

Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World: The Case of Lebedos

Sheila L. Ager

IT IS AXIOMATIC that the institution of the polis in the Hellenistic Age faced new challenges and crises, but the continuing vitality and adaptability of the polis in the face of the new monarchies of the era has been repeatedly demonstrated. Yet there still lingers a sense that the true era of the city-state was the Classical age, now over and done with. In the early 1990s, Erich Gruen challenged anew some of the still persistent clichés about the degeneration of the polis in the Hellenistic age: “Is it the case that the cities enjoyed only a sham autonomy, lacked independent authority, and carried no serious impact on the course of historical events? Could they no longer generate the enthusiasm, devotion, and civic pride that had once characterized the heyday of the classical polis?”¹

The tiny polis of Lebedos on the coast of Asia Minor offers little to answer the first of these questions. “Serious impact on the course of historical events” is not a phenomenon to be associated with this little state at any stage of its history. But what of the second question? A conventional interpretation of the vicissitudes of Lebedos’s history would portray it as the anonymous and impotent victim of royal whims. But the evidence for Lebedos from the Hellenistic Age, sparse as it is, demonstrates that “enthusiasm, devotion, and civic pride” are

¹“The Polis in the Hellenistic World,” in R. Rosen and J. Farrell, edd., *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald* (Ann Arbor 1993) 340.

all evident, as is a fierce determination to maintain, if not autonomy, then at least identity. The case of Lebedos supports the view that in a new cosmopolitan world, the emotional life of the Greeks was more firmly grounded in the polis than ever.

The determination of the Lebedians to maintain their communal integrity can be traced largely through the threats that integrity faced, through enforced synoikism or refoundation. The establishment of royal power under the Diadochoi in Asia Minor prompted a number of synoikisms; Lebedos was not the only polis to be targeted for the greater efficiency of a "merger" by the Hellenistic monarchs. It shared that honour with several other Asia Minor states, including some that were probably around the same size, such as Skepsis and Pygela. The city-state was a unit that, justifiably or not, was at times felt to be too small for its own good; maintenance of resources and manpower could often stymie the smaller poleis. But the advantages of synoikism were only bought at a price; increased security came at the cost of political independence. When a small polis such as Lebedos or Pygela or Skepsis was merged with a larger neighbour, the civic identity of its citizens could be submerged.

The kings could argue that the synoikisms they sponsored were necessary benefits they bestowed on small or resource-poor states. But the numerous refoundations and synoikisms, especially of the early Hellenistic age, were not wholly motivated by philanthropy.² Both Antigonos Monophthalmos and Lysimachos appear in the sources in the role of insistent synoikizers, and the character of their actions (selfish or selfless) can be interpreted according to the whim of the reader.³

²Benefits to the kings could appear through "rationalized" administrative and financial systems, and improved military defensiveness: P. Gauthier, *Opus* 6–8 (1987–1989 [1991]) 196.

³Strab. 507 (Antigonos and Skepsis); Paus. 1.9.8 and 7.3.4–5 (Lysimachos and Ephesos). Compare the opposing views presented by R. Billows, *Antigonos the One-eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State* (Berkeley 1990), who

Furthermore, it is questionable whether efforts to defend the disinterested character of the royal synoikisms are not misapplied in the first place. It should go without saying that the monarchs stood to gain something from these actions, even if nothing more than their own glory in the dynastic eponymy of new states such as Antigoneia or Arsinoeia. Considerations of population were not always a necessitating factor: the refoundation of Ephesos as Arsinoeia was certainly not essential from the point of view of demographics, although Lysimachos did give it an improved location.⁴ But for those forcibly incorporated into Ephesos-Arsinoeia, all indications are that this was a far from desirable move. Many of the Kolophonians who were to be absorbed died resisting; and when Lysimachos fell in battle in 281, his widow Arsinoe narrowly escaped slaughter at the hands of the Ephesians. Polyainos reports her colourful escape ruse (leaving behind a servant, dressed in Arsinoe's own royal clothing, to be a sacrificial scapegoat), and tells us that the factions declaring for Seleukos were driven by such a bitter spirit that they were hurling their pro-Lysimacheian fellow-citizens from the city walls (8.57). The popularity of enforced royal synoikisms was clearly not staggering, and the Roberts remark on a "detectable centrifugal trend," parallel and intertwined with the trends to synoikism, a trend that sought to re-establish in one form or another cities that had at one time been absorbed.⁵

