ΠΟΛΛΑΧΩΣ ΠΟΛΙΣ ΛΕΓΕΤΑΙ
(Arist. Pol. 1276a23)
The Copenhagen Inventory of *Poleis* and the *Lex Hafniensis de Civitate*[1]

Mogens Herman Hansen
(Respondent: Franz Georg Maier)

One of the main objectives of the Copenhagen Polis Centre is to build up an inventory of every single archaic and classical settlement which is explicitly called *polis* in contemporary sources. The main purpose of this investigation is to find out what the Greeks thought a *polis* was, and to compare that with what modern historians think a *polis* is.[2] The concept of *polis* found in the sources and in modern historiography ought, of course, to be the same. But that is far from always the case. Let me adduce just two examples. The orthodoxy is that the small Boiotian town Mykalessos was *not* a *polis*; it was rather a *kome*. This is indeed the term used by Strabo, whose classification is cited in, for example, *RE* s.v. Mykalessos, and again in the *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*.[3] What is passed over in silence in both these articles and in most other studies of the history of Boiotia is that Mykalessos is called a *polis* by Thucydides, not just once, but three times in a passage where he uses *polis* both in the urban and in the political sense of the word.[4] Similarly, it is commonly believed that a klerouchy was *not* a *polis*.[5] Nevertheless the Athenian klerouchies are repeatedly classified as being *poleis* both in literary texts and in inscriptions.[6]

Scores of other examples could be adduced but it would serve no purpose to list them here. In such cases the modern historian's reaction has normally been to admit that these settlements may well be *called poleis* in our sources, but then to imply or to state explicitly that they were not *poleis* in the true sense.[7] The curious result of such a policy is the view that our sources often apply the term *polis* to a settlement that, according to modern orthodoxy, was not a *polis*. We are faced with a *polis* that was *not* a *polis*.

The contradiction has its root in the fact that modern historians who write about ancient Greece like to use the term *polis* synonymously with the term city-state.[8] But city-state is a modern historical term which

seems to have been coined in the mid 19th century and first applied to the Roman republican concept of *civitas*,[9] from where it was rapidly transferred not only to studies of the Greek *polis*[10] but also to investigations of Italian city-states from ca. 1100 onwards,[11] of medieval German Reichsstädte, of Sumerian, Phoenician and Etruscan cities and of other city-state cultures as well.[12] Thus modern historical discussions of the concept of the city-state combine characteristics borrowed from many different cultures[13] and therefore the concept of city-state is not necessarily coextensive with the concept of *polis*. Mykalessos may well have been a *polis* in the eyes of the Greeks, although it is not a city-state in the eyes of a modern historian.

In order to avoid paradoxical statements of the type that a certain settlement though called a *polis* was not a *polis* I suggest that the two terms *polis* and city-state should be kept apart and not used indiscriminately. The term *polis* should be restricted to the Greeks' own understanding of what a *polis* was, whereas the term city-state should be used only when we discuss modern historical analyses of ancient Greek society.

Consequently, instead of saying that Mykalessos, though called a *polis*, was not a *polis* in the true sense, the historian ought to say that Mykalessos, though apparently a *polis* in the age of Thucydides, was not a city-state. In this form the statement makes sense. Whether it is historically true is a different matter. Whenever the city-state is discussed, independence or *autonomia* are singled out as the most important defining characteristics.[14] But a great number of communities called *polis* in our sources were *not* independent and did not enjoy *autonomia*.[15] Thus Mykalessos was a dependency of Tanagra;[16] the Greeks thought it was a *polis* but according to modern orthodoxy its lack of independence or *autonomia* indicates that it was not a city-state.

If we establish and acknowledge a distinction between the ancient concept of *polis* and the modern historical concept of city-state it follows that we can conduct two different investigations of ancient Greek society which may lead to different conclusions: if we study the city-state and apply the modern historians' understanding of what a city-state is, we get one picture of archaic and classical Hellas. If we go through the written sources and list all settlements that are actually called *poleis* in contemporary texts we investigate the ancient Greeks' understanding of their own settlement pattern and get a different picture.

It would be wrong to say that one of the two pictures is the right one and that the other is misleading; rather, the two pictures are complemen-

tary. It is always legitimate to contrast a culture's perception of itself with an outsider's more detached perception of the same culture.

At the Copenhagen Polis Centre we want to know how the Greeks perceived their own settlement pattern and therefore our investigation must be based, first of all, on a careful examination of the terminology used and the site-classifications found in our sources. In this type of study it is necessary to describe and define the ancient concept of the *polis* before we begin to compare it with the modern concept of the city-state.

So what do we do? In all literary and epigraphical sources of the archaic and classical periods we collect every attestation of the term *polis* in order to conduct two different investigations.

One of our tasks is to examine how the term *polis* is used whenever we meet it. Our sources tell us, for example, that a *polis* waged war, or made peace, or entered into an alliance, or struck coins, or passed a law, or a sentence, or founded a colony, or defrayed expenses, or repaired the walls, and we hear about the territory of a *polis,* or its roads and water supply, or its altars, or its protecting divinity.[17]

The other task is to examine every single attestation of the term *polis* referring to a named *polis* such as Korinth, or Melos, or Megalopolis.

In the first investigation we must analyse all the passages we have listed, no matter whether they concern a named *polis* or refer to a *polis* or the *polis* in general; and for this investigation a specific law passed by the *polis* Dreros is just as valuable a source as is a general reference in Aristotle that it is the *polis* which is responsible for passing laws.[18] Conducting the second investigation we must, of course, restrict ourselves to the attestations which contain an explicit reference to a named *polis* and ignore all the passages referring to the *polis* in general.

These two different investigations relate to a very simple, but very important distinction, acknowledged in linguistics and philosophy and applied in that branch of logic which is devoted to the definition and classification of concepts.

The meaning of a term is one thing; that which is denoted by a term because it has a certain meaning is another. In linguistics this distinction is sometimes referred to as the distinction between connotation and denotation; in modern logic the two terms used are the intension of a term (that is its meaning) and the extension of a term (that is the totality of objects to which the term refers).

Example: the *connotation* (or meaning) of the term "state" is something like "a geographically delimited segment of human society united

by common obedience to a single sovereign",[19] but the term "state" *denotes* any existing state, such as Greece, Denmark, Russia or Australia.

The *intension* of the term state is the sum total of all the proprieties that must be possessed by a community in order to be called a state; the *extension* of the term state is constituted by the total number of existing states.[20]

If we concentrate on the *connotation* or *intension* of a term we can determine its meaning by listing the essential characteristics which the term connotes, and then afterwards establish a list of the objects which fulfill the requirements of our definition.

If we concentrate on the *denotation* or *extension* of a term we shall do it the other way round: we begin by enumerating all the denotata, i.e. all objects to which the term is applied. Next, we look for the essential characteristics which these objects have in common, and finally we establish the meaning of the term by assembling the common characteristics we have found in order to build up a picture of the concept behind the term.

After this digression I will return to my topic and ask the question: what is a *polis*? Let me subdivide the main question into three questions: do we want to examine the term itself? or the concept behind the term? or the objects denoted by the term?

The term. An analysis of the term is principally a linguistic investigation and in a study of ancient Greek history it is relevant only in so far it can shed light on the meaning and uses of the term. By studying the etymology of the word *polis*, for example, we learn that it is related to Old Indian *púr*, Lithuanian *pilìs* and Latvian *pils* and that these three words originally meant stronghold.[21] Consequently the original meaning of *polis* must have been stronghold, and in this sense it may perhaps have been used about the fortified sites in Crete in the 10th century B.C. at, for example, Dreros and Anavlochos etc.[22]

The concept. A historian studies a term not for its own sake but in order to grasp the concept behind the term, to determine its essence, to find all the essential characteristics that go with it and transform these criteria into a description or even a definition of the concept. In doing all this the historian is faced with the problem that he has to apply modern terms and concepts in his description both of the ancient societies themselves and of the concepts used by the ancients themselves to describe them. Sometimes the historian prefers in his analysis to use modern terms, such as "state" or "settlement" or "town" or "village"; but sometimes the historian takes over an ancient term found in the sources and

uses it in transliterated form. As pointed out above, *polis* is precisely such a term and accordingly we cannot conduct our investigation of the term *polis* before we have decided whether we want to study the ancient concept of *polis* as found in our sources or the modern concept of *polis* as we meet it in the 19th and 20th century accounts of the history of ancient Greece, where the word *polis* is frequently used synonymously with the modern term city-state.

The objects. The third type of investigation is to focus on the denotata and analyse the communities or settlements referred to by the word *polis*. Such a study is not necessarily bound up with a study of the term itself to the same extent as is an investigation of the concept. It is a commonplace, but nevertheless true, that language is the medium in which concepts are expressed and words are the principal traces which ancient concepts have left behind for the modern historian to study. Symbols expressed in painting or sculpture or architecture etc. are important accessories, but to conduct an investigation of an ancient concept without focusing first on the words used to express it would be a nonsense.

On the other hand, the *objects* to which a term refers leave many other traces than the term itself. If we focus on the objects rather than on the concept, an examination of the terms used about the objects may be relegated to the background and that is in fact what has happened in recent studies of ancient Greek society. Inspired by the growing number of archaeological surveys of the Greek landscape the focus of interest has shifted from the written to the archaeological sources, and from the towns to the countryside. The result has been a rapidly increasing number of what can be called settlement pattern studies. Here the historian starts with the settlement pattern of a landscape, so far as it can be ascertained for macro-periods (archaic, classical, Hellenistic, Roman, late Roman), then the investigation is focused on the actual pattern of the social, economic and political structure of the landscape and its settlements, and only then does the historian start looking at the names given to the various types of settlement and the terms used to describe them.[23] In such an investigation it does not matter very much how the Greeks classified the different types of settlement, and what they themselves thought of their settlement pattern comes second to the study of the settlement pattern itself.[24]

Prominent examples of such an approach are John Fossey's studies of Boiotia, Lokris and Phokis. Or the Cherry-Davies-Mantzourani investigation of northern Keos. Or Carter's studies of Metapontion.[25] And a survey for the general reader, covering the whole of Hellas, is given by

Robin Osborne in his *Classical Landscape With Figures* (London 1987). In this study the settlements under discussion are called either "cities" or "towns" or "villages" (11). A discussion of the Greek terminology as applied to each individual settlement is eschewed. Admittedly, Osborne states in his preface that he will use the English term "city" synonymously with the Greek term "*polis*" in its political sense (ibid.). Nevertheless, he sometimes uses the term village about a settlement that, in a contemporary source, is unquestionably called a *polis* in the political sense.[26] Such inconsistencies, however, do not necessarily subtract from the value of his book, since the Greek terminology and the Greeks' understanding of their own environment are issues intentionally left out of consideration in this type of study.[27]

Although such investigations are extremely valuable in their own right they are not designed to answer the question: what is a *polis*? This is nevertheless still an important question although to some extent it seems to have become a neglected one. That is why we have set up the Copenhagen Polis Centre with the explicit aim of answering that question or at least to shed light on some important aspects of it.

First we collect all attestations of the term *polis* in archaic and classical sources in order to analyse and list how the term is used in every single case, i.e. that a *polis* wages war, or strikes coins, or passes a law, or has its walls repaired, or sets up a cult for a protecting divinity, etc.

After this first investigation which focuses on the intension of the term we move to the extension and try to build up an inventory of all attested *poleis*.

In our collection of all attestations of the term *polis* we now discard all the instances of the word *polis* being used in a general way without reference to any named *polis*, and in our second investigation we focus exclusively on attestations of the term *polis* being linked to a named locality such as Korinth, or Megalopolis, or Thasos, or Kyrene. Next, for every single locality that is called *polis* in a contemporary source we then attempt to have 45 other questions answered; cf. the specimen of the centre's data-base questionnaire: see Appendix IV on pages 55-62.

We start from the term itself as found in the written sources, but many of the entries can only be filled by adducing archaeological evidence. Did the *polis* in question possess an *agora* or a *bouleuterion* or a *prytaneion*? Do we know about victors in one of the Panhellenic games coming from this particular *polis*? Did it have a mint? Was its urban centre protected by a circuit of walls? Do we know about citizenship decrees

passed by the *polis*? Was the name of the *polis* used in personal names after the patronymic as a kind of city-ethnic, e.g. Korinthios or Thebaios, or is a citizen of this *polis* designated by e.g. a demotic instead of a city-ethnic? The 45 questions we ask have, of course, been generated by the first investigation in which we examined the various proprieties and activities typically connected with the concept of *polis*. When, for example, we ask for a *bouleuterion* it is because we know from our sources that a *boule* and its *bouleuterion* were a characteristic of a *polis* but not to be found in a *deme* or in a *kome*.[28]

Every attested *polis* is included in our inventory and classified as a *polis* type A. Next we collect information about locations which are *not* actually called *polis* in any contemporary source, but are known for a number of the activities we examined in our first investigation; for example, the community in question may have had an *agora* or a *bouleuterion* or a *prytaneion*; its citizens may have been known as victors in the Panhellenic games; or it possessed a mint. Its urban centre may have been protected by a circuit of walls, and a citizenship decree passed by the assembly may be preserved or referred to in a literary source.

If such a community shared a number of proprieties with the communities actually called *polis,* the presumption is that it was in fact considered a *polis* by the Greeks, and that it is only because of the fragmentary state of our sources that it is not attested directly as a *polis* in a contemporary inscription or piece of literature. If the community is called *polis* in Hellenistic or Roman sources, e.g. in Diodoros or Strabo or Pausanias, it is noted, especially if the reference is "retrospective".[29] All such communities are now added to our inventory, but classified as *poleis* type B and C. We choose between B and C according to how certain or uncertain we are that it is only due to lack of sources that the community in question is not actually recorded as a *polis* in archaic and classical sources.

Thus, our principal criterion for inclusion and classification is the requirement that a locality is called a *polis* in at least one contemporary source, that is in archaic and classical sources down to the death of Alexander the Great in 323. By adopting this method we are faced with a number of methodological problems: (a) to what extent was *polis* a loaded term and consequently subject to manipulation? (b) to what extent are our sources consistent in their terminology? (c) to what extent did the word *polis* denote the same concept in the 7th and again in the 4th century? (d) to what extent will the mass of Athenian evidence result in an inventory of *poleis* which reflects the idea of a *polis* in classical

Athens but obscures the complexity of the concept as used in the rest of the Greek world? (e) to what extent is our investigation thwarted by the fact that the word *polis* is used not just in one sense but has four different meanings?

(a)

To what extent was *polis* a loaded term? Did it matter to the ancient Greeks if they lived in a *polis* rather than in some other form of community? Was it something they took pride in? According to our sources it certainly was, and I shall adduce some passages to substantiate the point.

1. During the council of war before the battle of Salamis the Korinthian general Adeimantos tried to silence Themistokles by saying that he had no right to speak as long as he had no *patris* and was *apolis*. Now, Themistokles did not reply: "it is irrelevant whether or not we have a *patris* and a *polis*; what matters is that we have 200 ships." No, his answer was that Athens had an even better claim than Korinth to be labelled *polis* and *ge* (here echoing *patris*) as long as the Athenians had 200 ships.[30] This exchange of words is undoubtedly anecdotal, but it shows that Herodotos and his contemporary readers (or listeners) took the concept of the *polis* very seriously. It is worth noting that, a century and a half later, Lykourgos made the same point: by leaving Athens the Athenians had not left their *polis* but just moved it to Salamis.[31]

2. When Kyros had conquered the Ionian cities their representatives met at the Panionion to discuss whether they should put up with being Persian subjects or consider the alternatives. But, according to Herodotos, already before the Persian conquest the philosopher Thales had advised the Ionians to set up a common *bouleuterion* at Teos, and his proposal was concluded with the remark that the other *poleis* would be inhabited as before, but would change their status and become like demes.[32] The plan came to nothing, but the political status of a community – to be a *polis* or just to be a deme - was obviously a matter of considerable consequence.

3. The same idea is expressed by Isokrates in the *Panathenaikos* where he claims that the Spartans treated their perioikic communities so that in name they were *poleis* but in reality they had less self-government than demes.[33] Once again, it was desirable to be a *polis*, and there-

fore Isokrates comments on the universally accepted view that perioikic communities, a second rate sort of communities, were *poleis*.

4. Similarly, Thucydides tells us that when, in 431, many Athenians had to evacuate their houses and sanctuaries in the countryside and move into Athens they felt it "as if they were leaving their *polis*". What Thucydides wants to emphasize is the feelings an ordinary Athenian had towards his home, but the comparison he has chosen reveals the strong feelings a citizen must have possessed towards his *polis*.[34]

5. According to Thucydides the so-called synoikism of Attika in the age of Theseus consisted in the reduction of a number of *poleis* to local communities without a *bouleuterion* and a *prytaneion*.[35] Thucydides is emphatic in pointing out not just that all the other Attic communities lost their political institutions, but that one *polis* only was created by the reform.

6. In Xenophon's *Memorabilia polis* is singled out as one of the essential human concepts that are worth discussing and need a definition.[36]

7. Aristotle describes man as a *politikon zoon* and asserts that a person who is *apolis* is either subhuman or superhuman.[37] Other forms of community, such as the *oikia* or the *kome*, or the *ethnos,* are not as developed and valuable as the *polis* which is the perfect form of human society (1252a1-6, 1252b27-31). The ideal life which man is made for is the life of a citizen (*Pol.* 1288a38). *Ho politikos bios* is described as the life of a citizen who participates in the running of the political institutions of his *polis* (*Pol.* 1283b42-84a3). Similarly persons who do not participate in the *polis*, such as women, foreigners and slaves, are essentially secondrate. They live in the *polis* but they are not members of the *polis* (*Pol.* 1275a7-8, 1326a18-20). In his political philosophy Aristotle establishes a hierarchy within the human race, and only those who live in *poleis* and are members of a *polis*, typically adult male Hellenes, are capable of fulfilling man's purpose in life (1327b18-33).

8. Most Greeks believed that history of man had been a progress from bestiality to humanity and civilization, and in many accounts the formation of *poleis* was a decisive step towards civilization.[38]

To conclude; the concept of the *polis* mattered to the Greeks. They did not just live in *poleis*, they found it important to live in *poleis* rather than in some other form of political community. They were highly conscious about this, and that is one reason why the Greeks' use of the term *polis* is so important and well worth studying.

On the other hand, if living in a *polis* was something worth fighting

for, *polis* must have been a loaded term. Thus there is a risk that the use of the term was subject to manipulation and that the classification of a settlement as *polis* should not be taken at face value, but scrutinized as to when and by whom the classification was made. If this is the case it will affect our investigation of the concept and – more seriously – it may spoil the value of building up an inventory of all attested *poleis*. Let me illustrate this problem by a short digression about the modern concepts of democracy and state.

The meaning (or intension) of the term democracy is e.g. "a political system in which the whole people make the basic decisions on important matters of public policy",[39] whereas the reference (or extension) of the term comprises all democratically governed states.[40] But nowadays democracy has become a hurrah word and – apart from China, Iran, Nigeria and a few others – every nation claims to be a democracy. So an inventory including every state called a democracy will comprise more than one hundred states many of which do not fulfill the criteria included in the definition suggested above. To study the concept of democracy on the basis of a list of states called democracies would be grossly misleading.[41]

The meaning (or intension) of the term state is e.g. "a geographically delimited segment of human society united by common obedience to a single sovereign"; the corresponding reference (or extension) of the term comprises all states. Like democracy the word state is a loaded term, and it really matters to a people whether or not their country is recognized as a state, but, unlike democracy, there is very little disagreement about which countries to include in or exclude from a list of all states. There is no disagreement about the state-hood of the 185 members of the United Nations[42] plus Switzerland, and today the principal problems concern e.g. the former Jugoslavian republics of Bosnia and Macedonia and some other politically sore regions. Thus, a study of the extension of the term state and of the essential characteristics shared by all states will be a very valuable contribution to our understanding of the concept of state in our times.

Let us return to the term *polis*. Was it – like democracy – a hurrah word? or was it – like state – a loaded term, but not one which became a slogan to such an extent that it was constantly disputed whether or not a country was a state? Admittedly, the council of war before the battle of Salamis provides us with one such example: it testifies to a disagreement between the Korinthian and the Athenian generals as to whether Athens was a *polis* or not. There may have been other similar cases.

Suppose, for example, that the inhabitants of a small town insisted on being recognized as a *polis* but were dominated by a strong neighbouring town whose inhabitants would deny that the small dependent town was a *polis*. Let me adduce some possible instances to illustrate the problem.

