

Some Observations on *Koina* and Monetary Economy in Hellenistic Asia Minor

Marcus CHIN*

Ancient Greek history was greatly shaped by cities, but also by agglomerations of cities, from communities formed of bilateral agreements between, or the merger of, two smaller communities, to full-blown federal states. It is with organisations of the latter sort, that comprised multiple *pol-eis*, and were called, and identified themselves as, *koina*, that this paper will be concerned.¹ Such large associations, typically numbering four or more communities, and often bounded by regional geography and some form of ethnic affiliation, were especially prominent in the late classical and Hellenistic periods on the Greek mainland. *Koina* like those of Boiotia, Achaia, Aitolia, Thessaly, or the Chalkidike, for instance, have loomed large in studies of Greek federalism, with much attention centred on their political institutions and histories, as organisations pre-figuring modern federal ideals.² Only more recently has attention turned to the economic aspects of *koina*, with work highlighting the extent to which political federation was underpinned by pre-existing dynamics based on resource scarcity,³ and the coinages produced by these *koina* of mainland Greece being understood not only as reflections of claims to political authority, but also as indices of market-based economic exchange.⁴

The aim here is to contribute to these developments by studying a region that has so far received less attention in the debates around ancient federalism and its economic dimension – Asia Minor, and in particular its western half.⁵ Five *koina*, based in Anatolian sub-regions, developed and flourished over the late 4th to 1st centuries BCE: those of Athena Ilias based at Ilion, the cities of Lesbos, the thirteen cities of Ionia, the Karia-based Chrysaorian cities, and of the Lykians, are

* Dr. Marcus Chin, Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents, Faculty of Classics, Ioannou Centre for Classical & Byzantine Studies, 66, St. Giles', Oxford, OX1 3LU, UK (marcus.chin@classics.ox.ac.uk).

I would like to thank the participants of a workshop in Liverpool for their comments and suggestions (in particular, Zosia Archibald, Alain Bresson, John Davies, Alfred Hirt, Leah Lazar, Andrew Meadows and Charlotte van Regenmortel), and the editor and anonymous reviewer for their feedback and assistance. Work on this article was completed as part of the CHANGE project, with funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 865680).

¹ These will also be occasionally referred to as 'leagues', for convenience. The discussion here excludes intra-civic associations in the Hellenistic period that identified themselves as *koina*, as commonly attested on Rhodes, for instance.

² Larsen 1968; Beck 1997; Corsten 1999; Mackil 2013; Löbel 2014, and Beck – Funke 2015. The relationship between federalism and ethnic belonging is explored in Beck – Buraselis – McAuley 2019.

³ See in particular the work of Mackil 2013, 237-325; Mackil 2015; Mackil 2022.

⁴ Mackil – Alfen 2006; Psoma – Tsangari 2003.

⁵ As a matter of convenience 'Asia Minor' and 'Anatolia' will frequently be used here to denote 'western Asia Minor' and 'western Anatolia'.

especially prominent in our record. While each has been treated individually,⁶ they have much less often been examined in tandem, and the question asked if they exhibit broader regional patterns and similarities. Overviews of Greek federalism have, somewhat strangely, largely passed them by.⁷ This is partly due to the dominance in the scholarly imagination of the later *koina* of Roman imperial Asia Minor.⁸ Another more pragmatic reason is evidentiary: literary sources are scant (limited primarily to several passages of Strabo), while the main testimony is epigraphic, and coinage is attested only for the *koina* of Athena Ilias and Lykia. What the inscriptions do allow us to think about, however, even if only at the broadest level, are institutions and activities – how these *koina* were structured, and what they did.

Our interest here is in honing in on these institutions and activities in a specific way, by examining their monetary expenditure and economy – that is, how wealth was acquired by these *koina*, what it was used for, and whether attempts were made to regulate monetary supply at the federal level. The first two are easier to answer than the third, and form the subject of the first section, which suggests that these *koina* were associations primarily centred on regional sanctuaries and festivals, and less involved in the formation of cohesive political institutions through federal law-making or military mobilisation. They were monetarily ‘light’, as is explained in the second section, because they were not by and large especially fiscally cohesive, or exercised close oversight of monetary supply, with the notable exception of the Lykian league – taxation was not hugely intrusive or extensive, and little federal coinage was produced, for instance. These are traits that differentiate them, at a broad level of comparison, from federal organisations to the west of the Aegean, on mainland Greece. The final two sections then elaborate on this characteristic as a function of the regional specificities of political and economic power in the region, with *koina* acting parasitically as organisations ensconced between imperial states and civic communities, both reflecting and shaping the dominant role in the region of these two latter types of polity in the Hellenistic period. The overall method deployed here is synthesis rather than close reading, with the aim of arriving at general patterns that allow us to diversify our picture of Hellenistic *koina*.

I. Activities and expenditure: the primacy of the sanctuary

Three of the five *koina* (Athena Ilias, Ionian, Chrysaorian) were associations centred almost exclusively on specific sanctuaries, while two (Lesbian and Lykian) suggest the possibility of more comprehensive political integration, and collective military action, although there are mitigating factors. The following overview articulates these points by considering the activities of these *koina*,

⁶ Athena Ilias *koinon*: Robert 1966; Knoepfler 2010; Lefèvre – Pillot 2015; Ellis-Evans 2016; Ellis-Evans 2019, 46-55; Lesbian *koinon*: Buraselis 2015, 370-375; Ellis-Evans 2019, 202-247; Ionian *koinon*: Herrmann 2002; Hallmannsecker 2022, 61-70; Chrysaorian *koinon*: Robert – Robert 1983, 223-224; Debord 2003, 125-141; Gabrielsen 2011; Lykian *koinon*: Larsen 1968, 240-263; Behrwald 2000; Behrwald 2015. Two omissions are the Kibyran Tetrapolis based around Kibyra (including Oinoanda, Balboura and Boubon), for which see Str. 13.4.17, and now Meier 2019, 51-62, and the association of Dionysiac artists, whose trans-regional scope places them in a slightly different category: Le Guen 2001 and Aneziri 2003.

⁷ Apart from the Lykian league, the region is largely absent in federalism studies, and even in Beck – Funke 2015. Isolated studies have occasionally brought different Asia Minor *koina* into dialogue with one another: Pillot 2017, which compares the Ionian and Athena *koina*.

⁸ E.g. Vitale 2012; Edelmann-Singer 2015.

and by extension the sorts of spending and wealth accrual that were involved; synchronic characterisation has here been prioritised over diachronic analysis.

Athena Ilias

The *koinon* based around Athena at Ilion in the Troad is perhaps the best documented of the region in the Hellenistic period, being the subject of a number of inscriptions, and even producing its own silver coinage.⁹ It appears first as the ‘*koinon* of the cities’ in a stele of the late 4th century BCE;¹⁰ this organisation is also defined as ‘the cities who share in the temple (of Athena) and the festival’.¹¹ This stele records the benefactions of Malousios of Gargara, who had donated large sums towards the construction of Ilion’s theatre, and the funding of embassies to Antigonos Monophthalmos, under whose aegis the *koinon* may have been formally established.¹² Membership seems to have spanned the communities of the Troad (Ilion, Rhoiteion, Alexandria Troas, Assos, Gargara, Skepsis, Dardanos, Abydos, Lampsakos, Parion), both large and small, but also those beyond it, with cities like Kalchedon and Myrleia in the Propontis also attested as members.¹³

The *koinon*’s institutions suggest its fixation on the cult to Athena Ilias.¹⁴ A council, *synedrion*, was composed of two representatives from each of the member-states, somewhat on the model of equal (but not proportional) representation attested for the Delphic amphictyony.¹⁵ A major business will have been the organisation of the Panathenaia at Ilion, a festival that was held annually, and that was marked out every five years by a special penteteric event, known as the ‘Great Panathenaia’, to distinguish it from the ‘Lesser Panathenaia’ held in all other years. A board of five *agonothetai* was elected, probably every four years from the member-states (although an Ilian typically seems to have been the president), and charged with organisation of the festival.¹⁶ A decree of 77 BCE, outlining the financial administration of the *koinon* during the economic crises brought about by the first Mithridatic war, mentions the many aspects involving expense: the procession, sacrificial animals, oil for the competitors, the hosting of performers, prizes for competitors, and the hosting of *theoroi*.¹⁷ Apart from the Panathenaia, the *koinon* could make diplomatic overtures as a collective body on crucial political matters. The decree for Malousios records

⁹ *I.Ilion* 1-18; *SEG* 53.1373, and Ellis-Evans 2016 for the coinage.

¹⁰ *I.Ilion* 1, ll. 17, 22, 31, 36, 55. Importantly this was not a *koinon* ‘of the Troad’: Ellis-Evans 2019, 47; Robert 1966, 32.

¹¹ *I.Ilion* 1, ll. 25-26.

¹² *I.Ilion* 1, l. 24. For full discussion, see Pillot 2017, 159-160; Ellis-Evans 2016, 31 fn. 59. The shared coin-types of Abydos, Assos and Ilion in the mid-4th century, featuring an archaic statue of Athena on the reverse, may reflect a regional consciousness around Athena Ilias fostered by Memnon of Rhodes: Ellis-Evans 2018, 51-59.

¹³ Cf. *I.Ilion* 5-6; *I.Ilion* 10, ll. 2-13; *SEG* 53.1373, ll. 1-5, with Knoepfler 2010, 44-47. By the 1st century CE membership seems to have been more limited, with one honorific statue-base describing the ‘nine *demoi*’, presumably indicating the major cities of the Troad: *I.Ilion* 107, l. 7.

¹⁴ See also in this vein Pillot 2016, 162-164.

¹⁵ Knoepfler 2010, 38.

¹⁶ Knoepfler 2010, 34-39, although Ellis-Evans 2016, 133-141 notes on the basis of the *agonothetai* who appear on silver issues of the *koinon* that it is more likely that most held office for fewer than four years.

¹⁷ *I.Ilion* 10, ll. 21-43.

embassies concerning the ‘freedom and autonomy’ of the *koinon*’s cities.¹⁸ It is unclear, nevertheless, how significant this diplomatic function was in later centuries, as no honorific statue-bases by the *koinon* for kings or powerful outsiders survive, for one, from this period.¹⁹ Nor is there clear evidence for federal military action.²⁰

The *koinon* acquired its wealth in a variety of ways.²¹ There was, firstly, the sacred land of the sanctuary of Athena, which could grow through royal grants.²² Rental income from Athena’s land paid for sacrificial bulls at the Panathenaia.²³ Secondly, a tax was imposed on the markets held at the festival, as seen in the grant of *ateleia* to Malousios’ descendants within the context of the Panathenaia,²⁴ and the existence of an *agoranomos* who specifically oversaw the festival.²⁵ Thirdly, member-states made contributions towards the festival. They gave portions of the first-fruits of their harvests,²⁶ but also monetary payments, defined as ‘interest-payments’, τόκοι.²⁷ This probably reflects a system by which ‘loans’ were made by the *koinon* treasury to member-states, from which interest-repayments were construed as contributions towards the running of the festival.²⁸ Lastly, benefactors made donations – Malousios’ gifts, for one, would have amounted to a staggering 105,000 drachmas.²⁹ All these sources brought the *koinon* great wealth, as manifested in its minting of high-quality silver coinage from the 180s onwards, which are discussed later on.³⁰

The Ionians

The Ionian *koinon* further to the south was probably older than that of Athena Ilias, with its twelve constituent cities (Ephesos, Miletos, Myous, Lebedos, Kolophon, Priene, Teos, Erythrai, Phokaia, Klazomenai, Chios, Samos) forming an association around the celebration of the Panionia at the Panionion, a shrine on the Mykale peninsula,³¹ from possibly as early as the mid-6th century; it is

¹⁸ *I.Ilion* 1, ll. 24-25.

¹⁹ None are known before a base honouring Augustus, *I.Ilion* 81.

²⁰ *I.Ilion* 18 mentions the movement of an army (l. 7: ἐστράτευσε), but the context is completely unclear, and may also refer to a non-civic military force. Pol. 5.111.2-4 mentions aid rendered by Alexandria Troas to Ilion in 216 BCE, but this may not necessarily have involved the *koinon*.

²¹ Lefèvre – Pillot 2015 provide the best account.

²² Attalos II may have gifted land: *I.Ilion* 42.

²³ *I.Ilion* 10, ll. 23-24.

²⁴ *I.Ilion* 1, ll. 17-19, with Lefèvre – Pillot 2015, 10-11.

²⁵ *I.Ilion* 12, ll. 12-13, for an Agathes who was ‘*agoranomos* at the Great Panathenaia’ (ἀγορανομήσαντα ὑπὸ τὰ μεγάλα | [Πα]αναθήναια).

²⁶ *I.Ilion* 10, ll. 38-39.

²⁷ *I.Ilion* 5, ll. 10-12, 17-20; *I.Ilion* 6, ll. 9-10; *I.Ilion* 10, ll. 13-18.

²⁸ Lefèvre – Pillot 2015, 12-16.

²⁹ Sums are provided in gold *chrysoi*, which can be converted on the notional equivalence of one *chrysos* to twenty silver drachmas: Migeotte 1984, 267.

³⁰ Ellis-Evans 2016.

³¹ Hdt. 1.148.

then sporadically attested across the 5th and 4th centuries.³² Smyrna joined in the early Hellenistic period, increasing membership to thirteen cities.³³ Over the 3rd to 1st centuries member-cities continued to send *theoroi* to the Panionia,³⁴ while a number of honorific decrees and monuments for powerful outsiders show that it increasingly played a role as a larger stage for political communication between cities and rulers.³⁵ Honorific festivals for kings, such as an *Alexandreia* and *Antiocheia*, were also set up.³⁶

Like the *koinon* of Athena Ilias, however, there is no evidence for joint military activity. The major focal point for the Ionian league's spending is thus still likely to have been the Panionia festival, even as the honouring of foreign benefactors and diplomatic representation added new dimensions in the Hellenistic period. The chief official before the late 1st century BCE seems to have been the *basileus*, a priestly function, for one.³⁷ Member-states also seem to have made contributions in the form of interest-repayments to loans: this is implied by a late Hellenistic decree from Priene honouring the prominent citizen Moschion, recording that he had furnished 2,158 drachmas and four obols in interest payments owed by the city to the *koinon*.³⁸ The likelihood that this reflects the same practice as that attested for the *koinon* of Athena Ilias is suggested by the comparability of the sums owed by Priene to those recorded for member-states of the former.³⁹ There is no evidence for the Ionian *koinon* striking its own coinage in the Hellenistic period, however.

