

EPIGRAPHY AND FREEDOM OF THE GREEKS IN ASIA IN THE AGE OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

KRZYSZTOF NAWOTKA *

In the fourth century B.C. political writers began to recognise the Greeks of Asia as a distinct section of the Hellenic world and the issue of their freedom became a political slogan used frequently, especially after the King's Peace had been concluded¹. This slogan could turn into practicality with the Asian expedition of Alexander the Great whose official aim was to liberate Greek cities in the realm of the Great King². This paper aims at gauging sincerity of the proclaimed liberation of the Greeks. It is concerned primarily with Alexander's policy in 334-3 B.C., although sources, epigraphic and literary alike, referred to here are often later. The methodological principal of this paper is to peruse all fourth century public documents from the region and not only inscriptions expressly referring to Alexander. On this basis conclusions can be drawn as to the extent of political changes in Greek cities resulting from activities of Alexander the Great. Its scope will be limited to the cities of Asia Minor as their legal and political standing was fundamentally different than that of *poleis* of the continental Greece and of the islands. From the King's Peace, at the very latest, the cities of Asia Minor belonged to Persia and hence, by the Greek standards, they were not free. The situation of the islands in the age of Alexander is quite well known thanks to a number of rather unambiguous sources³: they obtained a democratic consti-

tution and some of them at least (Tenedos, Chios, some *poleis* in Lesbos) became members of the League of Corinth.

The *Anabasis* of Arrian and Diodorus⁴ paint the following picture. In the summer of 334, shortly after Granicus, Alexander arrived at Ephesus where, on testimony of Arrian, he dissolved an oligarchy, established a democracy and made the Ephesians pay to Artemis a tribute which used to be submitted to Persia. Soon, responding to embassies from Magnesia on the Maeander and Tralles, Alexander detailed an Alkimachos with at least 2700 soldiers to the cities of Ionia and Aeolia still under the Persian control, ordering him to overthrow oligarchies, establish democracies, restore their laws, and abolish the tribute. Diodorus states that Alexander made Greek cities of Caria autonomous and free of tribute. Additional information provided by Arrian (*An.*, 1.17.7) are about Alexander's appointment of one Nikias as an officer in charge of collecting the tribute and contribution (σύνταξις).

The precise meaning of Alexander's dealings with the Greeks in Asia Minor has been a matter of prolonged scholarly dispute. Not trying to relate here the whole discussion, it suffices to say that now prevails a rather pessimistic view of freedom of the Greeks in Asia harking back to a 1934 article by E. Bickermann who pointed out that Alexander, in accordance with the legal theories of his time, regarded Asia Minor (and other lands) his property by virtue of having won it with a

* Uniwersytet Wrocławski.

1. SEAGER, R.; TUPLIN, C., "The Freedom of the Greeks of Asia: On the origin of a concept and the creation of a slogan", *JHS* 100, 1980, 141-154; FLOWER, M.A. *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Oxford 1994, 89.

2. DIOD. 17.24.1: μάλιστα δ' εὐεργέτει τὰς Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις, ποιῶν αὐτὰς αὐτονόμους καὶ ἀφορολογήτους, προσεπιλέγων ὅτι τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερώσεως ἕνεκα τὸν πρὸς Πέρσας πόλεμον ἐπανήρηται.

3. Besides Arrian, inscriptions concerning Eresos, Mytilene

(both in Lesbos), Chios, published with ample commentary in HEISSERER, A.J., *Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence*, Norman, Oklahoma 1980.

4. ARR., *An.*, 1.17-18; DIOD., 17.24.

spear (δορίκτητος χώρα)⁵. Thus in legal terms Greek cities in Asia were Alexander's subjects who enjoyed freedom at king's pleasure without legal warranty of a treaty⁶. With time his view became almost an orthodoxy⁷. In line with this the very difference between the tribute paid to Persia and *syntaxis* submitted to Alexander has been questioned as well⁸. Some scholars argue that what Alexander actually did in the *poleis* of Asia Minor amounted simply to replacing the pro-Persian oligarchic elites with the pro-Macedonian regimes calling themselves democratic⁹. The minority view is that freedom, as an inborn and inalienable quality of the Greek cities, only temporarily hampered by the Persian rule, was automatically restored to them by virtue of Persian defeat inflicted by Alexander, which is reflected by Arrian's usage of the words τούς νόμους τούς σφῶν ἐκάστοις ἀποδοῦναι¹⁰.

