



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Riet Van Bremen The Demes and Phylai of Stratonikeia in Karia

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **30 • 2000**

Seite / Page **389–402**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/391/4999> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2000-30-p389-402-v4999.9

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

RIET VAN BREMEN

The Demes and Phylai of Stratonikeia in Karia*

The city of Stratonikeia in Karia was founded, sometime after the early 260s BC, as a Macedonian *katoikia*, in a region whose indigenous population was politically already highly organized – into small *poleis*, village-*koina*, or settlements surrounding sanctuaries.¹ At the time of its foundation or at some unknown time afterwards, several of these previously autonomous Karian communities must have been joined to the new city through *sympoliteia* or *synoikismos*. Much is still unclear about the process of integration of the various communities and about the extent of the original Macedonian settlement; the same is true of the organization of indigenous population and Macedonian settlers into one citizenbody.² Despite these uncertainties, Stratonikeia, as a

* Throughout this text the abbreviation IS will be used for Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia, vols. I and II.1 and 2 (IK vols. 21 and 22.1 and 2; ed. M. Ç. ŞAHİN). I wish to thank V. GABRIESEN, H. MÜLLER, and M. WÖRRLE, for pertinent and helpful criticism, and the Leverhulme Trust for funding a year's research leave to work on Stratonikeian matters.

¹ On the date of the foundation see J. and L. ROBERT, *Mélanges I. Lévy*, 1955, 561–564 (OMS V, 457–460); A. MASTROCINQUE, *AncSoc* 24, 1993, 33f.; and P. DEBORD, *Mélanges P. Lévêque*, 8, 1994, 107. There is a large literature on the identity of the founder – Antiochos I, or his son, Antiochos II – for a summary of which see G. M. COHEN, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, 1995, 269–271, and, most recently, J. MA, *Antiochos III and the Cities of western Asia Minor*, 1999, 277.

² I do not intend to discuss here the problems surrounding the integration of the various communities, though the very different opinions among scholars about the timing of this process should be noted: A. LAUMONIER, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, 1958, 234; M. Ç. ŞAHİN, *The Political and Religious Structure in the Territory of Stratonikeia in Caria*, 1976, 33–38; P. DEBORD, above, n. 1,117; V. GABRIESEN, forthcoming, *REA* 102, 2000. A still unpublished inscription referred to by DEBORD (above, n. 1,117, n. 62), in which, apparently, all five of the city's main constituent communities figure at the time of Rhodian control over the city – though in what context is not known – may throw more light on the early stages. DEBORD sees the formation of the city predominantly as a *synoikismos* of the region's existing communities, and minimises the size and importance of the original Macedonian settlement. GABRIESEN argues that the separate communities which were to become the city's *demoi* remained autonomous until at least the middle of the second century BC, which suggests that in his view the Macedonian *katoikia* must have been a viable entity in its own right for at least a century.

Seleukid foundation, is often held up as an example of a city structurally different from the older, Karian, cities around it, with a citizenbody that was organized on the Greek model into *phylai* and demes. J. and L. ROBERT specifically contrasted the system of *phylai* and *syngeneiai* found in «old Karian cities» such as Alabanda, Mylasa or Alinda, with that of Stratonikeia whose civic organization they saw as closely modelled on that of Athens, or Miletus, and resembling those of other royal Macedonian foundations like Alexandria or Seleukeia in Pieria.³

The argument about the alleged «Greekness» of the Stratonikeian system is largely based on the text of an honorific decree found in Assos, issued by the *demoi* of the Stratonikeis, praising the *demoi* of Assos and a judge sent by that city to Stratonikeia. The decree has been dated to after 167 BC on the grounds that it would have been unlikely for Stratonikeia, while still under Rhodian control, to receive arbitration from any city other than Rhodes.⁴ The judge thus honoured is given «citizenship for himself and his descendants on an equal footing with our own citizens» (ll. 17–18: καὶ δεδῶσθαι πολιτείαν αὐτῶι καὶ ἐγγ[όνοι]ς αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἴση [καὶ] ὁμοίᾳ τοῖς ἡμετέροις πολίταις) and is allocated «to a *phyle* and a deme» (ll. 18–19: καὶ ἐπικληρῶσαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ φυλὴν καὶ δῆμον).

Of the two organizational sub-units mentioned in the Assos decree, we are far better informed about local *demoi*, or territorial units of population, as constituents of the *polis* of Stratonikeia than we are about the division of its citizenbody into *phylai*. The designation of citizens by their locality within the city's territory (as in: Ἀριστέας Μενεδῆμου ΚΟ[λιοργεύς])⁵ is a characteristic and consistent feature of the epigraphic record of the city itself and of the two main sanctuaries in its territory – that of Hekate at Lagina and of Zeus at Panamara. These designations are attested from the late second century BC

³ Above, n. 1, 553f. (449f.); also in: Le sanctuaire de Sinuri, près de Mylasa, I, 1945, 27, n. 5. Cf. also M. WÖRRLE, Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien, 1988, 145; G. M. COHEN, The Seleucid Colonies. Studies in Founding, Administration and Organisation, 1978, 85, with n. 69; and idem, above, n. 1, 269; A. BRESSON – P. DEBORD, REA 87, 1985, 211, n. 91: «la répartition des citoyens de la cité de Stratonicee, colonie macédonienne, se fait en tribus et en demes, et . . . ressortit à la «koinè» institutionnelle de l'époque hellénistique»; N. F. JONES, Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A documentary Study, 1987, 335f. JONES draws attention to the Athenian-derived *phyle*-name of Erechteis in Alabanda: ibidem, 327. On the demes of Miletus, and their non-resemblance to those in the Kleisthenic system in Athens, see M. PIÉRART, MH 40, 1983, 1–18.