Karia and the Chrysaorians

In Karia, a *koinon* may have already existed in the 4th century, even if this is first explicitly attested only in a 2nd-century Mylasan land-lease document mentioning a 'king of the *koinon* of the

³² Ionians in the 6th century and Persian wars: Hdt. 1.170, 6.7 and 6.42 (Artaphernes compels the Ionians to make treaties with each other). Possible origins in even the 8th or 7th centuries BCE: MacSweeney 2013, 178-187; Pillot 2017, 161-162. Rites at Ephesos in the 5th century: Thuc. 3.104; see also Diod. Sic. 15.49. The satrap Strouthes invited judges from the Ionian cities to adjudicate a territorial dispute between Miletos and Myous: *I.Milet* 9 (391-388 BCE). Two 4th-century decrees of the *koinon* are known from Priene: *I.Priene* B-M 398 (regulation on the priesthood of Zeus Boulaios and Hera), 399 (fragment of a sacred law).

³³ Str. 14.1.4, Paus. 7.5.1, Vitruv. De arch. 4.1.4, and as attested in *I.Smyrna* 577. It is unclear if the 'Ionians and Aiolians' in a fragmentary late 4th-century Erythraian decree indicate a short-lived *koinon*-like association with the Aiolis: *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 16, l. 6, with Debord 1999, 178.

³⁴ E.g. *I.Priene* B-M 65, l. 53 (120s BCE).

³⁵ See the list in Müller – Prost 2013, 98 fn. 19. The Ionian *koinon* may have had a wider international reach than either of the *koina* examined so far, as monuments at even Delphi and Pergamon suggest: *F.Delphes* III.2 135; *I.Pergamon Asklepieion* 4.

³⁶ *Alexandreia*: Str. 14.1.31, *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 30, l. 23 (ca. 260 BCE); *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 87, l. 6 (3rd/2nd century BCE); *Antiocheia* for Antiochos I: *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 504, with ll. 5-6 and 25 mentioning honours to Alexander; see also *I.Priene* B-M 43 (ca. 130 BCE) for a procession for Nikomedes II Epiphanes of Bithynia.

³⁷ *I.Priene* B-M 399, ll. 17, 21, 22, 24 (350-300 BCE); *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 348, l. 8 (2nd century BCE), Str. 8.7.2, 14.1.3, and Herrmann 2002, 233; see Hallmannsecker 2022, 73-79 for the later history and relationship with the *archieus*.

³⁸ *I.Priene* B-M 64, ll. 103-109, with Hallmannsecker 2022, 64 fn. 24; see also Migeotte 1984, 297.

³⁹ They also measure up well against the contributions known from the Chrysaorian league at Amyzon, discussed below.

Karians', most likely a priestly office similar to that of the *basileus* for the Ionian league.⁴⁰ It is likely to have been centred on the shrine of Zeus Karios.⁴¹ Even as the Karian *koinon* continued to exist in the Hellenistic period, however, it had been joined from the early 3rd century by the *koinon* of the Chrysaorians, an organisation that became significant enough to earn a brief description by Strabo in the early 1st century CE.⁴² Member-states seem to have encompassed both coastal and inland Karia (Keramos, Thera, Mylasa, Stratonikeia, Labraunda, Amyzon, Alinda, Alabanda), some of whom may have been members of the Karian *koinon* as well.⁴³ The Chrysaorian *koinon*'s origins are obscure, but may lie in Ptolemaic fostering of a common Karian identity around the eponymous hero Chrysaor, as an alternative to the earlier Karian *koinon*.⁴⁴ Like the Ionian and Athena Ilias *koina*, the Chrysaorians engaged diplomatically with powerful benefactors, as seen in two honorific decrees of the early 3rd and early 2nd centuries BCE, for a Ptolemaic official, and for Aristonidas, a Stratonikeian citizen who served several member-states in various ways; these documents also attest the existence of some sort of collective assembly.⁴⁵ Broader legal rights might even be implied by an Amyzonian decree, which conferred on the Seleukid official Nikomedes the privileges enjoyed by 'Amyzonians in the Chrysaorian cities'. What these were, however, remain very obscure.⁴⁶

Like the Athena Ilias and Ionian *koina*, moreover, the Chrysaorian league was centred on a sanctuary, that of Zeus Chrysaoreus: this was where the *koinon* gathered 'to offer sacrifice and deliberate on common matters' (θύσοντές τε και βουλευσόμενοι περὶ τῶν κοινῶν).⁴⁷ Elsewhere, we learn of a 'festival organised by the Chrysaorians' ([έορ][τῆ]ι τῆι συντ[ελ]ουμένηι ὑπὸ Χρυσά-

⁴⁰ *I.Mylasa* 828, l. 12, and Hornblower 1982, 55-56. The 'Karians' are already attested as a collective group in Herodotos (5.118-119); the Karians sent an Arlissis to Artaxerxes I to conspire against Maussollos: *I.Mylasa* 1, l. 5; two inscribed lists from Sekköy, recording Karian communities who sent witnesses to observe a property transaction between Mylasa and Kindye, have been understood to reflect a *koinon* of the Karians: *I.Carie hautes terres* 90-91 = *SEG* 63.911, 40.992. These include old Greek cities (Halikarnassos, Iasos), but also inland ones in western Karia (e.g. Ouranion, Koliorga), and Kaunos as well. Disparities in the number of witnesses sent by various cities, implying a *koinon*-like hierarchy, and other fragmentary lists of witnesses from Mylasa and Labraunda (*I.Mylasa* 4, 8; *I.Labraunda* 67), appear to corroborate this view; cf. Debord 2003, 124. Bremen 2013, 22-23, however, is doubtful.

⁴¹ Attested already in Hdt 1.171.6 (although shared with Mysians and Lydians).

⁴² Str. 14.2.25.

⁴³ Debord 2003, 133-134, 142. If the two lists from Sekköy do record member-cities of the Karian *koinon*, this would imply that Keramos, Mylasa, Alabanda, and Amyzon, for instance, were members of both leagues. A royal letter of Philip V from Labraunda mentions both *koina* alongside each other: *I.Labraunda* 5, ll. 14-16.

⁴⁴ Debord 1994, 111; Debord 2003, 137; the identity of Chrysaor: Debord 2003, 126-130; Debord 2010, 239-246.

⁴⁵ *I.Labraunda* 43 (ca. 267 BCE, the earliest attestation of the *koinon*), and *SEG* 53.1229 (ca. 190; the text is highly fragmentary, however). A late 2nd-century decree for a Mylasan also praises this individual as an 'assembly-member and sacred delegate (έκκλησιαστήν και θεωρόν) who spoke on behalf of the city and the league: *I.Mylasa* 101, l. 15. Α τὸ πλῆθος τὸ Χρυσασορέων is attested in *SEG* 53.1229, ll. 64, 71.

⁴⁶ Robert, *Amyzon* 16, ll. 2-3. Gabrielsen 2011, 339-340 suggests this reflects some sort of *sympoliteia*, but Hamon in *BE* 2012, 381 is doubtful.

⁴⁷ Str. 14.2.25. The location of the sanctuary is still unknown.

οπέω[v]), and sacred functionaries named *hieramnemones*.⁴⁸ There is no reason to believe that the sanctuary of Zeus Chrysaoreus was not the primary focus for the *koinon*'s finances. The league's attempts to control Labraunda in the late 3rd century suggests a concern for acquiring landed income, and also in the context of a sanctuary.⁴⁹ A decree from Amyzon, probably of the reign of Antiochos III, moreover records the imposition of a mandatory five-drachma subscription on its male citizen body, towards repaying creditors who had earlier made contributions to the Chrysaorian league on the city's behalf.⁵⁰ Non-compliance would incur the hefty fine of 50 drachmas, and a lifetime ban from all 'Chrysaorian rites and all other rites' (μήτε τῶν Χρυσαιορικῶν μήτε τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν).⁵¹ Whether or not this was a regular sum, this decree shows that contributions were levied on member-states, and that their collection was a serious business.⁵² The fact that the lifetime penalty only targets rites strongly implies, yet again, the centrality of the sanctuary of Zeus Chrysaoreus and its activities to the *koinon*'s identity and finances.⁵³ There is only dubious evidence for federally organised military activity: the new decree for the Stratonikeian Aristonidas records military action by individual cities, but does not, so far as its fragmentary lines have been understood, seem to demonstrate the existence of a federal army.⁵⁴

The pattern of the three preceding cases should be obvious by now: these were *koina* that were based primarily around sanctuaries and cult, that did intercede diplomatically before powerful rulers, but for whom collective military and political institutions and offices of a more recognisably non-religious nature may not have existed. There is no good evidence these *koina* were bound by arrangements of *isopoliteia* or *sympoliteia* at a federal level, for instance. The two other significant *koina* in western Asia Minor, in Lesbos and Lykia, would appear to buck this trend, but mitigating aspects should also be noted.

Lesbos

The *koinon* of Lesbos' cities (Mytilene, Methymna, Eresos and Antissa) was probably formally established soon after the end of Ptolemaic rule in 204; a fragmentary early 2nd-century inscription found at Delos records the founding treaty.⁵⁵ These four cities had maintained independent

⁴⁸ SEG 53.1229, ll. 66-67, although this may have honoured Helios.

⁴⁹ I.Labraunda 5, see also below.

⁵⁰ Robert, *Amyzon* 28, ll. 1-5.

⁵¹ Robert, *Amyzon* 28, ll. 5-7.

⁵² A list of contributors of five-drachma sums from Akçaova, near Muğla, has been plausibly linked to the *koinon*: SEG 51.1487, with Bremen 2004, 378-382 (late 3rd to early 2nd centuries BCE); see further discussion below.

⁵³ It is hence probably primarily in relation to cultic activities, and not also to more encompassing political and legal rights, that we should also understand the unspecified Chrysaorian privileges granted to Nikomedes (Robert, *Amyzon* 16, l. 2).

⁵⁴ SEG 53.1229, ll. 4-11 (Alabanda), 14-24 (Stratonikeia), 48-51 (Alabanda), with Gabrielsen 2011, 337-338.

⁵⁵ The treaty is IG XII Suppl. 136. See also a fragmentary treaty with Rhodes (IG XII Suppl. 120, of similar date?), and the copy of an agreement between Eresos and Methymna about foreign judges (IG XII Suppl. 139, early 2nd century BCE).

identities throughout the 5th and 4th centuries,⁵⁶ and continued to do so under Ptolemaic rule, which Mytilene may even have avoided.⁵⁷ The larger organisation of the 2nd century thus represented a new step. The cultic sanctuary at Messon probably comprised the physical centre of the *koinon*'s activities, and is mentioned several times in the fragmentary treaty.⁵⁸ This document also suggests, however, that a more encompassing form of political integration, beyond cultic activities alone, was aimed at, in referring to military contingents by member cities, arrangements for *isopoliteia*, the organisation of courts, and the existence of a common assembly.⁵⁹ Contributions were also imposed on member-cities, with non-compliance incurring fines.⁶⁰ These are signs that the Lesbian *koinon* may have conceived of itself more in the mould of the more politically cohesive federations of mainland Greece (on which more below). It is striking, nonetheless, that local authority remained strong. It is unclear if federal magistrates existed,⁶¹ while foreign judges were appointed by cities,⁶² and payments towards *koinon* contributions were to be made through tax-contracts handed out to member-cities – potentially a less reliable way of collecting revenue than the making out of loans, as with the *koina* of Athena Ilias and the Ionians –, which gave more agency to the cities.⁶³ Moreover, these payments would be made in local coinage (πρὸς τὸ τὰς πόλιος νόμ[ισμα]), implying a conscious concern not to unify the use of monetary specie. For all the potential of developing into a politically integrated league like Boiotia or Achaia, then, the Lesbians' federation may have been marked by fissiparous tendencies from its inception: it is striking that it is mostly absent in the epigraphic record, after this foundational moment, before the early imperial period.⁶⁴

Lykia

In Lykia, a *koinon* may only have developed fairly late. While 'Lykian' identity and ethnics are attested already from the 5th century,⁶⁵ the first certain attestation of the *koinon* is in an honorific

⁵⁶ While late 6th- and 5th-century billon coinage featuring legends of ΑΕ and ΑΕΣ have been seen as 'federal' issues, closer examination has since shown that these issues were probably struck primarily by Mytilene, as part of its claims to dominance in the island: Ellis-Evans 2019, 224-227.

⁵⁷ Buraselis 2015, 372; Ellis-Evans 2019, 203-204.

⁵⁸ *IG XII Suppl.* 136, A l. 5; B ll. 32, 45. Its temple had been monumentalised in the late 4th century: Labarre 1996, 42-50.

⁵⁹ *IG XII Suppl.* 136, B ll. 1-6 (references to *misthophora*, pay for soldiers or mercenaries, and a military alliance, *symmachia*), 27, 30, 31, 40.

⁶⁰ *IG XII Suppl.* 136, B ll. 14-25 (a 1/60 tax exacted on Mytilenian oil, trees, and property, mention of a 1/30 contribution, and penalties for non-compliance).

⁶¹ *Strategoi* are mentioned in the treaty from Delos (*IG XII Suppl.* 136, B l. 27), but these were probably civic, and not federal, generals; moreover, the nine and six delegates from Methymna and Antissa (l. 30) probably refer not to members of the federal council, but an elected commission relating to a specific judicial issue; cf. Ellis-Evans 2019, 216-218.

⁶² As seen in several inscribed decrees of Eresos and Methymna for Milesian judges: *IG XII Suppl.* 139, with Ellis-Evans 2019, 211-213.

⁶³ *IG XII Suppl.* 136, B l. 17.

⁶⁴ *IG XII Suppl.* 7 (*koinon* honours for Potamon, early 1st century CE) is the next evidence for its existence after the early 2nd century BCE; see also Ellis-Evans 2019, 276 fn. 99.

