

Antiochus III and Ilium

Francis Piejko (Utica, N.Y.)

«Le labeur des érudits et des critiques serait vraiment trop ingrat, s'il n'aboutissait de temps en temps à la déroute des opinions qui passent, sans titres valables, pour «consacrées»», – M. Holleaux, *Études III*, 256.

I. HONORS FOR ANTIOCHUS III AT ILIUM. 197 B. C.

Stela found in 1718 at Yenisehir, the site of Sigeum. From 1766 to 1970 in Trinity College, Cambridge; now in Fitzwilliam Museum. Complete but right corner from l. 26 down broken off, and only the middle section of the last line remains.

E. Chishull, *Antiquitates Asiaticae Christianam aeram antecedentes*, London 1728, 49–58; P. Dobree, *The Classical Journal*, 30 (1824), 124–127, 135–138. (H. Rose, *Inscriptiones Graecae vetustissimae*, Cambridge 1825, 389, no. 4; A. Boeckh, *CIG* 3595; W. Dittenberger, *Syll.*¹ 156); E. Hicks, *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1882, 165; (Ch. Michel, *Recueil*..., Paris 1900, 525; W. Dittenberger, *OGIS* 219 – though dated this remains the 'eponymous' edition; P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion*, Bonn 1975, no. 32).

Cf. A. Brückner, in W. Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion II*, (1902), 579; M. Holleaux, *Études III*, 118–119, first published in 1903; Th. Sokoloff, *Klio* 4 (1904), 101–110; R. Laqueur, *Quaest. epigr.*, Stuttgart 1904, 80 n. 1; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. des Séleucides I* (1913), 73–74; *II* (1914), 535–536, 541, 544–546; E. Preuner, *Hermes* 61 (1926), 118–119 (*SEG IV*, 661); L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 182; D. Magie, *Roman Rule*, Princeton 1950, 95, 925–926; Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum*², München 1970, first published 1956; L. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade*, Paris 1966, 11–12; L. Robert, *Essays in Honor of C.B. Welles*, New Haven 1966, 175–210. Photograph; D. Musti, *Studi classici e orientali* 15 (1966), 61–111; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch*, München 1977, 43–72.

- Ἐπιμνηνέοντος Νυμφίου τοῦ Διοτρέφους, ἐπιστατοῦντος δὲ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἴππομέδοντος, Δημήτριος Διοῦς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος βασιλέως Σελεύκου ἐν ἀρχῇ τε παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ προστάς ἐνδόξου καὶ καλῆς αἰρέσεως, ἐζήτησε τὰς μὲν πόλεις τὰς κατὴν Σελευκίδα, περιεχομένας ὑπὸ καιρῶν δυσχερῶν διὰ τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῶν πραγμάτων, εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν εὐδαιμονίαν καταστήσαι, τοὺς δ' ἐπιθεμένους τοῖς πρᾶ(γ)μασιν ἐπεξελθὼν καθάπερ ἦν δίκαιον, ἀνακτῆσθαι τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχήν· διὸ καὶ χρησάμενος ἐπιβολῇ καλῇ καὶ δικαίᾳ[ι] καὶ (λ)αβὼν οὐ μόνον τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις εἰς τὸ διαγωνίσασθαι περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῷ προθύμ(ου)ς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον εὖνον καὶ συνεργόν, τὰς τε πόλεις εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν διάθεσιν κατέστησεν· νῦν τε παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰδε τοῦ Ταύρου μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἅμα καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν τὴν εἰρήνην κατεσκεύασεν καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς μείζω καὶ λαμπροτέραν διάθεσιν ἀγήγοχε, μάλιστα μὲν διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρετὴν, εἴτα καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν

