

THE ALLURE OF CONSENSUS AND THE PERSEVERANCE OF MINORITY: ASPECTS OF DEMOCRACY IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD

By Kostas Buraselis

Summary: If majority may count as the moving force, minority (and its distinct existence) is the distinctive quality of democracy. They are both precious components of a Herakleitian ‘balanced harmony’ (παλίντροπος ἁρμονίη), which one should always consider and respect in democratic practice. This maxim is studied on the basis of various testimonies from the Hellenistic period of ancient Greek history, when democracy underwent various limitations.¹

I

An inscription from the small Aegean island *polis* of Anaphe preserves a decree dated to the first century BC and concerning the local *euergetes* Archonidas, son of Sokles. The assembly of the people decides therein to thank him for his contribution (expressed in general terms) to sustaining the community, through various significant honours during his lifetime and after death. At the end of the decree, it is mentioned that the relevant proposal had been subjected to a vote (διαψ[αφ]ίξαι τάνδε τὰν [γνώ/μᾶν]) assisted by the responsible public servants (δαμόσιοι, perhaps public slaves). The result was a unanimous ‘yes’ of all ninety-five votes (ἔδοξε ἅ γνώ[μ]α [ὑπ]ἔρ α[ὐ]τ[οῦ] ταῖς ψάφοις πάσαις ἐνενήκοντα πέντε, IG XII.3. 249.38-39). The number is not surprising if one considers the plausible standards of this small *polis*, and it is probably not very different from that of the whole citizen body. Thus, in a panegyric manner, the whole citizenry of Anaphe expressed their absolute agreement on

1 On the topic discussed in this chapter, see also the chapter by Carbon, Isager & Pedersen in this volume (eds.).

the proper reaction of the city to the services offered them by Archonidas.

Not that long before, in the end of the second century BC, the important *polis* of Kolophon in Asia Minor honoured by a long decree its own *euergetes* Menippos son of Apollonides. His services to his home city are there described as capital in critical times (προστάντα τῆς πατρίδος ἐν καιροῖς ἀναγκαίοις). The context of his activity was precisely the highly delicate phase of Kolophon's status transition from a city in the Pergamene kingdom to a satellite of Rome and its final accommodation in the *provincia Asia*. Various questions pertaining to the territorial rights/claims of the city but also to the personal rights of Kolophonian citizens towards the Romans and their tendencies of encroaching upon them, had demanded subtle diplomacy and intense negotiations, which the educated and experienced Menippos – as the decree itself attests – had been able to conduct with praised success. At the end of the decree the exact city magistrates added the result of the respective vote in the assembly: there had been 1342 votes, of which 1326 of 'yes' and 16 of 'no'. Again, the total of votes (1342) does not seem to differ much from the total number of citizens (and potential voters). However, it is remarkable that on the issue of honouring such an apparently valuable man even a small minority (1.2%) of the Kolophonians assembled had both the wish and the possibility to disagree. This fact was faithfully reproduced in the decree of the city, which was erected in the temple of Apollo Klarios, the patron deity of Kolophon. The rejective tendency appears weak, but it existed, and it has been officially recorded in the relevant state act.

These two types of political decision, either with full consensus or with the distinct expression of a minority of opinion, persistent and also mentioned, are to be found in further preserved decrees by cities of the Hellenistic world, as we shall see. This typology and its significance for the political developments during the same period deserves our attention, and it has already caught the interest of historians.² Two basic views

2 A relatively recent treatment of the subject as part of an impressive synthesis on the appearance and development of majority decisions as an institution in world history, from antiquity into modern times, has been offered by Flaig 2013 (esp. 309–11). Maffi 2012 has studied almost in parallel but independently the notion and the beginnings

have defined the frame of the relevant discussion. The first, expressed by Luigi Moretti,³ preferred to recognize in the frequency of consensus decisions, witnessed in various civic decrees of the Hellenistic period, a bitterly realistic tendency to unanimity. The civic communities tended to overcome local differences and to attain a common stand toward the difficult problems which necessarily limited, more and more, the possibilities of autonomy but also of internal differentiation in the cities. As Moretti pointedly remarked, the time was long past when e.g. in Athens the notorious bestowal of a crown on Demosthenes after Chaironeia had become a rhetorical battlefield between the honoree and Aischines, centred on the person of the proponent of the relevant honorific decree, Ktesiphon. Self-restriction should have in later times replaced the practice of intense strife. In more general terms: the Greek city of Hellenistic times witnessed, through its frequent consensus, its disillusioned adaptation to the needs of a new political age.

