

SARA SABA

TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT HOUSING FOR NEW CITIZENS

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 40 (2007) 125–134

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT HOUSING FOR NEW CITIZENS

In 1997 W. Blümel published an inscription found in the area of Herakleia under Latmos that testifies to the attempt to establish a *sympoliteia* between Latmos and Pidasia at the end of the 4th century B.C. Since the *editio princeps*, the text has been studied and commented on on several occasions, and this led to significant improvements of the text and its understanding.¹ Recently Wörrle has provided a new, full commentary, and he has also given a new interpretation of the historical data thus suggesting a different scenario for 4th century Caria.² In this article, I intend to reassess, in light of Wörrle's contribution, the importance of a particular section of the text, the clauses referring to the housing which the Latmians had to provide the Pidasians in order to facilitate their relocation. It will become clear that the terminology used in the inscription implies the employment of quite specific measures for the Pidasians' initial accommodation. Moreover, on a broader historical and institutional level, housing-clauses may help us understand the agreement initiated was a *sympoliteia* or *synoecism*, or both.³

The Latmos-Pidasia agreement contains two clauses that describe, respectively, the temporary and permanent housing that was to be arranged for the newcomers. A section on – compulsory – intermarriage for six years⁴ and a curiously brief reference to magistracies⁵ separate these provisions in the inscription. The importance of this textual hiatus will become clearer after some further considerations. For now, it is important to stress that the duration of each type of accommodation, temporary or permanent, not only marks a practical difference, but helps define the character and intent of the treaty.

The temporary accommodation available to Pidasians once in Latmos is described as follows (lines 19–20): *σταθμοὺς δὲ παρέ/χειν Πιδασεῦσιν ἰκανοὺς Λατμίους ἐνιαυτ[όν]*. This clause was variously interpreted. A. Bencivenni⁶ translates the clause: “I Latmii forniscano ogni anno ai Pidasai stathmoi (di grano) in quantità sufficiente.” Clearly, she interprets *σταθμός* as a weight measure, leaving the text with provisions on permanent housing only.⁷ This is not the

¹ Blümel 1997 *editio princeps*; W. Blümel, Addendum zu dem Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasia: ΦΠΑΤΟΡΙΟΝ, *Ep. Anat.* 30, 1998, p. 185; Ch. Habicht, Zum Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasia, *Ep. Anat.* 30, 1998, pp. 9–10; Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1999, no. 462; Jones 1999; Bencivenni 2003, ch. 6. The inscription dates to the last years of Asander activity, 313 B.C. circa, see *infra* n. 49.

² Wörrle 2003, pp. 121–143; Gauthier *BE* 2004, no. 308.

³ The fluidity with which ancient sources use the terms *sympoliteia*-*synoikismos* hinders the formulation of a precise definition for them. In this, I follow Reger's approach, see Reger 2004, pp. 148–149, according to whom a sharp and clear-cut distinction and cataloguing of these agreements is not possible. *Contra* Bencivenni 2003, pp. 157–158, p. 232 who tries to specify – not always successfully – the difference between them on the basis of known cases.

⁴ On this see R. van Bremen, Family Structures, in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. A. Erskine, Oxford 2003, pp. 313–330, esp. pp. 313–317 and Wörrle 2003, pp. 132–134.

⁵ On this see Wörrle 2003, pp. 134–135.

⁶ Bencivenni 2003, ch. 6.

⁷ Bencivenni 2003, p. 153. F. Canali de Rossi in his review of Bencivenni's work (BMCR, 2006, e-review) also noted her translation and rejected it. I agree with Canali De Rossi's assessment, but would add another reason to translate the sentence as referring to temporary housing and not to food provisions. Agreements foreseeing a physical move of new residents into a partner city normally record regulations on provisional housing rather than on permanent housing. While a text can contain rules on temporary arrangements without permanent provisions,

only objection to her translation. The temporal expression ἐνιαυτ[όν] should not be understood as distributive – every year – but indicates a limited amount of time – for one year.⁸ Blümel’s original interpretation was more accurate: “und die Latmier sollen den Pidaseern auf ein Jahr ausreichend Wohnungen und Ställe zur Verfügung stellen”.⁹ His interpretation was based on the assumption that σταθμός has a broader meaning than “shelter” and reflects the paramilitary character of the provision. Finally, in 2003 Wörrle gave the following interpretation: “geeignete Unterkünfte sollen zur Verfügung stellen den Pidaseis die Latmier ein Jahr lang”.¹⁰ That is the Latmians did not have to assign space and inhabitable buildings to the Pidaseans; instead they had the obligation to host them in their own houses.

Like Wörrle, I think that this sentence should be translated: “enough Latmians must host (in their own houses) the Pidaseans for one year” or: “the Latmians must host (in their own houses) the Pidaseans for a year – offering enough space”. The adjective ἱκανούς is normally – and probably better – referred to σταθμούς thus the second rendition. However, if a few Latmians had been granted ἀνεπισταθμεία¹¹ *ad personam*¹² at the time of the treaty, and were thus exempted from lodging newcomers, ἱκανούς could refer to those Latmians who had to do as ordered, *i.e.* host the Pidaseans. This should be treated as a case of ἐπισταθμεία for civil purposes.

Σταθμός is the key term in this clause. Normally, it is used in military contexts to designate areas where army members are allowed to lodge more or less temporarily. These areas can be located in or outside a *polis*, and papyrological material reveals that the lodging of troops was always a heavy imposition on the local population.¹³ One of the best epigraphical records testifying to the burden of this forced hosting is a deme-decree of Rhamnous honoring Epichares for sparing the population this hardship.¹⁴ Lines 24–26: *παρεσκεύασε δὲ καὶ τοῖς παρὰ Πατρόκλου*

the opposite is not yet attested. If Bencivenni’s translation were accepted, as far as housing is concerned, this text would be highly unusual, if not unique.