- δυνάμεων εὐνοίαν. ὅπως οὖν ὁ δῆμος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρότερόν τε, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν, εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς διετέλει ποιούμενος, καὶ νῦν εὐνοὺς ὧν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν αἴρεσιν ἔχων, φανερός ἡ τῷ βασιλεῖ, τύχη τῇ ἀγαθῇ· δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ
- 20 δῆμῳ· τὴν μὲν ἱέρειαν καὶ τοὺς ἱερονόμους καὶ τοὺς πρυτάνεις εὐξασθαι τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ τῇ Ἰλιάδι μετὰ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν τὴν τε παρουσίαν γεγόνειναι (ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ) τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσης καὶ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων, καὶ γίνεσθαι τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀγαθὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τῇ βασιλίσσῃ πάντα, καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῖς διαμένειν λαμβάνου-
- 25 σαν ἐπίδοσιν καθάπερ αὐτοὶ προαιροῦνται· εὐξασθαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖας μετὰ τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου τῷ τε Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ ἀρχηγ[ῶ]ι τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ Νίκῃ καὶ τῷ Διὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις· ἐ[πὶ δὲ] ταῖς εὐχαῖς τῇ μὲν Ἀθηναίᾳ συντελεσάτωσαν τὴν νομιζομένην καὶ πάτ[ριον θυ-]σίαν οἱ τε ἱερονόμοι καὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις μετὰ τῆς ἱερείας καὶ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν, τ[ῶ]ι δὲ Ἀπόλ-
- 30 λωνι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἱ στρατηγοὶ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλω(ν) ἱερέων· ὅταν δὲ ποιῶ[σι τὰς θυ-]σίας, στεφανηφορεῖτωσαν οἱ τε πολῖται καὶ οἱ πάροικοι πάντες, καὶ συνιόν[τες κατὰ φυ-]λ[ῶ]ν συντε(λ)εῖτωσαν θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ (τ)οῦ βασιλέως καὶ τοῦ δήμου· [ὅπως δὲ τὰ] εἰς τὴν τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήκοντα συγκατασκευάζων ὁ δῆμος φανερός [ἡ πᾶσιν, ἐπαι-]νέσαι μὲν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ ἀνδραγαθίᾳ ἣν ἔχων [διατ]ελεῖ, [στήσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰ-]
- 35 κόνᾳ χρυσὴν ἐφ' ἵππου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν τῷ ἐπιφ[αν]εστάτῳ τόπῳ] ἐπὶ βήματος τοῦ λευκοῦ λίθου καὶ ἐπιγράψαι· ὁ δῆμος ὁ [Ἰλιέων βασιλέα Ἀντί-]οχον βασιλέως Σελεύκου εὐσεβείας ἔνεκεν τῆς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν[υ], εὐεργέτην καὶ σω-]τήρα γεγονότα τοῦ δήμου· ἀναγορεῦσαι δὲ καὶ ἐμ[ὲ]ν [Παναθηναίους τὰς τιμὰς ἐν τῷ] γυμνικῷ ἀγῶνι τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην καὶ τοὺς σὺνέδρους, ὅταν ἦ τε Ἰλιέων πό-]
- 40 λις καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις στεφανῶσιν τῷ ἀρ[ιστεῖ]ω στεφάνῳ τὴν Ἀθηναίων τὴν Ἰλι(ά)δα, τὴν ἀναγγελίαν ποιουμένους [διὰ τοῦ γραμματέως τῶν ἀγωνοθετῶν?] ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτὰς ἐκ πάν[των] Ἰλιέων ἀνδρας τρεῖς οἵτινες] ἀσπασάμενοι αὐτὸν παρὰ τ[οῦ] πλήθους καὶ συνησθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὑ-]γιαίνειν αὐτόν τε καὶ τῇ[ν] ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσαν Λαοδίκην]
- 45 καὶ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὰς [δυνάμεις ἀποδώσουσιν τὴν ἐμφημισμένην τι-]μὴν καὶ ἀπολογισάμ[ενοι τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὐνοίαν ἣν ἔχων εἰς τε τὸν πα-]τέρα αὐτοῦ βασιλέα Σ[έλευκον καὶ εἰς τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πράγματα ἀεὶ δια-]τετέλεκεν παρακαλοῦσ[ιν αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τιнос ἀγαθοῦ αἴτιον] [γίνεσθαι ἡμῖ]ν, συμβαλίν[οντος γὰρ] τούτου εὐχαριστήσῃ τῷ δήμῳ].

7. ΠΑΤΜΑΣΙΝ, stone. – 9. ΑΑΒΩΝ, stone. – 10. ΠΡΟΘΥΜΩΣ, stone, corr. Ditt., approved Robert, *Essays Welles*, 181, n. 31. – 22. ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ, added Boeckh as stonemason's omission. – 30. ΑΑΛΩΙ, stone. – 31/32. συνιόν[τες τὰς πάσ]ας, Boeckh; κατὰ τὰς οἰκί[ας], Robert, followed by Frisch; κατὰ φυ[λ]ῶν, Piejko. – 32. ΣΥΝΤΕΛΕΙΤΩΣΑΝ; ΠΟΥ, stone. – 33. πᾶσιν, editors. – 38. ἐμ[ὲ]ν [πανηγύρει καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐνεστώτι] γυμνικῷ, Chishull; ἐν [τῇ πανηγύρει, Dobree, Boeckh; ἐν [τοῖς Παναθηναίοις, Preuner; ἐμ[ὲ]ν [Παναθηναίοις, Robert; τὰς τιμὰς, Piejko. – 39. [κρήρυκας, Chishull; σ[τ]ρατηγούς, Dobree; σὺνέδρους, Robert; ὅποταν ἦ τε πό[λις] καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις στεφανῶσιν, τῷ δὲ [βασιλεῖ παρὰ τὴν Ἀθηναίων τὴν] Ἰλιάδα τὴν ἀναγγελίαν ποιουμένους [ἐπέχεσθαι πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ, Dobree; ὅταν, Boeckh; ὅτι αὐτὸν ἡ πό[λις] καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις στεφαν(οῦ)σιν τῶιδε [τῷ στεφάνῳ εὐσεβοῦντα περὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίων τὴν] Ἰλιάδα, Ditt.; ἦ τε τῶν Ἰλιέων πό[λις], Preuner; τῶν, suppressed Robert. – 40. ἀρ[ιστεῖ]ω στεφάνῳ, Brückner, Preuner. – 41. ΙΑΙΛΑΔΑ, stone; [διὰ τοῦ κήρυκος τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου], Dobree, Boeckh; condemned Robert; [διὰ τοῦ γραμματέως τῶν ἀγωνοθετῶν?], Piejko. – 42. ἐκ πάν[των] Ἰλιέων κτλ., Dobree, Boeckh. – 43. τ[οῦ] δήμου πρῶτον μὲν κελεύουσιν ὑ[ψ]γιαίνειν, Dobree, Boeckh; καὶ συνησθέντες, Holleaux; πλήθους, Piejko. – 44. βασιλίσσαν καὶ τὰ τέκνα],

Boeckh; *Λαοδίκην*], Piejko. – 45. *δυνάμεις, ἔπειτα δ' ἀπαγγελοῦσιν αὐτῷ τὴν τιμὴν*, Boeckh; [*δυνάμεις ἀνοίσουσιν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐψηφισμένην τιμὴν*, Holleaux; *ἀποδώσουσιν*, Piejko. – 46. Rest. Holleaux; *ἀπολογισά[μενοι ὅσα ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει πρὸς αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν πατέρα]*, Boeckh. – 47. *Σ[έλευκον ἐπαινέσουσιν τῆς αἰρέσεως ἧς ἔχων δια]τετέλεκεν*, Boeckh; *καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν βασιλικὴν οἰκίαν ἀεὶ δια]τετέλεκεν*, Holleaux, followed by Frisch; *καὶ εἰς τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πράγματα*, Piejko. – 48. *παρακαλοῦσιν δὲ καὶ*, Boeckh; *παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτόν*, Robert. – 48/49. Piejko.

