Sometime between 311 and 306 BCE, Antigonos the One-Eyed compelled the polis of Skepsis to join in the foundation of a new coastal metropolis, Antigoneia Troas, along with several other major cities of the region. Situated in the rich agricultural basin of the Skamandros River, at the foot of Mount Ida in the interior of the central Troad, Skepsis was roughly sixty kilometers (thirty-seven miles) from the urban center of Antigoneia along modern routes. The city, which had identified as Ionian since its incorporation of settlers fleeing the destruction of Miletos in 494, unwillingly joined the union alongside its hated neighbor across the Skamandros, the Aiolian polis Kebren. Antigonos’s synoikism was designed to consolidate his hold on the region in the wake of the peace of 311, as the rival heirs of Alexander’s empire took advantage of the cessation in hostilities to stabilize their emerging territorial kingdoms and prepare for the next round of conflict. The terms of this famous peace are most fully known from a fragmentary copy of a letter from Antigonos to Skepsis, in which he announces the settlement and professes to assent to the less palatable conditions of the agreement because he “was ambitious” (philotimesthai, l. 21) to secure the freedom and autonomy of the Greeks in his lifetime. The vaguely worded settlement was formalized through oaths requiring the Greek cities under Antigonos’s control to abide by its terms. The letter

1. Strabo 13.1.52. For a full discussion of the synoikism, see ch. 1.
3. OGIS 5 = RC 1.
carefully couches Antigonos’s unilateral decision to agree to the treaty in the language of benefaction and agilely recasts this setback to his personal ambition (*philotimias*, l. 33) as a benevolent act of philhellenism.4 The Skepsians responded, in a manner that would become so typical of the age, with a decree granting Antigonos cult in their city. They inscribed this decree prominently in the temple of Athena, asserting their important role in the economy of honors.5 Antigonos’s decision to incorporate the polis of Skepsis into his new port city in the Troad a short time later baldly contravened the terms of the peace and deprived the Skepsians of their autonomous existence, their corporate life, and even their name. In the aftermath of the next major conflict, the Battle of Ipsos in 301, however, the people of Skepsis managed to extricate themselves from the foundation by the permission of Lysimachos, the new master of the region, and they reconstituted their native city.6

Skepsis persisted as a discrete community into late antiquity, even as the new centers of the Troad surpassed it in prestige and importance. Antigoneia, refounded by Lysimachos as Alexandria Troas, soon became a major commercial center on the coast. Ilion, reinforced with the populations of many of the small poleis and villages of the northern Troad and with its sanctuary of Athena expanded and embellished, became the major religious center and head of the regional federation (*koinon*) of the Troad. Yet the enduring civic pride and fierce particularism of Skepsis are amply manifest in the writings of the second-century antiquarian Demetrios of Skepsis, whose massive, thirty-book commentary on the catalog of the Trojans (*Iliad* 2.816–77) asserts the Homeric heritage of Skepsis and contests the claims of contemporary Ilians. The region of Skepsis, according to Demetrios, was the homeland of Dardanos, who founded Ilion, and the city itself was the royal residence of Aineias, whose descendants continued to be called “kings” of the polis even in Demetrios’s time. He also denied the claims of the Ilians that their polis was the genuine site of ancient Troy. Demetrios intended his competing claim, part of both a wider discourse on Homeric heritage between the Ionian and Aiolian traditions and interpolis competition in the Troad, to undercut the cultural assertions of this “new” city of Ilion and to stake the cultural preeminence of Skepsis.7

---

4. For the nature of the “ambition” given up by Antigonos, see the comments of Welles (1934, 10) on RC 1, ll. 32–33. The reference is presumably to his desire to free the Greeks in the areas not under his control. This, of course, would have amounted to the elimination of Cassander and Ptolemy and the inheritance of the entire empire of Alexander.
5. OGIS 6.
7. Strabo 13.1.26, 13.1.52. For the fragments of Demetrios’s work see Gaede 1880. Notably, Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas, a friend (*philos*) of Antiochos III, wrote a history of the Troad (*Trōika*) under the pseudonym Kephalon of Gergis (*FGrH* 45). The alias was perhaps intended to invest the work with the cultural authority of the people of Gergis, whom Herodotos (5.122.2) called “the remnant of the ancient Teucrians” (τοὺς ὑπολειπθέντας τῶν ἄρχων Τευκρῶν). On the competing Ionian
The case of Skepsis delineates a number of issues central to the confrontation between the Greek poleis and imperial authorities of the early Hellenistic period. Skepsis was one of dozens of polities reorganized and incorporated into larger urban structures by generals, kings, dynasts, and their agents, a phenomenon central to the formation of the Hellenistic states. The complexities of this procedure are amply attested by the relationship of Skepsis to the foundation of Antigoneia Troas: the interests of Antigonus in organizing the strategic and commercial basis of his power on the eve of his coronation; the scope of this unification, which incorporated a vast swath of the coastal and inland Troad; the unwillingness of (at least some of) its participants; the interpolis rivalry so typical of the fragmented political ecology of the Greek world; the barriers of geography and distance; the challenges of collapsing civic, religious, and ethnic identities; the issue of political autonomy; and the fragility and potential for dissolution of such unions. Critical dimensions of this encounter are also lost to us. No document as detailed as Antigonus’s letter to Skepsis exists for the synoikism of Antigoneia Troas, leaving the nature of his directive and the method of its enforcement obscure. The intended effects on the pattern of settlement are undocumented: Were all the citizens of Skepsis to migrate to the new polis, or only a portion, or was the city left in place but subjected to a larger political entity? What was to be the fate of the cults of Skepsis? Would the elites of one polis be preeminent in the new city? How would the traditions of the Ionian and Aiolian cities be merged? A host of other practical, economic, and social considerations critical to this process of integration are not directly attested.

By the early third century BCE, the political community of Skepsis had withstood many transformations typical of the world of the polis: a migration (metoikisis) of the site from the heights of Mount Ida (Palaiskepsis) down to the plain of the Skamandros, refoundation and sympolity with Milesian colonists, Persian

and Aiolian Homeric traditions and the Ionian claims to ancient Troy, see Nagy 2012, 147–217. On the Aineadai, who have often been seen as patrons of Homer, see Smith 1981, 34–43. A work of Hestiaia of Alexandreia (Troas?), cited by Demetrios of Skepsis, also discussed the location of Troy (Strabo 13.1.36). 8. In the period after Lysimachos’s refoundation of the city, when Skepsis had withdrawn from the union, the preeminent role of Neandria was particularly evident in the coinage of Alexandreia Troas, which directly imitated the emblems of its coinage: Apollo laureate on the obverse and a grazing horse on the reverse (Head 1911, 540–41; Meadows 2004). The city projected an Aiolian identity inherited from the main contributors to the synoikism. See, e.g., FD III 1.275, l. 1 (Αἰολεὺς ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρείας – – –); L. Robert 1936a, 28–31, no. 25. See also SEG XI 1054, l. 2 (ca. 165 BCE); Paus. 5.8.11, referring to Phaidimos, an Olympic victor of 200 BCE, as "Αἰολεὺς ἐκ πόλεως Τρῳάδος"; Helly 2006a, on a second-century decree of Larisa in Thessaly honoring two citizens of Alexandreia Troas and proclaiming the syngeneia of the two poleis.


10. See Judeich 1898 for fifth-century bronze issues of Skepsis with the legend ΣΚΑΨΙΟΝ ΝΕ(ΟΝ), possibly a reference to the refoundation of the city after the merger with Milesian colonists.
domination (when it was granted to Themistokles to furnish his bedding and clothes); incorporation into a hegemonic alliance and empire (the Delian League); temporary evanescence through synoikism; and, ultimately, reemergence. The case of Skepsis draws out the complexity and resilience of the polis as a community of citizens and underscores the variety of responses to ecological, social, and imperial pressures. The coming of Macedonian domination and the emergence of the Hellenistic kingdoms brought new and profound transformations to the poleis of the Aegean world. This is particularly true of the period of intense conflict among the Successors, when the manipulations of Greek poleis like Skepsis, reorganized into larger urban agglomerations, came to play a conspicuous role in the formation of the Hellenistic states.