In her defense, translating *stathmos* as a measure of grain in the wrong context is not unique. Robert 1946, pp. 79–85, for example, corrected the old, accepted reading of an honorary inscription from Ephesos, now in *IEph* 1449. L. 4 ὑπὲρ τοῦ σταθμοῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ had been long interpreted as referring to a form of measurement, which led scholars to understand these lines as financial provisions for the sanctuary. Robert stressed instead that the text refers to a temporary – winter – camp for Macedonian soldiers located by the sanctuary, *i.e.* *epistathmeia*.

⁸ A search in the PHI confirmed that the distributive concept “every year” is rendered by the addition of the preposition *κατά*.

⁹ Blümel 1997, p. 138.

¹⁰ See Wörrle 2003, p. 123, pp. 131–132.

¹¹ For recent bibliography see *infra*, the starting point, however, is still Launey 1950, esp. ch. 12.

¹² On this see Hennig 1995, pp. 279–280.

¹³ Papyri report numerous complaints filed from locals upon whom soldiers were billeted. On this see the excellent study by Hennig 1995, pp. 269–275. For a few representative documents including royal interventions to regulate the situation see Lenger 1964, esp. nr. 1–10; 24; 53.

¹⁴ The *editio princeps* is V. Petrakos, *NEAI ΠΕΓΑΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΕΜΟΝΙΔΕΙΟΥ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΥ*, AA 22, 1967, pp. 38–52, he later added a fragment, see *SEG* LI 105. The bibliography on the text is extensive, also because of its historical significance. The decree dates to the end of the Chremonidean war (ca. 264/3 B.C.) and describes in detail how Epichares tried to save and defend the fortress of Rhamnous along with the crops, thus sheltering the local economy, and residents. On this last point see D. Knoepfler, *Les Kryptoi du stratège Épicharès à Rhamnounte et le début de la guerre de Chrémonidès*, *BCH* 117, 1993, pp. 327–341 and the recent reflections by G. J. Oliver, *Regions and Micro-Regions. Grain for Rhamnous*, in *Hellenistic Economies*, edd. Z. H. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen, G. J. Oliver, London 2001, pp. 137–155, esp. pp. 142–153. For a new edition of the text with recent bibliography see V. Petrakos, *Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΝΤΟΣ. ΣΥΝΟΨΗ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΑΣΚΑΦΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΡΕΥΝΩΝ (1813–1998). ΙΙ ΟΙ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΕΣ*, Athens 1999, no. 3.

/ [πα]ραγενομένοις [στρα]τιώταις ἐπὶ τὴν βοήθειαν, καὶ στέγα[ς] ὅπως ἔχωσιν ἰκανάς . . . (ca. 21–22) οὐθέννα ποιήσας ἐν ἐπισταθμεῖαι τῶν πολιτῶν οὐδὲ τῶν . . .¹⁵ The inscription strongly asserts Epichares' merits, remarking that he made sure no soldier was billeted upon the local population, in order to avoid the well-attested acts of violence that commonly arose from this arrangement. Epichares provided that there were enough στέγα[ς]¹⁶ for the soldiers and they did not have to resort to ἐπισταθμεῖα. As mentioned, papyri record innumerable complaints that testify to the hardship that ἐπισταθμεῖα imposed on the locals.¹⁷

Recently discovered inscriptions continue to suggest that soldiers thus accommodated were not welcomed anywhere.¹⁸ Gauthier 1989, n. 3 is another good example of what a heavy burden *epistathmeia* was. The text reveals the new, and newly repealed, measures that Antiochos III adopted in Sardis a few months after its re-conquest in 213 B.C.¹⁹ At that time, the king fined the city heavily and lodged part of his troops.²⁰ This inscription, however, shows a progressive reconciliation between the two parties. For example, in lines 7–9 the text says: καὶ εἰς / τοὺς κατασταθμευομένους δὲ παρ' ὑμῖν συνχωροῦμεν λαμβά/νεσθαι ὧν ἔχετε οἰκῶν ἀντὶ τῶν ἡμισέων τὰ τρίτα μέρη.²¹ Thus, when Sardis was taken back from Achaïos, the locals had to forfeit half of their own houses to the lodged troops, but later Antiochos ordered that soldiers occupied only 1/3 of them.²²

The potential damage caused by the forced lodging of troops induced several *poleis* to ask for the grant of ἀνεπισταθμεῖα, which can be translated as “immunity from forced lodging”.²³ Since I have mentioned the case of Sardis, I must conclude by pointing to a last document (*Sardis* VII.2) concerning the grant of ἀνεπισταθμεῖα to an unspecified city, which a few scholars would like to identify with Sardis. According to Piejko, for example, *Sardis* VII.2 would testify to the final act of pacification between the city and Antiochos.²⁴ Gauthier, however, commented on the inscription and Piejko's theories, arguing convincingly that there are no grounds for a definitive

¹⁵ “(Epichares) arranged barracks for Patroklos' soldiers, who came to help, so that there were enough (barracks) for them . . . and none of the citizens and of the (?) had to host them in their houses”.

¹⁶ On στέγας instead of the more usual στεγνάς see J. and L. Robert *BE* 1968, no. 247. According to the two scholars, the meaning is still that of “built, temporary barrack” as we learn from other epigraphical texts and papyri. See, for example, the well known text from Pergamon on the new (?) military settlement *AvP* VIII.1 158; the military regulation from Amphipolis, L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, vol. II, Firenze 1976, 114, and lines 166–185 of *Dikaiomata*, 1913, pp. 98–106. L. Robert also discussed this topic in 1946, pp. 79–85; see also Launey 1950, esp. ch. 12.