“When Nymphius son of Diotrephes was President of the Assembly for the month,¹⁾ Dionysius son of Hippomedon the Foreman of the Council’s Standing Committee, on the motion of Demetrius son of Dies:

Whereas King Antiochus son of King Seleucus from the beginning, as soon as he succeeded to the reign and proposed himself a (5) glorious and honorable course of action, sought to restore the cities of the Seleucis, vexed by the troublesome circumstances caused by those who had defected from the realm, to peace and original prosperity, pursuing the rebels against the state as it was just (in the endeavor) to regain his ancestral empire. Wherefore, since his purpose was honorable and just, in the contest for his cause (10) he was aided not only by friends and troops with alacrity, but also by the favor of the beneficent deity, so that he restored the cities to tranquillity and the kingdom to its pristine condition.²⁾

And now upon his arrival in the regions on this side of the Taurus with all due care and dispatch he has assured peace to the cities and at the same time brought his affairs and the Empire to a greater and more splendid condition. (15) (He has achieved this) owing above all to his personal valor, but also through the good will of his friends and of the troops.

Therefore in order that the people, in the same manner as once before, at the time when he succeeded to the kingdom, had performed vows and sacrifices to all gods on his behalf, might even now give to the King a manifestation of a good will and of their abiding in the same proposition, with a good luck, be it decreed by the Council and the (20) People: The Priestess, the cult officials and the governing magistrates shall pray to Athena of Ilium jointly with the ambassador for the propitious advent of the King, of her ladyship his Queen, and of the friends and the troops, and that among all other blessings, which may be granted to the King and the Queen, their rule and their kingdom might endure in stability and in constant (25) increase of strength, just as they wish themselves. Likewise, that other priests and priestesses pray together with the priest of King Antiochus to Apollo the Primogenitor of his race, to the Victory, to the Supreme Deity,³⁾ and to all gods and goddesses. On the occasion of prayers the cult officials and the governing magistrates together with the priests and ambassadors shall perform the traditional and prescribed rites to Athena, while the officers with the priests do the same to (30) Apollo and other gods. When they offer these sacrifices all the citizens and resident aliens shall wear festive crowns, and as they congregate by tribes they should make oblations to the gods in the intention of the King and of the people.

In order that the people give a fitting expression in respect to honor and esteem, to eulogize the King on his prowess and valor, with which he has been distinguishing himself, and to erect his (35) gilded equestrian statue in the sanctuary of Athena in the most con-

¹⁾ P. Frisch: „Priester der monatlichen Opfer war Nymphaios“.

²⁾ E. R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus I* (1902), 233–234 renders this passage somewhat differently.

³⁾ Cf. *CAH VII*, 5: “Zeus-Ammon-Yahweh-Ahuramazda-Jupiter ... became the Highest God or (since the Greek language was the *lingua franca*) Zeus simply“.

spicuous place, upon a basis of white stone and inscribe it: THE PEOPLE OF ILIUM (set up this statue of) KING ANTIOCHUS, THE SON OF KING SELEUCUS, FOR HIS DEVOTION TO THE SANCTUARY (and) BECAUSE HE BECAME BENEFACTOR AND SAVIOR OF THE PEOPLE. That the President of the Festival and the D[elegates] proclaim [the honors at the Panathenaea during the] athletic contest, when the city [of Ilium] (40) and the confederate cities crown the Ilian [Athena with the wreath of] valor, making the announcement [through the secretary of the directors of the festival?].

Furthermore to elect out of [all the citizens of Ilium a deputation of three men, who] having addressed the King on behalf of [the populace and congratulated him upon the] good health of himself and her [ladyship his Queen Laodice], (45) and of his friends and [troops, shall convey the decreed] honor, and after appropriate affirmations [of the constant good will, which has always animated our community towards his] father King S[eleucus and towards the affairs of the King himself], they shall exhort [him to continue also in the future as our benefactor], for [thus he will gratify the people"].

* * *

A capricious ruling of destiny has reserved this text, perhaps to illustrate the observation enunciated many times before, that historical studies of certain subjects and periods may be impeded not only by excessive gaps in our documentation, but also by the fact that relative scarcity of information may present to our view documents in a totally unreal isolation. This may greatly hinder their correct interpretation and proper arrangement into a fitting *genus commune et differentiam specificam*.⁴⁾

In terms of modern classical studies the inscription we are about to examine happens to be one of the oldest epigraphical records ever available to scholars. Discovered in 1718 by the British ambassador to the Ottoman Porte Lord Edward Wortley Montague and Lady Mary Wortley Montague⁵⁾ it remained in private possession until 1766 when Lady Bute the daughter of the Montagues presented it to the Trinity College. But even before that date the stela had been available for study to qualified scholars. In 1728 it was published in conformity with the then attainable standards in that widely acclaimed and fashionable *Antiquitates Asiaticae Christianam aera antedecedentes*, by Edward Chishull, Esq. At least three more publications of this "Stone of Sigeum", as it was dubbed in various works, followed in the course of the critical nineteenth century and at the beginning of the current one. By fateful compliance with the first attribution in Chishull (which may owe something to Milord Montague's suggestions) the notorious myth of Antiochus I Soter and his "soror regina" has been perpetuated from 1728 down to the latest edition in 1975 without a serious challenge. In 1977 it passed again a considerably more exacting scrutiny, indeed

⁴⁾ Of the third century W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (1913), p. 4 wrote: "Even the epigraphical material is sometimes wasted through utter uncertainty where to place it". In the same year A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Séleucides I*, regretted, p. 65 (about RC 15): "Ici, l'homonymie, le fléau de l'histoire hellénistique, accroît encore la difficulté qu'il y a à dater les textes épigraphiques". P. 74 (OGI 219; RC 15): "Les documents épigraphiques et autres, encombrés d'homonymes et le plus souvent impossibles à dater avec précision, épaississent les ténèbres qu'ils devraient dissiper". Although some progress has been made since that time (notably the "Eriza"), or is being made, much still remains as it was. Complaints about difficulties with inadequate source materials are almost a constant refrain of many studies down to our own days.