⁶⁵ Lykians in the tribute lists: *IG I³* 266, III l. 34. One might also note the use of common types across different communities under the 4th-century Lykian dynasts: Kraay 1976, 270; Troxell 1982, 9; Spier 1987,

statue-base for a Ptolemaic official set up at Alexandria (in Egypt), dating to 182-180.⁶⁶ Strabo's account offers a portrait of a sophisticated federal entity in the late 1st century BCE, comprising 23 cities, who contributed to a general assembly organised on the principle of proportional representation, and which elected federal magistrates, headed by the Lykiarch, and designated federal courts.⁶⁷ This was an advanced state of organisation, and the result of gradual accretion and development.⁶⁸ However, the most significant factor in the *koinon*'s emergence, as indicated by the date of the Alexandrian base, was likely Lykian resistance to Rhodian domination after 188.⁶⁹ Unlike the preceding four *koina*, no single cultic sanctuary may have served, initially, as the centre of federal activities. Mention of such a sanctuary is conspicuously absent in Strabo's account, contrasting somewhat with his description of the Chrysaorian *koinon*, for instance. Xanthos and Patara, both endowed with important sanctuaries to the Letoan triad and Apollo Patroos, may have had equal status as leading cities in the Hellenistic period, and sites of federal festivals.⁷⁰ It is significant, however, that the major festival of the Lykian *koinon* came to be the Letoia kai Romaia at Xanthos, a festival set up after 167 at Xanthos after Rome's liberation of Lykia from Rhodian hegemony in 167, which was grafted onto, and came to overshadow, Xanthos' pre-existing Letoia – a telling sign of the league's ideological foundation in resistance to Rhodes, and pro-Roman loyalty.⁷¹

The centrality of militarism is reflected in the pre-eminence of the *strategos* among the league's magistracies before the time of Strabo.⁷² Other federal offices of the 1st century BCE include the

31-36, see also Debord 1999, 182. Λύκιος accompanied by a civic ethnic is first attested in 212/211 BCE: *I.Delphinion* 46 (Skymnos, Λύκιος ἀπὸ Ξάνθου), with more examples from the 2nd century; this is not solid evidence, however, for the *koinon*'s formal existence at this early period: Behrwald 2000, 78-79; Behrwald 2015, 405 *pace* Bresson 1999, 111.

⁶⁶ OGIS 99.

⁶⁷ Str. 14.3.3.

⁶⁸ Xanthos and Araxa, for instance, may only have joined the league over time: the important decree for Orthagoras of Araxa (ca. mid-2nd century BCE) shows that Araxa had to send delegates to the *koinon* to ask for help, implying its externality to the federal union; moreover, the *koinon* is alternately referred to as a *sympoliteia* and *koinon* (SEG 18.570, ll. 56-57, 58-59, 61-62); the relative independence of Xanthos is also implied by an unpublished treaty with Rhodes in the early 2nd century, cf. Behrwald 2015, 405-406. It is perhaps only in the late 2nd century that the league assumed its full Strabonian shape.

⁶⁹ Behrwald 2000, 89-105; Behrwald 2015, 405-406, and Knoepfler 2013, 148-151.

⁷⁰ Xanthos was also where the treaty between the league and Oinoanda was set up: SEG 60.1569, ll. 106-107. Patara's *bouleuterion* was massively expanded in the 2nd century BCE: Behrwald 2015, 412; for the question of a federal 'capital' before the imperial period, see Behrwald 2000, 181-187. Apollo is depicted on the earliest bronze coinage of the league: Troxell 1982, 20-21; the priest of Apollo at Patara may have been the eponymous priest of the league in the mid-2nd century: SEG 60.1569, l. 2, with Rousset 2010, 16.

⁷¹ Xanthos' Romaia: SEG 28.1246, 25.467, and 63.1333, ll. 17-19. The Romaia may have attained precedence as the major penteteric festival, alongside the annual Letoia, in a manner analogous to the 'Great' and 'Lesser' Panathenaia festivals at Iliion: Schuler – Zimmermann 2012, 595-596.

⁷² Behrwald 2015, 409; cf. SEG 45.1825, l. 5 (Krinolaos, early 1st century BCE, *strategos autokrator*); TAM II 261, l. 7 (Artapates, 1st century BCE, *strategos* and *hipparch*); the Lykiarch is only certainly attested first in Strabo's account, and then epigraphically in the early 1st century CE: TAM II 583, l. 2; it may already have existed earlier, however, and may be the 'holder of the highest magistracy' mentioned in the Lykian league's

hipparchy and nauarchy.⁷³ This implies the existence of a federal army,⁷⁴ and thus the sort of spending that the Lykian *koinon* would have been involved in. Strabo mentions unspecified *eisphorai* and liturgies carried out by member-states on a proportional basis, implying that sophisticated political integration also mapped onto the fiscal sphere. The *koinon*'s treaty with Termessos-by-Oinoanda (mid-2nd century BCE), moreover, mentions customs-duties, *paragogia*, which may relate to federal border-duties,⁷⁵ while several documents from the imperial period, but probably reflecting the earlier Hellenistic situation, attest to customs regulations: a fragment from Myra, for one, shows that customs-duties were imposed at a federal level.⁷⁶ This need not necessarily mean the existence of a federal customs union,⁷⁷ but in any case suggests a level of fiscal complexity, and concern for regularising the amassing of federal wealth, that is not paralleled for the other Anatolian *koina*; it is probably not coincidence that it is the only one of the five for which the office of a financial treasurer is explicitly attested,⁷⁸ and for which an extensive coinage in precious-metal and bronze denominations exists (to be discussed shortly). Here, the strong military contingencies and history of the region, and perhaps relatively smaller role of cultic activities, must have played a major role.

Multi-civic *koina* were a prominent part of the political landscape of Hellenistic Asia Minor. By the mid-2nd century, a traveller passing from its north-western to south-western littoral would have likely encountered more communities that belonged to a *koinon*, than those that did not. Like the better-known *koina* of mainland Greece, the federations of Athena Ilias, the Ionians, Chrysaorians, Lesbians and the Lykians, even if organisations with antecedents in the classical period, matured and flourished after Alexander, and this distinctly Hellenistic inflection must reflect a genuine increase in the scale and sustained character of their activities. Nonetheless, three of these were primarily centred on cultic worship at specific sanctuaries (Athena Ilias, Ionians, Chrysaorians), and should be understood mainly in terms of being regional amphictyonies, like that based around Delphi,⁷⁹ than more fully integrated federations like Achaia or Aitolia, replete with federal office-holding and military activities. The Lesbian and Lykian leagues exhibit a greater tendency for such integration beyond common cult activities, but the former was shaped

treaty with Rome: *SEG* 55.1452, ll. 30-31; Larsen 1968, 251-252 had suggested that the *strategos* and *Lykiarch* were synonymous. In general, see Reitzenstein 2011, 29-35.

⁷³ *TAM* II 264, 265, 319 (Aichmon, navarch, early 1st century BCE); *SEG* 55.1502, l. 13 (Ptolemaios, hipparch, early 1st century BCE); cf. Reitzenstein 2011, 29-30.

⁷⁴ Probably already by the mid-2nd century, as the decree for Orthagoras alludes to his fighting alongside the 'Lykians' (μετὰ Λυκίων) as a collective: *SEG* 15.870, ll. 40, 43, 48.

⁷⁵ *SEG* 60.1569, ll. 24-25, cf. Rousset 2010, 39-43.

⁷⁶ *SEG* 35.1439; these were drawn, however, from a cut of the city's own tax on imported goods. See Rousset 2010, 39 fn. 109 for the other major documents from Andriake (unpublished), Oinoanda, Kaunos, and Xanthos.

⁷⁷ Tax was also payable on goods that were exported to other Lykian cities: Rousset 2010, 39, 43; Wörrle 1975, 298-300 and *I.Kaunos*, pp. 214-215 for discussion, contra Engelmann 1985, who advocates a Lykian customs-free exchange between member-cities.

⁷⁸ *TAM* II 583, ll. 12-13.

⁷⁹ For the Delphic amphictyony, see Lefèvre 1998 and Sánchez 2000.

by the priority of local power, while the latter was perhaps unusual in emerging out of conscious resistance to the external power of Rhodes. The sense that Anatolian *koina* were for the most part formed around highly specific activities based at sanctuaries, and were not federal entities in a more comprehensive sense, is also the impression one gains if closer attention is paid to their attitudes to fiscality and monetary supply, to which we now turn.

II. Discrepancies in fiscal and monetary practice

In each of the five cases there is evidence for concerted efforts towards the accrual of collective wealth, in the form of compulsory contributions made by member-states towards a federal sanctuary. Fines were even meted out by the *koinon* of Athena Ilias for non-compliance, while the Amyzonians threatened their non-contributing citizens with a ban on participation in Chrysao-rian rites. The holding of federal festivals would also have been a source of considerable revenue, in providing a setting for temporary festival-markets, whose proceeds could be taxed.⁸⁰ The grant of tax-immunity to the descendants of Malousios of Gargara, on ‘goods that they should sell or purchase’ (ὄ τι ἄν πωλώσιν ἢ ἀγοράσωσιν),⁸¹ implies such taxation. There is less firm evidence, however, for more intrusive forms of fiscal practice by the federal community, in the form of indirect taxation, or the existence of economic privileges facilitating cooperation orchestrated by the *koinon*. Only the Lykian league, which may already have exacted customs-dues at a federal level in the Hellenistic period, offers clear signs of this. Malousios of Gargara was granted tax-immunity by the *koinon* of Athena Ilias, ‘in accordance with the accompanying legal clauses’ (καθάπερ δέδοται), suggesting a potentially comprehensive range of fiscal privileges like immunity from harbour-dues and free movement of property, but this can only remain speculation for the moment.⁸² The Ionian league did also grant tax-immunity to the royal official Hippostratos, which presumably encompassed both direct and indirect contributions he would be liable for, but the need to specify that he would be ‘immune from all taxes in the Ionian cities’ (ἀτελῆ πάντων ἐν <ταῖς> | πόλεσι ταῖς Ἰώνων), may suggest this was an unusual instance, and not a grant that was regularly made by the *koinon*:⁸³ that is, the *koinon* ceded ultimate fiscal authority to its constituent cities.

Absence of evidence is, admittedly, not necessarily evidence of absence. Nevertheless, a brief glance at the evidentiary situation for federal communities across the Aegean, on the Greek mainland to the west, might serve to highlight the fiscal ‘lightness’ of these Anatolian *koina*. The leagues of Achaia, Aitolia, Boiotia and Thessaly in central Greece and the Peloponnese were also especially prominent in the Hellenistic period, and have been the focus of a number of studies; it suffices here to summarise the insights that have been gained into their fiscal and monetary economies over the period roughly spanning the 4th to 1st centuries BCE.⁸⁴ These three *koina* imposed direct

⁸⁰ For such markets, see also e.g. *IG IX I*² 583 from Olympia on the festival for Apollo Aktios at Anaktorion, with Migeotte 2014, 366-367; in general, see Chandezon 2000, in particular 85-100.

⁸¹ Robert 1966, 24.

⁸² Lefèvre – Pillot 2015, 11.

⁸³ *I.Milet* 10, ll. 9-10, *I.Smyrna* 577, ll. 11-12.

⁸⁴ See in particular Mackil 2013, 237-325; Mackil 2015; Mackil – Alfen 2006 and Psoma – Tsangari 2003 for coinage. For the pre-Hellenistic and Hellenistic histories of the *koina* of Achaia, Aitolia, and Boiotia, see Mackil 2013, 21-143, with Rizakis 2015, 123-131; Funke 2015, 101-117; Beck – Ganter 2015, 151-157; for the classical and Hellenistic Thessalian *koinon*, Bouchon – Helly 2015, 232-249.

contributions on member-states, as in Asia Minor.⁸⁵ Their fiscal intrusiveness ran deeper than in Asia Minor in three further respects, however. For one, there is also cogent evidence for the federal collection of customs and harbour-dues,⁸⁶ and even for authority over the movement of specific goods, like grain, outside the *koinon*'s borders.⁸⁷ Federal grants of privileges to foreign benefactors could also include grants of *ateleia*, implying federal oversight of the fiscal powers of member-states.⁸⁸ Finally, in these three *koina* there is also reason to believe that the movement of property between member-states, through intermarital and purchasing rights for federal citizens, allowing in theory for more cohesive economic activity, was regulated at a federal level.⁸⁹ These were obviously *koina* of a quite different character to those in Anatolia, as full-blooded political communities whose political histories were closely bound up in military conflict with neighbouring kings, and indeed sometimes among themselves. What deserves emphasis here, however, is the possibility of discerning differences in structural sophistication across the Aegean, given that fiscality was a common need for federalising communities in Greece and Asia Minor. Those in the former are on the whole better documented, but the epigraphic output of the latter is in general richer for the Hellenistic period. The absence of evidence is thus not entirely an argument to be discounted. Bluntly put, it suggests that beyond the imposition of direct contributions by members, the *koina* of Greece exercised fiscal authority in three further ways so far unattested in Anatolia, in conducting indirect taxation and the import and export of goods at the federal level, intruding into local fiscal practice, and regulating the movement of wealth between member-states through the grant of federal economic privileges of *epigamia* and *enktesis* across member-states.

⁸⁵ Achaia: Pol. 4.60.4-5 (Dyme, Triaia and Pharai refused to pay their contributions to the league when it failed to support them during an invasion by the Aitolians in the late 3rd century); Aitolia: *IG IX.1*² 188, ll. 20-21 (Aitolian arbitration between Melitaia and Pereia, 213/212 BCE; taxes payable to the league in proportion to their representation on the federal council); Boiotia: *I.Thespies* 55, ll. 26-27 (tax payable to *koinon* or city by farmers, ca. 240 BCE), possibly based on earlier tax-districts (Hell. Oxy. 16.3-4); in general, see Mackil 2013, 295-303; Mackil 2015, 497, and Migeotte 2014, 395-396.