The discussion of the freedom of the Greek cities in Asia Minor conducted primarily on the basis of literary sources has not brought decisive results. I propose to look at this topic from the standpoint of the fourth-century Greek meaning

of the words *autonomia* and *eleutheria* and in the light of contemporary legal documents. M. Hansen¹¹ has shown that for the Greeks a free *polis* was governed in accordance with its laws (*nomoi*), it controlled its territory (*chora*), it exercised its jurisdiction, including admitting and expelling foreigners, it could run its foreign policy, it made independent decisions concerning its finances, including taxation. The most important among these criteria was governing in accordance with one's laws because it defined the original meaning of the word αὐτονομία¹², which should not be translated as 'autonomy' but as 'freedom' or 'independence'¹³. The Greeks, Hansen shows, did not think that participating in a military alliance (συμμαχία) and an ensuing obligation to submit a war-related contribution (σύνταξις) were incompatible with the freedom of a *polis*. On the other hand, these *poleis* were not free upon whom substantial political conditions had been imposed, including the obligation to pay a tribute (φόρος). Among the *poleis* which the Greeks regarded not free were e.g. those ruled by tyrants or subjects of the Great King. To that from the 330s at the latest democracy was believed to be the natural political system of a *polis*¹⁴, a constitutional standard, referred to by the Greeks as πάτριον πολιτεία. Since oligarchy was perceived as a deviation from the natural political system too, only democratic *polis* was truly free¹⁵.

The table below presents a synopsis of all extant decrees of the cities of Ionia, Aeolia and Caria, i.e. the countries in which Alexander, on Arrian's and Diodorus' evidence, declared Greek cities free.

5. BICKERMANN, E., "Alexandre le Grand et les villes d'Asie", REG 8, 1934, 346-374. See MEHL, A., "Doriktetos chora: kritische Bemerkungen zum 'Speerbewerb' in Politik und Völkerrecht der hellenistischen Epoche", *Anc. Soc.* 11-12, 1980-1, 173-212 on this Greek concept of international law stressing victory in a pitched battle as a legal means of acquiring a territory.

6. BICKERMANN, *o.c.*, 369-71. BADIAN, E., "Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia", *Ancient Societies and Institutions: Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday*, New York 1967, 49 went even further, comparing the position of *poleis* of Asia Minor to that of the satellite states of the Soviet Union.

7. E.g. HAMILTON, J.R., *Alexander the Great*, London 1973, 59; HAMMOND, N.G.L., *Alexander the Great. King, Commander and Statesman*, London 1989³, 253-4; STEWART, A., *Faces of power: Alexander's image and Hellenistic politics*, Berkeley 1993, 89; RUIZ-ICKA, S., "The Eastern Greek World", TRITTLE, L.A. (ed.), *The Greek World in the fourth century: from the fall of the Athenian Empire to the successors of Alexander*, London and New York 1997, 127-9.

8. GREEN, P., *Alexander the Great*, London 1970, 103-4; JEHNE, M., *Koine Eirene. Untersuchungen zu den Beriedungs- und Stabilisierungsbemühungen in der griechischen Poliswelt des 4. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.* (*Hermes. Einzelschriften* 63), Stuttgart 1994, 209.

9. GREEN, *o.c.*, 102: "one lot of puppet rulers was replaced by another"; cf. SEIBERT, J., "Panhellenischer' Kreuzzug. Nationalkrieg, Rachefeldzug oder makedonischer Eroberungskrieg? Überlegungen zu den Ursachen des Krieges gegen Persien", WILL, W. (Hrsg.), *Alexander der Grosse, eine Welteroberung. Vorträge des Internationalen Bonner Alexanderkolloquiums*, Bonn 1998, 17-18. For a sober assessment of this way of historical thinking see SHIPLEY, G., *The Greek World after Alexander 323-30 B.C.*, London, New York 2000, 4.