⁵⁾ The incident is described in one of the famous letters of Lady Montague. Some interesting background facts are presented by L. Robert in *Essays in Honor of C. B. Welles (American Studies in Pap. I)*, 1966, pp. 178–180.



as if “consecrated”.⁶⁾ The inveterate error, now more than two and a half centuries, and a score old seemed to derive a countenance of truth from the homonymy of the kings and that of their fathers. A further unfavorable coincidence was that the queen’s name is withheld in the first two references to her in lines 22 and 23/24, and that the stone is damaged in l. 44, where she appears for the third time, but whether by name it may remain forever a matter of more or less “educated guesses”.

Admittedly there exists a certain analogy between the initial troubles of Antiochus I before he was able effectively to claim his inheritance, especially the unconsolidated recent acquisitions of his father’s in Asia Minor and Europe, as compared with the better documented challenges Antiochus III met on his accession, when he had to deal not only with the entangled court cabal, external hostility from the traditional enemy Egypt, but also from the disturbances in north Syria and the dangerous *apostatae* from the Empire, partly instigated by Egypt and partly counting on profiting from those troubles. However, once we set aside this document the analogies appear to be rather slight and vague; the two situations are quite different.

When by divine grace and active support of his loyal friends and brave troops Antiochus had finally demonstrated his worth as a king, much elated he came once more to Asia Minor to claim what he thought to be his inherited patrimony. On these matters our inscription, if only confronted with what is extant from such authors as Polybius, is quite plain and fairly explicit. Yet, generations of eminent scholars and *minorum gentium lumina* were accustomed to deal with this text in the manner of Roman tourists admiring the “Colossi of Memnon”, or as imaginative Levantines contemplated “Solomon’s Granaries”, and “Nemrod’s Castles”. Indeed the monuments were there, grandiose and imposing, but how profoundly misunderstood!

It is hard to say whether the interpretation of immediately relevant epigraphic discoveries, as they were made on by one, was more predicated on the “established” fallacy about the “Stone of Sigeum”, or whether the problems inherent in themselves contributed more to the reinforcement and canonization of the old error. The publication in 1875 by G. Hirschfeld of another decree of Ilium discovered in 1873, this time for Seleucus II Callinicus⁷⁾ (now *OGIS* 212, etc.) could be fitted with uncanny accuracy to its relative position vis-à-vis *OGI* 219, even if both attributions prove ultimately to be wrong. In the light of the old inscription Apollo ἀρχηγός τοῦ γένους seemed easy to explain. A reference to a previous good reception of the king’s father Seleucus now seemed to find a material counterpart in *OGI* 212, and indeed so far as it goes it need not be disputed. Since ἡ ἀδελφὴ βασίλισσα was not so well compatible with Antiochus I a good deal of “sophisticated” ex-

⁶⁾ E. Will, *Hist. polit. du monde hellénist.* I (1966), 122, assigns *OGI* 219 unequivocally to Antiochus I. In the second ed. I (1979), 140, he poses a question whether the king is not really A. III (“hé-sitation est légitime”), but chooses to stay with A. I.

⁷⁾ *OGI* 212 is subject of another article forthcoming in *Cl. et Med.* I was led to it after starting an intensive investigation of *OGI* 219 (with intermissions since 1970), which after a prior exposure to Polybius struck me almost immediately as quite suspect in its old setting. Since 1971 that suspicion has become a firm conviction, as many can testify. My conclusion about Seleucus II in *OGI* 212, which since 1972 was no hermetic secret, well antedates not only W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (München 1977), where only *OGI* 212 is classed correctly, but also P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion* (Bonn 1975), where nos. 31 and 32, are, as much else, “fast durchgehend übernommen”, with no real effort at a critical new edition. The present paper was essentially completed in 1976. It forms a part of a larger project on epigraphic testimonies for Antiochus III, which had been originally planned to be presented as a whole, but finally grew into a series of loosely connected treatises. Cf. *Gnomon* 52 (1980), 258; *AJPh* 108 (1987), 711, n. 7; 727; *Historia* 37 (1988), 162, n. 29.

planation was required to patch-up some reconciliation. That seemed to have been satisfactorily effected via Ptolemaic Alexandria (after Arsinoe II), through the recollection of the later Seleucid history, and from a snippet in Polyaeus VIII, 50 on Antiochus II and his *ὁμοπάτριος ἀδελφή*, although directly contradicted by Porphyry-Eusebius, and rejected by a good number of excellent scholars.⁸⁾

Apollo appeared again in a Iasian inscription from the British Museum, now *OGI* 237, as *ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ γένους τῶν βασιλέων*, but unfortunately in 1882 the first editor E. L. Hicks had attributed the inscription to Antiochus II Theos, although on account of line 11, *μεγάλου*, he did reserve in his commentary a possibility for Antiochus III. When in 1884 Pierre Paris and Maurice Holleaux found another inscription in Durdurkar, on the confines of Caria and Phrygia, subsequently celebrated as the “Edict of Eriza”,⁹⁾ and published it next year in the *BCH* 9, all doubts and all scruples seemed to have been obviated. The editors had decided promptly: that was Antiochus II instituting the cult of Laodice, whom he later divorced to marry the Egyptian Berenice. It was argued that the queen was styled *ἀδελφή βασίλισσα* merely in conformity with the conventional court title.¹⁰⁾ Hence—some insisted—there was no longer any reason to doubt the existence of the same convention already at the court of Antiochus I.¹¹⁾ This “plausible” explanation remained virtually undisputed even when the publication in 1885 of what is now *OGI* 222 gave something to think about and afforded no support for the presumed existence of such a conventional court title for queen Stratonice.¹²⁾ A distinguished historian and epigraphist argued vigorously, and for a long time too persuasively, for the wrong identification of the chief personages in his “Edict of Eriza”. The correct view (even if among faulty arguments) was first propounded by Th. Sokoloff and R. Laqueur in 1904, and about the

