A HELLENISTIC STRATÉGOI DEDICATION FROM STRATONIKEIA IN KARIA
AND THE DEFENCE OF THE CITY

I.Stratonikeia 1505 (SEG 58, 1289)

The following fragment of an inscription from Stratonikeia in Karia was published by M. Ç. Şahin, first in EA 41 (2008) 54–55, as no. 2 (photo) and subsequently in the third volume of his The Inscriptions of Stratonikeia III (IK 68, 2010), as no. 1505.¹ The stone is now in the museum depot at Stratonikeia (non vidi). The inscription is described as follows by Şahin: ‘Hellenistic fragment brought to us by a villager. According to the forms of letters, the inscription dates from the middle of the 3rd century BC. The marble fragment is too thick to originate from a stele. Hence ... it probably originates from a wall of a temple, which may have been again the temple of Zeus Chrysaorios ... Height 15 cm, width 20 cm, thickness 20 cm, height of letters 0.8–1.3 cm. Left side is original.’

Fig. 1

The inscription (Fig. 1), whose top, right side and base are all broken off, appears to end with l. 7, with seemingly no traces of letters below most of that line, but underneath the first A of

---

¹ These two publications are identical, both the Greek text and the commentary. The photo is not reproduced in IK. Of the four IK volumes (21, 22.1, 22.2 and 68), the first three are entitled Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia; the final one The Inscriptions of Stratonikeia.
ἄγαλ[μα] the right part of the upper horizontal of an epsilon, sigma or gamma is visible, while underneath the Κ of καί there is a faint upper part of a round letter. As will be seen below, the block was probably about twice as wide as the surviving fragment (c. 40 cm) and it was very likely taller. I discuss its shape and location further below.2

Şahin restored the text as follows, admitting that ‘the subject matter of the inscription is not clear’:

[   ]ΤΗΝ[   ]ΑΙ[   ]
νην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πυροῦ και ὁμονο[ια-    ]
4  τε στρατήγιον [    ]
καὶ τὸν πύργον ε[    ]
ἐξωγράφησαν τ[   ]ἐν στήλαις λιθί-[    ]
ναις και τὸ ἄγαλ[μα ἀνέθηκαν]

In EBGR of 2008 [2011], no. 138, A. Chaniotis commented: ‘As we may infer from references to grain (line 3: πυροῦ), concord (line 3), the seat of the strategoi (line 4: στρατηγίου) and a tower (line 5), the dedicants are somehow connected with a military context: a board of strategoi or (less likely) a group of soldiers’.

This is the first Stratonikeian inscription to mention a stratēgion. If Şahin’s dating is correct (the letters are not very carefully inscribed, which makes precise dating difficult), then this is certainly an important text, for it would indicate both that such a building existed not long after the city’s foundation, in the 260s, and, by extension, that the city had a board of stratēgoi at this early date.3 For comparison: In Laodikeia on Lykos, probably, though not certainly, founded by Antiochos II in the 250s, a stratēgion was built at a date soon after the foundation through the care of three men, whose office or title has not been preserved.4

Chaniotis’ suggestion that the inscription possibly concerned a board of stratēgoi puts us on the right path. From a small number of later inscriptions we know something about the city’s stratēgoi. These texts show a board of eight men, four of whom served the winter and four the summer half year.5 Of the four, three served κατὰ πόλιν, one ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας.6 At the end of

2 The block’s belonging to the wall of the temple of Chrysaorian Zeus (which has not yet been identified) is an unlikely guess.

3 On the date of the city’s foundation, by the Seleukid king Antiochos I (less likely his son Antiochos II), see now my ‘Mylasa in 261 BC’, this volume 1–20, at 10–11. For a low date, now no longer plausible, see A. Meadows, Stratonikeia in Caria: the Hellenistic City and its Coinage, NC 162 (2002) 79–134, at 116–117.


5 The Stratonikeian stratēgoi were never the city’s main magistrates: the main civic officials, proposers of the (few) known decrees of the city, were the prytanēs.

6 As is clear from I.Stratonikeia 1317 and 1318. One further inscription, I.Stratonikeia 485, is a dedication to Panamaran Zeus of a ‘Perseus with a Gorgon’ and a lock of his daughter’s hair, by Sōsandros Hekataiou, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας στρατηγός, which, if Şahin (ad loc.) is correct in seeing in him the son of Hekataios Sōsandrou, priest in I.Stratonikeia 686, whose name is attested on coins of the time of Nero or Claudius (A. Meadows, Stratonikeia 112–113: ‘group 4C, of AD 41–68; cf. 132), would be of the 1st century AD. On letterforms, I would put it a century later (photo in L. Robert, OMS II, Pl. XX).
their six months in office they would set up a dedicatory inscription, often (perhaps always – the texts are incomplete) to Nemesis; sometimes in combination with other deities (Zeus of Panamara, Zeus Stratios, Hekate) recording that they had exercised the stratēgia ‘in harmony’, ὀμονοιήσαντες. The surviving dedications, which are of different dates (ranging from the first century BC to the second AD), all use a slightly different formula: some list names and titles while others do not, but they are recognizably of a kind. For none of these inscriptions is a find-spot recorded, even though three (I.Stratonikeia 1006a, 1318 and 1319) came to light during the excavations of the 1980s. Known to date are the following (the full texts are in the Appendix; all numbers refer to I.Stratonikeia):

1. 1005, of the imperial period, dated [ἐπὶ Ἀρτεμίδωρο τοῦ Ἀρτεμίδωρο]υ, and dedicated, ὀμονοιήσαντες, to Zeus, Hekate and Nemesis. The text is inscribed above and to the left of a relief of Zeus Panamaros on horseback flanked by two torches (Appendix, Fig. 15): 4 one of the horse’s front legs rests on the wheel of Nemesis to lower r.; it refers to a year in which a pentateu-teric festival was celebrated and to [mono- or therio- or tauro-]machia. The stratēgoi are those of the summer semester: θερινῆς στρατηγοί (ll. 3–4).

2. 1006, dated by an archiereus, contains the names of four stratēgoi who, having served the winter semester, τὴν χειμερινὴν, set up a dedication to Nemesis, ὀμονοιήσαντες. The letter forms suggest a date in the first century AD.

2a. 1006a is a fragment, starting with the word στρατηγοί, with parts of two names surviving, most likely a dedication like the others (photo I.Stratonikeia II.1, Pl. XIV, showing letters of the 2nd century AD).

3. 1317 (‘time of Domitian’, ed. pr. and SEG 38, 1097, but probably earlier; on the date see the Appendix) is dated ἐπὶ Διομήδου τοῦ Διομήδου τοῦ Ἱεροκλέος; the four stratēgoi, listed by function, name and demotic, dedicate the inscription ὀμονοιήσαντες Νεμέσει.

4. 1318, whose complete text is given below, is of direct relevance to our fragment.

5. 1319 is a fragment.