New and enduring cities rose from the unification of smaller poleis. But the success and frequency of this practice demand explanation. While some foundations subsequently contracted, as member communities broke away and reconstituted themselves, and still others failed entirely, the durability of the process of synoikism nevertheless stands out. Indeed, other synoikized communities expanded beyond their original conception, drawing in additional communities by the centripetal force of their success. The creation of new or drastically transformed poleis almost always built on existing communities, and accordingly these cities are best understood as complex aggregates of citizen groups, cultic communities, discrete traditions, and competing interests. Viewed from this perspective, the motivations of the authorities that initiated such unions appear paradoxical. Why, given the propensity for resistance and the manifold challenges associated with overcoming the centrifugal tendencies of individual communities, would imperial authorities aspire to initiate such projects? Additionally, the consolidation of small, often weak and unwalled poleis invested them with great populations, resources, and defenses, and thus they became capable of offering resistance to the domination of the central authority. From an ideological standpoint, this policy had the added drawback of directly contradicting the rhetoric of freedom and autonomy for the Greek cities that became a cornerstone of the rivalry among the Successors, in a period when gaining the support of the Greek poleis was critical. Internally, the social stresses and competing interests intrinsic to these communities encouraged fragmentation. Yet in spite of these considerable obstacles, the process emerged as a major feature of Hellenistic rule in the first generation of kings and remained a defining phenomenon throughout the Hellenistic period.

These central issues—the relationship of urbanization to the organization of the Hellenistic states and the manner in which new communities emerged from such

12. See G. Cohen 1995, app., 5, for the very limited evidence for genuinely new foundations on previously uninhabited sites.
inorganic origins—are the subjects of this book. The delicate balance between cen-
tralized control and the maintenance of local autonomy is common to all imperial
states. The ways that state power manifests itself in the lives of subjects, however,
have often differed substantively, exposing key distinctions between imperial
frameworks. In the core territories of the Aegean and western Asia Minor, areas
dominated by highly organized but fragmented city-states, a conspicuous feature
of the imperial policies of the Successors was the frequency of enforced synoik-
isms, from the merger of two independent city-states to large multipolis unions
that encompassed vast territories. The result was the organization of many key
regions around expanded urban centers, cities on a scale that outstripped the
majority of the largest centers of the classical period, many of them, such as Ephe-
sos or Demetrias, ringed with massive fortifications running distances as large as
nine kilometers (5.6 miles), enclosing roughly 405 hectares (1,000 acres), and
commanding extensive territories. Such cities became nodes anchoring further
infrastructure—garrisons, ports, roads, customshouses—linking and intercon-
necting the vast regions that the new kingdoms aspired to embrace.

The manipulation and reorganization of communities played a central role in
the structure, formation, and maintenance of the Hellenistic states, but local
actors—both individuals and collectivities—reacted to, negotiated, and shaped
this process in critical ways. The Hellenistic kingdoms subjected local communi-
ties to profound transformations, and in no instance is this more apparent than in
the practice of synoikism. This book explores this phenomenon and argues that in
such interventions, the scale and manner of the penetration of Hellenistic rule into
the structure of communities, particularly Greek poleis, come into focus.13 It
reveals important dimensions of the imposition of empire at the local level, eluci-
dates social reactions to this exercise of power, and helps to account for the dura-
ability of unions built on fragile foundations.

This book is composed of two parts, mirroring the two main questions of the study:
what role did urbanization through synoikism have in structuring the imperial sys-
tem of the early Hellenistic kings, and what impact did this have on the communi-
ties subjected to this process? In the first part, I examine the political, ideological,
and economic interests of the Successors and how the resulting policies reshaped
communities and regions under their rule. Chapter 1 presents a selective chronolo-
gical narrative from 323 to circa 281, focusing on the ways in which state power
became enmeshed with local communities. It documents the most important cases
of synoikism and contextualizes and reconstructs the impact of synoikism on the

13. For a useful approach to the issue of sovereignty in the Hellenistic period as a multilayered and
negotiated construct, see Davies 2002. For the economic dimensions, see Capdetrey 2006.
settlement patterns and political structures of northern Greece and western Asia Minor. The focus on these regions seeks to elucidate the impact of urbanization on areas with strong polis traditions and to conceptualize the role of synoikism in structuring the early Hellenistic states (see map 1). Chronologically, this study is rooted in the early Hellenistic era, when much of the pattern of interaction between cities and the authorities of the emergent Hellenistic kingdoms developed, although it frequently ranges into later cases from the Hellenistic world and earlier instances of synoikism from the classical period. Likewise, the book follows a core set of cities (Kassandreia, Thessalonike, Herakleia Latmos, Lysimacheia, Alexandreia Troas, Ilion, Ephesos, Smyrna, and Demetrias), but the discussion is by no means limited to these sites. Chapter 2 explores the economic consequences of urbanization, examining how royal policies reshaped the productive landscape and how local communities responded to and participated in these transformations. After this largely macro-level focus on imperial structures, the second part systematically explores the internal life of the cities formed through synoikism and traces the ways in which communities negotiated the social stresses of this process to create functioning societies. Chapter 3 investigates religious activity and sites of cult and how the demographic, political, and physical ruptures of the period affected these fundamental expressions of communal self-representation and civic identity. The final chapter reconstructs the social and religious organization of the synoikized polis and the ways in which elites, communities, and the corporate body of the polis responded to the challenges of synoikism.

In the remainder of this introduction, I sketch the approach that this book adopts and the preliminary considerations that ground its investigation. First, I consider synoikism as a historical phenomenon and as a construct of modern historiography, clarifying the terminology used by ancient and modern sources and defining synoikism as a political, social, and demographic process. The importance of the Hellenistic practice, I suggest, is best understood in the wider context of the history of the eastern Mediterranean, and I analyze the ways in which centralization and state-sponsored urbanization in this period differed from previous exercises in imperial state formation. Turning to the social dimensions, the final sections explore synoikism as both a physical process and an ideological construct, exposing the problematic and contrasting impressions of synoikism provided by the literary, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence and orienting this book’s interdisciplinary approach.

LANGUAGE AND PHENOMENON

This book focuses on a historical process with three main components: the emergence of new or greatly expanded urban centers populated by multiple communities (whether poleis or villages), resulting demographic and settlement shifts, and
the role of outside powers (kings or dynasts) in initiating these unions. As is well known, the ancient sources, both literary and epigraphic, do not describe such political or demographic arrangements with consistency or precision. In referring to the phenomenon, modern scholarship variously employs the terms synoikismos and sympoliteia, both of which the ancient sources use (though not exclusively), without consistency as to their distinction.