⁴ I. Assos 8; the same text: IS 1039. J. and L. ROBERT, above, n. 1, 553f. (449f.). A. LAUMONIER (above, n. 2, 358) thought this decree was definitely later than 150 BC, though «certainement antérieur à Mithridate». A photograph of the squeeze is in I. Assos, Pl. IV.

⁵ IS 657.

onwards, through to the third century AD. There are no other ways (beyond name and patronymic) in which citizens are identified. That we should be thinking in terms of «demotics» for the abbreviations used, is the consensus among the majority of scholars.⁶ The use of the term *demot* to describe the collective membership of smaller units of population, including that of local *koina*, is well attested in the Stratonikeian region in the Hellenistic period.⁷ Although in itself the term *demot* is not a sufficient indicator of dependent status, or of the integration into the larger structure of a *polis*, the presence of *demarchoi* has generally been seen as showing precisely that kind of integration. That the three Karian *demarchoi* so far known all come from the Stratonikeian region cannot be accidental.⁸

These demotics, attached to name and patronymic, appear as the crucial indicator, within the city's territory, of full Stratonikeian citizenship. Five names dominate in the inscriptions, far outnumbering other territorially based designations of individuals, even though these five did not, as far as can be made out, constitute between them the total territory of Stratonikeia for much of the

⁶ So e.g. LAUMONIER, above, n. 2, 197–200; L. ROBERT, *Études Anatoliennes*, 1937, 563; DEBORD, above, n. 1, 107–120, espec. 112–116; GABRIELSEN, above, n. 2.

⁷ For the use of *demot* see e.g. IS 7 (mid second century BC?), l. 8, where several *demoi* are being persuaded to join the ranks of those who sacrifice (συνθῆναι) to Zeus Karios at Panamara. The term *koinon* is common in this part of Karia in the Hellenistic period as a name for a community, or a group of communities, which are politically organized into a *demot*, with an *ekklēsia* (though without a *boule*), a number of officials and a decisionmaking process closely resembling that of the *polis* (issuing decrees, conferring honours, including *politeia*), and which might be organized around a central sanctuary, though the latter was certainly not always the case. FOUCART's description of a *koinon* as a «communeauté des démotés» (BCH 14, 1890, 375) conveys the sense. An example of a single-settlement *koinon* is that of the [Koliorg?]eis, located at Kürbet Köy (in Stratonikeian territory), who are referred to in the fourth-century Sekköy inscriptions mentioned below, n. 10, as a *polis*, but refer to themselves as a *koinon* in IS 801, dated to the early second century BC. Discussions of *koina*: H. FRANCOU, *L'organisation des cités à Rhodes et en Carie*, 1906, 1–11; 20; H. OPPERMANN, *Zeus Panamaros*, 1924, 4–6; 13–17; GABRIELSEN, above, n. 2; there are many examples of *koina* in I. Rhod. Peraia.

⁸ On Stratonikeian *demarchoi* see most recently and convincingly WÖRRLE, above, n. 3, 145f., disagreeing with OPPERMANN's view that in Karia the *demarchos* was in fact the highest official of an autonomous *koinon* (above, n. 7, 23f.). The three *demarchoi* occur in a decree of the *koinon* of the [Koliorg?]eis (IS 801: second cent. BC; see also prev. note); in a decree of the Panamareis (IS 6: 197–166 BC) honouring a Rhodian; in a decree of a *koinon* (IS 8) assumed to be that of the Londargeis, but more probably that of the Londeis, whose main settlement, also known as Lōndokome, was situated just south of Panamara, at Çiftlik. The inscription is dated by its Rhodian eponym to between 197 and 167 BC. On this community (though without discussing the implication of its existence for IS 8) see E. VARINLIOĞLU, in: *Provisional Papers of the XIth Epigraphical Congress, Rome, 1997*, 301. I discuss this inscription more fully in a forthcoming article in YGIS 31.

city's existence.⁹ Three of the five names: Koranza, Koliorga and Hierakome belong to communities that had been *poleis* in the fourth century BC; the former status of the other two – Kôraia and Lobolda – is not known.¹⁰ All five occur in fairly equal measure in the lists of priests and priestly dedications from Lagina, in priestly dedications from Panamara, and in the (much less numerous) public decrees and other inscriptions from the city itself, first unabridged, then, from the late first century BC onwards, in abbreviated form as follows: KZ for Koranza, KO for Koliorga, KΩ for Kôraia, IE for Hierakome, and AO for Lobolda.¹¹