1318

Ed. E. Varinlioğlu, EA 12 (1988) 91, no. 18; I.Stratonikeia 1318 (SEG 38, 1098); not dated by ed. pr.; no photo. ‘Quadratische Stele aus weißem Marmor, die sich nach oben leicht verjüngt.’ H. 32 cm; w. 16.5–18 cm; d. 14 cm; letters 1.2 cm.

στρατηγοὶ οἱ ἄρξαντες τὴν χειμερινὴν τὴν ἐπὶ
4 στεφανηφόρου Ἀριστοκλάου Ἰάσων Νε-ωνος Λο(βολδέως) καθ’ υ(ἰοθεσίαν) Ἀριστέο[υ]

7 1005 and 1006 were found by G. Cousin in two different village houses: BCH 15 (1891) 423–425, nos 4 and 5 (these details are not repeated in I.Stratonikeia).

8 A detailed drawing survives in the 1893 Skizzenbuch of W. Reichel (II 52 and 52a) kept in the Institut für Kulturgeschichte der Antike (IKAnt), Arbeitsgruppe Epigraphik, in Vienna (with thanks to W. Blümel for alerting me to this drawing and for providing the photograph produced by the Arbeitsgruppe Epigraphik).
The stephanēphoros was identified by Şahin as Tib. Flavius Aristolaos (I.Stratonikeia 214–218, 1025, 1324; cf. stemma at no. 179) which would give a date in the early second century AD. Without a photograph or any certain prosopographic indications, however, this is only one possibility among several. The abbreviated demotics suggest a date not before the end of the second century BC.

Despite this uncertain date, the formulaic sections of 1318 suggest to me the following restoration of our 1505:

1. Although tempting, it is not possible to restore the first line of 1505 directly on the model of 1318, l. 1–2 (στρατηγοὶ οἱ ἀρξαντες). Şahin’s ΤΗΝ can be read as ΤΗΓ and his ΛΙ as ΑΡ (for ἀρξαντες). Traces of ΣΤΡΑ can be discerned at the beginning of the line. But there is not enough space to accommodate ΟΙΟΙ (for στρατηγοὶ οἱ) between ΤΗΓ and the presumed ΑΡ in l. 1. The only option I see, and which fits perfectly (see Fig. 2 for a photomontage with letters transposed from l. 6 of the same text) is to restore ΗΣ in the gap and to read the presumed Ρ (whose left upright alone is visible) as a Ν (with the left upright of the eta perhaps visible after the gamma, and the episilon after πυργον is clearly legible. 6 The upper left part of the tau’s horizontal is visible.

9 Ten separate individuals with the name are listed in LGPN V.B. An (early?) Hellenistic Aristolaos features in I.Stratonikeia 822: ‘jolies petites lettres de bonne époque’ (Cousin, BCH 18, 1894, 35, no. 3).

Another early Aristolaos in I.Stratonikeia 18, l. 3. For our 1318, LGPN V.B s.v. Stratonikeia (6) gives a date of ‘?ii–i bc’ which may be closer to the truth.
bottom right distinctive serif of the sigma visible before the alpha, so we get στρατηγήσαντες.

If this is followed (as in 1318) by an indication of the part of the year in which the stratēgoi held office, then -ΝΗΝ in l. 2 points either to [θερι]νήν or [χειμερι]νήν; it also gives an approximate line-length. The dating formula by stephanēphoros must follow as in 1318 (and others).

3. -πύρου does not allow for many possible names, and [Ζω]πύρου suggests itself.10 If right, then either [χειμερι]νήν, which would yield 24 letters in l. 1 (or [θερι]νήν – 21 letters) would fit with the 23 letters in l. 2. On the model of 1318 (and others) I restore ὁμονο- as the beginning of a verb, not a noun, so ὁμονο[ήσαντες] as in all other similar dedications.11

4. Here the epsilon is certain, and an initial tau was at least in part seen by ed. pr. Restoring τε means that there is a slight gap of 1–2 letters in the previous line before τό (which is required): despite a total of 22 letters, comparison with the position and spacing of the letters in the line above (l. 2) suggests that there would be space for 11, not 9, letters after the final (sliced-off) omicron. After τό | τε στρατήγιον καί is an option, in which case another structure will have been mentioned here: the stratēgion, and the [---], and the tower’. At nine letters, τόν πυλώνα, gateway,12 may just fit, but we could also think of τόν στοάν, or τόν πυλίδα, or τόν οἶκον (cf. the agalma in l. 7). Alternatively the location of the stratēgion is indicated here, e.g. τό | τε στρατήγιον [τό plus preposition] or finally, a verb: ἐπεσκεύασαν, or κατεσκεύασαν, or ὠικοδόμησαν,13 all depending on the context, which is not recoverable.

5. The verb that follows πύργον begins with an epsilon and is followed by a second verb, ἐζωγράφησαν. The stratēgoi may have repaired ἐ[πεσκεύασαν] the three structures, but here the word is too long and the specificity of ἐξωγράφησαν requires perhaps an equally specific (and

---

10 The (very common) name is not frequent in the city but occurs in western Karia (LGPN V.B s.v.) including in neighbouring Olympos (I,Mylasa 824, 835) and is attested in a list of priests from Lagina, probably of the 1st century BC: Ἑκαταῖος Ζωπύρου Ἱερ(οκωμήτης): I.Stratonikeia 611.

11 A dedication from Knidos offers a similarly abrupt, καί-linked sequence: [-ΝΗΝ-] | Λαθηναίου | τοῦ Λαθηναίου | τῶν ἱερ(οκλέους) | Στρατηγήσαντα | τὰν δευτέραν ἑξάμηνον | τὰν ἐπὶ δώματος [–c.4–] Ἀθηναίου | τῶν τῆς Αθηναίας | τῶν Πλάκας | τῶν ἱερ(οκωμήτης): I.Knidos 401 (1st century AD?), though the inscription is listed among the incerta: not certainly from Knidos.

12 As e.g. at Bargylia, I.Iasos 621 and 623 (Hellenistic).

13 For these verbs and their meaning see the index of Maier, Mauerbauschriften and M.-Chr. Hellmann, Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l’architecture grecque, d’après les inscriptions de Délos (1992) s.v.
a slightly shorter) companion verb: ἔχρισαν, ‘plastered’ or ‘rendered’, often used in combination with ζωγραφεῖν, results in 22 letters. We could think instead of ἐστέγασαν (‘covered over’, ‘roofed’) or ἐκόσμησαν.

In l. 6–7, I have restored ταῖς ἰδίαις δαπά|ναις rather than Şahin’s ἐν στήλαις λιθί|ναις, which is surely wrong here. However, one might ask, first, whether expressions like ταῖς ἰδίαις δαπά|ναις or ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων are suited for a collective, and secondly, the expression appears to be more common in the Roman imperial period than in the three centuries BC. It also gives a total of 25 letters (though there are five iotas). Alternatives are not easy to find however: [μαρμαρί]ναις would need an accompanying noun, but no obvious one comes to mind.

Intriguing is the ἄγαλμα in l. 7, which may have been dedicated, or put back in its original position, or repaired. It is pointless to speculate about the identity of the deity whose cult statue is referred to.