10. TARN, W.W., *Alexander the Great*, vol. II, Cambridge 1948, 202-5, 207; MAGIE, D., *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, Princeton 1950, 5-8; to a degree LANE FOX, R., *Alexander the Great*, London 1973, 129-39.

11. HANSEN, M.H., "The 'Autonomous city-state': ancient fact or modern fiction", HANSEN, M.H.; RAAFLAUB, K. (eds.), *Studies in the ancient Greek polis*, Wiesbaden 1995 (*Historia Einzelschriften* 95), 24-30. Similar line of argument already in MAGIE, *o.c.*, 56-7; also BILLOWS, R.A., *Antigonus the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1990, 190-97; GAUTHIER, PH., "Les cités hellénistiques", HANSEN, M.H. (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, July 1-4 1992*, Copenhagen 1993, 213.

12. HANSEN, M.H., *Polis and City-State: An Ancient Concept and its Modern Equivalent. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5*, Copenhagen 1998, 78-82; BILLOWS, *o.c.*, 196-7.

13. Cf. LSJ, s.v.

14. ARIST., *Pol.* 1286b20: ἴσως οὐδὲ ῥάδιον ἔτι γίνεσθαι πολιτεῖαν ἑτέραν παρὰ δημοκρατίαν; cf. GAUTHIER, PH., "Les cités hellénistiques: épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des régimes politiques", *Praktika tou 9 diethnous synedriou ellenikes kai latinikes epigraphikes*, I, Athena 1984, 86.

15. QUASS, F., "Zur Verfassung der griechischen Städte im Hellenismus", *Chiron* 9, 1979, 37-52; GAUTHIER, *o.c.*, 100; BILLOWS, *o.c.*, 197.

City/territory	Decrees preceding the fourth century	Fourth century decrees preceding the Macedonians	Remaining fourth century decrees
Ephesus	0-2 ¹⁶	1 ¹⁷	44 ¹⁸
Erythrai	3 ¹⁹	5-7 ²⁰	4-6 ²¹
Magnesia on the Maeander	0	0	1-2 ²²
Kolophon	0	0	5-6 ²³
Priene	0	0	4 ²⁴
Teos	3 ²⁵	0	0
Phygela	0	0	1 ²⁶
Klazomenai	0	0	1 ²⁷
Miletus	3 ²⁸	2 ²⁹	5-6 ³⁰
All of Ionia	9-11	8-10	66-71
Kyme	0	0	1 ³¹
All of Aeolia	0	0	1
Cnidus	0	6-12	0-6 ³²
Stratonikeia	0	0	1 ³³
Tralles	0	1 ³⁴	0
Koranza	0	1 ³⁵	2 ³⁶
Amyzon	0	0	1 ³⁷
Iasos	3 ³⁸	2 ³⁹	13 ⁴⁰

16. No proper decrees extant. But *IEphesos* 1 containing accounts of Artemisium may have been passed as a decree; the same with a *lex sacra* contained by *IEphesos* 1678B.

17. *IEphesos* 1417 dated by the first editor (KEIL, J., "Ephesische Bürgerrechts- und Proxenieedikrete aus dem vierten und dritten Jahrhundert v.Chr.", *JÖAI* 16, 1913, 196) to the beginning of the fourth or even to the end of the fifth century.

18. *IEphesos* 1389, 1418 (3 decrees), 1419-1438, 1440, 1452, 1474, 2009-2012; *SEG* 33.932 (5 decrees), 39.1151, 1155-1157, 115-1161, 1163. Most of inscriptions listed here belong to the earliest periods of Ephesian legislation, in RHODES, P.J.; LEWIS, D.M., *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford 1997, 358-9 classification "first style" and "transitional style". Also some decrees of Rhodes' "second style" may originate in the fourth century (perhaps *IEphesos* 1441). They are not listed here because of uncertainty as to their dates.

19. *IErythrai* 11, 11I, 2.

