



## ANTIOCHUS III AND TEOS RECONSIDERED

FRANCIS PIEJKO

P. Herrmann, "Antiochos der Grosse und Teos", *Anadolu* 9 (1965), pp. 29-159. Plates I-V.

Cf. J. & L. Robert, *Bull. Épigraphique*, 1968, 451; 1969, 495-502; 1973, 377; 1974, 481; 1977, 405. References to other comments, by author and title, will be found through these critical notices.

Generalities. The editor of these almost sensational inscriptions has been unanimously praised for his conscientious, thoroughgoing, and in many ways exemplary presentation, and for the rigorous and well organized commentaries. But a recognition due to an excellent work meritoriously executed does not obviate the necessity of further study and discussion. The purpose of the present undertaking<sup>1</sup> is a reassessment of certain aspects of the original edition, a critical evaluation of the restorations already proposed, and on various parts of the texts proposing a number of my own instead. In other words my aim is essentially to produce a reasoned and more or less settled contribution, partaking of the character of a comprehensive new edition. Since the texts themselves are rather too long to be displayed *in integro* it will be necessary to peruse these pages with the original publication constantly before the reader's eyes.

Still relatively recent the discoveries in Teos actually comprise a whole series of substantial inscriptions of which the greater part was found in 1963. To this the fragments of *four letters were added in 1966*. In their significance *for the history of the period these texts equal the discoveries in Iasus*, but surpass them considerably in volume. In addition to their contribution to the local history they also augment our original documentation of *royal cults* and will be of no less interest to students of special subjects, to mention only the history of the Greek language<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Presented here is a somewhat revised version of a draft essentially completed in May 1977. I am indebted to Professor Herrmann for the courtesy of reading the manuscript and offering a number of useful comments and suggestions, but it should be noted that I bear the sole responsibility for everything still at fault.

<sup>2</sup> Such for instance is the new documentation of the well pronounced tendency leading ultimately to Modern Greek phonology.

The date of the acquisition of Teos. Among historical facts of the first order of importance, which the editor is convinced to have established (the claim in which he found ready assent among critical and competent readers) is the date for the acquisition of Teos by Antiochus III, surprisingly in 204/3 B.C.<sup>3</sup> With impressive care and deftness Herrmann has marshalled probably all the data of immediate bearing on the problem and for this reason his arguments and his conclusions deserve to be taken very seriously. Nevertheless it appears to the present writer that it is not really possible to arrange our hitherto known facts into some kind of incontrovertibly solid premises from which the only and inescapable conclusion should be the one the editor has actually reached. I would rather venture to submit that the date 204/3 may indeed be advocated from a certain line (intellectually perfectly respectable) of reasoning, but after all said it must be owned that it is really inaccurate to maintain that this early date has been firmly established. Against a possible objection that it may perhaps be too much to affirm that in consequence of this sketchy incursion H.'s date has been positively disproved one may (I trust) at least anticipate that henceforth it will be generally admitted that it is quite assailable and that *the most convincing date is still eodem anno 197/6 B.C.*<sup>4</sup> H. himself has not completely discarded such an alternative, although that was not his declared choice.

In any case it does not seem that the arrival of the king with the court and the army (or fleet) was a mere episode resulting in the establishment of an isolated enclave away from the main area of operations in Caria. The event must rather stand in connection with the subjection of the adjacent territory, and most probably of Erythrae, all of which has taken place most probably during the fairly well-known campaign<sup>5</sup>. I cannot go here into discussion of all the evidence and criteria considered by the editor (some of which necessitates a good deal of familiarity with results of certain specialized work) but will try to use the information already provided.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. e.g. *Bull. Ép.* 1969, 495: "H. a bien établi la date de ceux deux decrets par de raisonnements convaincants." *Bull. Ép.* 1971, 600 speaks as a matter of course of the campaigns in Ionia and Caria in 204/3.

<sup>4</sup> See Livy 33.38.1. Cf. *Gnomon* 52 (1980), 258.

<sup>5</sup> In my opinion the subjugation of Erythrae is recorded in C.B. Welles, *RC* 15 and in Engelmann - Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai I* (1972), no. 30, both, even in the last edition, erroneously attributed to Antiochus I, and in *RC* to Antiochus II.

It is a matter of common knowledge that after the completion of his expedition to the Upper Satrapies, but before the commencement of the Fifth Syrian War, in the period *roughly between 205-200 B.C. Antiochus invaded Caria*<sup>6</sup>. In 198 his troops also operated somewhere against the Pergamene state, of which, however, little is known<sup>7</sup>. As for Teos it has been known from a long series of mostly local inscriptions that about the end of the third century and at the beginning of the second a number of cities and other political entities acknowledged the inviolability and neutrality of the temple of Dionysus and of the whole city and territory<sup>8</sup>. The confirmation had been sought most anxiously from the states where by sea and land piracy and brigandage had a long-standing, or even honorable, tradition, such as Aetolians and Cretans.

Formerly, because of the reply of M. Valerius Messala, praetor peregrinus in 193 B.C., the whole dossier on the Teian asyilia used to be dated to that year<sup>9</sup>. Adolf Wilhelm, however, showed that four of the replies must precede that date. All of them emanate from the continental Greece and were issued each respectively, by Aetolians, Amphictiones, Delphians, and Athamanians<sup>10</sup>. Principally on prosopographical criteria (for implications see H., 84) they come close to the year 204/3, when we know Antiochus should be in Caria<sup>11</sup>. All requests in continental Greece were made by the same set of emissaries from Teos. In addition to this there are two series of Cretan decrees of which the older one, solicited by different envoys, must be either simultaneous or not much later, but it is a remarkable fact that the Teian canvassing was very actively supported

<sup>6</sup> More evidence on this, especially for Amyzon, was in Professor Robert's possession awaiting publication. — *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I* (1983) has already come out. Unpublished letters of Antiochus III were also announced from Heraclea ad Latmum (*AA* 1977, 95) and Euromus (*Anat. Studies* 21, 1971, 48). Meanwhile some of these texts have already been published in one form or another. R. Merkelbach, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 7 (1986) 74 (A. III to Sardis, 213 B.C.); M. Errington, *Ep. Anat.* 8 (1986), 1-7 (Treaty between Euromus and Zeuxis, 197 B.C.); S. Şahin, *E.A.* 9 (1987), 55-59 (A. III and Zeuxis to Heraclea); much better, M. Wörle, *Chiron* 18 (1988) 421-476; H. Malay, *E.A.* 10 (1987), 8-15 (A. III to Zeuxis and two covering letters, found near Balıkesir in Mysia, 209 B.C.).

<sup>7</sup> Livy 32.8.15-16; 27.1. Cf. E. Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, p. 115.

<sup>8</sup> All collected in Le Bas - Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineure* (1870), nos. 60-85. Now re-edited by M. Guarducci in *Inscriptiones Creticae*.

<sup>9</sup> *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 601 (R.K. Sherck, *Roman Documents*, 34).

<sup>10</sup> *Syll* 563; 564; 565; *RC* 35.

<sup>11</sup> C.B. Welles, *RC* 38 is dated precisely 24 May, 203 B.C.

by an ambassador from king Philip V, one Perdiccas, (a Macedonian who at the same time was an honorary citizen of Teos), and incidentally by a representative of Antiochus, the Rhodian Hagesander. On one occasion both of them appear together, but it is clear that Hagesander's presence in Crete had been caused by matters not related to Teos. The decree of Eleutherna (LW 71, 14-15) states that he was there sent by king Antiochus ἐπὶ τὰς τῶ πολέμῳ διαλύσεις, but in view of the fact that local wars were nearly endemic in Crete, it is only a possibility that this was indeed the peace of ca. 201 B.C. after the immediately preceding "Cretan War".

From all these circumstances Holleaux once concluded that the point of time was 201 B.C. when Philip was probably the master of Teos<sup>12</sup>. Subsequently, however, Philip's support in Crete was satisfactorily accounted for by the fact of his traditional standing in several communities of Crete as the *prostates* of the island. Since (from the presence of his envoy) similar arguments could just as well be advanced for Antiochus one claimant to the possession of the city at that time had to be eliminated. Holleaux's ideas on Philip's control of Teos had not met with a universal approval and the general consensus, still standing, is that only Antiochus was established in the city of Dionysus, but the question is at what time precisely<sup>13</sup>. According to H. his dating would now provide a further proof that Holleaux's conception was all wrong, but I am not sure if it can be dismissed so simply. Perdiccas appears more often and is considerably more important than Hagesander. He is a constant companion (συμπροσβευτή), often a principal spokesman, veritable chief and patron of the embassy, and in several communities great deference is paid to him, no doubt on account of his standing with Philip. Obviously he must have gained the Teian citizenship for some important enough role or benefactions rendered probably at a moment when he stood in royal service. It is still conceivable that such an opportunity presented itself during Philip's expedition to Asia Minor. Although the fact is that about Macedonian

<sup>12</sup> *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques IV*, 1, pp. 185-188.

<sup>13</sup> F.W. Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 121, n. 3 simply states that "Hagesander's presence shows that Teos was at that time [205-203] in Antiochus' hands". Perhaps it does, but a routine support will not necessarily imply a political control, and how can we be sure that "that time" was precisely 205-3? Cf. Walbank, *Commentary on Polybius II*, p. 503.—A. Giovannini's contention, *Mus. Helv.* 40 (1983), 178-184, that on the basis of H.'s inscriptions A.III was not a master of Teos, but merely intervened for his friend Attalus, hardly calls for a serious refutation. Cf. *Bull.* 1984, 365.

control of Teos we know next to nothing, Philip, or his fleet-captains, operated near Teos in 201 B.C., and we know that he did capture Samos and probably Chios<sup>14</sup> and that his troops invaded the Erythraean Peninsula. Indeed actions against Pergamum, both on sea and land, formed a large part of Philip's eastern expedition, and on the other hand Antiochus was everywhere eager to step precisely in the vacuum created by Philip's defeat. It is true that in this case we are informed well enough that Teos was detached from Attalus, but a possibility that the Attalid supremacy might have been recently disturbed by Philip cannot be completely dismissed. This recent event may have been counted to the *συνεχεῖς πόλεμοι* mentioned in the decree.

But from the presence of Antiochus in Caria in 203 does it necessarily follow that he appeared at the head of his troops and took possession of Teos? Certainly there is a clear statement in the inscription that Antiochus "consecrated" Teos and solemnly proclaimed before the assembled citizens the city and its territory as "holy, inviolable, and tax-free"<sup>15</sup>. H. assumes that it was this very act that provided the formal inception and the legal basis for all other requests and grants of this particular assylia. No doubt, king Antiochus formally recognized the new status of Teos, and from the Cretan decrees it is clear that he had even supported Teian

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Appian, *Maced.* 4: Σάμον καὶ Χίον εἴλε, καὶ μέρος τῆς Ἀττάλου γῆς ἐπόρθησε. His capture of Samos is indirectly confirmed by an inscription published by Ch. Habicht, *Athen. Mitt.*, 72(1957), no. 64 and the commentary. But Holleaux and the consensus allow only a siege of Chios; cf. his *Études IV* 226, 266, 292, 294.

<sup>15</sup> Block I, line 15: καθιέρωσεν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν, 17-19: παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτὸς ἀνῆκε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν ἱερὰν καὶ ἀφορολόγητον. Save for the general omission of the word ἀφορολόγητον many of the acceptance documents declare in fact the same thing, namely the "consecration" of Teos, etc. Cf. LW 75 (Aptera): καὶ πρότερόν τε ἀσυλίαν ὑμῖν ἐδώκαμεν καὶ καθιέρωσαμεν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν. Cf. furthermore for Miletus *Syll.* 590, 11-18: ἔξ ὧν ἔθνη τε οὐκ ὀλίγα καὶ πόλεις καὶ τῶν βασιλέων οἱ τετευχότες τῶν μεγίστων τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ συμβουλίας τὴν τε καθιέρωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν ἀνηγόρευσαν ἀπαράκλητοι αὐτοί (N.B. Teos I 17-19), τῶι τε θεῶι καὶ τῇ πόλει τὴν ἀξίαν περὶ τούτων ἀπνεύμαιτες χάριν. This close relation to Apollo is characteristic of the Seleucids, especially of Antiochus III (cf. OGI 237). *Syll.* 590 looks very much like an allusion to a similar consecration of Miletus by Antiochus III. The only other and remote possibility would be Philip V after the battle of Lade. The document may therefore well date to 196 B.C. Herzog's opinion on the date of this and on the character and date of RC 22, cited by Herrmann, p. 122 n. 159 do not merit serious consideration today. Cf. the consecration of Xanthus by Antiochus III, OGI 746, which certainly does not mean a "token submission", as often repeated.

addresses in certain cities at a time which cannot be determined precisely, but may well be 201 B.C. Yet, it is remarkable that in a great majority of cities no account is made of any authority, or justification, other than the pleas of the Teian ambassadors and the prestige of their city in the Greek world. Even in those places where envoys of Philip and Antiochus are mentioned neither of the kings is credited directly, or by implication, for the origination of the proceedings. On the contrary, all is taking place as if due solely to the Teian initiative.

In the similar case of Magnesia on the Maeander (the acceptance of the local festival and of the *asylia*) in the great mass of the extant documents, only two decrees make express references to king Antiochus (nos. 60 and 61)<sup>16</sup>, beyond the general stereotyped formula of recognition by "nations, kings and cities". The king's and his son's letters of acceptance are also preserved, but the manifest fact that emerges from all this is that the king, however prominent in his role, does not seem to be responsible for the initiation of the entire movement<sup>17</sup>. It is true that Magnesia was at that time under the Seleucid authority and that such efforts could not have been carried on without at least a royal indulgence, but Antiochus was far from setting the precedent, for in this case we know that the movement had already had a long history, and that the first initiative (221 B.C.) proceeded from the interested city itself. Ca. 206 at the conclusion of long efforts Magnesians finally received a favorable response from the Delphian Apollo. There are numerous allusions to that oracle as a fact of crucial importance, by which the responses of individual cities are guided and motivated, while the Seleucid king is generally ignored. In the two extant cases where he was mentioned there might have been some special reasons for so doing. Unless this be a studiously maintained convention the impression one gains from his letter is that Antiochus *follows* rather than initiates anything, but he did promise to use his authority to further the city's objective (*RC* 31, 25-28). Since only concrete facts are accessible to our examination there would be little profit in speculation as to wheth-

<sup>16</sup> *I. Magn.* 60 is a severely damaged decree of an unknown city where Antiochus III is prominently mentioned. *Ibid.* 61 is a decree of Antioch in Persis, the place from which nos. 18 and 19 (*RC* 31-32) were dispatched. My treatment of 60 and 61 is scheduled to appear in *Rivista Storica dell' Antiquità* (Bologna).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *RC* 31; 32.

er such an oracle could not possibly have been obtained with an advance assurance of approval from the Court, in the first place<sup>18</sup>.

For historical precedents H. is impressed by the circumstances of the *asylia* grant by Seleucus II to Smyrna,<sup>19</sup> where the king's role is very prominently stressed, and that fact he cites in support of his assumption that the *asylia* of Teos should have been also first launched by Antiochus. However in reality the case of Smyrna is quite ambiguous for such an argument and may be even turned against it. In *OGI* 228 it is said *expressis verbis* that the king was following the oracle of the god of Delphi, on the surface then acting "just like everyone else", although in this case he may have indeed helped the god to find the proper answer<sup>20</sup>. Interestingly, in that decree of Delphi Seleucus is mentioned in most deferential terms. By contrast, is it not "telling" that Antiochus was completely ignored in all four of the early continental decrees? That neither he nor Philip is credited for any initiative? At the supposed time when the dramatic proclamation by Antiochus should have been responsible for the starting of the whole movement, and when that moment should have been only few months past? Not even the trite formula of the acceptance "by many others, kings, cities, dynasts and nations"?<sup>21</sup>

As we can learn from many other *asylia* grants, especially those for Cos and Magnesia, it is true that mention or ignoring of kings in such si-

<sup>18</sup> A. Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus*, pp. 145-154, emphasizes that Teos acted as an independent city and that kings had no power to bring about an international recognition of a particular status (e.g. a Panhellenic festival) for a city under their rule. They could only ask for it. — In the *asylia* of Cos of 242 B.C. it is a curious fact that the Greek cities in Italy and Sicily make no references to the Roman power, as noted by H. Bengtson, in his review of R. Herzog-G. Klaffenbach, *Asylurkunden aus Kos*, now in his *Kleine Schriften* (reissued in 1974), p. 361.

<sup>19</sup> *OGI* 228; 229, 10.

<sup>20</sup> When under Tiberius *asylia* claims of various Greek cities came under senatorial review Smyrna invoked only that oracle, although other cities did not omit to argue royal grants, some going back as far as Alexander and Darius, Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.63: *ceteros obscuris ob vetustaten initiis niti. nam Zmyrmaeos oraculum Apollinis, cuius imperio Stratonici di Veneri templum dicaverint, Tenios eiusdem carmen referre, quos sacrare, Neptuni effigiem aedemque iussi sint. propiora Sardinios: Alexandri victoris id donum. neque minus Milesios Dareo rege niti.*

<sup>21</sup> *OGI* 228. But even the Delphian response, given at the end of the century to envoys of Alabanda, where Antiochus III is mentioned very honorably, refers once more to the "god's oracle" as the ultimate justification for the proceedings. There is no express acknowledgement of the royal mandate, although this much is implied and understood that such actions could not have been organized against royal wishes.

tuations was not really "obligatory", but from the actual mention some inferences on the political situation are possible. It seems that when a king was involved more than in giving a routine assent he was likely to be credited for this. This much we hear of Philip and Antiochus concerning Teos in Crete, of Antigonus in the matter of the asyilia of Cos, who regulated it in various cities under his domination<sup>22</sup>, of Seleucus II in Delphi, or Antiochus III for Magnesia, and again of Antiochus III in the Delphian decree for Antioch of the Chrysaorians (Alabanda), or in the decree for Dicaearchus, dated possibly to the time of the Carian expedition<sup>23</sup>. Yet, in none of these cities do we hear of any king actually credited for launching an international status of an asyilia. This is clearly at variance with Herrmann's thesis. The new status for Alabanda was also credited to the god's oracle, but the Seleucid king received courteous acknowledgments both in the speech made by the envoys and in the Delphian decree.<sup>24</sup> Yet for Teos we hear absolutely nothing of this supposedly epoch-making royal proclamation, the supposed source of the actions taking place. The question therefore obtrudes itself whether that causal link assumed between the consecration by Antiochus and the continental and Cretan decrees is absolutely necessary. I believe the answer must be negative and that we are free to consider the chronology of the acceptance in Greece without its dependence upon the Antiochus' presence in Teos and *vice versa*. At any rate, in several cases of asyilia the efforts for the recognition and accession of individual cities were not necessarily a one-time affair, but might have stretched over a number of years. This we know from the asyilia of Cos, Magnesia and Teos. From the second Cretan series for Teos and from the documents of the Coan asyilia we can see clearly that some requests and grants were renewed and repeated after a lapse of some time.

According to specialists in local chronologies only the Aetolian and the Delphian rescripts can be dated by their eponymous magistrates, the other two are fitted only by the necessary synchronism. The Aetolian document is dated by the year of strategus Alexander of Calydon, which af-

<sup>22</sup> R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach, *Asylierkunden aus Kos* (Abh. d. Deut. Akad. d. Wiss., Kl. f. Sprachen, Lit. u. Kunst, 1952, 1, published 1957), nos. 6; 7; 8.

<sup>23</sup> *OGI* 228; *RC* 31 and 32; *OGI* 234; *OGI* 241. In the last named document R. Flacetiére, *Les Aetoliens à Delphes* (1937), p. 506, dated Xenon to 211-0? B.C. However, G. Daux, *Delphes* (1936), 512, identified him as Cleon, and placed his year in 168 B.C.