The names of the stratēgoi, which in 1318 come after the dating formula, are lacking in our text. Since στρατηγήσαντες cannot stand without a subject, one or more lines must be lost at the top. We could restore e.g. στρατηγοὶ οἱ, which would be quite short, but the words may have been centered, or στρατηγοὶ οἱ μετὰ ΝΝ. The most plausible option however is to follow the format of a late fourth-century (the earliest known) Rhodian stratēgoi dedication which starts with the names of the six stratēgoi (including one ἐπὶ τὰν χώραν) followed by στρατηγή̣σαντες and a dedicatory formula. A similar format is known from Erythrai.

---

14 On the combination see e.g. I.Iasos 22 of the mid-2nd century BC, in which a certain Charēs is given permission to χρίσειν ἐκ τῶν ἐκτὸς μερῶν καὶ ζωγραφήσειν πῃ τὸ ἀγορανόμιον (l. 11–13). Cf. also from Iasos, a dedication to Herakles Prophylax, in which the donor τὸν ναὸν ἔχρεισεν καὶ ἐκόσμησεν (1st century AD). The naos in question was a small chapel inside the western stoa (SEG 63, 880, l. 6–8; cf. BE 2014, 442). A similar combination can be found in an inscription from Panamara (I.Stratonikeia 108, 1st century BC/AD), in which two priests, brother and sister, dedicate a building, a pavement and an entranceway [σὺν καὶ τῆι ἐπιχρείσει καὶ ζωγρα[φίαι - - κτλ.]. A dedicatory inscription from Apollonia Salbake (2nd–3rd century AD) shows the paraphylax Stephanion and his troupe of neaniskoi financing the building of a [παρθενῶνα οἰκοδομήσας καὶ ξυλώσας καὶ κεραμώσας καὶ χρείσας καὶ ζωγραφήσας] ἀνέθηκαν (L. and J. Robert, La Carie II 281–283, no. 162; cf. Hellenica XI/XII 460–463). See more generally on χρίω/χρίσις Hellmann, Recherches 38–41 (‘enduit mural, à base de stuc’). On the related technique of ἀλείφω and variants, perhaps used interchangeably (‘application d’un badigeon, un vernis ou un enduit’) ibidem 37–38 and 40; cf. Maier, Mauerbauschriften II 73–74.

15 For στεγάζω/στέγω and related terms see Hellmann, Recherches s.v. In I.Iasos 22, l. 6–7, Charēs received permission to roof over the ἀγορανόμιον and an adjoining building: καὶ στέξαι τὸ ἀγορανόμιον καὶ τὸ προσκείμενον οἴκημα. On the need for towers to be roofed in the Hellenistic period, see e.g. McNicoll, Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates 11; see also below, p. 29 and nn. 30, 31 for the Thasian defensive complex, whose tower was roofed (l. Grandjean, Le rempart de Thasos (2011) 464–466 with further references).

16 For a collective see IG II' 3424 in which eleven wealthy Athenians set up (ἀνέθηκαν) statues of Antigonos and Dēmētrios, Saviours [Ὑπανάνοις] ἰδίαις.

17 Less likely is the possibility that the names came at the very end, under the dedication.

18 AD 26 B2 (1971) 539, no. 2 (l. Zervoudaki); new edition: N. Badoud, in idem (ed.), Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler (2011) 557–565 (SEG 61, 680). Six surviving names are followed by στρατηγήσαντες, the dedication being to Hermes Hagemonios. This format does not seem to be a typical Rhodian end of office dedication. The inscription is precisely dated by Badoud to between 323 and c. 310 BC.

19 As in I.Erythrai 32 (first third of the 3rd century BC according to ed., following Keil, but about a century later from the photograph Pl. XII): two identical inscriptions on two different stones are oddly merged by the
The original stone must, as I already suggested, have been twice as wide as the surviving 20 cm; and taller than 15 cm if four names stood at the beginning, so a height of 20+ cm. With a depth of 20 cm, this cannot have been a stele like the later dedications. We could think of a small dedicatory block inserted into the structure of the stratēgion, or the tower or any additional building for which the dedicants had been responsible, or possibly a small base for a dedicatory object.

Finally, the date. There are no precisely dated Stratonikeian inscriptions from the second half of the third century. The closest dated inscription we have is I.Stratonikeia 4, of 198 BC (third year of Philip V). A photograph of the squeeze can be found among the photos posted on the Internet Platform flickr of the IAS Photo Identification Project of the Fonds Louis Robert, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, which I here reproduce (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3

though showing some similarity with those of our inscription, look later in several aspects (the flattened and rather mannered phi, the curved horizontals of the alphas, the emphatic apices at the extremities of letters). The so-called Chrysaoric decree from Lagina, I.Stratonikeia 1418, whose date is not fixed despite its many tantalising historical references, has been said to belong in the early decades of the second century but in my view could be earlier. Its letters show clear similarities with our text, in particular a very unusual suspended omega with pronounced

---

20 I.Stratonikeia 6, of the early 3rd century, or 1001, of the time of Seleukos I, both clearly show earlier letter forms.

21 https://www.flickr.com/photos/abl_archive_of_louis_robert no. 103. See also there the photograph of I.Stratonikeia 9, dated to 180 BC (no. 208).

22 For a useful summary cf. P. Hamon, BE 2012, 381. I aim to return to this inscription and its context in a future article.
'wings' and a phi with a perfect ellipse halfway down the tall upright (both in l. 6: ἐζωγράφησαν); the ny, ypsilon and pi are equally alike. I reproduce three of its fragments (Fig. 4): the omega can be seen in fr. c; the phi in fr. d. There are broad similarities also with the letter forms of the four surviving so-called ‘mustering’ plaques (discussed below) that were once set in the city’s walls and towers, where they served to mobilise the city’s population in times of war but these look to me later. I suggest a date around 200 BC for our inscription; not later and possibly somewhat earlier.

The stratēgoi and the stratēgion

Stratēgoi and stratēgion go together. The institution of the former and the building of the latter must have been closely connected. I have no doubt that this is the earliest of all the known Stratonikeian stratēgoi dedications, even if I hesitate to follow Şahin in dating it to the mid-third century.23 The division into summer and winter semester and similarly the division κατὰ πόλιν and ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας can only have been the result of a reorganization after the city’s acquisition by Rhodes (in the 240s).24

Given that the city was most likely founded in the 260s,25 the stratēgion may have been part of the initial urban layout.26 Where was it located and what did it look like? There are remarkably few parallels on which to draw, and hardly any are archaeological. This very basic question can easily be extended to other cities, such as Aigai, Laodikeia on Lykos, and Kyme, for all of which a stratēgion is epigraphically attested, but whose location we do not know. Y. Garlan assembled all the evidence known to him in one single paragraph, including Athens, Karthaia, Laodikeia on

---

23 P. Hamon suggests to me that the expression ὁμονοήσαντες might point to a (relatively) recently synoikized city, after which it became a traditional phrase in stratēgoi dedications.