Synoikismos and the denominal verb synoikizein, literally meaning “founding/establishing a living space [for people] together,” cover a wide semantic range. The original senses of these terms emphasize a physical living arrangement as well as agency. They can refer to the union of people either through wedlock or through a political arrangement. The most common, and probably the original, usage of synoikizein expresses the action of giving a woman to someone in marriage. The verb form does not appear with a political meaning in prose before Thucydides, and in poetry its most common meaning is also that of marriage. The noun synoikismos first appears epigraphically in the letters of Antigonos to Teos and Lebedos and in prose in Polybios. Later authors commonly use both the noun and the verb in the sense of a political and physical merger of communities, but it should be stressed that they do not become technical terms. When used of cities, they can also simply mean to settle jointly, resettle, rebuild, reoccupy, or repopulate, but in each of these senses they envisage the union or reunion of people. Authors also frequently employ closely related terms, such as sympolizein, “to unite in one city,” underscoring the urbanistic dimensions of synoikism. Similarly, the union of Euaimon and Orchomenos in the mid-fourth century is called synoikia, and Thucydides uses the noun synoikisis of the planned unification of Mytilene. In these cases, the com-

15. E.g., Hdt. 2.121.7: καὶ οἱ τὴν θυγατέρα ταύτην συνοικίσαι (and he gave his daughter to him in marriage). Used also in epigraphic documents, e.g., I. Lasos 4, ll. 23–25, a letter from Laodike III to Lasos ca. 196 setting up a fund for the dowries of the daughters of poor citizens and allotting money “to each of the women being married” (ἐκάστη τῶν συνοικιζομένων).
16. Cf. Pindar’s description of Hegesias as the synoikistēr of Syracuse (Ol. 6, ll. 6–7), a usage derived from colonial oikistēs/oikistēr terminology. For the meaning of synoikistēr, see Foster 2013.
17. RC 3, ll. 79, 103; RC 4, l. 2; Polyb. 4.33.7 (of Messene and Megalopolis).
18. The rebuilding and repopulating of Lysimachea after its destruction at the hands of the Thracians during the reign of Antiochos III is called a synoikismos (App., Syr. 1.4; cf. Polyb. 18.51.7–8). Similarly, in his letter to Sardeis in 213, following the siege of Achaia, Antiochos III refers to the provisioning of supplies for the rebuilding of the city as a synoikism (Gauthier 1989, 13, no. 1, l. 13). See also BÉ 71.251 (J. Robert and L. Robert).
19. Strabo 13.1.52: συνεπόλισε (of Skepsis). Cf. 8.3.2, where συνοικίσθη (of Mantinea, Tegea, and Heraia) and συνεπόλισθη (of Aigion, Patrai, and Dyme) are used synonymously.
20. Euaimon and Orchomenos: IPArk. 15A1, ll. 2–6 (συνοικία Ὑσύμνιοι Ἀρχιμνίου ἐπί τοῖς ἐπί τοῖς Ἐρχομινίοις καὶ τοῖς ὑμοῖοις); see also Dušanić 1978. Mytilene: Thuc. 3.3.1.
pletion of the arrangement is emphasized over the process of foundation. Thucydides describes the synoikism of Olynthos with the verb anoikizein, denoting a specific geographical shift (inland), even through he uses synoikizein elsewhere.21 Alternatively, some sources refer to a synoikism elliptically, as in Herodotos’s description of the foundation of Ekbatana or Strabo’s account of Maussollos’s refoundation of Halikarnassos.22 The phrase “to depopulate a city” (tên polin anas-taton poiein) is also commonly used to describe the effects on a polis of synoikism with a larger partner.23 The term metoikizein (to settle [people] in another site) is another synonym for synoikizein, especially in cases where a city emerged on a previously uninhabited site.24 This range of terminology shares a common emphasis on the site of inhabitation and the cohabitation of previously discrete population groups. Moreover, the transitive verb synoikizen describes agency (whether that of king, general, state, or community representatives) in effecting the union.

By contrast, sympoliteia and sympoliteuein are employed in a somewhat more restricted sense to describe a political arrangement of “shared citizenship.”25 These terms cover a variety of arrangements. They describe the political merger of autonomous communities into a single state—either multiple communities into a federal league26 or two poleis into a single political community—and particularly the absorption of a lesser community by a greater one (so-called unequal sympolity).27 These terms are also used in instances where two communities were merged by the impetus of an outside force, like the Karian towns Kildara and Thodasa, united by Antiochos III as he attempted to strengthen his position against Ptolemaic forces nearby, or Chalketor and another city, probably Iasos, united by

21. Olynthos: Thuc. 1.58.2; cf. Paus. 7.3.4: τῶν ἀνοικισθέντων (of the populations synoikized into Ephesos). For Thucydides’s use of synoikizein, see Moggi 1975.
22. Ekbatana: Hdt. 1.98.3: ἡ γάγκατο ἐν πόλει ὁμοσαράθια καὶ τοῦτο περιστέλλοντας τῶν ἄλλων ἄραν εἶπελέεθα (he compelled them to create one city and to protect it and care for the others less). Halikarnassos: Strabo 13.1.59, quoting Kallisthenes: εἰς μίαν τὴν Ἀλικαρνασσὸν συνήγαγεν (he gathered them together into a single city, Halikarnassos). Herodotos’s language may reflect the fact that synoikizein and its cognates took on a political meaning only in the mid-fifth century, particularly in Athens, under the influence of the rhetoric surrounding the Theseeus myth and the synoikism of Athens.
23. E.g., Paus. 7.3.5 (of Lebedos). For the meaning of the phrase, see Hansen and Nielsen 2004a, 123.
26. For this, the so-called Bundesstaat type of sympoliteia, otherwise referred to as a koinon or koinonia in the sources, see Feldmann 1885; Giovannini 1971; Rzepka 2002.
the same king. These terms do not necessarily indicate that the communities were to remain physically distinct, that is, bound by a strictly political rather than a physical-political union: in the case of Euaimon and Orchomenos, the lesser party, Euaimon, persisted as a discrete settlement in some form and retained some limited local autonomy, even though the document describing the merger envisages some population movement to Orchomenos. Outside of a federal context, the use of *sympoliteia* appears to be restricted to occasions where only two cities were involved, whereas *synoikismos* frequently refers to the amalgamation of multiple communities.

As with *synoikizein* and its cognates, related terms and expressions often replace *sympoliteia* and *sympoliteuein*. In his description of a temporary union circa 392, Xenophon refers to the Corinthians’ “being forced to share in the *politeia* in Argos.” The arrangement by which Mantinea absorbed Helisson as a village (*kōmē*) of the larger polis is simply called a *synthesis* (agreement). In the document that joined Latmos and Pidasa (sometime between 323 and 313), the Latmians agreed to swear individually, “I will have *politeia* [politeusomai] with the Pidasians,” and the following line refers to “the same *politeuma*.” Smyrna “granted *politeia*” to Magnesia under Sipylos circa 245, and the agreement between the cities of Perea and Melitaia in Achaia Phthiotis in 213–212 uses similar language. A decree from the end of the third century describes the unification of Kos and Kalymnos as the “restoration of *homopoliteia*.” Conversely, the term *sympoliteia* is employed for grants of citizenship to an individual, where the term *politeia* would be more readily expected, and for arrangements that modern scholars would typically label *isopoliteia*, as in Polybios’s description of the rela-

28. For Kildara and Thodasa, see SEG LII 1038, l. 13 (Blümel 2000; Wiemer 2001; Ma 2002, 292–94, no. 5; Dreyer 2002; LaBaff 2016, 124–29): καὶ συμπολιτεύεσθαι Κιλλαρεῖς καὶ Θ[ωδασεῖς]. For Chalketer and Iasos(?) (190s), see *I. Mylasa* 913 = *RC* 29, ll. 4–6: ἵνα συμπολειτεύομεν ἐπ᾽ ἴσηι καὶ ὁμοίαι τῶν αὐτῶν μετέχῃ. For the identification of Chalketer and (probably) Iasos and the circumstances, see now Thibaut and Pont 2014, ch. 2, esp. 54–64; but note the reservations of van Breemen 2015.


31. RO 14, l. 2.


33. *Staatsvert.* III 492.


36. E.g., *IG* IV 1 59, l. 12 (Epidaurus, 250–200).
tionship between Kydonia and Apollonia, two nonadjacent poleis on Krete, in 170/69.37

This brief survey shows the range and overlap of the terms *sympoliteia* and *synoikismos*. They have important distinctions in sense and use, but they do not adequately distinguish between phenomena or indicate the levels of nuance differentiating closely related arrangements. Accordingly, the shorthand of *synoikismos* for a political and physical unification and *sympoliteia* for only a political unification with no subsequent demographic change oversimplifies the complexity and diversity of these political and urbanistic arrangements;38 moreover, these definitions do not map onto the ancient terminology with precision.