<sup>24</sup> *OGI* 234.



ter long and involved recounting has been fixed to 204/3 B.C. But the year for the Delphian archon Megartas cannot be completely independent from the date already established for Alexander. It is now set at 203/2, but one gathers there are still some delicate problems with this scheme. Not only the year for Megartas has not been determined by completely independent criteria, but we should also bear in mind that Alexander was strategus more than once (which H. does not mention), and that his second term falls quite remarkably in 196/5 B.C.<sup>25</sup> If the turnover in Teos had taken place in the fall of 197 that would fit in excellently. In the spring of 196 shortly after the opening of the navigation season and after the Aetolian elections the embassy of Teos would be pleading its cause in continental Greece.<sup>26</sup> But even under this scheme the silence about Antiochus would be intolerable. As already alluded to the most natural explanation under the early date would be that Antiochus was still few years ahead from his proclamation in Teos, but in 196 there would have been overwhelming political reasons why his activities on the other side of the Aegean could not have been publicized with approval, and such a mention was not absolutely required by the custom. That was the year of the Isthmian declaration after Cynoscephalae, when great Roman armies were still stationed in Greece, and the apprehensions of the Roman command, especially of Flamininus, about the whole program of Antiochus in western Asia and Europe could hardly be a secret to Greek governments, and certainly not to Aetolians and their neighbors.<sup>27</sup> But the lack of specification of iteration for the Aetolian eponym (τὸ δεύτερον, or τὸ β') seems to provide a strong presumptive evidence in favor of the earlier date for these responses. As pointed above, that does not necessarily entail, confirm, or imply the same date for Antiochus in Teos.

<sup>25</sup> See H., p. 94. Cf. Walbank, *Polybius Commentary II*, 555; Woodhouse, *Aetolia*, p. 101; Syll. 563 n. 1. That fact induced scholars to repeat simply "Alexander's first term" without further qualification. E.g. Holleaux, *Études IV*, 1, 179, ns. 2-3. The epigraphical appendix to Woodhouse, *Aetolia* gives several examples of τὸ δεύτερον, τὸ β', but it would be possible to construct any arguments only if it had been determined that the omission of the specification of iteration is admissible at all.

<sup>26</sup> It is very interesting to read in this connection what Holleaux, *Études IV*, 1, 202 wrote: "Au printemps de 196, selon toutes les apparences, Antiochos, maître d'Ephèse dès l'automne précédent, avait établi sa suzeraineté sur Teos". Holleaux felt it was a problem how to explain the long interval (since 201, he thought) between the royal grant and its formal recognition by Rome. As we can now see in fact not much more than three years may have elapsed and the delay is sufficiently explained by aggravation over despoiling of Rome's best ally.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Pol. 18, 45.10-11; 47.1-2; 50-52.

In 197 the Seleucid king established his headquarters in Ephesus, the city just conquered from Egypt. Almost all nearby places to the north, and as far as the Hellespont, submitted to his authority on various terms. Those on which Teos was gained left the city nominally free, with the widest, possible to define, amplitude of political, religious and fiscal liberties, if all that ever meant what it professed. Assuming that the desire for recognition of Teian "holiness and inviolability" had already manifested itself under the Attalid regime it is doubtful if any great practical consequences could follow from that. It is possible that in 201 the city could have taken advantage of Philip's attack to give a greater momentum to its ambition, but the continental responses seem to precede even that date. At any rate it is unlikely that such an effort could have met with a great favor from Pergamum or that anything tangible in tax privileges could have been conceded when Attalus was in need of money, to mention only his very costly involvement in the First, and even more in the Second, Macedonian War.<sup>28</sup> As is stated, explicitly for Teos and implicitly for Erythrae, Attalid cities were taxed heavily for war purposes. And we should not forget that even the liberator Antiochus remitted no Seleucid taxes but only those established by the previous regime, as was the ordinary practice of most liberators. Late in 197 when the king probably made his overtures to Teos and Erythrae Attalus, mortally ill after his stroke in Greece, might have been still alive.<sup>29</sup> A large part of the Pergamenian army and fleet might have been still left in Greece, while the Seleucid king was established not far away at the command of numerous troops and fleet ready for action. Another invasion army was concentrated at Sardis. In this situation all the dissatisfied elements in Teos, among them the Dionysiac artists, were easily persuaded to embrace the new hopes, or simply to yield to the necessity, as best as they could.<sup>30</sup> Antiochus sum-

<sup>28</sup> Note the *συνεχεῖς πόλεμοι* in I 13-14, and the war tax "Galatica" in Erythrae, both remitted by Antiochus III. It is my impression that the Galatica is identical with the contributions originally forced on the city by Galatians. At some time afterwards it may have been institutionalized as a city tax for emergencies of Galatian and general defense. Still later it must have been converted by Attalus to a regular royal tax, because he now assumed total responsibility for external defenses. Certainly Antiochus would not have interfered with the city taxes, and to me it is absolutely clear that this was not a Seleucid tax. Cf. Pol. 21.20. 3-5 on military participation and material expenditures of Attalus in Roman wars.

<sup>29</sup> E. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamum* (1971), pp. 66-67.

<sup>30</sup> G. Cardinali, *Regno di Pergamo* (1906), p. 61 stresses the impatient readiness of Attalid cities to take advantage for freeing themselves from financial burdens of that regime.

moned a competent city representation to meet him and discuss the terms of the concrete arrangements for his arrival, i.e. the surrender and the take-over of the city. As in other cities he tried to impress the envoys with his philhellenic and "philanthropic" policies (H., p. 34), graciously inquired about the matters of special concerns to the citizens, made generous promises, and thus the terms were made quickly. Having entered the city he made special capital of keeping his word, just as Flamininus was doing about the Roman *πίστις-fides* in Greece.

But as we read our documents and consider again the status Antiochus granted to Teos, in particular the privilege of ἀφορολογησία, which in the usual manner of such cases is contrasted with the fiscal oppression under Attalus, we are impressed that what really mattered here was a guarantee and recognition of the status of interstate neutrality and an assurance of freedom from spoliation. This could be best effected on religious pretexts, perhaps the only ones men of antiquity were prepared to respect, at least in principle, if not always in their actual conduct. It may be surprising to realize that the full formula ἱερά, ἄσυλος, καὶ ἀφορολόγητος is expressed only three times at all, i.e. in the rescripts of the Athamanians and Messala, and of course in the Teian decrees for Antiochus, but just one word ἀσυλία, or ἄσυλος already implies the whole notion. Scholars are not exactly of one mind on the meaning of this rather singular word ἀφορολόγητος, but all of them proceed from the notion of ἀφορολογησία in the obvious sense of freedom from regular taxation, imposed by a more or less legitimate authority. But difficulties arise as soon as one realizes that neither the insignificant Athamanians nor the all-powerful Romans exercised any direct control in Teos to be able to remit taxes there. Most commentators grasped quickly enough the logical consequence that the word cannot have such a literal application. Many thought that Athamanians and Romans give only a customary assent on the status already granted by the king,<sup>31</sup> for which they may seek a further support in the new inscription, but that is still not the whole truth. Others have read much more into the innocuous formula than it really expresses. Some were ready to accuse praetor Messala of clever propaganda to the cities of Asia Minor, to insinuate to them that there will be no financial oppression when their friends the Romans come there to put things in order.<sup>32</sup> In the year when relations with Antiochus were already

<sup>31</sup> E.g. C.B. Welles, *RC*, p. 155. Comment to Col. I, 1.6.

<sup>32</sup> Thus H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen zur Gesch. Antiochus' des Grossen und seiner Zeit* (Historia Einzelschriften, 6, 1964), p. 97.

strained the propaganda motive cannot be completely discounted,<sup>33</sup> but from the point of view of international diplomatic practices Messala's letter is strictly conventional (even in self-praise on piety) and impeccable in form, as outward courtesy to Antiochus and his representative is concerned. This was neither the occasion, nor the medium, for imperial politics, although one may already sense in the message certain allusions of that nature as well. But the emphasis was on the city with which Romans wished to be friendly, not on the king who had overpowered it just a few years ago at the expense of their best ally.

The Teian decrees for Antiochus leave no doubt that a tax remission is involved, but besides the ἀφορολογησία such a remission may be also expressed in other terms as well. In the Athamanian letter it is indicated specifically that the recognition of the status of ἀφορολόγητος had been granted in response to the request made by the Teian embassy. It is evident that this does not mean just the accession by recitation of formulae to the tax exemption already granted by Antiochus (whether that would be good enough with the people of Athamania was in itself a matter of supreme indifference in Teos), but rather it must express the official recognition of the foremost consequence, the freedom of spoliation and unlawful exactions (ἄγειν, συλαῖν). Although landlocked the not-too-civilized Athamanians plied diligently the trade and industry of piracy, just like their neighbors the Aetolians did. It was the payment of this sort of contributions to their worthy fellow Hellenes, so proud of their common name, that the Teians were anxious to avoid on religious pretexts. Their merchant shipping lines and their territory were always potentially exposed to such irregular "taxation". It was in this polite disguise that Athamanians were asked to refrain from φορολογεῖν, i.e. not to attempt the extortion of booty (φόρος), or any other depredations such as their own enterprise or good luck might place in their way.<sup>34</sup> Many acceding states

<sup>33</sup> So lately M. Errington, *ZPE* 39 (1980), 279-284.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the literary references in the similar sense given by Welles, *RC*, p. 319. Furthermore Pol. 1.8.1: οἱ Μαμερτινοὶ -- πολλὰ μέρη τῆς Σικελίας ἐφορολόγουν. 4.46.3-4: φόρος το Galatians of Tyllis. 30.11.1-2: Αἰτωλοὶ τὸν βίον ἀπὸ ληστείας καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης παρανομίας εἰώθεισαν ἔχειν. καὶ ἕως μὲν ἔξῃν τοὺς Ἑλληνας φέρειν καὶ λεηλατεῖν, ἐκ τούτων ἐπορίζοντο τοὺς βίους, πάσαν γῆν ἡγοῦμενοι πολεμίαν. Ath. en. 6.253; Αἰτωλικὸν γὰρ ἄρπασαι τὰ τῶν πέλας νῦν δὲ καὶ τὰ πόρρω. Diod. 5.32.5 (Galatians): οὗτοι γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ τὴν μὲν Ῥώμην ἐλόντες, τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς συλήσαντες. 28.1: Φίλιππος ὁ τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς Δικαίαρχον τὸν Αἰτωλὸν, ἄνδρα τολμηρὸν, πείσας πειρατεύειν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ναῦς εἴκοσι, προσέταξε δὲ τὰς

in Crete expressed in clear words their solemn assumption of obligation to prevent spoliation and damages to Teians, actively to help in defense against such actions, and not to suffer freebooters in their own harbors. This, not taxation systems, was the main concern of "international" *asylia* grants. An additional protection against incidents of wars was no doubt also hoped for, although in practice this was rather ineffective. Such might have been the practical implications of the Roman grant, i.e. chiefly refraining from using the territory and resources of Teos for war purposes, which was a commonplace hazard in the condition of ancient warfare. Considering the fact that Rome had already waged two wars in the East the request addressed to her was more than a diplomatic formality. When armies, hostile or friendly, tread on any soil not only nuisance but often considerable costs and damage was inflicted, not to mention various forms of soldierly "resourcefulness" and "self-help" (ὠφέλεια), a cause of great anxiety to local citizens.

A major war came sooner than expected, but unfortunately neither Antiochus nor the Romans respected the status of the city and its territory, which they had both solemnly recognized as exempt from such a contingency. Without much ceremony the "consecrated" city had to supply fleets and armies of both sides, its territory was invaded and pillaged. Before that time Teos had paid voluntary in form, but apparently regular, gifts to Antiochus. At the peace of Apamea it was returned to Eumenes and his house.

In my discussion of *OGIS* 219 (to be presented separately) I dwell on the fact that the circumstances of the royal arrival and the entire tone of propaganda in the two documents have so many points in common that it is now possible to interpret the Ilian document from Teos. Since the attribution of *OGI* 219 can no longer be in slightest doubt the reasoning in the opposite direction is also perfectly legitimate. Even H. notices the fact that the whole tone of that propaganda and the massive apparatus is much too intense and far too systematic for an incidental episode, a diversion from the campaign in Caria. He speculates that Antiochus may have already prepared for his Asianic campaign, unfolded only few years later,

---

νήσους φορολογεῖν. — οὗτος δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐμπόρους ἐλήστευε, τὰς δὲ νήσους ληλατῶν ἀργύριον εἰσπράττετο. *Syll* 495, 10: δῶρα τῆς παρόδου (plunder raids of Thracians in Istros). *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques* (1971), no. 8, 48: ἀπαιτοῦντος τὸν φόρον (forced contribution).

but was distracted by the enticement of the more immediate Syrian opportunities. That may sound plausible enough but there are serious difficulties, e.g. the seemingly total exterritoriality of that important acquisition in Teos with no free land access. To be sure the long experience of the Ptolemaic (but not Seleucid) Empire demonstrated that controlling of far-flung isolated outposts was perfectly feasible with only sea access remaining open, as long as the state was in command of a respectable fleet. But in 204/3 the Seleucid fleet was not much to speak of, and it would have to sail past two strong Egyptian naval bases in Samos and Ephesus. The situation was different in 197/6 in a carefully prepared scenario in which Teos was but one act.<sup>35</sup>



To sum up. *The initiative for the Teian asyilia apparently proceeds from the city itself and does not seem to result from any prior royal grant.* This established, it suffices for our purpose to take notice that the movement began at the end of the third century, and beyond that we need not be concerned with the subtleties of the chronology of the early decrees from the continent and Crete. The intense propaganda blast, made by Antiochus of his own recognition of the asyilia, was the enticement and the reward for the submission of Teos. The city decrees only reflect the official pro-Seleucid view of the matter. In each occupied city the general propaganda of the 197/6 campaign was skilfully adapted to local conditions and the case of Teos conforms well to that pattern. There are no indications that the recognition by Antiochus was of any unusual importance to the Greek outsiders in their own replies. Had Antiochus really initiated all those asyilia efforts no reason could be given for that strange conspiracy of silence about him, which would be tantamount to a deliberate affront to his dignity. I think he is ignored as initiator in all documents, in the first because his proclamation was still in an unpredictable future, and afterwards because the political conditions have changed. The consecration by Antiochus is fully acknowledged only in the Teian decree, but that was just a part of the public expression of acceptance of the new

<sup>35</sup> Today we are in possession of various bits of concrete epigraphical evidence all confirming that broad land access to Teos was at this time a fact. A dedication for Antiochus Jr. from Claros, L. Robert, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes I* (1964), 18 testifies to the Seleucid occupation of Colophon, where a Σελευκίς tribe is also attested (*Am. Jour. Phil.* 1935, 380, no. VI). Like Teos and other cities Colophon instituted a new festival Ἀντιόχεια in honor of Antiochus III (P. Frisch, *ZPE* 13, 1974, 115-116; 15, 1974, 97; *Bull. Ep.* 1974, 457, 546. All this contradicts H.'s impressions on that remarkable fidelity of Notium to Pergamum during the troublesome nineties.

overlord, to whom the liberated cities owed gratitude for liberation and protection. It was left for his rivals from the West to make an important alteration in such conditions and arrangements.<sup>36</sup>

Textual and other problems. In Block A, 1-8 I read and supply:

- Τιμου[χῶν καὶ στρατηγῶν γνώμη· ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς μέγας]  
 ὁ Ἀντίοχος ἐν ἀρχῇ τε παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν καλ-]  
 [λ.]ίστη[ν καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτην πᾶσι τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τῶν  
 Ἑλλήνων]  
 4 [ἀποδειξας π]ροαίρεισιν, κ[αὶ δια]φ[υ]λάσσω[ν τὴν π]αρά  
 π[ατέ-]  
 [ρων δοθεῖσα]ν ἑαυτῶι διὰ προ[γόνω]ν ὑπάρχουσα[ν εὖ-]  
 νοιαν, κα[ὶ]  
 [χάριν ἀνακ]τᾶσθαι προσαιρούμενος πολλαπλασ[ία]ν κοινῶς [εὖ-]  
 [εργέτης πρ]οσιρήται γίνεσθαι τῶν τε ἄλλων Ἑλληνίδωμ [πό-]  
 8 [λέων καὶ τ]ῆς πόλεως τῆς ἡμετέρας---

The text is inscribed in four blocks numbered by the editor in Roman numerals. The fragments within blocks he numbers by capital letters (A-B above). The engraved blocks belong to a παραστάς (not an anta, but either pilasters in some posterior position at the walls, or the space between the παραστάδες). Even with the later date here proposed it is not very likely that the building should be the new temple designed by the famous architect Hermogenes at the end of the third century, because such constructions usually took years to complete. As with many other inscriptions engraved on architectural surfaces the lines run appreciably longer than in majority of free-standing stelae. They range between 44-52 letters, but only spot count has been taken.

Inasmuch as the appellation μέγας does not occur anywhere in the first block the editor thought it was disqualified as a supplement for the

<sup>36</sup> Even H. is constrained to admit, p. 144: "Es ist sehr charakteristisch, dass gerade in dieser Dokumentengruppe die Initiativrolle des Seleukidenkönigs als des eigentlichen Urhebers der Privilegien an keiner Stelle auch nur andeutungsweise in Erscheinung tritt, sondern immer nur die durch ihn gewährte Unterstützung der diplomatischen Aktion selbst". With references to contrasting situations under Seleucus II and Eumenes II.

first line. Since nothing else seems to be available to fit the lacune he felt obliged to postulate a *vacat*. I am not persuaded by this argument and do not see any good reason for the exclusion, and there is no rule which requires absolute uniformity in all references to a king (e.g. as in I C, 46). The fact is that a near variant of that title is not missing in another block (II, 30) and, far more important, we do find it in an exactly analogous position in the exhortation formula of the decree from Iasus passed about the same time. Besides that Βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀντίοχος appears in Amyzon, in many dedicatory inscriptions elsewhere, and in a petition of Ptolemy son of Thraseas, from Scythopolis.<sup>37</sup> Since the title βασιλεὺς was often omitted for dead, especially foreign, kings, I am not sure if that ultra-rigorous distinction postulated by P. Spranger between the secular title βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀντίοχος and the cult title Μέγας Ἀντίοχος, may sometimes not be somewhat exaggerated. However that may be, during the king's life-time even his cult name will be normally preceded by the royal title so that in practice there may be little difference to the reader.<sup>38</sup> The only other possibility, the formula πρότερόν τε, so common in the ἐπειδή clauses of decrees, is not much likely to occur in line 1 because we find it actually in line 8. The following examples are intended for the illustration of the whole preamble:

*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 352: ἐπειδὴ Δημήτριος ὁ βασιλεὺς πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος ὦν] τυγχάνει περὶ το[ύ]ς Ἑλληνας καὶ τὴν πόλι[ν] τὴν ἡμετέραν.

*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 370,27: προαιρούμενος διαφυλάττειν τὴν [εὐνοίαν τὴν εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὴν παραδεδομένην [αὐτῷ παρὰ τῶν προγόνω].

*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 390,10: ἐπειδὴ ὁ [β]ασιλεὺς καὶ σωτὴρ Πτολεμαῖος πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος ἐγένετο τοῖς τε Νησιώταις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν, τὰς τε πόλεις ἐλευθερώσας --- καὶ νῦν ὁ βασιλεὺς [Π]τολεμαῖος διαδεξάμενος τὴν βασιλείαν παρ[ὰ] τοῦ πατρὸς<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> My revision is forthcoming in *L'Antiquité Classique*.

<sup>38</sup> But there is no logical cogency in the argument that μέγας must be excluded from I 1 simply because it does not occur in that form in the rest of the decree. It is interesting to note that the earliest epigraphical instance of the epithet ὁ Μέγας is attested for Demetrius Poliorcetes, L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche* I, no. 7: ἐπειδὴ πρότερόν μὲν Δημήτριος] ὁ Μέγας-----

<sup>39</sup> Of course the phrase fits any king on his accession, e.g. *OGI* 90 (several times); *RC* 22 and many other texts.



τὴν αὐτὴν εὐνοίαν καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν [π]αρεχόμενος διατελεῖ εἰς τε τοὺς Νησιώτας κα[ι] τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλληνας. 20: τὴν τε πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς [εὐσέβ]ειαν διαφυλάττων καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς προγόνου[ς] εὐνοίαν διατηρῶν.