20. Certain decrees are: *SEG* 36.1039, 31.969; *IErythrai* 6, 8, 12. *IErythrai* 9 contains a treaty with tyrant Hermias of Atarneus, most probably passed by the people of Erythrai as a decree, but because of the damage to the stone we no longer have the initial formulae probably pertaining to the legislative procedure. *IErythrai* 15 is either from Erythrai or Chios.

21. Certainly fourth century decrees: *IErythrai* 10, 11, 21, 22. *IErythrai* 13 and 34 are dated by the editor to the fourth/third century.

22. *IMagnesia* 1 and perhaps *IMagnesia* 2 dated by the editor to the fourth/third century.

23. MERITT, B.D., "Inscriptions of Colophon", *AJP* 56, 1935, 379-80 IV, 382-3 VIII, 372-7 II, 377-9 III, 359-72 I, and perhaps 381-2 VII dated by the editor to the fourth/third century.

24. *IPriene* 2, 5, 9, 10; dates after Crowther.

25. *Syll.*³ 37 and 38+*SEG* 31.984; *SEG* 31.985.

26. *IEphesos* 3111.

27. *IErythrai* 161.

28. *Milet* 1.6.187; HERRMANN, *Klio* 1970, 165-166. We learn from the later isopoliteia treaty with Olbia (*Milet* 1.3.136) that a treaty of this kind was binding upon these cities much earlier, probably in the fifth century. Doubtless, it had the form of a decree passed both by Olbia and Miletus.

29. *LSAM* 45 and an unpublished decree mentioned in EHRHARDT, N., *Milet und seine Kolonien. Vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen*, Frankfurt a.M. 1988, 382, n. 9.

30. *Milet* 1.3.135, 137, 142; *SEG* 38.1193; *IG* II² 1129. *Milet* 1.3.136 dated to 330-323 containing the isopoliteia treaty with Olbia obviously resulted from a decrees. The isopoliteia treaty with Istros (*ISM* 1.62) may have originated in the end of the fourth or in the beginning of the third century, NAWOTKA, K., *The Western Pontic Cities. History and Political Organization*, Amsterdam 1997, p. 33-34.

31. *IKyme* 1.

32. *IKnidus* 1, 603, 604, 5 (=SEG 39.1117), 7 are dated to the first half of the fourth century. *IKnidus* 605 was inscribed ca. mid-fourth century. *IKnidus* 4, 8-10, 160, 213, dated to the second half of the fourth century may precede the Macedonian invasion or postdate it.

33. ROBERT, J. et L., *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie. I. Exploration, historie, monnaies et inscriptions*, Paris 1983, 100.

34. *ITralles* 3.

35. *IStratonikeia* 502.

36. *IStratonikeia* 501, 503.

37. ROBERT, *o.c.*, no 2.

38. *SEG* 36.982 (3 decrees).

39. *Iiasos* 1, 52.

40. *Iiasos* 24, 30, 20 (reedition with substantial amendments: *SEG* 40.959), 32, 31, 27, 42, 47, 54, 59, 60, 2; *SEG* 36.981 (*SEG* 38.1059 contains another copy of the same decree). The dating in PUGLIESE-CARATELLI, G., "Ancora su Iasos e i Cari", *RAL* 42, 1987, 289-292 of *SEG* 36.981 to the years

City/territory	Decrees preceding the fourth century	Fourth century decrees preceding the Macedonians	Remaining fourth century decrees
Mylasa	0	6 ⁴¹	0
Halicarnassus	1 ⁴²	0	1 ⁴³
All of Caria	4	16-22	18-24
All of Ionia, Aeolia, Caria	13-15	24-32	85-96

In the broadest terms this table reflects trends well known in Greek epigraphy: a small number of public documents preceding the fourth century and a markedly growing number of inscriptions in the fourth century. On the other hand, the distribution of decrees in the cities included in the table is very uneven between the first 2/3 of the fourth century and the last 1/3: in the later part of the century the number of extant decrees is at least three times bigger than in its (twice as long) first part. Of course, it did not happen everywhere, to which I shall return later in this paper. This increase of the number of recorded decrees is most visible in large cities, like Ephesus, Miletus, Iasos, where very extensive archaeological investigation have been taking place over an extended period of time. These cities have yielded substantial number of inscriptions (Ephesus alone more than four thousand). It can therefore be safely assumed that our knowledge of their legislation is not governed by accidental finds of single decrees. It is not accidental that one Ephesian decree preceding the Macedonian invasion is extant while at least 44 from the last 1/3 of the fourth century have survived had a more or less similar number of decrees been produced in Ephesus in both parts of that century. Quite obviously many more decrees were inscribed in many of the cities included in the above table in the last 1/3 of the fourth century than in any preceding period.

