



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

R. Malcolm Errington
Εκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **25 • 1995**

Seite / Page **19–42**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1035/5402> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1995-25-p19-42-v5402.0

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

R. MALCOLM ERRINGTON

Ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης

For Christian Habicht: 26. 2. 1996

I

The interpretation of formal aspects of the decrees of Greek cities as expressions of their constitutional structure is a well-established historical method, which has made a major contribution to the advancement of our knowledge concerning the structure and history of ancient Greek constitutional practice. The difficulties involved in this method are, however, not to be underestimated. In particular, it seems dangerous, though often enough it is the only way, to infer merely from similarities of expression that a phrase, even a technical term, must have the same meaning wherever in the Greek world it occurs. The danger is especially great when large distances of time or place separate the cities where the expressions occur, or where the use of words is similar but not identical. The large and intensely analysed epigraphic crop from Athens, as we shall see, presents a danger all of its own for researchers in other areas, since the historian's desire to make inferences about the lesser known from the better-known – a principle which is inherent and unavoidable in most research in ancient history – in the area of constitutional practice often offers extreme temptations.

The epigraphic material which I shall discuss in this paper will indeed illustrate this danger, but will also, by trying to avoid it, offer some positive conclusions, though many loose ends will remain to be tied. I am concerned with the phrase ἔκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης, which is well-known to all historians who have worked with the hellenistic city, or pseudo-city, decrees from south-west Asia Minor. I shall also discuss some similar, or similarly constructed, expressions, and explore the possibility of interpreting each in the light of the other.

II

The phrase ἔκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης occurs in the prescripts of many decrees from a wide range of communities¹ dating mainly but not exclusively, from the

¹ See appendix for an extensive list.

fourth or third centuries B.C. and all but one situated in Asia Minor. Within the prescript the phrase can stand immediately before or immediately after the verb of decision, normally ἔδοξε + name of the community. The exact placing seems to be of no material significance. A prescript from Panamara may serve as an example: ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης, ἔδοξεν Παναμαρέων τῷ κοινῷ.² Attempts to interpret the phrase have been rare; those who have risked an interpretation have looked to Athens as a parallel, where the adjective κυρία was applied to ἐκκλησία in the restructuring of the meetings of the assembly introduced in 336/5 and described by the author of the *Athenaion Politeia*. In this system the ἐκκλησία κυρία was an especially important meeting of the assembly, taking place once in each prytany, for which particularly important agenda-items were reserved and for which the normal attendance-money was significantly raised.³ In this sense G. BUSOLT and H. SWOBODA,⁴ and M. WÖRRLE⁵ have interpreted the phrase, while J. and L. ROBERT,⁶ though translating it, sit on the fence and give it no precise technical interpretation. It must, however, be said, that only the interest of BUSOLT and SWOBODA was primarily directed towards the constitutional structures illustrated by the inscriptions, the latter scholars were concerned more with other matters of more immediate interest in the new texts they were publishing.

Nevertheless, important formal differences, when compared with Athens, were neglected in this search for parallels. In particular the essential connection of the ἐκκλησία κυρία described by the *Athenaion Politeia* with the Athenian prytany system makes it an unlikely model for extrapolation to places where no prytany system is known, nor even a probable assumption. Moreover, the first occurrence of the phrase (at Mylasa in 367/6)⁷ occurs thirty years before the system was introduced in Athens.⁸ A further contrast is provided by the epigraphic material from Athens, merely emphasising still more essential differences. In the texts from Asia Minor the ἐκκλησία κυρία occurs in prescripts, with extremely rare exceptions, in the form of a genitive absolute, normally with the participle γενομένης, but occasionally with οὔσης,⁹ moreover it always stands immediately before or after the constitutive ἔδοξε.

² I. Stratonikeia 9.

³ Ath. Pol. 43.4. On the introduction and functions of the *ekklesia kyria* at Athens cf. R.M. ERRINGTON, 'Ἐκκλησία κυρία in Athens, *Chiron* 24, 1994, 135 ff.

⁴ Griechische Staatskunde I, 446 with n.3 and 447 n.1.

⁵ Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II, *Chiron* 8, 1978, 202: «... fand eine Hauptsitzung der Volksversammlung statt.»

⁶ Fouilles d'Amcyzon en Carie I, Paris 1983, 120: «dans l'assemblée plénière.» Cf. also 110 and n.111 where a collection of evidence, but without interpretation, is offered.

⁷ I. Mylasa 1.

⁸ On Athens see ERRINGTON (as n.3) 135 f.

⁹ In Asia Minor: from Xanthos (J. & L. ROBERT, *Amyzon* [as n.6] 154 no.15B) (see also below, 34) and from Araxa (SEG 18, 570), where the adjective is however ἐννόμου. The for-

In Athens the notice about the type of meeting does not occur in the constitutive part of the prescript but in the dating formula, always between the dating by the prytany and the name of the *prohedros* responsible for the voting, and always as a simple notice in the nominative case, ἐκκλησία κυρία¹⁰ or (for meetings not κυρία in terms of the description of the *Athenaion Politeia*), simply ἐκκλησία.¹¹ This latter practice points to a further difference from the practice known from the communities in Asia Minor. From 44 epigraphic cases known to me from Asia Minor where ἐκκλησία is mentioned, an adjective is absent in only four of them, and in these cases there is good reason to believe that special circumstances played a part.¹² If we wished to apply the Athenian model to these communities, then we would need to assume that during the period when they used this phrase their meetings consisted exclusively of «main meetings» – quite differently from Athens where, since the ἐκκλησία κυρία made up only 25 % of the meetings, normal simple ἐκκλησία are regularly registered in the inscribed decrees.

A further difference may be noted. At Athens the notice about the type of meeting, once introduced, continued to be used for more than three centuries, until at least the end of the first century B.C.¹³ In the communities using the genitive absolute with κυρία there is a clear dominance of the fourth and third centuries B.C., after which only quite isolated instances are known. Moreover the placing of the genitive absolute immediately before or after ἔδοξε suggests that it expressed something centrally important, something constitutive, for the legality of the decree. Indeed, the fact alone that it can be placed after ἔδοξε makes it clear that this phrase was far more than a mere dating formula, which it seems to have been at Athens.¹⁴ We must therefore conclude that the ἐκκλησία κυρία in Athens will

mula with οὔσης (but with a different adjective, not κυρίας) is also known from a few Thesalian cities: Chyretiai (Arch. Eph. 1917, 10 no. 304), Mopsion (IG IX 2, 1056: here [ἀγ]ορᾶς νομίμας ἐό[νοας]) and perhaps Hypata (IG IX 2, 11 line 1, where there seems to be inadequate room to restore γενομένης). Cf. also, without adjective, Larisa (IG IX 2, 512b.7.22). For other variations see appendix, section 5.

¹⁰ E.g. IG II² 336.

¹¹ E.g. IG II² 330.

¹² From Kildara (4th century): I. Mylasa 961; from the neighbourhood of Denizli, the decree of the Neoteichitai and the Kiddiokomitai: M. WÖRRLÉ, *Antiochos I., Achaïos der Ältere und die Galater*, Chiron 5, 1975, 59f.; from Xanthos: TAM II 262 (256 B.C.), SEG 38, 1476 (cf. ed.pr. J. BOUSQUET, REG 101, 1988, 12–53) (206/5 B.C.). I omit from this list the undated inscription I. Magnesia Maeander 13, where an extremely fragmentary text is adventurously reconstructed from an inadequate copy to give the phrase without κυρίας. It would be misleading to regard this text as established. Outside of Asia Minor the construction with genitive absolute is extremely rare, in only two known cases is an adjective missing (see the list in the appendix). For discussion of the texts from Asia Minor see below 31 f.

¹³ E.g. Syll.³ 796 III.