In the classical period the small fortified town Aigosthena in northern Megaris was a dependency of the *polis* Megara, and in a Megarian decree of ca. 300 B.C. it is classified as a *kome*. But it is apparently referred to as a *polis* by Skylax, writing in the first half of the 4th cent.[43] Furthermore, in ca. 240 it became a member of the Boiotian federation and in a decree passed ca. 200 Aigosthena is explicitly called a *polis*.[44] We may reject the classification found in Skylax and hold that, in ca. 240 B.C., Aigosthena changed its status from being a *kome* in Megaris into being a member state of the Boiotian federation, i.e. a *polis*. But we cannot rule out the possibility that the Aigosthenitai had always claimed that they lived in a *polis* whereas the Megarians would only grant them the status of being a *kome*.

A somewhat similar problem may lie behind some of the entries in the Athenian Tribute Lists and in the list of Allies appended to the so-called Charter of the Second Athenian Naval Confederacy.[45] Let me adduce just one example: among the members of the Second Naval Confederacy is recorded Ζακυνθίων ὁ δῆμος ὁ ἐν Νήλλωι.[46] A comparison with the literary sources indicate that the *demos* in question was a rebellious faction of exiled democrats who had established themselves in a stronghold called Arkadia, probably to be identified with Nellos. Both Xenophon (*Hell.* 6.2.2-3) and Diodoros (15.45.4) contrast the exiled democrats with οἱ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ζακύνθιοι, indicating that the position held by the exiled democrats was *not* a *polis*. But the exiles in Nellos are included in the list of allied *poleis* appended to the decree proposed and carried by Aristoteles of Marathon. Now, from the use of the term *polis* in the heading of the list of allies we cannot infer that all the communities subsumed were actually *poleis* in the sense of being political communities of citizens. Nevertheless we cannot preclude the possibility that the Athenians and the exiled democrats themselves would claim that the stronghold on Zakynthos was a *polis*.[47]

On the other hand, it is worth noting that the exchange of words between Themistokles and Adeimantos is the only unquestionable example of a community whose status as a *polis* is claimed by one person but denied by another. Admittedly, there are more possible examples like the two I have cited, but, on the whole, there is a remarkable agree-

ment in our sources about whether or not a community was a *polis*. The perioikic communities in Lakedaimon, for example, are unanimously referred to as being *poleis*.[48] One suspects that the Spartans might have tried to deny them the status of *polis*, especially after the King's Peace of 386 B.C.,[49] but among the sources that classify the perioikic communities as *poleis* is Xenophon who had no axe to grind with the Spartans and, in my opinion, his use of the term guarantees that the Greeks were unanimous in their classification of the perioikic communities as dependent *poleis*, i.e. as *poleis* without *autonomia*.

To conclude: in our sources there is a remarkable agreement and very little disagreement about which communities were *poleis*, and the inference is that, like the word state but unlike the word democracy, the word *polis* did not become a slogan and its application to named communities seems only very occasionally to have been a bone of contention. Admittedly, there were no "international criteria" – like e.g. membership of the UN – by which it was formally decided whether a given political community was a *polis* or not. Yet, the rules for participation in the Panhellenic festivals, principally the Olympic Games, may have served as a yardstick not too far removed from some modern international agreements about statehood. A competitor had to be "the legitimate son of free Greek Parents" and "officially registered on the citizen roster of his native city".[50] I suspect that far from all *poleis* had rosters of citizens, but our sources show that every victor was proclaimed as a citizen of a named *polis* as well as in his own right. Thus, in cases of doubt the *hellanodikai* must have made a decision about the *polis* status of the community with which a competitor claimed to be affiliated.

(b)

Next, are the sources consistent in the way they use the term *polis*? Many historians are sceptical, and as an example I will quote Peter Rhodes' reaction to the way the Copenhagen Polis Centre has constructed its inventory of *poleis*: "I suspect we shall find that the Greeks themselves were not wholly consistent in their use of the word. They did not have the advantages of being able to use Liddell and Scott or Ibycus; and I ought to add here that they could not benefit from the researches of the Copenhagen Polis Centre: that is, they were often not as tidy and systematic in their use of their language as a tidy and systematic scholar would wish, and the principle that any political entity which a Greek is

known to have called a *polis* must have been a *polis* may not be a useful principle on which to base our research."[51]

This apparently cautious approach may land modern historians in a different pitfall: whenever a site-classification found in the sources does not fit their understanding of what a *polis* ought to be, they are inclined to dismiss the source as untrustworthy. Let me quote the judicious comment stated by Edmond Lévy: "Les modernes savent – ou croient savoir – mieux que les Anciens ce qu'est une cité, ce qui leur permet de reprocher à Hérodote d'appeler indûment telle localité une *polis*, d'affirmer que telle *polis* n'ést pas une vraie *polis* ou de traduire à l'occasion, quand le texte grec ne correspond pas oux conceptions modernes, *polis* par "petite cité", "bourgade" ou établissement".[52] Like Lévy I have always suspected that the ancient Greeks were more consistent in their use of the term *polis* than many modern historians believe – they were as consistent, I think, as modern Europeans are in their use of e.g. the term "state", see *supra* page 16. No great dictionary or computer concordance is required to use a term with reasonable precision. Most educated persons may not know all the problems concerning how to define a state, but they nevertheless apply the term to named countries with very few mistakes, and I can report that a collection of the use of the term *polis* in archaic and classical sources seems to confirm my suspicion.[53]

Now, first we must make sure what we mean by "inconsistency". In this context I take it to be an "inconsistency" if a named locality is described with mutually exclusive terms; whereas to describe a locality with two different terms that can be used synonymously is not an inconsistency. Let me adduce just two examples: if Skylax in his *periplous* had classified Eleusis as a *polis*, as some scholars believe,[54] it would have been a flagrant inconsistency, since Eleusis was incontestably a *demos* and since, in classical Attika, *demos* and *polis* are mutually exlusive terms.[55] On the other hand, to call a place *polis* in one passage but *chorion* in another one is not an inconsistency, since *chorion* is a vague term that could be used about any type of settlement.[56] Similarly the term *polisma* is often used synonymously with the term *polis* in its urban sense, which should cause no surprise.[57]

Following these guide-lines we in the Polis Centre plan to examine all archaic and classical sources and look out for two different types of inconsistency: (a) one author (or text) applies different and incompatible site-classifications to the same locality; (b) different authors apply dif-

ferent and incompatible site-classifications to the same locality. We have
not yet completed our investigation, but so far we have found very few
inconsistencies, and in some of these cases it can be debated whether
there is an inconsistency at all. Let me adduce just one example of each
type. (a) In Herodotos Anthele and Alpenos are both classified both as
poleis and as *komai*, see *infra* page 41. (b) When referred to at large the
perioikic communities in Lakonia are called *poleis* in all our sources;[58]
some of the named perioikic cities are called *poleis*, e.g. Anthene and
Thyrea,[59] but others are called *komai*, e.g. Oion, Tyros and Belbina.[60]

Conversely, the sources testify to a considerable degree of consisten-
cy. It is no wonder that all sources refer to e.g. Athens, Megara, Plataiai
and Naupaktos as being *poleis*. But it is worth noting that the consisten-
cy applies to many small settlements as well. There seems, for example,
to have been six urban communities on the Athos peninsula (including
Sane). They are called *poleis* by both Herodotos and Thucydides. One is
called a *polis* in the Peace of Nikias, five are listed in Skylax's *Peri-
plous*, and five turn up in the Athenian Tribute Lists.[61]

The conclusion of the investigations we have conducted so far is that
there is no support for the view that the Greeks were inconsistent in their
use of the term *polis*. They may not have been *wholly* consistent, but the
margin of error seems to be in the range of one per hundred or less. Nor
are modern Europeans *wholly* consistent in the way they use the term
"state".

(c)

Our investigation covers the period ca. 600 – 323 B.C., but this span of
almost three hundred years forces us to address the question whether the
concept of *polis* was transformed to such an extent that we ought to split
it up into a number of successive concepts rather than perceiving it as,
essentially, one concept which, of course, underwent some changes in
the course of the period. This question requires a thorough treatment,
but, provisionally, a comparison between Aristotle's *Politics* and some
archaic texts are offered here in support of my conviction that the con-
cept of *polis* had a core that persisted unchanged throughout the period
in question.

In the *Politics* Aristotle defines a *polis* both as a town created by the
synoikism of a number of *komai* (Book 1) and as a community of citi-
zens around their political institutions (a κοινωνία πολιτῶν πολιτείας)

(Book 3).[62] His two definitions match the two different senses of the word *polis*. Defining the *polis* as a town composed of *komai* which again are composed of *oikiai* he takes all the inhabitants, including women, children and slaves, to be members of the *polis*. When defining the *polis* as a political community he emphasizes that the *politai* are the adult male citizens to the exclusion of foreigners, women, children and slaves.

That Aristotle's view of the *polis* is essentially in agreement with views held ca. 600 B.C. is apparent, e.g., from the following five passages.

Alkaios fr. 426, Lobel & Page: τὸν λόγον ὃν πάλαι μὲν Ἀλκαῖος ὁ ποιητὴς εἶπεν .. ὡς ἄρα οὐ λίθοι οὐδὲ ξύλα οὐδὲ τέχνη τεκτόνων αἱ πόλεις εἶεν ἀλλ' ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ὦσιν ἄνδρες αὑτοὺς σῴζειν εἰδότες ἐνταῦθα καὶ τείχη καὶ πόλεις.

Alkaios fr. 130.17-23, Lobel and Page: ζώω μοῖραν ἔχων ἀγροϊωτίκαν / ἰμέρρων ἀγόρας ἄκουσαι / καρυ[ζο]μένας ὠγεσιλαΐδα / καὶ β[ό]λλας. τὰ πάτηρ καὶ πάτερος πάτηρ / κα....ηρας ἔχοντες πεδὰ τωνδέων / τὼν [ἀ]λλαλοκάκων πολίταν / ἔ ... [ἀ]πὺ τούτων ἀπελήλαμαι ...

Tyrtaios fr. 12.27-8, West: τὸν δ' ὀλοφύρονται μὲν ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες,/ ἀργαλέῳ δὲ πόθῳ πᾶσα κέκηδε πόλις.

IC IV 13 (Law from Gortyn, ca. 600 BV.C.): ... Ϝαστίαν δίκαν ἐν τᾶι ἀγορᾶι καὶ ἀδίκα .... αἰρεθῆι τοῖ κσενοδόϙοι ...

M&L 2.1-2 (Law from Dreros, ca. 600 B.C.): ἆδ' ἔϜαδε πόλι.

Alkaios argues that a *polis* is not just a town but a community. The personal sense of the word is emphasized at the expense of the urban sense, but the antithetical way of expressing his view reveals that others might prefer to describe a *polis* as a city in the urban sense of the term. So, as far back as our written sources go, the word *polis* is used to designate both a community of human beings and its physical setting, i.e. an urban centre and its hinterland. Next, the contemporary law from Dreros demonstrates that the persons who make up the *polis* act as a political community. Here the *polis* in the sense of community is identified with its *politai*. In the other Alkaios fragment the *politai* are described as some who participate in the meetings of the assembly (ἀγορά) and the council (βόλλα); and finally the fragmentary law from Gortyn testifies to an opposition between citizens (*astoi*) and foreigners (*xenoi*) and shows that the citizens form a (small) privileged group different from and smaller

than the inhabitants of the *polis* in the sense of a city with its hinter-land.[63] On the other hand, when Tyrtaios uses *polis* in its personal sense and speaks of how the whole *polis* mourns for a brave soldier killed in battle, women and children are undoubtedly included among those who constitute the *polis*.[64] Thus the essential elements in the concept of *polis* found in the late classical period are all present around 600 B.C. Aristo-tle can have had no difficulty agreeing with the archaic texts quoted above, and if Alkaios had had an opportunity to read Aristotle's *Politics* he would have appreciated the philosopher's descriptions of the *polis* in Books 1 and 3. How widespread this concept of *polis* was in ca. 600 B.C., and how many *poleis* there were in Alkaios' day are different questions not to be addressed here.

During the period ca. 600 – 323 B.C. the *polis* as an urban centre must have changed as much or perhaps even more than the *polis* as a commu-nity, and in the late 4th century towns like Athens, Eretria, Korinth and Syracuse were certainly very different from what they had been in the early 6th century. Yet, the concept of *polis* in the sense of town is al-ready apparent at the beginning of our period. The fragment of Alkaios quoted above shows, *e contrario*, that many would take a circuit of walls to be an essential element of a *polis*, and this impression is corroborated by what we learn from the Iliad and the Odyssey. The Homeric *polis*[65] has broad streets[66] and is enclosed with steep walls[67] and beautiful tow-ers.[68] Inside the city there is an assembly place,[69] and sanctuaries,[70] in which (sometimes) temples are erected.[71] We do not hear much about houses,[72] but the Homeric *polis* includes one or more mansions, which in some cases are so magnificent that the traditional designation of them as palaces seems well deserved.[73]

I do not intend here to reopen the debate about the eighth-century date of the so-called Homeric society but it is in any case indisputable that in the sixth century the Homeric poems were recited throughout the Greek world and formed an important part of a Greek's intellectual back-ground. Thus, although there can be no doubt that around 600 B.C. very few urban centres in Hellas had walls[74] and monumental buildings (apart from temples),[75] nevertheless our written sources show that the circuit of walls, the agora and the shrines of the gods were already associated with the concept of the *polis*. When we move down to the classical period the grid-plan, the terrace houses, the public political architecure and the larger size of many urban centres were very important accessories to the *polis* in the sense of town, but even in the 4th century most small *poleis*, as e.g. Koresia on Keos, Akraiphia in Boiotia or Alipheira in Arkadia,

cannot have been much different from what larger *poleis* such as Eretria or Argos had been like in the sixth century.

(d)

Not only chronological but also regional variations must be taken into account. One might suspect that the concept of *polis* in Athens was different from what people thought a *polis* was in Mantineia, or in Pantikapaion, or in Telmessos, or in Kyrene, etc. Consequently, since our investigation starts from the term *polis* as found in the written sources and since the bulk of our texts are Athenian we must beware of the risk that our inventory of *poleis* will reflect the idea of the *polis* in classical Athens and obscure the complexity of the concept as used in the rest of the Greek world. Let me adduce two examples. Most of our information about the number and identity of Greek *poleis* in the last third of the fifth century comes from Thucydides and from the Athenian Tribute Lists. But Thucycides, though in exile, was an Athenian citizen, and the tribute lists must reflect the official Athenian view of the members of the Delian League.[76] Furthermore, the most important general discussions of the concept of *polis* are found in Plato's dialogues and in Aristotle's political treatises. Plato was an Athenian citizen, and Aristotle, though born in Stageiros in Thrace, spent most of his adult life in Athens.

The only way of testing whether an investigation of the concept of *polis* based on all sources will be biassed by being too Atheno-centric is first to distinguish between Athenian and non-Athenian sources, and then to compare the concept of *polis* in the Athenian sources with what we find in all the non-Athenian authors and documents. A preliminary investigation points to a remarkable degree of agreement between the Athenian view of the *polis* and what we know about the concept of the *polis* in the rest of the Greek world.

Let me adduce four examples.

1. Apart from Thucydides, our principal source for the meaning and uses of the term *polis* in the fifth century is Herodotos, and he was *not* an Athenian but a Halicarnassian who probably spent the last two decades of his life in Thourioi. If we focus on the intension of the term *polis* we note, for example, that Herodotos and Thucydides both take a *bouleuterion* to be *the* public building which constitutes a *polis* in the sense of a self-governing community.[77] And if we examine the extension of the term *polis* we can compare the two historians' classification of the

Greek settlements from Argilos west of the river Strymon and to Potei-
daia on Pallene. Herodotos lists the *poleis* in this region in Book 7 in
connection with Xerxes' march through Thrace. Thucydides treats the
same region in Book 4 in his description of Brasidas' campagn in 424-
22 and a number of the communities are mentioned again in the Peace of
Nikias. A comparison between the settlements called *polis* by either au-
thor reveals a remarkable agreement and there is no detectable disagree-
ment. In the list presented here the references in brackets are to instances
of the settlement in question being called a *polis*.

> Aige (Hdt. 7.123.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Akanthos (Hdt. 7.115.2; Thuc. 4.85.6; 5.18.6)
> Akrothoon (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3)
> Aphytis (Hdt. 7.123.1) – Thuc. 1.64.2 without site-classification
> Argilos (Hdt. 7.115.1; Thuc. 4.103.4)
> Assa (Hdt.7.122.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Dion (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3)
> Gale[psos] (Hdt.7.122.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Kleonai (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3)
> Mekyberna (Hdt.7.122.1; Thuc. 5.18.6)
> Mende (Hdt. 7.123.1; Thuc. 4.123.1)
> Neapolis (Hdt. 7.123.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Olophyxos (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3)
> Olynthos (Hdt.7.122.1; Thuc. 1.58.2; 5.18.6)
> Piloros (Hdt.7.122.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Poteideia (Hdt. 7.123.1; Thuc. 1.62.1)
> Sane (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3; 5.18.6)
> Sane (Hdt. 7.123.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Sarte (Hdt.7.122.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Sermyle (Hdt.7.122.1; Thuc. 1.65.2)
> Singos (Hdt.7.122.1; Thuc. 5.18.6)
> Skione (Hdt. 7.123.1; Thuc. 4.120.1)
> Stageiros (Hdt. 7.115.2; Thuc. 5.18.5)
> Therambos (Hdt. 7.123.1) – not mentioned by Thuc.
> Thyssos (Hdt. 7.22.3; Thuc. 4.109.3)
> Torone (Hdt.7.122.1; Thuc. 4.110.2)

2. In his book *How to Survive Under Siege* Aineias the Tactician treats
the *polis* both as a (walled) urban centre and as a political community
which has to make decisions about its defence. His views of the *polis* are

so varied and illuminating that they have inspired a historian to write an article entitled: "Polisbegriff und Stasistheorie des Aeneas Tacticus."[78] Who Aineias was is still in dispute but the prevailing opinion – to which I subscribe – is that he was Aineias of Stymphalos, general of the Arkadians in the 360s.[79] Thus he provides us with another non-Athenian view of the *polis*, but nevertheless one which is indistinguishable from what we would have got if a similar investigation of the concept of *polis* had been based on Thucydides, Xenophon and Demosthenes.

3. As stated above, the 45 questions we ask concerning every community called *polis* in a contemporary source have been generated by our investigation of how the term *polis* is used in all sources: a *polis* struck coins, passed laws, was protected physically by its walls and spiritually by its protecting divinity, etc. The references given above in note 17 are all from Athenian sources. But in every single case non-Athenian sources can be adduced to show that the activity or characteristic in question was an element in the concept of the *polis*.[80]

4. In the *Politics* Aristotle adduces some 270 historical examples to illustrate and exemplify his analysis of the *polis*. Only some 30 of his historical examples concern Athens whereas the ca. 240 other examples are drawn from a wide range of *poleis*, e.g. Lakedaimon, Syracuse, Kyrene plus some 80 other *poleis*. The impression one gets from reading the empirical part of the treatise, viz. Books 3-6, is that the work is far from being Atheno-centric. It may, of course, be objected that Aristotle is interpreting all the other *poleis* and their constitutions in the light of the Athenian constitution, but as far as we can check them Aristotle's generalisations about the *polis* seem to be based on the non-Athenian much more than on the Athenian examples.

To conclude: our non-Athenian sources are so numerous and varied that with due caution it seems perfectly possible to counteract any tendency to draw a too Atheno-centric picture of the *polis*. Furthermore, a comparison between Athenian and non-Athenian sources indicates that an Athenian's idea of a *polis* cannot have been radically different from what an Arkadian or a Milesian or a Syracusan thought a *polis* was. Quite the contrary.

(e)

The most serious problem we have to face is that the term *polis* has more than one meaning. In fact, it seems to have had four, since it is found in

the senses of (1) stronghold (2) town (3) country and (4) state. When used synonymously with *akropolis* the term *polis* denotes a stronghold and/or a small hill-top settlement.[81] When used synonymously with *asty* the term *polis* denotes an urban centre.[82] When used synonymously with *ge* or *chora* the term *polis* denotes the totality of town plus hinterland,[83] and when used synonymously with a *koinonia* or a *plethos politon* the term *polis* denotes what we today call a city-state.[84]

Now, recording every single attestation of the word *polis* found in archaic and classical documents and literature must, accordingly, result in an inventory of *poleis* which comprises not only city-states, but also strongholds, towns, and countries. Under such circumstances an inventory of all localities called *polis* is apparently doomed to be a hotchpotch of settlements and of no value whatsoever. In the Polis Centre, however, we think that this problem is much less threatening than it appears, and this optimistic view is based on the following observations:

Let me first mention the relative frequency with which the four different senses occur. In archaic and classical authors and inscriptions attestations of *polis* in the sense of stronghold amount to *less* than one per hundred of all attestations, and attestations of *polis* where country is the principal sense or a secondary meaning that goes with the sense of town and/or state amount to less than two per hundred only. In the remaining ca. 98 per cent of the attestations *polis* is used either in the sense of town or in the sense of (city)-state, or the two senses are combined and indistinguishable. Again, in some authors, such as Herodotos and Aineias the Tactician, the urban sense is much more common than the political, whereas in Thucydides and Xenophon the sense of political community is about twice as common as the sense of urban centre. In inscriptions the political sense dominates and there are few attestations only of *polis* in the sense of town.