⁸⁶ Achaia: *SEG* 11.377, ll. 15, 22-23 (federal tax-farmers exacting tax on common pasture-land in an arbitration between Hermione and Epidauros, late 3rd century); Thessaly: *SEG* 58.525, II ll. 25-34 (reduction of customs-dues for Athenians exporting grain, 196-192 BCE), with Helly 2008, 91-100; Boiotia may also have imposed customs-dues: Mackil 2013, 292-293. Note that the Chalkidian league in the early 4th century drew its income from its harbours and ports: Xen. Hell. 5.2.16, with Mackil 2013, 290-291.

⁸⁷ Achaia: IPArk 18, ll. 15-16 (honorific decree of Elateia for Stymphalos, 189-186 BCE; embargo on grain exportation during time of famine); Thessaly: *SEG* 34.558, ll. 16-56 (decree organising for the despatch of 430,000 *kophinoi* of grain to Rome by the *koinon*, 150-130 BCE); Boiotia: *IG VII* 2383, ll. 4-6 (honorific decree of Chorsiai for Kapon; *koinon* voted against export of grain during grain-shortage, 180-170 BCE), with Mackil 2013, 307-308. It is noteworthy also that the Delphic amphictyony does seem to have regulated the collection of harbour-dues at the port of Kirrha: CID IV 2, ll. 7-11, with Lefèvre 1994, 106, and Lefèvre 1998, 279-282 for examples of grants of *ateleia* by the amphictyony.

⁸⁸ Achaia: *Syll.*³ 519, l. 10 (228-224 BCE, for hostages of Boiotia and Phokis); Aitolia: *SEG* 25.615, l. 3 (4th century, for unknown Athenian); Boiotia: *IG VII* 2408, l. 5 (364/363 BCE, for Byzantine citizen), *IG VII* 2407, l. 8 (360s/350s, for Nobas of Carthage), *SEG* 25.553 (335-300 BCE, for Oikles of Pellene), *I.Oropos* 21 l. 7 (*isoteleia*, 287-225 BCE, for Ophelas of Amphipolis), with Mackil 2013, 294.

⁸⁹ The evidence is extensive, and discussed in full by Mackil 2013, 255-264.

Furthermore, a number of these mainland Greek *koina* sought to control monetary supply. The Achaian league, as Polybius memorably expressed, was united not only in the use of federal political institutions and laws, but also in common weights, measures, and coinage.⁹⁰ Federal coinage, in the form of common types and legends minted by member-states, is certainly well-attested for Achaia, Aitolia, Thessaly and Boiotia. Achaia minted in silver (on the reduced Aeginetan standard) and bronze from the 2nd to 1st centuries.⁹¹ The Aitolians minted silver sporadically in the late 3rd BCE (Attic and reduced Korkyraian standards), and bronze from the late 4th to mid-2nd centuries.⁹² The Boiotian league produced silver (Aiginetan, reduced Aiginetan, and Attic standards) and bronze all the way through the 3rd and early 2nd centuries, up to its dissolution in 171,⁹³ while the Thessalian league, after its revival in 196, minted silver and bronze at various points in the 2nd and 1st centuries (full Aiginetan and Attic standards).⁹⁴ Moreover, smaller *koina* also minted, like the Akarnanians,⁹⁵ Perrhaibans,⁹⁶ Ainianes,⁹⁷ or Magnetans.⁹⁸ Interestingly, in some cases multiple weight-standards were used for different precious-metal denominations at the same time, as with the Aitolian league in the late 3rd century, which used the Attic for gold staters and silver tetradrachms, and a reduced Korkyraian standard for drachms and didrachms, or Boiotia in the early 3rd century, which used the reduced Aiginetan for drachms, and the Attic for tetradrachms.⁹⁹ Such concurrent use of different standards, perhaps intended to manage precious-metal supply for transactions of different scales (at the international, as opposed to regional, levels, for example), suggests in any case some degree of federal coordination around monetary policy.

While this evidence for federal monetary production should again be qualified – federal minting, like minting by cities or rulers, was ultimately episodic and bound to specific exigencies, and did not proceed continuously over this period –, it nevertheless suggests collective decisions about monetary supply, and an array of practices that contrast strikingly with those of Asia Minor's *koina*. The contrast lies in the absence, in the main, of collective federal coinage. Only the *koina* of the Lykians and Athena Ilias struck coinage of their own, and only the former on a scale comparable to that found further west. The study of Troxell determined five periods of production for

⁹⁰ Pol. 2.37.8-11.

⁹¹ Warren 2007, 110-111; Thompson 1968, 89-90; Grandjean 2000, 325-330.

⁹² Hoover 2014, 280-285.

⁹³ Hoover 2014, 346-349.

⁹⁴ Hoover 2014, 83-89.

⁹⁵ Silver (Corinthian and symmachic standards) in the late 4th to 2nd centuries, bronze in the 3rd century: Hoover 2014, 221-226.

⁹⁶ Silver (Attic standard) and bronze in the 2nd and late 3rd to 2nd centuries respectively: Hoover 2014, 64-65.

⁹⁷ Silver (reduced Attic and reduced symmachic standards) in the 1st century, bronze in the late 4th, 3rd and 1st centuries: Hoover 2014, 23-27.

⁹⁸ Silver (Attic and reduced Attic standards) and bronze in the 2nd and late 1st centuries: Hoover 2014, 31-34.

⁹⁹ For Aitolia, see also Tsangari 2007, 241-248. The Thessalian league also minted on the Aiginetan standard for staters, and the Attic for drachms: see Kremydi-Sicilianou 2004, 255-258.

the Lykian *koinon*'s coinage,¹⁰⁰ clearly identified by the reverse legend ΛΥΚΙΩΝ, of which four extend to the end of the 1st century. Two series of bronzes are known, one pre-dating 167 (I),¹⁰¹ and the second spanning the mid-2nd to early 1st century BCE (III). Silver, minted on the Rhodian plinthophoric standard, and featuring Apollo and a lyre on obverse and reverse, was first produced later, and spanned the mid-2nd to late 1st centuries BCE (series II and IV).¹⁰² Both silver and bronze were produced at different denominations (drachms, hemidrachms, quarter-drachms, and hemiobols, quarter-obols, chalkos), and do not seem, so far as available hoard evidence suggests, to have circulated widely beyond Lykia.¹⁰³ Metrologically, the silver drachms exhibit a gradual reduction in weight. Minting was done by multiple member-cities, over two major monetary districts, and it is possible that the federal *eisphorai* of Strabo were made in the form of this federal coinage.¹⁰⁴ This combination of minting across multiple metals and denominations likely reflects the Lykian league's more extensive state institutions: bronze, for instance, might have paid for assembly attendance, or public salaries, as well as armies and festivals.¹⁰⁵ More coordinated concern for monetary supply reminiscent of *koina* further west was thus necessary. This may be reflected in the gradual reduction in weight of the period II silver, which may have been intended to preserve silver-supply, so that bronze was used for international currency.¹⁰⁶

No explicitly federal coinage is explicitly attested for the Ionian or Lesbian leagues. Several communities in Karia, some epigraphically attested as members of the Chrysaorian league, others not (Alabanda, Alinda, Herakleia-under-the-Latmos, Stratonikeia, Bargylia, Euhippe and Hydisos), minted coins featuring a winged Pegasus on the reverse, although unaccompanied by any federal legend.¹⁰⁷ This has been taken to indicate 'Chrysaorian' coinage.¹⁰⁸ However, the association of Chrysaor with Pegasos is not absolutely watertight,¹⁰⁹ while these coins also seem to have been

¹⁰⁰ Troxell 1982.

¹⁰¹ See however Ashton 1987, 18-20, who downdates Troxell's dating of the 190s to the 180s or 170s based on countermarked Rhodian and pseudo-Rhodian old drachms.

¹⁰² For this dating, see Ashton – Meadows 2008.

¹⁰³ CH I 96 (Lykia), CH VIII 366 (location unknown), CH VIII 452 (Lykia), CH IX 536 (Antalya environs), CH IX 583 (location unknown), CH X 317 (Letoon). The only Lykian league coinage found outside Lykia is bronze (CH IX 548, Askalon, ca. 100 BCE), and moreover of the smallest denominations (3 chalkoi and 1 quarter-obol?): Gitler – Kahanov 2002, 262.

¹⁰⁴ This was perhaps also the function of coinage in the Achaean league: Grandjean 2000, 328-329.

¹⁰⁵ Marcellesi 2007, 81 fn. 131; for assembly pay, see the law on the *ekklesiastikon* at Iasos (*I.Iasos* 20); for a tax on offerings made in bronze, Picard 1990.

¹⁰⁶ The reduction in weight eventually tallied Lykian drachms, in the period IV silver, with the Roman *quinarius*: Meadows 2021, 162-163; for bronze outside Lykia, see fn. 103. This model of silver being used for local exchange, and bronze outside the region, is also advocated for Thessaly by Kremydi-Sicilianou 2004.

¹⁰⁷ Debord 2010, 238-239, 243 for an overview of types, to which one should add Babelon 1898, 93 no. 1695 (Herakleia-under-the-Latmos).

¹⁰⁸ E.g. Robert 1973, 452-453; Laumonier 1958, 206, but see Debord 2010, 243.

¹⁰⁹ Debord 2003, 126-127.

minted on different standards, and bore civic, and not federal, legends.¹¹⁰ It is thus at present difficult to define the relationship, if any, between these Karian winged Pegasus types and the Chrysaorian league.¹¹¹ In the case of the Lesbian league, as we saw earlier, it was even the decision of the federal assembly that local coinage should be used for furnishing contributions.¹¹² This mentality should perhaps be seen as the predominant one among the region's *koina*, with the exception of Lykian *koinon* – that is, that the production of federal coinage was unnecessary, because existing currency sufficed. This also seems to have been the case with the *koinon* of Athena Ilias, despite the fact that it was the only other *koinon* in western Asia Minor to mint its own coinage.¹¹³ This was a stunningly well-crafted series of Attic-weight tetradrachms, with a right-facing Athena bust on the obverse, and a cult-statue of the goddess, framed by the legend ΑΘΗΝΑΣ ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ and the name of the *agonothetes* on the reverse.¹¹⁴ Analysis of these named *agonothetai*, alongside die-studies, have shown that its production spanned over a century from the late 180s/early 170s to 60s/50s BCE. As the overall numismatic output of the *koinon*, however, it compares poorly to Lykia, or Achaia, Thessaly, or Boiotia. Moreover, the absence of civic mint-marks suggests that the coins were produced at Ilion, and not minted at and by member-states, even if this happened under the auspices of the *koinon*, and not Ilion's civic authorities.¹¹⁵ Another feature is that denominations lower than the drachm are not known to have been struck, and even with the drachms only in much smaller quantities than tetradrachms, and from 77 BCE onwards.¹¹⁶ This would imply that this high-value silver was probably intended primarily to service large payments for festival costs, and was not used by members to pay their contributions, or as so-called '*panegyris* coinage', in transactions at festival markets.¹¹⁷ The same basic practice of the non-regulation of monetary supply at the federal level expressed at Lesbos probably also held true for the *koinon* of Athena Ilias. Indeed, documents relating to the contributions owed by members demonstrate that these were made in 'Alexandreian drachmas', which probably refers to existing Attic-weight royal and posthumous coinage.¹¹⁸

Federal oversight over fiscal and monetary activity thus seems to have been fairly loose, indeed 'light', among the *koina* of Asia Minor. The evidence for deeper fiscal penetration beyond the direct procurement of contributions, in indirect taxation, and economic rights that facilitated exchange within *koina*, as well as for monetary production in the minting of federal coinage, remains shakier east of the Aegean than west of it. These characteristics were probably due to differing

¹¹⁰ The bronzes from Hydisos, for example, bore the legend ΥΔΙΣΕΩΝ, and were struck on Mylasa's pseudo-Rhodian standard: Delrieux 2007, 73-75, while the silver of Bargylia also bore a civic ethnic ΒΑΡΓΥΛΙΗΤΩΝ, and was minted on the Attic standard: Head 1897, 71 no. 1.

¹¹¹ More light on this will be shed by Andrew Meadows' forthcoming monograph on Alabanda, part of which he was kind enough to share with me, and has shaped the claims made here.

¹¹² *IG* XII Suppl. 136, B l. 17.

¹¹³ See Ellis-Evans 2016 for a die-study and revised chronology, as well as discussion of the scale, size, and rationale of the series.

¹¹⁴ Robert 1966, 59-59, 67-94.

¹¹⁵ Ellis-Evans 2019, 35, 37.

¹¹⁶ Ellis-Evans 2016, 107-120 (101 tetradrachms, 1 didrachm, 7 drachms), 141-142.

¹¹⁷ Ellis-Evans 2016, 141-149, contra Psoma 2008, 235.

¹¹⁸ *I.Ilion* 5, ll. 11-12, 14, 16, 19, 21-22, 23, 30.

levels of political integration, insofar as the minting of coin was an expression of political solidarity: none of these Anatolian *koina* developed federal governments that materially interfered with local autonomy, beyond highly specific common activities around cultic worship. By contrast, the constancy of warfare, and political geography, meant that the Achaian, Aitolian or Boiotian *koina* likely had to orient their expenditure around military spending, and be more conscious of monetary supply, beyond the fact that warfare also provided booty, a source of income that was likely less significant for the non-military *koina* of Asia Minor.¹¹⁹ The apparent ‘lightness’ of the monetary economies of the latter may also be seen, however, to reflect differing regional contexts. As we shall now see, the absence of military spending and coinage potentially obscures other, perhaps just as potent, forms of wealth-extraction, as *koina* were poised as conduits between royal powers and civic demands.