Moretti himself had noticed, of course, that the decrees in question concerned mainly honours offered to distinguished citizens. However, these personalities were obviously representative of crucial political views in their communities, so that reactions might be naturally expected. Thus, the study of this particular question finally inserted itself

of this institution in the Greek world of the archaic and classical age. A more specific, precious list of the results of voting mentioned in ancient Greek decrees, with accompanying notes, has been presented (as a supplement of Maffi's study) by Todd 2012. However, the data collected and preliminarily studied by Todd may be completed (as e.g. by the addition of examples from the cities of Macedonia, of significant importance; cf. below). For older, still useful notes on the same subject in more general works: Quass 1993: 361-62; Rhodes & Lewis 1997: 510-12. Recently, Canevaro 2018 has also examined the consensus/majority options in the democratic decisions of ancient Greek cities, focusing especially on Athens and the difference between judicial and (in a narrower sense) political decisions, with results converging with those reached in this particular study (cf. esp. ib. 144). Certainly, the research of the whole subject touches on many crucial problems not only of Hellenistic history but also of Greek history in general and deserves to be continued. – This brief study (an earlier Greek version of which was published in the collective volume: *Η των πλειόνων ψήφος κρατεῖτω* (edited by D. Apostolopoulos & E. Chrysos, Athens 2017, 15-27) is dedicated here with affection to the memory of Mogens Hansen whose work for the Greek polis remains essential.

3 Moretti 1967-68: esp. 57.

into the wider discussion of the quality of Hellenistic *polis* democracy and the degree of its eventual devaluation in comparison with the earlier, especially the classical centuries.⁴

Philippe Gauthier vigorously opposed this interpretation.⁵ He emphasized that the cases of decrees where the consensus is mentioned date not only from the Hellenistic but also from the subsequent, the Roman imperial period. In the latter the possibilities of free action and of following a local policy based on democratic dialogue were certainly even more limited. However, Gauthier himself underlined the importance of examples where, as we shall see, the civic decrees mention neither a consensus nor exact numbers of votes representing the majority and the minority. In these examples only the number of consenting votes is mentioned, which – as we may deduce – represented the majority of potential votes. In other words, in these cases the mention of a minority was omitted as the positive opinion had superseded (we do not know to which extent) the minimum of necessary votes, a sort of quorum, in respect to the total of potential voters. Therefore, the noted, practically majoritarian vote did not cease to represent symbolically the total of the deciding citizen body. Thus, no reduction in democratic ideas and practices of Hellenistic *poleis* could be discerned here. Furthermore, the literary sources (e.g. Polybios) provide us with unequivocal evidence for the continuing essence of political life and differentiation in the cities of the Hellenistic world, especially in respect to the increasing Roman intervention and control of the Greek world.⁶

II

Let us now take an analytical look at the relevant epigraphic evidence. It is mainly noteworthy that the express statement of political consensus

4 Relatively recent books on the level/quality of democracy in Hellenistic *poleis*: Carlsson 2005; Grieb 2008; Mann & Scholz 2012. – One may note the coincidence of views in these works, independently from each other, in re-assessing positively the democratic essence of various Hellenistic cities.

5 Gauthier 1990 (cf. SEG 40.1697).

6 The examples of political tensions and confrontations in various cities of Greece in the age of the Third Macedonian War are instructive, as noted in Plb. 30.7.9–8.1.