Next a brief discussion of the different meanings:

(a) *Polis* used synonymously with *akropolis* in the sense of stronghold is not only extremely rare, it is also confined to fixed formulas almost exclusively found in public documents, such as the provision that a certain document be inscribed and set up on the *polis*, that is on the *akropolis*, for everybody to inspect.[85] Consequently it is easy to spot and identify the very few attestations of a locality being called *polis* in the sense of stronghold or small hill-top settlement, and even if we include such sources for the sake of completeness, we shall find only a handful of lo-

calities which are called *polis* in the sense of *akropolis* without being a *polis* in the political sense. One such example is the Attic deme Erchia, whose sacrificial calendar has several references to the *polis*, that is the *akropolis* of the deme, to be distinguished from the *polis* of the *asty*, that is the *akropolis* of all Athenians in Athens.[86]

(b) In a number of passages "country" or "territory" is either the principal meaning of the word *polis* or at least a secondary meaning where the principal meaning is either "state" or "town" or both.[87] But whenever *polis* occurs in the sense of territory, there is no doubt that the reference is to the territory of a *polis* in the political sense. We have, for example, references to a law or a verdict prescribing that a person be exiled from a named *polis*, or that the corpse of an executed criminal be thrown over the border of the *polis*. In such passages *polis* must denote both the town and its hinterland, but obviously the reference is to the territory of a *polis* in the sense of "state". Consequently we do not muddle up our inventory of attested *poleis* if we classify such communities as *polis* type A.

(c) Having discussed *polis* in the sense of stronghold and in the sense of territory we are left with two different meanings of the word *polis* which are both very common, namely (1) *polis* in the sense of town denoting an urban centre and (2) *polis* in the sense of political community denoting what we today call a city-state. When constructing our inventory of *poleis* in the CPC we have to face two questions: (a) is it possible in our sources to distinguish between *polis* used in the sense of town and *polis* used in the sense of state? and (b) what happens if we simply record all attestations of the term *polis* irrespective of whether it means town or state?

Sometimes it is very easy to determine whether an author uses *polis* in the sense of town or state. See for example the following passage from Aeneas Tacticus in which the sense of town and the sense of state, both easily recognizable, appear only two lines apart: ἔτι δὲ συνεβούλευε καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τὴν πόλιν φυλασσόντων ἀπόμισθον ποιῆσαι, ἵν᾽ ὡς ἐλάχιστον δῆθεν ἀνάλωμα τῇ πόλει ᾖ (Aen. Tact. 11.4). Here those who guard the town (*polis*) and its walls are juxtaposed with the state (*polis*) providing their pay. But in many other cases it is simply impossible to know which of the two senses an author has in mind and in such cases the correct answer is that he probably uses the term in both senses without distinguishing one from the other, so that it is simply pointless to try to establish a distinction. When, for example, Herodotos lists the six *poleis* on Athos, it is impossible to decide whether the six names he

mentions denote towns or states: ἐν δὲ τῷ ἰσθμῷ τούτῳ, ἐς τὸν τελευτᾷ ὁ Ἄθως, Σάνη πόλις Ἑλλὰς οἴκηται, αἱ δὲ ἐκτὸς Σάνης, ἔσω δὲ τοῦ Ἄθω οἰκημέναι, τὰς τότε ὁ Πέρσης νησιώτιδας ἀντὶ ἠ-πειρωτίδων ὅρμητο ποιέειν, εἰσὶ αἵδε, Δῖον, Ὀλόφυξος, Ἀκρό-θωον, Θύσσος, Κλεωναί. πόλιες μὲν αὗται αἳ τὸν Ἄθον νέμονται (Hdt. 7.22.3-23.1). Here the word *polis* is probably intended to convey both meanings simultaneously.

One important reason for this ambiguity in the meaning of the term *polis* is that in almost all *poleis* the name of the town was the same as the name of the state. In modern Europe there is only one example of the name of a state being identical with the name of the state's principal city, namely Luxembourg. But in ancient Hellas, as we all know, this applied to nearly every *polis*. The toponym Κόρινθος, for example, can denote both the town Korinth and the Korinthian state[88] and the ethnic οἱ Κορίνθιοι is used to denote both the inhabitants of the town Korinth and the Korinthian citizens. So, when Xenophon, for example, tells us that the Korinthians feared that their *polis* was being betrayed, it is impossible to know whether their concern was for the town Korinth or the entire Korinthian state.[89]

In the case of Korinth this ambiguity does not confuse us because, even admitting that *polis* is used ambiguously in such a passage, we know from innumerable other sources that Korinth was a *polis* in the political sense as well as in the urban sense. Consequently it appears in our inventory as a *polis* type A. But what about all the *poleis* which are attested as *polis* in one passage only? If in this case we are in doubt whether the reference is to the town or the state, are we then, in our list of attested *poleis,* to include or to exclude the *polis* in question?

On the face of it, this ambiguity in the meaning of the term *polis* in our sources seems to be a major threat to the whole investigation we are conducting, but the difficulty in distinguishing between the sense of state and the sense of town does not make our investigation impossible, quite the contrary; it sheds light on an important aspect of the Greek *polis*.

A closer study of *polis* in the senses of town and state reveals that the term *polis* is not used to denote any town, but only a town that is also the urban centre of a *polis* in the sense of political community. The word *polis* has two different meanings, but its reference, its denotation, seems invariably to be what the Greeks called a *polis* in the sense of a *koinonia politon politeias*, and what we today call a city-state. Exceptions to this rule seem to amount to less than one percent. So far the investigation has

been completed for Herodotos,[90] Thucydides,[91] Xenophon[92] and Aineias the Tactician[93] and is being conducted for the Attic orators and for Skylax. The results look very promising and let me report them here for the three historians, the military expert and the geographer.

(a) Of 159 communities called *polis* in the urban sense in Herodotos 133 are attested either in Herodotos' own work or in some other source as *poleis* in the political sense as well. In 23 instances we have no contemporary information about the political status of the urban centre in question, Naukratis is a case apart, and there are only two exceptions to the rule we have stated, namely the small settlements Anthela and Alpenos near Thermopylai, which are classified both as *poleis* and as *komai*; cf. *infra* page 41.

(b) In Thucydides 70 communities are called *polis* in the urban sense. In some five cases we are in doubt whether the community was a *polis* in the political sense as well, and there is only one attestation of a *polis* in the urban sense, which seems *not* to have been a *polis* in the political sense, namely Skandeia, the harbour of Kythera, the island south of Lakonia. Skandeia is called *polis* in the urban sense at 4.54.1 although Kythera was a one-*polis* island with the city of Kythera as its political centre.[94] But even here Thucydides' use of the term *polis* does not necessarily break the rule stated above. A distinction is made between ἡ ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ πόλις (4.54.1) and ἡ ἄνω πόλις (4.54.2) which indicates that Thucydides took both Skandeia and Kythera to be one half of a *polis*, So Skandeia can be viewed as a part of Kythera and not as a *polis* in its own right.[95]

(c) In Xenophon's *Hellenika* there is no detectable exception to our rule. In 75 out of 86 cases we can be fairly certain that a town called *polis* by Xenophon was a city-state as well; in the remaining 11 cases the result is a *non liquet*. But if we extend the investigation to cover the other Xenophontic treatises we find in the *Poroi* Xenophon's proposal to increase the number of mining slaves and to found a new *polis* in the mining district.[96] Here the word *polis* is undeniably used about an urban centre that was not the political centre of a *polis*. This is an exception to our rule, but it is the only one in the entire Xenophontic corpus.

(d) In Aineias the Tactician's work *polis* in the sense of town obviously prevails over *polis* used in the sense of state, whereas *polis* in the sense of territory is attested in a few passages only.[97] In most cases the term *polis* refers either generally to any town under siege, or to an unnamed town. But occasionally Aineias' examples concern named *poleis* and the towns to which he refers are the following:

Abdera	15.9; 15.10bis;
Apollonia (Pontos)	20.4
Argos	11.8bis; 17.2; 17.4ter;
Chalkis	4.1; 4.2; 4.4
Chios	11.4bis;
Himera	10.22
Ilion	24.12; 24.14.
Klazomenai	28.5ter
Sparta	2.2bis (*polisma*);
Megara	4.10
Plataiai	2.3bis
Poteidaia	31.25
Teos	18.13; 18.15; 18.19

The list is short – only 13 entries – but there is no denying the fact that all the towns called *poleis* by Aineias were *poleis* in the political sense as well. Furthermore, in several of Aineias' references to an unnamed *polis* he takes it for granted that the town he describes was also a political community.[98]

To conclude, in Aineias' treatise the term *polis* has several meanings and is used most frequently in the sense of town, sometimes in the sense of state and occasionally in the sense of land or country; but the sites called *poleis* in the urban or territorial sense are all known to have been *poleis* in the political sense as well.

(e) Another text in which *polis* is used in the urbanistic rather than in the political sense is the fourth-century *Periplous* erroneously ascribed to Skylax of Karyanda. In this short text there are several hundred occurrences of *polis*, in fact the highest concentration of the term in any extant classical Greek text. The prevailing opinion is that, in so far as Skylax can be trusted, he uses the term *polis* in the urbanistic sense only and applies it to many settlements which no ancient historian would call a *polis* in the political sense and no modern historian would call a city-state. Moreover, the term is not infrequently used about settlements which, according to the usage in other sources, were certainly not *poleis*, not even in the urbanistic sense of the word. Let me quote the chapter on Attika and the verdict of an eminent Dutch scholar who, in his treatment of the Boiotian *poleis* in the 4th century B.C., prefers to avoid the term city-state altogether and has the following note: "Texts like Ps.-Scylax 57, in which the Attic towns of Rhamnous, Thorikos, Sounion, Anaphlystos, Peiraieus and Eleusis are referred to as

poleis (fourth century), can be used to explore the ancient notion of *polis*."[99]

Skylax's text runs as follows: μετὰ δὲ Μεγαρεῖς εἰσὶν Ἀθηναίων πόλεις. καὶ πρῶτον τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἐλευσίς, οὗ ἱερὸν Δήμητρός ἐστι καὶ τεῖχος. Κατὰ τοῦτό ἐστι Σαλαμὶς νῆσος καὶ πόλις καὶ λιμήν. ἔπειτα ὁ Πειραιεὺς καὶ τὰ σκέλη καὶ Ἀθῆναι. ὁ δὲ Πειραιεὺς λιμένας ἔχει γ'. Ἀνάφλυστος τεῖχος καὶ λιμήν. Σούνιον ἀκρωτήριον καὶ τεῖχος. ἱερὸν Ποσειδῶνος. Θορικὸς τεῖχος καὶ λιμένες δύο. Ῥαμνοῦς τεῖχος.

If we accept this interpretation of Chapter 57 in particular and of the *Periplous* in general it follows that the only extant geographical treatise of the classical period is of very limited value for our inventory of archaic and classical Greek *poleis*, and that, in the case of Skylax, we must allow not just for one or two, but for numerous exceptions to the rule we have established for the other authors.

However, a closer reading of Skylax' text shows that the generally accepted opinion of Skylax' use of the term *polis* is based on a slightly misleading interpretation of how he uses the word *polis* as a heading. A typical introduction to a chapter of the *Periplous* runs as follows: μετὰ δὲ Ἀκαρνανίαν Αἰτωλία ἐστὶν ἔθνος, καὶ πόλεις ἐν αὐτῇ εἰσιν αἵδε (35).[100] After the heading πόλεις αἵδε (*vel sim.*) follows an enumeration of names of sites. In many cases Skylax simply lists the names of the sites without any further comment, see e.g. Chapter 42 (Achaia); but often he adds a specification to many or sometimes even to all the names he lists, see e.g. Chapter 34 (Akarnania). The specifications used are the following: πόλις, δίπολις, τρίπολις, τετράπολις, ἱερόν, λιμήν, τεῖχος, νεώριον, ἐμπόριον, ἄκρα, ἀκρωτήριον, νῆσος, ποταμός, κόλπος, ὄρος, χώρα, and combinations of these, e.g. πόλις καὶ λιμήν, ἱερὸν καὶ τεῖχος etc. Thus, under the heading πόλεις αἵδε *vel sim.* Skylax records not only *poleis* but also harbours,[101] sanctuaries,[102] rivers,[103] mountains[104] and headlands.[105] Of course, rivers, mountains and headlands are not *poleis*, nor even settlements; furthermore there is no reason to believe that a site classified as a ἱερόν, a λιμήν or a τεῖχος was also a πόλις unless it is explicitly stated or clearly implied.[106] The inference is that Skylax uses the heading αἵδε πόλεις in a very loose manner and he has no intention of conveying the impression that every site listed under this heading is a *polis*.

With this in mind let me return to the chapter on Attika quoted above and suggest a more cautious interpretation than the one offered by Bakhuizen and others. The description is introduced with the phrase εἰσὶν

Ἀθηναίων πόλεις, and from the plural πόλεις we can infer that at least two of the communities subsumed under the heading must have been πόλεις, sc. Salamis (which, being a clerouchy, is correctly described as a *polis*)[107] and Athens itself (which is left without a site-classification but known by everybody to be a *polis*). None of the other sites, however, is called a *polis* by Skylax: Eleusis is described as a sanctuary and a fortress,[108] and if Skylax had taken it to be a *polis* he would have introduced the phrase with πρώτη, sc.πόλις[109] and not with πρῶτον. Furthermore, from the explicit reference to Salamis as a *polis* we can infer (a) that not all the sites listed after the heading πόλεις were actually *poleis* and (b) that the preceding site, sc. Eleusis, was probably *not* a *polis*. The status of Peiraieus is unclear; the information that it has three harbours may perhaps indicate that Skylax took it to be a *polis*, but not necessarily.[110] Anaphlystos is classified as a fortress with a harbour, Sounion as a promontory with a fortress and a sanctuary of Poseidon, Thorikos as a fortress with two harbours[111] and Rhamnous as a fortress.

A new reading of the whole *Periplous* along the lines indicated here leads to the conclusion that Skylax, of course, uses the term *polis* in its urbanistic sense, but, with a few exceptions, only about settlements which were *poleis* in the political sense as well. The most problematical section of the treatise is now the first section about Megaris. Μεγαρεῖς εἰσὶν ἔθνος, καὶ πόλεις αἵδε. Αἰγόσθενα, Πῆγαι, τεῖχος Γεράνεια, Ἄρις (39). From the plural πόλεις we would expect at least two of the sites listed to have been *poleis*, but none of them is according to the generally accepted view of the political organization of this region. In the Hellenistic period, however, both Aigosthena and Pegai were in fact *poleis*[112] and we cannot preclude that both were *poleis* in the 4th century as well.[113] If so they must have been dependencies of Megara. On the other hand it is worth noting that in an inscription of ca. 300 B.C. Aigosthena is classified as a *kome* in Megaris.[114] I will leave the problem here and announce that a detailed analysis of Skylax will be conducted by the Polis Centre by Pernille Flensted-Jensen and myself and published in a forthcoming volume of the Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre.

To conclude: as is well known, authors like Herodotos, Thucydides and Xenophon did not care much about technical terms. It is unlikely that they spent long hours making sure that in every case they had used the term *polis* in accordance with the rule stated above. In my opinion, their use of *polis* simply reflects the ordinary use of the word in classical Greek.

Thus, I think that a generalisation is permitted, and let me sum up by

stating what we in the Polis Centre propose to call the *lex Hafniensis de civitate*: in archaic and classical sources the term *polis* used in the sense of "town" to denote a named urban centre is not applied to any urban centre but only to a town which was also the political centre of a *polis*. Thus, the term *polis* has two different *meanings*, town and state, but even when it is used in the sense of town its *reference*, its denotation, seems almost invariably to be what the Greeks called *polis* in the sense of a *koinonia politon politeias* and what we call a city-state. The *lex Hafniensis* applies to Hellenic *poleis* only. The references to barbaric communities called *poleis* in the urban and/or in the political sense must, of course, be analysed separately. Whenever a term is transferred from one culture to describe a more or less similar phenomenon in other cultures it is unavoidably twisted, sometimes more, sometimes less according to how remote the other culture is. An obvious example is the term "state" as applied, for example, by historians to describe ancient Greek *poleis* or by 19th century politicians to describe contemporary African societies.

Consequently, in our inventory of archaic and classical *poleis* in the political sense of the term we can register as *poleis* type A not only localities explicitly called *polis* in the political sense but also all the localities explicitly called *polis* in the urban sense, but then implicitly in the political sense since we can infer from this usage that the town in question must have been a *polis* in the sense of state as well.

A further consequence of applying this law is the recognition that the concept of *polis* in the sense of town was much more closely connected with the concept of *polis* in the sense of state than many modern historians are inclined to believe. The prevailing orthodoxy is that there were city-states without an urban centre, or, to formulate the view in ancient terms, that there were *poleis* in the political sense which were not centred on a *polis* in the urban sense.[115] This orthodoxy is without support in our sources and, in my opinion, it ought to be rejected as unfounded, at least for the late archaic and classical periods. In the Copenhagen Polis Centre we expect every *polis* in the political sense to have had an urban centre, perhaps so small that a modern European would call it a village rather than a town; but in this context it is the existence of an urban centre, not its size that is important. Furthermore we hope that in many cases it is possible to trace the physical remains of these urban centres. And by combining the archaeological evidence of urbanisation with the written evidence about *polis* in the political sense we hope to revive the view that in ancient Greece the concept of state, or rather the concept of self-governing political community, was inseparably bound up with the concept of town. The

traditional rendering of *polis*, namely by city-state, is basically correct and not a mis-nomer as it has become rather fashionable to say. But that is a separate investigation to be developed in future studies.[116]

Appendix I
Polis Used Synonymously with Akropolis

A study of *polis* used synonymously with *akropolis* in the sense of stronghold must start from the etymology of the word *polis*. First, it should be noted that the early variant form of *polis*, namely *ptolis*, is probably attested in the Mycenean Linear-B tablets in the form *po-to-ri-jo*. But, alas, *po-to-ri-jo* is not attested as a noun, only as (part of) a proper name,[117] and we have no clue to what *po-to-ri-jo* can have meant in Mycenean Greek.

A comparison with other Indo-European languages yields better results. The Greek word *polis* is related etymologically to Old Indian *púr*, Lithuanian *pilìs* and Latvian *pils*.[118] In all three languages the original meaning was "stronghold", or "castle" but in Old Indian the word developed the meaning "town" or "city", whereas in the two Baltic languages it seems to have kept its original meaning and it is only in names, such as Daugapils (= Dynabourg), that the term has been applied to what is now a city.[119]

From the etymology it is reasonable to infer that the original meaning of *polis* in Greek too must have been "stronghold". Our sources support this assumption, but not as unambiguously as one could have hoped for. In Homer *polis* and *ptolis* occur 236 times,[120] but there are just two reasonably certain instances of the word being used synonymously with *akropolis*: *Il.* 4.514: ὥς φάτ᾽ ἀπὸ πτόλιος δεινὸς θεός and *Il.* 7.370: νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἕλεσθε κατὰ πτόλιν; in both cases the reference is to the akropolis of Troy.[121] Admittedly, there are many more instances of *polis* denoting the castle of Troy or some other city, but in all these cases it is the addition of the adjective ἀκρή *vel sim.* which shows that the reference is to the "citadel" and not to the "city".[122]

There are some more examples in later poetry, for example in the Homeric hymn to Demeter,[123] in Euripides[124] and in Aristophanes.[125] In Attic prose there are a few attestations, which seem to reflect official language[126] and are sometimes found in documents quoted by the author.[127]

It is in fact in inscriptions that we find the best evidence of *polis* used in the original sense of "stronghold" or "citadel". Many Athenian public

enactments of the archaic and classical periods include formulas such as γράψαι δ[ὲ ταῦτα ἐν στέλ]ει καὶ καταθἕναι ἐμ πόλει,[128] where *polis* is used synonymously with *akropolis* and in fact was replaced by *akropolis* from the beginning of the 4th century onwards.[129] The Athenian official departmental style, however, seems to have reflected common Athenian usage as we know from Thucydides who tells us that, in his day, the Akropolis was still called *polis* by the Athenians.[130] Similar formulas are found in inscriptions from other parts of Greece, e.g. Mykenai, Eretria, and Rhodes,[131] but it is worth noting how few they are.