¹⁴ The certain cases are 29 where the phrase stands before ἔδοξε and 21 where it stands after it. The fact that the order was unimportant emerges clearly from the cases where at the same place at about the same time both positions occur: at Lissa in Lykia (TAM II 158

not provide a satisfactory model with which the epigraphic material from Asia Minor can be explained.

III

If the Athenian model will not do, other methods whereby we might reach a feasible interpretation of what *ἐκκλησία κυρία* really means in these communities must be tried. It might be thought reasonable to see the phrase as an adaption of the formula used in some other communities, in particular from the Greek mainland and some of the islands, *ἐκκλησία ἔννομος* (or some other adjective constructed with *νόμος*), which must mean something like «legal», «valid», «according to the constitutional rules».¹⁵ Since *κύριος* when used non-technically means «sovereign», «competent», «dominant»,¹⁶ it might as a technical term conceivably also mean simply «constitutional». The problem here, however, is that the evidence from the two places in Asia Minor where the *ekklesia* is described by an adjective with a *νομ-* stem, Araxa¹⁷ and Magnesia on the Maeander¹⁸ seems explicitly to exclude the two expressions having the same meaning. Both Araxa and Magnesia on the Maeander belong to those communities, from which sufficient evidence exists to allow us to see that they changed their terminology over the years.

For Araxa an inscription from the third century B. C. shows that at that time the Araxians also used the expression *ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης*,¹⁹ whereas by the later second century the formula had become *ἐκκλησίας ἐννόμου οὔσης*.²⁰ In both cases the organs involved in passing the decree were apparently identical (in the third century: ἔδοξε Ἀραξέων τῆ πόλε[ι] καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν, whereas in the second

[277 B. C.], 160 [245 B. C.], both after ἔδοξε; *ibid.* 159 [275/4 B. C.], before ἔδοξε, and Magnesia on the Maeander (I. Magnesia Maeander 4,10 [after ἔδοξε], 5, 9,11 [before ἔδοξε] – all not precisely datable, but all third century). Cf. also Antikyra in Phokis, where the formula was ἐν ἐννόμοι ἐκκλησία: IG IX 1 nos. 1, 2 (after ἔδοξε), no. 3 (before).

¹⁵ Known from Ambrysos (IG IX 1, 11), Antikyra (IG IX 1, 1–3), Arkesine (IG XI 7, 50), Chaleion (IG IX 1, 330), Chyretiai (Arch. Eph. 1917, 10 no. 304), Hypata (IG IX 2, 11), Kierion (IG IX 2, 259), League of the Magnesians (IG IX 2, 1109), Thera (IG XII 3, 325, 326). Additionally there is *νομίμα* at Delphi (the Aetolians: BCH 6, 1882, 460 no. 92) and at Mopsion (IG IX 2, 1056). Cf. also the many known *ἀγοραὶ τέλειοι* at Delphi (e.g. Syll.³ 437, 450).

¹⁶ See the examples of this usage collected in ERRINGTON (as n. 3) 144f.

¹⁷ SEG 18, 570. On the date cf. R.M. ERRINGTON, *Θεὰ Πώμη und römischer Einfluß südlich des Mäanders im 2. Jh. v. Chr.*, Chiron 17, 1987, 114f.

¹⁸ I. Magnesia Maeander 5. An inscription from Mylasa (I. Mylasa 200), a decree of the tribe of the Otorkondeis, might conceivably show a trace of the same meaning if *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια* in the phrase *ἐκκλησίας κυρία[ς] γενομένης ἐν* | [T]αυροφονίους is not restricted in its meaning to [T]αυροφονίους.

¹⁹ A. ΜΑΙΥΡΙ, *Annuario* 8–9, 1925–6, 313–315 no. 1.

²⁰ SEG 18, 570.

century they merely replaced πόλει with δήμῳ), so that if we do not wish to assume a merely trivial or accidental verbal variation in the formula, it is necessary to conclude that the different formulae indeed reflect different constitutional rules, therefore that at Araxa ἔκκλησία κυρία does not simply mean the same thing as ἔκκλησία ἔννομος.

If Araxa might nevertheless leave a slight doubt, Magnesia on the Maeander offers conclusive proof that the two expressions had different meanings. At Magnesia, on the one occasion on which the νομ- adjective (here νομαία) occurs in the genitive absolute with ἔκκλησία it is coupled with κυρία: ἔκκλησίας νομαίας κυρίας γενομένης.²¹ In the four other known cases from Magnesia, all dating from the third century, κυρίας is the only adjective used.²² This situation is, however, not merely the result of an accident, since later inscriptions recording decrees of Magnesia abandon at the same time, it seems, both the distinctive adjective κυρία and the distinctive construction with the genitive absolute. Νομαία, however, is retained, but in the expression ἐν νομαίαι ἔκκλησίαι.²³ This change had been effected by 221/20.²⁴ Κυρία must therefore mean something different from νομαία, and if this is true for Magnesia on the Maeander then there is a good chance that it will also be true for Araxa. This means that ἔκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης cannot simply mean «a constitutional assembly» in these communities, since no other meaning is conceivable for the νομ- adjectives; and if it means something different at Magnesia and at Araxa, then it must surely also mean something different in the other Asia Minor communities – all situated in the immediate neighbourhood – where it occurs.

The immediate solution of the problem, however, seems to emerge from the material from Magnesia on the Maeander. All five third century texts from there which bear the genitive absolute construction with κυρίας all bear equally the addition ὑπὲρ ἑξακοσίων.²⁵ BUSOLT and SWOBODA recognised immediately that this number, «over 600», must be an indication that a quorum of 600 was required at Magnesia on the Maeander at this time for the recorded meetings of the *ekklesia*.²⁶

²¹ I. Magnesia Maeander 5.

²² I. Magnesia Maeander 4, 9, 10, 11. The formula is independent of the eponymous official used for dating, since it occurs both in documents dated by an eponymous prytanis (nos. 4 and 5) and those dated by the *stephanephoros* (nos. 9, 10, 11) – it is not known when precisely the change of eponymous magistrate took place. The phrase ἔκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης was not originally in use at Magnesia on the Maeander: No. 2, dated by the prytanis Apollophanes conferring proxeny and citizenship etc. on a Macedonian, also named Apollophanes, son of Lysanias, from Lete, does not have it. It must have been introduced subsequently, but still in the early third century. The decree of the Otorikondeis of Mylasa (n. 18 above) would, however, be a second example for a further definition of κυρίας if the phrase κατὰ τὰ πάτρια also qualified κυρίας.

²³ I. Magnesia Maeander 15, 89, 90, 98, 155.

²⁴ I. Magnesia Maeander 15, from this year.

²⁵ In two cases (nos. 4 and 10) with the spelling ἑξακοσίων.

²⁶ Griechische Staatskunde (as n. 4) 446 n. 3.

PH. GAUTHIER has recently studied this phenomenon at Magnesia and established a connection here between quorum and the expression *kyria*.²⁷ Unnoticed until now, however, is the fact that when the genitive absolute with *κυρίας* disappears, the quorum notice vanishes also. The successor formula *ἐν νομαίαι ἐκκλησίαι* never mentions the quorum number.²⁸ The most probable conclusion therefore is that at Magnesia on the Maeander the expression *ἐκκλησία κυρία* means that the *ekklesia* was valid precisely because the quorum had been reached, that the choice of *γενομένης* for the participle of the genitive absolute is intended to indicate explicitly that the quorum had been reached, had «come about». In this case the additional statement «over 600» would not be strictly necessary, but will represent merely a full restatement of the exact constitutional requirement expressed by *κυρίας*.