⁹ See the map in DEBORD, above, n. 1, 121, showing the hypothetical location of the five main demes, and a table showing the conjectural list of <demes> earlier drawn up by ŞAHİN and LAUMONIER (corrected by DEBORD). For a general discussion cf. 112–116, with all further references. For a calculation of the number of occurrences of demotics among priests (as worked out by ŞAHİN) see *ibidem*, 113. Of the five main demes, Lobolda is the least well attested (28 times, against, e.g. Koranza's 81, though both need updating in the light of recently published inscriptions). Certainly from the first century BC onward, if not earlier, Stratonikeia's territory must however have occupied a much larger area than that covered by the five main demes as shown on DEBORD's map, stretching in particular further to the south and south-east. The allocation, however temporarily, of Keramos to Stratonikeia, granted in the *senatus consultum* of 81 BC (IS 505) suggests that some of the territory in between the two cities may already have belonged to S. The various *koïna* located directly to the south and south-east of the city (and south of Panamara), such as those of the Lôndeis (above, n. 8), the Pisyetai, and the Tarmianoï, seem obvious candidates for take-over by Stratonikeia. On all these *koïna* see VARINGLIOĞLU, above, n. 8, 297–307.

¹⁰ Koranzeis, Hierokomitai and Koliorgeis feature as *poleis* in a fourth-century inscription from Sekköy published by W. BLÜMEL, *EpAnat* 16, 1990, 32–42, no. 2 (allocated no. 12 in I. Mylasi; cf. SEG 40, 992). See now also P. DEBORD, *L'Asie Mineure au IVE siècle (412–323 a. C.)*, 1999, 179–181. Koranza is attested specifically as a *polis* in IS 503, l. 9, dated to 318 BC. At that time it possessed two eponymous *archontes*, an *ekklesia* and *hierokerukes*. IS 549, dated on letterforms to the late third or early second cent. BC, is a decree of the Korazeis, dated by its own *archon*, and meeting in *ekklesia kyria*. It shows, to my mind unambiguously, that Koraza was still, at that time, autonomous. All three communities, if identified correctly within the city's territory, are situated close to the city's later political and administrative centre. The other two communities, Koraia and Lobolda, are only very tentatively placed on DEBORD's map. The maps in R. T. MARCHESE, *The Lower Maeander Flood Plain. A regional settlement study*, 1986, are misleading.

¹¹ The bulk of the inscriptions of Stratonikeia (including several of the city's public decrees) comes from these two major sanctuaries. Despite the fact that, until very recently, neither site had been excavated, they have together produced about three times as many texts as has the civic centre itself, though the latter has been the subject of excavations for several decades. The earliest priest-lists from Lagina (IS 601–620, inscribed on the temple), all but one of which show names with demotics, were dated by LAUMONIER to the late second and early first centuries BC (BCH 62, 1938, 251 f.): the lists dated with certainty by L. to before 41 BC contain the names of 63 priests, but given the uncertainty about these fragments' position on the temple wall, and the amount of text lost, it is not impossible that the priests go back earlier. Of all the

Only one further territorially derived abbreviation is attested: ΠΑ for Panamara, though it occurs extremely rarely – once only in abbreviated form; twice unabbreviated in the form <Panamareus> – and not at all among those who held the priesthood of Zeus at Panamara,¹² even though, in the late third and early second centuries BC, this cult was administered by a *koimon*: that of the Panamareis. At that time at least, the Panamareis appear to have been an actual community, presumably based near the sanctuary, and politically organized into a membership which referred to itself as *demoi*, and which was capable of conferring *politeia*, proxeny, and various other privileges, on those it honoured.¹³ The nature and timing of the integration of this *koimon*, and especially the virtual absence of Panamareis from Stratonikeia's records, is among the more problematic aspects of the history of this region. Other territorially based designations, such as Λωνδαργεύς or Ὠνδρεύς, occur, but very rarely (twice and one respectively), and never in abbreviated form. Later additions to the city's territory, such as the Themi-seis, allocated to Stratonikeia in the *senatus consultum* of 81 BC, or the Tarmianoi, barely show up among the citizen-names recorded in the inscriptions.¹⁴

extant fragments, there is only one (IS 601), placed first in L.'s chronological ranking, in which priests appear without demotics. This may well be significant, but whether the different usage indicates a change in civic organization or only in recording style is not clear. In IS 504, which in all likelihood dates to the 190s BC, the priest of Hekate, reappointed by the *boulentai* (of Stratonikeia?), to the priesthood of Helios and Rhodes, is not identified by a demotic. At Panamara, the first priestly dedication with a demotic is IS 102 (<to Zeus and Hera and the *demoi*>), which is dated, not very helpfully, by LAUMONIER, to <avant l'Empire> (BCH 61, 1937, 237f.). The earliest occurrence of a demotic in a public decree is in IS 507 (soon after 81 BC); then in IS 510 which is dated to 39 or 38 BC. Two further decrees, IS 1038 and EpAnat 29, 1997, 95f., no. 13, both of which feature demotics for public officials, are dated by their editor, M. Ç. ŞAHİN, as <first century BC>.

¹² The abbreviation ΠΑ occurs in IS 227, l. 12 (from Panamara, late second cent. AD), as the demotic of the priest's wife. In IS 615, a priest-list from Lagina (first cent. BC?) the priest is Διοκλῆς Καλλίου Κολιοργεύς καθ' ὄψθεσίαν δὲ Φανίου Παναμαρῆς; in IS 846, from Kafaca/Akçehisar (where there are said to be the ruins of a temple), the priest is Δαμόνιος Ἡρώδου ΠΑ(ναμαρῆς); the priestess has the demotic ΚΟ(λιοργίς). This text has been dated to the later Imperial period because of the occurrence of a *συνμύστης* (the couple's son) by LAUMONIER, above, n. 1, 212.