III. Parasitism and powerful cities

Four observations – two larger, two smaller – may be made. The first is that the political spaces covered by Anatolian *koina* often intersected directly, and indeed were submerged, within the sovereignties of higher powers, like kings. The *koinon* of Athena Ilias emerged under the domination of Antigonos Monophthalmos, and was under Seleukid rule at various points in the 3rd century.¹²⁰ The same is true of the Ionian league,¹²¹ while the Chrysaorian *koinon* seems to have been particularly closely associated with Seleukid presence in Karia, particularly under Antiochos III.¹²² Only the Lykian league defined itself more distinctly in terms of opposition to Rhodian domination, while the same may have been the case for the Lesbians *vis-à-vis* the Ptolemies. There were thus more *koina* than not that subsisted under and alongside imperial rule. Again, this is a pattern that might be broadly contrasted with that in mainland Greece, where *koina* were largely defined by, and fiercely defended, their externality to royal (particularly Antigonid) domination – the Achaian and Aitolian leagues stand out in this regard.¹²³ Where *koina* were subsumed under royal authority, or indeed the authority of other larger *koina* (as Phokis or Boiotia), this usually had a disruptive effect on the coherence and autonomy of their institutions.¹²⁴ Conversely, the end of such domination could signal a new era for the history of a *koinon*, as with the Thessalians.¹²⁵ As the short-lived Hellenic leagues of Demetrios Poliorketes or Antigonos Doson exemplify, the *modus operandi* for relations between rulers and *koina* seems to have been, where possible, alliance and co-existence, and not subsumption and integration, as in Asia Minor.¹²⁶

¹¹⁹ Booty remained an important source of money for Achaian league even after minting commenced: Grandjean 2000, 328-329.

¹²⁰ Pillot 2016, 145-158.

¹²¹ Note that the satrap Strouthes already had some oversight of the league in the early 4th century (*I.Milet* 9); consider also the various phases of royal domination at Miletos, Priene, Ephesos, Teos, or Samos, for instance.

¹²² Debord 2003, 138-141.

¹²³ For a narrative history of these interactions, see Mackil 2013, 91-128.

¹²⁴ Mackil 2013, 359, 442-443 for Phokis, and Beck – Ganter 2015, 155-156 for Boiotia.

¹²⁵ Bouchon – Helly 2015, 240-249.

¹²⁶ See Smarczyk 2015, 458-464 for the Hellenic leagues.

Be these differences as they may, the greater propensity for the interweaving of *koinon* and royal authority in Asia Minor, alongside the feature that three of the five were primarily focussed on cultic worship based at sanctuaries, should also imply a greater propensity for parasitism – that is, the extraction of contributions from member-states, by a *koinon*, where these member-states were also subject to contributions to a king. Suggestive evidence for this seems to lie in the Amyzonian decree on contributions to the Chrysaorian league briefly alluded to above. As suggested by Robert, this text probably dates to the period of Antiochos III's rule over the city in the late 3rd century.¹²⁷ If so, it is likely that the regulations in the decree reflect a particular moment of disruption, and perhaps an attempt on the part of the Seleukid administration to restore regularity to the Chrysaorians' finances.¹²⁸ It is striking, for one, that the city had had to rely on creditors to make an advance payment, which suggests financial difficulties. While this subscription may thus reflect extraordinary circumstances, the sum of five drachmas per capita was probably the standard sum for contributions to the *koinon*. Corroboration for this can be found in a late 3rd- or early 2nd-century list of contributors of five-drachma sums from Akçaova (near Muğla), which have been plausibly identified with contributions to the Chrysaorian league.¹²⁹ At Amyzon, assuming that the male citizen population was around 1,000 individuals strong,¹³⁰ this would have amounted to the not inconsiderable sum of 5,000 drachmas, or just under a talent – a sum within the range of that attested, as we have seen, at Priene and Ilion. At Ilion contributions were also made annually,¹³¹ and there is no reason to believe this would have been radically different for the Chrysaorian league: the regular celebration of festivals, and their associated expenses, would have demanded just as constant an input. The additional complication in the case of Amyzon was that the city also owed tax to the Seleukid administration, a fact that is alluded to in an honorific decree for the Seleukid administrator of its Artemision, which explicitly mentions 'other Amyzonians' living in autonomous cities, implying the city's subject status.¹³²

Moreover, five drachmas are unlikely to have been a negligible sum for most male Amyzonian citizens, if average daily wages for soldiers and assembly-goers hovered around two to three obols in the classical and Hellenistic periods.¹³³ Five drachmas is also unusually low as an average for public subscriptions,¹³⁴ with sums below ten drachmas being mainly attested for private associations and cult-groups, or small building works.¹³⁵ It should further be stressed that such

¹²⁷ Robert – Robert 1983, 225-226.

¹²⁸ Capdetrey 2007, 105-106.

¹²⁹ SEG 51.1487, with Bremen 2004, 378-382 (late 3rd to early 2nd centuries BCE); note that three individuals (ll. 2, 5, 9) gave 100 drachmas, although expressed in terms of a sum of 95 drachmas promised in addition to (σὺν τῷ προσεπηγγελμένῳ) the base sum of five drachmas.

¹³⁰ See Ruschenbusch 1985 for average male citizen populations in small-medium Hellenistic *poleis*.

¹³¹ E.g. *I.Ilion* 6, l. 5, *I.Ilion* 9 l. 14, which mention the interest due in specific years.

¹³² Robert, *Amyzon* 15, ll. 14-16. For Seleukid tax in general, see Ma 2002, 131-135, and Capdetrey 2007, 395-422.

¹³³ Cf. Marcellesi 2010, 262-266.

¹³⁴ Migeotte 1992, 349-356, with Migeotte, *Souscriptions* 40, 42, 43, 50, 53, 58, 65, 74, 75, and also Bremen 2004, 379 fn. 46.

¹³⁵ E.g. McCabe Halikarnassos 32 (2nd/1st century), for the construction of a well at Theangela; see also subscriptions at Tanagra for a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore (SEG 43.212 A, late 3rd or early 2nd century

subscriptions mainly record the voluntary spending of the wealthier strata of civic society. By contrast, the Amyzonians exacted five drachmas from each male citizen, at the threat of a tenfold fine – an imposition all the more intrusive because it affected a larger segment of the city’s population than a voluntary subscription might have done. It is perhaps apposite to note that Amyzon’s first known coinage, in bronze, was minted around 200, and in two denominations (perhaps the hemiobol (3.36g) and chalkos (0.9g)):¹³⁶ a case might therefore perhaps be made for associating these issues with the need for smaller fiduciary change brought on by economic pressures generated and compounded by the demands of the *koinon*. Indeed, a similar association between *koinon* demands and fiduciary currency can be observed with the *koinon* of Athena Ilias: Myrleia’s annual contribution, for instance, amounted to 245 drachmas and three obols, a sum that must have been furnished in part in bronze.¹³⁷ Furthermore, at Priene in the late 2nd century, as we saw above, Moschion contributed towards the city’s interest-payment of 2,158 drachmas and four obols to the Ionian league. What is striking about this sum is that it is considerably more specific than the other sums that Moschion had contributed at other times, which were mainly described in generic amounts of 1,000 drachma sums;¹³⁸ this suggests the importance that was attached to it. Moreover, the specific amount of four obols, reflecting interest due on an unknown rate, can only have been furnished through bronze denominations.¹³⁹ Here, too, we have some evidence for linking *koinon* obligations with an increased need for fiduciary bronze, even if at the civic level only – one of the significant developments of Hellenistic monetary history.¹⁴⁰

The wealth accumulated and managed by these *koina* was likely considerable. With their connections to the vast holdings of royal land in Asia Minor, these Anatolian *koina* may in fact have been richer than those on the mainland. The late 2nd-century records of contributions by cities towards the Delia festival at Tanagra in Boiotia, which also exacted contributions through interest-payments, show sums far lower than those attested for Kalchedon and Myrleia for Athena Ilias’ *koinon*, or Priene for the Panionia: Anthedon, for instance, only provided 93 drachmas in one year.¹⁴¹ Furthermore, the fact that at least two Anatolian *koina* collected contributions through interest-payments (it is only attested in Greece at Tanagra among the *koina*) even suggests a maximising mindset, as such payments might be interpreted as a means of diversifying and protecting capital by outsourcing it to member-states and their localised economies.¹⁴² The continuous minting of high-quality silver tetradrachms by the *koinon* of Athena Ilias, and for over a century, where it

BCE), and at Orchomenos for a shrine of Asklepios (*JG* VII 3191, mid-3rd century BCE); for subscriptions by private associations, see Migeotte 2013, and *I.Kaunos* 39, for a subscription by a *thiasos*.

¹³⁶ Robert – Robert 1983, 40 ns. 4, 5-9.

¹³⁷ *I.Ilion* 5, ll. 18-20; see also *I.Ilion* 6, a fragmentary list of fines which does mention a four-obol payment or fine (ll. 8-9).

¹³⁸ *I.Priene* B-M 64, ll. 31-55, 63-79, 89-102.

¹³⁹ Two denominations were minted at Priene in the late 2nd century: Regling 1927, 83-92, series S (average weight 5.85) and T (average weight 3.78g).

¹⁴⁰ For an overview of the rise of bronze coinage, see Marcellesi 2010.

¹⁴¹ *SEG* 57.452 III, with Brélaz – Andreiomenou – Ducrey 2007, 275-276.

¹⁴² Lefèvre – Pilot 2015, 14-15.

would have been more economical to simply use existing Attic-weight coinage, surely also hints at substantial wealth.

The Amyzonian decree, then, offers an insight into the parasitic dynamics in which *koina* in Asia Minor may have been engaged, as intermediate organisations that extracted contributions from their members in a manner reminiscent of high powers like kings, and created pressures at the level of local monetary economy. The second point following on from this, then, is that this pressure may also have contributed to accentuating inequalities of political and economic power between member-states. A test-case is the *koinon* of Athena Ilios, whose centrality on the sanctuary of Athena at Ilios made it virtually inevitable that the city would stand to gain considerably by it. We know that Ilios had pride of place in the *koinon*'s running, with the presiding *agonothetes* typically being Iliosian,¹⁴³ and the generosity of benefactors to the *koinon* like Malousios also benefiting the city, for he contributed to its theatre.¹⁴⁴ Iliosian citizens no doubt also had better opportunities to misappropriate *koinon* funds than others, and this is indeed the implication of one decree of the *koinon* outlining fines for communities and individuals who had not provided their obligatory contributions of money and sacrificial animals: at the end of the surviving fragment an Iliosian citizen is named, Menekrates, who had received funds towards a contract for rearing a sacrificial bull, but had not gone through with fulfilling his promise of actually procuring a bull.¹⁴⁵

It should also be stressed that Ilios's dominance within the *koinon* coincided with engagement in a regional economic network based around the Propontis. This is implied by the extent of the *koinon*'s membership, including places like Kalchedon and Myrleia in Bithynia, but also by the evidence of posthumous Lysimachi – Attic-weight coinage bearing the portrait of Lysimachos on the obverse, and produced by communities in the Propontis and northern Troad in the mid-3rd and early 2nd centuries BCE (Byzantion, Kalchedon, Abydos, Lampsakos, Ilios, Tenedos),¹⁴⁶ which strongly suggests the existence of a monetary zone. The civic mint at Ilios also struck posthumous Lysimachi, and it may not be pure coincidence that these issues, dateable to the 180s to 150s, coincided in time with the *koinon*'s own high-quality silver.¹⁴⁷ In any case, Ilios and its Panathenaia would have stood to benefit economically from this network, with the festival's timing, perhaps in August, making Ilios an ideal stopping-point for merchants returning from the Black Sea.¹⁴⁸

Parasitism, combined with a lively nexus of economic links in the Propontis, is thus likely to have enriched Ilios, even if this enrichment would in theory have gone only to the *koinon*. The extent to which this created serious economic imbalances between Ilios and other members of the *koinon* is difficult to tell, but it certainly would have generated envy at the prominence that Ilios

¹⁴³ Presidency of the *agonothetai* held by an Iliosian: *I.Ilios* 5, ll. 1-2; *I.Ilios* 7, ll. 1-2; *I.Ilios* 10, l. 2; *SEG* 53.1373, ll. 1-2, and Knoepfler 2010, 36-38; Ellis-Evans 2018, 51.

¹⁴⁴ *I.Ilios* 1, ll. 9-10, 37-41; see also *I.Ilios* 32, ll. 38-41, a decree of Ilios honouring Antiochos I in which the *agonothetes* (presumably the president of the board, and an Iliosian citizen) and *synedroi* are instructed to announce the king's honours at the *koinon*'s Panathenaia.

¹⁴⁵ *I.Ilios* 5, ll. 27-31.

¹⁴⁶ Ellis-Evans 2019, 33-42.

¹⁴⁷ Ellis-Evans 2019, 35.

¹⁴⁸ Ellis-Evans 2019, 50.

gained through the *koinon* and its festival. One indication of this is probably the rise of Alexandria Troas, a major member of the *koinon* to Ilion's south.¹⁴⁹ Its minting habits, revealing an increase in coin production over the 3rd century, suggest steadily rising wealth.¹⁵⁰ Whether or not this was due to the *koinon*, Alexandria also benefitted from gifts of territory from Rome after the peace of Apameia.¹⁵¹ In the early 2nd century, moreover, the city began to promote its own local festival, the Smintheia honouring Apollo Smintheus, and minted wreathed tetradrachms presenting the god and his cult-statue in very similar stylistic terms to those of Athena Ilias on the contemporaneous silver coinage of the *koinon*. The similarity of these issues is significant, because it suggests that the *koinon*'s coinage was understood to serve, at least in part, the civic pride of Ilion, and was thus worthy of imitation by member-states like Alexandria who similarly sought to compete with it and assert local identity.¹⁵² This similarity of production is thus strong evidence for inter-city competition between members of the *koinon* of Athena Ilias. More notable still is the fact that this competitive dynamic did not lead to the fragmentation of the *koinon*, as Alexandria is attested as a member well into the 1st century.¹⁵³ In fact, competition may have been a source of the *koinon*'s continuing vitality.