Apart from the extra notice «over 600», Magnesia on the Maeander uses exactly the same expression known from 19 other communities in southwestern Asia Minor.²⁹ Moreover, the evidence from other places is not only geographically proximate but also largely belongs to the same period. The conclusion seems inescapable that in all places where the genitive absolute in the prescript of decrees includes *κυρίας* the local constitution must have contained a hard and fixed quorum for valid meetings of the local *ekklesia*, though apart from Magnesia we are in no position even to guess how large this might have been.

If this conclusion is sound, an important question remaining is whether this quorum was general, applying to every meeting of an *ekklesia*, or (like at Athens, where there was no general quorum) the rules only applied to specific serious items of business such as grants of citizenship or other decisions about individual persons.³⁰ Since most decrees published on stone in the hellenistic period were honorary decrees relating to the actions of individual persons, the pre-selection of the epigraphic material makes this question difficult to decide, since the constitutional rules under which routine or short-term decisions were taken, which were not engraved for eternity on stone, are quite unknown. Despite the difficulty in principle of applying the Athenian regulation to other places – certainly for such a rule methodologically unacceptable – there are some instances among the inscrip-

²⁷ PH. GAUTHIER, *Quorum et participation civique dans les démocraties grecques*, in: C. NICOLET (ed.), *Du pouvoir dans l'antiquité: mots et réalités*, Genève 1990, 90: «Il existait donc, à Magnésie du Méandre, un quorum, fixé à 600, exigé en certaines circonstances pour que l'assemblée puisse valablement délibérer, être *kyria*.»

²⁸ GAUTHIER (as n.27) 42, assumes that the quorum of 600 was maintained also into the second century (although after I. Magnesia Maeander 11 it is never again explicitly mentioned), from which period some actual voting figures are however registered: 4678 in I. Magnesia 92 a, lines 15 and 16; 2113 in ib. 92 b, line 19; 3580 in ib. 94, line 14. The exclusive connection of the number 600 with the decrees containing the genitive absolute with *κυρίας* makes this assumption dubious.

²⁹ See appendix below for list.

³⁰ Discussion in GAUTHIER (as n.27) 77 f.

tions with ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης which suggest that the quorum rule in these communities in Asia Minor might indeed have been more general than simply for νόμοι ἐπ' ἀνδρί.

Honours which do not include πολιτεία, or entirely other matters, are recorded on some of the inscriptions which carry ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης. At Priene this is certainly the case;³¹ in the first texts from Mylasa the subject matter is general security, though the fate of individual conspirators is indeed a central feature;³² but at Amyzon financial matters are treated in such an assembly;³³ the Otorkondeis of Mylasa regulated their rules for letting public land under these conditions;³⁴ Telmessos decrees a general thanksgiving for a victory of Eumenes II in such an assembly.³⁵ These are not, it seems, subjects which on the whole would necessarily have required a quorum (of 6000) at Athens. Moreover, the fact that the precise rules expressed by the phrase ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης were dropped in nearly all the places using it during the third century, though many continued to pass decrees awarding *politeia*, for which, one might think – as at Athens and some other places – special rules concerning the quality of the assembly must have continued in force, means that if ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης merely expressed quorum rules, limited on the Athenian pattern to certain subjects, then we must assume that these were also abolished, which might not be impossible, but is hardly likely. At Magnesia on the Maeander we know for certain that other rules replaced the ἐκκλησία κυρία with its quorum of 600. At a later time on three recorded occasions votes were explicitly counted and the numbers recorded on the stones,³⁶ thus suggesting that the rules had changed, but that there still were certain rules governing the composition of a valid assembly, at least for the purpose of the recorded decrees. On balance, therefore, the evidence seems to point not to any limitation of subject for the rules governing the ἐκκλησία κυρία, but rather that the expression means «valid in the sense of a general quorum». The rules will therefore have most probably governed every meeting of an *ekklesia* in the communities which adopted them.

IV

This recognition has important consequences not only for the internal structure of the communities which used the quorum in the fourth and third centuries B.C., but also for the attitude of those who introduced it and for the way in which

³¹ I. Priene 4, 7.

³² I. Mylasa 1, 2.

³³ I. Amyzon (as n. 6), no. 3, 36.

³⁴ I. Mylasa 201.

³⁵ M. SEGRE, Riv. Fil. 60, 1932, 446.

³⁶ I. Magnesia Maeander 92 a, 92 b, 94.

they wished the democratically structured organs to function. It is clear that we are confronted here in this area at this time not merely with purely formalistic democratic structures. Those who created the rules for the quorum in these states were clearly interested in achieving at least a minimal representation of the citizens at the meetings held (only at Magnesia is a figure known, but even here it is mere guesswork to try to assess this quorum of 600, valid in the early third century, as a proportion of the – unknown – total citizen population of the time – a hundred years later it would have been a mere proportion of those actually voting;³⁷ but what this means for the third century is quite uncertain).

It is therefore clear that in principle the introduction of a general quorum tells us something about the attitude of the people who introduced it. The case of Priene, where we happen to know that the democratic structure was introduced as a result of Alexander the Great's deliberate policy, is a good example, since the Prieneans also made explicit their doubtless genuine pride at being autonomous again in the demonstrative notice which they placed in the prescripts of their earliest decrees, dating from the 330s and 320s, the first which they passed after regaining their autonomy: Πριηνέων αὐτονόμων ἑόντων.³⁸ This in itself has been noticed often enough, but it is more than a mere indication of date and civic pride. For in these decrees where the autonomy is proudly asserted, the assembly (which in Priene at this time was called σύλλογος) is also named κύριος in the now familiar genitive absolute: κυρίου συλλόγου γενομένου. Moreover, when the autonomy notice disappears from the inscriptions during the 320s, the Prieneans also stop calling their meetings κύριος.³⁹ The two things obviously belonged to-

³⁷ I. Magnesia Maeander 92 a, 92 b, 94, with numbers of 4678, 2113 and 3580 respectively. These high figures suggest that active citizenship – consisting of the right to participate in assemblies – had perhaps been newly defined and extended since the period of the quorum of 600. A natural increase of population of these dimensions seems less likely.

³⁸ I. Priene 2, 3, 4, 6, 7.

³⁹ Cf. n. 36. I. Priene 3 & 6 have the notice about the form of the meeting in the dative case with ἐν: ἐν κυρίῳ συλλόγῳ. This should justify the conclusion that a formula with ἐν, which also occurs elsewhere, could have the same substantive meaning as the genitive absolute (though it does not need to). In Asia Minor the formula with ἐν is, however, extremely rare. Only three examples are known, one from Mylasa (I. Mylasa 133) and two from Kios (I. Kios 1, 2). At Kios the formula is indeed only transmitted for I. Kios 2, and there correctly restored by the editor T. CORSTEN (though the translation «in der regelmäßigen Volksversammlung» will be incorrect); but the older publication of LE BAS – WADDINGTON (II p. 280, ad no. 1140) recognised the correct restoration of POCOCKE's sketch of no. 1, line 3. POCOCKE read ἸΑΗΣΙΑ here, and the restoration to ἐν κυρία ἐκκλησία must be right. The most recent editor, CORSTEN (in I. Kios), does not accept this and restores κυρία ἐκκλησία, without translating the phrase or justifying his departure from LE BAS – WADDINGTON. But as a nominative in the prescript the phrase is not known outside of Athens, and there the expression is always ἐκκλησία κυρία. He has therefore restored a hapax. It is thus best to return to LE BAS – WADDINGTON's restoration, and to assume that either POCOCKE or the stonemason, as so often, simply omitted the iota adscript. Both texts from Kios thus

ther. The Prieneans were thus just as proud of their democratic constitution as of their autonomy, and introduced the constitutional luxury of a quorum when freed from the Persians by Alexander. For reasons we can no longer discover it seems to have been dropped along with the assertion of autonomy under the satrapy of Antigonos Monophthalmos.

