

Δῶρος (Kar.): 230

The name appears in A1 in one of the fragments from Krateros, from which Stephanos assumed the existence of a city in Karia. But the assessment list merely shows that Doros was included in the Karic district, and Koehler (p. 121, note 3) suggested that the city be identified with the Phoinikian Doros below

483

Mt. Carmel. We believe that this identification is correct and attribute Stephanos' note ἔστι καὶ Καρίας Δῶρος πόλις to a false deduction from Krateros; cf. under Χαλκείαι. The city lay on the Palestinian coast about eight or ten miles north of Caesarea Palestina. See Benzinger's article in P. W., R. E., s. v. Dora (2) for testimonia and references.

Doros, biblical Dor, modern Tantura, was called by later Greek writers (e. g., Josephus) Δῶρα or Δώρα. Hekataios (frag. 275 Jacoby) says: μετὰ δὲ ἡ πάλαι Δῶρος, νῦν δὲ Δῶρα καλεῖται. The older form is attested for A1, and is also used by "Skylax," 104: Δῶρος πόλις Σιδωνίων. [Ἰόππη πόλις· ἐκεῖ θῆναι φασιν· ἐνταῦθα τὴν Ἀνδρομ[έδαν τῇ κῆτει ---].¹ We discuss in Volume II the circumstances in which a town on the Phoinikian coast could be assessed tribute in 454 B. C. The suggestion that Δῶρος possibly stood in A9, II, 155 (see note ad loc., p. 206) is tentative, and presupposes that no name that had ever stood in an assessment was omitted in A9.

cf. T116
mentioned
by Thucydides.

Thucydides T116 (II, 9): Παρασκευῇ μὲν οὖν καὶ γνώμῃ τοιαύτῃ ὥρμητο, πόλεις δὲ ἑκάτεροι τάσδε ἔχοντες
ATL I, p. 586 ξυμμάχους ἐς τὸν πόλεμον καθίσταντο. (2) Λακεδαιμονίων μὲν οἶδε ξύμμαχοι· Πελοποννήσιοι μὲν οἱ
ἐντὸς Ἰσθμοῦ πάντες πλὴν Ἀργείων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν (τούτοις δὲ ἐς ἀμφοτέρους φιλία ἦν· Πελληνῆς δὲ
Ἀχαιῶν μόνου ξυνεπολέμου τὸ πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δὲ ὕστερον καὶ ἅπαντες), ἔξω δὲ Πελοποννήσου Μεγαρῆς,
Βοιωτοί, Λοκροί, Φωκῆς, Ἀμπρακιῶται, Λευκάδιοι, Ἀνακτόριοι. (3) τούτων ναυτικὸν παρέχοντο Κορίν-
θιοι, Μεγαρῆς, Σικυνῶνιοι, Πελληνῆς, Ἠλείοι, Ἀμπρακιῶται, Λευκάδιοι, ἱππέας δὲ Βοιωτοί, Φωκῆς,
Λοκροί· αἱ δ' ἄλλαι πόλεις πεζὸν παρέχον. αὕτη μὲν Λακεδαιμονίων ξυμμαχία. (4) Ἀθηναίων δὲ
Χίοι, Λέσβιοι, Πλαταιῆς, Μεσσήνιοι οἱ ἐν Ναυπάκτῳ, Ἀκαρνάνων οἱ πλείους, Κερκυραῖοι, Ζακύνθιοι,
καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις αἱ ὑποτελεῖς οὖσαι ἐν ἔθνεσι τοσοῖσδε, Καρία ἡ ἐπὶ θαλάσσει, Δωριῆς Κασσι πρόσοι-
κοι, Ἰωνία, Ἑλλησπόντος, τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης, νῆσοι οὗσαι ἐντὸς Πελοποννήσου καὶ Κρήτης πρὸς ἥλιον
ἀνίσχοντα, πᾶσαι αἱ Κυκλάδες πλὴν Μήλου καὶ Θήρας. (5) τούτων ναυτικὸν παρέχοντο Χίοι, Λέσβιοι,
Κερκυραῖοι, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πεζὸν καὶ χρήματα. (6) ξυμμαχία μὲν αὕτη ἑκατέρων καὶ παρασκευῇ ἐς τὸν
πόλεμον ἦν.