¹⁷ See again Hennig 1995, pp. 267–282.

¹⁸ For example, on the Seleucid see Cohen 1978; Ma 1999, pp. 108–121.

¹⁹ On the re-conquest of Sardis from the hands of Achaïos see Ma 1999, pp. 54–63.

²⁰ For a historical reconstruction and bibliography see Ma 1999, pp. 61–63.

²¹ “And we agree that those who are lodged by you should occupy a third of the houses you possess instead of half of them.” On this see Gauthier's comment 1989, p. 100, who stresses that these words refer to a form of forced lodging and not to the requisition of houses/buildings where soldiers could live.

²² *C. Ord. Ptol.* 5–10, see Lenger 1964, pp. 9–19; see also Hennig 1995, pp. 270–272.

²³ For example, Welles 30 records *anepistathmeia* for Soli granted by Ptolemy IV; J. and L. Robert 1989, II.12 honors Menippos who also obtained this grant for Colophon; *SEG* XLIII 755/756 are letters to Ephesos (early I A.D.) where the city is declared free of *epistathmeia*. For other examples and a brief treatment see M. Wörrle, *Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens III. Ein hellenistischer Königsbrief aus Telmessos*, *Chiron* 9, 1979, pp. 83–112, esp. pp. 89–91. See again Hennig 1995, pp. 276–282.

²⁴ See F. Piejko, *The Settlement of Sardis after the Fall of Achaëus*, *AJPh* 108, 1987, pp. 707–728; Hennig 1995, p. 277 seems to agree.

attribution of this text to Sardis.²⁵ The grant of ἀνεπισταθμεία would have been in order for this city sooner or later, but this document does not testify to it.

Normally, the evidence on forced lodging comes from a specific type of documents – military –, but this does not rule out the possibility that bureaucracy employs the same military language in a civic context to better describe a similar, if not identical, – housing – arrangement. As mentioned, Blümel’s translation is to my mind extremely astute as he renders σταθμούς with “Wohnungen und Ställe²⁶ zur Verfügung”. With this, he perceives the paramilitary character of the temporary housing provisions in this text. The common use of σταθμός to indicate forced lodgment of foreign elements in a community, however, allows us to see lines 19–20 of the Latmos-Pidasa agreement as imposing the lodging of newcomers on Latmos’ residents rather than providing them with inhabitable but empty buildings.

The Latmos-Pidasa treaty contains provisions that concern also permanent housing (27–28): ἐξεῖναι δὲ Πιδασεῦσιν οἰκοδομεῖσθαι οἰκήσε[ις] ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐν τῇ δημοσίαι οὐ ἂν βούλωνται.²⁷ Note that the Latmians failed to grant specific lots to the Pidaseans, who were however allowed to build on public ground;²⁸ here parallels on housing provisions can be instructive. A major movement of people from one to another understandably could create concern in regard to housing. *Poleis* involved in synoikismos-sympoliteia agreements had to take care of such arrangements, and the surviving texts suggest that different housing provisions reflect also the attitude that a city had toward the agreement itself. It is undeniable that treaties with permanent housing provisions show a stronger will to complete the sympoliteia-synoikism, but it must be remembered also that this ‘will’ is not always the *poleis*’.

Housing arrangements are normally stated in rather simple terms, except for the well-known case of Teos-Lebedos, which elaborates on almost every point.²⁹ For the sake of clarity, I start with the analysis of more straightforward provisions, such as those contained in the treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia near Sipylos.³⁰ In section II (56–58), we read: δότωσαν δὲ Σμυρναῖοι καὶ εἰς κατασκήνωσιν³¹ τοῖς ἀποσκευαζομένοις τῶν ἐκ Μαγνησίας οἰκίας κλινῶν ὅσων ἂν τῶι δήμῳι δόζηι ἀφ’ οὗ ἄγ χρόνου ἢ ὁμολογία συνσφραγισθ(ῆ)ι εἰς ἑξάμηνον.³² According to the

²⁵ Gauthier 1989 *addendum*; idem *BE* 1988, no. 424. See also Robert 1964, pp. 19–21.

²⁶ On *stathmos* as stable see *P. Ent.* 13; see also Hennig 1995, p. 271 n. 120.

²⁷ “It should be possible for the Pidaseans to build houses on public ground, where they want”. On the restoration of οἰκήσε[ις] see Wörrle 2003 app. crit. According to Blümel 1997, such restoration was not possible, but, as Jones 1999, p. 6 noted, the picture he published, although very good, is inconclusive. Jones suggested then to restore οἰκήσι[v], but now the new reading of the text by Wörrle should be held as a more or less final clarification.

²⁸ The very detailed Teos-Lebedos agreement is a good term of comparison, but also a foil to the very generic dispositions of the Lebedos-Pidasa’s treaty. Given the paucity of the evidence, it becomes difficult to decide which is the exception and which the rule.

²⁹ The locus classicus for the text is Welles 3–4. Bencivenni 2003, ch. 7 has also republished the text with a rich bibliography and provided her own translation. The article by Ager 1998 is essential for the understanding of this text.

³⁰ *ISmyrna* 573; *OGIS* 229; *Staatsvertr.* III 492; Th. Ihnken, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Sipylos, mit einem Kommentar zum Sympoliteievertrag mit Smyrna* (IK 8), Bonn 1978, 1; see also H. Kotsidou, *Time kai doxa: Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*, Berlin 2000, 231 E1.

³¹ See Hennig 1995, p. 269.