Similar scenarios may be sketched, albeit more hazily, for the *koina* of the Ionians and the Chrysaorians. In the former, tensions may have existed between Ephesos and Priene as competing seats for the *koinon*'s sacred offices and rites in the 5th and 4th centuries.¹⁵⁴ By the 2nd century, however, Miletos seems to have gained the ascendancy, and was even able, through the offices of its citizen Eirenias, to honour Eumenes II on the *koinon*'s behalf with a statue set up at Miletos itself.¹⁵⁵ A sea-change seems to have taken place from the early 3rd century, when Hippostratos, friend of Lysimachos, was honoured by the Ionians with a statue at the Panionion.¹⁵⁶ In Karia, the Chrysaorian league faced challenges from its member-state Mylasa in the late 3rd BCE. A letter of Philipp V to the Mylasans (ca. 220), inscribed at Labraunda, and confirming their proprietorship of the sanctuary and its sacred lands, explicitly mentions attempts by the priest Hekatomnos and the Chrysaorian and Karian leagues to lay claim to Labraunda (on the basis of an earlier letter of Antigonos Dason), and that Mylasa had voted 'to exclude the Chrysaorians, even as they attempted to appropriate (the shrine) for themselves' (τοῦ δὲ X[ρυσ]σαορείς ζητοῦντας ἐξιδιάσασθαι αὐτ[οῦ] ἐκ[[κλε]ίειν).¹⁵⁷ Mylasa had been a member of the *koinon* since the early

¹⁴⁹ Although first attested only in the 1st century BCE (*I.Ilion* 10, l. 10, 7 l. 3), there is no reason to believe it was not part of the *koinon* from its inception: Knoepfler 2010, 45.

¹⁵⁰ Ellis-Evans forthcoming, chapter 3.

¹⁵¹ It received the territory of Hamaxitos, in particular: Bresson 2007.

¹⁵² Ellis-Evans 2016, 148-149; Ellis-Evans 2019, 53-54.

¹⁵³ *I.Ilion* 10, ll. 10-11: Alexandria sent an *agonothetes* and two *synedroi*.

¹⁵⁴ Ephesos was known as the seat of the Ionians' religious rites in the 5th century (Thuc. 3.104), although Priene seems to have taken the lead in retrieving Ionian antiquities from Helike in the 4th century: Diod. Sic. 15.49, Str. 8.7.2. Ephesos also claimed to be the seat of the king of the Ionians: Str. 14.1.3, *I.Priene* B-M 399, l. 22.

¹⁵⁵ *I.Milet* 306.

¹⁵⁶ *I.Milet* 10, ll. 11-12.

¹⁵⁷ *I.Labraunda* 5, ll. 5-18.

3rd century,¹⁵⁸ but in this case prioritised its civic interests over those of the league, and perhaps even forcibly so.¹⁵⁹ It is interesting here that the Chrysaorians were clearly concerned with the considerable wealth to be gained from controlling Labraunda, and also that they had joined forces with a king and local powerbroker to do so, reinforcing the picture observed earlier of an organisation that exacted from its members in the manner of royal power. Also striking here is that Mylasa continued to remain a member into the 2nd century,¹⁶⁰ even though it seems to have won out over the league in this instance, and pursued an aggressive policy of expansion of its own over this period.¹⁶¹ Much is obscure about these events, but they at least strongly suggest that the Ionian and Chrysaorian *koina*, like that of Athena Ilias, were similarly marked, and even sustained, by interactions with headstrong member-states. The Lesbian and Lykian leagues present differing circumstances, on the other hand, which may be seen to confirm this dynamic, with the Lesbian league possibly being short-lived for the strong tendency to separatism among the cities of Lesbos, while the Lykian federation was unusual – perhaps due to its isolated geography, and the nature of poliadisation in the region under Ptolemaic rule – in not being shaped (at least in the Hellenistic period), at least in a noticeable way, by inter-city tensions.¹⁶² This overall picture of Anatolian *koina* bolstered by civic competition, if accepted, would offer another point of difference from the Greek mainland, where separatism and imbalance between member-states was sometimes even met with iron-fisted response, such as the imposition of garrisons or military action.¹⁶³ Not only were Alexandria Troas and Mylasa able to challenge their *koina* openly, but this did not affect their member-status. Furthermore, responses to serious recalcitrance seem to have been confined, at most, to the imposition of fines, as with the *koinon* of Athena Ilias and Kalchedon and Myrleia – fines whose effectiveness we are perhaps entitled to doubt.

IV. *Koina* between the local and the royal

The two larger points outlined above, of the parasitic character of Anatolian *koina* within the umbrella of larger royal sovereignty, and the embedding of this within a dynamic where competition between member-states was tolerated and perhaps even encouraged, brings us to two smaller points. One is that the *koina* examined here should also be understood not only as facilitating or generating the emergence of inequalities among their members, but also as the products of pre-existing dynamics at the micro-regional, even micro-*koinon* level. The major pattern producing polities resembling those of mainland Greece, in ‘strong’ states with centralised political and fiscal institutions may rather have lain, in the Anatolian context, in *polis* hegemonies exercised over immediate neighbours, rather than broader federal formations. It is in polities arising out of amalgamation through synoecism, *sympoliteia*, or *isopoliteia*, that one finds cooperative

¹⁵⁸ A Mylasan proposed the honorific decree for the Ptolemaic official Apollonios in 267: *I.Labraunda* 43, l. 4.

¹⁵⁹ One might wonder if the ‘shutting out’ ([ἐκκλε]ίειν) of the Chrysaorians involved physical gatekeeping and confrontation.

¹⁶⁰ Mylasan athletic victors continue to use the Chrysaorian ethnic into the 2nd century: *IG XII.4* 454, B ll. 189-190, C ll. 275-276, 289-291 (Kos, 173 BCE); *IG II²* 2315, ll. 23-24 (Athens, 166 BCE).

¹⁶¹ Mylasan expansionism in the late 3rd and early 2nd centuries: Reger 2010.

¹⁶² We do not find signs of conflict or status-jostling between Xanthos and Patara, as between Ilion and Alexandria Troas, for instance.

¹⁶³ Mackil 2013, 363-370, in relation to the Achaean *koinon* in particular.

coinage – one thinks of the coinages of Kos or Rhodes off the coasts of western Asia Minor, for instance. Indeed, apart from the coinages of the *koina* of Athena Ilias (and moreover only in silver) and the Lykian league, the only known coinages minted jointly by multiple communities (mainly in bronze moreover, implying localised circulation), where types explicitly feature multiple civic legends, are those of *sympoliteiai* or closely neighbouring cities, in Karia (Aphrodisias and Plarasa), Lykia (Termessos Minor and Oinoanda) and Pisidia (Neapolis, Isinda, Kolbasa, and Kremna and Keraia).¹⁶⁴ This atomisation of ‘federal’ behaviour in Asia Minor may, however, have been part of a longer history, if we bring these Hellenistic coinages into connection with earlier phenomena in the 6th and 4th centuries, like the monetary pact between Mytilene and Phokaia, or the sharing of types and standards between Phokaia and Teos, and Aspendos and Selge.¹⁶⁵

Smaller *koina* and *sympoliteiai* also seem to have existed unproblematically within larger *koina*. Parion and Skepsis, for one, agreed to a treaty of *isopoliteia* even as they were member-states of the *koinon* of Athena Ilias,¹⁶⁶ while powerful *poleis* like Miletos and Mylasa made *sympoliteiai* with weaker neighbours, like Myous and Pidasas, and Olymos, Hydai, and Euromos, respectively, over the period they were members of their *koina*.¹⁶⁷ Even Lykia was not immune from these tendencies, with Xanthos and Myra establishing a treaty of *isopoliteia* in the mid-2nd century BCE.¹⁶⁸ In Karia, indeed, a number of micro-*koina* are attested in the 3rd and 2nd centuries – groups like the Koloneis, Pisyetai-Pladaseis, or Leukoideis.¹⁶⁹ Many are little more than names, and were probably proto-poliadic, rather than fully fledged *poleis*, but are significant in reflecting the highly complex and nucleated landscape faced by the larger Chrysaorian and Karian *koina*. It is an open question whether larger *koina* like the latter formed a model for these smaller formations. One example may be the *polis*-like *koinon* of the Tarmianois in eastern Karia, attested in several documents of the 1st century BCE, and which has been associated with the community underpinning a list of contributors from Akçaova, of the late 3rd to early 2nd centuries.¹⁷⁰ This list, as we saw earlier, records contributions of five-drachma sums that have been plausibly identified as contributions to the Chrysaorian league, and which were made by contributors from four different

¹⁶⁴ Aphrodisias and Plarasa: Macdonald 1992, 59-72, types 1-37 (silver and bronze); Termessos Minor and Oinoanda: Imhoof-Blumer 1890, 703-704, ns. 547, 548; for the Pisidian coinages, see Meadows forthcoming, who also discusses the previous two cases, and Sekunda 2021.

¹⁶⁵ Mytilene and Phokaia: IG XII.2 1, with Mackil – Alfen 2006, 210-219; Phokaia and Teos: Kraay 1976, 243; Balcer 1970; Aspendos and Selge: Kraay 1976, 277-278; for a possible short-lived monetary union based around Assos in the mid- to late 4th century, see Cook 1973, 249-250; Ellis-Evans 2019, 262-265. The major outlier is the ΣΥΝ coinage of the late 5th century, although this was most probably instigated by the Spartan admiral Lysandros: Kraay 1976, 113, 248, and now Kallet – Kroll 2020, 136-139.

¹⁶⁶ Taşlıklioğlu 1971, 204-205 n.1, with Robert in BE 1972, 371.

¹⁶⁷ For these cases see now LaBuff 2016, 87-117.

¹⁶⁸ SEG 44.1218.

¹⁶⁹ As surveyed by Debord 2003, 142-170.

¹⁷⁰ See Bremen 2004, 382-384 for the relevant documents. In these the Tarmianois function like a city, receiving dedications in the gymnasium alongside Herakles and Hermes (*I.Carie hautes terres* 64, 65), setting up honours for benefactors (*I.Carie hautes terres* 4, 63), and having their own ethnic adjective, Ταρπιανός (*I.Stratonikeia* 609, l. 7; *I.Stratonikeia* 613, l. 5).

smaller communities (the Lomeis, Mniesytai, Mobolleis, and Tabenoi).¹⁷¹ These communities are also mentioned in a shield-dedication of the early 1st century BCE, from Muğla,¹⁷² which, to judge from its monumental form, was probably set up alongside the late Hellenistic dedications that do mention the Tarmianoï, suggesting that these four communities may have formed the constituent sub-groups of the latter.¹⁷³ The difficulty with identifying the underlying community of the list of contributors from Akçaova with the Tarmianoï, however, is the century-long gap, and also the alternative possibility that this underlying community was the *koinon* of the Laodikeis, formed as a result of the demotion of the *polis* of Laodikeia by Rhodes to *koinon* status sometime before 188 BCE.¹⁷⁴ If, however, as has been argued, the Tarmianoï were one of these sub-groups of Laodikeia, which by the later Hellenistic period had become the dominant *koinon* that had superseded the Laodikeis,¹⁷⁵ this list of contributions may be seen to offer an insight into the some of the mechanisms by which minor *koina* like the Tarmianoï (who may have been one of the contributing communities in lost sections of the document) later became larger ones: that is, the extractive demands of the Chrysaorian *koinon*, and not only the state policy of high powers like Rhodes. In short, the historical process unfolding here may be something akin to the *koinon*'s tolerance of Mylasa's expansionism, for instance.

The question of models brings us to our final, more speculative point, which is that the specific shape of large *koina* in late classical and early Hellenistic Asia Minor, as wealthy but institutionally loose organisations, may have provided inspiration for higher powers themselves. The likelihood of this would have grown in the period after the withdrawal of Seleukid power from Anatolia after the peace of Apameia in 188. The later Attalid dynasty's attitudes towards civic communities, for one, have more recently been characterised as marking a transition in Hellenistic kingship, away from universalising charismatic rulership on the model of the Ptolemies and Seleukids, and rather towards a form of statecraft that demanded more regionally focussed, denser institution-building, with the result that the Attalids increasingly saw their empire in Anatolian terms.¹⁷⁶ The end of Seleukid dominance in the region after 188 meant that Eumenes II had to engage in more extensive economic exploitation of his expanded kingdom through the creation of military settlements, alongside devolving authority to local notables, and propagating an ideology of kingship that embedded it within the structures of civic elite society.¹⁷⁷ Part of this program, pertinent to our discussion here, was the interest in presenting the Attalid realm as a federation of cities – an impression which emerges most strongly from cistophoric coinage, so named for its unusual tetradrachm type, featuring a serpent emerging out of a wicker chest on the obverse, and snakes wrapped around a bow on the reverse. These were struck all across the Attalid realm from around the 160s, and on a special reduced Attic weight standard that limited their circulation outside, and was

¹⁷¹ SEG 51.1487.

¹⁷² *I. Carie hautes terres* 62.

¹⁷³ In particular, *I. Carie hautes terres* 4, 63-65, and Bremen 2004, 384 on their similarity as shield-dedications, and the likely gymnasial context of display.

¹⁷⁴ Bremen 2004, 367-391.

¹⁷⁵ Bremen 2004, 391-396, who argues convincingly for the Tarmianoï's later dominance, but does not explain how this might have come about.

¹⁷⁶ In this vein, Kaye 2022.

¹⁷⁷ Thonemann 2013, 5-47.

intended to conserve wealth within, the kingdom.¹⁷⁸ While the minting of a common type by multiple cities was not unparalleled – this was how earlier royal coinage featuring the ruler’s portrait was produced, for instance – the fact that this took place for coinage featuring an iconographic type that consciously eschewed the impression of being ‘royal’ has been seen as a sign of their ‘federal’ character.¹⁷⁹ Indeed, aside from the Lykian league’s coinage, *cistophoroi* represent, for the pre-Roman period, the sort of regional cooperative coinage most resembling that found in mainland Greece. Nevertheless, quantification and die-studies have left no doubt about royal agency, and it is more reasonable to characterise the Attalid *cistophoroi* as a form of ‘coordinated’ coinage.¹⁸⁰ The presentation of the coinage as ‘federal’ in character was thus part of deliberate royal policy, and has been plausibly interpreted as being modelled on the better-established federal states across the Aegean, like the Achaian *koinon*.¹⁸¹ One might wonder, however, in light of the three earlier points raised here, whether the *cistophoroi*, and the ‘federal’ conception of the Attalid realm and its post-188 fiscal system, were also inspired by the *koina* of Asia Minor, whose peculiarity lay in being systems of extraction that did not extend to overt political union.¹⁸²

If so, the striking point is that it took a king to form a ‘*koinon*’ based in western Asia Minor, albeit one that expanded the principles of pre-existing *koina* in the region. The Rhodians, who also produced coinage of limited circulation, the *plinthophoroi*, may have sought to do the same, but ruled Karia too briefly for lasting effects to be detected.¹⁸³ The Attalid model, however, would survive longer. Not only did the *cistophoros* become the main currency of the first century of Roman provincial rule after 129,¹⁸⁴ but the Attalids’ conception of their cities as a *koinon* must surely have formed the basis for the eventual creation, in the post-Attalid era, of the *koinon* of Asia over the course of the 1st century BCE.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁸ In general, see Kleiner – Noe 1977, and Meadows 2013; *cistophoric* mints included cities in the Attalid heartland (Pergamon, Ephesos, Tralleis, Adramytteion, Apameia, Sardeis), but also possibly several communities in southern Phrygia (Laodikeia on the Lykos, Blaundos, Dionysopolis, Dioskome, Lysias), and Milyas (Kormasa); cf. Kaye 2022, 138-139. Note that Ashton 2013, 245-249 retains a higher dating for the *cistophoroi*’s emergence in the late 190s or 180s.