¹³ IS 3 is a decree of the Panamareis in honour of Philip V, dated to 201 BC; IS 4 a decree in honour of an ἐπιστάτης of Philip V, dated to 198 BC; IS 5, 6, and 9 are decrees in honour of Rhodians, dated to between 197 and 166 BC; 7 is a decree in honour of the Stratonikeian Leon, in which Leon is granted *politeia* in return for his benefactions during the year of his priesthood at Panamara. Two further decrees for the same man (issued by other Karian communities) have recently been published by ŞAHİN, EpAnat 25, 1995, 83–86, with Pl. XVIII (SEG 45, 1556 and 1557). On *koimoi* see above, n. 7.

¹⁴ The two Londargeis and the Ondreus feature among the first-century AD priests at Lagina (IS 614, 627, 642). From IS 502 we know that Ondra was probably one of the constituent communities of the former *polis* of Koranza and thus presumably still

Even if many problems about the nature of the integration of various communities into the larger structure of the *polis* of Stratonikeia remain unsolved, it is hard to deny the fundamental and continued importance of the territorially based units within the latter's overall structure. In an inscription from the Severan period, two priests of Hekate boast of having provided meals for the entire *polis* and of having given a distribution of two denarii to each citizen in the theatre, having called up each *demos* according to the official lists: καὶ ἔδωκαν διανομῆς ἐκάστῳ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀνὰ δηνάρια δύο ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἕκαστον δῆμον ἐκ τῶν δέλτων καλέσαντες (IS 701, ll. 6–8). This is an activity which in many other cities took place κατὰ φυλάς.¹⁵ The existence of an official roll of citizens organized by locality suggests that within the *polis* of Stratonikeia the *demoi* rather than the *phylai* functioned as the most important subdivisions of its citizen-body.¹⁶

Unlike the *demoi*, Stratonikeia's *phylai* have, moreover, proved extremely elusive. The name of only one has been attested so far. In a decree, fairly securely dated to between 39 and 29 BC, of which I give here first the text as printed at IS 510, the *demos* of Stratonikeia dedicates a thank offering to Hekate Sôteira, the deity whose sanctuary stood at Lagina, 'having recovered the sacred land of Hekate which is in Alóssōs and in the *phyle* of Korollos' (ll. 1–5: Ὁ δῆμος Ἐκάτη Σωτείραι χαριστήριον ἀνακομισάμενος τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἐκάτης τὴν οὔσαν ἐν τε Ἀλωσσῶι καὶ Κορόλλου φυλῆι . . .).¹⁷ It has been considered some-

part of it after the latter's integration into the city of Stratonikeia. The use of the designation Ondreus can be explained from the fact that both Ondra and Lagina were situated within Koranza (see below, n. 20). A single Themeseus (IS 126, 654) features among the priests at Lagina and Panamara: Themissos was given to Stratonikeia in the *senatus consultum* of 81 BC (IS 505) together with Keramos and another, unknown, community. The two Tarmianoi who appear among the Lagina priests (IS 609, 613) in 35/34 BC, show, according to DEBORD (above, n. 1,114), that the *koionon* of the Tarmianoi had become one of Stratonikeia's demes at the latest after the campaign of Labienus. There are, however, no further references to Tarmianoi in later Stratonikeian inscriptions.

¹⁵ See the many examples in JONES, above, n. 3, and F. PIEJKO, APF 37, 1991, 39–41.

¹⁶ That the demotic had not, in the course of time, become an empty appendix to a person's name, no longer directly connected to the actual residence, is suggested by the fact that the great benefactor of the Severan period, M. Sempronius Clemens, who had been priest both at Panamara and Lagina, donated *agalмата* to be placed in both those sanctuaries, but also in that ἐν Κολιόργοις (IS 289, ll. 5–6), a sanctuary not otherwise very prominent in the epigraphic record. But Koliorga happened to be M. Sempronius Clemens' own deme (LAUMONIER, BCH 61, 1937, 287, at no. 131).

¹⁷ IS 510. The name of Artemidoros, son of Artemidoros, one of the *prytaneis* in this text (ll. 6–7), also occurs in the *senatus consultum* of 39 or 38 BC (IS 11, ll. 1–2); that of the priest, Polemon, son of Chrysaor (ll. 16–17) also in one of Lagina's priest-lists as priest in 30/29 BC (IS 609, l. 18). ŞAHİN's title for this inscription at IS 510: 'der Demos weiht der Hekate Soteira ein Tempelgut' is misleading.

thing of a problem that the only *phyle* so far known to us has a non-Greek name.¹⁸ J. and L. ROBERT, whose interpretation of Stratonikeia's *phyle*-system emphasised above all its Greekness, did not, as far as I know, comment on the indigenous name of this particular one. Not many have tried to explain it. P. DEBORD argued, not implausibly, that we should not be surprised to see Karian names for the city's *phylai*, because «pour l'essentiel, la cité de Stratonicee résulte de la fusion de plusieurs communautés kariennes et ... l'apport macédonien, ou gréco-macédonien, a dû être relativement mince».¹⁹ It is, however, not only the indigenous name, but just as much the fact that this *phyle*'s name is used to indicate a locality, which needs closer investigating. We know that the sanctuary at Lagina had previously been located within the *polis* of Koranza,²⁰ which by this time had become one of Stratonikeia's *demoi*. The land referred to as «of Hekate», which the Stratonikeian demos is said to have recovered, is very likely to have been within the larger unit of which Lagina

¹⁸ The name has «embarrassé nombre de commentateurs» according to DEBORD, above, n. 1, 116; cf. also 117. JONES, above, n. 3, 296, simply accepted that «in Karia, Plataseis and Stratonikeia substitute the names of contemporary *privati* (for their *phylai*; on the alleged Pladaseian *phyle* see below, n. 24); cf. also 335f.; so also J. CRAMPA, I. Labraunda III.2, p. 45.

