

RIET VAN BREMEN

NOTES ON SOME NEW INSCRIPTIONS FROM LAGINA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 35 (2003) 15–19

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON SOME NEW INSCRIPTIONS FROM LAGINA

M. Ç. Şahin has recently published a number of new inscriptions found during excavations at Lagina between 1993 and 1999: *EA* 29, 1997, 83–106 (*SEG* 47, nos. 1572–1592)¹ and *EA* 31, 1999, 35–36. I discuss here some problems and alternative readings.

1. A priest of Zeus Panamaros for life?

EA 29, 1997, no. 1 (*SEG* 47, 1575) is a dedication by Tib. Flavius Sabinianus Diomedes Menippos, found ‘at the ancient pool’ in Lagina (photo). It is restored as follows:

- [Διὶ Παναμάρῳ ἐπι]-
[φ]ανεσστάτῳ Τιβ[έ]-
[ρι]ὸς Φλάβιος Τίτο[υ]
4 [υἱὸς Κ]υρεί[ν]α, Σαβεινι-
[ανὸ]ς Διομήδης Μένι-
[ππο]ς Ἰε(ροκωμήτης) φιλοσέβασσ[τος]
[κ]αὶ φιλόπατρις, υἱὸς τ[ῆ]ς
8 [π]όλεως, ὁ διὰ βίου ἱερε[ύς]
[α]ὐτοῦ, ἱερατεύων καὶ τ[ῆ]ς
μεγίσστης καὶ ἐπιφανε[σ]σ-
τάτης θεᾶς Ἑκάτης
12 [κ]αθιέρωσεν

Şahin justified his restoration of the first line with the entirely plausible argument that among the male deities at Stratonikeia, Zeus Panamaros is the only one who bears the superlative adjective ἐπιφανέστατος. In ll. 8ff. of the inscription the dedicator is, however, referred to as ὁ διὰ βίου ἱερε[ύς α]ὐτοῦ, which is at odds with what we know of the cult of Zeus Panamaros, whose priests were annual. The dedicator, Tib. Flav. Sabinianus Diomedes Menippos himself is on record as having held the priesthood of Panamarian Zeus three times (and that of Hekate twice).² Since it is hard to see to which deity the ὁ διὰ βίου ἱερε[ύς α]ὐτοῦ could refer other than that implied in the dedicatory formula in l. 1, the dedication cannot have been to Zeus Panamaros, unless we assume that taking on a priesthood three times qualified a man to designate himself ἱερεὺς διὰ βίου. But all the – considerable – evidence speaks against this assumption. Not even M. Sempronius Clemens, who held the priesthood of Zeus Panamaros a record five times, and whose career is extremely well documented, claimed this title. In the large decree (*I. Stratonikeia* 16) honouring this great second-century benefactor for his accumulated priesthoods and offices, the priesthoods he held διὰ βίου (of Zeus Kapitolios,

¹ Whose heading ‘Roman Imperial Period’ is not correct. Cf. also A. Chaniotis, *EBGR* (1997) [2000] no. 326. In what follows the abbreviation *I. Stratonikeia* refers to the three (consecutively numbered) volumes of *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* I, II.1 and II.2 (ed. M. Ç. Şahin), *IK* vols. 21, 22.1 and 22.2.

² A. Laumonier, *BCH* 61 (1937) no. 59; *I. Stratonikeia* nos. 174, 183–188, 663, stemma at no. 183.