¹⁷⁹ As implied by Seyrig 1963, 24; Kleiner – Noe 1977, 120-125, however, re-affirm royal agency.

¹⁸⁰ Kaye 2022, 173-176, building on Thonemann 2013, 30-35.

¹⁸¹ Thonemann 2013, 33-34.

¹⁸² This is notwithstanding, of course, the existence in the Attalid kingdom of royal administrators, and of administrative districts that may have laid the basis for the later Roman Republican *conventus*, as argued by Mileta 1990.

¹⁸³ For the possibility of coordination in the creation of the *cistophoros* and Rhodes’ *plinthophoric* coinage, Ashton 2001, 94. We might note that the latter was produced, interestingly, alongside the striking of coinage on the older Rhodian standard by communities on the fringes of Rhodian rule, like Mylasa, Miletos, and Kos, perhaps as part of open political defiance. Mylasa, for one, may have done so precisely in part to fund its own local expansionism, as seen in its *sympoliteia* with Euromos, and the numerous land-lease documents; cf. Ashton 1992 and Ashton – Reger 2006.

¹⁸⁴ See in general Carbone 2020.

¹⁸⁵ For the early *koinon* of Asia, see Campanile 2007 and Edelmann-Singer 2015, 60-71 in particular.

Conclusions

The preceding pages have sought to argue for the regional distinctiveness of the *koina* of Asia Minor within the larger and diverse mosaic of federal polities in the Hellenistic world. This was attempted through a study of their monetary economies, as seen through extant epigraphy and coinage, which offer insights into attitudes to political coherence at a federal level. What we found was that the activities of the *koina* of Athena Ilias, the Ionians, and the Chrysaorians, were mainly centred on specific sanctuaries and their festivals, and did not seriously extend to the formation of cohesive federal political and military institutions; only with the (potentially short-lived) Lesbian and Lykian *koina* was this more the case. The relative lack of federal coinage, apart from Lykia and the exceptional silver of Athena Ilias, is telling in this regard, and adds to a picture that contrasts, in the main, with that of the *koina* in Greece, which were often strong states bound not only by collective worship, but also pressing political and military need. This impression of cult-centred *koina*, however, is also a reflection of the political economy of Asia Minor, where royal power allowed *koina* to exist as parasitic associations, drawing on the wealth of their members, and accentuating competition between their members. Large *koina* may ultimately have been an anomaly in a landscape where trans-local cohesion was achieved mainly at level of the micro-*koinon*, in arrangements like *sympoliteia*, and the miniature dominions of hegemonic *poleis*. The paradox of the *koina* in this macro-region, then, is that looseness and a tendency to fission may have also allowed for flexibility and sustainability – the *koina* of Athena Ilias, the Ionians, and Lykians, notably, seem to have enjoyed continuous existence well into the imperial period.

This has been an account that, admittedly, has sacrificed micro-regional detail in favour of macro-regional comparison; painting with broad brushstrokes, however, has hopefully highlighted, for instance, the anomalousness in the Anatolian context of the Lykian league, which commentators since Montesquieu have mostly considered in terms of the broader history of the Greek federal ideal.¹⁸⁶ The study of *koina* in other macro-regions will doubtless prove similarly fruitful.¹⁸⁷ While the largely fragmentary character of the evidence means that new discoveries threaten the solidity of claims advanced here, it should be stressed that the overall picture, especially in view of the wealth of epigraphical remains from Asia Minor, suggests at least either that political and economic federation in the manner of the *koina* of mainland Greece was largely absent, or that there was an unwillingness to advertise this through epigraphic display. For all the connections and imitative cross-fertilisation with the *koina* of Greece that must undoubtedly have taken place,¹⁸⁸ then, a crucial feature of these Anatolian conglomerates seems to have been a conscious desire to minimise the *appearance* of being strong federations. In the final analysis, we might recall the *koinon*-like ambiguity of late Attalid cistophoric coinage, which may be seen to epitomise western Asia Minor's general approach to federation in the Hellenistic period: a coinage that featured a

¹⁸⁶ Knoepfler 2013, 111-140.

¹⁸⁷ Such as e.g. the leagues based in the Aegean, or those of Molossia and Epeiros in north-western Greece, cf. Buraselis 2015; Meyer 2015.

¹⁸⁸ The Mytilenians and Aitolian league arranged an *isopoliteia* in the late 3rd century, for instance, probably some decades before the formalisation of the Lesbian *koinon*: IG XII.2 15-16; the similarity between the *koinon* of Athena Ilias' board of *synedroi* and that of the Delphic amphictyony was noted above. For the Achaian *koinon* serving as inspiration for the Lykians, see Knoepfler 2013, 151-153 and Behrwald 2015, 409.

mysterious common iconographic type and a consistent weight standard, but no legends beyond civic monograms and ethnics, and consequently never quite spelt out just who it was for.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

CH I	M. J. Price (ed.), <i>Coin Hoards I. Greek Hoards</i> , London 1975.
CH VIII	U. Wartenberg – M. J. Price – K. A. McGregor (eds.), <i>Coin Hoards VIII. Greek Hoards</i> , London 1994.
CH IX	A. Meadows – U. Wartenberg (eds.), <i>Coin Hoards IX. Greek Hoards</i> , London 2002.
CH X	O. Hoover – A. Meadows – U. Wartenberg (eds.), <i>Coin Hoards X. Greek Hoards</i> , New York 2010.
McCabe Halikarnassos	D. F. McCabe, <i>Halikarnassos Inscriptions: Texts and List</i> , Princeton 1991.

General

Aneziri 2003	S. Aneziri, <i>Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organisation und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine</i> , Stuttgart 2003.
Ashton 1987	R. H. J. Ashton, <i>Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms and the Beginning of the Lycian League Coinage</i> , NC 147, 1987, 8-25.
Ashton 1992	R. H. J. Ashton, <i>The Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms of Mylasa</i> , NC 152, 1992, 1-39.
Ashton 2001	R. H. J. Ashton, <i>The Coinage of Rhodes 408-c.190 BC</i> , in: A. Meadows – K. Shipton (eds.), <i>Money and its Uses in the Ancient Greek World</i> , Oxford 2001, 79-115.
Ashton 2013	R. H. J. Ashton, <i>The Use of the Cistophoric Weight-Standard Outside the Pergamene Kingdom</i> , in: P. Thonemann (ed.), <i>Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State</i> , Oxford 2013, 245-264.
Ashton – Meadows 2008	R. H. J. Ashton – A. R. Meadows, <i>The Letoon Deposit: Lycian League Coinage, Rhodian Plinthophori, and Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms from Haliartos (yet again) and Asia Minor</i> , NC 168, 2008, 111-134.
Ashton – Reger 2006	R. H. J. Ashton – G. Reger, <i>The Pseudo-Rhodian Drachms of Mylasa Revisited</i> , in: P. van Alfen (ed.), <i>Agoranomia. Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to John H. Kroll</i> , New York 2006, 125-150.
Babelon 1898	E. Babelon, <i>Inventaire sommaire de la Collection Waddington</i> , Paris 1898.
Balcer 1970	J. M. Balcer, <i>Phokaia and Teos: a monetary alliance</i> , SNR 49, 1970, 25-33.
Beck 1997	H. Beck, <i>H. Polis und Koinon</i> , Stuttgart 1997.

- Beck – Buraselis – McAuley 2019 H. Beck – K. Buraselis – A. McAuley (eds.), *Ethnos and Koinon. Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*, Stuttgart 2019.
- Beck – Funke 2015 H. Beck – P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 2015.
- Beck – Ganter 2015 H. Beck – A. Ganter, *Boiotia and the Boiotian Leagues*, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 132-157.
- Behrwald 2000 R. Behrwald, *Der Lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*, Bonn 2000.
- Behrwald 2015 R. Behrwald, *The Lykian League*, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 403-418.
- Bouchon – Helly 2015 R. Bouchon – B. Helly, *The Thessalian League*, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 231-249.
- Brélaz – Andreiomenou – Ducrey 2007 C. Brélaz – A. K. Andreiomenou – P. Ducrey, *Les premiers comptes du sanctuaire d'Apollon à Délion et le concours pan-béotien des Delia*, BCH 131.1, 2007, 235-308.
- Bremen 2004 R. van Bremen, *Laodikeia in Karia*, Chiron 34, 2004, 367-399.
- Bremen 2013 R. van Bremen, *A Property Transaction between Kindye and Mylasa. I. Mylasa 11 Reconsidered*, EA 46, 2013, 1-26.
- Bresson 1999 A. Bresson, *Rhodes and Lycia in Hellenistic Times*, in: V. Gabrielsen – P. Bilde – T. Engberg-Pedersen – L. Hannestad – J. Zahle (eds.), *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, Aarhus 1999, 98-131.
- Bresson 2007 A. Bresson, *Hamaxitos en Troade*, in: J. Dalaison (ed.), *Espaces et pouvoirs dans l'Antiquité de l'Anatolie à la Gaule. Hommages à Bernard Rémy*, Grenoble 2007, 139-158.
- Buraselis 2015 K. Buraselis, *Federalism and the sea. The koina of the Aegean islands*, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 358-376.
- Campanile 2007 M. D. Campanile, *L'assemblea provinciale d'Asia in età repubblicana*, in: G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 28-30 settembre 2006*, Pisa 2007, 129-140.
- Capdetrey 2007 L. Capdetrey, *Le pouvoir séleucide*, Rennes 2007.
- Carbone 2020 L. F. Carbone, *Hidden Power. Late Cistophoric Production and the Organization of Provincia Asia (128-89 BC)*, New York 2020.
- Chandezon 2000 C. Chandezon, *Foires et panégyries dans le monde grec classique et hellénistique*, REG 113.1, 2000, 70-100.
- Cook 1973 J. M. Cook, *The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study*, Oxford 1973.
- Corsten 1999 T. Corsten, *Von Stamm zum Bund. Gründung und territorial Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten*, Munich 1999.

- Debord 1994 P. Debord, Essai sur la géographie historique de la région de Stratonicee, in: M.-M. Mactoux – E. Geny (eds.), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*. Tome 8 : Religion, anthropologie et société, Besançon 1994, 107-121.
- Debord 1999 P. Debord, *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (412-323 a.c.)*, Bordeaux 1999.
- Debord 2003 P. Debord, Cité grecque – village carien : des usages du mot “koinon”, *Studi ellenistici* 15, 2003, 115-180.
- Debord 2010 P. Debord, Chrysaor, Bellérophon, Pégase en Carie, in: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (eds.), *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux 2010, 235-249.
- Delrieux 2007 F. Delrieux, Les monnaies hellénistiques et romaines d'Hydisos en Carie, in: P. Brun (ed.), *Scripta Anatolica. Hommages à Pierre Debord*, Bordeaux 2007, 57-86.
- Edelmann-Singer 2015 B. Edelmann-Singer, *Koina und Concilia. Genese, Organisation und sozioökonomische Funktion der Provinziallandtage im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart 2015.
- Ellis-Evans 2016 A. Ellis-Evans, The Koinon of Athena Ilias and its Coinage, *AJN* 28, 2016, 105-158.
- Ellis-Evans 2018 A. Ellis-Evans, Memnon and Mentor of Rhodes in the Troad, *NC* 178, 2018, 33-69.
- Ellis-Evans 2019 A. Ellis-Evans, *The Kingdom of Priam. Lesbos and the Troad between Anatolia and the Aegean*, Oxford 2019.
- Ellis-Evans forthcoming A. Ellis-Evans, *Alexandria Troas in the Hellenistic Period: War, Finance, and Civic Identity*, New York, forthcoming.
- Engelmann 1985 H. Engelmann, Die Zollinschrift von Myra, *ZPE* 59, 1985, 113-119.
- Funke 2015 P. Funke, Aitolia and the Aitolian League, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 86-117.
- Gabrielsen 2011 V. Gabrielsen, The Chrysaoreis of Caria, in: L. Karlsson – S. Carlsson (eds.), *Labraunda and Karia*, Uppsala 2011, 331-353.
- Gitler – Kahanov 2002 H. Gitler – Y. Kahanov, The Ascalon 1988 Hoard (CH 9. 548) A Periplus to Ascalon in the Late Hellenistic Period?, in: A. Meadows – U. Wartenberg (eds.), *Coin Hoards Volume IX, Greek Hoards*, London 2002, 259-268.
- Grandjean 2000 C. Grandjean, Guerre et monnaie en Grèce ancienne ; le cas du koinon achaien, in: J. Andreau – P. Briant – R. Descat (eds.), *Economie antique. La guerre dans les économies antique*, Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 2000, 315-336.
- Hallmannsecker 2022 M. Hallmannsecker, *Roman Ionia. Constructions of Cultural Identity in Western Asia Minor*, Cambridge 2022.
- Head 1897 B. V. Head, *Catalogue of the Greek coins of Caria, Cos, Rhodes, &c.*, London 1897.