*Syll* 463: ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος παραλαβὼν τὰν τῶν Ἰτανίων πόλιν καὶ τοὺς πολίτας παρὰ τῷ πατρὸς βασιλέως Πτολεμαίῳ καὶ τῶν προγόνων καλῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως εὐεργετῶν διατελεῖ καὶ διαφυλάσσει μετ' εὐνοίας ---

*Syll* 629: [ἐπ]εὶ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης ὑπάρχων φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος διὰ προγόνων τὰν οὖσαι[ν] πρότερον εἰς εὐνοίαν ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ φανερώς γίνεται συναύξων καὶ πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀποδειξε[ι]ς πεποιήται τ[ῆ]ς εἰς τὸ ἔθνος εὐνοίας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλληνας --- ἐπαυξηκῶς τὰμ βασιλείαν καὶ ἐν τὰν καλλίσταν διάθεσιν ἀγνηκῶς.<sup>40</sup>

*Syll* 630: Ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς] Εὐμένης παρεληφὼς παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς βασιλέως Ἀττάλο[υ] τὴν τε πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς] εὐσ[έβ]ειαν --- καὶ διατηρῶν τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους] φιλίαν αἰεὶ [τινος ἀγ]αθοῦ παραίτιος γινόμενος διατελεῖ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν. N.B l. 15: [εὐ]νοίαν ἦν ἔχων δ[ια]τελεῖ κ[οινη] τ[ε] πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς Ἑλληνας καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν πρὸς τὰς πόλεις.

A. Rehm, *Delphinion* 139, 22-29: ἐπειδὴ τοῦ δήμου καὶ πρότερον ἔλ[ο]μένου τὴν φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ σωτήρ[α] Πτολεμαῖον συνέβη τὴν τε πόλιν] εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν ἔλθειν καὶ τ[ὸν] δῆμον πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν ἀξιοθῆναι, δι' ἃς αἰτίας ἐτίμησεν αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος ταῖς μεγίσταις τιμαῖς, διαδεξάμενός τε τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ---

*OGI* 54: Βασιλεὺς μέγας Πτολεμαῖος --- παραλαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν.

*OGI* 90: Βασιλεύοντος τοῦ νέου καὶ παραλαβόντος τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς --- μέγας βασιλεὺς ---

*OGI* 219: ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος βασιλέως Σελεύκου ἐν ἀρχῇ τε παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ προστάς ἐνδόξου ταὶ καλῆς αἵρέσεως ἐζήτησε τὰς μὲν πόλεις ---. 16: ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρότερόν τε ---

<sup>40</sup> For corrections to certain supplements see L. Robert, *OMS* I, p. 151 n. 5.

OGI 237: ἀκόλουθα πράσσων τῆι διὰ πατέρων ὑπαρχούσῃ αὐ-  
τῶι πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας εὐεργεσίαι.

G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Annuario della Scuola Italiana di Atene* 45-46 (1967-68), p. 447, l. 41-43: ἐπειδὴ βασιλέως μεγάλου Ἀντιόχου] προγονικὴν αἵρεσιν διατηροῦντος εἰς πάντας [τοῦ]ς Ἑλλ[η]νας καὶ τοῖς μὲν εἰρήνην παρέχοντος —. 47: τὴν δὲ ἡμετέραν πόλιν πρότερον τε] ---<sup>41</sup>

*Ibid.*, p. 447, Col. II, lines 2-5 (I restore): ἐπεὶ οὖν προγονικὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἀξίως διεδέξατο εὐνοίαν, αὐτὸς τε τυγχάνει εὐ- νόως εἰς τὴν πόλιν διακείμενος, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι ἐπηνῆσθαι] βασι- λέα μέγαν Ἀντιόχον ---

C.B. Welles, *Royal Corresp.* 15, 16: ἐν ἀρχῆι τε αἰρούμενοι διατε- λοῦμεν τῆμ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐνοίαν (τηροῦντες, supplevi) θεωροῦντες —

RC 31, 16: ἔχοντες οὖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς π[ερὶ] τοῦ δήμου τὴν φι- λανθρωποτάτην διάληψιν διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν —

It occurs to me that in addition to the six immediately preceding ex- amples for Antiochus III it is also possible to restore that small fragment of another decree for the same king from Erythrae, RC, p. 80:

ἐπειδὴ πρότερόν τε βασιλεὺς Ἀν-  
[τίοχος παραλαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν διετέλεσεν καλῶς καὶ] ἐνδό[ξως]  
[τηρῶν τὴν πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς Ἑλληνας εὐνοίαν καὶ] πολ[λῶν]  
[καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν παραίτιος γινόμενος ταῖς] πόλε[σιν καὶ]  
[τῆι πόλει τῆι ἡμετέραι] ---

In accordance with this in the first extant line of the new decree for An- tiochus III from Erythrae (wrong attribution in Engelmann - Merkelbach, *Erythrae*, no. 30 I see καλῆς καὶ ἐνδό]ξου π[ροαιρέσεως] (although in- complete the Ξ is indisputably sure on the photograph. Only the first up- right hasta is extant of the Π).

Polybius 21.20.6 (Eumenes II): ἐγὼ δὲ διαδεξάμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν μὲν προαίρεσιν τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς διεφύλαξα.

RC 52,5 (paraphrasis of the Ionian decree for Eumenes II): διότι τὰς καλλίστας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐλόμενος πράξεις καὶ κοινὸν ἄ

<sup>41</sup> Correction, *Bull. Ép.* 1971, 621 (p. 504).

ναδείξας εμαυτὸν εὐεργέτην τῶν Ἑλλήνων<sup>42</sup>— ἅπασαν σπουδὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιού[με]νος, ὅπως οἱ τὰς Ἑλληνίδας κατοικοῦντες πόλε[ις] διὰ παντὸς ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τῇ βελτίστῃ καταστάσει ὑπάρχωσιν. N.B. line 16: φανερὰς ἀποδείξεις.

With many other accessories of Hellenistic monarchy this whole style was adopted in official usages of Roman Emperors. Cf. e.g. *OGI* 493, 17-24 (Antoninus Pius): τὴν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς πα[ραδοθεῖσαν] αὐτῷ βασιλείαν παραλαβὼν π[ᾶν μὲν τὸ τῶν] ἀνθρώπων ἀνασώζει γένος, ἐξ[αιρέτως δὲ τὴν] ἡμετέραν πόλιν — γενόμενος ἡμεί[ν ---] πολλῶ[ν καὶ μεγάλων] ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος.

Since the fourth century B.C. very similar formulae were quite commonly employed also for private benefactors. The number of such testimonies is past counting. For "demonstration" (ἀπόδειξις, etc.) I refer to Holleaux's examples,<sup>43</sup> but even that is just a sampling. The same may be said for the καλὰ καὶ ἔνδοξα, or their superlatives, as in our decree. This phrase has great many applications, e.g. *Syll* 709: ἐπε[ιδὴ] Διόφαντος Ἀσκλη[πι]οδώρου Σινοπεύς φίλος [μὲν καὶ εὐεργέτας ἀμῶν] ἐῶν — διὰ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιος γίνηται ἐ[κάστωι] ἀμῶν, ἐπὶ τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ ἔνδοξότατα τὸν βασιλεῖα προτρεψάμενος.

I 6: χάριν ἀνακτᾶσθαι πολλαπλασι[α]ν engages now our attention. This too is a fixed phrase. Cf. *Diod.* 11.71.49 καὶ πολλαπλασίους τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀποδώσει χάριτας. 15.11.1: τὰς μὲν εὐεργεσίας οὐ τίθεται πρὸς λόγον διὰ τὸ τὰς περὶ αὐτῶν χάριτας καὶ τιμὰς πολλαπλασίας ἀπειληφέναι. 16.55.4: πολλὰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλας παντοδαπὰς εὐεργεσίας καὶ δωρεὰς διασπείρων ἔκομίζετο τοὺς μισθοὺς πολλαπλασίους τῆς χάριτος. 20.20.3: ἐπαγγελόμενος πολλαπλασίους χάριτας ἀποδώσειν. 31.36: πολλαπλασίους χάριτας κομίζονται καὶ δωρεὰς λαμβάνουσι παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων. *Polybius* 3.98.8: τὴν δὲ χάριν αὐξήσειν ἔφη πολλαπλασίαν. 18.16.3: πολλα-

<sup>42</sup> The ambition to become κοινὸς εὐεργέτης of Greek cities (or, to be exact, to gain acceptance and influence by means other than raw compulsion) was vital to the policies of Hellenistic rulers and was very strongly voiced in the propaganda of Antiochus III. But very soon Romans overshadowed all predecessors in receiving homages as κοινοὶ εὐεργέται, which by the time of Mithridatic wars made of them κοινοὶ ἐχθιστοὶ πολέμοι. Cf. *Syll* 741, III-IV, *RC* 73-74.

<sup>43</sup> See his *Études VI*, "Mots grecs", ἀπόδειξις.

πλασίως ἐπιταθέντες ταῖς εὐνοίαις εἰκόνα τε χρυσοῦν ἐψηφίσαντο καὶ θυσίαν αὐτῷ συντελεῖν κατ' ἔτος ἐνομοθέτησαν. Polyaeus 4.2.6: ὅπως ὑμῖν πολλαπλασίως ἀποτίσαιμι τὰς χάριτας. *Syll.* 708, 30: διπλασιάζων ἑαυτῷ παρὰ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῶν εὐεργετουμένων χάριτας. *I. Priene* 113,74: καὶ κοινὰς ἑορτὰς ἐπισημοτέρας μᾶλλον [ἐπο]ίησε ταῖς εἰς ἀνθρώπους χάρισι, τοὺς δὲ ταύταις χρωμένους ἐδιπλασι[άσε] ταῖς εὐνοίαις. Not only Antiochus but Flamininus was also careful to advertise that Romans are out there only to win gratitude and honor. R.K. Sherk, *RD* 33, 13: περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενοι χάριτα καὶ φιλοδοξίαν. This places the whole celebrated "sentimental Hellenism" of Flamininus and other Romans in sharply illuminating stage lights.

These examples will permit us to identify the context of yet another instance, *Syll.* 326,2: [ἐπ]ε[ιδῆ Λ]υκοῦργο[ς Λυκόφρονος Βουτάδης παρ]α[λ]α[βῶν [πα]ρ[ὰ τῶν ἐ]α[υτ]οῦ π[ρο]γόνων καὶ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς] τ[ῆν] π[ρ]ὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνο[ιαν] καὶ προαιρούμενος πολλαπλασίαν τήν τε χ[ά]ρ[ιν] ἀ[να]κτᾶσθαι —

I 8-11: καὶ πρότερόν τε ὑπάρ[χων] ἐν τῇ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ταύρου πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐγίνετο παραίτιος ἡμί[ν] καὶ παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τόπους ἀποκατέστησε τὰ πράγματα εἰς συμφέρουσαν κατάστασιν. H. suggests that this may be an allusion to "previous diplomatic contacts", but I rather suspect that "previous benefits" when the king was still beyond the Taurus may be largely credited to the polite formulae of the "diplomatic language". The words sound too much like a "frame" for an exordium to about any honorific decree. Far more interesting is the fact that other phrases and references to φίλοι and δυνάμεις have a very close counterpart in the Ilian decree *OGI* 219, and, I think also, in the decree *Erythrai*, no. 30, of which I treat elsewhere. In *OGI* 219 after the highlights of the king's earlier career lines 12-16 proclaim: νῦν τε παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰδε τοῦ Ταύρου μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἅμα καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν τὴν εἰρήνην κατεσκευάσεν καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς μείζω καὶ λαμπροτέραν διάθεσιν ἀγήγοχε, μάλιστα μὲν διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρετὴν, εἶτα καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων εὐνοίαν. In both cities this is unmistakably the propaganda of the years beginning with 197 B.C., proclaimed in the course of the far-flung campaign when Antiochus *omnibus regni viribus cum ingentis copias terrestris maritimasque comparasset* (Livy 33.19.9) *omnes Asiae civitates in antiquam*

*imperii formulam redigere est conatus* (33.38.1). The same must be said for the accompaniment of the king Antiochus by his queen Laodice attested for the 197/6 campaign in Iasus, Teos, and Ilium, but there is not a word about her in any of the published documents of the Carian expedition.

I 13-14. As already remarked the *συνεχεῖς πόλεμοι* may be the wars waged by Pergamum in its recent history, but the complaint about the "hard times caused by war(s)" was often voiced at the moment of transfer of cities from one kingdom to another, often the very object and profit of such a war. It could be precisely the war which the liberator was waging, but it was impolite, imprudent, and impolitic to be more specific. On these considerations the supposition that Teos was transferred to Antiochus entirely peacefully may be granted, but is not necessarily proved. Such transfers were often accompanied by internal political upheavals and a party struggle among various factions. Some resistance may also be expected from the local garrison, if there was any.<sup>44</sup>

I 16. I agree with J. Crampa, *Labraunda I*, p. 59, n. 2 that H.'s insertion of (καὶ) is entirely arbitrary.

I 17: παρελθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτὸς ἀνῆκε τῆ[ν] πόλιν καὶ τῆν χώραν ἡμῶν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ ἀφορολόγητον. Note above I 15-16: καθιέρωσεν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν and χαρίζεσθαι. Dittenberger was probably right to assign the Milesian act, *Syll* 590 on the enhancement of the Didymea to ca. 196 B.C.<sup>45</sup> It is said

<sup>44</sup> Cf. e.g. the letter of Antiochus III to Jerusalem, *Jos.*, *A.J.*, 12.139. During the invasion the countryside of Teos may have been sorely affected, if only for supplies and provisions. After the surrender the king promised (II 52-53) that peace and order will be henceforth guaranteed. Cf. Amyzon *RC* 38; capitulation of Sardis, *Sardis VII*, 1, no. 2; (see now *AJPh* 108(1987), 707-728); Theangela, L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner*, p. 97-101 (I supply after L.R.): τυγχάνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡμετέρου δήμου ἀσθενῶς διακειμένου καὶ κωλυομένου γεωργεῖν διὰ τοὺς περιεσχηκότας αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ [πολέμῳ] καιροῦς, κτλ. Despite Holleaux's efforts to demonstrate the contrary there can be no doubt that in the Corragus inscription, *Études II*, p. 74 παράληψις τῆς πόλεως can signify only the change of regime and it must correspond to facts expressed in Teos (I 11) as ἀποκατέστησε τὰ πράγματα εἰς τὴν συμφέρουσαν κατάστασιν. Similar expression in Habicht, *Athen. Mitt.* 72 (1957), no. 64, 26-28: the restoration of Ptolemaic rule on Samos, which was accompanied by a good deal of rough fighting after a brief Macedonian interlude.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. n. 15. On other occasions Antiochus III regulated (during his sojourn, or sometimes at a distance) great many matters of religious concern in various cities, especially the questions of ἀσυλία and ἀτέλεια. Cf. e.g. Athymbra, *RC* 9 (with *RC* 43, and *ibid.*, p. 291. See my remark in *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 258); Magnesia, *RC* 31-32; Alabanda, *OGI* 234; Amyzon, *RC* 39-40; Tralles, *RC* 41 (*Chiron* 18, 1988, 55). Add now J. & L. Robert, *Fouilles*

there *inter alia* in line 9: τῆς τε πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας καθιερωθείσης. L. 11: καὶ τῶν βασιλέων οἱ τετευχότες τῶν μεγίστων, τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ συμβουλίας, τὴν τε καθιέρωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν ἀνηγόρευσαν ἀπαράκλητοι αὐτοί, τῷ τε θεῷ καὶ τῇ πόλει τὴν ἀξίαν τούτων ἀπονέμοντες χάριν. The βασιλεῖς may be a vague allusion to any kings, but above all it must mean Seleucids whose traditional relations with Apollo have always been very good. Furthermore we may recall that at one moment during his eastern expedition Philip was expected to capture Miletus, but it is rather improbable that there would have been time for Apollo's counsels.<sup>46</sup> *OGI* 237 shows what kind of a συμβουλία king Antiochus might have received from the god at the time when in Iasus ὁ τε θεὸς ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ γένους τῶν βασιλέων συνεγεμαρτύρηκεν τῷ βασιλεῖ περακαλῶν μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύεσθαι. Thus the case is very good that we should ascribe to Antiochus III the "dedication" of Miletus ca. 197 B.C. to its chief god<sup>47</sup>. As in Teos the event is recorded only locally. If the "kings" should be limited to the Seleucid dynasty the plural may also include the eldest son of Antiochus, the co-regent, and of course queen Laodice was also active in her own sphere in imperial politics. Perhaps that stoa inscribed [Ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μιλησίων [βασιλίσσῃ] Λαοδίκῃ belongs to her, if not rather to the consort of Antiochus IV.<sup>48</sup> Thus the consecration of Teos appears to be not an isolated act, but stands well in line with the consecration of Miletus and still earlier during the same expedition, of Xanthus, *OGI* 746 (*TAM II*, 266): Βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀντίοχος ἀφιέρωσεν τὴν πόλιν τῇ Λητώϊ καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνάπτουσιν συγγένειαν.

I 19-20. Financial regulations of this type, as clear evidence for incorporation of a city within the ambitus of the regulating power, would mer-

*d'Ambron* I (1983), no. 1 (which I complete): Ζεῦσις Κυνάγου Μακεδῶν τοὺς ἀγροὺς, τῶν βασιλέων κελευόντων, ἀπέδωκεν Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι, and *ibid.*, no. 12 (which I complete): [Ο]ἱ βασιλεῖς [ἀ]πέδωκαν [τὸ ἱερὸν] ἄσυλον, ὡς ἡ στήλη περι-ορίζει. Cf. *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 609, 613. Note the βασιλεῖς in relation to Miletus, *Syll* 590.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Holleaux, *Études IV* 220; 229; 247; 284; 292; 293; 296; 330; 334.

<sup>47</sup> *Syll* 590. A more direct evidence for Antiochus III comes only from a somewhat later time. Cf. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen...* p. 281.

<sup>48</sup> *Milet I*, 7, no. 184 (p. 282). Cf. the latter Laodice and Miletus in *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques*, no. 7. The Milesian Timarchus, officer of A. IV and future rebel dedicated in Miletus with his brother Heracleides a Bouleuterion in the king's name, *Bull.* 1977, 446.

it a special study. It might be treated in conjunction with the theory and practice of liberations. Only few words can be said here. For eminently practical reasons the first task of every new authority was to take stand on the existing political, administrative and financial order. Generally there was a tacit assumption that all the prerogatives of the previous paramount power devolved on the new one and continued in force, unless decided otherwise. The successor disposes of this according to his will or expedience. However, as much as practicable successors often try to make a good impression by offering concessions, apparent or real. Thus Alexander regulates and often remits Persian taxes in the conquered cities, Ptolemy does the same when the Nesiotic League comes under his control,<sup>49</sup> or when Iasus makes a treaty with him. Antiochus III grants fiscal and religious privileges to the newly conquered Jerusalem, and makes concessions to a just captured unknown city, most probably Sardis, and gives assurances and promises to the formerly Ptolemaic Amyzon. This is also what another king (presumably Antiochus III) does with Theangela, or still another in the decree for Corragus.<sup>50</sup> This is what all the successive regimes Ptolemaic, Seleucid and Antigonid had to settle in Mylasa and Labranda.<sup>51</sup> Even in this cursory form the list of references might be easily extended to fill a whole page. In Teos and Erythrae the Seleucid king was induced to grant ostensibly the status of ἀφορολόγητος to both cities because such pretenses had been made for them by earlier liberators. Of course the taxes regulated are those existing under the previous order, and this fact is very clearly specified in the Teian inscription. *No liberation at this time can happen away from the liberator, but the contrary.* Unfortunately the language of the facts of this nature may often be quite ambiguous, which in certain cases is ultimately responsible for a good deal of confusion, as e.g. on RC 15, in modern scholarship.

I 24: ἀποδίξιν ποιούμενος μεγίστην τῆς προϋπαρχούσης αὐτῶι πίστεως πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους. The Antiochist party in Teos is now willingly serving as a *tuba vocalis* for his propaganda. All those who

<sup>49</sup> *Syll* 390, 10-15.

<sup>50</sup> Theangela, L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner* (1936), pp. 97-101; Corragus, Holleaux, *Études II*, pp. 74-75; Jerusalem, Jos., *A.J.* 12, 138-144; Sardis, W.H. Buckler and D.M. Robinson, *Sardis VII*, 1, no. 2; (see now F. Piejko, *AJPh* 108, 1987, 707-728); Amyzon, RC 39, to be completed: τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἐπόλλωνος καὶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὸ ἐν Ἰ᾿Αμυζῶνι ἄσυλον εἶναι βουλόμεθα].