⁸⁾ E.g. M. Holleaux, *Études III*, 291: “Au reste il convient d’ajouter qu’en dépit de l’affirmation de Polyen, il n’est nullement établi que Laodice fut bien la sœur d’Antiochos II”. Cf. *ibid.*, 381, n. 1. Beloch, *GG IV*, 2, 201: “Und daß Antiochos Theos’ Gemahlin Laodike keineswegs seine Schwester gewesen ist, ergibt sich auch aus Euseb. I 251”. Also A. Aymard, *Études d’histoire ancienne* (1967), p. 215, n. 2. As a daughter of Achaeus (presumed to be a younger son of Seleucus I) Laodice I would be a paternal cousin of A. II, and (as we can see below, p. 36) *ἀδελφή* was the correct word even for a more distant cousin. This fact and the paternal relationship may possibly be the cause of confusion in Polyaeus, or perhaps his source might have read something like *ὁμοῦ πατρὸς ἀδελφοῦ θυγατέρα*.

⁹⁾ The text is now in C. B. Welles, *RC* 36, but see also L. Robert, *Hellenica VII*, 9–10, for improvements and the correct date 193 B. C.

¹⁰⁾ One may sample the argumentation in Holleaux, *Études III*, 380–81, some of which may today sound very strange in retrospect. Whatever was faulty or ridiculous in affirmations of Professor Holleaux’ opponents the truth of the matter is e.g. diametrically opposite to the sentence on p. 380, n. 7. Cf. E. Will, *Hist. polit. du monde hellénist. II*², 81: “De façon générale il faut lire ces pages d’Holleaux ... avec un esprit critique aussi impitoyablement éveillé que celui qu’Holleaux lui-même consacrait aux travaux des autres”. See L. Robert, *Villes d’Asie Mineure*² (1962), 418 for the *altera pars* and on the necessity of scholarly criticism and sometimes polemics.

¹¹⁾ E.g. E. Breccia, *Diritto dinastico* (1903), p. 160. W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch*, 72, is persuaded that such a custom had existed already at the court of Seleucus I. But for this Livy is no authority, nor can he be really pressed for Apama “soror Seleuci regis” (as e.g. Bouché-Leclercq thought); he is patently anachronistic, following the polite conventions of later and his own times.

¹²⁾ My text of this inscription is forthcoming in *Phoenix* (Toronto). Cf. also a tiny fragment from Teos, Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschen*², p. 102: [*βασιλέως*] *Ἀντιόχου καὶ βασίλισσας Στρατονίκης* [*τῆς*] *θεᾶς*] (supplevi) *καὶ Ἀντιόχου βασιλέως καὶ σωτήρος*. This is evidently Antiochus II reigning, queen-mother Stratonice, probably living (d. 254 B. C., Beloch, *GG IV*, 2, 200; but her posthumous style was *θεὰ Στρατονίκη*, *OGI* 229, 9), and Antiochus I dead. Let us add that the title *βασίλισσα* for Stratonice, here and in *OGI* 222, would not yet decide the question because all queens styled upon occasion *ἀδελφή βασίλισσα* continued at the same time to be called by the simple royal title.

same time Holleaux reached his new conclusions where he admitted Antiochus III, but no more than a possibility, and still had not completely abandoned Antiochus II.¹³⁾ That ungrudging concession he made only in 1930 after a thorough re-examination of the whole question, although the difficulty of decipherment is responsible for the fact that his date 205/4 B.C. was still inaccurate by few years. Yet even after 1904 in an untold number of works the error tended to persist as if nothing had ever happened, causing not a small harm among unwary readers and writers, some of whom may be found even among first rate scholars.¹⁴⁾ When in 1930 the title *ἀδελφῆ* was definitely returned to Laodice III it is rather surprising that *OGI* 219 has been left untouched, but unfortunately Holleaux died in 1932 and memories may last or fade, but *scripta manent*.

True, there had been some discordant voices, which had once declared for Antiochus III, such as Alfred Brückner (going a way back, but communicated to the public by E. Preuner in 1926; initially Brückner had also followed the tradition); Th. Sokoloff again, in *Klio* 4, 101; and R. Laqueur, *Quaestiones epigraphicae* (1904), p. 80; and Preuner himself, *Hermes* 61 (1926). But since there were obvious weaknesses and faults in the manner those views were presented and the best authority of that time combatted them, practically all others followed the suit and the new idea fell in discredit.¹⁵⁾ It was very unfortunate that in 1966 on two different occasions the old error was for all practical effects endorsed by the authority of Professor Louis Robert, even if after some hesitation.¹⁶⁾ Nevertheless Robert adjudged Brückner's opinion (a no mean specialist on the inscriptions of Ilium) as "not without weight". He fairly cites Preuner to the effect that Brückner had thought that the letter forms decide for Antiochus III, but for precisely the same reason, the script characters, Robert declared for the Chishull tradition. There can be no

¹³⁾ "L'erreur se glisse facilement au cœur des raisonnements les mieux établis. Holleaux ne s'endormait jamais sur ses positions. Il reprenait son examen dès que lui venait un doute" – G. Radet in Holl., *Études* VI, 53. For the problem of the date see Holl., *Études* III, 176. Cf. C. B. Welles, *RC*, nos. 36–37. The true date in L. Robert, *Hellenica* VII (1949), 13–14.

¹⁴⁾ It would be a Sisyphean labor to track down even the better known "standard works". Let some speak for all. Thus Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism* (1913), 231 was wrong on this point. He remained wrong in *CAH* VII (1928), 19. Some go wrong about the organization of the Imperial cult "under Antiochus Theos", even if otherwise aware that this Antiochus is now Megas. So evidently Rostovtzeff, *CAH* VII, 162 and Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*² (1951), 450, n. 3. Ernst Meyer, *Grenzen* ... (1925), 123 talks about Antiochus II selling land to a "Schwester". In general the necessary reclassification of *OGI* 212; 219; *RC* 9; 15; possibly 17, antiquates everything touched by these inscriptions as evidence.