The sudden rise in number of surviving decrees in the region from less than half per year in the first 2/3 of the fourth century to ca. 3 per year in the last 1/3 needs to be pondered over, since it happened in the milieu of *polis*, a 'citizen state'⁴⁴

immediately following 334 was disputed by GAUTHIER (*BEp* 1990. 276), yet without good reason, as it seems. To the fourth century may also belong at least some decrees dated by the editor to the fourth/third century: *Ilasos* 26, 33, 37, 39-41, 45, 46, 50, 53, 56, 57, 64, 66, 69.

41. *IMylasa* 1-5; *SEG* 40.985.

42. MEIGS, LEWIS, 32.

43. MICHEL, 452.

44. RUNCIMAN, W.G., "Doomed to extinction: the polis as an evolutionary dead-end", MURRAY, O.; PRICE, S. (eds), *The Greek*

lacking a bureaucratic machinery producing written documents for its own use. Greek authors immersed in the world of *polis* saw a close connection between the nature of a *polis'* constitution and the degree of openness to which public business was conducted⁴⁵. Already Herodotus (3.80.2) noticed that openness was one of the principal tenets of democracy. There is also an enormous hiatus between the number of extant public documents in Athens (ca. 1400 decrees alone), democratic for most time and in Sparta, Thebes and Corinth (a few surviving decrees), often oligarchic in the classical age. The interdependence between constitutional changes and a number of recorded decrees can be best followed in Athens, since due to the abundance of literary sources we almost always know what type of government was in force in Athens in a given year. There, the periods of oligarchic and democratic government find reflection in smaller or bigger numbers of recorded decrees⁴⁶. Thus, both the authors and the epigraphic sources attest the close link between the openness of public life and the nature of government of a *polis*⁴⁷.

The number of fourth-century decrees of cities of Ionia, Aeolia and Caria inscribed in stone is not sufficient for a sound statistical analysis. Yet most decrees originate in six cities (Miletus, Ephesus, Kolophon, Erythrai, Cnidus, Iasos) and some of

City from Homer to Alexander, Oxford 1990, 347-67. See also HENDRICK, C.W., "Democracy and the Athenian Epigraphical Habit", *Hesperia* 68, 1999, 387-8 for a good polemic with the notion of "writing as an exclusionary medium of communication".

45. More on that in VERNANT, J.-P., *Les origines de la pensée grecque*, Paris 1975, 44-52.

46. HENDRICK, *o.c.*, 402-7; see also interesting charts (p. 392 and 394) showing fluctuation in numbers of surviving Athenian inscriptions cut in successive periods of 100 and 25 years.

47. DOW, S., "Corinthiaca", *HSCP* 53, 1942, 89-119; MERITT, B.D., *Epigraphica Attica*, Cambridge, Mass. 1940; DETIENNE, M., "L'espace de la publicité, ses opérateurs intellectuels dans la cité", DETIENNE, M. (ed.), *Les Savoirs de l'écriture en Grèce ancienne*, Lille 1988, 29-81 and, with some reservation, also THOMAS, R., *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 1992 and HENDRICK, *o.c.*