(and not of a specific majority and minority) becomes the rule only in imperial times (about the end of the first century BC, that is, from the reign of Augustus on).⁷ In the preceding centuries the appearance of consensus is often connected with decrees of small *poleis*, as in the case of the Anaphian decree we saw at the beginning. A similar case is known from Astypalaia (*IG* XII.3 168, ca. 150 BC): the end of a decree mentions here that a systematic epigraphic record of the city's *proxenoi* and the way of financing it had been unanimously decided: Τόδε τὸ ψάφισμα ἔδοξε πάσαις.

The same holds true for the small Thessalian city of Chyretiai (in Peraibia, near the modern Tyrnavos). Here a notable honorific decree is issued in the difficult years of the Antiochic War (in 190 BC), when the Romans and the Aitolian allies of Antiochos III engaged in war and parallel burdens on the Thessalian cities, which had to be the theatre of their operations. A Roman resident in Chyretiai, Sextus Orfidienus M.f., acted in that context as a benefactor of the city, apparently limiting the impositions of Roman troops encamped in the area. What else could one then expect than the unanimous gratitude of the Chyretian citizens, as noted in a special decree of the city issued on the occasion of electing the local archons (*ISE* II 95)? Ἔδοξεν τῇ Χυρετιέων πόλει ἐν τοῖς ἀρχοστασίοις, ὁμογνωμονούντων τῶν πολιτῶν. Thus, the reasons for this emphatic mention of a common stance are clear: the small city had every interest in projecting its full unanimity in honouring the man who had secured, as far as possible, Chyretian rights. If some Chyretians did not actually share this view, they seem neither to have expressed their (real) opinion nor to have been mentioned at all. A breach of the consensus might have been politically (and critically) incorrect.

Further cases of unanimous decisions are known from a decree of the Kolophonians for a Smyrnaian *chresmologos* and a decree of an unknown, possibly insular community known from Delos, both datable to the second century BC: Διεψηφίσθη ἐν | [τῷ] δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον. *vac.* Οἱ

7 Some such examples: *Agora* XVI no. 335.65-67 (decree of the Athenian *demos* on the Athenians on Lemnos, end of first century BC); *IKnidos* 74.21-23 (decree of the Knidians for the Lykaithion, daughter of Aristokleidas, first/second century AD; *EAM* no. 186.15-16 (decree of the Battynaians, end of second century AD). Further examples are collected by Gauthier 1990: 95, n. 93.

ψηφίσαν|τες] δισχίλιοι· οὔτοι ἔδωκαν πάντες (SEG 42.1065, 40-42); [ψᾶφοι] αἷς ἔδοξε· πᾶσαι (IG XI.4 1057 + Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge* VI. 4-7).

A similar clause can be found in two of the somewhat earlier (ca. 242 BC) decrees of Greek cities recognizing the *asylia* of Kos (both the Sanctuary of Asklepios and the city itself). One of these comes from Amphipolis and includes the final epigrammatic notice: ... ἐψηφίσθη παραπάσαις (Rigsby 1996: no. 26, p. 137). At Ainos in Thrace the corresponding text ends with the phrase: ... προήδρευσαν πάντες (ib., no. 28, p. 141). These words have puzzled commentators, most recently Rigsby (ib.) who interpreted them in the sense that all members of the Ainian assembly collectively exercised chairmanship. As the presidents of an assembly are regularly also the proponents of its agenda and decisions, it seems to me reasonable to conclude that also here the acceptance of the Koan *asylia* after a unanimous relevant proposal by the agreeing presidents in the name of all citizens is meant. It is further noteworthy that in both these cases there seems to have been a fine interplay between civic consensus and royal will in the background. As a city of the Macedonian kingdom Amphipolis stated in its decree that it was issued after considering also the friendly feelings (εὐνοίαν) of the Koans towards king Antigonos Gonatas and the Macedonians. The Ainians, on the other hand, cannot have left out of their own consideration the traditional good relations of Hippokrates' island with the Ptolemies, to whose sphere of control the Thracian city belonged. After all, the Ainian decree specifically mentions as main motives of its issue the health and safety of the ruling Ptolemies (Euergetes I and his family). Both at Amphipolis and Ainos, then, the royal backing of the Koan petition most likely left no room for objections, the political consensus in the citizen body expressing a multi-faceted reality. Respect of the Koan *asylia* was obviously running no danger from the Amphipolitans or the Ainians but the case might be different with eventual actions of the two cities' royal patrons.