³² “The Smyrneans should provide those from Magnesia who are building (their own houses) with houses containing as many beds as the demos thinks appropriate for six months starting from the time the treaty has been concluded.”

text, the availability of the cost-free, provisional housing in Smyrna was limited to the six months immediately following the agreement. The newcomers were not expected to possess a fully built house by the end of the grace period, but probably to start paying. The text reveals that the city used public money to arrange the first free six months of the new residents' accommodation,³³ and the local authorities must have calculated that they could not afford to have the newcomers on the public payroll longer. It is reasonable to assume that they did not force the new residents out of their temporary accommodation, but these had to start paying for it. Also, no further provision regulating permanent housing appears in this text. There is no sign of permission to build a home on public land or assignment of other lots, as if this were in fact none of Smyrna's concern. This attitude may indeed find an explanation in the apparent lack of a plan for an *en masse* moving of Magnesia's residents to Smyrna. The transfer appears to be a voluntary relocation of a few individuals rather than a compact and unified moving of all residents.³⁴

The very articulated agreement between Teos and Lebedos deals with housing extensively.³⁵ The Lebedians are to be given a lot, as big as the one they left behind, where they can build a new home. In addition, the Teians are to provide free, temporary housing till completion of the Lebedians' permanent residences.³⁶ The amount of time necessary to build a house is hinted at

³³ μισθούσθω δὲ ὁ ταμίαις τῶν ὀσίωμ προσόδων [τ]ὰς οἰκίας μετὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ τὸ ἀνήλωμα διδότη ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς πόλεως προσόδων "The treasurer of the public revenues shall pay the rent of the houses with the strategoi and the money should come from the city revenues". For the treasurer see L. Migeotte, *Finances sacrées et finances publiques dans les cités grecques*, *Actas del Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* 9, 1995, pp. 180–185, esp. pp. 182–183; Hennig 1994, p. 341 n. 126. Bencivenni 2003, ch. 8 translates it as "il tesoriere delle entrate sacre" charging the adjective ὀσίωμ (*v*) with a strictly religious connotation. This interpretation, however, is questionable as it implies too overt involvement of sacred magistrates in the administration of civic funds meant. Given the general context, I prefer not to accept Bencivenni's translation. See also C. Chandezon, *Foires et panégyries dans le monde grec classique et hellénistique*, *REG* 113, 2000, pp. 70–100.

³⁴ I do not aim to explore further the reasons behind the Smyrna-Magnesia agreement. I have, however, to note several facts, and also that there is no certainty whether the Seleucid kings played a decisive role in the unification of these *poleis*. See again Bencivenni *op. cit.* and Reger 2004, on Smyrna p. 178; on the role of kings in such enterprises pp. 150 and 155–156. The evidence in this case suggests that the underlying interests were local, but still strongly supported by the royal authority.

That Magnesia near Sipylos was a military colony is now common knowledge, see Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe*, Berkeley 1995, pp. 216–217; *idem* 1978, pp. 76–83. The city appears to have had the status of a *polis* even if no traditional governmental organ is attested. On this see Bencivenni 2003, pp. 223–225; on the organization of Magnesia see Cohen *op. cit.* The treaty extends the agreement to include a third community, Palaimagnesia, which was an outpost and a fort. The provisions and the situation illustrated in the text resemble the agreement between Teos and Kyrbissos, see J. and L. Robert 1976. Kyrbissos was a fortress too and, probably, it had an institutional setting similar to that of Magnesia and Palaimagnesia. This institutional similarity can be inferred, for example, from the way residents of these communities are called. Bencivenni 2003, p. 224 has pointed out that: "benché Magnesia sia più volte definita come πόλις, non è mai utilizzato l'etnico derivato, ma sempre perifrasi con il nome della *polis*." J. and L. Robert 1976, p. 189 have a similar note for Kyrbissos: "il faut remarquer que, s'il est parlé de Kyrbissos comme forteresse et comme lieu habité, l'ethnique Κυρβισσεύς n'est jamais employé, comme autrefois dans les listes des tributes, mais le terme civique et juridique est celui-ci: les citoyens qui habitent à Kyrbissos". He adds that this particular use – or lack thereof – of the ethnic shows that the communities of Teos and Kyrbissos became indeed one. This vouches for a synoecism rather than a sympoliteia. Smyrna, Magnesia and Palaimagnesia, however, seem to sign only a sympoliteia agreement, maybe because of the presence of a more complex, viz. multiethnic, population living in Magnesia and its territory. Smyrna was probably not willing to allow all these different ethnic elements into its citizen body.

³⁵ *Syll.*³ 344; Bencivenni 2003, ch. 7 with a complete list of the rich bibliography on this intriguing text.

³⁶ Ll. 4–17: οἰόμεθα δὲ δεῖν καὶ οἰκόπεδον ἐκάστῳ τῶν Λ[εβεδίων δοθῆναι] / παρ' ὑμῖν ἴσον ᾧ ἂν καταλίπηι ἐν Λεβέδῳ· ἕως δ' ἂν οἰκοδομήσωνται, [ἅπανσι δοθῆναι] / [ο]ικίας τοῖς Λεβεδίοις ἄμισθί, ἐὰν μὲν διαμένῃ ἢ ὑπάρχουσα πόλις, τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῶν / ὑπαρχουσῶν οἰκιῶν· ἐὰν δὲ δεῖ κατασκάπτειν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πόλιν,

lines 14–15: if the lot had not been built after three years, the city is to repossess it. The last sentence of this paragraph adds another interesting detail: the Teians are to provide the Lebedians with a quantity of $\frac{1}{4}$ of *ταστεγνάς* every year for 4 years, so that the houses will be built faster. Welles and Bencivenni translate *ταστεγνάς*, which clearly conflates article and noun, as “roofs”. It would be better, however, to translate the term as “roof tiles”, as this is most likely what the city was providing.³⁷ The logical assumption is that houses could have been still under construction after 3 years, and probably only a completely empty lot triggered the repossession of the land on behalf of the city.