If the kings cannot be characterized as wholly disinterested parties, one is then compelled to question the degree to which the supposed unviability of Lebedos was a subjective and self-serving judgement call. Pausanias remarks that Lebedos was up-

defends Antigonos's motives; and H. Lund, *Lysimachos: a Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship* (London 1992), who proposes a more sensitive portrait of Lysimachos (often at the expense of Antigonos).

⁴E. Will characterizes this as an "acte souverain, mais bénéfique": *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*² I (Nancy 1979) 101.

⁵J. and L. Robert, *JSAV* 1976, 175. See also Gauthier (*supra* n.2) 195.

rooted only to magnify the glory of Lysimachos's new foundation at Ephesos, and that this was done even though Lebedos's own territory was well provided for. Such a comment (though late) should call into doubt the common assumption that Lebedos was too small and ill-provided for to survive on its own; yet Lebedos in particular seems to have had trouble in evading the machinations of others over its fate. Equidistant from the more significant poleis of Kolophon to the east and Teos to the northwest (120 stades from each, Strab. 643), the heart of the site is a small peninsula about 275 metres across, joined to the mainland by an isthmus about 200 metres broad. On the mainland opposite is a hill of about 60 metres that would have served as the acropolis, and may have been the site of the theatre that Lebedos surely had.⁶ The bulk of the Lebedian population probably lived on the mainland; the peninsula itself would have served as the defensive core of the state, ringed as it was with good ashlar walls, much finer than the defensive wall at Lebedos's larger neighbour Teos.⁷ Pausanias describes the territory of Lebedos as a fortunate one in every respect, and waxes particularly enthusiastic over the hot baths of the region, the finest and most plentiful along the coast (7.3.5, 7.5.11).

The population of Lebedos would of course always have been on the small side. Ruschenbusch has calculated it at around 800 citizens and a total of 3,200 inhabitants in the Classical age, based on its Delian League assessment of 1 talent.⁸ These figures, however, may not have much validity; Ruschenbusch's methods have been challenged by Nixon and Price, who argue convincingly that the theory of a direct mathematical relationship between tribute assessment and population

⁶For Lebedos's theatrical connections, see below.

⁷G. Weber, *AthMitt* 29 (1904) 230–231; G. Bean, *Aegean Turkey* (London 1979) 118–121.

⁸E. Ruschenbusch, *ZPE* 53 (1983) 142; these figures put it in the same category as other Asia Minor states such as Myous, Priene, Skepsis, Pygela, and Assos.

should be rejected.⁹ A state's resource base would also have formed part of the equation. In any case, Lebedos was far from the poorest of Delian League members in the fifth century; numerous members were assessed at considerably less than a talent.¹⁰ The fact that Lebedos was assessed at so much as a talent might indicate that her resources in fact made her reasonably self-sufficient by comparison with many other Greek poleis.

The first, and best documented, of the royal efforts to manipulate Lebedos's civic existence was Antigonos I's well-known proposal for a synoikism between Lebedos and Teos, a downsizing project initiated perhaps around 303.¹¹ Efforts to retrieve a truly sensitive Antigonos from these documents fail. Still, it would go too far to claim that there was no consideration given to the Lebedians at all. Lots and houses were to be provided in Teos to the Lebedians; Lebedian debts were to be assumed by the new synoikism in common; existing *proxenoi* and *euergetai* of Lebedos were to be given the same honours by the synoikized community. There were also some concessions made to specific concerns raised by the Lebedians: a new law code was to be drawn up, and while the Teians had wanted the code of Teos to be in effect in the interim, the Lebedians requested that it not be used; Antigonos therefore designated the law code of Kos instead. But overall, the net effect of the synoikism would have been to wipe out the communal identity of the polis of the Lebedians. The Teians who were to absorb them might have to shoulder an economic

⁹L. Nixon and S. Price, "The Size and Resources of Greek Cities," in O. Murray and S. Price, edd., *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990) 135–170.