The degree to which settlement patterns were affected is, however, a crucial criterion for understanding types of unions and foundations. Simon Hornblower, in his illuminating discussion of the synoikisms carried out by the Hekatomnid dynast Maussollos in fourth-century Karia, develops this as the main distinction and stresses that there are essentially two types: political and physical synoikism.39 In the former, the union entailed no change to the physical distribution of population and the existing urban centers persisted in their original form. In physical synoikism, new centers were established and old population sites frequently eliminated. Scholars have widely accepted this distinction.40 M. Hansen and T. Nielsen, however, in their discussion of classical synoikisms, argue that there are no attested examples of “purely political” synoikism and emphasize that some degree of population movement seems to have been involved in every instance.41 They have proposed a more detailed typology, based on settlement hierarchy,42 but their distinctions say little about the degree to which a new or expanded settlement emerged as a consequence of synoikism or how much this affected settlement patterns and still less about the impetus for these unions.

There are important structural differences between multipolis synoikisms on the scale of Megalopolis, engineered by a committee, the projects initiated by kings, instances when a larger polis swallows up its smaller neighbor (like Mantinea and Helisson), examples such as the absorption of Pidasa into Miletos, in which Pidasa willingly entered into a union, or cases where villages gradually coalesce through shared interests and ties over a long period of time. However, creating typologies of cases based solely on these criteria does not provide significant

37. Polyb. 28.14.3. See also Reger 2004, 148. Polybios does, however, use *sympoliteia* in the sense of the political unification of two poleis at 18.2.4 (Byzantion and Perinthos).
38. See, e.g., Chaniotis 1996, 105n630, for such a distinction between these terms. Walser (2009, 137) also stresses the insufficiency of this contrast.
40. E.g., Demand 1990; Davies 1992, 28; Reger 2004, 149n19.
42. Ibid., 117.
gains in understanding the larger issues. A further criterion, and one particularly
important for this study, is the involvement of hegemonic or imperial powers in
the creation of synoikized polities. Rather than envisioning the process of synoik-
ism or sympoliteia as defined by two poles (political/physical), it is better con-
ceived of as several overlapping spectrums along which various considerations can
be plotted: for instance, the extent of settlement shift, the types and numbers of
communities involved, the status and degree of autonomy left to the constituent
groups, the level of agency of the incorporated communities in effecting the union.

This book focuses on the concentration of population in new or expanded polis
centers, primarily cases in which more than two communities were joined together.
For the sake of convenience, I generally use the term synoikism to denote the union
of two or more communities, whether poleis or kōmai, in instances where outside
powers provided the impetus for the union. This term has the advantages of pre-
serving the sense of agency present in the Greek synoikizein and emphasizing the
urbanistic consequences of the process. Sympolity/sympoliteia, by contrast, is
reserved for examples where two poleis concluded an agreement to become one,
regardless of the interests involved or the degree of urban change. These are nev-
ertheless closely related phenomena, especially as sympoliteia frequently resulted
from the ambition of a larger neighbor to augment its position within a world of
great cities by absorbing additional territory and resources or from the responses
of small communities to the complex pressures of their place among competing
polities and hegemonic powers.43 The comparison of these at times overlapping
and at times contrasting processes illuminates the problems and interests associ-
ated with such projects.

URBANIZATION AND IMPERIALISM:
A COMPARATIVE SKETCH

By the time that Cassander undertook the first major synoikism, in 316, or Antigo-
os incorporated Skepsis into his new port in the Troad, the expansion or contrac-
tion of poleis as a means of extending regional hegemony or responding to impe-
rial pressure had a long history in the Greek world. These manipulations of the
Greek polis provided precedents and procedures that informed the Hellenistic
practice in important ways. Nevertheless, the central role that urbanization and
synoikism assumed in the formation and maintenance of the Hellenistic king-
doms characterizes a distinctive form of imperial rule and administration of sub-
ordinate communities.

43. For important regional studies of sympoliteiai, see, on Lykia, Zimmermann 1992, 123–41; on
The process of synoikism, in the form of the agglomeration of villages into a single unit, was intrinsic to the Greek conception of the polis itself, as Aristotle famously expressed at the outset of the Politics.44 In some cases this does seem to have been the historical origin of many early city-states, though the details are often elusive, and Greek writers generally considered the alternative—a dispersed pattern of settlement—the exception to the norm.45 In the late sixth and fifth centuries, a number of poleis arose through the consolidation or expansion of their territory through synoikism. Patrai formed in the late sixth or early fifth century from the synoikism of three closely linked villages, in the manner considered typical by the ancient authors, and became a substantial polis but never a major regional power.46 Throughout the fifth century, other important poleis, such as Tegea and Mantinea, emerged by a similar process.47 By contrast, a series of other cities greatly extended their influence and reach through more aggressive forms of expansion, far outstripping the average size of a typical Greek polis.48 Elis, synoikized circa 471, seems to have both concentrated its population in an urban center and asserted its control over dependent (perioikic) communities in its wider territory.49 Argos systematically conquered and absorbed its neighbors over the course of the fifth and fourth centuries, expanding its population and territory (to a maximum extent of around 1,400 square kilometers, or 541 square miles) and greatly augmenting the urban center of the polis.50 In Sicily, tyrants significantly expanded the Syracusan state through the subjection and (partial) incorporation of neighboring poleis, along with mercenaries and other foreigners, first under Gelon and again under Dionysios I and Timoleon. Syracuse ultimately controlled a huge territory spanning about twelve thousand square kilometers (4,633 square miles) in the fourth century,51 which represents one of the

44. Arist., Pol. 1252b.
46. Paus. 7.18.2–6; Moggi 1976b, 89–95; Petropoulos and Rizakis 1994, 203.
47. Tegea, synoikized from nine demes: Strabo 8.3.2; Paus. 8.45.1; Voyatzis 1990, 10–11. Mantinea: Strabo 8.3.2 (formed from five δήμοι); Diod. Sic. 15.5.4 (using the term κόμη; so too Ephoros, FGrH 70 F79); Xen., Hell. 5.2.7 (four κόμαι); see also Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981. For the supposed involvement of Themistokles in the synoikisms of Elis and Mantinea, see, e.g., Hornblower 1982a, 80; doubted by Demand 1990, 64–72.
48. According to the estimates of Hansen and Nielsen (2004c, 71), 60 percent of poleis controlled a territory of less than one hundred square kilometers (thirty-nine square miles) each and ca. 80 percent a territory of less than two hundred square kilometers (seventy-seven square miles). Only 10 percent possessed a territory of more than five hundred square kilometers (193 square miles).
51. Hansen and Nielsen 2004c, 72.
most striking efforts to build a major regional power around the expansion of a single polis.52

Consolidation and synoikism were also central to the formation of the Hellenistic monarchies, distinguishing them from their imperial forebears. An opposite approach to administering an empire is fragmentation, the principle of “divide and rule.” This has clear political and military advantages. By forming larger unions, polities could more easily resist imperial hegemony. For the architects of the Athenian Empire, for example, the domination of small poleis involved the administrative headache of assessing and collecting tribute from more than two hundred states, the majority of them tiny and yielding only modest revenues.53 But organizing the empire in this way had the advantage of preventing an organized coalition of opposition. To understand that this was a conscious element of the Athenian imperial system, we need look no further than the political pamphlet of the so-called Old Oligarch, which explicitly refers to the weakness of isolated island communities for whom resistance through synoikism was not an option.54 The consolidation of cities specifically countered one of the main aims of the Athenian imperial administration: the fragmentation of regions and allegiances and the prevention of any form of viable resistance to Athenian rule. In this context, synoikism was a frequent means of resisting the Athens of the fifth century.55 Other key Athenian instruments of empire—forced contributions to the Panathenaia, the regulation of coinage and standards, the practice of mass enslavement (andrapodismos), the institution of klerouchies—encouraged dependence on the imperial center. Spartan imperialism in the fourth century followed a similar logic. The Peace of Antalkidas in 387/86 specifically aimed at breaking up collectivities that might threaten Spartan preeminence, most strikingly seen in the dispersal (dioikismos) of Mantineia and the dismantling of the Boiotian League. As Spartan impe-