Finally, we have four decrees of the second century BC from Kos itself (IG XII. 4 56, 59, 109, 110), where an explicit consensus of the convened citizens appears: two of them are decrees of the city and two come respectively from the Koan demes of Halasarna and Antimacheia. It is interesting in these examples that consensus was expressed (and noticed) by throwing only positive votes (literally: 'solid, whole votes'), while no

‘opposite’ (έναντία) or ‘pierced’ (τετρυπαμένα) – as in classical Athens – vote had been found. It is further remarkable that the total number of positive votes was precisely mentioned as e.g. in the case of conferring a honorary crown to a Koan fellow citizen who had distinguished himself as head (*dikastagogs*) of a committee of judicial assistance (foreign judges) sent by the Koans to Smyrna: ψᾶφοι στερεαὶ ἐπιδιδούσα[ι]/τὸν στέφανον ὡπε’ (885) *vac.* τετρυπαμένα [οὐδεμί]α. *vac.* One gains the impression of a distinct formula in the Koan decrees of that period where the relevant entries of positive and negative votes had to be filled out. Simply, in the cases dealt with there was finally no need to fill out any number in the ‘second column’. The allure of consensus had completely won.

III

However, this could not be always taken for granted as not only Koan material but also testimonies from other Hellenistic cities may show. The Kolophonians of Menippos’ age did not need to feel alone. Thus, in honouring another *dikastagogs* around the middle of the second century BC objections were clearly expressed: as the end of the relevant Koan decree relates this time (*IG* XII.4 57), the not preserved (but obviously sufficient) number of positive votes were openly opposed by thirteen ‘votes against’ [ψᾶ][φοι στερε]αὶ διδοῦσαι τὸν στέφανον[-----, τε][τρυπαμέ]ναι ΔΙΙΙ (:13).

Opposite, on the coast of Asia Minor, we have a fragmentary decree from the city of Keramos and around the same date (*I.Keramos* 9) for a local *euergetes* (son of a Drakon), to whom honours are again awarded, in his lifetime and *post mortem* (i.a. contests of the children and ephebes of the city). The decree ends with the result of the relevant vote, falling again in two parts. Although some letters are not preserved, it is obvious that the positive votes numbered at least 901 (perhaps 951) and the negative ones at least 44 (perhaps 144): [ψᾶφοι αἷς ἔδ]οξε δοῦναι τὰς τιμὰς ἐνακόσια | [(e.g. πεντήκοντα) μία, αἷς δὲ μὴ | [?] ἐκατὸν τεσσ]αράκοντα τέσσαρες (26-29). However, the honorand had a definite majority to support his honours, but not all voters, and this fact was not concealed.

To the northwest of Keramos, at Iasos, there has been found a decree (*I.Iasos* 9) of the city's corporation of elders (*presbyteroi*) – and thus certainly of a more limited population group – in honour of a former financial co-administrator (συνδιοικητήν) of this association, Kritios son of Hermophantos. The honorand is praised for his fine feeling in respect to the needs of the group (probably we should understand some form of *euergesia* as background). Among the honours decided we find a golden crown and the erection of a painted portrait of Kritios. Seventy members were positive but four resisted and rejected. Who knows? Perhaps the man's financial administration had not convinced everyone to the same degree. This may happen. What is important is that despite the small total number of votes, the actual difference of opinion remained apparent, while the publication of the decree did not gloss over the existing minority.

In Athens itself around the beginning of the first century BC we meet an unfortunately very fragmentary decree (*IG II²* 1035) where, however, at least the indication of the final vote is preserved, and revealing: 3461 positive (not pierced) votes opposite to 155 negative (pierced) ones: μὴ τετρυπημέ]ναι 3461, αἱ δὲ τετρυπημένα αἴς οὐκ ἔδόκει 155. Again, a minority, in this case of 4.3%, is officially present.