them at least merit closer attention. Legislative activity in Miletus, as reflected in epigraphic sources, increased markedly after 334⁴⁸. The epigraphic sources testify to the evolution from a democracy of the Athenian type in the first part of the fourth century, through an oligarchy, probably introduced in Miletus by Mausolus, to a new democracy established in 334⁴⁹. This was a democracy of a rather moderate nature, with a probouleutic procedure in which motions of decrees were prepared and tabled by ad hoc committees or boards of magistrates⁵⁰, excluding in practice, if not by law, the so called pure decrees of the demos. Possibly it is because of the moderate nature of the Milesian democracy, that so much fewer decrees were inscribed in Miletus than in Ephesus in the last 1/3 of the fourth century. There, at least 44 decrees inscribed in the last 1/3 of the fourth century point at the active assembly, whose very existence before the Macedonian invasion is barely attested. Formulae of fourth-century Ephesian decrees⁵¹ show that the assembly was certainly not as tightly controlled by probouleutic bodies as that in Miletus. It is, of course, an indication of a much more radical form of democracy in Ephesus than in Miletus. This what we can deduce from epigraphic sources on the character of Ephesian constitution is congruous with Arrian's account of the political development in Ephesus in the 330s marred with frequent constitutional changes, short-lived oppressive oligarchy, overthrown by a democratic revolution in 334. Violent moves of the people against the pro-Persian oligarchs, whom Alexander had to take into protection (Arr., *An.*, 1.17.12), foretold the radical nature of the Ephesian democracy, attested by both the abundant production of decrees and the absence of control of the legislative procedure by narrow probouleutic bodies.

The sparse fifth-century evidence indicates that Iasos was a democratic *polis* at that time⁵². At one point also Iasos lost its independence to Mauso-

lus, but nothing indicates that his overlordship lead in Iasos, as in Erythrai, to replacing a democracy by an oligarchy⁵³. Most probably the democracy at that time was a moderate one⁵⁴. Beginning in 334 the legislative activity became more vigorous, bills were adopted both on motion of boards⁵⁵ and of individual citizens⁵⁶. The assembly pay (*ekklesiastikon*⁵⁷) attests to the decidedly democratic character of Iasos in the epoch of Alexander the Great. Because sources for the age of Mausolus are not so good, it is not possible to establish what exactly the scope of constitutional changes was in 334. Nevertheless, without any doubt under Alexander the democracy in Iasos became more active and radical than in the previous period, the memory of which was to be erased by honouring those who opposed Mausolus in Mylasa in 361/0⁵⁸.

The table shows that the beginning of the traceable legislative activity of Priene, Kolophon, Magnesia on the Maeander, Phygela, Klazomenai occurred in the last 1/3 of the fourth century. It is a justified conclusion, therefore, that at that time democracy was indeed established in Ionia, as, according to Arrian, Alexander wanted.

Situation in Caria is more ambiguous than in Ionia. Epigraphic sources do not attest any example of active democracy in the last 1/3 of the fourth century beside Iasos. The hellenised Carian towns Mylasa, Tralles, Amyzon, Koranza and the Greek city of Cnidus had decrees inscribed under Mausolus or in the last 1/3 of the fourth century, albeit without the democratic formulae ἔδοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ / ἔδοξε τῶι δήμῳ.

Instead they employed formulae ἔδοξε Μυλασεῦσιν (Ἀμυζονεῦσιν, Κορανζεῦσιν, Κνιδίοις), ἐψηφίσατο Τραλδεῖς⁵⁹. The similar habit of issuing public documents in the name of the *polis* and not its democratic legislative bodies (*boule* and *demos*) is attested in Miletus in the era of oligarchy installed by Mausolus⁶⁰. There is no reason to

48. Evidence for it are decrees listed in the table and a *titulus honorarius* Syll.³ 225 of 345/4.

49. NAWOTKA, K., *Boule and Demos in Miletus and its Pontic Colonies*, Wroc_aw 1999, 30-1, 33-4.

50. NAWOTKA, *o.c.*, 98-114.

51. Most, are in abbreviated form, but in all decrees in which formulae of proposer of motion are extant, they are in the form δεῖνα εἶπεν: *IEphesos* 1420, 1452; *SEG* 39.1151, 1156, 1159, 1160.

52. We know that both better preserved decrees in the dossier contained in *SEG* 36.982 have the formula ἔδοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ and the only decree (C in the dossier) with extant formula of proposer of motion was passed on motion of a single citizen (ὁ δεῖνα εἶπεν).