A.T.L. II, 1949, p. 40, A1

FRAGMENTS FROM KRATEROS
(ed. Krech)

Frag. 1

Καρικὸς φόρος
----- Δῶρος
----- Φασελίται

Frag. 18

----- Χαλκείαι

Frag. 19

----- Χαλκετορές

Frag. 24

[ἡελλεσπόντιος φόρος]
----- Σκέμφσιοι
----- Δανιοταιχίται

Frag. 2

[Ἴονικὸς φόρος]
----- Γρυνῆς
----- Πιταναῖοι
----- Καρεναῖοι

The first assessment period (454/3–451/0) is represented also by A1 (*A. T. L.*, II, p. 40), the assessment decree of 454, which was copied by Krateros and quotations from which have been preserved by Stephanos of Byzantion. As a note on Δῶρος in his *Ethnica* Stephanos writes: ἔστι καὶ Καρίας Δῶρος πόλις, ἣν συγκαταλέγει ταῖς πόλεσιν ταῖς Καρικαῖς Κρατερὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ψηφισμάτων τρίτῳ “Καρικὸς φόρος· Δῶρος, Φασηλίται.” This comes at the end of a long account of the Phoinikian Δῶρος and Stephanos thus betrays his belief that there was in Karia a separate Δῶρος, named in one of the Athenian decrees about tribute. This separate attribution to Karia has been favoured also by some modern scholars, Meineke, for example, in his edition of Stephanos, even suggesting as possible that the quotation from Krateros should be printed with a lacuna after the word Δῶρος in order to make room for other truly Karic cities to be associated with it and for an additional heading Παμφυλιακὸς φόρος to serve as a suitable introduction to Φασηλίται.¹² We now know, of course, that Phaselis, though situated geographically in Lykia,¹³ always appeared in the tribute lists under the heading Καρικὸς φόρος, or (when the Karic and Ionic panels were merged) under Ἴωνικὸς φόρος. Plainly Krateros and Stephanos were both correct, the one in his copy and the other in his quotation. Every city to the east of Karia in the tribute lists was Karian, whether it lay in Lykia, Pamphylia, Kilikia, or (for that matter) on the coast of Phoinike, and hence there is no more reason to deny the identity of Doros in A1 with the well-known Phoinikian city than there is to deny the identity of Phaselis with the Phaselis of Lykia.¹⁴ Koehler long ago arrived at the correct equation,¹⁵ observing that the only evidence for Doros being Karian

A.T.L., III, 1950

p. 9

7.

¹² August Meineke, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*, I (Berlin, 1849), p. 256: *mirum vero Phaselin accenseri urbibus Caricis. itaque nescio an post Δῶρος Caricarum urbium nomina omissa sint, ante Φασηλίται autem exciderit Παμφυλιακὸς φόρος.*

¹³ Not in Pamphylia, as Suidas and Aristodemos have it; cf. Wade-Gery, *Harv. Stud. Cl. Phil.*, Suppl. Vol. I (1940), p. 135.

¹⁴ Yet the tendency persists. Kahrstedt, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1939, p. 413, still seems to believe that Doros was in Karia.

¹⁵ *Urkunden und Untersuchungen*, p. 121, note 3: “Δῶρος war eine phönikische Stadt; dass