¹⁵⁾ In 1928 W. Otto, another eminent scholar, felt justified to draw the balance in his *Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte* (Abh. Akad. München, 34,1, 1928), p. 17, n.1: „der Versuch von Sokoloff ... das Dekret in die Zeit des 3. Antiochos zu setzen ist wohl allgemein abgelehnt worden“. To tell the truth that „allgemein“ was not without attenuating gradations, or even exceptions. Thus F. Stähelin, *Gesch. der kleinasiat. Galater*² (1907) wrote: „Übrigens weisen Sokoloff *Klio* 4, 101 ff. und (wenn auch weniger bestimmt) Laqueur, *Quaest. epigr. et pap. sel.* (Diss. Argentorat., 1904), S. 80, Anm. die genannte Inschrift mit beachtenswerten Gründen Antiochos III, zu“. Even more positive was A. Bouché-Lecq, *Hist. des Sel.* I (1913), p. 74: "L'Antiochos fils de Séleucos de l'inscription de Sigée pourrait être à la rigueur, Antiochos III". II (1924), p. 544: "On pourrait faire descendre d'une quarantaine ou cinquantaine d'années la date de l'inscription de Durdurkar – aussi bien que celle de l'inscription de Sigée – et attribuer l'une et l'autre au regne d'Antiochos III". Well, yes, certainly!

¹⁶⁾ *Monnaies antiques en Troade*, 12; *Bull. Ép.* 1976, 566 (p. 521): "le décret pour un Antiochos"; *Essays Welles*, 175, 181: "L'écriture empêche clairement de descendre jusqu'au regne d'Antiochos III". Approved without reserves by Habicht, *Gottmenschen*² (1970), p. 257. Followed by Frisch, *Ilium*, no. 32: "Decree for Antiochus I soon after 280 B.C." Frankly this is less than one should have expected after the publication of those important new inscriptions from Teos (1967) and Iasus (1969).

longer any doubt that the older tradition represented by scholars of great authority must be pronounced erroneous, and that the later date (the reign of Antiochus III generally, rather than Sokoloff's "exact" 213 B. C.), supported by scholars of less eminence, is the correct one.

Since it was the lettering that induced Robert to pronounce against the correct date we are obliged first to take a look at that matter. Before 1966, when the photograph was published, the consideration of script characters had only a subordinate place in discussions and before Brückner and Preuner it was not even mentioned.¹⁷⁾

As is known accuracy in dating by script is often problematic and for shorter periods quite risky, especially when this happens to be the only criterium. When local specimens and serial sequences are but imperfectly known this may lead to quite hazardous conclusions. Such eminent practitioners of the art as Adolf Wilhelm,¹⁸⁾ Maurice Holleaux,¹⁹⁾ and Louis Robert²⁰⁾ himself scattered many prudent counsels and salutary warnings against relying too much on letter shapes as the sole criterium in dating. This they wrote from the plenitude of their own experience, and yet on one occasion or another none of them escaped from falling in some traps of this nature. The causes may be many, but one of them is the virtual impossibility of accurate allowing for the persistence of certain characteristics and styles beyond their prime periods, when they coexist with those evolved later. The common result in such cases is dating too early, where even a fastidious expert may be deceived. M. Holleaux (still when he championed Antiochus II) had thought that the script in the letter of Antiochus III from 193 ("the edict of Eriza") resembles the oldest Greek papyri. This may be true, but no account was taken of the fact that the same script continued in use much longer. The same scholar had observed great contrast in letter shapes between the just named document and the epistles of Antiochus III to Magnesia and Amyzon.²¹⁾ Indeed it has been noted that the inscriptions from the reign of Antiochus III exhibit a remarkable variety of styles, which is probably attributable more to local differences in engraving rather than to the thirty-six year period of his reign, but the arguments derived from the letter shapes of *OGI* 219 turn out once more to be untenable.

Despite the presence of certain allegedly "archaistic" features a closer analysis will reveal that their significance has been exaggerated. In fact letter types are somewhat inconsistent in this not too carefully executed piece, where for quite a few characters the en-

¹⁷⁾ W. Orth, *op. cit.*, p. 62, treats to some extent of this question.

¹⁸⁾ E.g. *Jahreshefte* 3 (1901); 14 (1911); 17 (1914).

¹⁹⁾ *Études II*, 80: "dans cette matière ... les risques d'erreur sont infinis".

²⁰⁾ *Hellenica II*, 16: "un tel critère comporte presque toujours des chances d'erreur". The example of B. Meritt (*ibid.*, 16, n. 3) a major specialist in Attic inscriptions, who assigned a second century Athenian inscription to the fourth century, is very instructive. See *I. Priene*, no. 37 for a similar example, where a second century inscription is engraved in characters practically identical with those of the fourth century. *La Carie II*, 286: "résultat paradoxal pour ceux qui n'ont pas appris à être quelque peu sceptique sur la chronologie tirée de l'écriture lapidaire". *Hellenica VII*, 6 stresses the importance of the dated inscription from Nehavend for the study of engraving, but warns: "Il faudra naturellement n'en point tirer de conclusions abusives".