53. HORNBLLOWER, S., *Mausolus*, Oxford 1982, 112-3; BOSWORTH, A.B., *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge 1988, 253.

54. Two decrees of the boule and demos belong to the period of Mausolus: *Ilasos* 1 and 52. Only the last one has a formula of proposer of motion and it reads γυνῶμι πρυτανέων.

55. *Ilasos* 24, 27, 59, 60.

56. *SEG* 36.981 (another copy *SEG* 38.1059); *Ilasos* 32, 42, 54.

57. *Ilasos* 20. The date of this inscription is 330-325.

58. *SEG* 36.981 (another copy *SEG* 38.1059), passed in 334 or shortly after, cf. PUGLIESE-CARATELLI, *o.c.*

59. See decrees listed in the table.

60. *Syll.*³ 225; cf. NAWOTKA, *o.c.*, 34, 80.

believe that Carian towns were democratic before Alexander and nothing in epigraphic sources shows that their constitution changed in 334. In the light of what we know about the relation between the number of public documents and the constitution of a *polis*, Carian cities both before Alexander and after 334 were oligarchic. They continued to stay under satrapal control too⁶¹.

Since the right to issue one's laws in a democratic fashion and the freedom from an outside control constituted the essence of the notion of *autonomia*, Carian cities were not, in the light of their inscriptions, *autonomoi*, i.e. free. As a matter of fact this picture does not contradict Arrian's account about Alexander's resolution to transfer power in Caria to Ada daughter of Hecatomnus⁶². Since Ptolemy was in charge of military affairs in this territory, the responsibilities of Ada and after her death of a satrap (probably of Philoxenos⁶³) were of administrative nature⁶⁴, including the control of Carian towns. But we have also the passage in Diodorus quoted above which, read as a proof of maintaining by Alexander the same principles in Caria as in Ionia and Aeolia⁶⁵, seems to contradict the fourth-century Carian inscriptions. Preference should be given to epigraphic sources since they, as legal documents contemporary with the events to which they refer, are more reliable. Possibly Diodorus or his sources meant that Alexander had proclaimed free only the old Greek poleis on the sea shore. And indeed inscriptions show such city in Caria, Iasos, no less *autonomos* than poleis in Ionia. At any rate, certainly there was no universal proclamation of freedom of all Greek and native hellenised cities of Asia Minor but Alexander's policy was fine tuned and selective in this respect too.

Another important quality of a free *polis* was the right to run its finances, in particular the freedom from tribute⁶⁶. International treaties⁶⁷ show

61. Ἀσάνδρο ἐξαίθραπέυοντος: ROBERT 1983, no. 2 (Amyzon) and p. 100 (Stratonikeia); *IStratonikeia* 501, 503 (Koranza).

62. ARR., *An.*, 1.23.7-8; about Ada see HORNBLLOWER, *o.c.*, 45-51.

63. JACOBS, B., *Die Satrapieverwaltung im Perserreich zur Zeit Darius' III*, Wiesbaden 1994, 55.

64. BOSWORTH, *o.c.*, 229-30.

65. As maintained e.g. by BOSWORTH, *o.c.*, 153; RUIZICKA, S., *Politics of a Persian Dynasty. The Hecatomnids in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Norman, Oklahoma, London 1992, 138-140, 154; SARTRE, M., *L'Asie Mineure et l'Anatolie d'Alexandre à Dioclétien*, Paris 1995, 20; STONEMAN, R., *Alexander the Great*, London, New York 1997, 28.

66. About the importance of this factor in determining the scope of a polis' independence see now MA, J., *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford 1999, 155.

that the Greeks through most of the fourth century B.C. saw a clear difference between tribute (*phoros*) and *syntaxis*. In an edict inscribed under Lysimachus Alexander resolved that inhabitants of some villages were to submit the *phoros*, while Priene was being released from the *syntaxis*: τοὺς δὲ κατοικοῦντας ἐν ταῖς κώμαις ταύταις φέρειν τοὺς φόρους. τῆς δὲ συντάξεως ἀφήμι τὴν Πριηνέωμ πόλιν⁶⁸.