The use of a quorum was fairly widespread in southwestern Asia Minor in the later fourth and the third centuries B.C., in the second century it is hardly known. From several communities we have decrees, in some of which the quorum-formula is present, in others absent. In all cases the decrees without the quorum are later than those with it. The general trend is clear and indisputable, and I have already tried above to show that the change occurred between the third and second centuries at Magnesia on the Maeander and at Araxa. It is also explicitly traceable to this time at Amyzon and at Euromos; also for Mylasa and for the Phyle of the Otokondeis, which belongs to Mylasa, it is a very probable hypothesis that the change took place in mid- or late third century.

In Amyzon the change seems in some way to be connected with the conquest of the place by Antiochos III. All surviving prescripts from the late fourth and the third centuries contain the notice in the classic form with genitive absolute.⁴⁰ By 202/1, however, in a decree dated by the Seleucid era and by the regnal year of Antiochos III and his son Antiochos it has disappeared and does not occur again.⁴¹

have the same reading at this point. Cf. also I. Magnesia Maeander 15 et al.: ἐν νομαίαι ἐκκλησίαι, after abandoning the formula with the genitive absolute and κυρίας; I. Mylasa 103 line 5: ἐν ἐκκλησίαι.

The very fragmentary inscription I. Magnesia Maeander 1, which F. HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, I. Priene p. 6 ad no. 3, claimed for Priene because a σύλλογος, which is not otherwise known for Magnesia, is mentioned in it, would also require to have the autonomy notice restored, if HILLER were to be right, which in view of the structure of the text seems problematical.

⁴⁰ J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 20, 36. No. 36 is not dated securely by the ROBERTS, though they tend to place it in the second century and argue that the κατάστασις and the μεταβολαὶ τῶν καιρῶν mentioned there (lines 11–12) fit better into the time of Antiochos III or even of the Rhodian rule (p. 238). This might still be possible, but it would imply that alone of the inscriptions of the second century from Amyzon this text has the genitive absolute formula (cf. n. 39). It might therefore be better to place it in the period before the final conquest of the place by Antiochos III: μεταβολαὶ τῶν καιρῶν were indeed frequent enough in the area in the last years of the third century, and the only objective criterion, the form of the letters, does not provide a convincing argument against this. Moreover, a man with the same name as the speaker, Kleandros son of Dionysios, was Naopoiios under Ptolemaic rule (no. 6). The ROBERTS would like to explain him as a homonym; but another man, Apollonios son of Iatrokles, is also mentioned in the text who crops up in no. 17 as envoy to some royal functionary; and no. 17 was on the same block, but just above no. 14, the first text without the notice of the quorum. There does not therefore seem to be any good reason for not dating no. 36 into the last years before the conquest of Antiochos III.

⁴¹ Ibid. no. 14. It is certain that the notice was not present in nos. 15, 23, 28, 35, and very probably absent in nos. 19 and 22.

Euromos does not offer as much material in total as Amyzon, but the classic quorum-formula is found in two decrees from the earlier third century.⁴² In the second century it has disappeared.⁴³ Absolutely the earliest examples of the formula come from Mylasa, from the time of Maussollos.⁴⁴ Unfortunately no decrees dating from the third century have yet been found, but it is certain that the quorum-notice was not used in the second century,⁴⁵ which suggests a similar development to that noticed at neighbouring Euromos. Finally the Otokondeis: one decree dating from the third century carries the notice,⁴⁶ several from the second century and later do not have it.⁴⁷

This evidence suggests strongly that the later third century was a critical time for the functioning of popular assemblies in southwestern Asia Minor. The trend is too widespread to be explained merely on the assumption of a change in the recording techniques of the communities concerned. The dropping of the quorum notice from the inscribed decrees can only mean that the general quorum regulations themselves had fallen into disuse, which will doubtless have made the popular assemblies easier to control by those who had an interest in doing so. This observation will be a further confirmation of the long-term tendency of the time for the councils and elected officials gradually to achieve greater influence at the cost of the popular assemblies. There will doubtless have been local variations in the speed and the conditions under which the change took place, but the trend itself seems uncontroversial.

V

Local variations, which seem to vary from or even to contradict the general trend, will require explanation in terms of local conditions. Two examples from the territory of what eventually became Stratonikeia in Karia are particularly characteristic. The first concerns the Koroandis from the area of Lagina. From the first years after the death of Alexander the Great we have two honorary decrees issued by this community. The first dates from year one of Philip Arrhidaios,⁴⁸ the second from year six.⁴⁹ The first inscription pays no attention to the constitutional

⁴² R. M. ERRINGTON, *Inscripfen von Euromos*, *Ep. Anat.* 21, 1993, 15–19 nos. 1, 2.

⁴³ *ibid.* 28 f. no. 7.

⁴⁴ I. Mylasa 1, lines 2–4 and 44–5, cf. also I. Mylasa 886 (third century, from Olymos); L. ROBERT, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*, Paris 1945, 94 no. 73 (= S. HORNBLOWER, *Mausolus*, Oxford 1982, 365 M5) (the Πελέκωδος συγγενεῖς); I. Mylasa 911 (fourth century, from Chalketor).

⁴⁵ I. Mylasa 102.

⁴⁶ I. Mylasa 201.

⁴⁷ No less than six prescripts are preserved from the second and first centuries B. C. where it is certain that the notice was absent: I. Mylasa 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 116, cf. also 105.

⁴⁸ I. Stratonikeia 51.

⁴⁹ I. Stratonikeia 503.

character of the assembly, we read the simple ἔδοξεν Κοαρονδεῦσιν (line 4). In addition to the date given according to the first regnal year of Philip Arrhidaios, it is noted that Asandros was satrap. Five years later the prescript is much more sophisticated. In addition to the regnal year (year six) and the name of the satrap (still Asandros), the month is given, two local magistrates (ἄρχοντες) are named and immediately after the formula of decision (still in the simple form ἔδοξε Κοαρανζεῦσι)⁵⁰ we read: ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης σὺν τοῖς ἱεροκήρυξι. Whatever the formal function of the ἱεροκήρυκες within the constitutional structure of this community which now calls itself «polis» (line 9) may have been – in some way they will doubtless have represented the interests of the temple of Lagina – it is clear that in the five years intervening between the two decrees, i.e. between 323 and 318 B.C., a substantial formalisation of the constitution of the community had taken place, and that this was reflected in the much more informative prescript of the second decree. The change seems to have consisted of four things: 1) the introduction of the Macedonian calendar (the month named is Dios, line 2); 2) the institution of polis-type eponymous magistrates;⁵¹ 3) the structural participation of representatives of the temple of Lagina in decisions of the community; 4) the introduction of the quorum for decision-taking assemblies. Once again, therefore, we seem to have a case where, like Priene in 334, a Macedonian, this time a dynast (satrap!), seems to have actually created a form of polis democracy – here no doubt for the first time – which prescribed that a fixed minimum number of citizens participate in meetings of the assembly.

If the decrees of the Koarandeis show the introduction of the democratic quorum under the early Macedonian successors at a time when it is becoming quite well known from other places in the area as well (where however the persons responsible are not so easy to detect)⁵² the second example, from Panamara, shows a distinct development against the trend. More than one hundred years later, in 201/200, Philip V conquered parts of Karia including Panamara, which now was part of the Seleukid foundation Stratonikeia. Three prescripts of decrees survive from Panamara from this time. The first, a decree of the κοινὸν Παναμαρέων, honours king Philip for his attitude towards the temple. It bears no dating formula,

⁵⁰ The variation in the spelling of the name is doubtless merely an indication that the hellenisation of the tribe is still at an early stage of development: for further variations cf. W. BLÜMEL, I. Mylasa I, p. 9.

⁵¹ Both of these changes may, of course, theoretically have been earlier and merely omitted for some reason from the prescript of the first decree, since they are not constitutive for the legality of the decree. Nevertheless, since constitutional changes clearly were made in these years, it is perhaps not improbable that all the observed changes will have taken place at the same time under Asandros.