¹⁹ As DEBORD points out (above, n. 1, 117), there are few traces of Macedonian names in the city's inscriptions, so that it is to be doubted whether there was ever a large presence of non-Karian colonists in the city. That, however, does not in itself say anything about the level of «Greekness» of the city's institutions. The scarcity of Hellenistic inscriptions from the urban centre itself does not allow us to say much with certainty anyway. How significant is it, for instance, that among the relatively few Hellenistic decrees, the names of two major players, that of the ambassador sent to deliver Stratonikeia's honours to Assos (Πυθίων Ἐνπεδίωτος, above, n. 4) and that of the clearly important Λέων Χρυσάορος τοῦ Ζοιλίου τοῦ Πολυπέροχτος (above, n. 13), are, respectively, Thessalian and Macedonian-derived? The rare name Ἐνπεδίωτ (or its variants Ἐνπεδῶν, Ἐνπεδιῶν) is relatively frequent at Larissa (e.g. SEG 26, 672; 29, 529; 31, 579; 35, 627); for the Macedonian background of the latter see DEBORD, above, n. 1, 115.

²⁰ All references in DEBORD, above, n. 1, 110. The inference is based on the fact that several inscriptions mentioning the Koranzeis were found in the Lagina area, and, above all, on IS 502, in which men from five different localities are designated to supervise the inscribing of a *dogma* of the Koranzeis concerning the gift of a piece of land to Apollo and Artemis. Among these are men from Lagina. Whether, as ŞAHİN argued, and DEBORD accepts, this means that Lagina was one of Koranza's demes, is not clear from the inscription. ŞAHİN, Anadolu 17, 1973, 187–194, argues that of the five localities mentioned, only Lagina, Angora and Ondra were demes, since theirs are the only adjectivally formed designations, the other two are formed with *ek* or *ex*. DEBORD disagrees (above, n. 1, 112). In inscriptions of the Imperial period the site of Lagina is referred to as a *peripolion* (IS index, s.v.). On *peripolia* see CHR. SCHULER, Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien, 1998, 45–49, and on *peripolia* in Lykia, M. WÖRRLE, Chiron 29, 1999, 353–365. The term is also linked to Panamara by PH. GAUTHIER, REG 107, 1994, 340, n. 80, but Panamara is never thus referred to.

was itself a part. We should therefore be looking for a local, rather than a central, context for the *phyle* known as «of Korollos».

There is, in fact, good evidence to support the association of this *phyle* with Koranza. First, a closer reading of the photograph of the squeeze provided in IS (Pl. IV: ll. 4–17) shows clearly a *beta*, not a *rho*, after KO in l. 4, and the triangular letter following KOBOLA (not really visible on the photograph, but drawn as a *lambda* in NEWTON's rendering of the majuscule text),²¹ could just as well be a *delta*. So, instead of the *Korollou phyle* we can now read *Koboldou phyle*, a name suddenly familiar, since it occurs, in a slightly different form, in an inscription from Labraunda. In I.Labraunda III.2, no. 42, l. 7, mention is made, in connection with the territory of Koranza, of the Κοβολδῶου φυλή. Here, too, the *phyle* appears to have a territorial connotation. In this inscription, Eupolemos, the Macedonian *strategos* (active in Karia in the late fourth century BC),²² is said to have «had his camp in the territory of Koranza», when giving a judgment, or decision, to the Pladaseis concerning the *ateleia* of a Koan citizen.²³

The first two legible lines of this text were read by its editor, J. CRAMPA, as: [ἔδ]ωκεν Εὐπόλεμος στρατοπεδεύων ἐν Κωράνζοις, [στρατη]γὸς ἐγ Κοβολδῶου φυλῆι. CRAMPA translated the second part of this sentence as «in the presence of the Koboldou phyle» which was rightly rejected by L. ROBERT, who, admitting that he was at a loss to make sense of this line, or its relation to the rest of the text, suggested joining Ἐγ and κοβολδῶου to make one word, and perhaps reading ἔγραψεν either instead of [ἔδ]ωκεν or of the [στρατη]γὸς proposed by CRAMPA, thus making the *Enkoboldou phyle* the recipient of a letter from Eupolemos.²⁴ CRAMPA's own restoration, however, exceeded the number of letters he estimated for the space after Κωράνζοις (c. 5) as was pointed out by F. PIEJKO. PIEJKO, after re-examining the stone, confirmed CRAMPA's reading of a *sigma* as the final letter before ἐγ and he restored [πάροι]χος in the gap, because «one expects here an indication of Eupolemos' civic and/or residential status».²⁵ The final *sigma* read by PIEJKO, as well as the word's position in the

²¹ CH. NEWTON, *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Branchidae*, vol. II, 1863, 739ff. no. 98. I owe the reading of the crucial *beta* to H. MÜLLER, whose acuteness allowed me considerably to simplify my argument about this *phyle*'s belonging to Koranza.