<sup>51</sup> J. Crampa, *Labranda III, I-II* (Lund-Stockholm, 1969-1972).

would welcome him have only good to expect from the king who keeps his faith in promises and agreements. In some aspects this sounds familiar, like the glorification of the Roman *fides*. All this will have the practical implications of the *deditio in fidem*, since the notions of ἐγχειρίσαι (ἐνδούναι) ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν πίστιν, meaning surrender to the good faith of the victorious party, was well-known in Greek name and practice<sup>52</sup>. In his letter to the much afflicted Amyzon Antiochus gives assurances on this score, *RC* 38 ἡμεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μὲν πάντας [διατελοῦμεν εὐφρογυνοῦντες ὅσοι αὐτοὺς πιστεύσαντες ἡμῖν ἐνεχείρισαν, τὴν πᾶσαν αὐ[τῶν] ποιούμενοι πρόνοιαν πρὸς] τὸ μένοντας ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἐν τῇ πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ.<sup>53</sup> Cf. Teos II, 52(53). In narrower sense this is the concrete meaning of the peace theme voiced by Antiochus in many cities. Flamininus and the Romans were also much celebrated at this very time not only for the εὐεργεσίαι εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας --- ἀλλὰ καὶ πίστιν ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις καὶ δύναμιν ἢ χάρις ἀπήνια διακαίως (Plut., *Titus* 12). In Chalcis Titus Soter and the Ῥωμαίων Πίστις for a long time enjoyed a cult and were sung in a solemn paean.<sup>54</sup> Do we need to ask whether any less would have come to posterity from the same places for Antiochus, had he the last word in the great contest? Who knows if the soil of Euboea and of central Greece does not hide yet some shattered stones with similar adulations for the discomfited liberator. Even the claim to special divine protection, which guided Antiochus in his drive to the West was not wanting on the Roman side, as they advanced in the opposite direction. The claim was commonplace enough, but the perception, or need, for divine sanction on both sides was much deeper than that traditionally voiced in exhortations to troops on military campaigns, or during national emergencies. Ultimately the Romans had the

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Bull. Ep.* 1969, 498. For a good example of a forced capture and refusal to παραλαμβάνειν εἰς τὴν πίστιν see. Pol. 15, 4.1. The characteristically Roman *deditio in fidem*, often celebrated as true invention of the Roman original genius, seems to be in fact only a national adaptation of the very common practice, for which immediate models came from the realities of war and politics and from the more developed Greek customs. There are many independent Greek parallels.

<sup>53</sup> I restore in *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 610.

<sup>54</sup> Plut., *Titus* 16: Πίστιν δὲ Ῥωμαίων σέβασεν τὴν μεγαλευκτοτάτων ὄρκους φυλάσσειν μέλλετε καῦραι Ζήνα μέγαν Ῥώμαν τε Τίτον θ' ἄμα Ῥωμαίων τε Πίστιν ἔζητε Ποιάν, ὧ Τίτε σῶτερ. There is more in what follows. Cf. *Diod.* 23.1: Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ θρυλοῦντες τὸ τῆς πίστεως ὄνομα. After the War with Antiochus Roma and Pistic had also a separate cult in Teos, *BCH* 19 (1895), 554: Ἱερεὺς ἀπεδείχθη Ῥώμης καὶ Πίστεως Στράτων Ἐσσιαίου.



better of the argument, and they could point out to the uninterrupted success as a sure sign of the divine favor.<sup>55</sup>

I 29-36. Oliver's τὰ δ' ἔπι]τελέσει, *Bull. Ép.* 1969, 497, instead of H.'s τὰ δ' ἔ[τι] τελέσει, is here accepted. The fact that the usual three-man embassy was sent seems to indicate that Antiochus was not yet in the immediate vicinity, for in such event a more numerous, often ten-man, embassy would have been more appropriate.<sup>56</sup> This invitation for "talks", I, 29-31: πρεσβείαν ἣι συνλαλήσει περὶ ὧν ἔφη πεπεισθαι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ] συμφέρειν has an exact, almost word by word, counterpart in the king's remark on the departure of the ambassadors from Erythrae, *RC* 15, 35-38 (I modify): περὶ δὲ τούτων καὶ] τῶν ἄλλων ὧν συλλελαλή[καμεν ἀναγγελοῦσιν ὑμῖν καὶ οἱ πρεσβευταί, οὓς διὰ τε τὰ ἄλ[λα ἃ ἔπραξαν ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν ἣν ἐποιοῦν]το περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων τῶι δήμῳ]. This was to say the king was pleased with their cooperation and understanding in making the settlement, but the language is traditional and fixed, as is the custom of commendation of the ambassadors to their fellow citizens back home. The verb used for the "talks" in such negotiations is normal *koine*, and it occurs in Polybius, the New Testament, and of course in inscriptions, as e.g. *OGI*. 229, 23.

I 38: βασιλεῖ καὶ [ἀδελφῶι], supplied by Merkelbach, *ZPE* 3 (1968), 170-174, is good. It had also occurred to me independently.

I 52: διδῶσιν ἣ[μῖν τὰ]γαθὰ, not ἀγ]αθὰ. Precision contributed by J. & L. Robert, *Bull. Ép.* 1968, 451.

I 56. As H. has well noted a whole extra line may be added and modelled after Block II 63: [τοὺς ταμίαις ἐκ τῶν τιμῶν τῶν βασιλείων, ἣ ἐκ τῆς διοικη]σεως]. Cf. II 87-88.

Block II introduces a new numeration of lines. It consists of two fragments, *C* and *D*. After the first two completely lost lines neither the sense nor the possible connection of words in the next two lines are clear, but

<sup>55</sup> Religious self-justification is deeply rooted in collective psychology of all peoples ancient and modern, who feel safer with tutelary gods on their side, especially in the moments of crisis.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. e.g. *Pol.* 4.23.4: Philip approaching Mantinea in 219 B.C. asks for a plenipotentiary embassy to meet him. *I. Priene* 14.8: Lysimachus drawing near to the city. M. Wörrie, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 423: Heraclea ad Latrimum sends 22 men embassy to Zeuxis (nearly no doubt) after the recent Seleucid take-over.



- [ἰς κα]ὶ τῶν ἐν ἡλικίαι κα[ι] τῶν ἀπογραψαμένων πρὸς αὐτοὺς  
[τῶν πο-]
- 24 [λιτῶν] θύειν δὲ καὶ ἑορτάζειν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας τοὺς  
ο[ἰκοῦν-]  
[τας] τῆμ πόλιν ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις οἴκοις ἑκάστους κατὰ  
δύν[αμιν]  
[στε]φανηφορεῖν πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ  
ταύτῃ· ἄφει-]  
[vai δ]ὲ καὶ τὰς ἐργασίας πάσας τὰς τ' ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τῇ  
χώ[ρα καὶ εἰ-']
- 28 [vai ἐ]χεχίριας πᾶσι πρὸς πάντας ἐν τ' ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ.

II 4. There is a combination of three basic expression: (ἐπὶ πλεῖον) αὖξειν τὰς τιμὰς; τιμᾶν διαφερόντως; τὰς προσηκούσας (καθηκούσας, ἀξίας, ἀξιολόγους, πρεπούσας) τιμὰς ἀπονέμειν. E.g. *RC* 9, 7: συναύξειν τῶν θε[ῶν] τιμὰς; *RC* 36,3; *I. Magn.* s.v. τιμή; *OGI* 56,20: τὰς τε προὔπαρχούσας τιμὰς βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσηι Βερενίκηι — αὖξειν. H. Gauthier - H. Sottas, *Décret trilingue*, p. 67, inscr. 1. 30-37 (partly restored by editors on basis of Egyptian versions): τὰς τε προὔπαρχούσας τιμὰς — ἐπαύξειν μεγάλως. M. Segre, in L. Robert, *Hellenica* 5 (1948), p. 104, line 13-14: ἐπαύξειν τε βουλόμενοι τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῆς. *Diod.* 1.18.2: διαφερόντως ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων τιμώμενον; line 22,6: διεφερόντως τιμηθῆναι. 2.47.1; τιμᾶσθαι διαφερόντως. Cf. *Strabo* 11.532C; *Bull. Ép.* 1964, 478; *Pol.* 18.16.1: ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος ἐτιμᾶτο μὲν καὶ πρότερον — ὑπὸ τῆς Σικυωνίων πόλεως διαφερόντως; *Labraunda*, no. 4,2: τιμήσει ἐμὲ καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα Νικαίαν καὶ τὰ τέκνα ταῖς προσηκούσαις τιμαῖς.<sup>57</sup>

II 5-9. Names of festivals in neuter plural may stand with, but most commonly are expressed without, articles.<sup>58</sup> E.g. *I. Priene* no. 11, 29: ἄ-

<sup>57</sup> Cf. also *Syll.* index, s.v. τιμή; Habicht, *Gottmenschen*, 207.

<sup>58</sup> The statement of Ch. Habicht, *op. cit.*, p. 207, that festivals for deified humans are never called ἑορτή is completely mistaken. Attenuated on p. 266, but there is not just one new example from Teos but more than a dozen of testimonies (mostly among old epigraphical texts) contradicting the postulated distinction. The terms were used quite indiscriminately.

γειν ἑορτὴν Σωτήρια; L. Robert, *OMS I*, 199: ἄγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐαγγελίαις Ἀντιγόνεια καὶ Δημητρίεια. I supply l. 9: κατὰ συμφορίας on the analogy of the usual festive gatherings for banquets κατὰ φυλάς, and on the assumption that line 10 [τῶν] συμφοριῶν is anaphoric. However, I cannot follow without modification J. & L. Robert's explanation of this matter in the *Bull. Ép.* 1977, 405 and their idea that there was one prescription for a meeting of priests and magistrates (l. 7-24), and another for the whole population (24-32, if I interpret them correctly). The authors of the *Bulletin* propose to write πάντας τοὺς τῆς πόλεως ἄρχοντας, or τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῆς πόλεως πάντας. The idea that the magistrates, the priests and the Dionysiac artists should meet for the festive occasion is in principle good, but the prescription applies not only to them, the disconnected composition of the sentence notwithstanding. They could not have been so numerous as to create a need for a gathering together (συνεῖναι) only to be scattered into more manageable divisions. Nor would such a procedure have necessitated an elaborate census-taking for which heads of divisions were responsible (ll. 21-24), and create for the popular assembly a need to approve that unprecedented new expenditure on a considerable scale. It is therefore reasonably clear that the prescription concerns the entire citizen body of Teos. Cf. e.g. the συναρχαί in *OGI* 309 (Teos) cited below to II 26-28. As in other cities on such occasions the citizens will have the right to participate in public banquets financed from the city revenues, each in his own civic group, in accordance with the local divisions of the whole populace. The prescription in l. 24 concerns all others, the citizens and resident aliens, but at this time the latter are normally excluded by law from all strictly civic functions and privileges. Nevertheless they are (as in many other cities) urged to observe the general stephanephoria and to celebrate in the privacy of their own homes and according to their means. And of course all citizens are likewise encouraged to make the day festive also in their private houses, etc. The order to be followed by the Dionysiac artists is not completely clear, but it was no doubt largely regulated by a long-standing local custom. No doubt they were expected to officiate in certain ceremonies on behalf of the entire community, but for banqueting they might have formed a separate group of their own, or join the priests and magistrates. The latter dine separately in Pergamum, *OGI* 332, 17-21, while the rest of the people sacrifice by tribes, the heads of tribes obtaining the ne-

cessary funds from the public treasury, 1. 39-42.<sup>59</sup> For my added καὶ in line 9 cf. e.g. *OGI* 212,5: ἰδρύσασθαι δὲ καὶ βωμόν.

II 16-17: ἐν τοῖς Λευκαθῆροις has been contributed by the authors of the *Bull. Ép.* 1968, 451. That was a festival of Poseidon at the year's beginning in the local festival.

II 22-24: [ἀπογ]ραφήν --- τῶν ἐν ταῖς [ἄκμαῖς καὶ] ἐν ἡλικίαι --- [τῶν πολιτῶν]. In the same manner as heads of tribes elsewhere receive regularly from the common funds of the city money for holiday expenses (chiefly for victims) for their own subdivision of the citizen body, in an analogous manner the heads of the *symmoriai* are authorized to make preparations. The amount of cash they are going to receive will depend on the number of citizens in their respective units, entitled to participate. For this reason the headmen are required to present beforetime official lists of prospective participants. As a supplement for l. 22 H. considered, but without committing himself, ἐν ταῖς [συμορταῖς], which however exceeds the number of letters indicated for the lacuna. The editor tried to explain the passage by admission of a possibility of three categories of participants, but could find no convincing solution. Inasmuch as the ultimate confirmation may depend on the peculiarities of the local constitutional arrangements, which are largely unknown to us, I am not positively sure of having found the correct answer. Nevertheless it is known that in most states young men were required, on attainment of certain age to be registered in their demes (or similar). From such registers the numbers were computed for individual φυλαί, or the total was taken for the whole state. These were then οἱ ἀπογραψάμενοι τῶν πολιτῶν. For practical reasons (e.g. military service, liturgies) such and other registers may have been classified by age. But at certain public religious sacrifices and banquets associated with them not only adult registered male citizens (οἱ ἐν ἡλικίαι) were entitled to attend and share, but also their wives and free dependents of both sexes. Non-citizens and slaves were normally not included, although there were exceptions and the historical tendency worked toward relaxation of such restrictions. Apparently all those eligible in Teos were listed for such purposes under the "rubrics" for individual heads of households, just as we find it in certain lists of citizenship grants. It seems that the word ἡλικία is following another specification of age

<sup>59</sup> After L. Robert's repertory in *Études anat.* and *Studies in Honor of G.B. Welles* I have collected further examples of συνεῖναι κατὰ φυλάς in my discussion of *OGI* 219.

and for that short lacuna I can think of nothing more suitable than ἀκμαῖς. Admittedly this results in a somewhat pleonastic phrase, but that was probably a fixed expression, or it may apply to those who are not yet registered as adult citizens, e.g. παῖδες and ἔφηβοι, who are often required to attend public ceremonies in a prescribed order. Ἀκμή is ordinarily the prime of life when citizen is liable to active military service, but the phrase ἀκμάζων τῇ ἡλικίᾳ is one of those petrified idioms in Greek. Cf. *Arists., Polit.* 1275a, 15: καθάπερ καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς μήπω δι' ἡλικίαν ἐγγεγραμμένους ταὶ τοὺς γερόντας τοὺς ἀφεμένους φατέον εἶναι μὲν πῶς πολίτας, οὐχ ἄπλῶς δὲ λίαν ἀλλὰ προστιθέντας, τοὺς μὲν ἀτελεῖς τοὺς δὲ παρηκμακότας, ἧ' τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον. *Pol.* 2.23.9: ἀπογραφὰς τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἡλικίαις σπουδάζοντες εἰδέναι τὸ συμπᾶν πλήθος. 5.64.1; κατὰ γένη καὶ καθ' ἡλικίαν (διελόντες τὸ πλήθος). 31.29.7: ὡς κατὰ τε τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀκμαίως ἔχοντος. 36.8.1: κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀκμάζων. *Ps. Aristeas* 37: εἰς δὲ τὸ στράτευμα τοὺς ἀκμαιοτάτους ταῖς ἡλικίαις τετάχαμεν. *Jos., A.J.* 12.47; τοὺς δε ἀκμάζοντας ταῖς ἡλικίαις εἰς τὸν στρατιωτικὸν κατάλογον κατέταξα. *Plut., Philop.* 11: ἀκμάζοντάς τε τοῖς σώμασι ἅπαντας καὶ ταῖς ἡλικίαις. *Syll* 671,15: εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἡγεμόνων κατεγραψάντων τοὺς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ μὴ θέλοι πειθαρχεῖν δυνατὸς ὢν — he will be fined. 18: εἰ δὲ φαίη ἀδύνατος εἶμεν ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἔξομοσάτω. *Syll* 709,10: τοὺς ἐν ἀκμᾷ τῶν πολιτῶν. This is still further confirmed by the expressions τὸ πλήθος τῶν πολιτῶν, which abounds.

Π 25: ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις οἴκοις κατὰ δύναμιν. H. states (p. 60) that he knows no parallel for such a disposition and *Syll* 695,6 ff.; 43ff; 86 is cited by him as a completely different category, while in fact it is on the same level. Cf. furthermore *I. Priene* 14,30 (*OGI* 11; I supply): τοὺς τε ἐν τῇ πόλει οἰκοῦντας καὶ] ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ κατὰ [δύναμιν ἐκάστους βωμοὺς ἰδρύσα]σθαι καὶ θύειμ βα[σιλεῖ Λυσιμάχῳ. In the second column of the Iasus decree (*Annuario Sc. Ital.*, 45-46, p. 448) I restore, 30-36:

ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέ-]

ραι στεφ[ανηφορεῖτωσαν οἱ πολῖται πάντες συνόδους]  
ποιού[μενοι κατὰ φυλὰς καὶ θυσιάζοντες ἀφείσθαι]  
δὲ [τοὺς παῖδας ἀπὸ τῶν μαθημάτων καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας ἀ-]  
πὸ τ[ῶν ἔργων ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ θυέτωσαν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέ-]  
ραι ο[ἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἐν τῇ πόλει οἰκοῦντες καθὼς ἄν]  
ἦ δυ[νατὸν ἐκάστῳ].

Indeed οἱ ἄλλοι are often contrasted with πολῖται as in *OGI* 339, 28-30: ἐπιστραφεῖς οὐ μόνον τῶν πολιτῶν [καὶ] τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατοικούντων τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν παρεπιδημούντων ξένων. *Syll.* 398,30: καὶ στεφαναφορεῖν τοὺς πολίτας καὶ τοὺς παροίκους καὶ τὸς ἄλλοις τὸς ἔνδαμεῦντας ἐν Κῳι πάντας. *Syll.* 589, 28-29 (quoted below under II 52-53). J. Crampa, *Labraunda I*, no. 6, 4-8: τοὺς τε πολίτας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς ἔκτημένους ἐν τῇ χώρῃ στεφαναφορῆσαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκαταστάσει τῶν πατρωίων ἱερῶν καὶ θυσίαν προσαγαγεῖν. Πάροικοι often means the same as παρεπιδημούντες, although strictly speaking the latter designates sojourners for a short time.<sup>60</sup>

II 26-28. H. was too scrupulously hesitant about supplying ἀφεῖναι. I see no problem there. Other attempts (Oliver, Dunst, Merkelbach), such as παύειν, παύεσθαι (cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1969, 474-498) are not acceptable. H.'s restoration of the Teian honors for Apollonios, *OGI* 309 (L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes*, 18-19) cited with approval in the *Bull.*, *loc. cit.*, would still stand some improvement. H. proposes, p. 62:

--- συναρχίας [καὶ --- τὰς]

[ἐργασίας πάσας] τὰς ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τῇ χώρῃ, καὶ εἶναι  
ἔχεχειρίας πᾶσ[ι πρὸς]

[πάντ]α[ς ἐν τῇ] ἡμέρα(ι τ) αὐτῇ.

I would rather suggest:

[ἀγειν δὲ ἱε]ρα[ν] τὴν ἡμέραν. συνεῖναι δὲ καὶ τὰς συναρχίας  
[καὶ τοὺς πολί-]

[τας τοὺς οἰκοῦν]τας ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τῇ χώρῃ, καὶ εἶναι ἔχε-  
χειρίας πᾶσ[ι πρὸς]

[πάντας ἐν τῇ] ἡμέρα(ι τ)αὐτῇ. L. 12: εὐπρε]πῶς.

In τῇμέραι ταύτῃ I would see (if not another τε) a deaspirated crasis (for θῆμέραι), or rather a radical elision (τῇ ἡμέραι), but in no case an engraving error and no justification for editorial intervention.

<sup>60</sup> The main ceremony in such private sacrifices was incense burning at individual altars in front of one's own house. That was one ancient custom Greeks shared with many Oriental and Mediterranean peoples. Hebrew prophets were scandalized by some Jews, who in this backsliding manner worshipped in the streets gods other than Yahweh. Cf. e.g. Jeremiah 44, 21.