⁵² Evidence from the time of Philip Arrhidaios also from Amyzon (Amyzon [as n.6], no.2) and from Pladasa (SEG 40, 996); under Pleistarchos from Euromos (Ep. Anat. [as n.42], 16 no.1), cf. also Kildara (I. Mylasa 961), below 31 f.).

but the arguments of MAURICE HOLLEAUX make it extremely probable that it belongs to 201/200.⁵³ The second inscription is dated by the local *stephanephoros*,⁵⁴ but also by Philip's regnal year (the 23rd) and the Macedonian calendar (7th of Xandikos), which gives a date of spring 198 B.C. Again it is a decree honouring the king, this time together with his *epistates* Asklepiades, for his activities on behalf of the sanctuary after an earthquake.⁵⁵ The third decree has to be placed after the end of Macedonian rule, since it is dated by the Rhodian priest Archidamos and by the Rhodian calendar (in the month Dalios). This decree was originally in honour of the Rhodian *epistates*, whose name was subsequently deliberately erased, presumably after the end of Rhodian rule in Stratonikeia in 166 B.C.⁵⁶

The surprising thing about this group of Panamarean texts is that the latter pair, though both clearly written and passed while Panamara stood under foreign rule and at a time when many other places in the area had just abandoned their quorum rules, clearly carry the quorum phrase *ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης*. The first text, though severely damaged, does not appear to have room for it,⁵⁷ although at this time the *koinon*, apart from the limitation of its freedom resulting from its participation in the larger political structure of the polis Stratonikeia, does not seem to have been under direct foreign control. It seems that we must conclude that it was the Macedonian rule which brought the quorum (?back) to Panamara at this time, just as other places in the immediate neighbourhood – Euromos, perhaps Mylasa and Magnesia on the Maeander – had already given it up. Indeed, unless the *koinon* at Panamara had never had a quorum and was introducing one for the first time, it also had ceased to practice it by 201/200. In this case it will have conformed to the general trend until Philip's conquest. But there is no evidence either way for this detail.

The earlier instances we have observed seem to reflect a basic and perhaps genuine pride in democratic institutions – explicitly so at Priene – or an early phase in the introduction of them (as, e.g. with the Koroandeis and some other instances to be discussed below). Can we use the same interpretation model for these examples from the second century? There is reason to be sceptical about this when the content of the decrees is considered, since both are concerned with praising the ruling power and its local representative. Moreover in the case of the Rhodian *epistates* the *koinon* did not later wish to be reminded of its decision and had his

⁵³ I.Stratonikeia 3; cf. HOLLEAUX, *Études* IV 204 f.

⁵⁴ Apollo [τὸ τῶ]τον – here perhaps a particularly extreme sign of bad times, since the temple at Panamara belonged to Zeus.

⁵⁵ I.Stratonikeia 4.

⁵⁶ I.Stratonikeia 9. For the erasure cf. A. WILHELM, GGA 1900, 90f., who restored the name as Π[ο]λ[υ]κ[α]ρ[α]τ[ι]δ[α]ς [Δ]αλ[ι]όχου; cf. also HOLLEAUX, *Études* I 412. For the Rhodian loss of Stratonikeia in 166: Polyb. 30,19,3.

⁵⁷ HOLLEAUX' restoration (*Études* IV 204 f.) must be correct in principle, and it leaves no room for the phrase.

name erased. It seems therefore reasonable to consider the possibility that it was not the *koimon* in its democratic wisdom which introduced the quorum but the new ruling power Macedonia, perhaps with the explicit aim that the decrees passed in honour of the king would seem to the public reading them – perhaps at Panamara one should think particularly of the crowds attending the festivals of Zeus Panamareus – as if they had been passed in assemblies voting according to rules traditional in the area, but which, perhaps under Seleukid pressure, in other places had already been abandoned. The Rhodians, as direct successors of the Macedonians here would for the same reasons have the same interest in maintaining this state of affairs, where it already existed.

VI

There are four texts from Asia Minor dating from the fourth and third centuries where the genitive absolute with γενομένης occurs, but where the critical adjective κυρίας is absent.⁵⁸ The question arises, given the rarity of the case in a context where the adjective would normally be expected at this time, whether its absence is historically significant. Proceeding chronologically, the first inscription comes from Kildara and dates from the fourth century.⁵⁹ The text is characterised by its exceptional brevity and minimal indication of formal constitutionality:

ἔδοξε Κιλδαρεῦσιν ἐκκλησίας γενομένης· Ὑσσ[ωλλοι?]
 Σαμῶου εὐεργέτη γενομένωι Κιλδαρέων ἀπέ[λειαν]
 δοῦναι καὶ προεδρίαν καὶ ἔσαγωγήν καὶ ἔξαγωγήν]
 καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἀσυλῆι καὶ ἀσπονδεῖ καὶ αὐτῶι
 καὶ ἐκγόνοις καὶ Κιλδαρέας εἶναι ἂν θέ[λωσιν?]

Various features, which would normally be expected in such a text, are missing here: there is no dating formula; there is no reason given for the decree, which would normally be introduced by a clause with ἐπειδή; there is no instruction to

⁵⁸ A fifth text of this sort, though not from Asia Minor, is known from Kalindioia in the Chalkidike (SEG 35, 744) dating precisely to AD 1. Since both the geographical and the temporal contexts are far removed from those of the texts from southwestern Asia Minor another explanation of the phrase – doubtless a much simpler one – will be acceptable here. As in the other cases of a genitive construction in later Macedonia the adjective κύριος is unknown, and in each case the politarchs or some other magistrate seem to have played a part in summoning the assembly: this is explicitly so in the Battynaiian inscription (SEG 30, 568: ἐκκλησίας ἀγομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ Βαττυναίων πολετάρχου) and something similar is implied by the use of the phrase συναχθεῖσιν ἐκκλησίας in the gymnasiarchy law from Beroia (SEG 27, 261; see now PH. GAUTHIER and M. B. HATZOPOULOS, La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia, Athens 1993). At Kalindioia, as in these other Macedonian communities, the point of the genitive absolute seems thus to be to emphasise the fact alone that a popular assembly – however constituted – took place at all. In view of Macedonian history no small thing in itself.

⁵⁹ I. Mylasa 961 (text also in HORNBLLOWER, Mausolus [as n.42] 365 M6); cf. also L. ROBERT, Hellenica 8, 14 no. 11.

publish the decree; in line 4 the customary ἐν πολέμῳ seems to have fallen out; although the honorand does not come from Kildara – he and his children receive the offer of citizenship (lines 4–5) – the stone gives no indication of where exactly he does come from (though it is clear from his name that he was a Karian).

For decrees of this kind, which seem to ignore the democratic practice of extensive textual publication – certainly itself a form of self-advertisement for the communities concerned – there seem to be two possible explanations. The first would involve the assumption that at the time when this decree was passed Kildara was an «underdeveloped» polis, which had inadequate experience and ability in drafting such decrees in Greek: for this reason the odd brevity of the text. This explanation is, however, not very satisfactory. Kildara, as the decree itself shows, was not so far in the backwoods that it did not have a functioning tax system and a clearly defined citizenship which could be granted to foreigners. Moreover, many other texts from the area dating to this period or perhaps even earlier, show that this text is an exception in its severe brevity, and that in general it was well-enough known how such decrees should be drafted.⁶⁰

The second explanation therefore seems more appropriate, that the text has been deliberately abbreviated before publication. If so, the most likely reason for this would be if this were a private inscription set up by the man honoured, who was concerned about the privileges he had received and about their legality, but nothing else will have interested him sufficiently for it to be worthwhile spending money on having it engraved. If this is the explanation, then the possibility becomes real that, like the certainly merely careless omission of ἐν πολέμῳ in line 4, the constitutive word κυρίας could have been dropped from the prescript. Certainty is not to be achieved here, but the text offers enough other peculiarities to make a search for a possible alternative meaning of ἐκκλησίας γενομένης in Kildara at present seem fruitless. The probability that κυρίας was in the original text seems reasonably high, therefore that Kildara should be added to those communities which in their newly democratised constitutions after the Macedonian conquest in the fourth century practised a quorum for their popular assemblies.