²² On Eupolemos see R. BILLOWS, *CA* 8.2, 1989, 173–206. Cf. also J. KOBES, *Kleine Könige*, 1996, 126ff. and R. DESCAT, *REA* 100, 1998, 167–190 (with *BE* 1999, 152).

²³ This Koan, Diokles, had presented proof of a grant of *ateleia* conferred upon his father (and his descendants) by the *koinon* of the Pladaseis.

²⁴ *BE* 1973, 408. This interpretation is followed by E. VARINLIOĞLU et al., *REA* 92, 1990, 68: «da Κοβολδῶου (?) φυλή de la ligne 3 pourrait être l'interlocuteur d'Eupolemos; il s'agirait alors d'une tribu de Platasa. La raison la plus logique serait que le Coéen avait été placé dans cette tribu (ligne 18)».

²⁵ F. PIEJKO, *OAth* 18, 1990, 141 f.; *SEG* 40, 979.

sentence, make it likely that the missing word should refer to Eupolemos, but to expect an indication of the civic status of a grandee like Eupolemos, who had, moreover, only pitched his camp in the area, might be stretching civic formalities too far. Some further specification of ‘having his camp in the Koranza region’ would be more plausible.²⁶

It seems unavoidable to see in the *Koboldou phyle* of IS 510 a direct continuation of the *Koboldōou phyle* in which Eupolemos was encamped; in other words, a specific locality, originally within the autonomous *polis*, then the Stratonikeian *demos*, of Koranza. Several problems emerge from this. First, the fact that a *phyle* is referred to – twice, unambiguously – as a locality, is highly unusual, and is not in the least solved by assuming that the land thus designated simply ‘belonged to’ this particular *phyle*, as was suggested by P. DEBORD.²⁷ Secondly, the naming of a *phyle* using an individual’s name in the genitive: ‘the *phyle* of Koboldōos/Koboldos’ is not at all common, although it is not entirely unparalleled in a Karian context. CRAMPA, in his commentary on the Eupolemos text, drew attention to a late-third-century BC inscription from Labraunda, in which the priest Korris confers upon the honorand membership of a *phyle*, whose name is identically constituted to that of the Koranzan *phyle*: εἶναι δ’ αὐτὸν φυλῆς [Ἰβα]νωλλιος μετέχοντα ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πάντων.²⁸ This genitive form, which is more commonly encountered among the names of Karian *syngeneiai*, such as those of Mylasa and its constituent communities (Labraunda, Olymos, Sinuri), is of course an indicator par excellence of a social, not a territorially-based, organizational structure, and we should presumably see it as a fundamental characteristic of the *phyle* of Koboldos, too.²⁹ The uniqueness of the *Koboldou phyle* lies therefore not so much in the unusual nature of its name

²⁶ One could perhaps think of [γενόμε]νος.

²⁷ DEBORD, above, n. 1, 116: ‘da tribu Korollou, qui, comme il arrive souvent ailleurs, est propriétaire de terrains sacrés’. JONES (above, n. 3, 203f.) points out a similar territorial designation with reference to a *phyle* on Tenos (IG XII 5.2, 872, l. 68: ἐν Ἡρακλειδῶν).

²⁸ I. Labraunda III.1, no. 11, ll. 10–11. On the name Ἰβανωλλίς see W. BLÜMEL, EpAnat 20, 1992, 14. In this text, too, the nature of the *phyle* to which the honorand is allocated, and its place within the larger, Mylasan, context, is unclear. BRESSON and DEBORD, REA 87, 1985, 205, n. 54, assume that it formed a subunit of the larger Karian structure of the Chrysaoric league; CRAMPA saw in it a local, Labraundan, unit which had persisted despite Labraunda’s integration into the *polis* of Mylasa and the allocation of its people to the latter’s three *phylai*: I. Labraunda III.1, at no. 11, p. 25. Its position was, therefore, in certain respects, similar to that of the *Koboldou phyle* within Stratonikeia.

²⁹ L. ROBERT, above, n. 3, 26, no. 1: the συγγένεια τοῦ Τελεσείου; no. 73, l. 1: [ἔδοξεν] Πελεκωδος συγγενεῦσιν, both at Sinuri; cf. BRESSON – DEBORD, above, n. 28, 203–210, on Karian *syngeneiai*. JONES, above, n. 3, 369–371, points out similarly formed *phyle* names in Termessos and Kibyra.

as in its use as a toponym. Thirdly, there is the more general problem of the significance of the *phyle's* continued existence within the new city of Stratonikeia. Whether the *Koboldou phyle* had retained its former status and name within Koranza even after the latter's integration within the larger organization of Stratonikeia cannot be ascertained from the text but has to be considered a distinct possibility.³⁰