This document has also an epistolary appendix, a royal letter with financial measures meant to guarantee a smooth transition to the Lebedians.³⁸ The financial conditions under which the Lebedians were to move to Teos were undoubtedly favorable. The text explains that the Teian

[καταλειφθῆναι] / [μὲ]ν τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν τὰς ἡμισείας, τούτων δὲ τὸ τρίτον μέρος δοθῆ[ναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις, τὰ] / [δ]ὲ δύο μέρη ἔχειν ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως κατασκάπτηται, [καὶ ἱκαναὶ ὄσιν, αἱ κατα]/λειπόμεναι δέξασθαι καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ τοὺς Λεβεδίους, δοθῆναι τοῖς Λε[βε]δίοις τούτων τὸ] / [τρ]ίτον μέρος· ἐὰν δὲ αἱ καταλειπόμεναι μὴ ἱκαναὶ ὄσι δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς [τε καὶ τοὺς Λεβεδίους, οἱ]/[κί]ας καταλειφθῆναι τῶν μελλουσῶν κατασκάπτεσθαι τὰς ἱκανά[ς, ὅταν δὲ συντελεσθῶσιν] / [ικ]αναὶ οἰκίαι ἐν τῇ κατασκευαζομένῃ πόλει, κατασκάπτει τὰς οἰκίας τὰ[ς καταλειπομένας ὅ]/[σαι] ἂν ἔξω πίπτωσι τῆς περιβαλλομένης πόλεως· οἰκοδομ[εῖν δὲ τοὺς Λεβεδίους] / [πάν]τας τὰ οἰκόπεδα ἐ[ν] ἔτεσιν τρισίν. εἰ δὲ μὴ, δημόσια εἶναι τὰ [οἰκόπεδα. οἰόμεθα δὲ δεῖν καὶ τὰστέγας τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀποδοθῆναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις [ὅ]πως τάχιστα κατασκευά]/[ζω]νται αἱ οἰκίαι, [ἐν ἔτε]σιν τέσσαρσιν πρὸς μέρος ἐκάστου ἐν[αν]του. “We think that you should give to each of the Lebedians a lot equal to that he has left in Lebedos; until they build (their dwellings), housing for free shall be given to all Lebedians. In case the existing polis keeps on standing, they shall have a third of the existing houses. If, however, the current polis must be destroyed, destroy half of the houses, and of these a third shall be given to the Lebedians, the other two thirds you shall keep. In case only part of the city has to be destroyed, and the remaining houses are not to take in you and the Lebedians, give to them a third of these dwellings. If they do not suffice, just destroy enough of the houses that will be destroyed, and when enough new dwellings in the new polis under construction shall be completed, destroy the rest of the houses that ought to be and lie outside the city limits. Those who have taken lots shall build their houses within three years, if not, the land is to be public property. We also think that you should provide the Lebedians with roof tiles for the houses, so that these shall be complete as quickly as possible, over four years, a quarter each year.”

³⁷ On *στεγνά* as buildings see *infra*; in this paragraph it should be taken as a substantive deriving from the adjective *στεγνός* normally meaning “covered”. Also on this see Welles’s comment *ad. loc.* and Hennig 1994, p. 343.

³⁸ Ll. 109–120: [Βασ]ιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος Τηίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν. ἡμεῖς τὸ [πρότερον σκοποῦντες δι’ οὗ] / [τρ]όπου τάχιστ’ ἂν συντελεσθεῖ ὁ συνοικισμός, οὐκ ἐρωῶμεν τὰ [ἀναγκαῖα ὑμῖν] / [χ]ρήματα πόθεν πορισθῆι, τοῦ ἔχειν Λεβεδίο[ι]ς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν οἰ[κιῶν] ἐξ ἐτοίμου ἀποδι]/[δό]ναι, διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐκ τῶν προσόδων γινόμενα κατὰ χρόνους / προσπορεύ[εσθαι ὑμῖν μακροτέρους· δεξάμε]/νοι δὲ τοὺς τε παρ’ ὑμῶν καὶ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν Λεβεδίων διαπυθάνομε[νοι αὐτῶν εἴ τινα ἔχουσιν ἢ]/μῖν πόρον εἰσηγεῖσθαι, οἱ ὑ φ]αμένων δὲ ἔχειν ἔξω τῶν περὶ τὰ τέλη ἐπισ[κευά]μενοι τὰ εἰθισμένα] / αὐτοῖς, εὐρίσκομεν ἀεὶ μ[όν]ον [πρ]οεισενεγκεῖν ὑμῶν τοὺς εὐπορωτά[τους, ἡμῖν οὖν καλῶς δο]/[κ]εῖ ἔχειν, τοὺς μὲν γε εὐποροῦντας εἶναι ἐξακοσίους, προεισενεγκεῖν [δὲ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα χρήματα] / κατὰ τὰς οὐσίας, ὥστε γενέσθαι τὸ τέταρτον μέρος τῶν τιμῶν τάχιστ[α τοῖς Λεβεδίοις,] / τὴν δὲ κομιδὴν γενέσθαι τοῖς προεμπορίσασιν πρώτοις ἐκ τῶν προσόδω[ν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τοῦ ἐ]/[ν]εστῶτος πασῶν συντασσομένων. τοὺς μὲν ἄξοντας τοὺς τιμήσοντα[ς τὰς οἰκίας ... “King Antigonos to the boule and the demos of Teos, greetings. Previously, investigating how the synoecism can take place as fast as possible, we did not look into how the money you need would be provided, so that you could give promptly to the Lebedians the price of their houses, as this money from the revenues would indeed arrive in a rather long time. When receiving the Lebedian envoys and yours, I asked them whether they had any suggestion for the incoming of the money. Since they had none besides taxation, we discovered that always only the richest have given money in advance. As this does not seem appropriate to us, (we decided) that the richest should be 600, and, according to their means, they should provide in advance the necessary money, so that $\frac{1}{4}$ of the value could be given to the Lebedians very soon. (We decided) that repayment should be given to these men first from the revenues exacted for paying the houses every year ...”