Finally, a charmingly extreme example of such a reality comes from Beroia in Macedonia. In the famous gymnasiarchal law of the city, that is the official regulation of the local *gymnasion* (probably going back to the royal period, before Pydna) a final note on the relevant vote concerning that corpus of detailed regulations is appended. The city magistrates, the *politarchai*, recorded the result of the vote in the assembly in the final line of the text: Παρὰ τῶν πολιταρχῶν ν. Τοῦ ψηφίσματος «οὐ» εἷς (Gauthier & Hatzopoulos 1993: l. 110). In other words, the arguments mentioned in the preceding text for the importance and usefulness of regulating the life of the *gymnasion* also in that important city of Macedonia had gained the consent of all voters but one. Nevertheless, even that one 'No' had been regarded as worthy of record. If we consider the preceding remarks on that older consensus of the Amphipolitans on the Koan *asylia* and its background, and that the royal aegis must have somehow protected the institution of the *gymnasion* at Beroia, too, the appearance of that single negative vote is not insignificant. Unfortunately, we

cannot know more about its background. Anyway, Beroia insisted on a democratic protocol.

IV

Of course, as already noted, we find also alternative methods of decision and recording the ultimately positive vote result in Hellenistic decrees, which essentially complete the picture drawn by the material analysed so far. Another method practiced was that of ultimately publishing just the number of positive votes, which had obviously sufficed. This not only avoided pretending that there existed a consensus of all citizens/voters but also stating precisely how many negative votes had been cast at the same time. In this way, as Gauthier has already remarked, the focus was on the achievement of a majority, which was at the same time cleverly presented as a collective action of the city without traceable objection.⁸ This practice is known to us already from Delphian decrees of the fourth century BC.⁹ In the Hellenistic period various similar examples are known especially from Kolophon by the sea but also from other communities in southern Asia Minor. As far as Kolophon by the sea is concerned, we know a series of decrees from the same period concluded by the mention of the acceptance of the decree and the fluctuating but always sufficient number of approving citizens. In the city's decree for the Mytilenaeon Hermonax son of Satyros (ca. 250-200 BC), the final sentence is: Διεψηφίσθη | ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ν καὶ ἐδόθη ψηφισάντων ἐνακοσίων τριῶν.¹⁰ The total of positive votes in this case (903) becomes still higher in the other Kolophonian examples.¹¹ Further evidence of

8 Gauthier 1990: esp. 97.

9 The case of the decree *CID* I 13.35-37 on the award of various privileges by Delphi to the Skiathians is very instructive: it is mentioned there that the decision has been taken σὺν τετρακα[τρί]α[ι] ψηφῶι καὶ πλ[έον]ι, i.e. with more than 400 votes, obviously a necessary indication of a certain quorum reached. For further examples from Delphi and their analysis: Gauthier 1990: 86-89.

10 Gauthier 2003: 486-92 = *SEG* 53.1300.27-29.

11 On the rest such examples from Kolophon: Gauthier 2003: 492, n. 42.

such an ‘approbation protocol’ from Asia Minor is known from Phygela,¹² Halikarnassos,¹³ Magnesia on the Maeander,¹⁴ and Theangela.¹⁵ Finally, a mere mention of the number of positive votes is included in decrees from Greek cities in North Africa (Arsinoe, Kyrene) dating from the second/first century BC.¹⁶

A probable variant of this sort of procedure may be recognized in approximately contemporaneous (end of the third-first century BC) honorific decrees from Iasos (six certain cases) and Alabanda (one probable testimony), that is on the coast and in the interior of Karia respectively. Here the additional element is the examination of the relevant proposal in both legislative bodies of the cities, the council (*boule*) and the assembly (*ekklesia*), but also the description of the voting as secret, by using the term κρυφαία ψῆφος. Thus e.g. in the honorary decree of the Iasians for Hekatomnos son of Korris, priest of Zeus Labrandeus (SEG 57.1074.20-22, ca. 225 BC), the end runs: ἐδόθη ψήφωι κρυφαί[α]· ψῆφοι αἱ διδοῦσαι ἐμὲν τῇ | βουλῇ ὀγδοηκοντατρεῖς, ἐν δὲ τῷ δήμῳ χίλια | δεκαμία· πρεσβευταὶ ἡρέθησαν ... Also, in this category of decrees the number of positive votes varies from case to case,¹⁷ but we must conclude that it was above the minimum guaranteeing a majority of the potential total. In the decree of the Alabandeis for the local euergetes Pyrrakos (?) (ca. 80 BC)