Given that the only *phyle* known within the larger structure of the *polis* of Stratonikeia has proved to be a subdivision of one of the latter's constituent *demoi*, we are left wondering how to interpret the reference in the Assos decree to the allocation of the honorand (to a *phyle* and a *deme*). In the light of what has been said so far, it would take a great deal of special pleading to have to conceive of the city's population as divided into *phylai* and demes on the Athenian model with a relatively large number of demes functioning as local subdivisions of a unknown number of *phylai*. Even the Milesian parallel suggested by the ROBERTS, though superficially closer, does not, in the end, look particularly apposite. At Miletus, five, or possibly more, main demotics cut across twelve *phylai*, although precisely how is not clear.³¹ The apparent similarity between the two systems lies, however, mainly in the small number of demes and their relatively large size.³² At Miletus, the role of the *phylai* as the prime organizational device of the citizen-body is well attested and most of its *phylai* are known by name.³³ In Stratonikeia, on the other hand, the role of the *phylai* is totally obscure and can neither be inferred from what we know about the way civic bodies and magistracies were constituted, nor from inscriptions documenting distributions to the citizen body or other civic rituals that might show up internal divisions, as they do in most other cities. In fact, as we saw earlier, in the only text that does show up such divisions, the citizenbody is organized according to demes, not *phylai*.

Partly in response to this problem, M. Ç. ŞAHİN has argued that the five main abbreviations (KZ, KO, KΩ, IE, and ΛO) in reality referred to Stratonikeia's *phylai*, and that these were themselves subdivided into demes (on the Athenian model), just as the original *koima* and *poleis* had themselves previously been divided into demes.³⁴ Thus, for example, Lagina, which despite being the site

³⁰ That the name was only retained because it had of old been the location of sacred territory, i.e. as a conscious archaism, cannot, however, be absolutely excluded.

³¹ M. PIÉRART has pointed out the difference between the Milesian and Athenian systems, above, n. 3. See also JONES, above, n. 3, 320–327, where the possibility of a sixth and seventh Milesian deme is discussed.

³² JONES, above, n. 3, 323f., on the location of the Milesian demes; n. 5 above on those of Stratonikeia.

³³ See JONES, above, n. 3, 320–327.

³⁴ ŞAHİN, above, n. 1, 37–41. SCHULER, above, n. 20, 209, refers to Koranza as a *phyle* of Stratonikeia, but does not explain his choice of words.

of one of the region's two sanctuaries, never occurs as an indicator of citizen-status ($\Lambda\alpha\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ or $\Lambda\Lambda$) within the larger Stratonikeian territory, had at one time been one of the constituent demes of the *polis* of Koranza, and continued to be one after Stratonikeia's foundation, and the absorption of Koranza into the new city.³⁵ Lagina and many other, similar, smaller *demoi*, thus largely disappeared from the epigraphic record, because as smaller sub-units they were not used to identify someone as a citizen on a central *polis* level.

Perhaps because other elements in his attempted reconstruction of the political and religious structure of the Stratonikeian region have been considered too speculative, ŞAHİN's interpretation has not convinced many.³⁶ Moreover, his version was only able to accommodate the *Koboldou phyle* by postulating a much larger total number of *phylai* – he proposed twenty – than is warranted by the frequency of occurrence of their abbreviations.³⁷ If, as I have argued, this particular *phyle* was a continuing local subdivision, then, on ŞAHİN's interpretation, we would presumably need to think in terms of two different layers of *phylai*: central and local ones, rather on the Rhodian model, where, after the synoikism, each of the three – territorially-based – main *phylai* of Ialysia, Kameiris and Lindia themselves retained their own subdivisions, among which were both demes and *phylai*.³⁸ But even though the possibility of Rhodian influence on Karian cities within the island's so-called Peraia is not to be dismissed lightly, and the *synoikismos* of the island's previously autonomous *poleis* provides a model of sorts, the cumulative evidence in favour of *demoi* in the Stratonikeian case is too great to ignore.

If the *phylai* remain invisible as a central organizational principle, the distribution of Stratonikeian demotics among priests and office-holders does not, at first sight, reveal the principles of an organizational or electoral system either: there is no evidence that the priests at Lagina or Panamara were elected from a number of candidates put forward by the demes (as happened in the case of the prophets at Miletus/Didyma), nor is there conclusive evidence that collegiate offices were in any way filled on the basis of rotation among demes, or of

³⁵ For Lagina and other possible sub-units of Koranza, see above, n. 20.

³⁶ See e.g. DEBORD's discussion of his reconstruction of the Chrysaoric League, above, n. 1, 108f.; 112f.

³⁷ ŞAHİN, above, n. 1, 42–44. Almost all of this is highly speculative. For his argument about the size of the *boule* (and therefore the number of *phylai*) see now the correction implicit in IS 172. The aim of an – artificial – division into *phylai* was precisely to achieve an even spread of citizens. To find that five among twenty vastly outnumber the others in the surviving evidence then becomes a real problem. The problem does not, of course, apply in the case of *demoi* whose size could vary greatly, as could their distance to the political centre.

³⁸ For the Rhodian *phylai* see JONES, above, n. 3, 243–252, and, for a more general discussion, *ibidem*, 4–6.

proportional representation.³⁹ ŞAHİN's attempt to show that all five *prytaneis* in the *Koboldou phyle* text discussed above had the same demotic/*phyle* designation (KO) is contradicted by his revised version of the text (IS 510), where it is clear that one of the five names is followed by the abbreviation ΚΩ, not KO, and another by KZ.⁴⁰ There are, however, simply too few texts overall to allow any conclusion to be drawn: apart from IS 510, there are no inscriptions in which the names and demotics of individual *prytaneis* are listed. The city's other two attested collegiate offices – *strategoï* and *tamiai* – are equally poorly documented and do not show up an organizational principle either.⁴¹ These texts may very well contain some kind of proportional allocation based on the size of the respective demes, but the principle escapes us.