The second text offers quite a different problem. It is the decree of the Neoteichitai and Kiddiokomitai from near Denizli dated to 268/7.⁶¹ This community was indeed not a polis, but the structure and form of the decree make it indistinguishable from a polis-decree.⁶² It is dated by the rulers, by the Seleukid era, by

⁶⁰ See the texts collected by HORNBLLOWER, *Mausolus* (as n.44), *Dossier of Inscriptions*. For the absence of a reasoning clause with ἐπειδή cf. e.g. the decree of the Koarandeis from 323 B.C. (I.Stratonikeia 501), which however has a full dating formula by the regnal year and the satrap (lines 1–3) and the publication instruction (lines 12–13). Otherwise cf. the «decree» of Maussollos and Artemisia, I.Labraunda 40).

⁶¹ M. WÖRRLE (as n. 12).

⁶² So WÖRRLE, *ib.* 84–5.

the Macedonian month and by the name of the ἐπιμελετής τοῦ τόπου. The other formal aspects of the text and its general structuring are satisfactory and reflect a respectable level of competence in drafting such documents.⁶³ The absence of the usual adjective κυρίας with ἐκκλησίας in the genitive absolute thus seems the more remarkable. The explanations suggested for the text from Kildara will not apply here, since it has certainly not been abbreviated, nor does it show any other serious formal faults. Possibilities therefore are: 1) the secretary or the mason simply forgot the critical word. Against this stands the fact that the stone, after being inscribed, has been carefully proofread and even trivial mistakes in the text corrected.⁶⁴ It therefore seems improbable that a whole important word could have slipped out of the prescript unnoticed. The second possibility will therefore have to be seriously considered, that the community of the Neoteichitai and Kiddiokomitai imitated indeed all the normal formal aspects of polis-decrees known from the area, including the phrase in the genitive absolute ἐκκλησίας γενομένης, but since no quorum was known, the adjective expressing this, κυρίας, had to be omitted.

The evidence from Xanthos offers a different picture again. Here four relevant dated documents are to be considered. In one form or another all have a genitive absolute with ἐκκλησίας. The first, dated to 260/59 by the regnal year of Ptolemy Philadelphos and Ptolemy «the son», and the Macedonian month Peritios, has between dating formula and verb of decision ἔδοξε the full formula ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης.⁶⁵ The second text, dated only four years later, in 256, has a prescript which in other respects is exactly parallel, except that the genitive absolute has no adjective, merely ἐκκλησίας γενομένης.⁶⁶ The third text, dating from 206/5 – Xanthos was still a Ptolemaic possession – also has the shortened formula;⁶⁷ but in the fourth text, ten years later again (196), after Xanthos had been taken over by Antiochos III, the adjective re-appears, but the participle has changed. We now have for the first and last time in Asia Minor the formula ἐκκλησίας οὐσης κυρίας.⁶⁸

Are these differences significant for historical change or are they merely an indication of the unreliability of the persons responsible for the inscription? The difference between the two inscriptions of the time of Ptolemy Philadelphos might seem to suggest *prima facie* the second solution, particularly since the second inscription, that without κυρίας from 256, is not in any case the original document but a copy engraved in the Roman imperial period, when attention to such forma-

⁶³ The secretary does run into some editorial difficulties (lines 24f.), but these occur in other texts also.

⁶⁴ Cf. even in the prescript, where the article with τόπου (line 4) and the second delta of Κίδδιοκομίταις had to be added; see also lines 16, 19, 21 for other corrections.

⁶⁵ J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) 126 no. 4A.

⁶⁶ TAM II 262.

⁶⁷ SEG 38, 1476 (ed. pr. J. BOUSQUET, REG 101, 1988, 12–53).

⁶⁸ J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) 154 no. 15B.

listic antiquarian details, one could think, might not have been too precise. This might indeed be the correct explanation, but the new find from 206/5 shows that *κυρίας* was certainly absent then. While the possibility that it is for the second time an accidental omission cannot be absolutely excluded, the chances seem better that a real change in the rules governing assemblies had taken place at Xanthos, since the general trend of the time in the area was in this direction. If this is correct, the time of the change here can be accurately dated, more accurately indeed than anywhere else, to the time between 260 and 256 B.C. A reason is currently not discernable.

The reappearance of *κυρίας* in the fourth inscription, more than sixty years after its disappearance, thus requires explanation. What seems reasonably clear, is that the change in the assembly rules will most probably have been contemporaneous with the change of ruler – a parallel for this would be the contemporaneous change introduced by Philip V at Panamara.⁶⁹ However, the phrase which the Xanthians use in 196, *ἐκκλησίας οὔσης κυρίας*, is unique and in the form used seems declamatory: the *ekklesia is kyria*, when compared with the earlier standard formula with *γενομένης*, which rather emphasises not the fact but the achievement of the quorum. The question thus arises, whether in this case the word *κυρίας* must still bear the same meaning as it did in the standard formula with *γενομένης*, or whether or not we do not here have a more declamatory general meaning with a sense adapted to the political circumstances of the time: perhaps the traditional meaning in political contexts known from Athens from the late fifth century onwards, of «sovereign», «competent»⁷⁰ should be considered, which could be used to emphasise the (claimed) difference from the *ἐκκλησία* under recent Ptolemaic rule, but expressed in a way which inevitably also brought reminiscences of the earlier «democratic» formula, which until 260 the city itself also had used.⁷¹

VII

Outside southwestern Asia Minor the standard formula occurs, as far as present knowledge reaches, only at one place, at Praisos in eastern Krete. The formula in two decrees dating from the third century is in its placing within the formula of decision precisely the same as the instances from Asia Minor.⁷² Modern accounts

⁶⁹ Cf. above, 29f.

⁷⁰ Some literary texts with this sense listed in ERRINGTON (as n.3) 144f.

⁷¹ J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n.6) 161 do not notice the difference: «la formule *ἐκκλησίας οὔσης κυρίας* continue celle que nous avons signalée ... pour les villes de Carie et de Lycie au IV^e siècle et au III^e.»

⁷² I.Cret. III, VI 9, 10. There exists another decree from Praisos (ibid. no.7), which M. GUARDUCCI, on the basis of letter forms, attributed to the early third century. This decree does not have the expression *ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης*. GUARDUCCI dates this decree before nos. 9 and 10 which have the phrase, but since these are in general much more care-

of ancient Krete have not recognised this and have always used the Athenian model as explanation. So M. MUTTLEESE: «Wie in Athen und in anderen griechischen Staaten wird auch hier zwischen ordentlichen und außerordentlichen Volksversammlungen unterschieden.»⁷³ Or H. VAN EFFENTERRE, who indeed interprets the phrase correctly enough as evidence for a functioning sovereign popular assembly, but where an explicit reference to MUTTLEESE betrays his own acceptance of the Athenian model.⁷⁴ But both the geography and the traditional relations with Karia, as well as the fact that the phrase has a different form and a different function at Athens, rules this explanation out. Indeed, the precisely parallel formulation suggests that this observation might be added to the other evidence for Kretan connections with Karia.⁷⁵

There is one further piece of evidence from Praisos, which seems to be a further indication of the correctness of an interpretation of ἐκκλησία κυρία there on the Asia Minor model. The third century treaty between Praisos and Hierapytna⁷⁶ lays down that when a citizen of one state wished to actualise his potential citizenship in the other, then a vote *ad personam* had to take place ἐν κυρο[ία] ἐκκλησι[α]ι, where more than two votes against served for rejection. Now even at Athens, where a general quorum did not exist, there was one (of 6000) for awards of citizenship (though the term κυρία was not used for this).⁷⁷ Since we here have a general case of a law affecting individuals and the assembly which deals with the question has to be explicitly κυρία,⁷⁸ then this usage seems a further indication that κυρία here must have the meaning «valid with a quorum reached».

fully executed than no. 7, to judge by the photographs in I. Cret., the relative age of the texts, as long as it can only be assessed on the letter-forms, will remain quite uncertain. It therefore seems possible to posit the development model known from Asia Minor, that when a democratic structure was first introduced, a quorum, which emphasised the importance of individual meetings, was also introduced, but after gaining experience of its practical functioning it was dropped.