52. Vattuone 1994; Harris, forthcoming.
53. The Athenians did permit synteleiai (grouping of joint tribute payment) and restricted hegemonies over neighboring settlements, but the synteleiai could also be broken up and separately assessed. See Paarmann 2004; Constantakopoulou 2007, 219–22; Jensen 2010; Constantakopoulou 2013.
54. [Xen.], Ath. Pol. 2.2–3. This cold calculus is highly revealing of the nature of the Athenian Empire, with its explicitly economic underpinning. See also Kallet 2013.
55. When Mytilene revolted in 428/27, it resisted Athens through the synoikism of the island of Lesbos (Thuc. 3.2.3). After its defeat, the Athenians pulled down its walls, distributed the land of Lesbos to Athenian klerouchs, and took possession of its towns in the Troad (3.50.1–3). Likewise, the synoikism of the Chalkidians into Olynthos in 433/32, in the run-up to the Peloponnesian War, was orchestrated to resist Athens (1.58.2), and Thebes absorbed six communities of southern Boiotia, probably sometime between 427 and 424, as a response to growing Athenian pressure, a move that doubled its size and population (Hell. Oxy. 16.3, 17.3; for the controversial date, see Moggi 1976a, 197–204; Demand 1990, 82–85, which puts it at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War; Mackil 2013, 41n93, which has it after the destruction of Plataia). In 408/7 the island of Rhodes underwent synoikism in the last phase of the Peloponnesian War (Diod. Sic. 13.75.1; Gabrielsen 2000).
rialism began to collapse, three important cities were founded or refounded through synoikism: Mantinea, Messene, and Megalopolis, the last two with the aid of Epameinondas and the Boiotians. The foundation of Megalopolis both consolidated scattered populations and provided a neutral space around which to form the new Arkadian League, which sought to neutralize the long-standing hostility between Tegea and Mantinea. Together these cities represented a powerful bulwark against future Spartan imperialism. With the rise of the second Athenian naval confederacy, we see a wider Aegean movement toward centralization, designed to counter the growing power of Athens. Maussollos, the Persian satrap of Karia (r. 377–353), consolidated his dynastic hold on the province by shifting its capital from Mylasa to the coastal city of Halikarnassos, which he expanded considerably through the synoikism of six poleis and communities.56 The synoikism of Kos in 366/65 also belongs to this period and to this strategy, possibly initiated at the behest of Maussollos or at least with his approval.57

In Asia Minor, the Achaemenids found a dispersed settlement pattern conducive to their rule and typically encouraged it, as well as frequently fostering division among elites by supporting certain factions within cities. Persian control mainly eschewed direct urban development, instead mapping satrapal headquarters onto preexisting sites like Daskyleion and Sardeis and largely distributing Iranian elites to landed estates in the countryside.58 Persian rule replicated this geographic policy in its manipulation of the social order of the empire. In effect, the elites of communities were successfully co-opted in a way that discouraged local solidarity and coordination.59 Accordingly, elites’ primary loyalties were to the Achaemenid court and were less horizontally integrated between communities, in

57. Diod. Sic. 15.76.2; Strabo 14.2.19, with Moggi 1976a; Hornblower 1982, 103–4; Demand 1990, 132; Reger 2001, 171–74. Kos was allied with Maussollos and also took part in the Social War against Athens (Dem. 15.3, 15.27; Diod. Sic. 16.7.3; Staatsvert. III 305, with Sherwin-White 1978).
58. For an overview of Persian rule in Asia Minor, see Dusinberre 2013. See ch. 2 for further discussion. For the imperial structure of Persian rule in general, see Wiesehöfer 1996, 58–59; Khatchadourian 2016, xxx–xxxi.
59. Barjamovic 2012, 54: “Ideally they [local leaders] were appointed by their peers to act as an instrument of the community, both internally and in relation to the imperial central power. In reality both Assyrian and Persian policy pursued the familiar paradigm of divide et impera by actively drawing the loyalty of local leadership away from its constituency so as to penetrate and co-ordinate aspects of society to which they had only limited direct access. Multiple overlapping and intersecting sociospatial networks of power constituted society on a local level. Immersed in this multiplicity of power relations, the imperial agents sought to create a space in which to manoeuvre and play off various interest groups against each other for the benefit of imperial policy. As already argued, this may well have been the most important function of the imperial diplomacy: to act among the subjugated elites in order to create a sense of imperial unity at the expense of local social and political cohesion.” Compare the modalities of Ottoman rule as described by Barkey 1994, 26–27, 40.
contrast to the dynamic interstate relations between poleis in the Hellenistic period. The implementation of dynastic rule in areas like Karia and Lykia also encouraged this segmentation. By such means, the Athenian and Persian systems manipulated human geography and local agency in specific ways to support imperial rule.

In important ways, the consolidation of the Macedonian state under Philip II prefigured the impact of the Hellenistic kingdoms on settlement patterns and city life in subsequent generations. Philip was celebrated, as is well known, as a great urbanizer. In particular, the foundation of Philippoi in 356 provided a powerful model for the extension of Macedonian imperialism and a blueprint for royal cities. Other new cities anchored Macedonian rule in neighboring regions, such as Herakleia Lynkestis in Illyria circa 358 and the numerous settlements in Thrace following the campaigns of 342–340. Philip may also have refounded Gomphoi in Thessaly as another Philippopolis. Such precedents undoubtedly influenced the policies of Alexander and the Successors, but differing imperatives and considerations also guided the practices of each of these periods. A conspicuous feature of Philip’s rule was the development of Macedonia and its expanding borders at the expense of the rival Greek cities and neighboring tribes. Macedonian colonization played a prominent role in this project. More important, Philip's policy overwhelmingly relied on the subjection and destruction of autonomous poleis and the dispersal of populations (dioikismos). This eliminated coordinated resistance to

61. For continuities between the practices of Persian and Athenian imperial administrations, see Raaflaub 2009. L. Robert (1935, 488; 1951, 8–11, 34–36; 1967a, 16–19; see also J. Robert and Robert 1976) repeatedly stressed the movement from fragmentation to centralization in Asia Minor between the eras of Persian and Athenian rule and the Hellenistic period.
62. Alexander’s speech to his men at Opis (Arr., Anab. 7.9.2–3), despite its exaggerated rhetoric, stresses this image. Cf. Just. 8.5.7, 8.6.1–2, describing the transplanting of populations throughout Philip’s kingdom.
63. Philip founded Philippoi on the Thasian colony Krenides, populated in part by Macedonian settlers and in part by the remainder of the Thasian colonists and indigenous Thracian inhabitants. The city provided Philip with a bulwark against the Thracians and a major source of revenue from the rich gold mines in the area (App., BC 4.13.105; Strabo 7αF34; Diod. Sic. 16.3.7).
64. E.g., Philippopolis and Kabyle, in inland Thrace, grafted on to existing Thracian centers: see Hammond and Griffith 1979, 554–66; Archibald 2004, 893–95. For a discussion of the aims and impact of Macedonian urbanization in Thrace, see Nankov 2015; see also Adams 1997; Adams 2007.
66. For a punitive transfer of subjected people by Philip, see Polyainos, Strat. 4.2.12. The king moved populations “as shepherds move their flocks now to winter, now to summer pastures” (Just. 8.5.7). According to Theopompos (FGrH 115 F110), Philippopolis in Thrace was nicknamed Poneropolis, “City of rogues,” because of the sorts of people whom Philip settled there. According to Demosthenes, he destroyed Olynthos, Methone, Apollonia, and thirty-two other poleis in Thrace (9.26), and Hypereides maintains that he expelled the inhabitants of forty poleis in the Chalkidike after the
Macedonian hegemony and allowed Philip to distribute the territory confiscated from subjected poleis to Macedonians, especially in the form of large landed estates granted to the Macedonian elite and in some cases to allied cities. Philip’s legacy as a great builder of cities, accordingly, must be balanced against his reliance on settlement dispersal in his relations with the Greek world. Alexander’s famous destruction of Thebes continued this tactic, and very little building can be attributed to him in Greece or Asia Minor. Of course, his conquests ushered in great changes. In regions traditionally dominated by the hegemonies of large poleis, Macedonian control dramatically realigned the political landscape. Likewise, in the wake of Alexander’s pro-Greek pronouncements and the sudden evacuation of Persian control, the Greek communities of western Asia Minor suddenly found themselves in a very new position. But Alexander’s life was largely spent in conquest, and it was in the decades after his death that the greatest changes to the political geography of these core territories occurred, as the empires of the Successors took shape. The Hellenistic kingdoms, particularly those that incorporated the lands ruled by the Persian kings, maintained important aspects of the Persian imperial apparatus, inheriting, as all empires do, distinctive facets of administration and organization. But the continuities between the imperial system of the Achaemenids and the Hellenistic kingdoms should not be emphasized at the