Both in literary and in epigraphical sources the use of *polis* in the sense of stronghold is much more restricted than usually believed; and furthermore, with a few exceptions, this usage is only tolerated after a local preposition, and in certain familiar and unambiguous combinations such as ἀναγράψαι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι ἐμ πόλει προξένους καὶ εὐεργέτας αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκγόνους τῆς πόλεως τῆς ᾿Αθηναίων.[132]

Let me adduce some passages from Thucydides to illustrate that even in Athens, where the formulaic use of *polis* in the sense of *akropolis* was widespread and to some extent reflected common usage, an Athenian would not have the meanings "stronghold" or "citadel" springing to his mind when he heard the word *polis*, except, of course, when it was applied in one of the formulas discussed above. In all other cases the word *polis* would not be used synonymously with *akropolis*.

The word *akropolis* could designate both an eminence used as a settlement and a fortified place devoid of human habitation. Mylai in Sicily is an example of the first type of akropolis,[133] Pylos on the Peloponnesian west coast of the second.[134] But when Thucydides tells us that the Akropolis was called *polis* by the Athenians he points out that the reason for this usage is that the Akropolis was once the centre of the urban settlement. Similarly when Dekeleia was fortified and all grain had to be brought by sea to Athens Thucydides has the comment that Athens had become a fortress instead of a *polis*: ἀντὶ τοῦ πόλις εἶναι φρούριον κατέστη.[135] This would be a strange comment if *polis* had been commonly used in the sense of stronghold or fortress. On the contrary the comment suggests that a *polis* was, essentially, different from a *phrourion*, i.e. a town, not a fortress.

So the use of the word *polis* to designate an *akropolis* was probably restricted to *akropoleis* that were centres of human habitation. On the other hand, the *akropoleis* which were called *poleis* did not have to be the centres of a *polis* in the political sense of the term, as were e.g. the *akropoleis*

of Athens or Korinth. The word could also be used to denote the *akropolis* of a civic subdivision, such as an Attic deme. The sacrificial calendar of Erchia, for example, regulates the cults of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus, both located in the *polis*, i.e. on the *akropolis* of Erchia,[136] and explicitly distinguished from the *polis* in the *asty*, i.e. the Akropolis of Athens.[137] Similarly, Thucydides mentions a *kome* in Lokris called Polis,[138] and according to Pausanias the ruins of Old Mantineia could still be seen on a mountain called Ptolis.[139] In both cases the name Polis is probably used synonymously with the noun *akropolis* in its original sense of "stronghold" and applied to a small settlement situated on an eminence.

The cults of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus deserve a further note. The epithets *Polias* and *Polieus* seem to be derived from *polis* in the sense of *akropolis*.[140] Admittedly, in the classical period Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus were interpreted as protectors of the *polis*, not just of the *akropolis*,[141] but that is a secondary meaning of the epithet developed only after the connection between *polis* = *akropolis* and the epithets *Polias/Polieus* had been forgotten or at least obscured.[142]

To sum up: The Indo-European etymology strongly suggests that the original meaning of *polis* was "stronghold" or "citadel", and that the word may have signified a settlement on a fortified eminence, like Dreros or Anavlochos. Our early written sources confirm that in certain contexts *polis* could be used synonymously with *akropolis*, but this meaning of the word, already rare in the archaic period, died out in the classical and Hellenistic periods, and in the Roman period only men of learning would know that *polis* had once been used synonymously with *akropolis*, as is apparent from a passage in Plutarch's life of Pelopidas: τὸν δ' ἱερὸν λόχον ὥς φασι συνετάξατο Γοργίδας πρῶτος ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ἐπιλέκτων τριακοσίων, οἷς ἡ πόλις ἄσκησιν καὶ δίαιταν ἐν τῇ Καδμείᾳ στρατοπεδευομένοις παρεῖχε. καὶ διὰ τοῦθ' ὁ ἐκ πόλεως λόχος ἐκαλοῦντο. τὰς γὰρ ἀκροπόλεις ἐπιεικῶς οἱ τότε πόλεις ᾠνόμαζον.[143] In the same vein Pausanias notes that, in his day, the Athenian Akropolis was no longer called *polis*: Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀκροπόλει, τότε δὲ ὀνομαζένῃ πόλει.[144]

Appendix II
Polis Used in the Sense of Country

When used in a topographical sense rather than in a personal-political sense *polis* means "town" and is often opposed to terms such as *agros*[145]

or *ge*[146] or *chora*.[147] One of the most illuminating attestations of this meaning of the term *polis* is the 4th-century B.C. boundary stone from Paros inscribed: ὅρος πόλεως.[148] Since Paros was a one-*polis*-island, the stone can not have marked the boundary between two *poleis;* it must have marked the line between the town (*polis*) and its hinterland; cf. the reference in Aristotle's *Politics* to laws prescribing how much land a citizen may own in the immediate vicinity of the town.[149] Such laws presuppose that it is known where the town ends and the countryside begins.

Occasionally, however, *polis* denotes *both* the town *and* its hinterland. It is used as the generic term for *chora*-plus-*asty*[150] or for *chora*-plus-*polis* (where *polis* is used in the specific sense of town).[151] In such cases *polis* carries the meaning "country", as we should say. This is only what we should expect. It is a common linguistic phenomenon that, in a pair of antonymes, one of the two opposed words may also be used to denote the whole category.[152] In many Indo-European languages the words for urban centre and countryside form a pair of antonyms, e.g. city/country (English) Stadt/Land (German) cité/pays (French) and by/land (Danish). Only in ancient Greek was it the word for town (*polis*) which came to denote the totality of town-plus-country, whereas in modern European languages it is invariably the word for country which is used about the entity of urban and rural sites.[153] What is more surprising is that in a few cases *polis* may take on the sense of countryside alone almost to the exclusion of its urban centre:

Hdt. 7.58.2: ὁ δὲ κατ' ἤπειρον στρατὸς ... ἐποιέετο τὴν ὁδὸν διὰ τῆς Χερσονήσου ... διὰ μέσης πορευόμενος πόλιος τῇ οὔνομα τυγχάνει ἐὸν 'Αγορή.

Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.49: τὰ πρὸς ἔω τῆς τῶν Θηβαίων πόλεως ἐδήου (ὁ 'Αγησίλαος) μέχρι τῆς Ταναγραίων. ἔτι γὰρ τότε καὶ τὴν Τάναγραν οἱ περὶ 'Υπατόδωρον, φίλοι ὄντες τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, εἶχον.

In both these passages *polis* is used to denote the countryside alone: Xerxes' army did not march through the gates of the city of Agore, and Agesilaos pillaged "the eastern part of the territory of Thebes up to the territory of Tanagra", and not "the countryside east of the city of Thebes up to the city of Tanagra".[154]

An inspection of the attestations of *polis* in the sense of country shows that it is not used about the hinterland of any urban centre, but only about the hinterland of an urban centre which was the centre of a *polis* in the sense of political community. In most cases, in fact, "territory" is a better rendering than hinterland or countryside.[155] Some attestations

are from a law or a verdict that a person be exiled from a named *polis*[156] or that the corpse of an executed criminal be thrown over the border of the *polis*.[157] Other attestations concern the borders between two or more *poleis*.[158]

The investigation of *polis* in the sense of territory leads to the following supplement to the *lex Hafniensis*: when the term *polis* is used in the sense of country or territory the reference is always to the territory of a *polis* in the political sense; there is no attestation of *polis* being used about the territory of a subdivision of a *polis*, such as a deme or a *kome*, or about the territory of a plurality of *poleis* or about a whole region. It such cases the proper term to use is *chora*.[159] This may seem very commonplace and almost too obvious to be stated as a general rule. Yet the observation is not without importance. Its corollary is that the (infrequent) occurrences of *polis* in the sense of country will not upset our inventory of all *poleis* in the political sense attested in archaic and classical sources, since the word *polis*, even when it is used synonymously with *chora* or *ge* in the sense of country, must refer to what was a *polis* in the sense of a *koinonia politon politeias*. Thus, apart from the few attestations of *polis* in the sense of akropolis, the word *polis* is used in three different senses, namely (1) town (2) country and (3) state but the object referred to by the term in sense (1) and (2) seems invariably to be a political community of the type called *polis* by the Greeks and city-state by modern historians.

The habit of using *polis* in three different senses all referring to the same denotatum is reflected in the way the Greeks named their *poleis*. It is common knowledge that the people of an ancient Greek city-state used the same name to denote the city and the state. Thus, Korinthos is either the name of the Korinthian state or of its urban centre.[160] What is hardly ever discussed is that the name of the state and city was also commonly used to designate the countryside. Thus the name Tanagra designates either the Tanagraian state (Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.49) or its urban centre (Heraclides 8 in *GGM* I p. 101) or its hinterland (Thuc. 1.108.1), just as the term *polis* can be used to designate the Tanagraian state (Thuc. 4.91.1 & 93.4) or the town (Heraclides 8 in *GGM* I p. 101) or the territory (Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.49). Let me add that the case of Tanagra is not an exception; rather, it is the rule, and other examples of names of town which can be used about the territory as well include Chaironeia (Lycurg. 1.16), Haliartos (Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.17), Koroneia (Arist. *Mir.* 842b3), Lebadeia (Xen. *Mem.* 3.5.4), Mykalessos (Paus. 9.19.5), Orchomenos (Thuc. 1.113.2), Oropos (Hyp. 3.16), Plataiai (Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.48), Siphai (Arist.

Part. An. 696a5) and Thebes (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.25), to mention just the examples from Boiotia.

Appendix III
Herodotos' Use of "*Polis*" in the sense of "Town"

The term *polis* occurs 469 times in Herodotos' work. In some 320 passages the only or the principal meaning is "urban centre" or "town";[161] in some 85 passages it is "political community" or "state"[162] and in 5 passages it is "country" or "territory".[163] In the remaining ca. 60 passages there is no way of deciding whether the principal meaning is "town" or "state" or "country".[164] There is no occurrence in Herodotos of *polis* being used synonymously with *akropolis* in the sense of "stronghold".[165] The overlap between the different senses of the word makes it impossible to give more precise figures, and although town is the most common meaning of *polis* in Herodotos "community" is a connotation which goes with "town" in many of the 320 passages. Occasionally the term is used about one or more unnamed *poleis*,[166] but in most passages the reference is to one or more identifiable communities and here the word *polis* appears juxtaposed with the name(s) of the *pol(e)is* in question.[167] A count shows that it is applied to 254 different named communities, namely 194 Hellenic and 60 barbarian *poleis*. In this investigation I shall focus on *polis* used about the Hellenic communities only[168] and reserve the treatment of barbarian *poleis* to a forthcoming study.

Of the 194 Hellenic *poleis* 34 are referred to in the political sense only,[169] one is called *polis* in the territorial sense only,[170] whereas 159 communites are referred to as being *poleis* either in the urban sense only or in both the urban and the political sense of the term or, in a few cases, in both the urban and the territorial sense. Let me adduce a few examples: Thespiai is called a *polis* once in Herodotos, viz. at 8.50.2 and here in the urban sense: ὁ γὰρ διὰ Βοιωτῶν τραπόμενος στρατὸς ἅμα Ξέρξῃ ἐμπρήσας Θεσπιέων τὴν πόλιν ... ἧκέ τε ἐς τὰς ᾿Αθήνας ... At 7.122.1 five *poleis* on Sithonia are referred to as *poleis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too: ὁ ναυτικὸς στρατὸς ... παραμείβετο Ἑλληνίδας τάσδε πόλις, ἐκ τῶν νέας τε καὶ στρατιὴν παρελάμβανε, Τορώνην, Γαληψόν, Σερμύλην, Μηκύβερναν, ῎Ολυνθον. ἡ μέν νυν χώρη αὕτη Σιθωνίη καλέεται. Tenedos is referred to as a *polis* in the urban sense at 1.151.2: ἐν Τενέδῳ δὲ μία οἰκέεται πόλις, but it is included among the *poleis* in the political sense mentioned at

1.151.3: Λεσβίοισι μέν νυν καὶ Τενεδίοισι, κατά περ Ἰώνων τοῖσι
τὰς νήσους ἔχουσι, ἦν δεινὸν οὐδέν. τῆσι δὲ λοιπῆσι πόλισι ἔαδε
κοινῇ Ἴωσι ἔπεσθαι ... Kyrene is called *polis* in the urban sense at
4.164.3, but in the territorial sense at 4.156..3: ... καὶ ἔκτισαν νῆσον
ἐπὶ Λιβύῃ κειμένην, τῇ οὔνομα ... ἐστὶ Πλατέα. λέγεται δὲ ἴση εἶναι
ἡ νῆσος τῇ νῦν Κυρηναίων πόλι.

Below follows an alphabetically ordered list of the 159 Hellenic com-
munities which in Herodotos' work are called *polis* in the urban sense.
After the name of the settlement I have recorded (in italics) all occur-
rences in Herodotos of *polis* in the sense of town being used for the
settlement in question. Next, I have cited one or more sources which
show that the community was a *polis* in the political sense too. The evi-
dence adduced is selective and in many cases I find it sufficient to cite
one (good) archaic or classical source in which the locality in question is
called a *polis* in the political sense.[171] Often it is Herodotos himself who
in another passage has a reference to the town as a *polis* in the political
sense. In many other cases the reference given is to Thucydides or
Xenophon or Demosthenes or an archaic or classical inscription, etc. In
quite a few instances, however, there is no attestation of the settlement
being called *polis* in the political sense in any archaic or classical
source, and here other sources must be adduced, e.g. an entry in the
Athenian tribute lists, or evidence of *proxenoi* or *theorodokoi*, or coins
struck by the city etc. Admittedly to be recorded in the tribute lists does
not amount to proof that the settlement in question was a *polis*, but a
combination of Herodotos' mention of the settlement as a *polis* in the ur-
ban sense with an entry in the Athenian tribute lists is in my opinion a
very strong indication that the settlement must have been a *polis* in the
political sense as well as in the urban sense. The same line of argument
applies to towns which had a mint, etc.

To conclude, the investigation shows that of the 159 communites
called *polis* in the urban sense 133 are attested either in Herodotos' own
work or in some other source as *poleis* in the political sense as well. In
23 instances[172] we have no other contemporary information about the
political status of the urban centre in question. It may have been a *polis*
in the political sense, but we do not know. Next, at 2.178.1 Herodotos
seems to refer to Naukratis as a *polis* and at 2.179.1 as an *emporion*; but
the prevailing view is that Herodotos is using *polis* in a loose sense and
that Naukratis was a *emporion*, not a *polis*.[173] Yet, as duly noted by Aus-
tin in his description of Naukratis, "Herodotos is making a fundamental
distinction between the residents of the *polis* and those who only came

for trade but did not settle permanently in Naukratis ... It seems rather that we are dealing with, so to speak, a double Naukratis, the first composed of citizens resident on the spot, the second of foreigners not included in the civic organization."[174] Thus, the probability is that Naukratis became a *polis* in the political sense already during the reign of Amasis and not in the fourth century only.[175] Finally, in two cases a community which Herodotos calls *polis* in the urban sense is referred to in another chapter as being a *kome*. The two communities are Anthela and Alpenos. Anthela was a small settlement in Oitaia near Thermopylai. At 7.176.2 it is called a *polis* but when referred to again at 7.200.2 it is called a *kome*. Alpenoi was a settlement in East Lokris. It is called a *polis* at 7.216.1 but a *kome* at 7.176.5. These are the only demonstrable inconsistencies in Herodotos' use of the term *polis*. Thus, Herodotos used the term *polis* much more consistently than is commonly believed,[176] and with Anthela and Alpenos as the only exceptions Herodotos corroborates what was found by our study of the term *polis* in Thucycides and in Xenophon's *Hellenika*: in archaic and classical sources the term *polis* used in the sense of town to denote a named and identifiable urban centre is not applied to any urban centre, but only to a town which was also the political centre of a *polis* in the sense of "state". The term *polis* is used in two different meanings, "city" and "state" but the reference seems, with two exceptions, to be what the Greeks called *polis* in the sense of a *koinonia politon politeias* and what we today call a city-state. The consistency with which Herodotos uses the term *polis* should not be ascribed to a particular interest in political terminology. As in the case of Thucydides and Xenophon the presumption is rather that his way of applying the term *polis* followed common Greek usage in the archaic and classical periods.

List of poleis

Abai   *8.33.1*, in 346 exempted from the *dioikismos* of the Phokian *poleis* (Paus. 10.3.2).

Abdera   *1.168.1*; *7.109.1*, a Tean colony; called *polis* in the personal/political sense by Anakreon fr. 100, Diehl. (Isaac 73-108).

Abydos   *5.117.1*, a Milesian colony; called *polis* in the political sense by Xen. in *Hell*. at 4.8.36. (Cook 56-7).

Achilleion   *5.94.2*, 'A[χίλλειον] restored in the assessment decree

of 425/4 (*IG* I³ 71 col. 3.137); coins struck ca. 350-300 (Head 540). (Cook 180).

Aigaiai
: *1.149.1*, One of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; the Αἰγαιεῖς are referred to by Xen. at *Hell*. 4.8.5 as forming an independent political community .

Aige
: *7.123.1*, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene; Αἰγάντιοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 269 col. 3.4). (Zahrnt 142).

Aigina
: *5.83.2*; *6.88.1*, called *polis* in the political sense at 2.178.3 and 8.46.1, cf. 8.42.1 & 49.1

Aigiroessa
: *1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*, unknown from other sources. The identification with the Aiolian city Elaia mentioned by Strabo at 13.1.67 seems unfounded.

Aineia
: *7.123.2*, one of seven *poleis* in Krousis in the Thermaic Gulf; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; Αἰνεᾶται in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 266 col. 2.34). (Zahrnt 231-3); coins struck from before 500 to ca. 350 (Head 214); *theorodokos* appointed in 359 (*IG* IV² 94 1b.10). (Zahrnt 142-4).

Ainos
: *4.90.2*; *7.58.3*. Implicitly referred to as a *polis* by Antiphon at 5.78; Αἴνιοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 260 col. 6.15); coins struck ca. 450 onwards (Head 246-7); *theorodokos* appointed in 359 (*IG* IV² 94 1b.46). (Isaac 140-6).

Aiolidai
: *8.35.1*. For the otherwise unknown Αἰολιδέων Valckenaer conjectured Λιλαιέων, and Lilaia was one of the Phokian *poleis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.1). Accepting the the MSS reading we have no other source. The possible location of Aiolidai is discussed most recently by J.M. Fossey in *The Ancient Topography of Eastern Phokis* (Amsterdam 1986) 54-5.

Akraiphia
: *8.135.1*, called *polis* in the political sense by the Oxyrhynchus historian at 19.3, Chambers.

Akrothoon
: *7.22.3*, one of six *poleis* on Athos called *polis* by Thucydides at 4.109.3, possibly in the political sense. In contradistinction to the other five *poleis* on Athos listed by Herodotos at 7.22.3, Akrothoon is not attested in the Athenian tribute lists, (Zahrnt 150-1), but the Ἀκρόθοιοι are recorded in the assessment decree of

422/1 (*IG* I³ 77 col. 5.33).

Alalia   *1.165.1*, a Phokaian colony and probably a *polis* in the political sense during the few years of its existence. (Morel 861).

Alpenos   *7.216.1*, called *kome* at 7.176.5. In an honorary decree of 271/0 a certain Φρίκος 'Αλπώνιος is recorded as the Lokrian *hieromnemon* (*Syll³* 419) and the city-ethnic 'Αλπων[ίου] is also attested in *CID* II 126.1, C3.

Amphikaia   *8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).

Amphissa   *8.32.2*. To judge from Aischines' account at 3.123-9 Amphissa was undoubtedly a *polis* in the political sense. In the Delphic accounts of 337/6 a citizen of Amphissa is recorded as one of the two Lokrian *hieromnemones* (*CID* II 74 I 37-8).

Antandros   *7.42.1*, called *polis* by Alkaios (*PLF* Z13); one of the 'Ακταῖαι πόλεις mentioned by Thuc. at 4.52.3 where *polis* is used in the political sense; "Ανταν[δ]ρο[ς] in the assessment decree of 422/1 (*IG* I³ 77 col. 4.15). In 410 the Antandrians voted to give *politeia* to the Syracusans (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.26).

Anthele   *7.176.2*, called *kome* at 7.200.2.

Antikyra   *7.198.2*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).

Aphytis   *7.123.1*, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene; 'Αφυταῖοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 261 col. 1.1); fragment of coinage decree found in Aphytis (*M&L* 45); *theorodokos* appointed in 359 (*IG* IV² 94 1b.24); coins struck in the 4th cent. before the conquest by Philip (Head 209-10). (Zahrnt 167-9).

Apollonia   *4.93.1* (in the Pontic), a Milesian colony; described as an oligarchy by Aristotle in *Pol.* 1306a9-10. (Isaac 241-7).

Apollonia   *9.93.1; 9.94.2* (in Illyria); called *polis* in the political sense by Aristotle in *Pol.* 1290b11-2.