Asklepios, Hygieia, Hestia) are carefully separated from those he took on for one year or repeatedly.³

It may be significant that Menippos' uncle, Tib. Claudius Lainas, who, like his nephew, accumulated three priesthoods of Zeus Panamaros, is also on record as holding a priesthood for life in a dedicatory inscription of his own, this time from Panamara, which, unfortunately, is also dedicated to a deity whose name is not preserved (*I. Stratonikeia* 173 – restored on the basis of other inscriptions for the same man):⁴

- [Τιβ. Κλ. Τι. υἱὸς Κυ(ρεῖνα) Λαίνας]
 [ἱερεὺς] τ[ὸ τρίτον ἐν]
 [Ἑραίοι]ς πρῶτ[ος καὶ]
 4 [μόνος] καὶ γυμνα[σίαρχος]
 [ἐνιαύ]σειος μετ[ὰ τοῦ υἱ]-
 [οῦ Τι.] Κλ. Σαβεῖν[ιανοῦ]
 [Παιω]νίου, ὁ διὰ β[ίου]
 8 [ἱερεὺς] χαρι[στήριον]

Laumonier commented on this text ‘sa troisième prêtrise panamaréenne, exercée avec sa mère Mamalon est commémorée ... et mentionnée dans une dédicace adressée à une divinité dont il est prêtre à vie’. It is clear from Lainas' dedication that his three priesthoods of Zeus Panamaros were a separate affair from his priesthood διὰ βίου: one cannot, at the same time, have held a priesthood three times and hold it for life. This, therefore, should increase our scepticism about his nephew's priesthood διὰ βίου being in fact that of Panamaran Zeus.⁵

It is not easy to suggest another deity, important enough to be ἐπιφανέστατος, but marginal enough to the main cults of Stratonikeia, and thus to the main arena of elite competitiveness, to warrant a priest διὰ βίου. Zeus Narasos, Londargos and Chrysaoreus do not qualify, since their priests were annual.⁶ Zeus Kannokos was served by a priest διὰ βίου and so was Zeus Kapetolios, whose most famous priest was again the great Sempronius Clemens. We know too little about these deities within a Stratonikeian context. The epithet ἐπιφανέστατος, though mostly used for Panamaran Zeus and for Hekate, is not totally exclusive: it is used, in one case, for Hera (*IS* 113, l. 8–9, first cent. AD) so that its use as an epithet for other deities cannot be excluded.

³ On Sempronius Clemens see Laumonier (prev. note) no. 131; *I. Stratonikeia* at no 16.

⁴ On Lainas see Laumonier, *BCH* 61 (1937) no. 49; the stemma in *I. Stratonikeia* at no. 168, and, ibidem, nos. 169–176; 183, 185 and 1024 (175 is a very similar dedication to the one quoted in the main text, this time to Θεαῖς μεγίσταις Νεμέσσει).

⁵ It is possible that another, very fragmentary, dedicatory inscription of Menippos (*I. Stratonikeia* 184) whose lines 7 (end), 8, 9 and 10 were uncertainly restored by its ed. pr., Cousin as υἱ[ὸς τῆς π]όλεως, με[τὰ τῆς γυναι-κὸς(?) ἀ]υτοῦ κα[θιέρω]σεν, but whose majuscule text clearly has ΥΣ, not Σ, in l. 9, should in fact also be read at least as [- - ἱερε]ῦς ἀ]υτοῦ. Cousin's text is reproduced in *I. Stratonikeia* but without the (?) in l. 9. Its first line, restored by Cousin as [Ἱερεὺς ἐξ ἱε]ρώς is rendered by Şahin in *I. Stratonikeia*, as [Ἱερεὺς ἐξ ἱε]ρέων though without justification.

⁶ See the decree for Sempronius Clemens, *I. Stratonikeia* no. 16, l. 6–7.

There is no immediate and obvious solution,⁷ but if we are willing to accept that Zeus Panamaros had priests who called themselves διὰ βίου we must realize that this has profound implications for our understanding of the working of this cult within the city of Stratonikeia. Perhaps, for the time being, it is better to remain sceptical.

2. Adoptions and demotic status

In *EA* 31 (1999), 35–36 (photo), Şahin published the following inscription, on what is perhaps part of a larger monument, found in front of the southwestern corner of the temple at Lagina. He dates it as ‘probably hellenistic’. The unabbreviated form of the woman’s demotic and the shape of the letters point towards a date in the first century BC:

- 1 Οἱ ἐνεκτημένοι καὶ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Κωραζίδα Δημη[ητρίας]
- 2 τῆς Μέλανος κατὰ θυγατροποίησιν δὲ Ἑρώδου Λοβο[λδίδος]
- 3 γυναικὸς δὲ Ἑρακ[λεί]του τοῦ Διονυσοδώρου κλ[ειδοφόρου?]