II 29. Full stop after βύβλιον.

II 33. Concerning ἡ κοινὴ τῆς πόλεως ἑστία the question arises whether it was located in the Prytaneum or in the Buleuterium. In various cities there might exist even two such hearths at the same time, or in different times, but the "hearth" in the phrases about invitation to a public reception εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῆς πόλεως ἑστίαν should not necessarily be understood literally. Prytaneum was a central government building of a city provided with an entertainment hall. Public dining facilities were originally located in the building where the "common hearth" was symbolically burning, but afterwards a mere *hospitium*, repast, reception, or banquet came to be called ἑστία, ἑστίασις, ἑστίαω, the ultimate etymology going back to the prehistoric past when everyone had meals and entertained guests by his fireplace.

II 33-34: συντελεῖν θυσίαν τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ Χάρισιν καὶ Μνήμῃ. The most famous city where magistrates sacrificed to the personified People and the Graces, although not to the Memory, was Athens, where after the liberation from Macedonia in 229 B.C. a temple to the first two deified personifications was built.<sup>61</sup>

II 36: κατὰ τὸ(ν νόμον), *supplevi*. Cf. *OGI* 56,65: συντελέσουσιν ὁμοίως θυσίαν καὶ τὰλλα τὰ συντελουμένα νόμιμα. *OGI* 78,24: συντελεῖν τὰ ἱερά τοῖς θεοῖσι καττὸν νόμον. *OGI* 219,28: συντελεσάτωσαν τὴν νομιζομένην καὶ πάτ(ριον θυ)σίαν. Cf. furthermore τὰ νόμιμα, ὡς νόμος, καθὼς νομίζεται, in prescriptions of sacred rituals.

II 38. Full stop after τέλειον.

II 48. [αὐτ]οῦς, *supplevi*.

II 50. I would delete the comma after παρέσχεν.

II 51. There is no problem with ἐκούφισιν. It should be left exactly as engraved without ill-advised correction, or deletions (H.), or unnecessary orthographic cosmetics (Oliver, cf. *Bull.* 1969, 497), but in principle Oliver's solution is certainly right. We are dealing here with a matter of haplographic spelling, so common in these very texts from Teos. Haplog-

<sup>61</sup> Cf. W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (1911), p. 212. Also *OGI* 117, 20; 118, 20. *Bull.* 1966, 139: ἔθυσαν τὰ εἰσιτητήρια καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τῷ τε Δήμῳ καὶ ταῖς Χάρισιν καὶ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι τῷ Ἰππῶι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. Cf. a false decree in Demosth., *De cor.* 92, forgery contemporary with Philip V, *Bull.* 1946-47, 24.



graphic writing of words compounded with  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ - followed by a *kappa* is not so rare<sup>62</sup>. The same phenomenon affects often enough even separate words in mere juxtaposition and may occasionally be a cause of some misunderstandings to modern scholars. Although this is not the place to expatiate on all implications of the problem I suspect for example that ΕΚΟΡΑC in the Commagenian inscriptions belongs to this category.<sup>63</sup> The enigmatic group ἀρνούμενης ΕΚΟΡΑC ὀφθαλμόν τε τήκων, which is twice attested, should not be resolved to  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa(\theta)\rho\alpha\varsigma$  because the etymon and the identical groupings of the consonantal letters involved occur elsewhere in those inscriptions without any phonetic alterations (dissimilation). Accordingly the letters should be transcribed  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\rho\alpha\varsigma$  and understood  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  κόρας, pupil of the eye being meant.<sup>64</sup> In *OGI* 308,10:  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  was wrongly corrected by Dittenberger, who needlessly suppressed the first letter. That "correction" is passed on without comments by e.g. L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie*<sup>2</sup>, p. 159, but it is simply a haplographic transcription of  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ .

Π 52-53; μετ' ἀσφαλεί[ας] is the correct reading established by J. & L. Robert, *Bull.* 1968, 451; 1969, 497. Cf. *Bull.* 1981, 241 (p. 405): συνκ[ομισθῶσιν οἱ  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  γῆς καρποὶ μετ' ἀσφαλείας For peace after victorious campaigns as condition for flourishing of agriculture (εἰρήνη καὶ πλοῦτος) cf. *I. Mac.* 14,8: καὶ ἦσαν γεωργοῦντες τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν μετ' εἰρήνης, καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐδίδου τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν. Such notions go back to the old (also Biblical) ideals, as in *I Kings* 4.24-25: "and he (Solomon) had peace on all sides about him. And Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig tree." In *Syll.* 589,26-31 (Magnesia on Meander) the sacred and civil officials are to pray ὑπὲρ τε σωτηρίας τῆς τε πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν τῇ πόλει

<sup>62</sup> E.g. *Bull.* 1956, 194: ἐκλήσῳ; Bengtson, *Kl. Schriften*, p. 365: ἐκλήσῳ; *Delphinion*, no. 143, 27: ἐκλήσῳ; *Sardis VII*, I, no. 189: ἐκαμάτων. R. Herzog-A. Klaffenbach, *Asyienurkunden aus Kos*, nos. 6; 22; 43: ἐκλήσῳ, ἐκλήσῳ.

<sup>63</sup> See F.K. Dörmer -Th. Goell, *Asamania am Nymphaios*. Berlin 1963 (Istanbuler Forschungen, 23), p. 56, line 216 and notes *ibid.* New edition H. Waldmann, *Die kommagenischen Kulturreformen unter König Mithridates I. Kallinikos*. Leiden, 1973, p. 71, 1. 33 (Incidentally W. treats the irregular haplographic spelling Καλινίκου as engraving error, p. 17, l. 6, and commentary, p. 19. The omission of the *iota adscriptum* by engraver was ignored by the editor, even as ordinary *subscriptum* — a debatable principle).

<sup>64</sup> The idiom ὀφθαλμόν τήκειν means to "eye with envy". Cf. e.g. G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca*, Indices, s.v. τήκειν.

καὶ τῆι χώραι, ὑπὲρ τε εἰρήνης καὶ πλοῦτου καὶ σίτου φορᾶς καὶ τῶν καρπῶν πάντων καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν.

Π 77. G. Daux's [χρησ]θαι (cf. *Bull.* 1974, 481) is to be preferred to the editor's ὑ[δρεύεσ]θαι. It eliminates the repetitiousness (l. 79) and the faulty syntax: the dative (l.78) fits well the former verb, but not the latter, which normally takes the accusative for direct objects.

Π 83. After long hesitation I have come to the conclusion that the Roberts' μετ' ἄρυσ|τρίδος (*Bull.* 1968, 451; 1969,499) does not satisfy the requirements of the contexts. Certainly ἄρυσ|τρίς (rare in this form) is a vessel for drawing water, which combined with the restoration ὕδρ|ευ-ομένας (not πορ|ευομένας) makes some sense. However this misses the whole point of the solemnity in that ritual (l. 82), which requires that those fetching water for cult purposes should appear ceremoniously in festive cloths with wreaths on their heads. But women who would come to draw water for the customary ablutions of brides should be attired in a similar fashion and ... come with [6-8]ΑΤΡΙΛΟΣ. Of course it goes without saying that some water container will be needed for any purpose, but that may be too banal and too obvious to require a special, but empty, regulation, and thus ἄρυσ|τρίδος falls flat and adds nothing essential to what was supposed to be a complementary prescription. I had been thinking of [μετ' αὐλη|τρίδος, an accompaniment by a flute-player to enhance the occasion. Afterwards [μετὰ αὐλη|τρίδος appeared in an article by F. Sokolowski, *Greek, Roman and Byz. Studies* 13 (1972), p. 171, v.10 supposed that a musician helped to keep pace in a stately processional marching. Although much in that superficial article is full of errors and misunderstandings I am inclined to think that the accompaniment by a flutist may be still the best solution hitherto proposed.<sup>65</sup> However, it is worthy of note that the closest approximation to the reported lettering (the detail cannot be controlled on the photograph) is [μετὰ τῆς λ|ἀτριδος, which may possibly denote a ceremonial maid in this cultic-ritual service.<sup>66</sup> Other suggestions (just random guesses) may be found through the references in the *Bull. Ép.* listed at the head of this article.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. the real customs in other civilizations, W. Robertson Smyth, *The Religion of the Semites* (Meridian Books, repr., 1956), p. 231: "In the actual practice of later Judaism, however, water was drawn from the fountain Siloam and carried into the Temple amidst blare of trumpets".

<sup>66</sup> An attendant handmaid? Cf. cultic terms such as ὑπουργός, ὑπηρέτης, λάτρις, discussed by W. Pleket, "Religious history as the history of mentality", *Faith, Hope and Worship*, edited by H.S. Versnoll (Leyden, 1981), 152-192.

II 84-86. I supply ἀποδείξαι ἐπιστάτας δύο ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν πολιτῶν οἵτινες [ἐπιμελήσονται] τῆς κατασκευῆς τῆς κρήνης καὶ τῆς ἀναθέσεως εἶναι δε τὴν κρήνην ὕδατος παρεσομένην. (full stop). Those untenable improvisations in *GRBS* 13 (1972) are rightly censured and refuted in the *Bull* 1973, 377. The end of the first sentence can be easily supplied from II 59-61: ἀποδείξαι δὲ καὶ ἐπιστάτας δύο [ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν πολιτῶν οἵτινες ἐπιμελήσονται τῆς τε κατασκευῆς τοῦ ἀγάλματος καὶ τῆς ἀναθέσεως. Cf. I 53-54. Also from II 70-73: ἐπιμελήθηνα[ι] ὅπως εἰς αὐτὴν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀχθῆ καὶ ἀναθεῖναι τὴν κρήνην τῇ ἀδελ[φῆ] τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου βασιλίσση Λαοδίκη, καὶ εἶναι αὐτὴν ἐπώνυμ[ον] Λαοδίκης. But examples of setting up a commission charged with carrying out the provisions of a decree, e.g. οἵτινες ἐπιμελήσονται τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῆς στήλης καὶ τῆς ἀναθέσεως, or τῆς ποιήσεως τῆς εἰκόνης καὶ τῆς ἀναθέσεως, go by thousands. Yet the "short story" of this passage exemplifies once more how even "absolutely obvious" things need to be in the first place properly identified, or what seems to be a valid analogy may be irrelevant or misleading.

From the parallels just cited I think there is hardly a place for a debate about the completion of the second part in the sense it has been done here. There is however some problem with παρεσομεν..., but that concerns only the case ending, not the reading. The future participle must agree either with the restored κρήνη or ὕδωρ, and it all signifies that the water should be coming from, or through, the device (cf. l. 71). One imagines it was a pipe, a spout, or a more elaborate gargoyle. Etymologically it probably derives from παρήμι (cf. πάρεσις, "letting through"), or πάρειμι ("pass"). Even παρρέω (from παραρέω) cannot be a priori excluded, although that participle (if we should allow for the haplography of the *rho*), regularly formed, should be παρευσομένην. The phenomenon of the "vulgar" pronunciation suppressing -v- is operative even at this early date.<sup>67</sup> Cf. *OGI* 483: περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖς προαστείοις κρηνῶν ἐπιμελὲς μινέσθω τοῖς ἀστυνόμοις ὅπως καθαρά τε ὦσιν καὶ οἱ εἰς αὐτὰς ὑπόνομοι εἰσάγοντες καὶ ἐξάγοντες τὸ [ὑδ]ωρ εὐρους ὑπάρχωσιν.

II 100: [προ(γόν)οις, suggested by H., p. 80 n. 71, is not good, even if its echoes such very common formulae as ἀνανεώσασθαι τὴν διὰ

<sup>67</sup> Meisterhans - Schwyzer, *Grammatik der alt. Inschriften*<sup>3</sup>, p. 61 n. 516; 154 n. 1318. Cf. *OGI* 405, 11: ἑατόν; 458, 9 ἀτώ.

προγόνων ὑπάρχουσαν (or προγονικὴν) εὐνοίαν, φιλίαν, οἰκειότη-  
τα, etc. The right word is [καὶ [τῆ]ν προὑπάρχουσαν τοῖς [δῆμ]οις  
πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀνανεωσόμεθα φιλίαν.

II 103-104. Perhaps the omission of Aramea should not be regarded as deliberate exclusion of the Iranian Arame from the "ancestor" tableau. E. Breccia, *Diritto dinastico*, explains that in royal succession only the descent through male line counted, although in natural descent both lines were about equal in honor. In fact Seleucus I named newly founded cities after both of his parents, who were only commoners, but they had no part in the royal cult. Perhaps the real motive in the exclusion lies in the punishment for the mutiny of the Cyrrhestans in Aramea, over twenty years ago.

II 113. I add the last word καὶ δηλώσαντες αὐτοῖς [ὅτι]. See *Syll.*, index s.v. δηλώω.

Block III is a very small fragment whose even approximate context escapes us. The first word seems to be τ]αῦτα.

The royal letters. There are five of them in unequal states of preservation and offering varying problems of restoration. Three are issued in the name of Antiochus (*Anadolu* 9, pp. 41-42; 157-158) and two are from queen Laodice (*ibid.*, 159).

Block IV. After two lines of which only few characters remain (line 1: Ἐ]αν]τιόχωι) and separated by an apparent vacant line there follows a somewhat damaged toward the end, but still fairly well preserved letter of Antiochus to Teos, which I would read and complete as follows.

1. Letter of Antiochus III. Ca. 196/5 B.C. *Anadolu* 9 (1965), p. 41-42.

[Βασιλεὺς [Ἄ]ντιόχος Τητίων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι  
χαίρειν· οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν]

4 [πρεσβ]ευταὶ Πυθόδοτος καὶ Πολύθρους καὶ [-- ca. 8 -- τὸ  
ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν,  
[ἐν] δὲ ἐγγράφειτε εὐχαριστοῦντες ἐπὶ τ[οῖς] πρότερον γεγε-  
νημένοις ὑμῖν]  
[φιλ]ανθρώποις, καὶ ὅτι βουλόμενοι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀ[ῖ]ρεσιν ἐπὶ  
πλεῖον ἀπο-  
δείκνυσθαι στεφανώσαιτε ἡμᾶς χρυσῶι στεφάν[ωι καθ' ἕκασ-  
τον ἐνιαυ-]

8 τὸν καὶ εἰκόνι χρυσοῦ· διελέχθησαν δέ καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις [μετὰ  
σπουδῆς ἔμφα-]

νίζοντες τὴν τοῦ δήμου ἐκτένειαν· θεωροῦντες οὖν ὑμᾶς εὐ-  
 χαρίστως καὶ γνη-  
 σίως διακειμένους πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν ἡμῶν ἐπαινοῦμεν ὡς  
 ἐνδ[έχεται μάλιστα.]  
 ἀποδεδέγμεθα δὲ καὶ τὸν στέφανον καὶ τὰς τιμὰς φιλοφρόνως  
 κα[ὶ ο]ἱ κ[είως].

12 τὰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁμοίως πολλῶι προθυμότερους παρα-  
 σκ[ευά]ζ[οντας εἰς]  
 πᾶν τὸ συμφέρον συνκατασκευάζειν τῇ πόλει καὶ μὴ μόνον  
 συντηρε[ῖν τὰ ὑπο-]  
 κείμενα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσ' ἂν ἀνήκη πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν  
 σ[υναύξε]ιν ὑμῖν, κα[ὶ κοινῆι]  
 καὶ ἰδίαί ἐκάστου ποιεῖσθαι τὴν προσήκουσαν πολυ[ωρίαν]  
 καὶ] νῦν ὑ[πομνη-]

16 σάντων τῶν πρεσβευτῶν ἐντετάλθαι ὑμᾶς [αὐτοῖς ἀναγγέ]λ[λειν-]  
 ταῦτα ἡ-]  
 [μῖν, ὁ]ρῶντες ἐμ πᾶσ[ι]ν ὄντας ὑμᾶς ἐκτενεῖς κ[αὶ τῆς ὑμῶν]  
 αἰρέσεως ποιού-]  
 [μένους ἀ]ποδειξ[εῖς οἰό]μεθα δεῖν τῆμ πόλιν [ὑμῶν εἰδέναι  
 περὶ τούτων]  
 [τὰ δὲ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγγ]ελοῦσιν ὑμῖν καὶ οἱ π[ρεσβευταί,  
 ἀκηκοότες αὐτὰ]

20 [παρ' ἡμῶν? ἔρρωσθε.]

Critical notes: 3-4 engraved on a gasure. -5. δεδεμένοις ὑμῖν ὑφ' ἡμῶν, H. -6. ἐπὶ πλείον, P.; τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, H. - 11. κα[.] IΣ[ca. 8], H. - 12, παρασκ[ευά]ζ[ειν εἰς τὸ?], H. - 16-20, P.

"King Antiochus to the Council and People of Teos greeting. Your envoys Pythodotus, Polythrus and [ca. 8] have delivered your decree, in which you wrote that as a token of gratitude for the favors previously extended to you, and wishing even more to express your loyalty, you would crown us every year with a gold wreath and a gold statue.

The envoys also discoursed earnestly, dwelling at length on the devotion of the people. Considering then your appreciative and sincere bearing towards our house we are certainly most gratified. Likewise we have accepted gladly and in a good spirit the crown and the honors, which are obliging ourselves as well as the government to even greater readiness to

combine our efforts towards devising every manner of advantage to the city, not merely for the preservation of the existing order, but also for the promotion of your interests in all that pertains to honor and glory, and in general, as well as in particular to take proper care of everyone.

And now since your envoys have mentioned that you had charged them to announce these matters to us, seeing that in all respects you are dedicated and giving expressions of your zeal we deem it appropriate that your city should be notified of this. But about the details you shall learn from the envoys, as they have heard them from us. Farewell”.

This letter and all the subsequent ones was written after the submission to Antiochus, i.e. after 197/6 B.C. and few years before he lost the city in 190. Without going here into punctilious analysis of stylistic aspects the similarity of wording and ideas with the letter of the same Antiochus to Erythrae, *RC* 15, and of Laodice's letter to Iasus, should be particularly stressed. Some account of the rationale of my restorations is due.

IV 5. H.'s line looks too short and the awkward ὑμῖν ὑφ' ἡμῶν is begging questions. Cf. *RC* 15,33: καὶ τοῖς προγεγενημένοις ὑμῖν ἀκοιλοῦθως; *I. Magn.* 39,23: καὶ τῶν προγεγενημένων ποθ' αὐτοῦς φιλανθρώπων; Holleaux, *Études III*, 142, inscr. l. 26/27: ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις. *Pol.* 29.24.14: τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐγεγόνεν φιλάνθρωπα κατὰ τοὺς ἀνώτερον χρόνους. *Syll* 563,5: καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ πρότερον γεγονότα αὐτοῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν φιλανθρώπων. But ἐπὶ τ[οῖς παρ' ἡμῶν γεγενημένοις ὑμῖν] would be also possible.

IV 6. H.'s restoration is in place and as such it is a good idiom, but I feel there is a question of an intensified or repeated (ἐπὶ πλεῖον, ἔτι μᾶλλον) “demonstration”, especially since we may assume that this was not the first time when some, at least verbal, evidences of loyalty had already been presented. The concrete substance of this fresh “demonstration” (if one only considers the plethora of honors in the decree of Teos, including the cult statues) makes a good impression of being something distinct from that. That impression is also reinforced by the two other letters of Antiochus (numbered here 2-3), which in their relative chronology may really precede the one here discussed. This is what seems to be suggested also by the mention of the “crowns and other honors” there, still occasional, not annual as here, and no less from the continued assurances on the recently granted status to the city as free, autonomous and inviol-

able, of which no more is made in this letter, i.e. the subject was already settled. Cf. furthermore *RC* 36,2-3: [βουλόμενοι]οι --- [τ]ὰς τιμὰς ἐπὶ πλείον αὐ' ἕξειν. *Delphinion* no. 146,12-13: βουλόμενός τε ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μυλασέων ἐπὶ πλείον αὐ' ἕξειν τὰ παρ' ἑκατέρων φιλάνθρωπα. *Syll* 580,15: φιλοτιμουμένοις ἐπὶ πλείον ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἑαυτῶν εὐνοίαν.