- Helly 2008 B. Helly, Encore le blé thessalien. Trois décrets de Larisa (IG IX 2, 506) accordant aux Athéniens licence d'exportation et réduction des droits de douane sur leurs achats de blé, *Studi ellenistici* 20, 2008, 25-108.
- Herrmann 2002 P. Herrmann, Das κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων unter römischer Herrschaft, in: N. Ehrhardt – L.-M. Günther (eds.), *Widerstand - Anpassung - Integration. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom. Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2002, 223-240.
- Hoover 2014 O. D. Hoover, *Handbook of Coins of Northern and Central Greece: Achaia Phthiotis, Ainis, Magnesia, Malis, Oita, Perrhaibia, Thessaly, Akarnania, Aitolia, Lokris, Phokis, Boiotia, Euboa, Attica, Megaris and Corinthia, Sixth to First Centuries BC*, Lancaster-London 2014.
- Hornblower 1982 S. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, Oxford 1982.
- Imhoof-Blumer 1890 F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Griechische Münzen: Neue Beiträge und Untersuchungen*, Munich 1890.
- Kallet – Kroll 2020 L. Kallet – J. H. Kroll, *The Athenian Empire. Using Coins as Sources*, Cambridge 2020.
- Kaye 2022 N. Kaye, *The Attalids of Pergamon and Anatolia. Money, Culture, and State Power*, Cambridge 2022.
- Kleiner – Noe 1977 F. Kleiner – S. Noe, *The Early Cistophoric Coinage*, New York 1977.
- Knoepfler 2010 D. Knoepfler, Les agonothètes de la Confédération d'Athéna Ilias. Une interprétation nouvelle des données épigraphiques et ses conséquences pour la chronologie des émissions monétaires du koinon, *Studi ellenistici* 24, 2010, 33-62.
- Knoepfler 2013 D. Knoepfler, « Un modèle d'une belle république fédérative » ? Montesquieu et le système politique des Lyciens, de la genèse de l'Esprit des lois aux découvertes épigraphiques les plus récentes en Asie Mineure méridionale, *JS*, 2013, 111-154.
- Kraay 1976 C. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, London 1976.
- Kremydi-Sicilianou 2004 S. Kremydi-Sicilianou, Hoard Evidence from Thessaly in the Second and First Centuries BC: from a Multi-currency to a Double-currency System', in: *To νόμισμα στο Θεσσαλικό χώρο*, Athens 2004, 235-258.
- Labarre 1996 G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Paris 1996.
- LaBuff 2016 J. LaBuff, *Polis Expansion and Elite Power in Hellenistic Karia*, Lanham 2016.
- Larsen 1968 J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, Oxford 1968.
- Laumonier 1958 A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, Paris 1958.
- Lefèvre 1994 F. Lefèvre, Un document amphictionique inédit du IV^e siècle, *BCH* 118, 1994, 99-112.

- Lefèvre 1998 F. Lefèvre, L'amphictionie pyléo-delphique. Histoire et institutions, Paris 1998.
- Lefèvre – Pillot 2015 F. Lefèvre – W. Pillot, La Confédération d'Athéna Ilias : administration et pratiques financières, REG 128.1, 2015, 1-27.
- Le Guen 2001 B. Le Guen, Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique, Nancy 2001.
- Löbel 2014 Y. Löbel, Die Poleis der bundesstaatlichen Gemeinwesen im antiken Griechenland, Alessandria 2014.
- Ma 2002 J. Ma, Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor, Oxford 2002.
- MacDonald 1992 D. J. MacDonald, The Coinage of Aphrodisias, London 1992.
- Mackil 2013 E. Mackil, Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon, Berkeley and Los Angeles 2013.
- Mackil 2015 E. Mackil, The economics of federation in the ancient Greek world, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 487-502.
- Mackil 2022 E. Mackil, Regionalism, Federalism, and Mediterranean Connectivity, in: S. von Reden (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to the Ancient Greek Economy, Cambridge 2022, 360-372.
- Mackil – Alfen 2006 E. Mackil – P. van Alfen, Cooperative Coinage, in: P. van Alfen (ed.), Agoronomia: Studies in Money and Exchange Presented to John H. Kroll, New York 2006, 201-246.
- MacSweeney 2013 N. MacSweeney, Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia, Cambridge 2013.
- Marcellesi 2007 M.-C. Marcellesi, Le « trésor » du temple du Létôon de Xanthos (1975-2002). Les monnaies rhodiennes et la circulation monétaire en Lycie à la basse époque hellénistique, RN 163, 2007, 45-90.
- Marcellesi 2010 M.-C. Marcellesi, Adoption et diffusion de la monnaie de bronze dans le monde égéen : une évolution économique et institutionnelle, Studi ellenistici 24, 2010, 255-271.
- Meadows 2013 A. Meadows, The Closed Currency System of the Attalid Kingdom, in: P. Thonemann (ed.), Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State, Oxford 2013, 150-205.
- Meadows 2021 A. Meadows, The Penetration of the *Denarius* and *Quinarius* Standards into Asia Minor in the 1st Century BC, in: R. Ashton – N. Badoud (eds.), Graecia capta? Rome et les monnayages du monde égéen (IIe-Ier s. av. J.-C.), Basel 2021, 127-185.
- Meadows forthcoming A. Meadows, Neapolis, Isinda and Kolbasa in Pisidia. A co-operative coinage?, in: Festschrift for Catherine Grandjean, forthcoming.
- Meier 2019 L. Meier, Kibyra in hellenistischer Zeit. Neue Staatsverträge und Ehrenschriften, Vienna 2019.

- Meyer 2015 E. A. Meyer, Molossia and Epeiros, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 297-318.
- Migeotte 1984 L. Migeotte, L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques, Quebec 1984.
- Migeotte 1992 L. Migeotte, Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques, Quebec 1992.
- Migeotte 2013 L. Migeotte, Les souscriptions dans les associations privées, in: P. Fröhlich – P. Hamon (eds.), Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. - IIe siècle apr. J.-C.), Geneva 2013, 113-127.
- Migeotte 2014 L. Migeotte, Les finances des cités grecques, Paris 2014.
- Mileta 1990 C. Mileta, Zur Vorgeschichte und Entstehung der Gerichtsbezirke der Provinz Asia, *Klio* 72.2, 1990, 427-444.
- Müller – Prost 2013 C. Müller – F. Prost, Un décret du *koinon* des Ioniens trouvé à Claros, *Chiron* 43, 2013, 93-126.
- Picard 1990 O. Picard, Les oboles de Théogénès, in: Mélanges Pierre Lévêque. Tome 5 : Anthropologie et société, Besançon 1990, 315-323.
- Pillot 2016 W. Pillot, Ilios, Athéna Ilios et les Détroits, d'Alexandre le Grand à Antiochos III. Identité régionale d'une communauté politique et de son sanctuaire, au carrefour d'influences européennes et asiatiques, in: M. Dana – F. Prêteux (eds.), Identité régionale, identités civiques autour des Détroits des Dardanelles et du Bosphore (Ve siècle av. J.-C.–IIe siècle après J.-C.), Clermont-Ferrand 2016, 133-170.
- Pillot 2017 W. Pillot, Ethnicity et *koina* supra-civiques d'Asie Mineure. Quelques réflexions à partir de l'étude comparée du *koinon* d'Athéna Ilios et du *koinon* des Ioniens, *Erga-Logoi* 5.2, 2017, 155-167.
- Psoma 2008 S. Psoma, *Panegyris* Coinages, *AJN* 20, 2008, 227-255.
- Psoma – Tsangari 2003 S. Psoma – D. Tsangari, Monnaie commune et États fédéraux : La circulation des monnayages frappés par les États fédéraux du monde Grec, in: K. Buraselis – K. Zoumboulakis (eds.), Idea of European community in history II. Aspects of connecting poleis and ethne in Ancient Greece, Athens 2003, 111-141.
- Reger 2010 G. Reger, Mylasa and its Territory, in: R. van Bremen – J.-M. Carbon (eds.), Hellenistic Karia, Bordeaux 2010, 43-57.
- Regling 1927 K. Regling, Die Münzen von Priene, Berlin 1927.
- Reitzenstein 2011 D. Reitzenstein, Die lykischen Bundespriester. Repräsentation der kaiserzeitlichen Elite Lykiens, Berlin 2011.
- Rizakis 2015 A. Rizakis, The Achaian League, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 118-131.
- Robert – Robert 1983 J. Robert – L. Robert, Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie, Paris 1983.
- Robert 1966 L. Robert, Monnaies antiques en Troade, Geneva and Paris 1966.
- Robert 1973 L. Robert, Sur des inscriptions de Délos, in: Études déliennes, BCH Suppl. 1, Paris 1973, 435-489.

- Rousset 2010 D. Rousset, *De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda*, Geneva 2010.
- Ruschenbusch 1985 E. Ruschenbusch, Die Zahl der griechischen Staaten und Arealgröße und Bürgerzahl der "Normalpolis", *ZPE* 59, 1985, 253-263.
- Sánchez 2000 P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes. Recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au IIe siècle de notre ère*, Stuttgart 2000.
- Schuler – Zimmermann 2012 C. Schuler – K. Zimmermann, Neue Inschriften aus Patara I: Zur Elite der Stadt in Hellenismus und früher Kaiserzeit, *Chiron* 42, 2012, 567-626.
- Sekunda 2021 N. Sekunda, The Cretan and Pisidian Keraïtai, in: A. Meadows – U. Wartenberg (eds.), *Presbeus. Studies in Ancient Coinage Presented to Richard Ashton*, New York 2021, 335-364.
- Seyrig 1963 H. Seyrig, Monnaies hellénistiques, *RN* 5, 1963, 7-64.
- Smarczyk 2015 B. Smarczyk, The Hellenic leagues of late Classical and Hellenistic times and their place in the history of Greek federalism, in: Beck – Funke 2015, 452-470.
- Spier 1987 J. Spier, Lycian coins in the Decadrachm hoard, in: I. Carradice (ed.), *Coinage and administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires*, Oxford 1987, 29-37.
- Taşlıklioğlu 1971 Z. Taşlıklioğlu, *Trakya'da Epigrafiya Araştırmaları (Biga Yarımadası'nda bulunan kitabelerle birlikte) II*, Istanbul 1971.
- Thompson 1968 M. Thompson, *The Agrinion Hoard*, New York 1968.
- Thonemann 2013 P. Thonemann, The Attalid State, 188-133 BC, in: P. Thonemann (ed.), *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, Oxford 2013, 1-47.
- Troxell 1982 H. A. Troxell, *The Coinage of the Lycian League*, New York 1982.
- Tsangari 2007 D. I. Tsangari, *Corpus des monnaies d'or, d'argent et de bronze de la confédération étolienne*, Athens 2007.
- Vitale 2012 M. Vitale, *Eparchie und Koinon in Kleinasien von der ausgehenden Republik bis ins 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Bonn 2012.
- Warren 2007 J. Warren, *The Bronze Coinage of the Achaian Koinon*, London 2007.
- Wörrle 1975 M. Wörrle, Regelung von Zollfragen durch eine unbekannte römische Autorität des 2. Jhs., in: J. Borchhardt (ed.), *Myra, eine lykische Metropolis in antiker und byzantinischer Zeit*, Berlin 1975, 286-300.

Hellenistik Dönem Küçük Asya'sında *Koina* ve Para Ekonomisi Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler

Özet

Athena Ilias, Lesbos, Ionia, Khrysaoria ve Lykia gibi batı ve güney kıyıları boyunca uzanan birkaç büyük birlik yapısından oluşan Roma öncesi Küçük Asya koinonları, Yunanistan anakarasındaki daha iyi belgelenmiş koinonlara kıyasla daha az anlaşılabilir federal devletler topluluğu sunmaktadır. Bu makale, parasal ve siyasi ekonomilerini inceleyerek bu Anadolu koinonlarının bölgesel özelliklerini vurgulamaktadır. İlk olarak, Hellenistik Dönem'de Küçük Asya'nın batısındaki federalleşme hareketinin bölgesel kutsal alanlara ve festivallere odaklanma eğiliminde olduğunu ve federal yasa yapma veya askeri seferberlik yoluyla birleşmiş siyasi yapıların oluşumuna daha az dahil olduğunu öne sürmektedir. Bu durum aynı zamanda, ikinci bölümde açıklandığı üzere, parasal açıdan 'hafif' oldukları izlenimini yaratmıştır, çünkü mali açıdan büyük ölçüde uyumlu değillerdi ya da Lykia Birliği hariç olmak üzere parasal arzı yakından denetlemiyorlardı – vergilendirme çok müdahaleci ya da kapsamlı değildi ve çok az federal sikke üretiliyordu. Son iki bölüm bu 'hafifliği' bölgedeki siyasi ve ekonomik gücün özelliklerinin bir işlevi olarak ele almakta, koinonların imparatorluk devletleri ile sivil topluluklar arasında parazitik bir şekilde yerleştirilmiş örgütler olarak işlev gördüğünü ve Hellenistik dönemde bu iki tür yönetimin bölgedeki baskın rolünü hem yansıttığını hem de şekillendirdiğini öne sürmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *koina*, Küçük Asya, epigrafi, para ekonomisi, sikke, krallar, şehirler.

Some Observations on *Koina* and Monetary Economy in Hellenistic Asia Minor

Abstract

The *koina* of pre-Roman Asia Minor, comprising several major organisations along its western and southern coasts like the *koina* of Athena Ilias, the Lesbians, the Ionians, the Chrysaorians, and the Lykians, present a collection of federal states less well understood than the better documented *koina* in mainland Greece. This paper highlights the regional characteristics of these Anatolian *koina* by examining their monetary and political economies. It first suggests that federalising behaviour in Hellenistic western Asia Minor tended to be centred on regional sanctuaries and festivals, and less involved in the formation of cohesive political institutions through federal law-making or military mobilisation. This also had the effect that they present the impression of being monetarily 'light', as is explained in the second section, because they were not by and large fiscally cohesive, or had close oversight of monetary supply, with the notable exception of the Lykian league – taxation was not hugely intrusive or extensive, and little federal coinage was produced. The last two sections consider this 'lightness' as a function of the specificities of political and economic power in the region, suggesting that *koina* functioned parasitically as organisations ensconced between imperial states and civic communities, both reflecting and shaping the dominant role in the region of these two types of polity in the Hellenistic period.

Keywords: *koina*, Asia Minor, epigraphy, monetary economy, coinage, kings, cities.