12 *I.Ephesos*, VII.1 3111.11-13 (ψῆφοι ἐγένοντο εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν στάμνον τριακόσiai πεντήκοντα, end of fourth century BC). In this case it is certainly more probable that there was no second στάμνος, that is, no alternative way of voting. Cf. Todd 2012: 43 (A. 18).

13 *IG XII.4.1* 142.36-38 (ca. 220 BC, 100 votes in the *boule* and 4000 in the *demos*); *ib.*, 176. 23-25 (second century BC, 113 votes in the *boule*, uncertain – restored – number in the *demos*’ voting); *BCH* 14 (1890): 95, no. 3.4-6 (mention of the number of votes in the *boule*: 92, and in the *demos*: 1200, uncertain date). Cf. Todd 2012: 43-44 (A.25-27).

14 *I.Magnesia* 92b.19 (2113 votes) and 94.14-15 (3580 votes), in both cases: beginning of the second century BC. Cf. Todd 2012: 45 (A.36-37)

15 *IG XI.4* 1054b.21-22 (second century BC, second half). Cf. Todd 2012: 45 (A.38, cf. also 39; SEG 27.511: similarly restored inscription of the same provenance).

16 *SEG* 26.1817.80 (decree of *gerousia* and *boule* for Aleximachos, son of Sosistratos from Arsinoe/Tokra, end of second-first half of first century BC); *ib.* 9.354, 26 (*kome* of Kyrene, first century BC). Here (in both cases) only the number of ‘white votes’ is mentioned (respectively: 109 and 53). Cf. Todd 2012: 45 (A.40-41).

17 The other testimonies from Iasos: *SEG* 41.929, 932; 57.1046.II, 1078, 1083.

Gauthier also supposed a secret vote before the final decision on the matter in the popular assembly.¹⁸

It is interesting that the secrecy of these last voting procedures is always connected with the announcement of a positive result. In contrast to that, in earlier examples of such a secret vote as e.g. at the verdict of the Eresian judicial assembly (Tod, *GHI* 191 = Rhodes-Osborne, *GHI* 83.i.15-19, ca. 335 BC) convened to judge the philopersion tyrants Agonippos and Eurysilaos in the age of Alexander, again [κ]ρύπτει ψάφιγγι, this sort of vote had allowed an absolving minority to appear, which was also specifically mentioned. Very probably, the secret vote in Iasos and Alabanda pursued another purpose: concealing the eventual negative attitude of a number, however limited, of citizen voters to the proposal, meant also to disarm any wish to spot these dissidents. The veil of a fictitious consensus served everyone's interests.¹⁹ Disagreement may have reached the ballot box, but it was also buried in it. Therefore, we cannot fail to discern here a certain preparation of the later, imperial data, where declared consensus – as already remarked – does dominate, without any complementary numeric statement of votes being regarded as necessary.

A further, characteristic aspect of the whole question of majority and binding consensus in a community may be offered by a Kretan text showing how -according to the matter at stake – a minority might assert itself as a majority of civic opinion. The treaty of *isopoliteia* between Praisos and Hierapytna (*I.Cret.* III, S.7 = *Staatsverträge* III 554.20-33, ca. beginning third century BC) provided that a vote in a main session of the two cities' assemblies would confer civic rights to the citizens of the other city. However, even three citizens' negative votes from the 'brother city' in that procedure would suffice to exclude respectively some Praisians or Hierapytnians from this privilege. It seems that the tradition of the Dorian spirit of a 'closed group,' as in the Spartan *syssitia*, had been here