came from the heading of the Karic list of tribute which Krateros had before him, and suggesting that Athens temporarily had a foothold on the Palestinian coast below Mt. Carmel. These views have been set forth in *A. T. L.*, I (p. 483), and some of the reasons have been given for attributing the assessment list in question to 454 (*op. cit.*, pp. 203-204). The facts are that Krateros arranged his work in chronological order; that citations from the records of assessment in book IX belong to 410/09; and that the quotations from book III belong earlier at least than 451, for parts of a decree mentioning *ναυτοδίκαι* are cited in book IV and these quotations may with virtual certainty be attributed to Perikles' law of citizenship,¹⁸ the date of which is known from Aristotle, *Ἀθ. Πολ.*, 26, 3: — — — ἐπὶ Ἀντιδότου (451/0) διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν Περικλέους εἰπόντος ἔγνωσαν, μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ᾖ γεγονώς. Körte¹⁹ argues that the functions of the *ξενοδίκαι* in the general scrutiny of 445/4 B. C. (Plutarch, *Pericles*, 37) must date the law to which Krateros refers at least later than 443/2, when *ξενοδίκαι* (not *ναυτοδίκαι*) were still handling cases of *ξενία*,²⁰ and hence he does not believe that Krateros is quoting Perikles' law. But, as Gomme justly observes,²¹ the *ξενοδίκαι* seem to have been created and to have functioned for a particular occasion *ca.* 445/4. Hence one may seek *ναυτοδίκαι* before as well as after, and Krateros' law may still be Perikles' law. Nor is it a contrary argument that the one speaks of penalizing a son who has both parents aliens, implying that it was legitimate to enroll in a phratry if one parent was alien, while the other demands that both parents be citizens. Our quotation from the law in Krateros is fragmentary, and no such fine distinction can be inferred for the whole law from the little that has been preserved. What is certain is that both laws deal with citizenship; that the date 451 B. C. suits admirably the schedule of Krateros' collection; and that the evidence of the *ξενοδίκαι* is entirely concerned with a quite different occasion.

But the telling argument for dating Krateros' fragments from book III to 454/3 is his mention of Doros and Phaselis. He was quoting from an Athenian decree, and "although assessments were no doubt made before this date, it was not until 454/3 that they became decrees of the Athenian state."²² The assessment of Doros would have been inexplicable before the campaign to Egypt in 460. Yet for that campaign,

eine gleichnamige in Karien existiert habe, ist aus der Schätzungsliste geschlossen, in der der Name unter dem karischen Tribut stand. Sollte nicht doch die phönikische Stadt gemeint sein und die Athener dort vorübergehend festen Fuss gefasst haben?"

¹⁸ Fragment 4 (Krech), from Harpokration, *s.v.* *ναυτοδίκαι*: Λυσίας ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀλκιβιάδην, εἰ γνήσιος ὁ λόγος. ἀρχὴ τις ἦν Ἀθηναίων οἱ *ναυτοδίκαι*. Κρατερός γοῦν ἐν τῷ δ' τῶν ψηφισμάτων φησὶν "ἐὰν δέ τις ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ξένου γεγονώς φρατρίῃ, διώκειν εἶναι τῷ βουλομένῳ Ἀθηναίων, οἷς δίκαι εἰσὶ, λαγχάνειν δὲ τῇ ἡν καὶ νῦν πρὸς τοὺς *ναυτοδίκας*." Some further evidence about the *nautodikai* appears in new readings of *I. G.*, I², 68/69; Meritt, *Hesperia*, XIV (1945), pp. 114-115.

¹⁹ *Hermes*, LXVIII (1933), pp. 238-242.

²⁰ Cf. *I. G.*, I², 342, lines 38-39, and 343, line 89.

²¹ *Essays*, p. 80, note 2.

²² *A. T. L.*, I, p. 203.

THE TEXTS OF THE FIRST ASSESSMENT PERIOD

11

and thereafter until 454, the Athenians needed a way-station along the route by which they maintained communication with their forces of occupation, a route which led eastward by way of Phaselis, Aspendos, and Kelenderis (all doubtless assessed in 454), and then southward to Kypros, the main forward base, and on to Doros and the mouths of the Nile. One of the public funeral lists is mute epigraphic testimony to the fighting in Phoinike that attended the establishment of this base at Doros in 460.²³

Athens still remained mistress of the sea, even after the Egyptian disaster,²⁴ and no doubt held, or tried to hold, Doros. So it was assessed in 454, the one assessment *par excellence* in which its name should have appeared. By 450 Athens was fighting again in Kypros, regaining lost ground, and we do not know the fate of Doros or Athenian aspirations concerning it. It may at that time have been completely lost, and Athens definitely could have held no hope of recovering it after the ratification of the Peace of Kallias.²⁵

This fragment from Krateros serves therefore to define the extent of the Athenian Empire at the time of its greatest expansion.