24 Stratonikeia’s two boulai, rotating also on the six-monthly principle, were clearly part of the same (re-)organization of the city’s institutions, see e.g. l.Stratonikeia 16, 17, 181, 230b, 526, 536 (all of the Roman period). The six-monthly rotational system is well-attested for Rhodes from the 3rd century onwards: see N. Badoud,Temps de Rhodes 17 and 24–27. For the (Rhodian) boule: ἡ βουλὰ ἡ βουλεύσα τὴν χειμερινὰν or τὴν θερινὰν ἕξαμηνον see the references in Badoud. On the territorial designations see G. Reger, The relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC, in V. Gabrielsen et al. (eds), Hellenistic Rhodes. Politics, Culture, and Society (1999) 76–97, at 80–81 with all references. On the date of Rhodes’ acquisition of Stratonikeia, see e.g. van Bremen, Mediterranean Historical Review 22 (2007) 113–131, at 114–115, with further references; similarly H. U. Wiemer, Krieg, Handel und Piraterie (2002) 182–184. For a low date see especially Meadows, Stratonikeia 116–117.

25 Above, n. 3.

26 Always cited is Strabo’s statement that the new city was ‘decorated by the kings with costly buildings’ ἐκοσμήθη δὲ καὶ αὕτη κατασκευαῖς πολυτελέσιν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων (Strabo 14.2.25), but this says little about who was responsible for its original layout.
Lykos and Sikyon as well as a passage in Aeneas Tacticus. Aeneas Tacticus (Poliorketika 22.2–3) recommends (in case of imminent danger) installing the chief strategos and his colleagues in or around the magistrates’ buildings (κατὰ τὰ περιαρχεῖα) and in the agora ‘if the locations can be defended’; otherwise to choose ‘the best fortified position in the city and that which can be best seen from the city itself’. In 11.3, describing a betrayal that led to the deliverance of Chios to the enemy (the historical context is unknown), it is clear that the relevant magistrates, presumably those charged with the defense of the city, resided in a tower by the harbour.

Y. Grandjean has recently shown for Thasos, whose polemarchoi were the equivalent of our strategoi, that the polemarcheion in which he assumes they resided (although the building is not specifically mentioned in any text) was located in a structure adjoining one of the harbour towers which formed part of the Thasian fortification system built in the final decades of the fourth century: ‘placé à proximité immédiate de la porte maritime par où passait la rue menant de l’agora au port commercial situé à l’Ouest du port de guerre’. The entire complex consisted of four rooms located on two separate levels below the rampart walk and a tower with three rooms on three separate floors and a roofed crenelated platform on top. At a later stage, the tower’s third-floor room was extended above, and made to project from, the middle two rooms below the rampart walk, thus allowing for an effective surveillance of the closed harbour (port fermé) which was Thasos’ military harbour. The actual office of the polemarchoi according to Grandjean was most likely located in one of the two first-floor rooms of the building adjoining the tower, accessible via an integral stairway (see especially the photos figs 301–303bis in Grandjean, Rempart 291), and was thus at the same time part of a defensive structure and an official civic space.

We cannot compare the maritime focus of the Thasian defensive system with Stratonikeia’s land-locked location, nor perhaps assume a similar sophistication of spatial organization, but as at Thasos, the connection with the city’s walled circuit has to be assumed from the reference to a tower and I would suggest seeking the strategion here, somewhere near the part of the walls that most closely adjoined and/or was visible from the civic centre (see Fig. 5).

---

28 Aen. Tact. 22.2: τὸν μὲν στρατηγὸν τὸν τοῦ ἑλεύθερου καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτοῦ τετάχθαι κατὰ τὰ περιαρχεῖα καὶ τὴν ἀγοράν, ἐὰν ὀχυρότητας μετέχῃ Visibility: τόπον τῆς πόλεως ἐρυμνότατον τε καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τῆς πόλεως ὄρμωνον. In the next line, 22.3, the word stratēgion is specifically mentioned: περὶ δὲ τὸν στρατηγὸν σκηνοῦν καὶ διατελεῖν ἀεὶ τὸν σαλπιγκτὴν καὶ τοὺς δρομοκήρυκας.
29 τῶν τε νεωρίων ἐπεσκευάσθαι τὰ στάζοντα καὶ τὴν ἐχομένην αὐτῶν στοὰν καὶ τὸν πύργον, ἐν οἷς δητῶντο οἱ στρατηγοὶ, ἐχομένην τῆς στοὰς. Mentioned in Grandjean (next n.) at p. 189.
30 Y. Grandjean, Ou siégeaient les polémarques thasiens?, REG 127 (2014) 187–193. For a discussion of the role of the polemarchoi in 4th and 3rd century Thasos see P. Hamon, BCH 134 (2010) [2011] 301–315. In the 1920s, when the porte maritime was first uncovered, two polemarchoi dedications to Soteira were found, one of which was still in its original position, against the entrance of the porte maritime. This suggested that the seat of the five polemarchoi had to be in this very area. The tower with its adjoining two-story structure was only uncovered in the 1970s and Grandjean connected the building with the dedicatory inscriptions. The latter are republished, with a brief commentary, by P. Hamon in CITh III as nos 80–81.
31 Grandjean, REG 127, 188, with the drawings and detailed description in idem, Rempart 289–298 with figs 300–302, and 446–478 with figs 370–373, showing the entire complex, the tower and the staircase. Cf. 546–549 on the relation with the porte maritime.
Fig. 5
The stratêgion and the city walls

Given the suggested integration of a stratêgion into or near the city’s walls, something needs to be said about their date, extent and type, but very little can be established with certainty, for the remains of the impressive walled circuit, which survives to a length of c. 2.5 km (the original circuit was c. 3.5 km, enclosing a surface area of approximately 1 km²), have never been adequately published (Fig. 5 shows the walls as part of the general city plan). The only discussions that I am aware of are by A. Tırpan and B. Söğüt who differ quite substantially on dating. Tırpan, in two separate articles, of 1983 and 1990, gives an analysis of the structure and the materials of the entire circuit, with drawings and photos, including some of the towers. Fourteen of these are said to survive but they are not easy to locate on the plans provided. Söğüt dedicates a few pages to the city’s walls within a more general article.32 Photographs of the foundations of a square tower and a section of the southern part of the wall on Kale Tepe, to the south-east of the city, above the Milas–Yatağan road, are presented in a recent article by U. Oğuzhanoğlu as part of a discussion of early settlements in the immediate vicinity of the city.33

L. Robert’s description (from the 1950s) of the southern – upper – sections of the walled circuit is evocative: ‘Au sud de la ville, la colline où est creusé le théâtre, s’élève en pente raide; au sommet, un rempart, avec une série de tours, avec une porte, suit sur toute sa longueur la crête de la colline; il domine d’un côté la ville étendue à ses pieds, dans un site commode et propice au peuplement, avec l’agora se détachant parmi les maisons modernes comme un rectangle cultivé, mais non bâti, – de l’autre, un ravin profond, au fond duquel court une rivièrre, apparemment “le fleuve” (ποταμός) de l’inscription topographique34; le ravin est borné au nord par une pente boisée, très raide elle aussi. Ces murs hellénistiques doivent remonter à la fondation de la ville par les Séleucides au IIIe siècle’ (italics mine).35