Argilos   *7.115.1*, an Andrian colony (Thuc. 4.103.3); called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.5). (Isaac 52-4).

Argos   *6.82.1; 6.82.2*, called *polis* in the political sense at 7.151.1.

Artake   *4.14.2*, cf. 6.33.2, a Milesian colony (Anaximenes of Lampsakos [*FGrHist* 72] fr. 26 = Strab. 14.1.6; Steph.

	Byz. 127.13).
Assa	*7.122.1*, probably to be identified with Assera (Zahrnt 162-7), one of four *poleis* along the east coast of Sithonia; later in 7.122.1 *polis* is used in what is probably the political sense of the term; ’Ασσερῖται in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 263 col. 3.17). (Zahrnt 162-3).
Athenai	*6.99.2; 7.133.2; 7.140.2; 8.41.3*, called *polis* in the political sense at 1.30.4; 1.59.6; 5.91.2; 5.97.1; 8.44.1.
Barke	*4.160.1; 4.200.1; 4.200.2; 4.203.1, 2.* It is apparent from Herodotos’ account (4.160-204) that Barke was a *polis* in the political sense and the term *polis* is used principally in the political sense at 4.202.2.
Byzantion	*4.87.2; 6.33.1.*
Charadra	*8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).
Chios	*1.142.4; 6.27.2*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense at 2.178.2.
Dardanos	*5.117.1; 7.43.2*, where Dardanos is described as “bounding on Abydos”; one of six Hellespontine *poleis*; Δαρδανὲς in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 267 col. 1.24). (Cook 60).
Daulis	*8.35.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.1).
Delphoi	*8.36.2*, called *polis* in the political sense in the account of the *naopoioi* of 358 B.C. (*CID* II 31.1).
Dikaia	*7.109.1*, ’Δίκαια παρὰ ῎Αβδερα in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 263 col. 3.19-20); coins struck ca. 500-450 (J.M.F. May in *NC* (1965) 1-21). (Isaac 109-11).
Dion	*7.22.3*, one of six *poleis* on Athos called *polis* by Thucydides at 4.109.3, possibly in the political sense; Διὲς ἀπ[ὸ τ]õ ῎Αθο in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 269 col. 2.35). (Zahrnt 182-5).
Drymos	*8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).
Eion	*7.113.1*, ruled by Boges and thus a *polis* in the political sense as well; coins struck ca. 500-450 (Head 197); (Isaac 60-3 takes Eion to be a military base only and not a true settlement); called *emporion* by Thuc. at 4.102.4.
Elateia	*8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).
Ephesos	*1.26.2bis; 1.142.3*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in the arbitration treaty between Miletos and Myous of ca. 390 B.C. (Tod 113.28 & 38).

Epion	*4.148.4*, one of six *poleis* in Triphylia, see Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23 & 30 where Epeion is included among the perioikic *poleis* ruled by Elis. (Heine 88).
Eretria	*6.99.2*; *6.100.2*; *6.101.2*; *6.101.3*, referred to as a *polis* in the political sense at 8.46.2, cf. 8.42.1.
Erochos	*8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).
Erythrai	*1.142.4*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in the arbitration treaty between Miletos and Myous of ca. 390 B.C. (Tod 113.15 & 38).
Galepsos	*7.122.1*, one of five *poleis* on Sithonia; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too. I follow *ATL* (Gazetteer 477) in believing that Γαληψός is Herodotos' or somebody else's error for *Γάλη, cf. the Γαλαῖοι in the assessment decree of 422/1 (*IG* I³ 77 col. 5.24). (Zahrnt 178-9).
Gigonos	*7.123.2*, one of seven *poleis* in Krousis in the Thermaic Gulf; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; Γίγονος in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 278 col. 6.32). (Zahrnt 179-80).
Gonnos	*7.128.1*; *7.173.4*, in Perrhaibia (Helly I.75); ἡ πόλις ἡ Γοννέων in Hellenistic decrees (Helly II no. 5.1-2, 3rd cent. etc.); bronze coins of the early 4th cent. (Helly I.75).
Gryneia	*1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*, see Hekataios (*FGrHist* 1) fr. 225 = Steph. Byz. 213.12 (see Whitehead 119); Γρυνειες in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 265 col. 1.17); the ethnic Γρυνεῖς attested in a *psephisma* quoted by Krateros (*FGrHist* 342) fr. 2; coins struck in the 3rd cent. B.C. (Head 555). (Heine 89-90).
Hekatonnesoi	*1.151.2*, included among the *poleis* in the political sense mentioned at 1.151.3; coins struck in the 4th cent. (Head 563).
Heraion	*4.90.2*, same as Heraionteichos (Dem. 3.4), a Samian colony (Harp. s.v.). It was certainly a *polis* in the political sense in the mid 3rd cent. B.C. (*F.Delphes* III 3 207) and presumably in the early 5th cent. as well. (Isaac 203).
Histiaia	*8.23.1*, called *polis* in the political sense in the treaty

with Keos of 363/2 (*Syll.³* 172.3).

Hyampolis   *8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).

Hyele   *1.167.3*, a Phokaian colony (Elea, Velia). (Morel 858-61).

Hyria   *7.170.2*; *7.170.3*, allegedly a Cretan colony east of Tarent, cf. Strab. 6.3.6.

Itanos   *4.151.2.* For Itanos as a political community, and probably a *polis*, see τὸνς 'Iτανίονς in an archaic law from Lyttos (*SEG* 35 991.4); coins struck in the 5th and 4th cent. (Head 469-70).

Kardia   *6.33.3*; *6.36.2*; *6.41.1*; *7.58.2*; *9.115.1*, called *polis* in the political sense by Demosthenes at 23.181-2. (Isaac 187-8).

Karene   *7.42.1*, in Mysia; the ethnic Kαϱηναῖοι attested in a *psephisma* quoted by Krateros (*FGrHist* 342) fr. 2.

Kampsa   *7.123.2*, one of seven *poleis* in Krousis in the Thermaic Gulf; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; probably to be identified with *Σκάψα, cf. Σκαφσαῖοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 279 col. 2.49); coins struck before ca. 480 (Head 212).(Zahrnt 231-3).

Kasmenai   *7.155.2*, Syracusan colony (Thuc. 6.5.2), see A. di Vita, "Town Planning in the Greek Colonies of Sicily from the Time of their Foundations to the Punic Wars," in J.P. Descæudres (ed.), *Greek Colonies and Native Populations* (Oxford 1990) 350.

Kasthanaia   *7.183.3*; *7.188.1*, called *kome* by Strabo at 9.5.22; it was probably synoikized with Demetrias in 294 and may on that occasion have changed its status from *polis* to *kome*. (Stählin 51-2, 68)

Killa   *1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*, mentioned again by Strabo at 13.1.62. Apart from Herodotos' classification of Killa as a *polis* nothing is known about its status.

Klazomenai   *1.142.3 5.123.1*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense at 2.178.2 and in the arbitration treaty between Miletos and Myous of ca. 390 B.C. (Tod 113.21 & 38).

Kleonai   *7.22.3*, one of six *poleis* on Athos, called *polis* by Thucydides at 4.109.3, possibly in the political sense;

Κλεοναί in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 278 col. 6.23). (Zahrnt 194).

Kolophon *1.142.3*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in a decree of ca. 334 B.C. (*AJP* 56 [1935] 3.11, 16 p. 378).

Kombreia *7.123.2*, one of seven *poleis* in Krousis in the Thermaic Gulf; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; otherwise unknown apart from the ethnic Κομβρεᾶται which is attested in *SEG* 38 681 (1st cent. A.D). (Zahrnt 198-9).

Kroton *3.137.3*, listed as a *polis* in the political sense at 8.47.1, cf. 8.42.1 & 49.1.

Kyme *1.149.1; 5.123.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; the city-ethnic Κυμαῖος is attested at 5.37.1 where Kyme is listed as a *polis* in the political sense, ruled by a tyrant; Κυμαῖοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 261 col. 5.2); coins struck from ca. 600 onwards (Head 552-3).

Kyrene *4.156.3; 4.164.3; 4.203.1; 4.203.2bis*, called *polis* in the political sense in the foundation decree of the 4th/7th cent. (*M&L* 5.3-4).

Lampsakos *5.117.1*, a Phokaian colony; Λαμφσακενοί in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 269 col. 2.10); coins struck ca. 500 onwards (Head 529-30).

Larisa *1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; called *polis* in the urban sense by Xenophon in *Hell.* at 3.1.13; and in *Cyrop.* at 7.1.45; Λ[άρισα] restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (*IG* I³ 71 col. 3.130); cf. Cook 196-8.

Lebedos *1.142.3*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in the arbitration treaty between Miletos and Myous of ca. 390 B.C. (Tod 113.25 & 38).

Lepreon *4.148.4*, one of six *poleis* in Triphylia; called *polis* in the political sense by Thucydides at 5.31.4-5; Λεπρεᾶται recorded on the Serpent Column (*M&L* 27.11).

Lipaxos *7.123.2*, one of seven *poleis* in Krousis in the Thermaic Gulf; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; cf. Steph. Byz. 418.7 but virtually unattested in other sources. (Zahrnt 199).

Madytos *9.120.4*, Μαδύτιοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³

	271 col. 2.34); coins struck ca. 350 and later (Head 260); (Isaac 194).
Makistos	*4.148.4*, one of six *poleis* in Triphylia; see Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.25, 30, cf. 23 where Makistos is included among the perioikic *poleis* ruled by Elis.
Maroneia	*7.109.1*, Μαρονῖται in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 260 col. 6.19); coins struck from ca. 500 onwards (Head 248-52; A.B. West in *NNM* 40 [1929]).
Mekyberna	*7.122.1*, one of five *poleis* on Sithonia; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.6). (Zahrnt 203-4).
Meliboia	*7.188.3*, proxeny decree of the 3rd cent. passed by Iasos for a citizen of Meliboia (Michel 463); coins struck ca. 400-344 (Head 301). (Stählin 50).
Mende	*7.123.1*, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene; called *polis* in the political sense by Thucydides at 4.121.2. (Zahrnt 200-203).
Mesambria (Pontic)	*4.93.1*, a colony founded in ca. 510 by Megara, Byzantion and Chalkedon, called *polis* in the political sense at 6.33.2.
Mesambria (Thrace)	*7.108.2*, unknown from other sources apart from a bronze coin of the 1st cent. (Head 248).
Miletos	*1.142.3*; *6.7.1*; *6.18.1*; *6.20.1*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in the arbitration treaty between Miletos and Myous of ca. 390 B.C. (Tod 113.8-9 & 32).
Myrina	*1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; Μυριναῖοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 265 col. 1.11); coins struck in the 4th cent. B.C. (Head 555).(Heine 92).
Myous	*1.142.3*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in the arbitration treaty between Miletos and Myous of ca. 390 B.C. (Tod 113.8-9 & 32).
Naukratis	*2.178.1*, ἡ πόλις ἡ Ναυκρατιτ[ῶν] in an honorary decree of the 4th cent. Flinders Petrie, *Naukratis* I (1886) p. 63 no. 3; Athenian proxeny decree of 349/8 for Θεογένης ὁ Ναυκρατίτης (*IG* II² 206).(Austin 29-33).
Naxos (the island)	*5.30.3*; *5.30.4*; *6.96.1*, called *polis* in the political sense by Thucydides at 1.98.4.

Neapolis
7.123.1, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene; Νεάπολ[ις] in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 267 col. 2.29 *versus* col. 3.5).(Zahrnt 207).

Neon
8.32.1; *8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2); coins struck in the archaic period (Head 343).

Neonteichos
1.149.1, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*, cf. Steph. Byz. 472.14 but unattested in other sources.

Nonakris
6.74.1; *6.74.2bis*, called *polisma* by Pausanias at 8.17.6, otherwise unattested; cf. J. Hejnic, *Pausanias the Perieget and the Archaic History of Arcadia* (Prague 1961) 38.

Notion
1.149.1, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*, unattested in other sources.

Noudion
4.148.1, one of six *poleis* in Triphylia; unattested in other sources.

Oasis polis
3.26.1, a Samian colony in Libya; cf. F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie de Battiades* (Paris 1953) 64; N. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (Philadelphia 1987) 195.

Oaxos
4.154.1, called *polis* in the political sense in a 6th century law (*I.Cret* II.v no.1 = Koerner 101).

Olbia
4.79.2 (οἱ ἐν Βορυσθενειτέων τῇ πόλι); the term ἄστυ occurs at 4.78.3 and ἐμπόριον at 4.17.1; called *polis* in the political sense at *Syll*³ 218.14-5: τὸ νόμισμα τὸ τῆ[ς πόλ]εως; a Milesian colony (Hdt. 4.78.3, *CAH* 3.3, 126).

Olophyxos
7.22.3, one of six *poleis* on Athos; called *polis* by Thucydides at 4.109.3, possibly in the political sense; Ὀλοφύχσιοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 268 col. 2.23); coins struck ca. 350 B.C. (Head 206). (Zahrnt 208).

Olynthos
8.127.1, called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.5). (Zahrnt 209-10).

Ophryneion
7.43.2, Ὀ[φρύνειον] restored in the assessment decree of 425/4 (*IG* I³ 71 col. 3.131); coins struck ca. 350-300 (Head 547-8). Cf. Cook 72-7.

Paion
6.127.3, a *theorodokos* from Paion is recorded in the Delphic list of ca. 200 B.C. (*BCH* 45 [1921] 2.72); cf. Hejnic (*supra* s.v. Nonakris) 41.

Paisos   *5.117.1*, one of six Hellespontine *poleis*; a Milesian col-
                  ony according to Anaximenes of Lampsakos (*FGrHist*
                  72 fr. 26); Παισενοί in the Athenian tribute lists. (*IG* I³
                  272 col. 132).

Panopeis   *8.35.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.1).

Parapotamioi   *8.33.1*, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).

Parion   *5.117.1*, the city-ethnic Παριηνός is attested at 4.138.1
                  where Parion is listed as a *polis* (4.137.2) in the politi-
                  cal sense, ruled by a tyrant; Παριανοί in the Athenian
                  tribute lists (*IG* I³ 259 col. 6.15).

Paros   *6.133.3*; *6.134.2*; called *polis* in the political sense in
                  Parian decrees of the fourth century B.C. (*IG* XII 5
                  110.6; 111.6; 114.15).

Pedasa   *8.104.1*, at 6.20.1 the Pedaseis are referred to as a peo-
                  ple forming a political community; Πεδασὲς in the
                  Athenian tribute lists.

Pedieis   *8.33.1*, Phokian *polis*; mentioned by the Oxyrhynchus
                  historian at 21.5, Chambers, otherwise unknown.

Perinthos   *6.33.1*, a Samian colony. Περίνθιοι in the Athenian tri-
                  bute lists (*IG* I³ 261 col. 5.3).

Perkote   *5.117.1*, one of six Hellespontine *poleis*; a Milesian col-
                  ony according to Anaximenes of Lampsakos (*FGrHist*
                  72 fr. 25); according to Schol. Hom. *Il.* 11.229 [III 167,
                  Erbse] situated in the territory of Lampsakos and pre-
                  sumably a dependent *polis*; Περκόσιοι in the Athenian
                  tribute lists (*IG* I³ 272 col. 1.33).

Phokaia   *1.80.1*; *1.142.4*; *1.162.2-163.1*; *1.163.3*; *1.165.2*;
                  1.165.3, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the
                  political sense at 2.178.2 and in the treaty with Myti-
                  lene of the early 4th cent. (Tod 112.1, 6).

Phrixai   *4.148.4*, one of six *poleis* in Triphylia; see Xen. *Hell.*
                  3.2.30, cf. 23-5 where Phrixa is included among the
                  perioikic *poleis* ruled by Elis.

Piloros   *7.122.1*, one of four *poleis* along the east coast of Sitho-
                  nia; later in 7.122.1 *polis* is used in what is probably the
                  political sense of the term; Πίλορος in the Athenian
                  tribute lists (*IG* I³ 278 col. 6.22). (Zahrnt 212-3).

Pitane   *1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; Πιταναῖοι in the
                  Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 262 col. 3.24); coins struck
                  in the 5th and 4th cent. (Head 537).

Plataiai	*8.50.2*; *9.51.2*; *9.52.1bis*; called *polis* in the political sense by Thucydides e.g. at 2.2.2; 3.57.2.
Pistyros	*7.109.1*, *polis* in Thrace; called *emporion* by Steph. Byz. at 524.11 but unattested in other sources, cf. Thuc. 1.100.2 (Bresson 202).
Posideion	*3.91.1*, a colony in northern Syria founded by Amphilochos; called *polichne* by Strab. at 16.2.8 & 12 and *polis* by Steph. Byz. at 533.12.
Poteidaia	*7.123.1*, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene, called *polis* in the political sense by Thucydides at 1.66.1.
Priene	*1.142.3*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*, called *polis* in the political sense in an honorary decree of 334 B.C. (*Syll.³* 278.5-7).
Prokonnesos	*4.14.2*, cf. 6.33.2, called *polis* in the political sense at 4.15.1.
Pyrgos	*4.148.4*, one of six *poleis* in Triphylia; listed again among the Triphylian *poleis* by Polybios at 4.77.9, 4.80.13, cf. E. Meyer, *Neue Peloponnesische Wanderungen* (Bern 1957) 69-70.
Rhoiteion	*7.43.2*, one of the Ἀκταῖαι πόλεις mentioned by Thuc. at 4.52.2 where *polis* is used in the political sense; Ῥοίτειον in the Athenian assessment decree of 422/1 (*IG* I³ 77 col. 4.16); coins struck ca. 350-300 (Head 548). Cf. Cook 87-9.
Salamis (Cyprus)	*5.115.1*, called *polis* in the political sense at 5.104.3.
Sale	*7.59.2*, a Samothracian colony; unattested in other Greek sources.
Samos	*1.142.4*; *3.54.1*; *3.55.1*; *3.60.2*; *3.139.1*; *3.146.1*; *6.25.2*, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*;
Sane	*7.22.3*; *7.23.1,* one of six *poleis* on Athos called *polis* by Thucydides at 4.109.3, probably in the political sense; called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.6). (Zahrnt 219-21).
Sane	*7.123.1*, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene, mentioned again by Strabo at 7 fr. 27 but unknown from other sources. (Zahrnt 221, rejecting the identification with the Sane on Athos suggested by Gomme in *Comm.* III 588, 673).
Sarte	*7.122.1*, one of four *poleis* along the east coast of Sithonia; later in 7.122.1 *polis* is used in what is probably the

	political sense of the term; Σαϱταῖοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 279 col. 2.79).
Selymbria	*6.33.1*, a Megarian colony; Athenian decree about Selymbria in 408-7 (*IG* I³ 118); Σελυμβϱιανοί in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 267 col. 1.26); coins struck ca. 500-450 (Head 271).
Sestos	*7.33.1*; *9.118.2.* referred to as a political community at 7.78.1; Σέστιοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 267 col. 4.33);
Sermyle	*7.122.1*, one of five *poleis* on Sithonia; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.8). (Zahrnt 225-6).
Sindos	*7.123.3*, in the Thermaic Gulf; unattested in other sources.
Singos	*7.122.1*, one of four *poleis* along the east coast of Sithonia; later in 7.122.1 *polis* is used in what is probably the political sense of the term; called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.6). (Zahrnt 226-9).
Sinope	*1.76.1*; *4.12.2*, called a *polis* in the political sense of the term by Xenophon in *Anabasis* at 5.5.8 and 10.
Siphnos	*3.58.1*, called *polis* in the political sense at 8.46.4.
Skione	*7.123.1*, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene; called *polis* in the political sense at 8.128.3, and in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.8). (Zahrnt 234-6).
Smila	*7.123.2*, one of seven *poleis* in Krousis in the Thermaic Gulf; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; Σμίλλα in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 278 col. 6.31). (Zahrnt 236).
Smyrna	*1.149.1*, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; doikized in ca. 545, but classified as a *polis* in the political sense in *IG* II² 28.17-20 (of 387/6 B.C., restored).
Soloi	*5.115.2*, but at 5.110.1 Soloi is juxtaposed with Salamis and referred to as a political community.
Sparta	*6.58.1*; called *polis* in the political sense at 7.101.1 and 7.234.2.
Stagiros	*7.115.2*, called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.5). (Zahrnt 238-43).

Stryme 7.108.2, a Thasian colony; described as a *chorion* by Demosthenes at 50.22; classified as a *polis* by Steph. Byz. at 587.17 citing Androtion (*FGrHist* 324 fr. 31), but we cannot be sure that the site-classification stems from Androtion, see Whitehead 118-9; see also *IG* XII 8 p. 79 *re* 361 (hieme).

Sybaris 5.45.1, called *polis* in the political sense at 6.21.1.

Syrakousai 7.155.2, called *polis* in the political sense at 7.154.2.