¹⁰71% of Delian League members in 441 fell into the category of "little spenders," paying 1 talent or less: Nixon/Price (*supra* n.9) 143.

¹¹Welles *Royal Corres.* 3–4. The absolute *termini* are 306 (when Antigonos assumed the royal title) and 302 (when the region was removed from his control); there may be some connection with the Ionian earthquake of 304/3 and the consequent destruction Lebedos may have suffered.

burden, but their political identity at least remained unthreatened. Furthermore, the Teians themselves might even have viewed the synoikism as an opportunity to exercise a little local micro-imperialism.¹² The new community was clearly to be known as Teos; the Lebedians themselves were to move physically to Teian territory; and future representation to the Panionion was to be under the Teian umbrella, and go by the name of Teos. Although Lebedos was one of the original twelve cities of Ionia, its name would now be erased from the roll of the Ionian League.

It is generally assumed that the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos was never completed. The evidence usually cited to prove that it was never carried out is the move of the Lebedians to Ephesos in the 290s.¹³ But this migration to Ephesos proves nothing one way or the other about the Teos-Lebedos synoikism. Further evidence from the third century, discussed below, shows that royal synoikisms, even when fully effected, were not always permanently successful, and that synoikism was not always enough to destroy civic identity. Hence, the reappearance of a body of "Lebedians," available to be incorporated into Ephesos less than a decade after the Teos-Lebedos synoikism, should not be taken as definitive proof that the synoikism was never accomplished, though it certainly implies its swift dissolution.

There are, moreover, a pair of inscriptions that point to the synoikism's realization, at least in substantial part. *SEG II 579* is a fragment of a Teian decree, from the end of the fourth century. The decree regulated the incorporation of new citizens into the civic body of Teos, new citizens who are unidentified in the extant fragment. This fragment deals specifically with the

¹²F. Landucci Gattinoni, "Immigrazioni ed emigrazioni nella Ionia d'Asia nella prima età ellenistica," in M. Sordi, ed., *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico* (Milan 1994) 169–185.

¹³*Syll.*³ 344; Welles, *Royal Corres.* p.25; M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World* (Cambridge 1981) no. 40; Billows (*supra* n.3) 214.

(temporary) exemption of these new citizens from a number of taxes, including various liturgies. The coincidence of timing and of subject would lead one to suspect that this inscription refers to the details of absorbing the Lebedians into the Teian population. Nevertheless, a connection between the Teos-Lebedos synoikism and SEG II 579 is generally rejected (on grounds that are perhaps insufficiently persuasive).¹⁴ Yet there have been some who support the idea, such as Wilhelm, who points out the appearance of the *choregia* as an exemption in both the synoikism and SEG II 579.¹⁵ The latter inscription also refers to the medical tax, the *iatrikon*, a tax from which the new inhabitants were *not* exempt; a medical tax might very well be associated with a new synoikism that was set in place with help from the island of Kos (as the Teos-Lebedos synoikism was). There is a minor discrepancy in the periods of exemption: in Antigonos's letter, the Lebedians were to be *ateleis* for a period of three years, in the Teian decree for a period of four years. But the synoikism proposal itself provides for arbitration of disputed points in the execution of the agreement, and it is quite possible that modification was made to the original agreement, especially if, as seems likely, the Lebedians were feeling hard done by. So SEG II 579 may indeed suggest that the synoikism did move along to a more advanced stage.

Another inscription supports this view. SEG XXVIII 697 is the final judgement in a boundary arbitration between Klazomenai and a neighbour, probably Teos.¹⁶ This arbitration was carried out by judges from Kos, perhaps around 302. The role of Kos as an intermediary might have been suggested by the Koan role in the Teos-Lebedos synoikism, and the Koan judges in this

¹⁴J. and L. Robert (*supra* n.5) 88 n.41, who argued that the resources of the community referred to are not those of a community like Lebedos.