The annual crown is almost certainly a disguised form of a tribute, or tax. One example of a very similar arrangement is known from the far-away Messembria. It was a treaty, dated loosely in third century, between a Thracian dynast Sadalas and that city. In addition to a χρυσοῦς στέφανος voted for one particular occasion the Messembrians decree στεφανοῦσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν στεφάνωι στατήρων πεντέκοντα.<sup>68</sup> We know that στέφανος (which was to culminate in its development as the Roman *aurum coronarium*) was a fairly regular source of revenue to Hellenistic kings.<sup>69</sup> The custom (originally not necessarily of excessive value) is pre-Hellenistic, but since Alexander it becomes another form of "voluntary" exactions.

IV 9-10. θεωροῦντες οὖν ὑμ[ᾶς] εὐχαρίστως καὶ γνησίως διακειμένους πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν ἡμῶν ἐπαινοῦμεν ὡς ἐνδ[έχεται] μάλιστα]. Cf. *RC* 14,11: ἐπαινοῦμεν ὡς ἐνι μάλιστα. *RC* 15,16-19: θεωροῦντες ἀπλάστως καὶ ἀληθίνως ἐμ πᾶσι προσφερομένους καὶ νῦν πολὺ τι μᾶλλον ἐπεοπάσμεθα, κατανοοῦντες τὸ εὐγενές ὑμῶν. Similar ideas are expressed in *RC* 22, 7-17.<sup>70</sup>

IV 11. The courteous reception (with kindness, gladness) is often expressed in one or two adverbs, among which φιλοφρόνως, οἰκείως, ἐκτενῶς and εὐγνομόνως are favorites. Cf. L. Robert, *OMS I*, 75: ἀποδέξασθαι εὐγνομόνως τὰ δεδογμένα. *Fouilles de Delphes III*, 4, no. 175,8: τοῖς πολίταις συνεστράφη καλῶς καὶ εὐγνομόνως. *Diod.*

<sup>68</sup> H. Schmitt, *Staatsverträge III*, no. 556, 8-10.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. e.g. *Jos.*, *A.J.* 12, 142; *I. Macc.* 10,29; 13,39.

<sup>70</sup> In the letter of Ptolemy to Cos, R. Herzog-G. Klassenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* (1957), no. 1 I restore lines 27-28: καὶ ἐπαινοῦμεν ὡς ἐνδέχεται μάλιστα. See now *Επιγραφικα* 48(1986), 10. I supply the end of *RC* 22: καὶ ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ἡγούμενοι τῆμ πόλιν ὑμῶν] εἰς ἐπιφανεστέρην διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν [καὶ πάντα τὰ τίμια καὶ] φιλάνθρωπα ἐπίδ[ωσιν] λάβοντα συνδιαφυλάσσειν τῷ δήμῳ]. Cf. our 3<sup>rd</sup> letter to Teos, l. 31. A. Rehm's *II Didyma* 493: παρ' ἡμῶν φιλάνθρωπα, ἐπὶ διὲ τούτοις --- does not lead anywhere.

19.9.6: εὐγνομόνως τοῖς πλήθῃσι προσφέρεται. Pol. 8.19. 1: προσδε-  
ξάμενος ἔκτενῶς καὶ φιλοφρόνως. There is not much firm guidance  
in the letter traces indicated by H. and the photograph is completely ille-  
gible. The best supplement would be εἰϋγ[νομόνως, but this resulting in  
a rhyme should better be avoided.

IV 12. Cf. 267,26: βουλόμενος τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς  
καθισταμένους προθυμοτέρους κατασκευάζειν εἰς τὸ φροντίζειν.  
*Syll* 709,45: συνεργῶν εἰς πᾶν τὸ συμφέρον. *I. Priene* 108,313: προ-  
θύμους ἑαυτοὺς παρασκευάζωσιν εἰς τὰ συμφέροντα.

IV 13-15. Cf. *RC* 15,11-12: καὶ (δ)μοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνήκουσι πρὸς  
τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν συναύξειν τὰ τῆς πόλεως. Also the letter of Antio-  
chus III to Pium, *RC* 42 (Frisch, *Iliou* 37) in my restoration:

----- δμοίως]  
τε πρὸς τὸ σ[υ]νκατασκ[ευάζειν ὑμῖν πάν-]  
τα τὰ πρὸς ἐπιμέλειαν κ[αὶ πρόνοιαν ἀνή-]  
κοντα· πειρασόμεθα γὰρ οὐ μόνον τὰ δι-]  
ὰ προγόνων προὔπηργμ[ένα εἰς τὸν δῆ-]  
5 μον συντηρεῖν, ἀλλὰ κ[αὶ ἵνα τῶν πρὸς]  
δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκ[όντων μηθενὸς]  
ὑστερητε ποιεῖσθαι τ[ὴν προσήκου-]  
[σαν] καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίαι ἐκ[άστου πο-]  
[λυωρίαν συγχω]ροῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ [ἄλλα]  
10 [πάντα? -----

Similar expressions in *RC* 52, 17-20, and *ibid.* 32-26. Cf. the pro-  
mises of a better deal under Antiochus in his consort's letter to Iasus,  
lines 8-11: τὴν τε ἐλευθερίαν ὑμῖν ἀπέδωκεν καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ  
τὰ λοιπὰ προτέθειται συναύξειν τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ εἰς βελτίονα  
διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν, and the like assurances of Seleucus II to Miletus, *RC*  
22, quoted in n. 70, as I restore it.

IV 16-20. The subject of this charge cannot be anything special, but  
is a "diplomatic" banality. One might think of ἀοπάσ[α]σθαι ἡμᾶς καὶ  
ὀρῶντες, which involves only the completion of the Λ into Α, but the  
choice is determined by the parallels cited below. In l. 17 in place of



αἰρέσεως equivalents such as εὐνοίας, προαιρέσεως, or προθυμίας might be also considered, but whatever it may be, the supplement cannot be long. For line 18, which is the customary courtesy for the envoys relayed to their government and communities back home Cf. *RC* 15, 35-38) one might also consider οἰόμεθα δεῖν τῆμ πόλιν [ὑμῶν ἀμείψασθαι ἀντὶ τούτων]. Cf. M. Th. Lenger, *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolemées*<sup>2</sup> (1980), no. 42, 17 (I supply): καὶ ὑμᾶς δ' οἰόμεθα δεῖν [εἰδέναί. R. Herzog - G. Klaffenbach, *Azylienkunden aus Kos* (1957), no. 1, 20-23 (I supply): καὶ τὴν σπουδ(ῆ)ν ἅμα τε τὴν φιλοτιμίαν τῶν πρεσβευτῶν βουλόμενοι κατὰ [τὸ δυνατόν ἀμείψασθαι, οἰόμεθα δεῖν] τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου ἀπομαρτύρεσθαι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτα[ς αὐτῶν ἵνα εἰδῶσιν ---.<sup>71</sup>

Some further parallels. *RC* 1,69: ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων καὶ γράψαι μοι ἔδοκε καὶ ἀποστεῖλαι Ἄκιον διαλεξόμενον. 14,14-15: τὰ δὲ πλείω] συντετάχαμεν Ἡγεστράτῳ περὶ τούτων διαλεχθῆναι καὶ ἀσπάσασθαι παρ' ἡμῶν. 15, 35 (I modify the supplement): περὶ δὲ τούτων καὶ] τῶν ἄλλων ὧν συλλελαλή[καμεν ἀναγγελοῦσιν ὑμῖν καὶ οἱ] πρεσβευταί. 23,18: καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὧμεθα δεῖν γράψαι περὶ τούτων. 25,47: περὶ αὐτῶν (FP) τούτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλω[ν ὧν] ἡβουλόμεθα ἐντέταλμαι ἀν[αγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν. L. Robert, in *Laodicée du Lycos: Le Nymphee* (1969), p. 248 n. 1 quotes an unpublished letter of Antiochus III to Sardis: ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων ἀναγγελοῦσιν ὑμῖν οἱ περὶ Μητρόδωρον. *RC* 49,10: τὰ δὲ πλείονα περὶ τούτων ἀκούσετε παρ' αὐτῶν]. 50, 20-22: τὰ δὲ πλείονα] περὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος [ἀκούσετε παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν θεωρῶν. 52,68: τὰ δὲ κατὰ μέρος — ἀκηκόετε οἱ πρεσβευταί δηλώσουσιν ὑμῖν. 58,10: καὶ αὐτὸς τούτῳ ἄπερ ἐνόμιζον ἀναγκαῖον εἰδέναί δε κεκοινολογησάμενος εἶρηκα ἀναγγέλλειν. Teos I 34: ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ γράψας ἔφη ἐντετάλθαι τοῖς [πρεσβευταῖ]ς ἀναγγέλλειν ἡμῖν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβευταί ἀνήγγ[ι]λαν ταῦτα τῷ δήμῳ. Cf. the first letter to Teos, l. 19 (quoted here p. 26). Pol. 21. 15,12: ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἡρακλείδης (the envoy of Antiochus) ταῦτα ἀκούσας ἐπανῆλθε καὶ συμμείξας διεσάφει τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ κατὰ μέρος. *I. Mac.* 12,23: ἐνταλλόμεθα οὖν ὅπως ἀπαγγείλωσιν ὑμῖν κατὰ ταῦτα. *Annuario* 45-46 (Aristobulus to Iasus): ὑπὲρ τούτων ἔδοκε μοι βέλτιον εἶναι ἐπιστεῖλαι ὑμῖν. *Labraunda I*, no. 3, 32-34 (Olympichus to Mylasa): περὶ αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων καὶ τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς ἐντε-

<sup>71</sup> *Epigraphica* 42 (1986), 10.

τάλμεθα ἀπαγγέλλειν ὑμῖν. *Ibid.*, no. 6B, 11-13 (O. to M.): καὶ τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς [αὐτὸς δι]αλεγείς ἐντέταλμαι ἀπαγγέλλειν ὑμῖν τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ. Sherk, *RD* 1,6: ὅπως οὖν εἰδῆτε κρινον ὑμῖν γρά[ψαι περὶ τούτων]. *Ibid.* 57, 33: ὑμῖν δ(ἐ) γέγραψα περὶ τούτων. *Syll* 572,8 (Philip V to Nisyros): ἐντέταλμαι αὐτῷ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν ἃ βουλόμεθα ὑμᾶς εἰδῆσαι. *Syll* 671B,4 (Eumenes II): τὰ ἀξιούμενα ἐπαγγείλατο ποιῆσειν καὶ τοῖς τε πρεσβευταῖς ἐνετείλατο ἀναγγέλλειν διότι πρόκειται αὐτῷ ἐπιτελεῖν τὰ παρακαλούμενα ὑπὸ τᾶς πόλιος καὶ γράφειν ὑπὲρ τούτων ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν. Wilcken, *Chrest.*, no. 12: Ὅπως οὖν εἰδότες εὐθάρσεις ὑπάρχητε ἐκρίναμεν σημήναι. 156,7: Ἐγράψαμεν οὖν ὑμῖν ἵνα εἰδῆτε. *I. Magn.* 91a, 7: καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκρίναμεν ὑμῖν γράψαι περὶ αὐτοῦ (cf. *ibid.* b., line 7). Cf. in private correspondence *P. Cairo Zen.* 59332: τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ὃ φέρων σοι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔρει. M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (988), p. 423, N II, 1 (A. III to Heraclea ad Latmum): [ὑπ] ἐρ αὐτῶν δέ τούτων ἀκο [ύσεσθε ἐκ τ] ὦν πρεσβευτῶν.,

It is plain enough that the king's promise was only a vague formulaic phrase and that οἰόμεθα δεῖν corresponds exactly to ἡγούμενοι of *RC* 22 and that the promise was comparable to that in Laodice's letter to Iasus. Cf however the letter of Antiochus III concerning Jerusalem with the wording of our considered alternative restoration. *Jos.*, *A.7.* 12, 139: ἡξιώσαμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ τούτων αὐτοὺς ἀμείψασθαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἀναλαβεῖν. *Ibid.* 134: ὁ οὖν Ἀντίοχος δίκαιον ἡγησάμενος τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρὸς αὐτὸν σπουδῆν ἀμείψασθαι.

2-3. Letters of Antiochus. Ca. 196 B.C. *Anadolu* 9 (1965), pp. 157-158.

[Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Τητίων] τῆι βουλῆι καὶ [τῶι]  
[δῆμωι χαίρειν· οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν] πρεσβευταὶ Διονύ-  
[σιος καὶ Θεόδωρος? τό τε ψή]φισμα ἀπέδωκαν

4 [καὶ αὐτοὶ εμφανίζοντες ἦν] ἔχετε διὰ παντὸς  
[εὖνοιαν διελέχθησαν δὲ καὶ] περὶ τῶν τιμῶν  
[ἃς ἐψηφίσασθε τοῖς τε προγ]όνοις καὶ ὧν ἐμοὶ  
[μετεδώκατε· προσδέδεγμα]· δὲ καὶ τὸν στέφανον

8 [καὶ τὴν τοῦ πλήθους ἐπαινώ] αἴρεσιν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς  
[τιμαῖς πειρασόμεθα τὴν τε] δημοκρατίαν ὑμῖν  
[συντηρεῖν, καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ] τὴν χώραν ἱερὰν καὶ  
[ἄσυλον παραδέξασθαι· καθά]περ καὶ οἱ πατέρες καὶ

- 12 [αὐτὸς ἔκρινα ἀντὶ τῆς ἐξ ὑμῶν εὐνοίας αἰείτινος  
[ἀγαθοῦ αἰτίος ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι]. ἔρρωσθε.  
[Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Τηίων τῆι βουλήι καὶ τῶι δή-  
[μωι χαίρειν· ἀνήνεγκαν οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ
- 16 [τὰ τῶι δήμωι δεδογμένα ἐν] οἷς καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὴν ἀ-  
[δελφὴν ἔστεφάνωσε, καὶ τὰ ψῆφίσματα καθ' ἃ ἔτετι-  
[μήκετε ἡμᾶς διότι τὴν τε] ἔλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν  
[αὐτονομίαν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλάνθρωπα τῆι πόλει
- 20 [ὑμῶν συνδιαφυλάσσομεν καὶ τῶν χρησίμων αἰεί  
[τι παρεχόμεθα, καὶ περὶ τῶν] ἄλλων τῶν ἐν τοῖς  
[ψηφίσμασι διελέγησαν μετὰ] πάσης σπουδῆς  
[καὶ φιλοτιμίας· τοὺς δὴ στε]φάνους καὶ τὰς ἄλλας
- 24 [τιμὰς τὰς ἡμῖν ἐψηφισμένας οἰκείως προσδεδέγμε-  
[θα καὶ Τηίων τὸν δῆμον ἐπαινο]ῦμεν διατηροῦντα  
[ἐν παντὶ καιρῶι τὴν αὐτὴν αἴ]ρεσιν, ὡς προσῆκόν  
[ἔστιν, καὶ εἰς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα, κ]αθάπερ ἀξιούτε, τῆι
- 28 [τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων ὑψηγ]ήσει κατακολου-  
[θούντες, πειρασόμεθα ὑμῖν συ]νπράσσειν καὶ τὴν  
[ἐλευθερίαν καὶ αὐτονομίαν] καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ δεδομέ-  
[να ὑμῖν τίμια καὶ φιλάνθρ]ωπα συνδιαφυλάσ-
- 32 [σειν, ἔμμενόντων καὶ ὑμῶν ἐ]ν τῆι αὐτῆι διαθέσει καὶ  
[εὐνοίαι. τὰ δὲ πλείω περὶ το]ύτων καὶ οἱ πρεσβευ-  
[ταὶ κατὰ μέρος δηλώσουσιν] ὑμῖν. ἔρρωσθ[ε].

When H. decided to append these later finds (1966) to his edition of the main bulk (found in 1963) he was able to contribute only few restorations (e.g. lines 1-2, 14) and separate words here and there. In line 12 H. had ἐγώ; in l. 34 ἀναγγελοῦσιν.

"King Antiochus to the Council and People of Teos greetings. Your envoys Dionysius and Theodorus? had delivered your decree and having themselves made assurances of your constant goodwill, they also spoke about the honors, which you had voted to my ancestors and in which you have accorded a share to me.

I have accepted the crown and commend the demeanor of the populace, and in reciprocation for the honors I shall endeavor to protect your

democracy and see to it that your city may be recognized as holy and inviolable. Just as my fathers, I for my own part am also determined, obliged by your graciousness, to become to you always an agent of some good. Farewell.

King Antiochus to the Council and the People of Teos greetings. Your envoys brought what the people had decided, wherein you have crowned myself and the queen consort, and the decrees in which you have honored us, because we are instrumental in maintaining your freedom and autonomy, as well as for other favors to the city, and that we continue conferring benefits of one kind or another. They also spoke with all earnestness and diligence on the remaining matters in the decrees.

We have then accepted with satisfaction the crowns and the honors voted to us and we thank the people for remaining steadfastly in the same attitude, as it is proper. And for the future, just as you are asking, we, following the lead of our ancestors, shall endeavor to work together with you and help to safeguard your freedom and autonomy and other advantages granted to you, as long as you also continue in the same disposition and in a good will. But more about this the envoys will no doubt reveal to you in detail. Farewell."

Many formal exchanges must have already been made between the city and the Seleucid king. The letters are brief and depend very heavily on the ready supply of formulaic expressions. They carry very little of any concrete information. Just "diplomatic", "public relations", or "courtesy" letters. The time may be still rather early in the proceedings, but not immediately after the take-over. The restoration was facilitated by this formulaic composition, but even so it was a precision work requiring a good deal of patient attention to minute details. Certainly as historical documents these letters are of no great importance, yet together with other materials for the same events they are not without merits even in this respect and they bring a good deal of material for the study of chancery styles and related subjects. Ultimately this may be of some use in the study of other complete and incomplete inscriptions.

Noteworthy is the first person singular which the king (or rather his secretary) is compelled to employ by the exigencies of the situation. It was so because he was speaking also for the queen, but wished to keep his own identity separate. One may find it stated in all modern works that the normal style of Seleucid royal letters was plural, just as the singular

form was characteristic of the Attalids, but this is one more good reminder, that such "rules" are always apt to be more flexible than rigid schematism of modern classifications. Naturally in his treaty with Lysimachia, Frisch, *Iliön* 45,<sup>72</sup> Antiochus also swears in the first person singular, as was the form imposed by the time-hallowed custom. Oath is an expression of individual and personal will and obligation. But there exist other examples, rather untypical for the Seleucid chancery, as e.g. *RC* 32, the letter of the son and co-regent of Antiochus III, and *RC* 70, whose author and date is currently a subject of debates ranging between Antiochus I to the last days of the dynasty, but a question might perhaps be asked if it could not just as well emanate from the reign of Antiochus III.<sup>73</sup> The letters in the Maccabees often shift between singular and plural.<sup>74</sup> Let us now turn to the additional evidence.

L. 3. The embassy consisted of only two members, named without patronymics, evidently because they were already well-known personages at the court and by this time some of the more burdensome ceremonial could be dispensed with. Dionysius may be identical with the son of Apollodotus (?) in I 31/32, and the other man presumably had also the same experience. Either Hermagoras or Theodorus would fit well, but a shorter name seems preferable, although this is frankly only a "filling" conjecture.<sup>75</sup> For τε (very common here) cf. e.g. *RC* 31,10: τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέχθησαν and IV 8; *Labraunda* I 5, 4, but διελέγησαν is equally grammatical<sup>76</sup> and idiomatic.

L. 4. Cf. II 55; 98. *RC* 15, 6; 52, 12. Διὰ παντός is a "fossil" abbreviation for διὰ παντός τοῦ χρόνου. Still *in extenso* in *RC* 22, 8.

<sup>72</sup> I treat of this in *Historia* 37 (1988), 151-165.

<sup>73</sup> Antiochus rex junior? Th. Fischer, *Schwarz. Numismat. Rundschau* 65 (1986), 66-67 attributed to the co-regent an entirely separate royal coinage from Tyre, so why not some letters from Syria, where he sojourned in an official capacity and died in 193? At least as some possibility. However, K.J. Rigsby, *TAPA* 110 (1980), 248-254, had argued again for the traditional date of *RC* 70 between the end of the second and the beginning of the first century B.C.