authorities were to give the newcomers the full value of the houses they left behind. This was done so that they could afford comparable homes in the Teian territory.³⁹

Another inscription with detailed temporary housing provisions is *Milet I 3*, 149. The context is the sympoliteia between Miletus⁴⁰ and Pidasa normally dated to the 180s.⁴¹ The housing provisions are here limited to one sentence (24–27): δοῦναι δὲ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μιλησίων Πιδασεῦσιν τοῖς κατοικηκόσιν καὶ ἐνμεμενήκοσιν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν χρόνου ἔμ Πιδάσεισιν ἢ τῆι χώραι τῆι Πιδασέων οἰκ(ή)σεις εἰς κλινῶν τριακοσίων καὶ ἐνενήκοντα.⁴² Like the Smyrna-Magnesia agreement, this text does not list any separate provisions for permanent housing. Also, it neither records time limits for the temporary lodging granted to the Pidaseans, nor implies that the housing is actually cost-free. Finally, it must be noted that the Milesians impose a limitation on who was entitled to move to the *polis* with housing. Only the Pidaseans who had been living in that community up to the signing of the agreement were granted this option.

The wording of this text is quite close to that of the agreement between Smyrna and Magnesia. In both texts the major *poleis* provide houses for a certain number of people, quantified in number of beds, and also they avoid the problem of permanent accommodation. Smyrna and Miletus seem to have had a very similar attitude, and this suggests that the Miletus-Pidasa agreement, like Smyrna's, did not plan or entail any mass transfer of population. This sympoliteia appears to have had two main goals, increasing both the Milesian territory and the Pidasean security. The treaty was not meant to prompt or/and accomplish a physical union of the two *poleis*, and this last point is well illustrated by the settling of a new garrison in Pidasa.⁴³

³⁹ I do not discuss here this text fully and especially the issues involved in the possible moving of the whole site of Teos-Lebedos. See Bencivenni 2003 and Ager 1998.

⁴⁰ An additional text from Miletus testifying to the grant of land to foreigners–new citizens is *Milet I 3*, 33. There, the *polis* gave land and housing to Cretan soldiers, see Hennig 1994, pp. 340–341. These properties were located in the chora of Myous then Miletus' property. The housing provisions, however, are too fragmentary to provide a substantial contribution to my argument.

⁴¹ On this text, its dating and historical context see Reger 2004, pp. 156–162; the excellent study by Ph. Gauthier, Pidaséens et Milésiens: la procédure et les modalités institutionnelles, in *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.*, edd. A. Bresson and R. Descat, Bordeaux 2001, pp. 117–127; on the financial clauses see L. Migeotte, Le traité entre Milet et Pidasa (Delphinion 149). Les clauses financières, in *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e siècle a.C.*, pp. 129–135. Dating the inscription is difficult as this depends on the general reconstruction of the historical decade 90s–80s of the 2nd century B.C., see M. Wörrle, Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos I: Antiochos III, Zeuxis und Herakleia, *Chiron* 18, 1988, pp. 421–476, esp. pp. 428–448. The text cannot be studied without considering at least two other crucial inscriptions: *Milet I 3*, 148 and 150. The first is a peace treaty between Magnesia on the Meander and Miletus. The second establishes the condition for peace and isopoliteia between Miletus and Herakleia under Latmos. The events recorded in these texts reveal parts of the territorial struggles during the years of Philip V's intervention in the area. Probably Pidasa was caught in the crossfire and, fearing for its safety, requested "protection" and sympoliteia with Miletus. On this see Wörrle 2004. For a historical overview of the events in Caria and South-West Asia Minor in general see Ma 1999, pp. 78–81; see also *infra*.

For an overview of the archeological evidence related to the Milesian garrison in Pidasa see Radt 1973/4, pp. 170 and 172–173.

⁴² "The Milesians shall give to the Pidaseans who have so far lived and resided in Pidasa or in the chora of the Pidaseans houses with 390 beds."

⁴³ Ll. 15–18: πέμπειν δὲ Μιλησίους εἰς Πίδασα τὸν λαχόντα τῶν πολιτῶν / φρούραρχον καὶ φρουρούς, ὅσους ἂν ἱκανοὺς εἶναι φαίνηται, καὶ προνοεῖν, ὅπως / τὰ τεῖχη ἐπισκευάζηται καὶ κατὰ χώραν μένηι, καὶ τῆς φυλακῆς ἐπιμε/λειῆσθαι, καθότι ἂν κρίνωσιν συμφέρειν. "(It is decreed that) the Milesians shall send to Pidasa a phourarchos chosen by lot among the citizens, and as many guards as necessary to fortify further the walls, reside in the chora and take care of guarding it as they think appropriate." On the repairs, and interventions on the wall of Pidasa see Radt 1973/4, pp. 170–171.