¹⁵A. Wilhelm, *Klio* 27 (1934) 270–285; see also R. Herzog, *Koische Forschungen und Funde* (Leipzig 1899) 204.

¹⁶S. Ager, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 87–97; *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World* (Berkeley 1996) no. 15.

arbitration may have been individuals who were already in the neighbourhood, carrying out the assessment of Lebedian property or providing the law code for the new synoikism.¹⁷ There is no reference to Lebedos in this arbitration between Teos and Klazomenai, but there is a reference to a boundary point somewhere along “the borders of Kolophon.” This is precisely what we might expect if the synoikism had actually been carried out: Lebedos disappears, and the boundary between Teos and Klazomenai now extends all the way to the other side of Lebedos, to Kolophon in fact. The arbitration might even be linked in a causative fashion to the synoikism; if there were increased pressures on Teian territory, as a result of the influx of Lebedians, and if some of the synoikized people moved further westwards and northwards (“into the peninsula,” as *Royal Corres.* 3.71 stipulates), then there would naturally be boundary frictions with Klazomenai, Teos’s northern neighbour.

One final piece of literary evidence may also support the belief that the synoikism was more fully accomplished than is usually assumed. Diodoros says that Prepelaos “secured the adherence” (προσηγάγετο) of the people of Teos and Kolophon in 302 (20.107.5). It is hard to believe this would not include the people of little Lebedos as well; the absence of any specification of Lebedos here suggests that it was temporarily not in existence, that the synoikism had been carried out, and that it was now Teos and Kolophon that bordered on each other.

The Teos-Lebedos synoikism, then, may have been completed after all. But in any case, its existence was brief enough, and the Lebedian sense of identity strong enough, that the larger polis failed to overwhelm the smaller. Whether he found them still in Teos or whether they had already returned to their peninsula, sometime in the 290s (perhaps around 294),¹⁸ the

¹⁷ Ager, *ZPE* (*supra* n.16) 95.

¹⁸ Lund (*supra* n.3) 92; J. and L. Robert, *Claros I* (Paris 1989) 79; G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (Berkeley 1995) 177.

Lebedians provided bodies for Lysimachos to exploit in his refoundation of Ephesos as Arsinoeia. Pausanias tells us that Lysimachos moved the site of Ephesos closer to the sea, and bolstered its population, not to mention aggrandized its territory,¹⁹ by adding the inhabitants of Lebedos and Kolophon to it.²⁰ The move was not tremendously popular with the Ephesians themselves (Strab. 640). According to Pausanias, however, the only ones to offer military resistance to the forced migrations were the Kolophonians (with some support from Smyrna). It was a hopeless resistance, naturally, and perhaps the Lebedians recognized this; or perhaps the Lebedians were themselves simply in no position to offer opposition. We know too little about their situation in the years between the Teian synoikism and the foundation of Arsinoeia. One thing we do know, however, is that they evidently still clung to some sort of corporate identity.

Ephesos was an enormous place in comparison with Lebedos (or Teos, for that matter), and if Ephesos had remained a stable Arsinoeia for many decades it is hard to say what might have happened to the Lebedians, whether their political identity might not in the end have been submerged and assimilated completely. Nevertheless, there are indications that, even during the period of their absorption into Arsinoeia, the Lebedians managed to retain a sense of their own identity. They were evidently registered within the Ephesian citizenry in their own unit, the *χλιαστὺς Λεβέδιος*.²¹ Furthermore, the arrangements drawn up

¹⁹J. and L. Robert (*supra* n.18) 81.

²⁰1.9.7, 7.3.4–5. Probably the Phygelans/Pygelans as well; J. and L. Robert (*supra* n.18) 80–81; Cohen (*supra* n.18) 179. Lysimachos is said to have “destroyed” Lebedos and Kolophon when he constituted Arsinoeia (Paus. 1.9.8), but the later existence of both these places precludes a literal understanding of this remark; temporary political destruction and partial physical destruction (e.g., dismantling of defensive walls) may be meant.