²¹⁾ *Études III*, 166–167. Cf. L. Robert's observations *CRAI*, 1967, 281–297 on the differences in lapidary script in the three exemplars of the same edict of Antiochus III from 193 B.C. The problems of dating solely by palaeographical criteria are even more hazardous in manuscripts. Cf. e.g. A. A. van Groningen, *Short Manual of Greek Palaeography* (Leiden 1967), p. 30: "Different lines of development often run parallel to one another ... it must be understood that periods may be indicated only approximately: the transition from one style to another always takes at least one generation". Cf. C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands* (Oxford 1955), p. xv.

graver employed, so to speak, multiple “typefaces”. Our stela shows a close affinity with the lettering of the not much later Corragus decree, found in Brusa. Certain inscriptions discovered in Iran and adjacent lands, all datable to the first half of the third century, provide a very instructive repertory for contrasts and comparisons.²²⁾ As in Ilium the letters there are drawn in strokes of even thickness, without apices, but they tend to be *squatty*, and are spaced generously within the lines, and interlinear spaces are quite ample. This is precisely what sets them apart from the decree of Ilium, the “edict of Eriza”, and the decree for Corragus. The characters in all these three just named cases tend to be *elongated* and spaced more thickly. The supposed early features, though impressive at first sight, are already accompanied by numerous marks of a later age.²³⁾ One may instance the shapes of A against A, or A, and compare E: E, K: k, \wedge : M, N: N, Γ : Γ : Π , ξ : ξ : Σ . Following these observations with some persistence one must soon be led to the conclusion that Brückner was right: *our inscription as a whole presents nothing unusual for the times of Antiochus the Great*. Almost every character may conjointly with others, or isolated by itself, occur well down to the end of the first half of the second century B.C.²⁴⁾ Anyone may examine the examples in our references and make his own judgment, as to whether or not the script presents any interdict against Antiochus III. From what I have been compelled to learn about engraving it appears that the characters as such would permit an extension of the chronological scope to ca. 260–160 B.C., which well encompasses the true date, ca. 197 B.C., as we can well gather from the internal analysis and the comparison with the known historical facts.²⁵⁾

²²⁾ The photograph of the decree for Corragus is appended to Holleaux, *Études II* (end). For Iran see L. Robert, *Hellenica X*, Pl. XXXIX (ca. 265 B.C.); *Hellenica XI–XII*, Pl. V (262, or 261 B.C.); M. Wheeler, *Flames over Persepolis* (1968), p. 60–61 (ca. 255 B.C., but note *ibid.*, p. 67, 69, the strongly contrasting letters of another inscription of Aśoka). The photograph is also included in L. Robert, *Opera Min. Sel. III*, Pl. XXXVII.

²³⁾ For the photograph of the “Eriza” see BCH 1930, Pl. XII–XIII. Analysis: Holleaux, *Études III*, 166–169. The Aristodicides stela in RC, 10–13, invoked in this connection, is not clear enough for the purpose. Cf. also H. Gauthier – H. Sottas, *Un décret trilingue ...* (1925), Pl. IX, of 217 B.C. For excellent western example of engraving similar to the earlier Iranian inscriptions see W. Dittenberger – K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, no. 39, dated by script and dialectical features to the first half of the third century.

²⁴⁾ Arched transverse bar of *alpha* is not wanting even in early third century. Cf. e.g. *II Didyma*, 115 (in one pronounced instance almost broken). The divergent *mu* and *sigma* are still quite common throughout the second century. Cf. *I. Olympia*, no. 39, where the straight-crossed *alpha* is the principal point of difference with OGI 219. Dated by Kirchhoff only approximately to ca. 323–146, but this may well be the first half of the third century. Cf. *ibid.*, no. 46 from the time of Polybius. B. Latyshev, *IOSPE*, I², no. 402: facsimile drawing of a treaty between Pharnaces I and Chersonesus, 179 B.C. Individual letters practically identical with our stela, except for the straight-crossed *alpha* and nearly parallel *sigma*. Divergent *mu* of this shape is rare after the last quarter of third century, but is still found sporadically down to the end of Hellenistic period. Cf. an Ilian inscription from the time of Augustus in L. Robert, *Troade*, Pl. III. The same may be said of the unequal perpendiculars of *nu*, very rare by the first century B.C. For the contrary phenomenon of a decisively later-looking script in relation to its true date see A. Rehm, *II Didyma*, no. 492. One should not miss to examine the lettering of the treaty of Antiochus III with Lysimachia from 196 B.C.: published by Z. Taşlıklioğlu and P. Frisch, *ZPE* 17, 2 (1975), Pl. IVa. This induced J. L. Ferrary and Ph. Gauthier, *Journal des Savants* (1981), 327–345, to maintain that the letters in the new fragment are too early for A. III.

²⁵⁾ L. Robert concluded in an analogical case where faulty dating by palaeographical criteria stood in the way of correct interpretation: “Nous essaierons donc nous appuyer sur le document lui-même et non sur la gravure de la pierre”, *Hellenica II*, p. 17. But in our case the very notion of a “script problem” should be completely abandoned.

L. 1. *Ἐπιμηνιεύοντος*. Frisch quotes his authorities to the effect that this was not an eponymous magistrate, and translates „Priester der monatlichen Opfer was Nymphaios“. But that interpretation the authorities cited have pronounced as inapplicable in this case. It may be the president of the popular assembly for the month (*ἐπιμηνιεύων τῆς ἐκκλησίας*), or possibly of the Council (*ἐ. τῆς βουλῆς*, cf. e.g. *OGI* 22, 30), whose function must be distinguished here from that of *ὁ ἐπιστάτης*, the foreman for the day of the council's section representing the executive branch of the government.²⁶⁾

L. 2–4. *Ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος βασιλέως Σελεύκου ἐν ἀρχῇ τε παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν — — — ἐζήτησε τὰς μὲν πόλεις — — — εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν εὐδαιμονίαν καταστήσαι*. Taking exordium from a king's accession to the throne is a familiar pattern in many decrees for kings. It varies in such respects as the inclusion or omission of *παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς* (or *προγόνων*), or *πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος ἐγένετο*, in the actual expression of the *εὐεργεσία* concept, etc, but the formula rarely omits *καλὰ καὶ ἔνδοξα* and the benevolence towards the *πόλεις*, the *Ἕλληνες*, or the *Ἑλληνίδες πόλεις*, especially the assurance of peace and prosperity. All this is very much a traditional stock, peculiar not only to adulation of kings and rulers, but it may be extended to important individuals. Contrary to superficial, and often naive, interpretations one may meet in modern discussions, such recitations do not necessarily represent factual merits. To discover these we would have to look harder beyond the formulaic verbiage for facts ascertainable from other sources. The blessings of peace, prosperity, justice and better conditions for the entire kingdom (if not a particular region, or city) were qualities people desired from all good kings, and not only from the Greek ones. The praises for these accomplishments (actually realized, or only hoped for) are echoed and re-echoed in many Hellenistic texts. The phraseology was so much hackneyed that a king may be credited for bringing peace to a community even if it was himself whose ambition, or military operations disturbed the *status quo* and peace, and who is now asserting himself in the city and promising peace under a new settlement.²⁷⁾