⁷³ M. MUTTLEESE, *Zur Verfassungsgeschichte Kretas im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, Glückstadt-Hamburg 1925, 16.

⁷⁴ La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe, Paris 1948, 165, though his generalisation is unfounded: «Dans l'est même, c'est tout au début du III^e siècle que des expressions comme κυρία ἐκκλησία confirment la puissance souveraine de l'assemblée qui est un des traits caractéristiques du régime démocratique.» There remain only the two texts from Praisos to support this view! This sentence, including the unfounded generalisation, is translated into English (but without reference to VAN EFFENTERRE) by R. F. WILLETTS, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete*, London 1955, 172. His own explicit assumption of the Athenian model is shown by his reference to Ath. Pol. 43.4 (134).

⁷⁵ J. & L. ROBERT, *Amyzon* (as n. 6) 165 f., cf. ERRINGTON (as n. 42) 24 f. no. 5.

⁷⁶ Staatsverträge des Altertums III no. 554, lines 20 f. = I. Cret. III, IV 1.

⁷⁷ [Dem.] 59, 89–90.

⁷⁸ The terms of the treaty seem to imply that the decisive assembly was to be κυρία also at Hierapytna. If this impression is not merely a result of imprecise drafting, we shall have to assume similar rules there also, though they are not otherwise in evidence.

With Praisos we have exhausted the examples where the combination ἐκκλησία κυρία occurs in a prescript in a genitive absolute. There seems to be only one more instance where it occurs in a prescript at all, and that is in a severely damaged text from Thaumakoi in Achaia Phthiotica, but here in the form ἐν κυρίῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ.⁷⁹ The inscription seems to be unique and is totally without constitutional context. A certain interpretation is thus not reachable, and even assuming the restoration to be correct, some special local significance, which might conform neither to the Athenian nor to the Asia Minor model, cannot be ruled out.

Outside the prescript the Samians resident on Amorgos held a meeting around 100 B. C. which was called κυρία ἐκκλησία.⁸⁰ Certain payments had to be made in the month Kronion ἐν κυρίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. The probability is quite strong that something like the Athenian model will have to serve as explanation here, since it would be impossibly impractical to make the *receipt* of payments dependent on the assembly's reaching an arbitrary quorum, whereas a regular (perhaps monthly) «main meeting» would be entirely appropriate for registering such formal actions. Moreover, the inscription is almost a century later than the last occurrence of the prescript phrase ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης, from a time when those communities which had used a formal general quorum had already given it up long ago,⁸¹ whereas the Athenian practice continued for at least another century.

VIII

The historical results of this investigation are both complex and in part, at least, surprising. Certainly important is the establishment that the great mass of decrees with ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης belong to the earliest hellenistic period, before the end of the third century. With few exceptions they seem to belong to the earliest phase of the democratic constitutions of the states where the phrase occurs, at a time when the functioning of the *ekklesia* as a representative assembly of the whole citizen community clearly was in need of particular emphasis. At the same time characteristic for the mass of these decrees is that they were passed at a time when a satrap or king ruled over the community concerned. The earliest examples show the trend: in Mylasa under Maussollos a quorum was required,⁸² then at

⁷⁹ IG IX 2, 218 line 2.

⁸⁰ IG XII 7, 237 line 36 (Syll.³ 1047). Cf. also Kolophon, B. D. MERRITT, AJPh 39, 1935, 381–382, VII line 32.

⁸¹ The last firmly dated instance is from Telmessos: M. SEGREGRE, Riv. Fil. 60, 1932, 446 (from 184/3); approximately contemporary, and certainly before 166, is the inscription from Panamara I. Stratonikeia 9.

⁸² I. Mylasa 1 (Syll.³ 167). Under Maussollos the *ekklesia* of the whole community was still not sovereign, since the engraved decrees were confirmed before their publication by the assemblies of the three constitutive *phylai* (which presumably had a different – perhaps more conservative – structure). This record presumably means that this confirmation was compulsory.

Priene after the liberation by Alexander.⁸³ Then follow Amyzon, the Koroandeis and Pladasa under Philip Arrhidaios and Asandros,⁸⁴ Euromos under Pleistarchos.⁸⁵ A quorum, at least for particular purposes, was not indeed unknown in the area,⁸⁶ but the lack of epigraphical material under Persian rule puts the flourishing epigraphic harvest after its effective ending into a fresh perspective.

This sudden growth of the epigraphic habit in southwestern Asia Minor is intimately linked with the introduction of democratic structures, which received some local impulses (or, at least, tolerance) from Maussollos,⁸⁷ but more generally resulted from Alexander's instruction, issued at Ephesos in 334, that oligarchies were to be dismantled and democratic structures organised to replace them.⁸⁸ The aim was naturally political. The oligarchies had supported and been supported by the Persians, therefore the Macedonians – paradoxically, in view of their experience in Greece – had to rely in Asia Minor on those favouring democratic structures; and in order to bind large parts of the newly freed population to the freedom-bringer, the role of the citizen assembly within the community had to be demonstratively guaranteed. One way of achieving this was to introduce a general quorum, as already at Priene in 334. Successors, particularly it seems, Asandros, followed up Alexander's method in Karia after the king's death.

As to the reason why, from mid-third century onwards, but perhaps even earlier, the general quorum seems to have been gradually abolished again, we can only speculate. In some places a quorum will doubtless have been retained for specific exceptionally important purposes, as the evidence from Magnesia on the Maeander suggests, where at least in some cases in the second century the exact number of votes cast was registered,⁸⁹ which suggests that some form of quorum, though not necessarily set as low as the 600, which was prescribed for the general quorum in the early third century, was retained.⁹⁰ In other places all traces disappear.

This could have occurred for a range of reasons, which need not have been the same everywhere. It is conceivable that once the development phase of the hellenistic monarchies was completed, once the royal relationship with the cities was firmly established and once the pro-Persian rule of the oligarchies became far removed from the actual experience of the living population, that the necessity of binding so many citizens into decisions of the *ekklesia* was no longer felt to be

⁸³ I. Priene nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 cf. above 26f.

⁸⁴ J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) 97 no. 2 (Amyzon); I. Stratonikeia nos. 501, 503, cf. above 28f. (Koroandeis); SEG 40, 996 (Pladasa).

⁸⁵ ERRINGTON (as n. 42) 15f. no. 1.

⁸⁶ Cf. e.g. SEG 31, 985 lines 16–18 (Teos, fifth century).

⁸⁷ Cf. HORNBLOWER (as n. 44) esp. 67f.

⁸⁸ Arr. Anab. 1, 18, 2.

⁸⁹ I. Magnesia Maeander 92 a lines 15–16; 92 b line 19; 94 line 14.