²¹The *chiliastys*, originally a military division (the “1,000”), was a subdivision of the *phyle* at Ephesos; see M. B. Sakellariou, *Hellenika* 15 (1957) 220–231; N. F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece* (Philadelphia 1987) 311–315. The “Lebedian *chiliastys*” cannot have appeared in Ephesos

by Lysimachos may have been more generous with regard to traditional representation in the Ionian League than were those of Antigonos. In 289/8, a decree of the Ionian League could refer to Ephesos as Arsinoeia;²² the implication is that the new community was complete, as Lysimachos planned it, down to the assimilation of Lebedos and Kolophon. But the Smyrnaian copy of the same decree²³ refers specifically to the League of *thirteen* Ionian cities. The traditional number, which included Lebedos and Kolophon, was twelve; the number thirteen would refer to the recent inclusion of Smyrna itself within the Ionian League, when it too was refounded by Lysimachos.²⁴ The Smyrnaians were no doubt concerned to highlight the entry of their own polis into the Ionian *koinon*, as the new and legitimate thirteenth member, and so perhaps were being rather loose in their terminology. Still, this inscription may imply that there was traditional participation going on again at the Panionion, even if the political status of some poleis was compromised.²⁵ Lebedos may have been incorporated into Arsinoeia; but her representation at the Panionion may have continued in some independent sense.

In 281, with the arrival of Seleukos and the death of Lysimachos, Ephesos threw off the Lysimacheian yoke and the Arsinoeian name. Whatever trials the Lebedians had faced in their incorporation into Ephesos, and the sedition and violence

only in the wake of Lysimachos's refoundation; *I.Ephesos* 1453, which refers unequivocally to the Lebedian *chiliastys*, is firmly dated to 300/299 B.C. It seems likely that this tribal subdivision was already in existence in Ephesos, perhaps reflecting a previous and otherwise unattested migration of Lebedians (just as the Ephesian *phyle Teios* appears to commemorate a major influx of Teians).

²² *Syll.*³ 368, from Miletos.

²³ *I.Smyrna* II 577.

²⁴ Strab. 633; Vittr. *De arch.* 4.1, 4.

²⁵ The Roberts (*supra* n.18: 84) take this inscription as evidence that Kolophon was fully reconstituted as an independent state (rather than a portion of the Ephesian/Arsinoeian state) by 289; they say nothing about Lebedos.

that overtook the city at the time of Koroupedion, within a decade of the fall of Lysimachos they had re-established themselves as an independent polis in their old territory. An inscription from the 260s, a decree of the Ionians for Antiochos I, refers to both the Lebedians and the Ephesians (now as Ephesians).²⁶ The independence of Lebedos from Ephesos is now clearly attested. The decree expresses the hope that Antiochos will support the Ionian cities in their goal of “freedom, democracy, and ancestral constitutions”; although there is no evidence to suggest it, it may be that Antiochos played a role in the reinstatement of Lebedos.²⁷

The amalgamation into Arsinoeia appears to have been the last trial the Lebedians faced in terms of enforced synoikism. But it was not the final threat to their civic existence and ancestral identity. The next time their name appears in the epigraphic record they are identified as only *quondam* Lebedians: Πτολεμαίεις οἱ πρότερον καλούμενοι Λεβέδιοι.²⁸ The relevant inscription, from Magnesia on the Maiander, is a decree, probably of Klazomenai, granting *asylia* to Magnesia and Panhellenic standing to its festival of Artemis Leukophryene; appended to the decree is a list of the other Ionian cities who subscribed to this, a list that includes Old Kolophon, Kolophon by the sea, and the “Ptolemaians, who were formerly known as Lebedians.” The *asylia* decree is dated to 208. At some point in the third century, then, the Lebedians changed their name, clearly under Ptolemaic auspices. The obvious context, or at least the best guess, for such a conversion is the period of the Third Syrian War, when Ptolemy III reabsorbed much of Ionia,

²⁶ OGIS 222 (I.Priene 507; I.Erythrai/Klazomenai 504); F. Piejko, *Phoenix* 45 (1991) 126–147.