The lower reaches of the steep slope above the theatre are now separated from its upper section and from the walls on its summit by the modern Milas–Yatağan road, which runs directly behind the theatre and the imperial temple above it: see e.g. the photograph in Söğüt, Stratonikeia ve Çevresi Araştırmaları 6, Fig. 4, and see the plan Fig. 5.36 Remains of the upper circuit, stretches of which can still be clearly seen on Google Earth, survive across three hills: the central

---

32 A. Tırpan: 5. KST (1983) 209–214 (drawings at p. 453–455) and Edebiyat Dergisi 5 (1990) 217–234, with drawings and photos on pp. 229–234. B. Söğüt, Stratonikeia’da Hellenistik Dönem Öncesi, in Studies in Honour of K. Levent Zoroğlu (2013), 605–623, at 609–611. A brief description is also given in I. H. Mert’s study of Stratonikeian architectural decoration (Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Bauornamentik von Stratonikeia (2008) 12–13 with Abb. 5); his one photo entitled ‘Stadtmauer’ has however no indication of this particular section’s location, but shows most likely part of a tower gate in the upper circuit, on Kadıkule tepesi, identical to Fig. 2, p. 620 in Söğüt (‘Kadikulesi Tepesi’ndeki Kapı Kulesi Duvar Detayı’ = my Fig. 7). Mert described the walls’ construction as pseudo-isodomic (though on his photograph trapezoidal blocks are clearly visible); the stone as local schist, but he did not differentiate between upper and lower parts of the circuit.

33 In B. Söğüt (ed.), Stratonikeia ve Çevresi Araştırmaları (2015) 9–28, at 27–28, figs 14, 16 and 17. For the approximate location see the map in this article, p. 22.

34 By which is meant I.Stratonikeia 1004, one of the city’s four mustering inscriptions: δεύτερος [τού] Ἡρακλείου καὶ τῶι ἐχόμενωι φυλακι[είοι]代价 τὸ Σαμοθράικιον καὶ τὸ ἐχόμενον ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ. ἐπίσημον ἰόπαλον. On these see below, pp. 35–40. The ‘fleuve’ Robert refers to is the modern Işık dere.


36 As can be seen on the city plan, Fig. 5, a wider road has recently been constructed which leads off the Milas road around the northern part of the ancient city in a big loop, and meets up with the Milas–Yatağan road again past the site.
Kadikule tepesi with Yeldeğirmen tepe to its west and Kale tepe to its east (see the map Fig. 6). Figs 7 and 8 show a tower on Kadikule tepesi and a stretch of wall on Yeldeğirmen tepe respectively; Fig. 9 a stretch of wall on Kale tepe. These examples clearly show different construction techniques and dates.\(^{37}\)

As we saw, Robert dated the entire walled circuit to the early third century. Tırpan and Söğüt on the other hand have shown that we ought to distinguish between the upper and the lower circuit and between at least two separate building phases. Tırpan prefers to date the upper part of the circuit to the fifth or early fourth century, the lower part of the walls to after the 270s.\(^{38}\) For Söğüt the oldest parts of the upper walls as well as some terrace walls at Kadikule tepesi show features of the late Geometric and/or Archaic period but stretches of repair or rebuilding can also be seen, which may date to the time of the lower city walls’ construction.

The upper wall and towers made of flat irregular stones (*Plattenmauerwerk*: Fig. 10; cf. Fig. 8) are likely to be archaic or early classical. The extent and shape of this early fortification wall


\(^{38}\) A. Tırpan, above, n. 32, 217–214, comparative schedule on p. 220.
is not known but a walled circuit confined to the acropolis, which may have served the local communities as a kind of Fluchtburg before the foundation of the city seems possible. The construction is reminiscent of that of Pedasa or Alazeytin and that of the other ‘Lelegian’ settlements in Karia.

The south-western stretches of wall, on the Kadıkule hill, show different features. I reproduce here, with his permission, and with reference to the city plan Fig. 5, and my Figs 7 (this page) and 11 (below, p. 34), the assessment of Baptiste Vergnaud:

On the south-western sector of the city wall, the Kadıkule area, one can notice a change in masonry and material in the East-West stretch between the square tower built of irregular masonry and the hexagonal tower. The stone is most probably marble, the blocks are polygonal and where the wall changes direction, there is a drafted edge, a feature that is

---

39 George Bean in *Turkey beyond the Maeander* (1971) 69 only dedicates a few sentences to the walls, but he does remark (without further clarifying) that ‘The acropolis hill … is fortified with a ring wall beyond the summit.’ The ravine through which the Işık dere flows may have served as natural fortification to the south.

40 See W. Radt, *Siedlungen und Bauten auf der Halbinsel von Halikarnassos unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archaischen Epoche*, IstMitt Beih. 3 (1970). I am grateful to Baptiste Vergnaud for a discussion of these aspects of the upper walls based on his recent autopsy.
not earlier than the fourth century BC. This stretch presents similarities with the tower built of trapezoidal blocks located south of the hexagonal tower and probably belongs to the same construction phase. The massive hexagonal tower which is made of irregular blocks is very particular. Its masonry is similar to that of the first-phase walls but its hexagonal plan is absolutely unknown before the Hellenistic period. My hypothesis is that the blocks from the early wall were used to create this tower during the Hellenistic reinforcement or replanning of the city’s defenses. Below this tower, on the N-S section of the wall, there is another tower of quadrangular plan which is built of trapezoidal blocks [here Fig. 7] with occasional headers. This composite technique is hard to date but it is probably contemporary with the preserved stretches of the lower city wall [here Fig. 11].

In the view of B. Söğüt, the lower city walls belong to the later fourth century, more precisely the Hekatomnid period, showing similarities with those of Alabanda, Amyzôn and Latmos.41 It should be noted however that e.g. the distinctive header-and-stretcher style, so characteristic of Hekatomnid building techniques, is lacking and there are clear differences between what remains of the Stratonikeian walls and those of Hekatomnid construction elsewhere.42 In particular the trapezoidal masonry visible in certain stretches (Fig. 11), which is quite common in mainland Greece in the fourth century, is virtually inexistant in Karia at this time and only becomes more widespread in the Hellenistic period.43

41 ‘Fortifications of the Lelegian type and some other structures were constructed in the Archaic and Classical periods. In particular, in the period of the Hekatomnids in the 4th century BC, both upper and lower cities were surrounded by new fortification walls which had at least four gates.’ Söğüt, summary, p. 605. A full publication is eagerly awaited.
42 A photograph published by E. Varinlioğlu, REA 96 (1994) 189–191 (without indication of its location), also shows a section of the wall to the north of the city (according to Debord, Questions stratonicéennes [n. 45] 158 and 159, n. 19). On the characteristic features of Hekatomnid defensive structures see especially I. Pimouguet-Pédarros, Existe-t-il un style de construction hékatomnide?, in P. Brun et al. (eds), Esploia. La Lycie et la Carie antiques (2013) 153–173, with further references.
43 I. Pimouguet-Pédarros, Archéologie de la défense 94–95.
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Very provisionally we may settle for two main periods that are clearly identifiable: the archaic/early classical phase comprising the upper fortifications and towers in irregular masonry and a second phase which included a remodeling of the existing defenses and the construction of a lower part of the circuit to protect both the upper and the lower city. That second phase most likely belongs to the early Hellenistic period, partly because of the nature of its construction (trapezoidal elements), partly because of the presence of the hexagonal tower discussed above, and therefore most likely belongs to the time of or after the city’s foundation.