18 Gauthier 2005: 85-89 (cf. *SEG* 55.1100 with previous literature).

19 Todd 2012: 38 is inclined to follow the same line of interpretation.

inserted into the system of an institution of ideally democratic orientation and spirit as the *isopoliteia* at least presented itself.²⁰ The exact wording was: ... δια[ψ]|αφιζέσθω|ν ἐν κυρ[ία]|ι ἐκκλησι[ία]|ι πότερ[ον δ]|οκεῖ πολ[ιτεί]|αν δε[δόσθ]|αι ἢ μή· κα[ὶ α]|ῖ κα ἀντίθε|τοι ψᾶφοι γ|ίνωνται τ|ρεῖς, μὴ ἔσ|τω πολίτα|ς ...

V

To sum up in a concise way and conclude, we may say that if the majority is the moving force in a democracy, the minority (and its distinct presence and freedom of expression) has always been the characteristic quality of real democracy. They are both valuable, constitutive parts of a Herakleitian ‘harmony of the opposites’ (παλίντροπος ἁρμονία), which we should remember and respect in our actions. For the survival of democracy was not a concern only of the Hellenistic age but of every phase of really communal history. This is ultimately the fascination of history: it does never need to become cheap to remain of current interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Canevaro, M. 2018. ‘Majority Rule vs. Consensus: The Practice of Democratic Deliberation in the Greek *Poleis*’ in M. Canevaro et al. (eds.) *Ancient Greek History and Contemporary Social Science*. Edinburgh, 101–56.
- Carlsson, S. 2010. *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States*. Stuttgart.
- Chaniotis, A. 1996. *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Flaig, E. 2013. *Die Mehrheitsentscheidung. Entstehung und kulturelle Dynamik*. Paderborn.

20 Cf. the comments by Chaniotis 1996: 187 (referring especially to the testimony of Plut. *Lyc.* 12. 8). Maffi 2012: 26 prefers to discern here a survival of the ‘principle of unanimity’ (*principe de l’unanimité*) since the Archaic period, which does not seem more persuasive. Had it been so, why should the limit of decisive objection have been set at the number of three and not even one vote?

- Gauthier, P. 1990. 'Quorum et participation civique dans les démocraties grecques' in C. Nicolet (ed.) *Du pouvoir dans l'Antiquité: Mots et réalités*. Geneva, 73-99.
- Gauthier, P. 2003. 'Deux décrets hellénistiques de Colophon-sur-Mer' *REG* 116, 470-93.
- Gauthier, P. 2005. 'Trois exemples méconnus d'intervenants dans des décrets de la basse époque hellénistique' in P. Fröhlich & C. Müller (eds.) *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*. Geneva, 79-93.
- Gauthier, P. & M. Hatzopoulos 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*. Athens.
- Grieb, V. 2008. *Hellenistische Demokratie: politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Großen*. Stuttgart.
- Maffi, A. 2012. 'Origine et application du principe de majorité dans la Grèce ancienne' in B. Legras & G. Thür (eds.) *Symposion 2011. Études d'histoire du droit grec et hellénistique*. Vienna, 21-31.
- Mann, C. & P. Scholz (eds.) 2012. *Demokratie im Hellenismus – Von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren?* Mainz.
- Moretti, L. 1967-68. 'Sui rapporti fra cittadino e polis nell'età ellenistica' *Cultura e Scuola* 23, 53-63 (= id., *Tra epigrafia e storia. Scritti scelti e annotati*. Rome 1990).
- Quass, F. 1993. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Rhodes, P.J. & D.M. Lewis 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford.
- Rigsby, K. 1996. *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley.
- Robert, L. 1963. 'Nouvelles inscriptions d'Iasos' *REA* 65, 304-7 = *OMS* III, 1499-1502.
- Todd, S.C. 2012. 'The publication of voting-figures in the ancient Greek world: A response to Alberto Maffi' in B. Legras & G. Thür (eds.) *Symposion 2011. Études d'histoire du droit grec et hellénistique*. Vienna, 33-48.