²⁷ Antiochos I restored Kebren in the Troad (under the name of Antioch!), which had been forcibly synoikized by Antigonos into his Antigoneia (Will [*supra* n.4] 137); it seems possible that he could have had a hand in restoring Lebedos as well.

²⁸ I.Magnesia 53; I.Erythrai/Klazomenai 507; K. Rigsby, *Asylia* (Berkeley 1996) no. 102.

recovering territory lost as a result of the revolt of “Ptolemy the son” and the Second Syrian War.²⁹

Why should Lebedos have become “Ptolemaïs”? It has been suggested that the Lebedians *voluntarily* changed their name because of some favour or liberality from Ptolemy.³⁰ The new baptism might reflect a refoundation of the city, and perhaps repair, if she was still languishing from the effects of earthquake and deliberate destruction, not to mention forced migrations under Antigonos and Lysimachos.³¹ So in material terms, the Ptolemaic patronage may have been beneficial; but in political terms, it represented yet another threat to their civic identity. In view of the phrasing employed in the *asylia* inscription, it seems unlikely that such a voluntary act of gratitude as surrendering their ancestral name sprang spontaneously and without reservation from the Lebedian people. The decree comes from the last decade of the third century, perhaps thirty years after the name change, and its wording suggests that the Lebedians were still trying to cling to their ancient name.³² Their evident reluctance to assume fully the name “Ptolemaïs” contravenes Roger Bagnall’s argument that the retention of the name Ptolemaïs to the end of the third century does not necessarily indicate continued Ptolemaic control.³³ If the assumption of the name was not a

²⁹R. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976) 169–170, 175 (Ptolemaic conquests under Euergetes may have included Ephesos, Kolophon, Lebedos, and Teos, as well as the recapture of Samos); see also Will (*supra* n.4) 234, 239, 260; Cohen (*supra* n.18) 189; and M. Amandry, in G. Le Rider *et al.*, edd., *Kraay-Mørkholm Essays* (Louvain 1989) 2, who has Lebedos refounded as Ptolemaïs between 241 and 230. A fragment of an inscription found at Lebedos refers to Ptolemy III and Berenike II: P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965) 114 n.141; Cohen 189.

³⁰B. Haussoullier, *Etudes sur l’histoire de Milet et du Didymeion* (Paris 1902) 24.

³¹L. Robert, *BCH* 70 (1946) 519.

³²Since this is a decree of Klazomenai, inscribed at Magnesia, we cannot state with certainty that this is the phrasing chosen by the Lebedians themselves; yet it seems most likely that this was their preferred self-designation, and that their Ionian neighbours acquiesced in it.

³³Bagnall (*supra* n.29) 169.

voluntary act in the first place, it stands to reason that it was only retained because the Lebedians perceived a continuing Ptolemaic pressure to do so.

Lebedos's ancient identity may have been particularly vital in the regional context of the traditional Ionian League, which appears to be represented in the *asylia* subscription.³⁴ Lebedos also appears as "Ptolemaïs" in another, somewhat earlier, inscription, but this time there is no explanatory note identifying the "former Lebedians." This is the Delphic *theorodokoi* inscription, from around 230–220 B.C.³⁵ A list is given of the states which the sacred ambassadors from Delphi visited, a list that is in geographical order, and there, between Ephesos and Teos, the simple name Ptolemaïs is mentioned. The lack of uniformity in nomenclature between the two inscriptions may be explicable in terms of regional issues. The *theorodokoi* list was generated in Delphi, on the Greek mainland, probably with little concern for the subtle minutiae of Ionian political affairs. The *asylia* text on the other hand comes from the Ionian states, all of them intimately familiar with their own history and local culture, and perhaps more politically sensitive to such matters as Lebedos's status.