<sup>74</sup> J. Crampa in his commentaries to *Labraunda I* attaches an exaggerated importance to the use of the singular or plural form by Olympichus in his letters. I doubt very much if the dynast had any conscious "prepossessions" of the kind imputed to him. It was a very trivial matter of style, normal in ancient (e.g. Cicero; the New Test.), and in a good deal of the present day epistolary practice. The only effect striven for seems to be variation.

<sup>75</sup> The number of letters in the restored left half ranges between 21 and 24.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *RC* 6, 4, which should be restored τό τε ψήφισμα (ὑμῶν ἀπέδωκαν); 15, 2; 32, 10; *Labraunda I*, no. 5, 2, 18, 21.

L. 5-6: διελέχθησαν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν τιμῶν [ἃς ἐψηφίσασθε. Cf. *RC* 15, 3-4. More *infra ad lineam* 24.

L. 6-7: τοῖς τε προγ[ό]νοις καὶ ὧν ἐ[μοὶ] μετεώκατε. Perhaps it would be too pedantic to illustrate by examples the constructions of μετεῖναι, μεταδιδόναι τῶι τιμῶν, πολιτείας, θυσιῶν, δόσιων καὶ νομίμων, etc., but cf. one for all, *Delphinion* 143,14: μεταδιδούς αὐτοῖς τῶν παρ' αὐτῶι τιμῶν<sup>77</sup>. The phrase in the letter may be construed either as a reference to previous honors for Seleucid kings in Teos, profane and cultic,<sup>78</sup> voted cumulatively over the years in the past and all probably preceding the last Attalid period, or else Antiochus may be acknowledging the cult honors just recently conferred on his πρόγονοι by a single act. In the decree of Iasus he is indeed literally sharing in the cult honors voted to his deified ancestors. There are some further allusions to the ancestors in Teos (I 5; III 95), but the texts we have afford no direct evidence about the installation of this cult. As I had already an occasion to note elsewhere (e.g. in the discussion of *OGI* 219) the emphasis on the House (οἶκος, οἰκία), Ancestors (πρόγονοι, πατέρες), and Family (γένος) is a distinguishing characteristic of the documentary evidence for Antiochus III.<sup>79</sup> I have emphasized that the "House" category does not occur at all before the reign of this ruler, while the "Ancestors" make their first appearance in inscriptions of Seleucus II, the father of Antiochus III.<sup>80</sup> It is obvious that the lapse of few generations was required before sufficient historical perspective and any real consciousness of a series of deified royal ancestors had a chance to develop. This may be the convenient place to collect the most important references to the πρόγονοι under Antiochus III.

*RC* 15,23: καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρόγο[νο]ι ἔσπευδον ἀεὶ ποτε περὶ αὐτῆς (scil. Ἐρυθραίων πόλεως); 36, 17 (the priestess of Laodice will be henceforth inscribed as eponym in public documents): μετὰ τοὺς τῶν [προγόν]ων καὶ ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεῖς. (Nearly identical exemplar from Me-

<sup>77</sup> Schwyzer, *Griech. Grammatik II*, 451.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum*<sup>2</sup>, p. 102 (also p. 20) and *OGI* 246, on which see Hermann, *op. cit.*, p. 149-150 and *Bull.* 1969, 502 (local, not imported). Despite the censure in *Bull. Ep.* 1983, 332, and the spirited tourney by A. Mastrocinque in *Ep. Anat.* 3(1984), 83-85 I hold fast (until something better comes along) to my reconstruction in *ZPE* 49 (1982). The copy cannot be absolutely accurate.

<sup>79</sup> I discuss this matter in my treatment of *OGI* 219, at end.

dia, L. Robert, *Hellenica VII*, p. 7, l. 25); 42,4 (Frisch, *Iliou* 37), cited above to IV, 13-14, p. 42. *RC* 44, 26 (*OGI* 244. Appointment of a priest at Daphne): ἀξίως τῆς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τόπου σπουδῆς ἦν ἔσχον οἱ τε πρόγονοι καὶ ἡμεῖς (N.B.: τε — καὶ); *OGI* 234, 19-22 (the envoy of Alabanda in Delphi): ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ εὐεργέτα Ἀντιοχέων εὐλόγηκε εὐχαριστῶν διότι τὰν δαμοκρατίαν διαφυλάσσει καττὰν τῶν προγόνων ὑπάγησιν. (Teos 3rd letter, line 28 and *RC* 32, 21: κατακολουθῶν [τῆι τοῦ] πα[τρ]ῶς ὑψηγήσει). Pol. 18.51.4: Antiochus argues before Roman embassy in Lysimachia that he had merely recovered places lost κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ προγόνων περισπασμούς. Cf. Appian, *Syr.* 3: Θράκην τῶν προγόνων αὐτοῦ γενομένην, *bis*. Jos., *A.J.* 12.150 (letter to Zeuxis on Jewish colonists): καὶ μαρτυρουμένους αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων εἰς πίστιν οἶδα καὶ προθυμίαν.<sup>81</sup> M. Wörtle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), p. 423, N II, 8-9 (Zeuxis to Heraclea): ἀνακεκομισμένων ἡμῶν τῶι βασιλεῖ τὴν πόλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχουσαν τοῖς προγόνοις αὐτοῦ. N III (p. 424), 13-15: Σπεύδοντες οὖν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διάθεσιν ἀποκατασταθῆναι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων τοῦ βασιλέως [συγκεχ]ωρημένα.

L. 8. The equivalent of ἡ τοῦ πλήθους αἵρεσις is ἡ τοῦ δήμου εὐνοία, as in *OGI* 219, 16, 18: ὅπως οὖν ὁ δῆμος — εὖνους ὦν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν αἵρεσιν ἔχων φανερός τι τῶι βασιλεῖ. *RC* 15, 7-9: καὶ καθόλου περὶ εὐχαριστίας τοῦ πλήθους.<sup>82</sup> *RC* 52, 40: ἔξηγου [μενοι σύμπα]ντος τοῦ πλήθους πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔκτενε[στάτην καὶ εἰλικρινῆ] τὴν εὐνοίαν. Cf. 52, 33: τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ πλήθους. *Recherches sur ... Thasos II*, p. 21, no. 170, line 24: τὴν αἵρεσιν τοῦ πλήθους ὡς δι-

<sup>80</sup> *RC* 22: letter of Icadion to Icarus in the Persian Gulf, first published by K. Jepsen in *Kuml* 1960. My text appears in *Classica et Mediaevalia* 39 (1988), 95-96. (Typographical error, p. 95, l. 5 should be: εἰς στή|λην δ' ἔκθετε). The πρόγονοι in *Labraunda I*, no. 9 are not the king Seleucus', but those of Olympichus. Phrases such as in *OGI* 222, 20 belong to a different (formulaic) category.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. also Livy 33.20.7: *legatos se Rhodum missurum respondit iisque mandaturum, ut renovarent vetusta iura cum ea civitate sua maiorumque suorum et velarent eos pertimescere adventum regis*. One may recognize here a Polybian idiom, something like e.g. λέγων ὅτι πρόκειται αὐτῷ πρεσβευτὰς εἰς Ῥόδον ἀποστεῖλαι αἷς ἐντετάλθαι ἀνανεώσασθαι τὴν τε ἐ αὐτῷ διὰ προγόνων ὑπάρχουσαν οἰκειότητα καὶ τὰ δίκαια (cf. II 99-100) ἅμα τε παρακαλέσαι Ῥοδίουσιν ἑταροῦντας δέχεσθαι τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως παρουσίαν.

<sup>82</sup> Some references for πλήθος (*plebs, populus*) are collected by W. Günther, *Das Orakel von Didyma*, p. 33 n. 39.

ακείται εὐχαρίστως. *Delphinion* 139, 36 (king Ptolemy II): ἐπαινεῖ τὸν δῆμον ἐπὶ τῇ αἰρέσει.

L. 8-9: ἐπὶ ταῖς τιμαῖς, "in consideration (reciprocation) for the honors". Cf. *OGI* 332, 4: ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἀγαθοῖς τῷ βασιλεὶ ἐκτενεῖς οἱ πολῖται φαίνωνται καὶ ἀποδιδόντες αὐτῷ τὰς καταξίας χάριτας. *OGI* 475 (Nero to Menophilus): ἐδήλωσαν ὅσα τε αὐτὸς ἐφιλοτιμήθης πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ὅσα εἰσηγήσω τῇ πόλει περιέχοντα τὰς ἡμετέρας τιμὰς, ἐφ' οἷς he grants favors. See also the position of τὰ τίμια *RC* 52, 41 and 45: πειράσομαι.

L. 9. Cf. below on lines 18-19. Freedom, autonomy, democracy are all near equivalents and are used indiscriminately. There was no particular Hellenistic power devoted more to those ideals than any other, and none would renounce employing such slogans whenever suitable opportunity presented itself.<sup>83</sup> For the expression cf. *Labraunda I*, no. 3, 29: καὶ πειρασόμεθα συνδιατηρεῖν ὑμῖν τὴν τε δημοκρατίαν καὶ τὴν χώραν καὶ πάντα, καθότι ὤεισθε δεῖν.

L. 11. The verbs of acceptance, or dedication τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον vary. It may be ἀναθεῖναι, ἀνα-, ἀπο-, παρα-, προσδέχεσθαι, also εἶναι, ἐπαγγέλλειν, καθιερώσαι. See the decrees for Teos in *LW* and in *I. Magn.*, *passim*.

L. 11-13. The king singles himself out as true follower of the example set up by his ancestors. The language is very much "prefabricated". Some examples have already been quoted along with the πρόγονοι. The nearest parallel is *RC* 15, 23-24: καὶ ἡμέτεροι πρόγον[οι] -- θεωροῦ(ν)τες τούτους τε κρίναντας δικαίως καὶ αὐτοὶ --. *RC* 14, 4: διὰ τὸ τὸν πατέρα τὸν ἡμέτερον ὄραν --, l. 10; καὶ αὐτοὶ παρακολουθοῦντες --, l. 11-14: appeal to continued loyalty and promise of further benefits in return. *RC* 22,2: τῶμ προγόνων ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς --, l.7; ὁ-

<sup>83</sup> See on this all A. Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher*, p. 221. W.W. Tarn, *Alexander II* (1948), p. 204. Herrmann's views that Antiochus avoided the use of the terms, ἐλευθερία, as embarrassed, or conceding its monopoly to the hostile Roman propaganda, are quite inaccurate. This may be compared with the notions of unsophisticated news "consumers" in modern adversary "blocks", who may be surprised on the discovery that not only the media on their own side speak of "justice, freedom and democracy", but on the opposite side no less. Both the Romans and Antiochus freely used the "liberation" theme. The notions that ἐλευθερία, αὐτονομία and δημοκρατία denote varying degrees, or kinds of freedom have been proved completely false. Cf. e.g. Holleaux, *Etudes III* 15341; Tarn, *Alexander II*, 204 n. 6; 208 n. 11.



ρῶντες καὶ αὐτοὶ, 1.15-17: promise of further benefits. *RC* 23, 14; κρίνοντες οὖν δίκαιον εἶναι ---; 17: αὐτοὶ τε διεγνώκαμεν. *RC* 25,9; καθάπερ καὶ Νικομήδης ὁ πατήρ --- ἡμεῖς ---. Promises. *RC* 36, 10: κρίνουεν δὲ καθάπερ. *Jos.*, *A.J.* 12, 139; ἡξιώσαμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ τούτων αὐτοὺς ἀμείψασθαι καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἀναλαβεῖν. *I. Mac.* 10, 27: καὶ νῦν ἐμμείνατε ἐπὶ τοῦ συντηρῆσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς πίστιν, καὶ ἀνταποδώσομεν ὑμῖν ἀγαθὰ ἀνθ' ὧν ποιεῖτε μεθ' ἡμῶν. *Laetanda I*, no. 7, 10: καὶ ἐγὼ δίκαιον εἶναι κρίνω. *Ibid.* II, 42, 6: κρί(ν)ομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς. And the most decisive, *I. Macc.* 11. 33: ἐκρίναμεν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι χάριν τῆς ἕξ αὐτῶν εἰνοίας<sup>84</sup>.

L. 15-17. Cf. *RC* 15,2f.: οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν, καθ' ὃ ἐψηφίσθε τὰς τιμὰς καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἀνήνεγκαν ὧι ἔστεφανώσατε ἡμᾶς. For ἐν οἷς cf. IV,5 ἐν ὧι. *Syll* 426, 44-49: ἀποδοῦναι τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸ ψήφισμα — ἀναγγεῖλαι καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τὰ δόξαντα (too short for our purpose) τῷ δήμῳ. Y. Garlan, *ZPE* 9 (1972), p. 223: παραγινόμενοι οἱ πρέσβεις διελέγοντό μοι φέροντες τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀξιώματα ἐν οἷς ---. Although not as apt ἀπήγγειλαν, or even ἀπέδωκαν, would also come under some consideration.

L. 18-19. Cf. *RC* 15, 26: τὴν τε αὐτονομίαν ὑμῖν συνδιατηρήσωμεν καὶ ἀφορο[λογ]ήτους εἶναι συγχωροῦμεν (cf. *ibid.*, l. 22-23). Laodice to Iasus, *Annuario* 45-46, p. 445, line 8-9: τὴν τε ἐλευθερίαν ὑμῖν ἀπέδωκεν καὶ τοὺς νόμους. *OGI* 237: προαιρούμεγο[ς] ὑμῖν (FP) τὴν δημοκρ[α]τ[ι]άν καὶ αὐ[τ]ονομίαν διαφυλάσσειν. érisch, *Iliou* 45, 12-15 (Treaty of Antiochus III with Lysimachia; I restore): καὶ διαφυλάξω τὴν πόλιν [ἐν ἐλευθερίαι καὶ] ἐν δημοκρατίαι [αὐτόνομον οὔ]σαν καὶ ἀφροῦρητον [καὶ ἀφορολόγητον].<sup>85</sup> Some other connotations of the ἐλευθερία terms. *OGI*, no. 1 (Alexander): αὐτονόμους εἶναι καὶ ἐγευθέρους. *Delphinion* 123, 2-4 (Miletus): ἡ πόλις ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου καὶ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη. *OGI* 6, 6 (Antigonus): καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰρήνης καὶ αὐτονομίας; *ibid.* l. 14: ἐλεύθεροι καὶ αὐτόνομοι ὄντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ. *RC* 1, 54-55 (Antigonus): συνδιαφυλάσσειν ἀλλήλοις τὴν ἐ

<sup>84</sup> For other varieties of such "recompensation" cf. *OGI* 90, 35; 229, 6; 352, 54.

<sup>85</sup> For the treaty with Lysimachia ref. above n. 72. H.'s remarks on tax exemption, p. 139-140 would now need considerable revisions in accordance with my re-attribution of the concerned documents.

λευθερίαν καὶ αὐτονομίαν. *Syll* 330, 24-25 (Frisch, *Iliou*, no. 1); ἀποστελλόντων τῶν συνέδρων πρέσβεις πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ αὐτονομίας. Y. Garlan, *ZPE* 9 (1972), p. 223: ἐν οἷς τὴν πόλιν [ἐλευθέραν καὶ] αὐτόνομον εἶναι καὶ ἐν συμμαχίαι. Holleaux, *Études IV*, 147, inscr., lines 8-10 (Rhodian decree for Iasus): πρόνοιαν [ποιεῖσθαι ὅπως ἅ πόλις αὐτῶν ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος [διαμένη]ι]. L. Robert, *OMS I*, 504 (Chios, 3rd century): βουλόμενοι διὰ παντὸς ἐλευθέ[ραν] καὶ αὐτόνομον τὴν πατρίδα διαμένειν. *OGI* 222, 14-17 (Ionian League for Antiochus I): παρακαλείτωσαν δὲ οἱ πρέσβεις τὸν βασιλέα τὴν προσήκουσαν ἤδη ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν πόλεων τῶν Ἰάδων, ὅπως εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐλευθέροι οὔσαι καὶ δημοκρατουμέναι μεθ' ὁμοιοῦς πολιτεύονται κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους ἕκαστων νόμους. *OGI* 229, 10 (Seleucus II and Smyrna): ἔβαβαίωσεν τῷ δήμῳ τὴν αὐτονομίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν. *Ibid.*, l. 65 (military oath): συνδιατηρήσω τὴν τε αὐτονομίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν καὶ τὰλλα τὰ ἐπικεχωρημένα Συμρναίοις. *OGI* 234, 19-22: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ εὐεργέτα Ἀντιοχέων εὐλόγηκε εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ διότι τὰν δημοκρατίαν καὶ τὰν εἰρήναν τοῖς Ἀντιοχεῦσιν διαφυλάσσει κατὰν προγόνων ἢ φάγηιν. *Syll* 591, 30 (Hegesias of Lampsacus on a mission to Rome). The Roman people διατηρήσει τὴν δημοκρατίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτονομίαν καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην. *Syll*. 613 (An envoy to Rome) ἐπετέλεσεν πάντα τὰ κοινῇ συμφέροντα τοῖς τε Ἀμφικτιόσιν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλήσιν τοῖς αἰρουμένοις τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν. This may suffice to show that there is a certain flexibility in the use of those associated terms but the connection of ἐλευθερία καὶ αὐτονομία predominates by far and this is the supplement which best fits the circumstances of our text.<sup>86</sup>

L. 21. I depart from phrases such as *χρείας παρέχειν, χρήσιμον ἑαυτὸν παρέχεσθαι*, and a variety of constructions around the notion *ἄει τινος ἀγαθοῦ (παρ)αίτιον γίνεσθαι, ἄει τι τῶν χρησίμων κατασκευάζειν, περιποιεῖν, πράσσειν*.<sup>87</sup> *OGI* 339, 7: βουλόμενός τε τῷ μὲν δήμῳ διὰ τῆς ἰδίας οπουδῆς ἄει τι τῶν χρησίμων κατασκευάζειν. *Ibid.* l. 91: περιποιεῖν ἄει τι καὶ κοινῇ πᾶσιν καὶ

<sup>86</sup> I restore in parts. My text of *OGI* 222 is forthcoming in *Phoenix* (Toronto).

<sup>87</sup> It is very old in Greek. Cf. *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*, ed. par A. Pelletier, p. 101 n. 3, citing Sophocles: Ἄει τι βούλου χρήσιμον προσημανθάνειν. Ps. Arist., 135; ἔξευρόντων τι πρὸς τὸ ζῆν χρησίμων.

κατὰ πόλεις ἑκάστοις τῶν πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων. Holleaux, *Études III*, 290 (Gurob Pap.), line 21-22: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς τῷ πράσσειν τι τῶν χρησίμων ἐγινόμεθα.<sup>88</sup> Diod. 2.40.3: προκατασκευάζουσιν αἰεὶ τι τῶν χρησίμων. Jos., *A.J.* 1.9: πειθόμενος ὡς αἰεὶ τοῖς χρήσιμον ἢ καλὸν τι πράττειν δυναμένοις. Pol. 9.4.7: ἀμύνασθαι τι τῶν χρησίμων.

L. 23. Cf. *RC* 15, 10: μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ προθυμίας, but the formula is extremely "trivial". At random: *OGI* 219, 13. *Delphinion* 146, 7 (οἱ πρεσβευταὶ) μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ποιησάμενοι τοὺς λόγους, διελέγησαν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς εὐνοίας τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φιλανθρώπων. I quote this to show the essential identity in this respect of epistolary style with decree drafting.

L. 24. *RC* 15, 12: τὰς τε δὴ τιμὰς καὶ τὸν στέφανον δεδέγμεθα οἰκείως. Cf. II 113; IV 11. *RC* 31, 21-22: ἀποδεχόμεθα τὰς ἐψηφισμένας ὑφ' ὑμῶν τιμὰς τῆι θεᾷ. *Syll.* 536, 40; 620, 20; 656, 40; *OGI* 299, 15; L. Robert, *Études anat.*, p. 19, 13; *Delphinion* 143, 16; *RC* 52, 41.