67. G. Cohen 1995, 420–23. An important exception is the grant of the Bottiaian polis of Kalindoa and neighboring territories to the Macedonians for resettlement as a Macedonian polis (SEG XXXVI 626), though here we might stress the imperative of making grants to subordinates on the eve of Alexander’s Persian campaigns (Plut., Alex. 15). Little is known about Alexandria, founded by Alexander ca. 340, when he was sixteen or seventeen, in the territory of the Thracian Maidoi (Plut., Alex. 9.1, with G. Cohen 1995, 82). Its existence has been doubted: Fraser 1996, 26, 29–30; Archibald 2004, 892; Nankov 2015. For Alexander’s “cities” in the East, see Holt 1986; Fraser 1996; G. Cohen 2006; G. Cohen 2013.

68. Gauthier (1987, 194) has called attention to the dynamic changes in regional power structures following the eclipse of the great hegemons (Athens, Sparta, Thebes) in the late fourth century.

69. Arr., Anab. 1.18.1–2.

70. For continuities, see, e.g., Briant 1982; Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993. For common institutions of control, see Ma 2009; Raaflaub 2009.
expense of identifying important structural differences in the ways that they constructed and replicated their rule.\textsuperscript{71}

The period of the Successors was characterized by fierce interstate competition between rival kingdoms and constantly shifting borders. As a system of unrivaled imperial authority (the Achaemenids, Alexander) was replaced by competing claimants to rule and, ultimately, peer kingdoms, the development of the urban core of the kingdoms was increasingly important. This could be viewed as “structural urbanization,” whose focus was not just on the selective augmentation of specific sites but also on constructing a nodal framework, linking and interconnecting cities and regions in a way that mapped out the infrastructural power of these nascent kingdoms.\textsuperscript{72} This approach had patent benefits, of course—the marshaling of resources, the ease of administration, the simplification of diplomacy in dealing only with larger collectivities—but also dangers. It was a disruptive and difficult social process, and it created potentially powerful and dangerous entities, fortified strongholds able to resist the will of the king or even go over to a rival monarch. There was, nevertheless, a difference between what rulers sought to achieve and what was practicable. Royal power and its ambitions, I argue, introduced important structural changes to the organization of communities, but the longevity of these projects depended on the dynamics between local constituencies and actors. To understand this process, it is necessary to explore the permutations of state-fostered centralization in detail, tracing the historical circumstances of individual synoikisms and their impact on patterns of settlement.

\textbf{THE PROCESS OF FOUNDATION}

We do not have a complete picture of how a synoikism was achieved—the process by which kings and their agents directed populations to coalesce or the modalities by which this procedure was brokered. Our literary sources, often late, lay stress on the power and destructive force of the kings, perhaps inevitably. Most of their descriptions follow a fairly standard pattern of a city founded out of the destruction of preexisting settlements and the forced migration of their populations to the new urban center.\textsuperscript{73} The language employed (“destroy,” “raze,” “lay waste,” “demolish”) was typically employed to describe such a process. However, it is important to note that the process of foundation was not always a simple or straightforward one. It was often a complex and multifaceted process, involving a range of factors that shaped the outcome.

\textsuperscript{71} For a useful framework for comparing imperial structures, see Barkey 2008, 9–15.

\textsuperscript{72} For “structural urbanization,” see J. de Vries 1984, 12; for a critique of “urbanization” as a construct of ancient history, see Osborne 2005. Purcell (2005b) calls for greater attention to dynamic processes of urbanism (expansion, contraction, social change). These are, of course, the underlying assumptions of Horoden and Purcell 2000. Vlassopoullos (2007, 195–202), building on the world-systems analysis of Immanuel Wallerstein (2004), stresses understanding the place of poleis within a larger framework, or systèm-monde.

\textsuperscript{73} E.g., the destructions of Kolophon (ἀνελών, Paus. 1.9.7; ἐρημωθῆναι, 7.3.4), Kardia (ἀνελών, 1.9.8), the towns (polismata) in Krousis and on the Thermaic Gulf (καθεκάπται, Strabo 7a F21; cf. καθηρίζη, Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom. 1.49.4–5), and Iolkos (possibly) (κατέσκαπται, Strabo 9.5.15).
ish”) evokes a picture of the absolute power of the kings to transform settlement patterns by force and without the consent of the constituent parties. These descriptions conceal the degree to which settlements persisted as villages, demes, dependent poleis,74 or fortified outposts after the synoikism and the ways in which the process was negotiated, managed, and organized.

The archaeological evidence for the synoikisms of the early Hellenistic period and their effects on patterns of settlement, though incomplete, shows no signs of systematic destruction on the scale that the sources suggest. Displacement and migration, however, are well attested, and it is perhaps inevitable that the elimination of autonomous political communities and the traumatic loss of discrete citizen identity would be translated into the trope of the destruction of a city itself, particularly by sources hostile to the kings. At face value, however, the literary sources provide a simplified and distorted picture of what was in reality a much more complex, diverse, and nuanced process. The “destruction” of a city, then, should be understood primarily as the eclipse of an autonomous unit and the transference of some or all of its population to a new site. This could also involve dismantling existing structures for building materials and carrying away movable property like windows, doors, woodwork, hearths, and other installations. The overall effect on patterns of settlement varied. There were, at times, strong continuity of inhabitation in centers now demoted to second-order status, the conversion of old sites into fortresses or other outposts, and the complete abandonment of settlements. In the aftermath of these reorganizations, many communities resisted and reconstituted themselves in some form.