Both numismatic and epigraphic evidence affirm that the Lebedians recovered their own name in the early second century, and retained it thereafter, though the circumstances surrounding the abandonment of the name Ptolemaïs are unknown.³⁶ An inscription set up at Samos, and dated on prosopographic grounds to around 200 or a little later, is a

³⁴If Miletos and Klazomenai are restored to the decree, the list includes all thirteen Ionian states (Rigsby [*supra* n.28] 245).

³⁵A. Plassart, *BCH* 45 (1921) 1–85; on Lebedos-Ptolemaïs, see Robert (*supra* n.31) 506–523, esp. 516–519. For a summary bibliography on the dating of the *theorodokoi* inscription, see Cohen (*supra* n.18) 124. The inscriptions are not the only evidence for the name-change to Ptolemaïs, though they offer the clearest evidence for it. There is numismatic evidence as well, autonomous city bronzes with the legend ΠΤΟΛΑ: A. Dieudonné, *JLAN* 5 (1902) 45–60; see also Cohen 190.

³⁶Amandry (*supra* n.29) thinks it may have been connected with Antiochos III's presence in Asia Minor from 197 B.C. on.

ψήφισμα παρὰ Λεβεδίων, a Lebedian decree for a Samian judge and *grammateus*.³⁷ Clearly the inscription provides a *terminus ante quem* for the resumption of the ancestral name of Lebedos. Another *terminus* is provided by the numismatic evidence. Lebedos coined Attic tetradrachms in its own ancestral name after Apameia; at the least, therefore, they had thrown off the Ptolemaic identification by 188, if not earlier. The fact that Lebedos did not issue cistophoric coinage is probably an indication that it was free too of Pergamene authority.³⁸ The ability of the kings to interfere in Ionian affairs was curtailed after Apameia; it is perhaps no coincidence that we find no more threats to the political identity of Lebedos.

Throughout the century or so during which Lebedos's civic existence was repeatedly compromised, there were various mechanisms by which the Lebedians had retained a sense of ancestral identity. Their stubborn retention of their name, whether they were officially "Arsinoeians" or "Ptolemaians," has already been demonstrated. Coinage was another such mechanism: the iconography of Lebedian coinage remained relatively constant, with Athena in particular appearing continuously through the centuries, whether the Lebedians were coining in their own name, or as Ptolemaïans, or under the Roman Empire, when Athena appears on the reverse of Lebedian coins of Julia Domna and Geta.³⁹ And while we have no direct evidence for it, it seems likely that retention of traditional civic cults could have fostered an ongoing sense of solidarity among Lebedian transplantees. This would seem to be a possibility

³⁷L. Robert, *Hellenica* XI–XII (Paris 1960) 204–213; O. Curty, *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques* (Geneva 1995) no. 28.

³⁸H. Seyrig, *RevNum* 5 (1963) 20; R. E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom* (Oxford 1983) 111. E. Bikerman (*REG* 50 [1937] 237) had argued that Lebedos was Pergamene after Apameia on the basis of Strabo 643 (see below); but the passage in question proves nothing about the status of Lebedos specifically.

³⁹On the coinage of Lebedos see B. V. Head, *Historia numorum*² (London 1911) 580–581; P. Kinns, *Studies in the Coinage of Ionia: Erythrae, Teos, Lebedus, Colophon, c. 400–30 B.C.* (diss. Cambridge 1980).

especially in Arsinoeia, where the Lebedians were registered as a separate subdivision of the Ephesian tribe. In the Teos synoikism, the Lebedians were to be given a separate place to bury their dead (*Royal Corres.* 3.18), a fact which would again tend to focus their social and religious sentiments on their own separate corporate identity.