Miletus is expected to establish a fortress and garrison in the smaller partner-city, as Teos did in Kyrbissos in the 3rd century B.C.⁴⁴ Miletus, Smyrna, and Teos(-Kyrbissos) reinforced and enlarged their territory by means of such agreements, and they gained useful posts to guard their boundaries.⁴⁵ On the other hand, Teos(-Lebedos) and Latmos did not acquire much from the defensive and territorial point of view from their sympoliteiai agreements. At the least, one can say that the *poleis* appeared not to be too interested in such acquisitions, while the stress fell on the increase of population. It is no coincidence that these two treaties include clauses on permanent housing while two out of the three texts mentioned above only deal with temporary housing.⁴⁶ Treaties dictated by local interests do not normally have a permanent housing clause because the goal of the subscribers was defense, or aggrandizement of the chora. This suggests that major towns involved in local interpoleis agreements did not care for a permanent moving of the partner *polis* residents, but were more interested in the strategic value of the areas thus acquired.⁴⁷ Royal (prompted by royal interventions) sympoliteiai/synoikismoι had a different scope, the physical unification of two *poleis* with an increase in the size of the population, and this made housing for new citizens/residents necessary.⁴⁸

The Latmos-Pidasa agreement was clearly directed by a higher authority, Asander,⁴⁹ who prompted the *poleis* to unite, and show concern for the necessary living arrangements. The Latmians, however, granted to the Pidaseans only permission to build in “public ground”, without further allowance. This of course did not hinder the Pidaseans from buying any land they might have wanted, but the provision has a careless, almost dismissive tone. It is almost as if the Latmians did not support the unification. This attitude, in a way, anticipates the failure of the agreement. One can wonder whether the sympoliteia even took place, but we know that even if it did, it dissolved not long afterwards. The extant treaty between Miletus and Pidasa shows that in the 2nd century B.C. Pidasa was again an independent community. At that date, however, historical conditions recommended to the small polis a new alliance with a stronger partner, *i.e.* Miletus. The span between the last years of Asander,⁵⁰ when the treaty can be reasonably dated, and 180s⁵¹ could have seen numerous developments. In fact, the history of the sympoliteia between Latmos and Pidasa must be speculative.

⁴⁴ See J. and L. Robert 1976, pp. 155–156 and 199–204. For the management of the Teian territory see Ch. Veligianni-Terzi, Τέως και Ἀβδερᾶ, in *APAXAIA ΘΠΑKH II*, Komotini 1997, pp. 691–705, esp. pp. 700–703 treating more specifically of Abdera.

⁴⁵ See J. Ma, Fighting *Poleis* of the Hellenistic World, in *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, ed. by van Wess, London 2000, pp. 337–376 for the difference between the recurrent “big” (*viz.* dynastic) and “small” (*viz.* civic) wars which constantly involved *poleis* in Asia Minor.

⁴⁶ The treaty Teos-Kyrbissos preserves no record of such provisions.

⁴⁷ The problem of oligandria must have been confined to the smaller cities entering sympoliteia or synoikismos agreements. These communities probably accepted to be part of such agreements because their small population could not guarantee safety any longer. See Reger 2004, pp. 159–160.

⁴⁸ For an overview see Reger 2004, pp. 178–179, which summarizes the conclusions reached in his article/chapter.

⁴⁹ See again Blümel 1997. For the historical commentary see Wörrle 2003, pp. 139–143.

⁵⁰ On Asander see L. O’Sullivan, Asander, Athens and IG II² 450: A New Interpretation, *ZPE* 119, 1997, pp. 107–116 and S. D. Lambert’s response (*IG II² 450, Athens and Asandros: A Note*, *ZPE* 126, 1999, pp. 129–130); J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d’Amyzon en Carie I*, Paris 1983, esp. pp. 99–100.

⁵¹ See again n. 18.

At the end of the 4th century, Latmos was abandoned for a new city located only about a kilometer south-west of the original site.⁵² That became Herakleia under Latmos, until Pleistarchos renamed it – temporarily – Pleistarcheia.⁵³ Of particular interest is the first relocation of Latmos-Herakleia, which might have given Pidasas the chance to break free, acquire again its identity as an independent *polis*, and get back its own *chora*.⁵⁴ It is impossible to say exactly when this could have happened, but the general timeframe is as follows: the *terminus post quem* must be 313 B.C., *i.e.* presumably the last year of Asander’s power, the *ante quem* the end of 4th century, *i.e.* when Latmos became Herakleia. If Gauthier was right in suggesting a later date for text,⁵⁵ one could even hypothesize that the Pidasians never even moved to Latmos and that the sympoliteia remained, so to speak, on paper. After all, the re-creation of a small center, and its re-definition as an autonomous polis would not be so unusual.⁵⁶ If this happened, it was not to the detriment of the Latmians, who, otherwise, would have been forced to put up with the heavy burden of hosting the Pidasians in their own homes, at least until the moment of the physical move of the whole, new population to the site of new Herakleia.

The interpretation of lines 19–20 as indicating the civil *epistathmeia* is viable only because the stipulation of this agreement was conducted by a dynast. It is unlikely that *poleis* would willingly inflict upon their citizens a burden such as the compulsory hosting of newcomers. It is possible, on the other hand, that a higher authority would find this acceptable, just as the imposition of soldiers had been so many times before. Also, the small size of Pidasas’s population could have contributed to facilitating the idea of an *epistathmeia* type of accommodation rather than finding empty houses, perhaps to rent. This is an additional point: renting houses for newcomers could have been on the city payroll, but forcing Latmians to host Pidasians was, for the city, free and possibly less of a worry for Asander himself.

A final remark is in order on how these clauses can help us understand whether the agreement was signed with the intention to be carried out. Permanent housing provisions appear in sympoliteiai agreements directed by “higher” authorities, who had a special interest in seeing these *poleis* physically united. The surviving evidence is too sparse to make a real argument out of an occasional observation, but I believe that a special interest for permanent housing in an *interpo-*

⁵² See in passing Reger 2004, p. 151; A. Peschlow-Bindokat, Die Umgestaltung von Latmos in der ersten Hälfte des 4. Jhs. v. Chr., in *Architecture and Society in Hecatomnid Caria. Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1987*, edd. by T. Linders and P. Hellström, Uppsala 1989, pp. 69–76; ead., Die Befestigung von Latmos, *REA* 96, 1994, pp. 155–172.