Şahin’s restoration of the final word of l. 3: κλ[ειδοφόρου?] the most common female religious office at Lagina, will have resulted from the consideration that, although three Stratonikeian demotics have an initial K, none begins with, or is abbreviated with, the letters ΚΛ or ΚΑ. And yet we would expect a demotic to follow the name of the woman’s husband. The best solution is therefore to assume that, like that of his wife, the husband’s name was immediately followed by an indication of his adoptive status: κα[θ’ ὑθεσίαν κτλ.], then by his demotic.

EA 29 (1997), 85–86 nos. 3 and 4 (photos) are dedicatory honorific inscriptions on two statue bases found in the area of the newly excavated propylon, for two brothers, Menekles and Epainetos, sons of Leon. Şahin suggests a date in the late first century BC. The bases stood beside one another:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>4 Ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν Μενεκλῆν Λέοντος
{ι} καθ’ ὑθεσίαν δὲ Ἀντιπάτρου Κωραῆι
ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐεργεσίας ἐπαίνωι
χρυσέωι στεφάνωι, εἰκόνι, σιτήσῃ ἐν
πρυτανείωι, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ὦν ἀγαθὸς
καὶ εὖνους τῆι πατρίδι διατελεῖ</p> | <p>Ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν Ἐπαίνετον
Λέοντος καθ’ ὑθεσίαν δὲ
Ἀντιπάτρου Κ vacat ἐπαίνωι, χρυσῶι
στεφάνωι καὶ εἰκόνι χαλκῆι ἀρετῆς
ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχων διετέ-
λεσεν εἰς τὸν δῆμον</p> |
|--|--|

Both men had been adopted by a certain Antipatros. In the dedicatory inscription for Menekles, his demotic is given as Κωραῆι (*sic*); in that for Epainetos only part of a first letter, K, survives of his demotic; attempts were made to erase it, and it is followed by an empty space on the stone. No effort was made to substitute a – correct? – demotic. Why? In neither case is

⁷ It is possible that more lines precede Şahin’s suggested l. 1: cf. the photographs of similar altars in *MDAI(I)* 25 (1975) pl. 60, nos. 1 and 2, illustrating the article by P. Roos, *Alte und neue Inschriftenfunde aus Zentral-karien*, pp. 335–341.

it possible to establish if the demotic is that of the men's adoptive or of their natural father; the use of the dative, and the *vacat*, do not allow the matching of cases. Şahin's explanation for the erasure, namely 'that Epainetos was not from the deme of Koraia like his brother' is not self-evident, either with reference to the men's – identical – adoptive father nor to their natural father (demotics followed filiation, both for men and for women). As to the double adoption, Şahin suggests that the adoption of both men by the same Antipatros could have occurred because 'they were both orphans'.

The half-hearted erasure may in fact have been caused by confusion generated by a succession of adoptions down the generations. A Leon Antipatrou is known from one of Lagina's early priest lists (*I. Stratonikeia* 605, l. 9, dated by A. Laumonier 'perhaps to the time of Augustus':⁸ a date suitably vague to be compatible with that of these inscriptions). This Leon had himself been adopted, though the adoptive father's name is lost as is his demotic: Λέων Ἀντιπάτρου καθ' [ύοθεσίαν δὲ - -]. There is an Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀντιπάτρου [τροῦ - -] in l. 6 of the same list: very likely these men were brothers. So perhaps the two grandsons Menekles and Epainetos were adopted *back* by their grandfather Antipatros at some point after their father Leon had himself been adopted away into another family – and possibly another deme. We can only speculate about the reason for this: Antipatros' other son, Alexandros, may have died childless, so that suddenly Antipatros was left with no male successors, but there are other possibilities. The brothers' demotic identity may have been different because one had been born before his natural father's own adoption, the other after, or because one had been an adult, the other a child at the time of their father's adoption. We know too little about adoptive practices and their effect on individuals' statuses to be more precise.⁹ The uncertainty about Epainetos' demotic was possibly caused by the fact that his father (and therefore he himself) had been adopted into another deme. Perhaps the case was so confusing to start with that a mistake was made in the erasing of what was in fact correct: Epainetos took on the demotic of his paternal grandfather even if his own demotic at birth had been the adoptive demotic of his own father.