Outside the bounds of their own tribe or community, the Lebedians' sense of self revolved around their recognition as a member of the ancient Ionian *dodekapolis*; inducing their fellow Ionians to maintain that recognition through the bad times would have been part of their lifeline. The right to religious representation in the Ionian League was jealously guarded. Some decades before the Teos-Lebedos synoikism, the Lebedians had fought and won a case in the Ionian *koinon* that guaranteed them the right to administer one of the federal cults (*I.Priene* 139). Such a recognition of Lebedos when she was, apart from Myous, probably the smallest of all the Ionian states, was vital to her. It was precisely this religious representation that was barred to her by the terms of the Teos-Lebedos synoikism, since all ambassadors to the Panionion were henceforth to be known as Teian. This ruling must have been devastating to the Lebedians, an attack on their cherished position as one of the original Ionian states, made all the more bitter if indeed the Teians, their fellow Ionians, had deliberately sought to betray them.⁴⁰ A century later, at the time of the Magnesian *asylia* decrees, the Ionians displayed a collective sensitivity in honouring the preferred nomenclature of the Lebedians. Coinage was also part of Lebedos's expression of itself as a specifically Ionian community; between 150 and 130 B.C., for example, Lebedos, Smyrna, Kolophon, and other local states all produced the same type of Attic standard tetradrachms.

After the vicissitudes of the third century, and the machinations of the various monarchs with an interest in giving the

⁴⁰See Landucci Gattinoni (*supra* n.12).

communities of Ionia a “helping hand,” the civic existence of the Lebedians seems to have never again been endangered. They evidently continued to be troubled by a dearth of population: when the Dionysiac *technitai* (always cranky neighbours, it seems) were removed from Teos in the time of Attalos III, the Lebedians were glad to receive them because of the minute size of their own population (Strab. 643). But that small size by itself does not really appear to have threatened Lebedos’s existence, in spite of assumptions made by earlier Hellenistic kings. Horace talks of Lebedos as desolate,⁴¹ but it was still there for Pliny to remark on, whereas its neighbour, the “formerly existing” town of Notion, evidently was not.⁴² And from the time the Dionysiac artists settled there until at least Strabo’s day, Lebedos was home to all the Dionysiac artists of Ionia as far as Hellespont, as well as to their annual games and a festal assembly. The theatre and the guild of theatre artists would have put Lebedos on the cultural map, and would have been one more thing that was quintessentially “political” about her.⁴³

So at last the migration went in the other direction, and the Lebedians received an influx of population. Unlike the inhabitants of Myous, they successfully preserved their civic identity into the time of the Roman Empire and beyond. In spite of the mutability of its fate and its population, Lebedos clung determinedly to polis status for well over a thousand years; it was still there, with its own bishop, in the Byzantine era.⁴⁴ The Hellenistic age, the period in which Lebedos “failed to hold its own,”⁴⁵ the centuries during which it “never completely arose

⁴¹ *Epist.* 1.11.6–10; Horace also remarks that he would love to live there.

⁴² Plin. *HN* 5.116: *fuit et Notium oppidum*.

⁴³ A. Giovannini, in A. Bulloch *et al.*, *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1993) 265–286, points to the gymnasium and the theatre as essential symbols of the city-state, of Greekness.

⁴⁴ Weber (*supra* n.7) 229; Bean (*supra* n.7) 121.

⁴⁵ E. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus I* (London 1902) 114.

from its ruins,"⁴⁶ was in fact the age when Lebedos displayed the most determined regard for its identity, a regard that proved ultimately successful.⁴⁷

In the end, the benefactions of the Hellenistic kings in carrying out synoikisms and refoundations may have done more to undermine the civic identity of the Greek polis than to maintain and nurture it. If a state like Lebedos retained its sense of civic pride over the centuries, it was in spite of the kings rather than because of them. The Lebedians' own determination to survive was responsible for their repeated renaissance; and the organic nature of the Greek polis defied the repeated attempts at artificial manipulation. So perhaps we can say that, after all, states such as Lebedos did have a serious impact on the course of their own history.

September, 1999

Dept. of Anthropology and
Classical Studies
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario
Canada N2L 3G1
sager@watarts.uwaterloo.ca

⁴⁶Haussoullier (*supra* n.30) 24.

⁴⁷Cf. Gauthier (*supra* n.2) 196: "Comment ne pas croire, en lisant les documents gravés et en suivant les vicissitudes de leur histoire, à la vitalité de ces petites cités du premier âge hellénistique, éprises d'indépendance, gardiennes de leurs traditions et de leurs cultes?"