Taucheira 4.171.1, coins struck ca. 480-31 (Head 874); called *polis* in the political sense by Arrian *De Succ. Alex.* fr. 1.17.

Temnos 1.149.1, one of eleven Aiolian *poleis*; not recorded in the Athenian tribute lists; coins struck in the 4th cent. B.C. (Head 556); called a *polis* in the political sense of the term by Xenophon in *Hell.* at 4.8.5.

Tenedos 1.151.2, included among the *poleis* in the political sense mentioned at 1.151.3; Τενέδιοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 261 col. 1.6); coins struck from ca. 550 to ca. 387 (Head 550).

Teos 1.142.3, one of twelve Ionian *poleis*; called *polis* in the political sense in some public imprecations of ca. 470 B.C. (*Syll.³* 37, 38; *SEG* 31 984).

Tethronion 8.33.1, Phokian *polis* dioikized in 346 (Paus. 10.3.2).

Thebai 9.86.1, called *polis* in the political sense at 1.61.3.

Thera 4.150.2, classified under the heading *polis* in the political sense of the term by Thucydides at 2.9.4.

Therambos 7.123.1, one of eight *poleis* on Pallene; Θραμβαῖοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 262 col. 1.4). (Zahrnt 187-8).

Therme 7.124.1, called *polis* in the urban sense by Hekataios (fr. 146); not attested in the Athenian tribute list; called a *chorion* by Aischines at 2.27. The attribution to Therme of some late archaic coins rests on no strong evidence (Head 203, Kraay 141).(Zahrnt 188-9).

Thespiai 8.50.2, called *polis* in the political sense in an honorary decree of ca. 414 B.C. (*IG* I³ 72.6).

Thyssos 7.22.3, one of six *poleis* on Athos called *polis* by Thucydides at 4.109.3, possibly in the political sense. Θύσσοι in the Athenian tribute lists (*IG* I³ 263 col. 3.23). (Zahrnt 189-91).

Torone	*7.122.1*, one of five *poleis* on Sithonia; referred to as a *polis* principally in the urban sense, but probably in the political sense too; called *polis* in the political sense in the Peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.8). (Zahrnt 247-51).
Trachis	*7.199.1*, the urban centre of the Τραχίνιοι, one of the three "tribes" into which the Malians were subdivided (Thuc. 3.92.2).
Tritea	*8.33.1*, listed by Herodotos among the Phokian *poleis*, but by Thucydides at 3.101.2 listed among the Lokrian towns of which most, and presumably all, were *poleis* in the political sense. See L. Lerat, *Les Locriens de l'Ouest* II (Paris 1952) 39, 116.
Zankle	*6.23.3*; *6.23.4*; *6.23.5*; *6.24.2*; *7.164.1*, a Chalkidian colony, called *polis* in the political sense at 7.154.2.
Zone	*7.59.2*, Ζόνε παρὰ Σέρρειον in the assessment decree of 422/1 (*IG* I³ 77 col. 5.27-8); coins struck in the 4th cent. (Isaac 130-1).

NB. At 7.123.2 Λισαί is probably a corruption for Αἶσα, cf. *ATL*, Gazetteer 466.

Abbreviations: *ATL* (Gazetteer) = B.D. Meritt, H.T. Wade-Gery & M.F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists* I (Cambridge Mass. 1939) 461-566; Austin = M.M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age*. *PCPS* Suppl. 2 (1970); Bresson = A. Bresson, "Les cités grecques et leurs *emporia*," in A. Bresson & P. Rouillard, *L'emporion* (Paris 1993) 163-226. Cook = J.M. Cook, *The Troad* (Oxford 1973); Head = B.V. Head, *Historia Numorum* (2nd edn. London 1911); Heine = Th. Heine Nielsen, "Was Eutaia a *Polis*," *Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 2 (1995) 83-102; Helly = B. Helly, *Gonnoi* I-II (Amsterdam 1973); Isaac = B. Isaac *The Greek settlements in Thrace until the Macdonian Conquest* (1986) 203; Morel = J.-P. Morel, "L'expansion Phocéenne en occident. Dix années de recherches (1966-75) *BCH* 99 (1975) 853-96 (see also *PP* 107 [1966] 378-420); Stählin = Fr. Stählin, *Das hellenistische Thessalien* (Stuttgart 1924); Whitehead = D. Whitehead, "Site-Classification and Reliability in Stephanus of Byzantium," *Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 1 (1994) 99-124; Zahrnt = M. Zahrnt, *Olynth und die Chalkidier* (München 1971).

Appendix IV
Database Layout Filled in for Tanagra[177]

NAME (toponym and/or ethnic): *Tanagra (Tanagraios)*.
SITE (map reference): Map 54. Lat. 38.20, long. 23.35.
SIZE OF TERRITORY: 5.
CATEGORY: A.

1.   NAME & ETHNIC: Τάναγρα (Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 35, 36 = Laz-
       zarini 998); Ταναγραῖος (*LSAG* 95 no. 12; *SEG* 9 2.32, C4s);
       Ταναγρῆος (*IG* VII 3055.25 C4m; 2723.2-3, C3e);
       Ταναγρεῖος (*IG* VII 522.10, C3s).
2.   LOCATION

3A. CALLED A *POLIS*:

	C6 and earlier	C5	C4
Arch/Class.		Thuc. 4.91.1 & 93.4.	Isoc. 14.9 (implicitly).

	retrospective	contemporary
later sources	Strab. 9.2.25.	*IG* VII 504-9 (C3s).

3B. CALLED A *POLIS*
       in topographical sense
              qua citadel (akropolis)
              qua town (*asty*): Heraclides (*GGM* I p. 101) 8.
              qua totality of territory (*asty+chora*): Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.49.
       in personal/political sense: Thuc. 4.91.1 & 93.4; Isoc. 14.9.

4.   *POLIS* COGNATES
              polites (sg./pl.)
              politeia
              politeuein/politeuesthai
              politikos
              polisma/polichne/polichnion
              other

5. *ASTY* + COGNATES
       asty
       astos
       other

6. *PATRIS* + COGNATES

7. *ETHNIKON*:

	INDIVIDUAL	COLLECTIVE
INTERNAL	*IG* VII 540.5 = *SEG* 19 335 (C1f).	Head (1911) 347-8, (C4f).
EXTERNAL	*CID* II 76 col 2. 19-20 (335).	*LSAG* 95 no. 12. (C6s); *SEG* 15 245 (C6s).

8. ALTERNATIVE TOPONYMS
       emporion
       hieron/temenos
       kome: ἔτι τῆς Ταναγρικῆς κατὰ κώμας οἰκουμένης (Plut.
           Mor. 299C).
       limen/epineion
       phrourion/teichos

9. TERRITORY name of territory: (+-*chora, ge*): Τάναγρα (Thuc.
    3.91.3-4); ἡ Ταναγραία (Thuc. 4.76.4); ἡ Ταναγραική (Strab.
    9.2.11). During the first federation one of the eleven Boiotian
    districts (*Hell. Oxy.* 19.3); it comprised Delion (Thuc. 4.76.4),
    Aulis (Nikokrates *FGrHist* 376 fr. 1; Strab. 9.2.8), Salganeus
    (Nikokrates *FGrHist* 376 fr. 1), the *Tetrakomia*, i.e. Eleon,
    Harma, Mykalessos and Pharai (Strab. 9.2.14, Fossey [1988]
    43-99 and 222-3). Tanagra was bounded on the east by Oro-
    pos (Heraclides 7-8, *GGM* I, 101) on the west by Skolos (be-
    longing to Thebes)(Hdt. 9.15.2; 5.79.2; Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.49) and
    on the north by Anthedon (Nikokrates *FGrHist* 376 fr. 1) and
    Glisas (Hdt. 9.43.1)(belonging to Thebes, Strab. 9.2.31).

10. POPULATION: casualty list of Tanagraians killed at Delion in 424
    (*IG* VII 585, *SEG* 35 411).

11. REGION: Boiotia (Thuc. 1.108.1; *Hell. Oxy.* 19.2-4).

12. TRIBAL AFFILIATION

13. FEDERAL MEMBERSHIP: first Boiotian Confederacy 446-386
     (*Hell. Oxy.* 19.3); Second Boiotian Confederacy 374-338
     (Isoc. 14.9); third Boiotian confederacy 338-172 (*SEG* 32
     476.14, Tanagraian boiotarch shortly after 338).

14. LEAGUE MEMBERSHIP

15. ALLIANCE MEMBERSHIP: alliance between Thebes, Thespiai,
     Koroneia and Tanagra in 506 and earlier (Hdt. 5.79.2).

16. PARTY TO A TREATY
     equal
     subordinate
     superior
     unknown

17. SYNOIKISM, METOIKISM, DIOIKISM, *ANDRAPODISMOS*,
     REFOUNDATION, *SYMPOLITEIA* etc.
     synoikism
     metoikism
     dioikism
     andrapodismos
     physical destruction
     refoundation
     sympoliteia

18. EXILES, REFUGEES

19. MILITARY MATTERS
     armed forces: at Delion in 424 (Thuc. 4.91.1 & 93.4).
     commanders

20. ENVOYS

21. *PROXENIA*
    given: (*IG* VII 504-09, ca. 245-10; cf. J.M. Fossey, in *Ho-*
                ros 2 [1984] 119-35).
    received: Eretria (*IG* XII.9 203, C4s).

22. NATURALIZATION
    citizenship given
    citizenship received

23. *THEORODOKOI & THEOROI*: *Theorodokoi* to host *theoroi* from
    Delphi: ἐν [Τ]ανάγραι (*BCH* 45 [1921] 2.21, 2.150, 5.7, C2).

24. CIVIC SUBDIVISIONS: *phratriai* attested in a C1 list of victors
    (*SEG* 19 335.67) see Knoepfler (1992) 430.

25. CONSTITUTION TYPE: Oligarchy: *Hell. Oxy.* 19.2. Probably a
    Constitution of Tanagra among the 158 Aristotelian *Politeiai*
    (Plut. *Mor.* 299C, cf. Hansen [1995a] 53).

26. PUBLIC ENACTMENTS: the oldest attested public enactments
    are some proxeny decrees of C3s (*IG* VII 504-09 = *EBi* 34-5).

27. OTHER MANIFESTATIONS OF LEGAL SYSTEM (δίκαι ἀπὸ
    συμβ., arbitration, [death] sentences, lawgiver etc.)

28. OFFICIALS
    eponymous: *archon* attested only from C3s onwards (*IG* VII
                505), cf. Sherk [1990] 286-7.
    boule: (*Hell. Oxy.* 19.2).
    other: Tanagraian boiotarch shortly after 338 (*SEG* 32
                476.14); ἀφεδριατευόντων ... Νίωνος ᾽Αριστω-
                νυμίω Ταναγρήω (*IG* VII 2724b.4-5, ca. 280-70
                B.C.).

29. ASSEMBLY

30. PUBLIC ARCHITECTURE
    bouleuterion
    prytaneion
    ekklesiasterion

agora

law courts

stoas

temples/ cult sites: temple of Hermes Promachos near the
theatre (Paus. 9.22.2)

theatre: there are a few remains of a theatre, which may date
from C4 (Roller [1989] 182-4).

fountain houses and drains

other

31. AKROPOLIS

32. WALLS: walled city in 457 but walls demolished by the Athenians
(Thuc. 1.108.1). Existing circuit of walls of 2,2 km with 43
towers, mostly of isodomic ashlar construction. Dated ca.
425-375 and presumably erected after the King's Peace (Roll-
er [1974], [1987]). τὸ τεῖχος at Xen. *Hell*. 5.4.49 refers to the
Theban stockade, not to the walls of Tanagra (Munn [1987]
124-6).

33. URBANISATION: Walls enclose an area of 60 hectares (Bintliff
[1991] 201). Except, perhaps, a temple of Hermes Promachos
near the theatre (Paus. 9.22.2) all architectural remains seem
to be later than the reconstruction of the walls in the early
fourth century; and the elaborate orthogonal town plan, with
insulae of 52 x 102 metres was clearly devised to fit the exist-
ing walls. Nothing of archaic and fifth-century Tanagra is vis-
ible today (Roller 1987). For Hellenistic Tanagra cf. the de-
scription in Heraclides, *GGM* I p. 101.8.

34. MINT: Coins on the Aiginetan standard from ca. 500 to 446, from
before 410 to 374 (or later) (Hansen [1995] 20-1) and again
from ca. 338 to 315. Obv.: mostly Boiotian shield but some of
the earliest have the forepart of a bridled horse (Schachter
[1958] 43-6); Rev.: mostly an incuse but between 410 and 374
some have a horse's head or the stern of a galley, legend: T,
TA, TAN, TANA. Between 480 and 456 some are inscribed
BO or BOI (Head 347-8; Kraay 109-14; Schachter [1989]
85).

35. CONTROL OF LAND OWNERSHIP
        enktesis grants
        other mechanisms

36. TAXATION
        levied
        paid

37. FREE NON-CITIZENS

38. CULTS
        patron deities (*polias*, *polieus*, *poliouchos*): Hermes with the
            epithets Kriophoros and Promachos (Schachter 2 [1986]
            47).
        other communal cults
        festivals

39. CALENDAR: Roesch (1982) 25-28, Hellenistic.

40. COMMUNAL ORACLE CONSULTATION (incl. *promanteia*)

41. PARTICIPATION/VICTORS IN GAMES
        Isthmian
        Nemean
        Olympian
        Pythian
        Other

42. COMMUNAL DEDICATIONS
        internal
        external (incl. *thesauroi* at Delphi/Olympia): Lazzarini 958 (=
            LSAG 95 no. 12), Olympia (C6l); Lazzarini 968, Olympia
            (ca. 500); Lazzarini 987 (*LSAG* p. 375), Delphi (458/7);
            Lazzarini 998 (= Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 36), Olympia
            (458/7).

43. COLONIZER: of Herakleia Pontike ca. 560 (Paus. 5.26.7), Bur-
        stein 15-8.

44. COLONIZED
    foundation year
    metropolis
    oikist(s)

45. FOUNDATION MYTH

46. HELLENIC/BARBARIAN POLIS
    Hellenic
    barbarian
    mixed

47. BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Bintliff, "Die Polis-Landschaften Griechen-
    lands: Probleme und Aussichten der Bevölkerungsgeschich-
    te," in E. Olshausen & H. Sonnabend (eds.), *Geographica
    Historica* 5 (1991) 149-202; S.M. Burstein, *Outposts of Hel-
    lenism. The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea* (Berke-
    ley & Los Angeles 1976); J.M. Fossey, *Topography and Pop-
    ulation of Ancient Boiotia* (Chicago 1988) 43-99; M.H. Han-
    sen, "Boiotian *Poleis*. A Test Case," in M.H. Hansen (ed.),
    Sources for The Ancient Greek City-State. Acts of the Copen-
    hagen Polis Centre 2. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes
    Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 72 (Copenhagen
    1995) 13-63; M.H. Hansen, "*Kome*. A Study in How the
    Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements which were not
    Poleis," in M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the
    Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Cen-
    tre 2. *Historia* Einzelschriften 95 (Stuttgart 1995) 45-82. [=
    1995a]; D. Knoepfler, "Sept années de recherches sur
    l'épigraphie de la Béotie (1985-1991)," *Chiron* 22 (1992)
    411-503; M.L. Lazzarini, *Le formule delle dediche votive nel-
    la Grecia arcaica*. Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei
    373 (Rome 1976); M. Munn, "Agesilaos' Boiotian Cam-
    paigns," *Cl.Ant.* 6 (1987) 106-38; P. Roesch, *Études
    Béotiennes* (Paris 1982); D.W. Roller, *Tanagran Studies I.
    Sources and Documents on Tanagra in Boiotia. II.The Proso-
    pography of Tanagra in Boiotia* (Amsterdam 1989); D.W.
    Roller, "The Date of the Walls at Tanagra," *Hesperia* (1974)
    260-3; D.W. Roller, "Tanagra Survey Project 1985," *BSA* 82
    (1987) 213-32; D.W. Roller, "Recent Investigations at

Grimádha (Tanagra)," *Boeotia Antiqua* 1 (1989) 129-63; A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* II, *BICS* 38.2 (1986); A.Schachter, "Horse Coins from Tanagra," *Num. Chron.* 6.18 (1958) 43-6; A. Schachter, "Boiotia in the Sixth Century B.C.," in H. Beister and J. Buckler (eds.), *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium* (München 1989) 73-86; R. Sherk, "The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities," *ZPE* 83 (1990) 279-88.[178]

Notes

1   We have called it the *lex Hafniensis* on the assumption that the Latinized name of the *Copenhagen Polis Centre* would be *Institutum de Civitatibus Graecis Hafniense*.

2   M.H. Hansen, "*Poleis* and City-States, 600-323 B.C. A Comprehensive Research Programme," in D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1. *Historia* Einzelschriften 87 (1994) 14-5.

3   Strab. 9.2.11, 14. Fiehn, "Mykalessos," *RE* XVI,1 (1935) 1005; M.H. Mc Allister, "Mykalessos," *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton 1976) 600-1.

4   Thuc. 7.29.3, 5; 7.30.2; see M.H. Hansen, "Boiotian *Poleis* – A Test Case," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for The Ancient Greek City-State*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 72 (Copenhagen 1995) 18-21.

5   See e.g. the thorough discussion of klerouchies in A.J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Manchester 1964) 166-92; cf. also P.J. Rhodes, "Epigraphical Evidence. Laws and Decrees," in Hansen (ed.) (*supra* n. 4) 94-5.

6   *IG* I³ 285 col. 1.107-11: [πόλ]ες αἵδε στρατιᾶι μισθὸν ἐτέλεσαν ... Ἐφαιστιἐς, ᾿Ἰμβριοι, Μυριναῖοι vacat; Hyp. 2.18: ἐστεφανώθην ὑπὸ τοῦ δ[ήμ]ου τοῦ ἐν Ἡφαισ[τί]αι καὶ ἑτέροις ὑ[πὸ] τοῦ ἐν Μυ{ρ}ρίνηι ... παρακατατιθέμενοι δύο πόλεις τῶν ὑμετέρων αὐτῶν. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31 and Skylax 57.

7   See e.g. P.J. Rhodes, "Demes, Cities and Leagues," in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City-State*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 67 (Copenhagen 1993) 163 (writing about the perioikic towns in Lakonia). Cf. also Rhodes' comments in Hansen (ed.) (*supra* n. 4) 91-2, quoted and discussed *supra* page 18. Contrast E. Lévy, "La cité grecque: invention moderne ou réalité antique?" *Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz* 1 (1990) 53-67.

8   See e.g. M.I. Finley, "The Ancient City: From Fustel de Coulanges to Max Weber and Beyond," in *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (London 1981) 4.

9   M.H.Hansen, "*Polis, Civitas,* Stadtstaat and City-State," in Whitehead (ed.) (*supra* n. 2) 19-22.

10   W. Gawantka, *Die sogenannte Polis* (Wiesbaden 1985) 204-6.

11   A. Molho, K. Raaflaub and J. Emlen (eds.), *City-States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy* (Stuttgart 1991).

12 R. Griffeth and C.G. Thomas, (eds.), *The City-State in Five Cultures* (Santa Barbara 1981). Cf. the list in Hansen (ed.) (*supra* n. 2) 10-11.

13 P. Burke, "City-States," in J.A. Hall (ed.), *States in History* (Oxford 1986) 137-53.

14 M.I. Finley (*supra* n. 8) 4-5: "Aristotle ... was writing about the autonomous city-state, the *polis* in Greek ... (5) ... The ancient city was soon to lose its autonomy. The process began soon after Aristotle died."; O. Murray & S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City-State From Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) vii: "our focus has been the autonomous Greek city-state or *polis* from its origins in the "Dark Age" until the point at which it was transformed into a basis for world civilization by the conquests of Alexander the Great."; R. Osborne, *Classical Landscape with Figures* (London 1987) 195: "The essential mark of the Greek city is political independence." (For city = *polis* see Osborne page 11).

15 M.H. Hansen, "The "Autonomous City-State". Ancient Fact or Modern Fiction?" in M.H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 2. *Historia* Einzelschriften 95 (Stuttgart 1995) 36. See also Burke (*supra* n. 13) 137, 140 etc.

16 Hansen (*supra* n. 4) 36-7.

17 A *polis* waged war (Aeschin. 3.122); made peace (Dem. 19.336); entered into an alliance (*IG* II² 43.32); struck coins (Dem. 24.213); passed a law (Ar. *Wasps* 467; Dem. 18.120); passed a sentence (Lycurg. 1.93); founded a colony (as μητρόπολις) (Thuc. 1.24.6); defrayed expenses (Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.6); erected or repaired the walls (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.5); organized a festival (Dem. 21.26, 34); *horoi* marking the borders of a *polis* (Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.6); the roads and water supply of a *polis* (Dem. 13.30); the altars of a *polis* (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.2), the protecting divinities of a *polis* (Ar. *Eq.* 763; Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 23.4-5).