On a more general level, too, it is certainly possible that we are badly misled by a body of evidence that is genuinely defective in what it tells us of political, as against religious, office holding, so that the role of Stratonikeia's *phylai* simply escapes our view. For the moment, however, all the evidence we do have suggests that the proper Greek terminology used in the Assos decree may have covered a rather different political reality than the one it suggested to the ROBERTS, namely one in which local *phylai* functioned as sub-units of the larger, territorial, units that were the *demoi*. According to this reality, the judge in the Assos decree could well have been allocated to, for instance, the *phyle* of Koboldos and the *demos* of Koranza.

In a Karian context, where Greek political terminology (*phyle*, *demos*, *syngeneia*, and even the word *polis* itself) had long been used to describe existing indigenous organizational structures and Greek political procedures had profoundly influenced and shaped those of local communities, already in the fourth century BC, the categorisation into structurally 'Karian' or structurally 'Greek' loses much of its meaning. If, in the case of Stratonikeia, the use of *demoi* and of demotics resembles the Athenian, or Milesian, situation, or suggests Macedonian-imposed structures, the continued existence of the *Koboldou phyle*, and the way its name is constituted, remind us of other, Karian organizational forms, encountered in formerly autonomous communities such as Sinuri, or Labraunda, which had been integrated into larger *polis* structures, such as Mylasa.

³⁹ That the priest at Panamara was appointed by the Stratonikeians already in the Hellenistic period is shown in EpAnat 25, 1995, 82–86, no. 1, ll. 29–31: καὶ ἐπαινέσαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ καλὸν [χ]άραθρον ἄνδρα καθεστακέναι ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ ἱερῷ. On the Milesian system see PIÉRART, above, n. 3, 10–11; J. FONTENROSE, Didyma, Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions, 1988, 46–48.

⁴⁰ Original version: ŞAHİN, above, n. 2, 39–41. There are further only the [οἰ περὶ Ἀπολλόδ]στον Χρυσάορος ΚΩ(ραιέα) πρυτάνει[ς] in IS 1038 (first cent. BC).

⁴¹ Named *strategoï* (either three or two κατὰ πόλιν, one ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας): all first century AD or after, though most are undated by the ed. pr.: IS 1006, 1317, 1318; named *tamiai* (three): EpAnat 27, 1997, 95f., no. 13 (first cent. BC).

It is becoming increasingly clear that the communities that became the *demoi* of the *polis* of Stratonikeia had their own Graeco-Karian pre-history, a political organization, and a place within larger Karian political structures, well before the city was founded.⁴² The synoikized nature of the new city, the relative equality in size and status of the constituent communities, the – presumed – weakness of the Macedonian settlement, and the obvious fact that much of Stratonikeia's population must have continued to live in the territory,⁴³ all strongly favour the image of a dispersed city, in which territorial residence (or origin) much more prominently defined the identity of individual citizens than an artificially imposed social organization. The continuation of local subdivisions like the *Koboldou phyle* (even if we have no way of knowing whether there were others like it, though very likely there were) only strengthens this picture.⁴⁴ Rather than seeing Stratonikeia as predominantly a Graeco-Macedonian creation among indigenous Karian communities, we might do better to see it predominantly as a *polis* whose nature, organization and appearance were the result of a complex blend of local geography and pre-existing political structures.

University College, London
 Department of History
 Gower Street
 GB-London WC1E6BT

⁴² See especially DEBORD, above, n. 10, 178–181.

⁴³ The monumental centre, at Eskihisar, however magnificent and wealthy in aspect, is nevertheless far too small within its walls ever to have served as a major residential centre: it has to be seen rather as an administrative, economic, and ritual centre for what must have been a large region. On the map provided in DEBORD (above, n. 1) the area within the walls occupies roughly one third of the area there allocated to the deme of Hierakome.

⁴⁴ In a recently published Hellenistic inscription from Lagina (EpAnat 31, 1999, 35f.), a group, referring to itself as οἱ ἐνεκτημένοι καὶ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Κοραζίδα honours a woman with the demotic Loboldis. Its editor, M. Ç. ŞAHİN, suggests they were those who had the right of γῆς καὶ οἰκίας ἐγκτήσις in Koranza, referring to the definition in LIDDEL-SCOTT s.v. ἐγκτάομαι: 'citizens who possess property in a deme not their own, opp. δημόται'. It is entirely possible that the woman honoured was herself among the group of those who owned land specifically in the territory of the *demos* of Koranza, and who were themselves members of Stratonikeia's other *demoi*. This case, if correctly interpreted, shows again the extent to which the constituent *demoi* of Stratonikeia retained not only their own identity but may also have retained their own territories. The granting of *politeia*, by the *koinon* of the Panamareis, to Leon, a Stratonikeian, (IS 7, with further refs. above, n. 13) has often been seen as incompatible with the Panamareis' dependent status within the *polis* of Stratonikeia at that time (mid-second century BC?) but it, too, may well have included, among other things, the right to own land ἐν Παναμάροις.