⁵³ Wörrle 2003, pp. 140–143 treats the problem of Latmos-Herakleia-Pleistarcheia. According to him, Asander played a greater role in the – at least – planning of the city of Herakleia than is normally held. See also O. Hülten, Pleistarchos und die Befestigungsanlagen von Herakleia am Latmos, *Klio* 82, 2000, pp. 382–408.

⁵⁴ Bencivenni 2003, pp. 155, n. 9 makes an interesting point on the topic. She does not take a definite stand on whether the sympoliteia happened or not but states: “la pubblicazione del documento della stele è già di per sé una prova dell’attuazione, anche solo ad uno stadio iniziale e parziale, del piano di Asandro”. Even though I do not completely share her views, as such documents could be a way to jumpstart a process, which may not go through, hers is still a stimulating reflection.

Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1999, no. 462 postulates that the sympoliteia took place, but did not survive Asander’s. Contra Jones 1999, p. 3 who, mainly on numismatic grounds, believe that the unity of the two *poleis* lasted well into the 3rd century, that is even after Latmos was re-founded as Herakleia. See also L. Robert, Documents d’Asie Mineure, *BCH* 102, 1978, pp. 395–543. There are no certain proofs for either theory. I prefer Gauthier’s, and believe that a re-foundation was the perfect occasion for the Pidasians to go back to the pre-Asander polis status.

⁵⁵ Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1999, no. 462 suggests that this text dates to the very last years of Asander’s activity in Caria. See again Bencivenni 2003, pp. 155–156 on the date.

⁵⁶ See Reger 2004, esp. pp. 162–172.

leis agreement can be considered a sign of the intention to complete successfully a unification process. This often happened independently of the will of the communities directly involved, as the intervention of kings or royal agents shows. This observation applies to the Latmos-Pidasa agreement, where the two *poleis* must have had only a marginal interest in the completion of a *sympoliteia* wanted by Asander. Finally, its attested dissolution reinforces this hypothesis.*

Bibliography

- Ager S., Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World: The Case of Lebedos, *GRBS* 39, 1998, pp. 5–21.
- Bencivenni A., *Progetti di riforme costituzionali nelle epigrafi greche dei secoli IV–II a.C.*, Bologna 2003.
- Blümel W., Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasa, *Ep. Anat.* 29, 1997, pp. 135–142.
- Cohen G. M., *The Seleucid Colonies. Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization*, Wiesbaden 1978.
- Gauthier Ph., *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes II*, Geneva 1989.
- Hennig D., Immobilienerwerb durch Nichtbürger in der klassischen und hellenistischen Polis, *Chiron* 24, 1994, pp. 305–344.
- Staatliche Ansprüche an privaten Immobilienbesitz in der klassischen und hellenistischen Polis, *Chiron* 25, 1995, pp. 235–282.
- Jones C. P., The Union of Latmos and Pidasa, *Ep. Anat.* 31, 1999, pp. 1–7.
- Launey M., *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, Paris 1950.
- Lenger M.-Th., *Corpus de ordonnances des Ptolémées (C. Ord. Ptol.)*, Bruxelles 1964.
- Ma J., *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Cambridge (1999) 2000.
- Radt W., Pidasa bei Milet. Ergänzende Bemerkungen zu einer ‘karischen’ Stadtanlage, *Ist. Mitt.* 23–24, 1973–74, pp. 169–174.
- Reger G., *Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor*, in *The Greco-Roman East*, ed. by St. Colvin, Cambridge 2004, pp. 145–180.
- Robert J. and L., Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie. L’union de Téos et de Kyrbissos, *JSav* 1976, pp. 153–235.
- *Claros I. Décrets hellénistiques*, Paris 1989.
- Robert L., Sur un décret d’Éphèse, *Hellenica* 3, 1946, pp. 79–85.
- *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes*, Paris 1964.
- Welles C. B., *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study on Greek Epigraphy*, New Haven 1934.
- Wörrle M., Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos III: Der Synoikismos der Latmioi mit den Pidaseis, *Chiron* 33, 2003, pp. 121–143.
- Der Friede zwischen Milet und Magnesia. Methodische Probleme einer *communis opinio*, *Chiron* 34, 2004, pp. 45–57.

* For the Turkish abstract see p. 174.

ÖZET**S. Saba, “Temporary and Permanent Housing ...”**

Makalede, W. Blümel tarafından Herakleia Latmos’da (Kapıkırı) bulunarak *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29, 1997, s. 135–142’de yayınlanan ve Latmos ile Pidası kentleri arasında imzalanan bir ortak vatandaşlık (*sympoliteia*) anlaşmasını kaydeden yazıt üzerine bazı yeni yorumlar getirilmektedir (İ.Ö. IV. yüzyıl sonlarına tarihlenen bu önemli yazıt için ayrıca bk. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 30, 1998, s. 9–10 [Chr. Habicht]; 30, 1998, s. 185 [W. Blümel] ve 31, 1999, s. 1–7 [C. P. Jones] ve M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 33, 2003, s. 121–143). Bu anlaşma ile Latmos’luların, kentlerine göç eden Pidası vatandaşlarının kente kolay intibak etmelerini sağlamak üzere onları “*kendi evlerinde bir yıl boyunca konuk etme*”yi üstlenmiş olmalarından hareketle yazar, diğer birçok epigrafik kaynaktan hareketle, antik kentlerde vatandaşlığa yeni kabul edilenlere sağlanan bu türden *geçici* ve *kalıcı* barınma imkanlarını incelemektedir.