18 Law on the proclamation of crowns passed by the *polis* (Dem. 18.120); the passing of laws is one of the principal duties of a *polis* (Arist. *Rhet.* 1360a18ff).

19 F.M. Watkins s.v. "State" in *The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 17 (reprint 1972) 150.

20 The connotation versus the denotation of a term: J.S. Mill, *A System of Logic* (1843) Book 1, Sections 2, 5 and 6. The intension versus the extension of a concept: N. Rescher, *Introduction to Logic* (New York 1964) 26-7. On the definition (connotation, intension) of the term *polis* cf. now M. Sakellariou, *The Polis State. Definition and Origin* (Athens 1989).

21 See Hansen (*supra* n. 7) 9-10 and Appendix I p. 34.

22 K. Nowicki, "Fortifications in Dark Age Krete," in S. van de Maele & J.M. Fossey (eds.), *Fortificationes Antiquae* (Amsterdam 1992) 72-3.

23 Cf. M.H. Hansen, "*Kome*. A Study in How the Greeks Designated and Classified Settlements which were not *Poleis*," in Hansen & Raaflaub (eds.) (*supra* n. 15) 46-7.

24 Cf. J.M. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris* (Amsterdam 1990) 94-5: "The overall conclusion must be that in this area it is purely an *archaeological* investigation, almost entirely bereft of written sources, which can reconstruct the history of Opountian Lokris. The primacy of archaeology as our means of investigating the past of this part – and of many others – of Greece, even in the "historical" period is beyond dispute, *pace* those colleagues in the Classical profession who would see archaeology essentially as an adjunct, or peripheral aspect of their discipline."

25 J.M. Fossey, *The Ancient Topography of Eastern Phokis* (Amsterdam 1986); *Idem*, *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia* (Chicago 1988); for Lokris see preceding note; J.F. Cherry, J.L. Davies and E. Mantzourani, *Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History* (Los Angeles 1991); J.C. Carter, "The Decline of Magna Graecia in the Age of

Pyrrhos? New Evidence from the Chora," in T. Hackens *et alii* (eds.), *The Age of Pyrrhus* (Louvain 1992) 97-145.

26   According to Osborne Elis is the only "city" (= *polis*) in the region and other settlements are described as "villages" (124-7), but in the *Hellenika* Xenophon repeatedly refers to several of them as being *poleis*, see 3.2.23; 3.2.30; 3.5.12; 6.5.2.

27   See e.g. Fossey's thorough and valuable studies of the settlement pattern of Boiotia, Phokis and Opountian Lokris (*supra* nn. 24-5) in which he focuses on site-location and has no discussion whatsoever of the site-classifications found in our sources.

28   Hdt. 1.170.3 (quoted *infra* n. 32); Thuc. 2.15.2 (quoted *infra* n. 35). See Rhodes (*supra* n. 5) 102.

29   *"Later sources"* are subdivided into (a) *Retrospective*: the literary sources belonging here are e.g. attestations of the term *polis* in Diodoros, Strabo, Plutarch and Pausanias referring to the archaic/classical period, e.g. Strabo's list of synoikisms in 8.3.2 or ἐρείπια πόλεως in Paus. when associated with the archaic or classical periods. Retrospective epigraphical sources are e.g. the renewal of a treaty originally concluded before 323, confirmation of a grant or references in inscriptions to earlier events (e.g. *IG* II² 505.17ff and *I.-Priene* 37-8). (b) *Contemporary*: references to a community being a *polis* in the age of the author or document in question, e.g. Strabo's remark that in his days Thespiai and Tanagra are the only settlements which deserve to be called *poleis* (Strab. 9.2.5); Hellenistic proxeny-decrees or alliances etc.

30   Hdt. 8.61: ταῦτα λέγοντος Θεμιστοκλέος αὖτις ὁ Κορίνθιος Ἀδείμαντος ἐπεφέρετο, σιγᾶν τε κελεύων τῷ μή ἐστι πατρὶς καὶ Εὐρυβιάδην οὐκ ἐῶν ἐπιψηφίζειν ἀπόλι ἀνδρί. πόλιν γὰρ τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα παρεχόμενον ἐκέλευε οὕτω γνώμας συμβάλλεσθαι. ... τότε δὴ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς ... ἔλεγε, ἑωυτοῖσί τε ἐδήλου λόγῳ ὡς εἴη καὶ πόλις καὶ γῆ μέζων ἤ περ ἐκείνοισι, ἔστ' ἂν διακόσιαι νέες σφι ἔωσι πεπληρωμέναι.

31   Lykourg. 1.69: οὐ γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ἐξέλιπον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον μετήλλαξαν.

32   Hdt. 1.170.3: χρηστὴ δὲ καὶ (sc. γνώμη) πρὶν ἢ διαφθαρῆναι Ἰωνίην Θαλέω ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου ἐγένετο, ... ὃς ἐκέλευε ἓν βουλευτήριον Ἴωνας ἐκτῆσθαι, τὸ δὲ εἶναι ἐν Τέῳ, Τέων γὰρ μέσον εἶναι Ἰωνίης, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας πόλιας οἰκεομένας μηδὲν ἧσσον νομίζεσθαι κατά περ εἰ δῆμοι εἶεν.

33   Isoc. 12.179: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διελόντας τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ὡς οἷόν τ' ἦν εἰς ἐλαχίστους εἰς τόπους κατοικίσαι μικροὺς καὶ πολλούς, ὀνόμασι μὲν προσαγορευομένους ὡς πόλεις οἰκοῦντας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν ἔχοντας ἐλάττω τῶν δήμων τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν.

34   Thuc. 2.16.2: ἐβαρύνοντο δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον οἰκίας τε καταλείποντες καὶ ἱερὰ ἅ διὰ παντὸς ἦν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον πολιτείας πάτρια δίαιτάν τε μέλλοντες μεταβάλλειν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὑτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος.

35   Thuc. 2.15.2: ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς ἐβασίλευσε, ... τά τε ἄλλα διεκόσμησε τὴν χώραν καὶ καταλύσας τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων τά τε βουλευτήρια καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν οὖσαν, ἓν βουλευτήριον ἀποδείξας καὶ πρυτανεῖον, ξυνῴκισε πάντας, καὶ νεμομένους τὰ αὑτῶν ἑκάστους ἅπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἠνάγκασε μιᾷ πόλει ταύτῃ χρῆσθαι, ἣ ἁπάντων ἤδη ξυντελούντων ἐς αὐτὴν μεγάλη γενομένη παρεδόθη ὑπὸ Θησέως τοῖς ἔπειτα.

36   Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.16: αὐτὸς δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἀεὶ διελέγετο σκοπῶν τί εὐσεβές, τί ἀσεβές, τί καλόν, τί αἰσχρόν, τί δίκαιον, τί ἄδικον, τί σωφροσύνη, τί μανία, τί ἀνδρεία, τί δειλία, τί πόλις, τί πολιτικός, τί ἀρχὴ ἀνθρώπων, τί ἀρχικὸς ἀνθρώπων, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἅ τοὺς μὲν εἰδότας ἡγεῖτο καλοὺς κἀγαθοὺς εἶναι, τοὺς δ' ἀγνοοῦντας ἀνδραποδώδεις ἂν δικαίως κεκλῆσθαι.

37 Arist. *Pol.* 1253a2-4: ὁ ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον, καὶ ὁ ἄπολις διὰ φύσιν καὶ οὐ διὰ τύχην ἤτοι φαῦλός ἐστιν, ἢ κρείττων ἢ ἄνθρωπος.

38 Soph. *Ant.* 370: ὑψίπολις *versus* ἄπολις; Pl. *Resp.* 369C: πολλοὺς εἰς μίαν οἴ-κησιν ἀγείραντας κοινωνούς τε καὶ βοηθούς, ταύτῃ τῇ συνοικίᾳ ἐθέμεθα πόλιν ὄνο-μα; Isoc. 3.6 = 15.254: συνελθόντες πόλεις ᾠκίσαμεν καὶ νόμους ἐθέμεθα καὶ τέχνας εὕρομεν; Moschion fr. 6.6-8: οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν / οὔτε στεγήρης οἶκος οὔτε λαΐνοις / εὐ-ρεῖα πύργοις ᾠχυρωμένη πόλις; Philochoros (*FGrHist* 328) fr. 2b: ἄστυ δὲ προσηγ-όρευσαν τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὸ πρότερον νομάδας καὶ σποράδην ζῶντας τότε συνελθεῖν.

39 B. Holden, *The Nature of Democracy* (London 1974) 8.

40 See e.g. A. Lijphart, *Democracies. Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One Countries* (New Haven 1984) Chapter 3, 37-45: *The Universe of Democracies.*

41 Holden (*supra* n. 39) 6-8.

42 All members of the UN are states. See *The Charter*, Chapter 2 Articles 3-4 and *Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly* 134-38.

43 Skylax 39, see the discussion *infra* page 30).

44 *IG* VII 1.18 (ca. 300 B.C.) and 207.4 (ca. 200 B.C.).

45 See A. Avram, "*Poleis* und Nicht-*Poleis* im Ersten und Zweiten Attischen Seebund," in Hansen & Raaflaub (eds.) (*supra* n. 15) 191-200.

46 *IG* II² 43 B 35-8.

47 See M. Dreher,"Poleis und Nicht-Poleis im Zweiten Athenischen Seebund," in Hansen (ed.) (*supra* n. 4) 176-8.

48 Pherecydes (*FGrHist* 3) fr. 168; Hdt. 7.234.2; Thuc. 5.54.1; Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.21; *Ages.* 2.24; *Lac. Pol.* 15.3; Skylax 46; Isoc. 12.179; Strab. 8.4.11; Paus. 3.2.6; Polemon Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι πόλεων, p. 50 Preller. See S. Isager and J.E. Skydsgaard, *Ancient Greek Agriculture* (London 1992) 131; P.J. Rhodes (*supra* n. 7) 163-4.

49 Cf. the exchange of words between Agesilaos and Epameinondas in 371 reported by Pausanias at 9.13.2 and by Plutarch in *Ages.* 28.1-3.

50 M.I. Finley & H.W. Pleket, *The Olympic Games* (London 1976) 61. References to the sources are omitted from this work but can easily be supplied: we know from Hdt. 5.22.1-2 that competitors in the Olympic games had to be Greeks, cf. also Hdt. 2.160.3. That the crown was awarded the *polis* as well as the victor is apparent from e.g. Dem. 58.66: ὁ πάππος ὁ ἐμὸς Ὀλυμπίασι νικήσας παῖδας στάδιον ἐστεφάνωσε τὴν πόλιν, cf. Isoc. 16.32. Several sources confirm that affiliation with a *polis* was a condition for participating in the games: In 420 Sparta was excluded from the Olympic games but a Spartan named Lichas participated and had his victory proclaimed pretending that he was a Boiotian (Thuc. 5.50.4; cf. Eur. fr. 282, Nauck). The Syracusans tried to bribe Kleinopatros of Miletos to have his victorious son proclaimed as a Syracusan (Paus. 6.2.6). Astylos of Kroton won three successive victories at Olympia; the second and third times he consented to being proclaimed a Syracusan, whereupon the Krotoniatai confiscated his house (Paus.6.13.1). In 380 the victorious runner Sotades from Crete was bribed by the Ephesians to be proclaimed as a citizen of Ephesos and was subsequently exiled by the Cretans (Paus. 6.18.6). That the same rules applied at the other Panhellenic games is apparent from Paus. 5.2.1-5; 6.3.9; 6.16.2 (Elis excluded from the Isthmian Games) and Paus. 8.18.8 (the fact that a man of Lousoi was proclaimed victor in the Pythian Games in 546 is adduced as proof that Lousoi was once a *polis*). It must be added that Kimon, although in exile, twice sent a *quadriga* to Olympia and was twice victorious. The second time he allowed Peisistratos to be proclaimed; what he did the first time is unknown (Hdt. 6.103.2).

51   Rhodes (*supra* n. 5) 91-2.

52   Lévy (*supra* n. 7) 53-4.

53   I have once before had the same experience. Until recently it was universally ac-
cepted by modern historians that the fourth-century Athenians were inconsistent in their
way of using the terms *nomos* and *psephisma* and that the assembly often legislated by
psephisma although the passing of all *nomoi* rested with the *nomothetai*. A collection of all
relevant sources showed that the Athenians were much more consistent in their legislative
procedures and in their use of the terms *nomos* and *psephisma* than modern historians had
believed (without having examined the evidence). See M.H. Hansen, *The Athenian Eccle-
sia* I (Copenhagen 1983) 161-206.

54   Skylax 57 (in *GGM* I p. 46). See the interpretation of the passage *supra* pages 30-32.

55   The so-called Marathonian τετράπολις, composed of four δῆμοι, is apparently a
contradiction in terms, but a plausible explanation is that the four communities were *poleis*
long before they were made into demes by Kleisthenes' reforms, see R. Sherk, "The Epon-
ymous Officials of Greek Cities," *ZPE* 83 (1990) 278.

56   Compare e.g. *Hell. Oxy.* 20.3, Chambers (where the small Boiotian communities syn-
oikized with Thebes in ca. 430 are called *choria*) with 21.5 (where the term *chorion* is
used jointly with *polis* about Hyampolis which was undeniably a *polis* in the political
sense).

57   Thucydides uses the terms *polis* and *polisma* synonymously about the four cities in
Doris (Thuc. 1.107.2); Chaironeia is classified as a *polis* by the Oxyrhynchus Historian at
19.2-3 but as a *polisma* by Aristophanes Boeotus (*FGrHist* 379) fr. 3. Cf. P. Flensted-Jen-
sen, "The Bottiaians and their *Poleis*," in Hansen & Raaflaub (eds.) (*supra* n. 15) Appen-
dix 129-31.

58   See *supra* n. 48.

59   Thuc. 4.56.2-57.3 (Thyrea) and 5.41.2 (Thyrea and Anthene).

60   Oion: Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.25-6; Tyros: *F. Delphes* III 1 68; Belbina: *Comica Adespota* P.
Oxy. 1801 col. 2.42 = Austin *CGF* fr. 343. Cf. Hansen (*supra* n. 23) 74.

61   Hdt. 7.22.3-23.1; Thuc. 4.109.3; 5.18.6 (Peace of Nikias, where Sane is called *polis*);
Skylax 66; *IG* I³ 269 col. 2.35 (Dion), 278 col. 6.23 (Kleonai), 268 col. 2.23 (Olophyxos),
260 col. 8.19 (Sane), 263 col. 3.23 (Thyssos); see *supra* p. 24.

62   Arist. *Pol.* 1252b19-20, 27-30; 1276b1-3. See M.H. Hansen, "Aristotle's two Comple-
mentary views of the Greek *Polis*," forthcoming in R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris (eds.),
Transitions to Empire in the Graeco-Roman World, 360-146 B.C. (Oklahoma 1996).

63   Se also the Solonian law Plut. *Solon* 24.4 (= Fr. 75, Ruschenbusch): παρέχει δ' ἀ-
πορίαν καὶ ὁ τῶν δημοποιήτων νόμος, ὅτι γενέσθαι πολίτας οὐ δίδωσι πλὴν τοῖς
φεύγουσιν ἀειφυγίᾳ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἢ πανεστίοις ᾿Αθήναζε μετοικιζομένοις ἐπὶ τέχνῃ. I
fully endorse the interpretation offered by S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (Ann Ar-
bor 1993) 381-3, *pace* J.K. Davies, "The Descent Group and the Alternatives," *CJ* 73
(1978) 105-21.

64   Cf. e.g. Thuc. 2.44-5; Lycurg. 1.40

65   See S. Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaka 1990); K. Raaflaub, "Homer to Sol-
on. The Rise of the *Polis*. The Written Sources," in Hansen (ed.) (*supra* n. 7) 46-59.

66   νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν *Il.* 2.12, 29, 66 etc.

67   *Od.* 14.472; *Il.* 1.129 (Troy); *Il.* 18.514 (shield of Achilles); *Od.* 6.9 (Scheria).

68   *Il.* 3.153 (Troy); *Od.* 6.262-3 (Scheria).

69   *Il.* 18.497 (shield of Achilles); *Od.* 6.266 (Scheria).

70 *Od*. 6.10, 266 (Scheria).

71 *Il*. 1.39; 5.446; 7.83 (Temple of Apollon); *Il*. 6.297-300 (temple of Athena).

72 *Od*. 6.9 (Scheria).

73 *Il*. 6.242ff (palace of Priamos); *Od*. 4.15ff (palace of Menelaos); *Od*. 7.81ff (palace of Alkinoos). Cf. C. Rider, *The Greek House* (reprint Cambridge 1965), Chapter xiv: "Homeric Palaces" 166-209.

74 P. Ducrey, "La muraille est-elle un élément constitutif d'une cité?," in Hansen (*supra* n. 4) 245-56.

75 M.H. Hansen and T. Fischer-Hansen, "Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Geek *Poleis*," in Whitehead (ed.) (*supra* n. 2) 85.

76 W. Schuller, "*Poleis* im Ersten Attischen Seebund," in Hansen (ed.) (*supra* n. 4) 165-70.

77 See *supra* n. 28.

78 Aloys Winterling in *Historia* 40 (1991) 193-229, cf. especially 205-11.

79 D. Whitehead, *Aineias the Tactician. How to Survive under Siege* (Oxford 1990) 10-3.

80 A *polis* waged war (Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 42B31-2, Argos); made peace (Tod, *GHI* 145.5-6, Argos); entered into an alliance (*OlBer*. 7 (1961) 207-10, Poseidonia); struck coins (*Syll³* 218.10, Olbia); passed a law (*CID* I 9.2-3, Delphoi; Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 2.1-2, Dreros); passed a sentence (*Syll³* 530.4, Dyme); founded a colony (Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 5.37, Thera); defrayed expenses (Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 83.2, Thasos; *IvO* 16.7-8, Elis and Skillous); repaired the walls (*CEG* 869, Paphos); organised a festival (*IG* XII 9 189.5, Eretria); *horoi* marking the borders of a *polis* (Treaty between Sparta and Argos quoted by Thuc. 5.79.4); the water supply of a *polis* (Heraclides 13-4, *GGM* I 102-3, Thebai); the altars of a *polis* (*F. Delphes* III 2.18.5-7, Delphoi); the protecting divinities of a *polis* (*IG* XII 8 356, Thasos).

81 Thuc. 2.15.6: καλεῖται δὲ διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν ταύτῃ κατοίκησιν καὶ ἡ ἀκρόπολις μέχρι τοῦδε ἔτι ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων πόλις.

82 Dem. 18.215-6: οὕτως οἰκείως ὑμᾶς ἐδέχοντο (sc. οἱ Θηβαῖοι) ὥστ' ἔξω τῶν ὁπλιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἱππέων ὄντων εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ τὸ ἄστυ δέχεσθαι τὴν στρατιὰν ἐπὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τιμιώτατα ... οὔτε γὰρ εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσελθόντος τοῦ στρατοπέδου οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἀδίκως ὑμῖν ἐνεκάλεσεν.

83 Hdt. 7.58.2: ὁ δὲ κατ' ἤπειρον στρατὸς (Xerxes' army) ... ἐποιέετο τὴν ὁδὸν διὰ τῆς Χερσονήσου ... διὰ μέσης δὲ πορευόμενος πόλιος τῇ οὔνομά τυγχάνει ἐὸν Ἀγορή.

84 Thuc. 5.18.5 (Peace of Nikias): ὅσας δὲ πόλεις παρέδοσαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι Ἀθηναίοις, ἐξέστω ἀπιέναι ὅποι ἂν βούλωνται αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἔχοντας.

85 See Appendix I on pages 34-6.

86 Sacrificial calendar of Erchia: *SEG* 21 541. Cult of Athena Polias (col. 1 lines 62-66) and of Zeus Polieus (col. 3 lines 59-64) on the akropolis of Erchia (distinguished from the akropolis in the city of Athens: col. 3 lines 15-7). See *infra* notes 136-7.

87 See Appendix II on pages 36-9.

88 Thuc. 2.93.2 (town); Xen. *Hell*. 4.4.6 (state), quoted in note 158 *infra*. See Hansen (*supra* n. 7) 20 with notes 139-40 and *infra* p. 38 at n. 160.

89 Xen. *Hell*. 4.5.3: Ἀγησίλαος ... ἀπεχώρησε μετ' ἄριστον πρὸς τὸ ἄστυ, ὡς προδιδομένης τῆς πόλεως, ὥστε οἱ Κορίνθιοι δείσαντες μὴ προδιδοῖτο ὑπό τινων ἡ πόλις, μετεπέμψαντο τὸν Ἰφικράτην.