⁹⁰ As assumed by PH. GAUTHIER (as n. 27) 97.

so great as to warrant the inconvenience of insisting on a general quorum. Perhaps it seemed more important that such meeting took place at all, even if enthusiasm were limited. This could explain why the evidence is concentrated into the consolidation phase, and is then replaced later by other constitutional rules. This would then also serve to explain why the general quorum was occasionally introduced (or re-introduced) when a change of hegemony took place at later periods, and once more a new structure based on new people – and in general, broader-based – had to be constructed, as at Panamara under Philip V⁹¹ and the Rhodians,⁹² or at Xanthos under Antiochos III.⁹³

If this interpretation is broadly acceptable, the general quorum appears as a characteristic of the consolidation phase of the hellenistic monarchies in southwestern Asia Minor and offers a new regionally limited insight into the relations between city and king, particularly in the early hellenistic period. It seems to be a development beginning under the semi-independent rule of Maussollos in Karia. This would indeed help to explain why the characteristic expression of this quorum through the prescript phrase ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης seems to be limited to Karia and adjacent areas. If this were so, it would show that the early Macedonian rulers in this area were all too happy to follow up and build on this essentially anti-Persian local precedent in order to present themselves in Asia Minor, as Alexander had begun to do openly in 334, as supporters of the democratic elements in the cities, while at the same time ensuring broad participation in the meetings and widespread responsibility for decisions taken in them. We have no reason to believe that this was not at first meant seriously.⁹⁴

Universität Marburg
Seminar für Alte Geschichte
Wilhelm-Röpke-Str. 6 C
35032 Marburg/Lahn

⁹¹ I. Stratonikeia 4, cf. above 29f.

⁹² I. Stratonikeia 9, cf. above 30f.

⁹³ J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n.6) 154 no.15B, cf. above 34.

⁹⁴ I wish to thank V. LOSEMANN, H.-U. WIEMER and M. WÖRRLE for constructive criticism of an earlier draft.

Appendix

All cases known to me (outside of Athens) for indications of the type of meeting shown by a genitive absolute construction with or without the use of κυρία, or by other constructions with κυρία, are listed here. Places outside of Asia Minor are shown in *italics*. All dates are B. C. unless specifically noted.

1. Ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης

Amyzon

J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) no. 2	321/20
Ibid. no. 3	273
Ibid. no. 4 (κ.ἔ.γ.)	Ptolemaic period
Ibid. no. 5	Ptolemy II
Ibid. no. 20	III/II century
Ibid. no. 36	III/II century

Araxa

Annuario 8–9, 1925–6, 313 no. 1	III century
---------------------------------	-------------

Chalketor

I. Mylasa 911	IV century
---------------	------------

Euromos

R. M. ERRINGTON, Ep. Anat. 21, 1993, 15 f. no. 1	Pleistarchos
Ibid. 18 f. no. 2	III century

Hippokome

TAM II 168	
------------	--

Hyllarima

Ist. Mitt. 25, 1975, 339	Pleistarchos
--------------------------	--------------

Koaranza

I. Stratonikeia 503	318
---------------------	-----

Lissa

TAM II 158 (κυρίας ἔ.γ.)	275
TAM II 159	272
TAM II 160 (κυρίας ἔ.γ.)	245

Magnesia on the Maeander

I. Magnesia 4	III century
Ibid. 5 (ἔ. νομαίας κυρίας γ.)	III century
Ibid. 9 (ἔ. κ. γ. ὑπὲρ ἑξακοσίων)	III century
Ibid. 10 (ἔ. κ. γ. ὑπὲρ ἑξακοσίων)	III century
Ibid. 11 (ἔ. κ. γ. ὑπὲρ ἑξακοσίων)	III century

Mylasa

I. Mylasa 1	367/6
I. Mylasa 2	361/0

Olymos		
I. Mylasa 866		III century
Otorkondeis (Mylasa)		
I. Mylasa 201		III century
Panamara		
I. Stratonikeia 9		II century
I. Stratonikeia 4		198
Pladasa		
SEG 40, 996		319/18
<i>Praisos</i>		
I. Cret. III,VI,9		III century
I. Cret. III,VI,10		III century
Priene		
I. Priene 2 (in Priene the <i>ekklesia</i> is called σύλλογος and the formula is κ.σ.γ)		334
I. Priene 4		before 327
I. Priene 7		after 330
Sinuri (Πελέκωδος συγγενεῖς)		
L. ROBERT, Sinuri no. 73		IV century
Telmessos		
M. WÖRRLE, Chiron 8, 1978, 201 f.		279
TAM II 1		240
L. ROBERT, Documents d'Asie Mineure méridionale 55		Ptolemy II
M. SEGRE, Riv.Fil. 60, 1932, 446		184/3
Termessos		
L. ROBERT, Documents d'Asie Mineure méridionale 53		278
Xanthos		
J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) no. 4A		260/59
2. ἐκκλησίαις γενομένης		
Kildara		
I. Mylasa 961		IV century
Neoteichitai & Kiddiokomitai		
M. WÖRRLE, Chiron 5, 1975, 59 f.		III century
Xanthos		
TAM II 262		256
SEG 38, 1476		206/5
Vgl. <i>Kierion</i> (<i>Thessaly</i>)		
IG IX 2, 259 (ἐ.γ.ἐννόμου)		
<i>Kalindoia</i> (<i>Macedonia</i>)		
SEG 35, 744 (γενομένης ἐ.)		1 A. D.

3. οὔσης

Araxa

SEG 18, 570 (ἐ. ἐννόμου οὔ.)

II century

Chyretiai

Arch. Eph. 1917, 10 no. 304 (ἐ. οὔ. ἐννόμου)

II century

Hypata

IG IX 2, 11 (ἐ. ἐννόμ[ου] —)

II century

Larisa

IG IX 2, 512 b (ἀγορᾶς ἐόνσας)

II century

Mopsion

IG IX 2, 1056 (ἀγορᾶς νομίμας ἐόνσας)

III century

Xanthos

J. & L. ROBERT, Amyzon (as n. 6) no. 15B (ἐ. οὔ. κ.)

196

4. Other formulae with genitive

Arkesine (Naxians)

IG XII 7, 50 (ἔννομον ἐ. ἀγώντων)

Beroia

SEG 27, 261 (συναχθείσης ἐ.)

II century

Orestis

SEG 30, 568 (ἐ. ἀγομένης)

II century A. D.

Thera

IG XII 3, 325 (ἀγομένης ἐ. ἐννόμου)

149 A. D.

Ibid. 326 (ἐ. ἀγ. ἐννόμου)

II century A. D.

5. Other formulae with κυρία

*Amorgos (Samians)*IG XII 7, 237 line 36: (καταβαλλέτω τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ
Κρονιῶνος ἐν κυρία ἐκκλησίαι)

II century?

*Byzantion*Milet I, 3. Das Delphinion, no. 153 (ἐγ κυρία ὑπὲρ
στεφάνου δικαστᾶι)

II century

Kios

I. Kios 2 (ἐν κυρία] ἐ).

IV century

Ibid. 1 (cf. n. 37 above).

IV century

*Kolophon*B. D. MERITT, AJPh 39, 1935, 381–382, VII line 32
(ἐν τῇ κ. ἐ.).

IV century

*Miletos*Syll.³ 683 line 45 (ἐ. συνήχθη κυρία)

ca. 140

Mylasa

I. Mylasa 133 (ἐν κυρί[αι ἐ.]

III/II century

Nasos

IG XII 2, 645B line 22 (very fragmentary: ἐ]γ κυ[ρία ἐκ[λησί]α)

Praisos (and Hieropytna)

I. Cret. III, IV 1, lines 20f. (ἐν κυρ[ία]ι ἐκκλησ[ία]ι)

III century

Priene

I. Priene 3 ([ἐν κυρίωι σ]υλλόγωι)

ca. 332

Ibid. 6 ([ἐν κ. συλ]λό[γ]ωι)

ca. 330

Thaumakoi

IG IX 2, 218 (ἐν κυρί]αι ἐ.)

II century