The city walls and the mustering inscriptions

The defence of the city, and the mobilisation of its male citizens in the case of a siege, was organized by city quarters, amphoda, ‘unités tactiques d’auto-défense’, topographically related to sections of the city walls. We know this from four small inscribed plaques, I.Stratonikeia 1003, 1004, 1531 and 1532, mustering inscriptions of a type known also from Hellenistic Smyrna, once probably set into the city’s towers or walls. A similar organization has to be assumed for both cities. A comparison with the pyrgoi-based defensive organization of Teos has also been made, most recently by Jonathan Strang in a dissertation of 2007, who dates that city’s walled circuit and the emergence of the pyrgoi divisions to the late third or early second century BC.

The Stratonikeian plaques have been dated (in first instance by L. Robert) to the early phase of the city’s history, post-dating by about five decades the presumed construction of the walls. Robert, who at the time knew only the plaque that is now 1003 (Fig. 12) wrote: ‘très légers apices, les pi et les nu à hastes inégales, les petitsomicron accrochés au sommet de la ligne, me semble dater cette inscription comme une des plus anciennes de Stratonicée; je la rapporterais volontiers à la fin du IIIe siècle, au plus tard au début du IIe.’

For three of the plaques we now have a photograph either of the stone (1003; 1532) or of the squeeze (1531); the fourth exists only in a majuscule copy. The format of each plaque is the same (an inscribed rectangle within a wide moulded frame) as are the dimensions (w. 36 cm, h. 26.5/27 cm; the depth varies). They must have been produced and inscribed at the same time, for the letter forms in so far as they can be compared are very similar.

These small plaques with their brief lapidary texts reveal the location of mustering points in the city. Each mustering point had its own sign (ἐπίσημον): a club, a Delphic tripod, an image of Herakles, an elephant. In each case, the reference point was a tower (πύργος) though in one

---

47 Études anatoliennes 530.
case this is restored, and since the surviving circuit of the city walls still contains the remains of 14 such towers, the number of mustering points, and the accompanying episema, will have exceeded that number.48 Adolf Wilhelm first compared the one Stratonikean plaque known to him with the very similar inscriptions from Smyrnya. These are now in G. Petzl’s Die Inschriften von Smyrnya II.1, with a discussion on p. 108.49 Unlike those of Stratonikeia, the Smyrna plaques appear to date from different periods: a) third/second century; b) second century; c) third century (so Wilhelm, confirmed by the photographs in I.Smyrna). Below I give the texts and photographs of the plaques with a brief commentary. The numbers are those of I.Stratonikeia.

1003

Ed. A. Laumonier, BCH 58 (1934) 339–340, no. 24; L. Robert, Études anatoliennes 529–536, improved reading with photo Pl. XVII 1; E. Varinlioğlu, REA 96 (1994) 189–191 (correction to Robert’s reading). H. 27 cm; surviving w. 21 cm; no depth recorded; letters 1.4 cm (Fig. 12).

Date (Robert): ‘fin du IIIe siècle, au plus tard au début du IIe’; ‘écriture du IIe s. av. J.-C.’ (Laumonier). The fragment was found built into a modern wall: ‘à droite quand on va de la maison de Murat Bey à l’école’ (Laumonier). The alpha has curved crossbars.

Fig. 12

1 L. Robert, Études anatoliennes 531 (cf. ATAM 153), assumed that lines were missing at the beginning and restored [- - έως τοῦ] | αὐχένο[ς - - - - - ] on the model of no. 1004 (below). But from the photograph (Pl. XVII 1 and here Fig. 12) it is clear that this is not possible, something seen

---

48 In Teos, the number of pyrgoi listed in the catalogue CIG 3064 (with p. 1125; cf. SEG 4, 620) is 27; not an implausible number for a circuit of c. 4 km. See the discussion in Taşdelen and Polat, above, n. 46, and in Boulay, Arês 191–194. For Smyrna, where six towers are certainly attested in three inscriptions, and seven are implied, see Petzl, next n. ad loc., and Boulay, Arês 190.


50 L. Robert, who spends many pages (531–538) on the meaning of πλατεία, does not seem concerned with how to translate, and where to locate, the puzzling αὐχένι.
already by E. Varinlioğlu. Varinlioğlu thought there was space for an ordinal numeral before πύργος (or πύργου), on the analogy of the other plaques, but there is perhaps no need for this if αὐχένος qualifies the tower. The photograph of 1532 (Fig. 14) moreover shows that there the first line does not fill the available space, and 13 letters broadly correspond to the number in l. 4 and 6 (14 and 12 respectively). According to Varinlioğlu, Αὐχήν is a toponym. 2–5 For a discussion of πλατεῖα see L. Robert, Études anatoliennes 531–538; Debord, Questions stratonicéennes 159–160. 4 The triple gate has not (yet) been identified. Robert at p. 532 left open whether this was a gate in the walled circuit or a gate into the agora. 5–6 Herakles as an episemon: L. Robert drew attention to a relief head of Herakles from Pisidian Antioch (JHS 1930, 272–274; photo) which Ramsay considered was the episemon of a vicus Hercules. Neither scholar dates the relief (or gives dimensions). The relief is apparently now lost. 54 M. Ç. Şahin refers to the episemon in 1003 as ‘eine Stange mit Herakles’, perhaps reading the Greek word for ‘Stange’ (English ‘stick’, ‘pole’, ‘rod’) in the noun αὐχήν. Note also the ‘tower of Herakles’ in Smyrna, I.Smyrna 613c.