L. 26. *Delphinion* 139, 41-42: τὸμ μὲ[ν] βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον ἐπηνῆσθαι διότι ἐμ παντὶ καιρῶι τὴν αὐτὴν αἴρεσιν ἔχει. *RC* 31, 18: διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν ἣν τυγχάνει (ὁ δῆμος) ἀποδεδειγμένος ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς καιροῖς εἰς τε ἡμᾶς καὶ πράγματα. *RC* 50, 20; 58, 8; 62, 3; *Syll.* 535, 21; *OGI* 219, 18. For commendations or exhortations "on your gracious attitude, as it is proper" (καθάπερ δίκαιόν ἐστι, ὡς καθήκει) cf. especially *RC* 15, 30-33 (supplevi): παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς μνημονεύοντάς ὧν εὐ ἐπάθετε — τὴν αὐτὴν τ]ε εὐνοίαν, καθάπερ δίκαιόν ἐστι, καὶ ὕστερον διαφυλάσσειν; and Laodice to Iasus, lines 25-28: γινομένοις δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς τε τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ καθόλου εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἡμῶν οἴους καθήκει καὶ τῶν ἀπαντωμένων εὐεργεσιῶν μεμνημένους εὐχαρίστως πειράσομαι κτλ.

L. 27-30. The most common καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν, or εἰς τὸ ὕστερον, seems to be too short. Caesar in R.K. Sherk, *RD* 26, Col. 1a also follows a good Hellenistic style), 10-11: ἡδέως τε τὴν πόλιν [ὑμῶν εὐεργετῆν πειράσομαι καὶ κατὰ τ]οὺς παρόντας καιροὺς καὶ ἐν

<sup>88</sup> My re-edition is forthcoming in *Archiv für Papyrologie*.

τοῖς μετὰ ταῦ[τα χρόνοις. Cf. Sherk *RD* 34, 17-24, cited under L. 32. At the end of a letter of A. III to Amyzon after the acknowledgment of the "crown" etc. I restore, *Gnomon* 57 (1985): καὶ εἰς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα πειρασόμεθα κτλ. *OGI* 234, 21 (quoted above, p<sup>m</sup>). *RC* 32, 21-23 (*rex Antiochus iunior*): πειρασόμεθα κατακολουθῶν [τῆι τοῦ] πα[τρ]ῶς ὑφηγήσει συναύξειν ὑμῖν [ἐν οἷς ἄ]ν παρακαλήτε ἢ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπινοῶ. *RC* 23, 13 (Pergamenian magistrates "following the lead"): ἐπακολουθοῦντας τῆι ὑφηγήσει.

L. 31. The combination of τὰ τίμια καὶ φιλόφρονα abounds and not rare is the amplification of δεδομένα, or γεγενημένα. The ἔνδοξα καὶ τίμια συνδιαφυλάσσειν recurs several times in the Cretan decrees for Teos (e.g. *LW* 67, 20). *RC* 22 (quoted above, n. 70); *OGI* 234, 14; *RC* 64, 13; 67, 14-15; *Syll* 564, 10; 669, 20; 705, 45; τὰ δεδομένα τίμια καὶ φιλόφρονα. *SGDI* 1178; 1379; 1380 (three times); 4566, 40; Sherk, *RD* 15, 48: συντηρήσαι τὰ ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων δεδομένα τίμια καὶ φιλόφρονα. *Ibid.* 34, 21; 57, 13-14.

L. 32. The perfect parallel is Messala's letter to Teos, Sherk, *RD* 34, 17-24: καὶ τὰ εἰς τὸν θεὸν τίμια καὶ τὰ εἰς ὑμᾶς φιλόφρονα πειρασόμεθα συνεπαύξειν, διατηροῦντων ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν. Conditional promises of future favors occur also in honorific decrees. It is a characteristic of Athenian decrees of about this very time<sup>89</sup> and it enjoyed a wide application in letters, of which examples will be found in *RC*, as the appeal of no. 14, 12-14 shows: παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν χρόνον τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν αἴρεσιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς τοιούτων ὑμῶν ὄντων ἐπιπλέον ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς πόλεως ποιώμεθα. Cf. further more Jos., A.J., 13.48 (Demetrius I): ἐπειδὴ διατηρήσατε τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς φιλίαν — καὶ ταύτην μὲν ὑμῶν ἐπαινώ τὴν πίστιν καὶ παρακαλῶ δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐμμένειν ἀποληψομένους ἀμοιβὰς παρ' ἡμῶν καὶ χάριτας. Cf. the first letter to Teos, l. 18. But (ἐμ)μένω also alludes to mutual obligation to keep the existing understanding, which is always conditional upon the good faith of the opposite contraahent. As such, the formulation is borrowed from the language of treaties, (e.g. ἐμμενώ ἐν τοῖς ὅρκοις καὶ ἐν τῆι τιθεμένῃ συμμαχίᾳ), and this may be very much the connotation Antiochus is trying to impress on the Teians. As pointed out (af-

<sup>89</sup> *Syll* 535, 70; 540, 50; Moretti, *Iscr. stor. ellenist.*, no. 28,41; *Syll.* 704 F. 13 should probably be restored διαφυλάσσειν τὰ δεδομένα αὐτοῖς τίμια καὶ φιλόφρονα.

ter Heuss) in my discussion of Iasus a *de facto* state of a *symmachia* need not rest on a formal treaty. The people of Iasus are indeed numbered among the king's φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι, but we may take for granted that most of the "free cities" associated to the Empire (not only the Seleucid ones) were officially "friends and allies".<sup>90</sup>

The case of Lysimachia affords one good example of such relations based on a formal treaty and verbal comparisons are interesting. Frisch, *Iliion* 45, 12 (quoted to L. 18-19, p<sup>m</sup>), and 1. 24: ἔμμενόντος καὶ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου ἐν τῇ συμμαχίαι. Cf. also the treaty of Pharnaces I with Chersonesus Taurica, 179 B.C., *IOSPE*, no. 402, 22: ἀλλὰ συνδιαφυλάξω τὴν δημοκρατίαν κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν, ἔμμενόντων (scil. Χερσονησιωτῶν) ἐν τῇ πρὸς ἐμὲ φιλίαι καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὄρκον ὁμοσάντων. In Teos ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ διαθέσει καὶ εὐνοίαι alludes to very much the same condition and it is clear that the kind is trying to solidify his hold on the city by appeal to a moral obligation generally incurred by virtue of a treaty.

More for the δηλώσειν κατὰ μέρος, etc. Cf. Pol. 4.66.10: ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡμεῖς τὰ μὲν κατὰ μέρος ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ βυβλίῳ δεδηλώκαμεν. 21.13.6: ὑπὲρ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς δηλώσομεν. Diod. 12.1.2: ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων αἱ κατὰ μέρος πράξεις ἕκαστα δηλώσουσιν. 17.6.3; 17.79.4: κατὰ μέρος ἐπαγγελίας ἠξίωσε τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαγγεῖλαι τῷ βασιλεῖ. *II Macc.* 11.19-20 (Lysias to Jews): εἰάν μὲν συντηρήσατε τὴν εἰς τὰ πράγματα εὐνοίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν πειράσομαι παραίτιος ἀγαθῶν (ὑμῖν) ἔσεσθαι. ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐντέταλμαι τούτοις τε καὶ τοῖς παρ' ἐμοῦ διαλεχθῆναι ὑμῖν. *Syll* 633, 14: ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας — ἐξέθεντο τὰ κατὰ μέρος.<sup>91</sup>

4-5. Letters from queen Laodice. *Anadolu* 9 (1965), p. 159.

[--- --- --- --- --- διάληψιν --- --- --- --- --- ἦ] γ διει[ληφῶς ἔ-]  
[χει περὶ τοῦ δήμου· προαιρουμένη δὴ] καὶ αὐ[τῇ εὐεργε-]  
[τεῖν τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν, πειράσομαι κ]αὶ εἰς τὸ [λοιπόν.]

<sup>90</sup> See Bikerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* (1938), p. 144. A formal treaty of φιλία καὶ συμμαχία was concluded in 197 B.C. on behalf of his suzerain by Zeuxis with Euromus, M. Errington, *Ep. Anat.* 8 (1986), 1 (there were four envoys in genitive, with no patronymics [no τοῦ preceding the names so understood], rather than two with them). Ca 196 B.C. an elaborate treaty on similar conditions was made by A. III with Lysimachia, *Historia* 37 (1988), 152, with further references.

<sup>91</sup> For τὰ κατὰ μέρος cf. also Holleaux, *Études I*, 447 n.2. Cf. Teos IV 19 in the text above here.

- 4 [καθότι ἄν ἡμᾶς παρακαλήτε, οὐθενδὸς ἀφίοτα[σθαι τῶν  
[συμφερόντων καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλ]οις Ἑλλη[σιν, καὶ]  
[μη ἀχαριστεῖν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἀξιου]μένοις, δ[ι] ἔμοῦ, ἦ]  
[διὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ· τηροῦντων δὲ ὑμῶν] τὴν αὐτῆ[ν αἴρεσιν]
- 8 [εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον οἶκον καὶ τὴν εὐν]οιαν τὴμ π[ρὸς ἡμᾶς]  
[παρασκευάσομεν ὑμῖν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα,] ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ ἀδ[ελφός,]  
[ὅ]σα πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήκει.] ἔ' ρρ[ωσθε.]  
[--- --- --- Βασίλισσα Λαοδίκη]
- 12 [τῶι κοινῶι τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσσον] τεχνιτῶν [χαίρειν.]  
[οἱ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν πρέσβεις τὸ ψ]ήφισμα τὸ [παρ' ὑμῶν]  
[καὶ ἐμοὶ ἀπέδωκαν, καλὸν καὶ φιλ]άνθρωπ[ον, καὶ αὐτοὶ]  
[ἀπολογισάμενοι τὴν εὐνο]ιαν, ἦν]ἔχε[τε διὰ παντὸς εἰς]
- 16 [τὴν ἡμετέραν οἰκίαν καὶ εἰς ἡμ]ᾶς,] ἦξι[ον ---

It may be stated with some confidence that although extensively reconstructed the first letter has fair claims to consideration as a genuine restoration. The second one is far too fragmentary and the remains are too scanty to allow a similar assurance, but from one or two details that can still be grasped it is, with all due reservations, also a reasonable hypothesis *exempli gratia*, shall we say.

It is quite evident that these lines carried no specific message, as they consist largely of widely used closing and opening formulae. However, seeing that the queen's letter to Iasus also ended in a similar manner, it is quite possible that the now lost portion also contained something comparable to her foundation in that city. That she is the authoress of the second letter was well surmised by H. because for this we have a good circumstantial support from the fact that the lower letter follows immediately after the first one, identified in l. 9, an arrangement analogous to the engraving of the king's letters 2-3. The lines as restored would amount to ca 40-43 letters. It will not be practicable to apportion parallels to their strictly respective lines, but we shall roughly follow their sequence.

L. 1. Reference to king's benefactions and his opinion of the city, most probably ἀντίληψις, or διάληψις. Cf. Laodice to Iasus, line 5: ἦν τε ἀντίληψιν τῶν ἐκείνου φίλων καὶ συμμάχων διατελεῖ ποιούμενος, where, however the word in question chiefly signifies 'succor', 'relief' but may also mean, apprehension, 'conception'. *OGI* 237, 11: ἦν ἔχων διάληψιν δῆμος — ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως — scil. διατελεῖ. *Syll* 721, 25:

ἔσαν ἔχει διάληψιν; *II Macc.* 3.32: μήποτε διάληψιν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔχηι -- περι. *RC.* 31, 16-17: ἔχοντες οὖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς περι τοῦ δήμου τὴν φιλανθρωποτάτην δι ληψιν. Cf. *RC.* 32, 16. *RC.* 35, 11: οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν φιλόστοργον διάληψιν ἔχειν. *Pol.* 31.23.10: δῆλον ὅτι καὶ σὺ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχεις διάληψιν.

L. 2. Cf. L.'s letter to Iasus, 11-12: προαιρουμένη δὲ καὶ ἐγὼ ἀκόλουθα πράσειν τῇ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔκτενεῖται. Reiterated l. 29-30: παντὶ τρόπῳ συνεκτρέχειν (concur) προαιρουμένη τῇ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ θηλήσει. Teos I 36: κατ' ταῦτα καὶ ἀδελφῆ αὐτοῦ βασίλισσα Λαοδίκη ἐν [ἅπασι καιρ]οῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα γνώμην διατελεῖ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ [ἀδελφῶι κ]αὶ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὴν πόλιν φιλανθρώποις ἔκτενῆ καὶ πρόθυμον ἑαυτὴν παρέχεται πρὸς τὰς εὐεργεσίας. *RC.* 9, 5: [προαιρούμ]ε[θ]α γὰρ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων αἰ τοῖς πολίταις μὲν εὐ[ε]ργ[ε]τοῦντες χαρίζεσθαι. *Syll.* 412, 7: τοὺς προαιρουμένους εὐεργετεῖν τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν. All this is a regular "idiom". The letter of King Antiochus the Younger in *RC* 32 should be recalled with special attention to l. 17-19, which shows how in their public acts members of royal family indicate that their authority is consistent with, and subordinate to, the king's will.

L. 2-6. καθάπερ ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖτε is also thinkable, cf. 3rd letter of A. to Teos, l. 27. *RC.* 66: πειρασόμεθα δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ὅτι ἂν ἔχομεν τῶν συμφερόντων καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν παρασκευάζειν. *RC.* 25, 30-32; ἐν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς καθ' ὅ ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀξιῶτε, πειρασόμεθα καὶ ἰδία ἐκάστῳ καὶ κοινῇ πᾶσι φιλανθρωπεῖν καθ' ὅσον δυνατοί ἐσμεν. 26, 22-27: καθότι ὁ δῆμος ἠξίωσεν, καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν πειρασόμεθα, τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄντων ἐν ἡσυχίαι, μὴ ἀχαριστεῖν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις.<sup>92</sup> *Syll.* 495, 155: οὐδέν βουλόμενος ἀχαριστεῖν. The same idea is expressed positively in *RC.* 9, 6 as χαρίζεσθαι and *RC* 35, 14: χάριν διδόναι.

For doing a favor to someone καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν cf. Demosth., *De cor.* 187; *Epist.* I, 2; *Syll.* 390, 11; 629, 2; *OGI* 6, 10. With οὐδενὸς ἀφίστασθαι τῶν συμφερόντων (χρησίμων) volumes may be filled. *Delphinion* 141, 21; 149, 21; *I. Priene* 15, 13; 107, 114; *LW* 70, 15; *I. Magn.* 53, 62-65; 58, 25; *RC* 6, 12-13; 52, 42-46; *Labraunda I*, no. 3, 29-32: καὶ πειρασόμεθα συνδιατηρεῖν ὑμῖν τὴν τε δημοκρατίαν καὶ

<sup>92</sup> Cf. *RC* 35, 7: ἅπαντα τὰ ἀξιούμενα ὑπακούειν.

τὴν χάραν καὶ πάντα καθότι ὤιεσθε δεῖν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις οὐ-  
θενὸς ἀποστησόμεθα τῶν τῶι δῆμῳ συμφερόντων.

L. 6-7 Two antithetic, or complementary διὰ in motivation of access-  
sion to requests was one of those "recherché" stylistic devices. In religious  
matters it was often construed "for the god's sake and for your own sake",  
as in *RC* 41,6 (I modify): Βουλόμενος οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸν θεὸν  
καὶ δι' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖν πάντ[α τὰ δίκαια. Cf. *RC*. 35, 9-13. For a paral-  
lel in secular matters cf. *Labrounda I*, no. 4, end (as restored in *Bull. Ép.*  
1965, 368): καθότι ἤξιον[τε, καὶ εἰς τό λοιπὸν δὲ] πειράσομαι συν-  
κατασκευάζειν ὑμῖν [διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως κ]αὶ δι' ἑμαυτοῦ, ὅσα πρὸς  
τιμὴν καὶ δόξ[αν ἀνήκει. *Ibid.* no. 8,10-12: προαιρούμενοι εὐεργε-  
τεῖν ἐν παντί καιρῶι τὰ μέγιστα τὴν πα[τρίδα οὐδέποτε] ἀπέστη-  
μεν τῶν εἰς δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκόν[των. *Ibid.* line 16-17 (I suppose):  
προ[αιρούμενοι ἐν οὐδε]νὶ δ[ε]ύτεροι εἶναι τῶν εὐεργετησάντων  
ποτέ τὴν πόλιν, ἔτι δὲ βουλόμενοι ὑμῖν χαρίζεσθαι.<sup>93</sup>

For the "honor and glory" a good number of examples has already  
been displayed *passim*, but for the sake of convenience these additional  
references are added here. *RC*. 15, 12; 42,6 (*Ilion* 37); *RC* 52, 20; 37, 44;  
*Teos IV* 13; *OGI* 219, 33; *OGI* 771, 50.

If the line marked vacant by the editor (the 11th in my numbering)  
should be completely free that would entail the necessity that the second  
epistle could not continue in the alignment of the same column, but  
would have to be shifted to the left by some twelve letters. In inscriptions  
incised on pre-existing architectural structures that is always possible, but  
here rather improbable. Considering the fact that the two letters from An-  
tiochus (2-3) run consecutively in one column with an intervening blank  
line,<sup>94</sup> that the right margin is easily amenable to restoration that keeps  
the preserved parts directly beneath those of the top letter, one cannot  
avoid the conclusion that the apparently vacant line is most likely to have  
been partially filled. It may have contained no more than the queen's title  
and name (for which there is no room in line 12), or it might have been

<sup>93</sup> Upon re-examination the editor J. Crampa reported ὑμῶν as his new reading for  
the original τῶδε, with some ambiguity about the east letter. My observations on this cor-  
pus are forthcoming in *Opuscula Atheniensia*.

<sup>94</sup> The "vacat" line in that little fragment on the top of the letter no. 1 in Block IV  
cannot be cited as possible evidence to the contrary because we know nothing of its now  
lost left margin.



preceded by some designation added in Teos, such as e.g. Ἐπιτολή, or Παρὰ τῆς αὐτῆς. Her letter to Iasus still bears traces of such an intitulation: Ἐπιτολή πα[ρὰ βασιλίσσης Λαοδίκης], and such superscriptions are a very ordinary thing, as e.g. *OGI*, no. 1, or *RC* 70, Ἐπιτολή, or ἡ αὐτή may appear as super-, or subscription of administrative letters, as in Wilcken, *Chrestomathie*, no. 2, 19; the letters of Antiochus III from Scythopolis, re-issued by Th. Fischer, *ZPE* 33 (1979), 131-138; or the letter of Dolabella to Peparethus (I think), Sherk, *RD* 21, end.

For l. 13 we may again utilize the letter of Antiochus Junior, *RC* 32, esp. lines 9-10: ἀπέδωκαν καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἐμὲ ψήφισμα. But one cannot discard a possibility that he may be the author of this second letter. E.g.11: [Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος ὁ νεώτερος?]; 13: [οἱ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πρεσβευταί.] 13: [οἱ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πρεσβευταί.]

L. 14. Cf. Demosth. 19, 39: Ἀκούετε ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι τῆς ἐπιτολῆς, ὡς καλῆ καὶ φιλόφρωνος. *RC* 48A, 4-5: ἀπέδωκαν τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν ψήφισμα καλὸν καὶ ἐκ]τε[νές. *RC* 52, 4-5: ἀπέδωκαν [τὸ] (I add) ψήφισμα, καλὸν καὶ φιλόφρωνον. *RC* 58,6: τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιτολὴν ἀπέδωκεν μοι, οὖσαν ἐκτενῆ καὶ φιλικήν. Cf. the Latin calque, *Cic.*, *Fam.* 9,1: *Litteras plenas humanitatis, officii, diligentiae.*

For l. 15-16 one may gather that there certainly followed the usual "apology" and a "request". The object of that request need not be very substantial. The rest is a matter of adjustment of pertinent phrases from our "crown witnesses" *RC* 15 and Laodice's letter to Iasus, and other inscriptions coming next. It will be interesting to learn in the future how the other unpublished letters of this royal couple affect these interpretations.<sup>95</sup>

Utica, New York

<sup>95</sup> So far as known to me the new publications (n. 6 above) do not seem to contradict anything essential stated here.