There is a further difference between the two men's inscriptions: only Menekles received the honour of *sitesis* in the *prytaneion*, which begs the question why his brother did not receive a similar privilege. The fact that the present form διατελεῖ is used for Menekles, the aorist διετέλεσεν for his brother, suggests that the latter may no longer have been alive at the time of the honours. This, in itself, illustrates the kind of demographic unpredictability with which families had to juggle. In this particular case three generations of one family were involved in adoptive procedures, while in our first inscription, both husband and wife had been adopted.

The relative frequency with which adoptions occur among the Stratonikeian elite in the last two centuries BC, both within the five demes and across deme-boundaries, is noticeable. The demes were geographically distinctive units that had been separate *poleis* before they came together in the new city. A comparison with the Rhodian situation after the *synoikismos* suggests itself. The practice of adoption is less frequent in Stratonikeia than among the Rhodian elite, and less likely to be governed by complex cyclical patterns of office-holding

⁸ *BCH* 62 (1938) 255.

⁹ See, with similar problems, on the adoptive habits of the Rhodian elite, V. Gabrielsen, *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes* (1997) ch. 5.

and concomitant strategic thinking,¹⁰ but it is worth asking what if any specific effect the *synoikismos/sympoliteia* that created the *polis* of Stratonikeia had on cross-deme marriage- and adoptive strategies.

EA 29 (1997) 95 no. 13A and B, are two fragments of a Hellenistic decree dated by Stratonikeia's *stephanephoros*: A is a small fragment of the block that originally belonged above B; B a large slightly curved block which Şahin places in the southeast corner of the propylon. A is very likely identical to *I. Stratonikeia* 550 (known previously only from Benndorf's sketchbook, whose copy shows that a few more letters were visible at that time) and is restored by Şahin as follows:

A Ἐπὶ [στεφανηφόρου]
 Ἄπ[ολλοδότου τοῦ]
 Χρῦ[σάορος Κω(ραιέως) μηνὸς - -]
 4 δε[υτέραι πρυ]-
 [τανευόντων]
 []
 []
 8 [γραμματεύοντος]

Demotics were a fixed element in the official identification of Stratonikeians, male and female; they occur in the epigraphic record from the late second century onwards. There are few exceptions to this rule. One is in the dating formula by the city's eponymous *stephanephoros*: no demotic is attached to the incumbent's name when used in this way, so e.g. *I. Stratonikeia* 11, 105, 512, 526, 1034, 1101. A demotic should therefore not be restored for the *stephanephoros* in this inscription. Şahin's particular suggestion, made already in *I. Stratonikeia* II.2, p. 31, that the man in question is identical to Apollodotos, son of Chrysaor, of Koraia, who features in *I. Stratonikeia* 1038a as *prytanis*, is wholly uncertain.¹¹ It is not clear that the line-lengths of A were as short (and as irregular) as Şahin's restoration requires, given the width of B (166.5 cm) and its line-length; cf. also the example of e.g. *I. Stratonikeia* 512 l. 1, which is of similar date but quite differently arranged.

University College London

Riet van Bremen

¹⁰ Although even there, the precise link between cyclical holding of priesthoods and adoptive practices are not really as clearcut as some would like.

¹¹ His further suggestion, made on the basis of this perceived identity, that in Stratonikeia the *stephanephoros* may have served as president of the *boule*, is unfounded.