Of the four texts discussed here, this is the most puzzling in terms of the city’s topography. Since a tower features at the beginning of each of the three other inscriptions, the word has been restored here too. Quite how we should understand the location depends on the meaning of αὐχήν: literally ‘neck’ and, in geographical writing, always used of a narrow strip of land or a gorge. The further description ‘along the street’ etc.: I have assumed that this concerns the mustering, at the tower, of all those who lived along the main plateia (and its side-streets?), or, as T. Boulay understands it, it is the assembling itself that is to take place ‘[se rassembler] près de la rue qui va du tripylon jusqu’à l’autre rue’. 56

---

51 REA 96 (1994) 190: ‘A ce que je peux voir sur la photographie de la pierre donnée par L. Robert, l’inscription aussi est dans un panneau en retrait encadré d’une moulure, très nette en haut. Il n’y a donc pas lieu de restituer une première ligne. C’est directement, à mon avis: Αὐχένος [πύργου ou πύργος] παρὰ τὴν πλατεῖαν κτλ.’ Şahin retained Robert’s version without explanation. We now know, as Robert did not, that one further plaque, 1531, omits to mention amphodon. That text is the briefest of the four, lapidary in the extreme. The implication of all four texts is that the mustering went by amphodon and/or by other locations, i.e. those living along or near a particular road. See also Boulay, Arès 190–191, and Debord, Questions stratonicéennes 159–162. 52 See also L. Robert, ATAM 152–157. On the relation between plateia and amphodon cf. Debord, Questions stratonicéennes 159–160, with a critical comparison of the ‘openness’ of Robert’s view of plateiai and the closedness emphasized in Philo of Byzantium’s Poliorketika. Cf. G. Petzl, I.Smyrna II.1 p. 108, who translates ἄμφοδον as ‘das, was sich auf beiden Seiten der Straße befindet’, while Liddell–Scott–Jones give ‘that which is surrounded by streets’. The best discussion is in Y. Garlan, Cités, armées et stratégie à l’époque hellénistique d’après l’œuvre de Philon de Byzance, Historia 22 (1973) 16–33, at 21–22 (cf. Garlan, Recherches 382), emphasizing the different meanings of the term amphodon: basic meaning ‘a street of houses’; interpreted in a wider context they were quarters or sectors of a city serving as ‘unités d’auto-défense’. 55 P. Debord, Questions stratonicéennes, argued for an agora gate. 54 Information from S. Mitchell, per ep. 56 ibidem.
Second tower; by the Herakleion and the adjoining guard-post, the quarters of the Samothrakion and that adjoining it, as far as the river. Emblem: club.

1–2 Wilhelm (187): πρός is to be assumed before τῶι Ἡρακλείῳ.

3–4 ἄμφοδον τὸ Σαμοθραίκιον: Wilhelm (187) wrote that this is probably a street named after its Samothrakian residents rather than a reference to a sanctuary of the Samothrakian gods, ‘zu stellen haben sich die Bewohner der Samothrakischen Straße und die der nächsten bis zum Flusse’. But a city-quarter named after the sanctuary situated there is more likely. A Samothrakion at this relatively early time strongly suggests Ptolemaic presence before the foundation of the Seleukid city, as does the Sarapieion in the next inscription.

5–6 ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ: The Greek can imply, but need not, that both amphoda went as far as the river. L. Robert’s description (above, n. 34) may be repeated here ‘de l’autre [côté], un ravin profond, au fond duquel court une rivière, apparemment “le fleuve” (ποταμός) de l’inscription topographique’. But there were branches of the Çine Çayı (ancient Marsyas) to the east of the city and which ‘river’ was meant is not certain.

1531


H. 26.5 cm; w. 36 cm; letters 0.8 cm. Small, suspended omegas, light apices, pi and nu have shorter r. hastas, phi has very small triangular ring halfway down the upright; alphas have curved cross-bars. Same script as 1003 and 1004 (Fig. 13).

57 Wilhelm: ‘zu sammeln haben sich die zu seiner Beziehung berufene Mannschaft bei dem Heiligtum des Herakles und dem anschließenden Wachthause’.

58 So also P. Debord (Questions stratonicéennes 161), drawing on parallels from Smyrna – discussed below. The Sarapieion in I.Stratonikeia 1531 (which Wilhelm did not know of) makes the existence of a Samothrakion more plausible, and suggests Ptolemaic influence and/or presence. Debord, at p. 161, reminds us however that, in Smyrna, Queen Stratonicē, wife of Antiochos I and mother of Antiochos II, was the patroness of an association of worshippers of Anubis (I.Smyrna 765, dated to the mid-3rd century) and that therefore her influence might count if the city was founded while she was still alive, i.e. before end 254 BC). She would, however, have had no association with the Samothrakion.
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?At the third tower of the middle gate at the foot of the Sarapieion. The emblem (is) a Delphic tripod.

The height of this plaque is more or less the same as 1003; the width shows that the latter has lost approximately half of its total surface. The mouldings are identical on 1003, 1531 and 1532.

1–2 Both the tower and the middle gate are in the genitive which make the translation awkward, unless one ignores it, as does Boulay: ‘Troisième tour. [Se rassembler] à la porte du milieu au pied du Sarapieion etc.’ In my understanding, the middle gate qualifies the tower (see the commentary on the next inscription).

In this particular text there is no obvious reference to who are to assemble. The Sarapieion must be at a higher level and the location may have been in the southern part of the walled circuit.

1532

Ed. M. Ç. Şahin, EA 41 (2008) 66, no. 31. ‘A cubical, relatively small block of marble ... framed with mouldings ... It is clear that the block was set in a wall.’ No findspot given. Now in the museum depot at Stratonikeia. H. 26.5 cm; w. 36 cm; d. 31 cm; letters 1.3–1.8 cm. Photo (Fig. 14).

?At the third tower the guard-post quarter, having as emblem an elephant.

---

59 Gauthier, BE 1996, 401 does not comment.

60 On the Ptolemaic antecedents of the Seleukid city (the Sarapieion, the Samothrakion, perhaps the Herakleion) see especially Debord, Questions stratonicéennes 160–162, comparing the many references to Herakles (Herakleion, club and Herakles as episema) with similar in Smyrna. For Herakles the connotation must be Macedonian rather than Ptolemaic or Seleukid.
As in the previous inscription, here we have another ‘third tower’, which may suggest some overall organization having multiple points from which towers were counted. Alternatively, the qualifying ‘of the middle gate’ in 1531 did the job of distinguishing that tower from the one in 1532.

A (similar?) carved image of an elephant survives over a doorway in one of the towers of the Seleukid fortress on Mt. Karasis in eastern Cilicia; ‘eine Herakleskeule’ is also mentioned among the reliefs on its walls. In a recent article the building of this fortification has, with good arguments, been attributed to Antiochos I (rather than to Antiochos IV as has been the assumption hitherto); a date compatible with the foundation and fortification of Stratonikeia.

The emblems on the towers were most likely Seleukid and integral to the original construction: their symbolism (Herakles, club, elephant, Delphic tripod) fits a Macedonian/Seleukid context. Whether the same can be said of the organization of the city’s defence as it is reflected in the four plaques is less straightforward: their letter forms suggest a date in the early second century (above, p. 35); but emblems and plaques need not be of the same period. Should we imagine the plaques set into the very towers where the episema were located or would there have been one location where all the plaques could be read collectively?

The relation between the stratēgoi, their stratēgion, the work done to the (adjoining?) tower and the chronology of the construction of the city’s walls cannot (yet?) be precisely understood. Equally, the organization of the citizen body for defensive purposes, though partly visible, remains to be explored, both in terms of chronology and topography, as do many other aspects of the early history and the military and civic organization of this remarkable city.