Even if the kings and their agents do not seem to have resorted to violent destruction and forced deportation of populations to create their new cities, these projects may still have been deeply unpopular and depended on other forms of coercion. As we saw in the case of Skepsis, Antigonos’s synoikism absorbed this community very much against its will, and it broke away as soon as the opportunity arose (as did its hostile neighbor Kebren). Numerous other communities followed suit: Lebedos broke from Teos, only to be absorbed into Ephesos;75 but reemerged again; Kolophon secured its release after its synoikism with Ephesos;76 Teion revolted from Amastris;77 Pidasa broke from Latmos, reconstituted itself, and later willingly joined in sympolity with Miletos.78 The desire for self-determination and autonomous existence was not easily overcome. Our

74. For dismissals of autonomy as a necessary criterion for polis status, see Hansen 1995; Vlassopoulous 2007, 191–93. For the various types of dependent poleis, see Hansen and Nielsen 2004e.
75. Paus. 1.9.7, 7.3.4–5.
77. Strabo 12.3.10.
78. Milet I.3, 149; Gauthier 2001; Wörrle 2003a. See ch. 1 for detailed discussions of these cases.
sources attest to the reactions of some individuals. Phoinix of Kolophon, a choliambic poet contemporary with the synoikism of Kolophon into Ephesos (circa 294), composed a lament (*thrēnēsai*) for Lysimachos’s “capture” (*halōsis*) of Kolophon, which was well known in antiquity.\(^{79}\) An army of Kolophonians, along with Smyrnaeans, resisted—the only known instance of armed opposition to synoikism—but the Lysimachean forces defeated them, even if Kolophon itself does not seem to have been sacked in the manner that Phoinix’s poem suggests.\(^{80}\) Similarly, the great historian of the period, Hieronymos of Kardia, according to Pausanias, harbored a deep resentment of Lysimachos for the destruction of his native city, which was incorporated into Lysimacheia in 309.\(^{81}\)

On the ground, however, the language and ideological presentation that shaped the negotiations between kings and cities were certainly more nuanced, and occasional epigraphic documents shed some light on these interactions. Much, it would seem, simply went unsaid. Kings wrote to communities under their control suggesting such projects, presenting these unions as beneficial arrangements, and the cities recognized the underlying command.\(^{82}\) This is the overall impression of Antigonos’s letters to Teos concerning its synoikism with Lebedos.\(^{83}\) Throughout, Antigonos presents himself as a third party, offering advice to the embassies of each community and prefacing each injunction with the gentle phrase “we think it best” (*oiometha de dein*) or posing as an arbitrator (*epikekrikamen*; l. 60)—dealing with these cities, in other words, with what Welles describes as a “simplicity of bearing.”\(^{84}\) All parties recognized that force lay behind these asymmetric relationships, but equally evident in these letters is the ability of the communities to secure privileges and concessions from Antigonos, even where they ran contrary to his initial plans. Such was the power of the discourse of euergetism that defined these encounters and became such a central part of the dialogue between cities and kings.\(^{85}\) Still, Antigonos overtly mentions the possibility of dismantlement (of Teos), but here again he poses as a concerned outsider, primarily interested in

---

79. Paus. 1.9.7. The description is redolent of works like Phyrnichos’s infamous “Capture of Miletos” (*Μιλήτου ἅλωσις*, Hdt. 6.21.2) and other examples of the *halōsis* genre. For the literary tradition commemorating the fall of cities, see Bachvarova, Dutsch, and Suter 2016.
80. Paus. 7.3.4. For the archeological evidence from Kolophon, see ch. 1.
81. Paus. 1.9.8.
82. As C. Welles (1934, 135) succinctly put it, “A king would refer to his part in the matter as ‘advice’ (*συνεβούλευσα*), while the city would recognize it as an ‘order’ (*κελεύει*)” (comm. on *RC* 29, on the union of Iasos[?] and Chalketor in the 190s, probably at the hands of Antiochos III). The two documents presented as *RC* 29 in Welles’s edition, however, have been shown to have no relation to each other (Crampa 1968).
84. Welles 1934, 26.
85. For a full exposition, see Ma 2002, 179–214.
securing the most advantageous site for the new city and its population and careful not to issue an absolute command.\textsuperscript{86}

By the later Hellenistic period, royal rescripts and civic decrees increasingly document unions created by royal initiative. Their language describes the process with the typical locution of royal benefaction. An illustrative example is preserved from the foundation of Attalid Apollonis in northern Lydia during the reign of Eumenes II (197–159).\textsuperscript{87} The agent charged with the synoikism was one of the king’s brothers, whom the community honored as “founder and benefactor” for his role in bringing the king’s plans to fruition. A decree of the polis of Apollonis singles out his role in “providing both [food and] money for those being synoikized, and [in addition to these, also] procuring other things related to [safety and] prosperity/happiness \textit{[eudaimonia]}, [on account of his exceeding] goodwill toward them.”\textsuperscript{88} This document illustrates the type of rhetoric employed in such contexts. Stressing the efforts of the king on behalf of the communities and his central role as founder (\textit{ktistēs}), the decree describes the synoikism as a natural extension of the success of the kingdom. A fragmentary document from Karia, a city decree recording a royal order (likely of Antiochos III) and a subsequent resolution, reflects the ways that cities themselves replicated this discourse. From concern for the well-being of (probably) Iasos and because he “considered it a matter of greatest importance,” the decree records, Antiochos wrote to its \textit{boulē} and \textit{dēmos} to annex Chalketor and join in sympolity with its citizens.\textsuperscript{89} The royal interests in rewarding Iasos and shoring up the Seleukid hold on coastal Karia are, naturally, passed over, as are the aggrandizing ambitions of the larger partner in the union. Such was the presentation: the king as benefactor, interested in the prosperity and success of the cities under his command and careful to avoid the language of domination.

The importance of this form of discourse extended to the wider presentation of empire and even to its structure. In the context of the Greek poleis, it was critical for the Hellenistic dynasts to distinguish and individualize their form of kingship,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Syll. 3 344 = RC 3, l. 7: ἐὰν δὲ δεῖ κατασκάπτειν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πόλιν . . . (but if it is necessary to tear down the existing city . . .). Compare Thuc. 1.58.2: “Perdikkas persuaded the Chalkidians to abandon and dismantle [\textit{katabalontas}] their poleis on the coast and settle inland at Olynthos and make it a single, strong city.”
\item \textsuperscript{87} For the site, see G. Cohen 1995, 200–204. The community seems to have been populated in part by Macedonian military colonists and by the inhabitants of the surrounding villages.
\item \textsuperscript{88} TAM V. 2 1187, ll. 6–10: ἐπιδόντα τ[ε σῖτον καὶ] | χρήματα τοῖς συνοικισθεῖσιν, ἐ[τὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ] ὁ[λὰ περιποιήσαντα τὰ π[ρὸς ἀσφάλειαν καὶ] | εὐδαιμονίαν ἀνήκον[τα, διὰ τὴν ὑπερφυῆ εἰς] | ἑαυτοὺς εὔνοιαν. See also the language of a Teian decree that praises Antiochos III for “the advantages through which our city reaches prosperity/happiness \textit{[eudaimonia]}” (Herrmann 1965, 34–36, ll. 27–28 [SEG XLI 1003; Ma 2002, no. 17]).
\item \textsuperscript{89} I. Mylasa 913, ll. 2–6.
\end{itemize}
linking it to ideal notions and not to the autocratic image of the tyrant or the Eastern king. Yet the elimination of autonomous cities and the movement of populations were patently at odds with this presentation. By the time of Xenophon and Aristotle, intervention in the organization of a civic community had become a trope typical of tyrants. Following the unification of Corinth and Argos orchestrated by anti-Spartans in 393 or 392, Xenophon described the faction in charge as “ruling as tyrants” by eliminating these cities’ political and territorial distinctions. Aristotle, by contrast, portrays the tyrant as marked by fear of collective action, discouraging centralized settlement and the mingling of citizens. For Aristotle, the tyrant was someone who prevented mutual acquaintance, for fear of political action, and drove citizens from the city and into scattered living arrangements.

According to the Aristotelian *Constitution of the Athenians*, Peisistratos encouraged a dispersed pattern of settlement and Periander did not let citizens live in the city. As instruments of control, forced deportation and resettlement had a long history in Near Eastern kingship. This is particularly evident in the policies of the Neo-Assyrian kings, a pillar of whose rule was the “calculated frightfulness” of their sieges and deportations, boasted of in imperial inscriptions and represented prominently in official art. More immediately, population transfers were an instrument of Achaemenid control, and literary sources attest to Greek anxieties over those undertaken or allegedly contemplated by the Persians and said to have been planned by Alexander and forestalled by his death.