This documents is of particular importance: its legal language carries inherently far greater precision in legal matters than historical accounts of Diodorus and Arrian. The meaning of the passage from *IPriene* 1 is rather unambiguous: it refers to the *syntaxis* and (different from it) taxes called *phoroi* which are taxes paid by the inhabitants of villages in the royal land (χώρα in line 10), different from the rural territory of Priene, also called χώρα⁶⁹. Release from *syntaxis* granted to Priene by Alexander indirectly confirms universality of this war-related contribution in Ionia. In addition, the passage in *IPriene* 1 quoted above attests that Alexander was recognising Priene's rights to control its territory which was a constituent factor in the Greek notion of a *polis' autonomia*⁷⁰.

46 readable decrees deal with foreign policy matters. They shows that the *poleis* of Asia Minor handled the foreign policy lore typical of the Greek cities of that epoch. They appreciated the importance of Macedonia and successor states but also some of them were busy signing treaties with other Greek cities: Miletus with Sardes,

67. I.e. the charter of the Second Athenian League of 377, Theopompus, *FGrH* 175 F 98; *IG* II² — member states were not liable to phoros (μητε φόρον φέροντα); cf. CHANKOWSKI, A.S., "Miasta pozbawione autonomii, podleg[e, opodatowane. Uwagi o stosunkach *polis* - król w epoce hellenistycznej", *PH* 87, 1996, 215-6. Funds created by collecting it were disbursed by the decision of the syndrion of allied states: καὶ ἐχ[ωσ]ιν ο[ἱ] φρουροὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀ[νδρω]ῖσι μισθ[ο]ν ἐκ τῶν συντάξεων κ[α]τ[ὰ] τ[ὰ] τ[ὴ]ν δόγματ[α] τ[ῶ]ν συμμάχων; *IG* II² 123 = *Syll.*³ 192; see CARGILL, J., *The Second Athenian League. Empire or Free Alliance?*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1981, 124-7. Another is a document of the Nesiotic League *IG* XI.4.1036: [ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν χρημάτων κατὰ [τὴν σύνταξιν] τὴν νῦν οὔσαν τοῖς νησιώταις ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀντιγο[ν]ειῶν καὶ ἐάν τινες τῶν νησιωτῶν [μητρώσιω] ἰς ταῦτα τὴν σύνταξιν τὴν ἐπιβ[άλ]λουσαν - -]. It is a quotation from a law of the Nesiotic League concerned with organizing a holiday of the League; hence the word *syntaxis* could be used in this document only in the meaning of contribution payable to the common fund. About the Nesiotic League in that period see BILLOWS, *o.c.*, 220-5.

68. *IPriene* 1, lines 11-15.

69. SHERWIN-WHITE, S.M., "Ancient archives: the edict of Alexander to Priene, a reappraisal", *JHS* 105, 1985, 69-89, 83-4.

70. DEBORD, P., *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (412-323 a.C.) Pouvoirs et jeux politiques*, Bordeaux 1999, 439.

Kyzikos, Phygela, Olbia, Istros⁷¹, Priene with Maroneia⁷².

Our sources, especially those produced in Asia Minor, point at 334 as the year when fundamental changes began in Ionia, Aeolia and the old coastal Greek cities of Caria. The few democracies which survived the Persian rule became, for the most part, more active and radical; in other poleis oligarchic regimes were replaced by democratic governments. The abundant legislative production and signs of active assemblies indicate that not only the name but the very nature of the states was

democratic. The poleis of Ionia, Aeolia and on the coast of Caria controlled their rural territories and finances, were in general not liable to tribute and required only to submit for a limited time (probably for four years) a contribution for the purpose of the war with Persia which for them was the war of liberation. In all probability they, in contrast to inland Caria, were not subject to satrapal control. Thus in the light of epigraphic sources Alexander indeed brought freedom to Greek cities in Asia Minor. No wonder that they, as later inscriptions show, for centuries cherished memories of Alexander the Great as their liberator.

71. Milet 1.3. 135-137, 142; *ISM* 1.62.

72. *IPriene* 10.