**APPENDIX**

Stratēgoi dedications

I. Stratonikeia 1005


---


62 Until recently Antiochos IV was argued to have been the ‘Bauherr’ (so A. Hoffman, R. Posamentir, M. Sayar (eds), *Hellenismus in der Kilikia Pedias*, Byzas 14 (2011) passim); but in a recent article M. Durukan, U. Tepebaş and M. Yılmaz have argued convincingly that the initial building phase was under Antiochos I (*Vir Doctus Anatolicus: Studies in Memory of Sencer Şahin*, *Philia* Supplement 1, 2016, 308–329). An elephant also features on a rare preserved city seal of Sagalassos. The seal is dated to the 2nd or 3rd century AD, but the editor plausibly argues that its origin may lie in the Seleukid period and the presence of a settlement of Macedonian soldiers there. K. Vandorpe, Sagalassos’ city-seal, in M. Waelkens et al. (eds), *Sagalassos III* (1995) 299–306; see also *ibidem*, E. Kosmetatou, M. Waelkens, The Macedonian shields of Sagalassos (277–292).
'Petite stèle, représentant un cavalier' (Cousin), probably Zeus Panamaros. Reichel's drawing shows a small circular object in the horseman's right hand (a phiale?). The relief is set in a banded frame; the first three lines are inscribed on the frame (illegible in Laumonier’s photo). Reichel's drawing, however, clearly shows both the relief and the text's distribution on the stone. To l. and r. torches; the horse’s front leg rests on the wheel of Nemesis. H. 49 cm; w. 38 cm; d. 12 cm (Reichel); letters 1.5–2 cm (Reichel).

[..] Cousin, assuming a line before l. 1, but there is no space on the stone. 2 End: ἀγὼν καί? Robert, Şahin, seemingly confirmed by Reichel’s drawing; the squeeze shows rather a my, as on Cousin’s majuscule drawing: μ[α]- Cousin. 3 νομαχία Cousin, but there is space for καί; end: οἱ Cousin but there is no space, and Reichel indicates vacat here. 4 [οἱ] Robert, Şahin, but Reichel’s drawing suggests that the flame of the torch fills up the space.

I.Stratonikeia 1006
H. 33 cm; w. 24 cm; letters: 1.2–1.5 cm. Regular, well-spaced script; apices; omega clean circle with very long detached horizontal; omicron full size, wide mu with diverging uprights; wide sigma; kappa with slightly shorter horizontals; wide zeta and epsilon, latter with short inner horizontal.

[..] Robert, Şahin, seemingly confirmed by Reichel’s drawing; the squeeze shows rather a my, as on Cousin’s majuscule drawing: μ[α]- Cousin. 3 νομαχία Cousin, but there is space for καί; end: οἱ Cousin but there is no space, and Reichel indicates vacat here. 4 [οἱ] Robert, Şahin, but Reichel’s drawing suggests that the flame of the torch fills up the space.
ρείς Ζήνωνος Κω(ραιεύς),
καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς χώ-
ρας στρατηγὸς
Μενέδημος Ἀπε-
λλοῦ Ἰε(ροκωμήτης), ὀμονοή-
[αντ]ες Νεμέσει.

1 [Οἱ σ]τρατηγοὶ Cousin, Şahin, but cf. 1318.

1.Stratonikeia 1006a
Ed. M. Ç. Şahin, who (probably correctly) calls it 'Strategenliste'; photo vol. II.2, Tafel XIV. No findspot or dimensions given. Complete on r. and above (though the upper part above the moulding is damaged), broken l. and below. How much is missing on l. is unclear. Şahin assumed one or two letters. At the top traces of a moulding, possibly a pediment, and a raised band also on r. Present location unknown.

Fragment of a (?) dedication by stra-
τηγοὶ of a semester. 2nd century AD (?).

[- - - - - - - - - - - - - -] στρατηγοὶ
[- - - - - - - - - - - -Χρ]υσάωρ Διο
[σίου τοῦ Διονυσίου Κ(ωρα)ζ(εύς),
[ - - - - - - - - - - ]σιου ΟΣ[. . .]

2–3 Χρυσάωρ Διονυ|σίου Κ(ωρα)ζ(εύς) Şahin.

1.Stratonikeia 1317
Ed. E. Varinlioğlu, EA 12 (1988) 90, no. 17: ‘Quadratische Stele aus schmutzigweißem Marmor, die sich nach oben leicht verjüngt.’ Broken in two parts. H. 41 cm; w. 19.5–20.5 cm; letters 1.5–2 cm. Irregular script. Photo Pl. II (SEG 38, 1097).

ἐπὶ Διομήδου[ς]
τοῦ Διομήδου-
ς τοῦ Ἰεροκλέος
4 χιμερινήν(ν)ς
στρ(α)τηγοὶ ἐ-
πί μὲν τῆς χώ-
ρας Λεωνίδης
8 Λεωνίδου Κο(λιοργεύς),
κατὰ πόλιν δὲ
Ἰεροκλῆς Θε-
ομνήστου Λο(βολδεύς),
12 Καλλικράτης
Χροσίπ(π)ου Ἰε(ροκωμῆτης),
Μενέδημος
Λέοντος τοῦ
A Hellenistic stratēgoi dedication from Stratonikeia in Karia

16 Μενεδήμου Κω(ραιεὺς),
ομονοίσαντες
Νεμέσει νεωκόροι
Στέφανος ΟΝΣ[-]

20 [—]ο[—]

4 χιμερνήνιος Varinlioğlu. 13 IA lapis, Ἰα(σεύς) Şahin. 19 (?) Ὀνήσιος Varinlioğlu.

Ed. pr. (followed in SEG 38, 1097) suggested that the eponym is identical with T. Flavius Diomēdēs, married to Claudia Leontis quae et Sabina; stemma in I.Stratonikeia I, p. 76; not followed by Şahin, and not certain. The son of Hieroklēs Theoμnēstos, l. 10–11 (called Hieroklēs, like his father) occurs in a list of gymnasiarchs, no. 25A (= I.Stratonikeia 1325a; SEG 38 1080), l. 17–18, which can be dated approximately to the first century AD (see EA 12, 1988, 98 for a prosopographical discussion of no. 25). In l. 13, the restored Ἰα(σεύς) as the demotic/ethnic of the third stratēgos cannot be right: the IA is probably a mistake for IE: Ἱε(ροκωμήτης).

I.Stratonikeia 1318
For the text and commentary of this inscription see above, p. 23–24.

I. Stratonikeia 1319
Ed. E. Varinlioğlu, EA 12 (1988) 91–92, no. 19: ‘Weiβer Marmor; links und oben unbeschädigt, sonst alle Seiten abgebrochen.’ H. 70 cm; w. 19 cm; d. 9 cm; letters 1.5–1.8 cm. No photo. Text as in I.Stratonikeia.

ἐπὶ Φα[- - - - - - -]
τοῦ Διο[- - - - - - -]
χιμερνήνιος στρατηγοὶ
4 Ἀρτεμί[δωρος - - - - - - - - -]
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