopsis on federal experiences in ancient Greece will have to depart from the emergence of regional identity, which — no matter how fictional — provided the basis for the formation of integrated political structures. This process of a primordial regional identity taking shape was closely interwoven with the genesis of smaller identity units (*poleis*, subtribes, *komai*). Consequently, future studies on 'intra-hellenic' regional groups such as the Boiotians, Arkadians, or Akarnanians, will not only have to embrace both levels, *polis* and *ethnos*, but also have to uncover the complex interplay of their complementary, and at times competing, identities. This approach will be crucial for political patterns as well. Institutions, (double) citizenship, demarcation(s) of territories — research on these features will have to concentrate on the precarious need for perpetual confirmation of, and reconciliation between, the authorities of *polis* and *ethnos*. And the tension between these authorities in turn will have to be considered in the light of Greek political thinking.

Since the early days of classical scholarship on Greek federalism, research underwent several conceptual shifts. The views prevailing in the early twentieth century were of destruction and defeat, since federalism failed to unite the Greek *poleis* against Philip of Macedon. As one author in the first edition of Volume 6 of the *Cambridge Ancient History* (published in 1927) put it: 'One service, indeed, was rendered by the federal principle in the very

---

38. H. Beck, 'The "Laws of the Fathers" versus "the Laws of the League". Xenophon on Federalism', *CPh* 96 (2001), 355-375; cf. J. Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of his Times*, London and New York 1995, 41-98 passim.

moment of the the death of Greek independence [scil. the battle of Chaironeia]. It became the coffin of the corpse'.<sup>39</sup> In the 1960s, the topic could be — in fact was — addressed from perspectives such as nuclear balance and hegemonic rivalry.<sup>40</sup> Is it mere coincidence that the present debate is dominated by paradigms such as regional identity and ethnicity? Is it only by chance that scholars are turning away from universally applicable models of federalism and instead stress the fluidity and flexibility of federal arrangements in ancient Greece? Whatever the answer. If anything, the debate on Greek federalism in the last decade shows that the topic has lost nothing of its attraction — ever since the Founding Fathers of America adopted this political principle of an 'old Europe' to argue for a new world.

---

39. E. Barker, 'Greek Political Thought and Theory in the Fourth Century', in: *CAH* vol. 6, 1927, 505-535 (quote pp. 508 f.).

40. Cf. J.A.O. Larsen, 'Freedom and its Obstacles in ancient Greece', *CPh* 57 (1962), 230-234.