90 See Appendix III on pages 38-54.

91 See Hansen (*supra* n. 4) 39-45.

92   See Th. Heine Nielsen, "Was Eutaia a *Polis*? A Note on Xenophon's Use of the Term *Polis* in the *Hellenika*," in Hansen & Raaflaub (eds.) (*supra* n. 15) 83-102.

93   See *infra* pages 29-30.

94   Thuc. 4.54.1: ἡ ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ πόλις as opposed to Kythera which at 4.54.2 is called: ἡ ἄνω πόλις. Cf. 54.4 where the reference is to: Σκάνδειαν τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ λιμένι πόλισμα. As far as we know the island Kythera had only one polis, *viz.* Kythera (cf. Skylax 46; Strab. 8.5.1; Paus. 3.23.1), and Skandeia is just the port of Kythera, not a political community in its own right. Cf. A.W. Gomme *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* III (Oxford 1956) 509.

95   See Hansen (*supra* n. 4) 43-4.

96   In Xenophon the term *polis* is used about the urban centre to be founded in the mining district (*Vect.* 4.50). How strange Xenophon's usage is here is duly noted by Ph. Gauthier in his *Commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon* (Paris 1976) 188-9.

97   E.g. at 1.1; 7.1.

98   E.g. at 10.23.

99   S.C. Bakhuizen, "Thebes and Boeotia in the Fourth Century B.C.," *Phoenix* 48 (1994) 308 n. 3.

100   Repeated with small variations in 36, 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65. In the rest of the work replaced by πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες αἵδε, cf. 67 etc.

101   E.g. Achilleios and Psamathous (46), Isai (65).

102   E.g. sanctuaries of Poseidon at Cape Tainaros (46) and Cape Geraistos (58).

103   E.g. Alpheios (43) and Eurotas (46).

104   Geraneia (39). Since there is no reliable evidence of any fortification on Mount Geraneia (Paus 1.43.8; Thuc. 1.105.3; 4.70.1) I suggest the punctuation Αἰγόσθενα, Πῆγαι τεῖχος, Γεράνεια, Ἄρις. In the 1831 edn. R.H. Klausen suggests the attractive conjecture: Γεράνεια ὄρος.

105   E.g. Cape Malea (46).

106   In addition to πόλις καὶ λιμήν (e.g. Leukas and Astakas, 34) and λιμήν (Achilleios and Psamathous, 46) we also find καὶ λιμήν in contexts which indicate that πόλις has to be understood from the heading so that the meaning is <πόλις> καὶ λιμήν, cf. Siphai (38), Kyllene (43), Messene (45) etc.

107   See *supra* page 7 with n. 6.

108   For the relative οὗ cf. καὶ Ἰσθμός, οὗ ἱερὸν Ποσειδῶνος. Like Eleusis, the Isthmos was certainly not a *polis* and Skylax does not say so.

109   Cf. e.g. 34, 47, 62, 66 etc.

110   For ἔχει cf. 58: Πάρος λιμένας ἔχουσα δύο, where it is unclear whether νῆσος or πόλις is to be understood with the participle ἔχουσα. Alternatively, since islands are grammatically feminine, ἔχουσα may go directly with Πάρος.

111   It is worth noting, however, that Hekataios seems to have used the term *polis* about Thorikos, see Steph. Byz 315.7-8 (= *FGrHist* 1 fr. 126): Θόρικος, δῆμος τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος φυλῆς. Ἑκαταῖος δε πόλιν αὐτήν φησιν.

112   Aigosthena: *IG* VII 207; Pegai: *IG* VII 190.

113   See Hansen (*supra* n. 23) 74-5.

114   *IG* VII 1.

115   E. g. W.G. Runciman, "Doomed to Extinction: The *Polis* as an Evolutionary Dead-End," in Murray and Price (*supra* n. 14) 348; K.-W. Welwei, *Die griechische Polis* (Köln 1983) 16; K. Raaflaub, "Homer und die Geschichte des 8. Jh.s v. Chr.," in J. Latacz (ed.), *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung* (Stuttgart 1991) 241.

116 Argued provisionally in Hansen (*supra* n. 7) 13-6.

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

118 Cf. H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* II (Heidelberg 1970) 576-7; M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford 1899) 635: "púr, f. a rampart, wall, stronghold, fortress, castle, city, town." K. Strunk, "Verkannte Spuren eines weiteren Tiefstufentyps im Griechischen," *Glotta* 47 (1970) 2.

119 It is misleading when in his book *Indo-European Language and Society* (London 1973) 298 E. Benveniste claims: "we have thus here an old Indo-European term, which in Greek, and only in Greek, has taken on the sense of "town, city", then "state"." In Sanskrit *púr* certainly developed the meaning "town", "city" (see *supra* n. 118) and since many of these cities were actually states I would not preclude that the word may take on the sense of "state" or "political community" as well.

120 E. Lévy, "*Asty* et *Polis* dans l'*Iliade*," *Ktema* 8 (1983) 55 nn.3-4.

121 But Lévy (*supra* n. 120) 59-60 is prepared to question even these two occurrences and holds that *polis* in the sense of *akropolis* is unattested in the Iliad. Sakellariou (*supra* n. 20) 156 n. 3 would like to add *Il.* 17.144: ὅππως κε πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ σαώσῃς whereas Lévy (60-1) believes that here and in similar instances *polis* is used synonymously with *asty*.

122 See e.g. *Il.* 6.88, 297, 317 etc.

123 *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 270-2: ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι νηόν τε μέγαν καὶ βωμὸν ὑπ' αὐτῷ / τευχόντων πᾶς δῆμος ὑπαὶ πόλιν αἰπύ τε τεῖχος / Καλλιχόρου καθύπερθεν ἐπὶ προὔχοντι κολωνῷ.

124 Eur. fr. 228.6, Nauck; Strab. 5.2.4; 8.6.9.

125 ἐς πόλιν (*Lys.* 302, 912; *Thesm.* 812); πρὸς πόλιν (*Nub.* 69; *Lys.* 266, 288); ἐκ πόλεως (*Eq.* 1093); ἐν πόλει (*Eq.* 267; *Lys.* 245, 317, 754, 758, 1183).

126 Ant. 6.39; Andoc. 1.132; Is. 5.44; Aeschin. 1.97; see the extremely illuminative note in W. Wyse, *The Speeches of Isaeus* (Cambridge 1904) 476-77 (*ad* Is. 5.44).

127 Thuc. 5.18.10; 5.23.5; 5.47.11.

128 *IG* I³ 46.21-2. The earliest attestation in a decree is in *IG* I³ 4 B.3 (485/4), the last securely dated attestation is *IG* II² 17.10 (394/3).

129 A. Henry, "Polis/Acropolis, Paymasters and the Ten Talent Fund," *Chiron* 12 (1982) 91-118.

130 Thuc. 2.15.6, quoted *supra* n. 81.

131 Mykenai: *IG* IV.2 492.2: παρ' Ἀθηναίας ἐς πόλιος ἱκέτας ἔγεντο (6th cent. B.C.); Eretria: XII 9 196.8-11: ἀναθεῖναι ὅπου ἂν βούληται τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐρετρίαι ἢ τῆς πόλεως; Rhodos: *IG* XII 1 677.13-9: [θ]έμειν δὲ τὰς στήλας .... ἄλλαν δὲ ἐπὶ τᾶς καταβάσιος τᾶ[ς] ἐξ Ἀχαΐας πόλιος.

132 E.g. *IG* II² 57. Note that *polis* is used without the article in the sense of *akropolis* but with the article when it signifies the Athenian state. See Wyse's note to Is 5.44 (*supra* n. 126).

133 Thuc. 3.90.3. See L. Bernabò Brea & M. Cavalier, *Mylai* (Novara 1959).

134 Thuc. 4.26.2, cf. 4.3.2-3.

135 Thuc.7.28.1.

136 *SEG* 21 541 col. I 62-4: Ἀθηνάαι Πολιάδι, ἐμ πόλει Ἐρχιᾶσι; col. III 61-3: Διὶ Πολιε(ῖ), ἐμ πόλει Ἐρχιᾶσι (375-50 B.C.).

137 *SEG* 21 541 col. 3.15-7: Διὶ Πολιε(ῖ) ἐμ πόλε(ι) ἐν ἄστε(ι).

138 Thuc. 3.101.2.

139   Paus. 8.12.7. Remains of old Cyclopean walls have been found on the eminence. See R. Hope Simpson and J.F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford 1970) 92-3.

140   See S. Cole, "Civic Cult and Civic Identity," in Hansen (*supra* n. 4) 301-5.

141   See e.g. the Kolophonians' decree about the repair of their walls (ca. 311-06 B.C.), L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques* (Genève 1992) no. 69 lines 18-20.

142   Note, however, that the archaic sanctuary of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus at Alalkomenai (Steph. Byz. 68.18-9) was located in the plain and not on an *akropolis* (Strabo 9.2.36; Paus. 9.33.5). The inference is that the epithets *Polias* and *Polieus* must be taken to mean "protecting the *polis*" and that this interpretation of the epithet seems to be considerably older than Susan Cole assumes. See Hansen (*supra* n. 4) 32-3.

143   Plut. *Pelop.* 18.1.

144   Paus. 1.26.6.

145   Thuc. 2.5.4: οἱ Θηβαῖοι ... ἐπεβούλευον τοῖς ἔξω τῆς πόλεως τῶν Πλαταιῶν. ἦσαν γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωποι κατὰ τοὺς ἀγροὺς καὶ κατασκευή, ...

146   Thuc. 2.71.2: ἀπεδίδου (Pausanias) Πλαταιεῦσι γῆν καὶ πόλιν τὴν σφετέραν ἔχοντας αὐτονόμους οἰκεῖν.

147   Thuc. 2.68.9: ἐλθόντες τε πρὸς τὸ Ἄργος τῆς μὲν χώρας ἐκράτουν, τὴν δὲ πόλιν ὡς οὐκ ἐδύναντο ἑλεῖν προσβαλόντες, ἀπεχώρησαν ἐπ᾽ οἴκου καὶ διελύθησαν κατὰ ἔθνη.

148   Apparently unpublished but exhibited in the court of the Museum on Paros. I am grateful to Prof. J.E. Skydsgaard for drawing my attention to this precious source and providing me with a photo of the stone, and to Prof. Stephen Tracy for dating the inscription to (presumably) the second half of the 4th century B.C., but perhaps a little later.

149   Arist. *Pol.* 1319a8-10; cf 1330a14-6 and Plat. *Lg.* 745C.

150   Hdt. 5.29.2: διεξελάσαντες δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν χώρην ... ὡς τάχιστα κατέβησαν ἐς τὸ ἄστυ, ἀλίην ποιησάμενοι ἀπέδεξαν τούτους μὲν τὴν πόλιν νέμειν τῶν εὗρον τοὺς ἀγροὺς εὖ ἐξεργασμένους.

151   Arist *Pol.* 1325b36: περὶ τῆς μελλούσης κατ᾽ εὐχὴν συνεστάναι πόλεως (*polis* used as the generic term); 1326b26: τὰ περὶ τῆς χώρας (the hinterland of the *polis*); 1327a3-4: τῆς δὲ πόλεως τὴν θέσιν εἰ χρὴ ποιεῖν κατ᾽ εὐχήν (*polis* used in the more specific sense of town).

152   For this linguistic phenomenon (sometimes called participatory opposition) cf. J. Lyons, *Semantics* I (Cambridge 1977) 307-8: "semantic marking".

153   See Hansen (*supra* n. 7) 15.

154   As is apparent from the passage the Tanagraians were allied with the Lakedaimonians, and accordingly it is unbelievable that Agesilaos pillaged the western part of the territory of Tanagra up to the city of Tanagra. Thus the genitive πόλεως to be understood after τῆς Ταναγραίων must denote the territory, not the town, and, similarly, in the phrase τῆς τῶν Θηβαίων πόλεως the term πόλις must denote the territory of Thebes, not the city of Thebes. Thus, *pace* LSJ s.v. ἠώς, the genitive τῆς τῶν Θηβαίων πόλεως must be partitive and not separative. See also τοῦ Τελευτίου ἐστρατευμένου πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ὀλυνθίων πόλιν at *Hell.* 5.3.3.

155   Lys. 6.46: ἀλλ᾽ οὐδεπώποτ᾽ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐστρατεύσατο, οὔτε ἱππεὺς οὔτε ὁπλίτης, οὔτε τριήραρχος οὔτ᾽ ἐπιβάτης...

156   Lys. 6.15: οὗτος μὲν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου φεύξεται τὴν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος πόλιν.

157   Din. 1.77: τὸν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλιτήριον ἀποκτείναντας ἐξόριστον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ποιῆσαι.

158   Xen. *Hell*. 4.4.6: αἰσθανόμενοι (the Korinthians) ἀφανιζομένην τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὸ καὶ ὅρους ἀνασπᾶσθαι καὶ Ἄργος ἀντὶ Κορίνθου τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῖς ὀνομάζεσθαι ... Isoc. 4.131: ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἔχομεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιτιμᾶν, ὅτι τῇ μὲν αὐτῶν πόλει τοὺς ὀ- μόρους εἱλωτεύειν ἀναγκάζουσι (the Lakedaimonians). See D. Rousset,"Les frontières des cités grecques. Premières réflexions à partir du recueil des documents épigraphiques," *Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz* 5 (1994) 97-126.

159   Cf. e.g. *Hell. Oxy.* 19.3, Chambers, where *chora* is used to denote the whole of Boiotia subdivided into eleven *mere*, and Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.28 where *chora* is used about the territory of the Parrhasians.

160   See *supra* page 28 with n. 88.

161   See e.g. Hdt. 6.96.1: οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι ... ἐνέπρησαν καὶ τὰ ἱρὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν (i.e. Naxos).

162   See e.g. Hdt. 5.92β1; Κορινθίοισι γὰρ ἦν πόλιος κατάστασις τοιήδε. ἦν ὀλ- ιγαρχίη ...

163   See e.g. Hdt. 6.74.2: ἐν δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ πόλι (Nonakris) λέγεται εἶναι ὑπ᾽ Ἀρκάδων τὸ Στυγὸς ὕδωρ.

164   See e.g. Hdt. 4.150.3: χρᾷ ἡ Πυθίη κτίζειν ἐν Λιβύῃ πόλιν.

165   In his description of Aigina Herodotos mentions ἡ παλαιὴ καλεομένη πόλις (Hdt. 6.88.1). One might think that he had the akropolis in mind, but it is more likely that the ref- erence is to the oldest part of the city near the bay north of Cape Colonna; see T. Figueira, *Aegina. Society and Politics* (Salem 1981) 190-1.

166   *Polis* in the sense of political community used about the Hellenic cities in general: εἰ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτό γε δοκέει ὑμῖν εἶναι χρηστὸν ὥστε τυραννεύεσθαι τὰς πόλις, κτλ. (Hdt. 5.92α2). *Polis* in the sense of town used about the Ionian cities in general: οὗτος ὡνὴρ ... ὡς ἀπίκετο ἐς τὴν Ἰωνίην, αἵρεε τὰς πόλιας χώμασι (Hdt. 1.162.2).

167   In surveys, e.g. of contingents in a battle, where the term *polis* is used as a heading it is a matter of interpretation how many of the names listed are covered by the heading. One example is Herodotos' list at 8.43-48 of the ships which fought on the Greek side in the battle of Salamis. The heading is συνελέχθησάν τε δὴ πολλῷ πλεῦνες νέες ἢ ἐπ᾽ Ἀρτεμισίῳ ἐναυμάχεον καὶ ἀπὸ πολίων πλεύνων (8.42.1). Again, after the list the ac- count of the Greeks' war council is opened with the phrase: ὡς δὲ ἐς τὴν Σαλαμῖνα συνῆλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων πολίων, ἐβουλεύοντο ... (8.49.1). A list of twenty-two named communities is sandwiched between ἀπὸ πολίων πλεύνων at 8.42.1 and ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων πολίων at 8.49.1, and I believe that Herodotos must have taken these twenty-two communities to be *poleis* in the political sense of the term.

168   Thus, I exclude (a) Atramyttion, called *polis* at 7.42.1, because, in the lifetime of Herodotos, it was a barbarian *polis* and not hellenized until 422 when it was settled by the Delians (Thuc. 5.1.1; Diod. 12.73.1; Skylax 98); (b) the Edonian *polis* Myrkinos (*5.11.2; 5.24.4*, cf. Thuc. 4.107.3) although the colonists were probable Hellenes (Hdt. 5.23.2); (c) the Sicilian town Maktorion (*7.153.3*) to be Hellenized only after the age of Herodotos. (d) Pyrene (2.33.2) which, however, may have been the Massalian colony Emporion.

169   They are Aineia (7.123.2); Amprakia (8.45.1); Arisba (1.151.2); Asine (8.73.2); Chalkis (8.46.2); Elis (8.73.2); Epidauros (8.43.1); Eretria (8.46.2); Halikarnassos (1.144.3; 2.178.2; 7.99.2); Hermione (8.43.1; 8.73.2); Ialysos (1.144.3); Kallipolis (7.154.2); Kalydnos (7.99.2); Kamiros (1.144.3); Keos (the four *poleis* perhaps united, cf. Brun in *ZPE* 76 [1989] 129) (8.46.2); Knidos (1.144.3, 2.178.2); Korinthos (5.92β1bis;

8.43.1); Kos (1.144.3; 7.99.2); Kythnos (8.46.4); Kyzikos (4.15.1, cf. 4.14.1); Leontinoi (7.154.2); Leukas (8.45.1); Lindos (1.144.3); Megara (8.45.1); Melos (8.46.4); Mytilene (2.178.2); Naxos (in Sicily) (7.154.2); Nisyros (7.99.2); Phaselis (2.178.2); Rhodos (probably = Kamiros, Ialysos and Lindos combined) (2.178.2); Seriphos (8.46.4); Sikyon (8.43.1); Styra (8.46.4); Troizen (8.43.1, cf. *supra* n. 167).

170   Agore in the Thracian Chersonese, mentioned at 7.58.2.

171   For the Phokian *poleis* I cite Pausanias' account at 10.3.2 of the *dioikismos* of Phokis in 346, cf. Diod. 16.60.1-2; Dem. 19.123 (twenty-two Phokian *poleis*). For a full discussion of the archaic and classical sources see Jacques Oulhen's and Dennis Rousset's forthcoming contribution to the *CPC* inventory of *poleis*.

172   Indicated in the list by italics.

173   Interpreting Thuc. 4.102.3 Bresson emphasizes how a *polis* was often developed out of an *emporion*. See A. Bresson, "les cités grecques et leurs *emporia*," in A. Bresson & P. Rouillard (eds.), *L'emporion* (Paris 1993) 218-21.

174   M.M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age*. *PCPS* Suppl. 2 (1970) 30.

175   As argued most recently by A. Bresson, "Rhodes, L'Hellénion et le statut de Naucratis (VIe- IVe siècle a.C.)," *DAH* 6 (1980) 291-349. Bresson's discussion on pages 316-7 of the use of the ethnic Ναυϰρατίτης will be discussed in my forthcoming article on ethnics as evidence for *polis*-ness, to be published in *Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 3.

176   Cf. e.g. Macan's comment on Hdt. 7.123 (page 156-7): "One might wish to believe that this list of trivial villages were a gloss from a local pedant! Why should Hdt. stud the few miles of Krossian coast with this heptarchy of hamlets?".

177   *Conventions:* references to Greek authors follow the abbreviations of *OCD*. References to inscriptions follow the latest standard editions, conventions are those of *SEG*. Citations of modern works follow the abbreviations of *American Journal of Archaeology* (1991 issue). Centuries are abbreviated C6, C5, C4 (= 6th, 5th, 4th cent. B.C.). C5e (= early fifth century B.C.), C5f (= first half of the 5th cent.) C5m (= ca. 450 B.C.) C5s (second half of the 5th cent.). C5l (= late fifth century B.C.). Whenever a source is used retrospectively the period to which it refers is indicated. A reference in Diodoros to an event in 402 B.C. is recorded: Diod. 14.17.3, r402 B.C. or: Harp. s.v. Hysiai, rC4. – Apart from some later additions and revisions this database layout was composed during the summer and autumn of 1993 by Mogens Herman Hansen, Lene Rubinstein and David Whitehead.

178   For valuable comments on this paper I would like to thank my respondent Franz Georg Maier and my colleagues in the *CPC*: Tobias Fischer-Hansen, Pernille Flensted-Jensen, Antony Keen, Thomas Heine Nielsen and Lene Rubinstein. A much shorter version of the paper was delivered at the symposion on *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, arranged by P.J. Rhodes and held in Durham in Sept. 1995. It will appear in the acts of the symposion published by Routledge.