Two versions of encounters between kings and cities emerge from the written sources, both probably distortions: the literary trope of the king as tyrant, destroying cities and forcing their populations into new capitals, and the epigraphic image of the king as benefactor. Past approaches have attempted to resolve the apparent contradiction between the rhetoric of the Successors and their frequent interventions in the autonomous life of the Greek poleis. Writing of Antigonus’s synoikism

---

90. On ideal kingship and Aristotle, see Bringmann 1993.
91. Xen., *Hell.* 4.4.6. For the nature of this union, see 000n30.
94. “Calculated frightfulness”: Olmstead 1918; deportations: Oded 1979. The next phase of Assyrian policy created massive new provincial capitals, often on the sites of former cities, which were populated with transplants from other parts of the empire. See Stern 2001, 10–13, 18–31, for the case of Palestine. For urbanization in the Jazirah, in Assyria proper, see Kühne 1994.
95. E.g., transfer of the Eretrians to the Red Sea (Hdt. 6.119.1–4; Diod. Sic. 17.119); deportation of Milesians to Susa (Hdt. 6.20.1); (supposedly voluntary) resettlement of the Branchidai in Sogdiana (Kallisthenes, *FGrH* 124 F14 = Strabo 17.1.43; Strabo 11.11.4; Curt. 7.5.28–35; Plut., *Mor.* 557b); relocation of the Paionians (Hdt. 5.15.3, 5.15.98); feared population exchange between Phoenicia and Ionia (Hdt. 6.3.1). See also Briant 2002, 505. We have already noted the contemporary view of Philip’s population transfers (see 000n66). For synoikisms and population movements in the *hypomnemata* of Alexander, see Diod. Sic. 18.4.1–6, with Badian 1968 on their ultimately Perdikkian origin.
of Antigoneia in the Troad, D. Magie commented, “Whatever infraction of rights was involved, the plan may have seemed justifiable on the grounds of expediency; for a group of evidently decayed towns was replaced by a city which soon attained great commercial importance.” Historians have largely moved away from the legalistic framework of such an approach to a more dynamic, interactive model that stresses the role of negotiation and mutual constraint in the confrontations between kings and cities. Intrinsic to Magie’s “decayed towns” is the notion of the degradation and weakness of the late classical and Hellenistic poleis and the inevitability of their eclipse. Many of the communities reformed into major cities through synoikism were, of course, relatively insignificant, but the majority of poleis, small communities that rarely entered on to the international stage, nevertheless had vibrant civic lives and clung tenaciously to their traditions and autonomy. Moreover, many of the cities synoikized in this period were fairly substantial places, perfectly capable of existing independently. An alternative approach to stressing the weakness of the Hellenistic polis must allow for a more complex explanation both of the role of synoikism in building the network of power and resources essential to the nascent territorial kingdoms of the Successors and of the various mechanisms by which kings and communities brokered the process of creating a unified polis in a manner that addressed the institutional complexities, varying traditions, and competing interests of its constituent groups. Such a focus exposes local dynamics of power and the ways that synoikism served to redraw the contours of political communities as part of the larger process of imperial state formation.

**BECOMING A POLIS: COMMUNITY, CUSTOMS, AND ORGANIZATION**

I have already alluded to the manifold institutional and social consequences of synoikism. Synoikized communities arose out of the direct application of imperial authority, but the approach I adopt here stresses how the norms of the Greek polis, the traditions of the participant communities, and ideological negotiations constrained the power of the dynasts and mediated the ways in which the synoikized poleis took shape. The interests and concerns of elites and other social actors

96. Magie 1950, 1:69. Magie follows the position of Heuss 1937, that the Greek cities were formally allies of the kings and thus the control of the kings did not amount to a legal encroachment on their autonomy. Bickerman 1938 thoroughly demonstrates the deficiencies of this model. Orth (1977), by contrast, stressed the repression and weakness of the Greek cities.

97. Ma 2002 fundamentally reorients this central issue, emphasizing the agency of Greek cities and the power of language to frame these interactions. The question of the formal statuses of Greek cities within the Hellenistic kingdoms remains a point of much discussion. See Ma 2002, 150–74, for a proposed typology; for an alternative, more flexible approach, see Capdetrey 2007, 191–217.

played an important role,99 and mechanisms other than force (whether ideological, symbolic, or ritual) shaped the formation of these communities. This encounter worked in both directions, a reciprocal exchange between king and community. At the same time, constituent parts of the new polis also brokered their new union, asserting their traditions and interests or working toward unity and consensus. There were, therefore, limits and complex dynamics that affected these projects, which should not be conceptualized as the simple result of imperial fiat or as formed on a blank slate.100

This book views synoikism as an evolving process, in terms of both the physical development of the city and the relations between social groups. As we saw in the case of Antigoneia/Alexandreia Troas, the union of discrete communities cut across meaningful lines distinguishing constituent members of the new polis. It is important to explain how unity and cohesiveness emerged from this diversity and competition and what the broader impact of synoikism on social organization and religious practice was. The democratic poleis created by synoikism were notionally egalitarian, but the process involved a negotiation of statuses and civic identities, and asymmetric relationships could produce winners and losers. There always was the danger that larger parties might hold greater influence in the polis, even though strategies for bridging or even obliterating the distinctions between the constituent communities of a synoikism were often put in place. Many synoikisms blurred the lines between historic ethnic groups, and where there is evidence, it would seem that a unified ethnic identity emerged from these unions, such as in Demetrias, a large-scale synoikism that combined Magnesian and Thessalian communities. In this instance, a late third-century funeral epitaph proudly calls the deceased Magnēs, a Magnesian, an unambiguous, timeless assertion of his identity, even though his polis was the result of a complex historical amalgamation of traditional ethnic divisions.101 Particularly in Asia Minor, these projects often included indigenous, non-Greek populations or communities subordinated to a larger polis. In many cases, the precise relationship between the central polis and such population groups is unclear. Did the former royal peasants who inhabited the land directly controlled by the Persian and Hellenistic kings, the laoi on royal estates, enter into these communities as citizens or slaves? Should they be identified with the groups that the epigraphic sources found in many cities of Asia Minor label paroikoi, free but without full civic rights?102 Did synoikism seek to expand

99. For a valuable approach to polis formation in the second century, see Savalli-Lestrade 2005.
100. Miletä’s (2009) category of “Retorten-poleis” (test-tube cities), in which he places communities like Laodikeia on the Lykos (“Da die Retorten-poleis praktisch auf dem grünen Rasen entstanden waren” [85]), sidesteps some of the complexity of the genesis of such cities.
101. Moretti 1976, no. 107, ll. 6–7.
102. For discussions of this problem, see Hahn 1981; Gauthier 1987; Gauthier 1988; Wörrle 1991; Papazoglou 1997; Schuler 1998, 180–90, 202–7; Gagliardi 2009; Flinterman 2012.
cities through “concealed enfranchisement” precisely to blur lines of distinction, as has been argued for Halikarnassos or as Aristotle explicitly states of the reforms of Kleisthenes?\textsuperscript{103}

The evidence sheds some light on these issues, but direct testimony for the modalities of forming these unions and the concerns of the communities involved is often limited. The literary sources and epigraphic record are better at elucidating the responses of civic actors to social stress and their negotiation of this changed reality. The challenges of forming a coherent civic identity and the institutions (\textit{nomima}) and practices basic to corporate self-representation are evident in the kinds of strategies employed to bridge the social disruption of this process. Tracing the impact of synoikism on religious practice, civic rituals, social organization, and cultural identity reveals responses to the changes introduced by imperial authorities. In this manner, we can also recover the ways in which both the will of rulers and the active role of communities contributed to the construction of an imperial system.

\textsuperscript{103} Halikarnassos: Hornblower 1982a, 84. Reforms of Kleisthenes: Arist., \textit{Pol.} 1275b7–8.