But as we render ourselves account of the traditional nature of this phraseology, we must be also on guard not to fall into the opposite extreme: these words *may* sometimes convey some facts, or allude to events which actually have taken place. The facts and circumstances will have to be determined for each case individually. Those scholars who have looked here in earnest for genuine information on the peace-treaty between Antiochus I and Antigonos Gonatas, or for any other peaces, let themselves too easily to be misguided by the stereotyped formula.²⁸⁾ The words of the decree simply pay homage to Antiochus III as Prince of Peace.

We shall review some examples with peace references in order to illustrate this proposi-

²⁶⁾ See on this in addition to L. Robert, *Troade*, 13–14; H. Swoboda, *Die griech. Volksbeschlüsse* (1890), p. 96, that it might be „Priester, welche monatliche Opfer darbrachten“, or „für Monatsdauer bestellte Vorsteher des Rathes“. The same view in Hicks, *A Manual of Greek Hist. Inscriptions* (1892), no. 165. The former function, however, is not in case at Ilium. Cf. also *Bull. Ép.* 1968, 365.

²⁷⁾ Cf. Athenaeus 6. 63 (p. 263 e), 20: Athenians sing to Demetrius in 291 or 290: *εὐχόμεθα δὴ σοι πρῶτον μὲν εἰρήνην ποιήσον φίλτατε· κύριος γὰρ εἶ σύ. Letter of Aristeas*, 291 (dialogue on kingship): *Τί μέγιστόν ἐστι βασιλείας; Πρὸς ταῦτα εἶπε: Τὸ διὰ παντὸς ἐν εἰρήνῃ καθεστάναι τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους, καὶ κομίζεσθαι τὸ δίκαιον ταχέως ἐν ταῖς διακρίσεσι*. See also Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW I*, 193; L. Cerfaux et J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains* (1957), p. 185.

²⁸⁾ E.g. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (1913), 168, n. 3. Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum*² (1956, 1970), 84, n. 3; E. Will, *Hist. polit.* I² (1979), 143; D. Musti, *Studi classici e orientali* 15 (1966), 74, n. 20; P. Frisch, *Ilium*, no. 32, comment to line 13. By contrast this point is treated well by W. Orth.

tion. Diod. 18.56.1–2 (Philip III): Ἐπειδὴ συμβέβηκε τοῖς προγόνους ἡμῶν πολλὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας εὐεργετηκέναι, βουλόμεθα διαφυλάττειν τὴν ἐκείνων προαίρεσιν — — — ἡγούμενοι ἐπαγαγεῖν πάντας ἐπὶ τὴν εἰρήνην, κτλ. The message is constructed on the traditional pattern, but the peace here and in the next sentence is concrete and means freedom from internal dissensions after the return of the exiles. Real peace is also meant in the decree of Scepis for Antigonos, 311 B. C., *OGI* 6, 8: καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰρήνης καὶ αὐτονομίας; 15: συνησθῆναι δὲ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὅτι ἐλεύθεροι καὶ αὐτόνομοι ἐν εἰρήνῃ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν διάξουσιν.

A. Rehm, *Delphinion* 139, 30 (Ptolemy II to Miletus): καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην παρασκευάζων τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν παραιτίος γενόμενος τῇ πόλει.

OGI 56 (Canopus decree for Ptolemy III): τὴν τε χώραν ἐν εἰρήνῃ διατετήρηκεν προπολεμῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς πρὸς πολλὰ ἔθνη καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς δυναστεύοντας, καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ χώρῃ πᾶσιν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτῶν (scil. *regis reginaeque*) βασιλείαν τασσομένοις τὴν εὐνομίαν παρέχουσιν. These are the traditional virtues of any Pharaoh, or Oriental ruler.²⁹) Even the rulers of Ethiopian Adulis have eventually learned to boast on this account, *OGI* 199, 35: καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ καταστήσας πάντα τὸν ὑπ' ἐμοὶ κόσμον — — —

The idea of peace is much stressed in our Ilian document (lines 6, 11, 13), but it is also well in evidence in other decrees for Antiochus III. Obviously the king wished to take special credit for the future protection of the cities, once they had been confirmed to his Empire. The cities (at least their pro-Seleucid parties) were raised once more to fresh hopes that a new era of peace might be inaugurated, or on the contrary, they may have been full of apprehensions about the prospects for peace considering the “world politics” of the time.

OGI 234, 20 (Delphi for Antioch of the Chrysaorians, i.e. Alabanda): ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ εὐεργέτα Ἀντιοχέων εὐλόγηκε εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ διότι τὰν δαμοκρατίαν καὶ τὰν εἰρήναν τοῖς Ἀντιοχεῦσιν διαφυλάσσει, κατ' τὰν τῶν προγόνων ὑφάγησιν.³⁰)

G. Pugliese Carratelli, “Suppl. Epigr. di Iasos”, 2 I, 41 (*Annuario della Scuola Ital.* 45–46, 1969), 447: ἐπειδὴ βασιλέως μεγάλου Ἀντιόχου προγονικὴν αἵρεσιν διατηροῦντος εἰς πάντας [τοῦ]ς Ἑλλ[ή]νας καὶ τοῖς μὲν εἰρήνην παρέχοντος, κτλ.

P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965), p. 38, l. 50: ἐπειδὴ οὐ μόνον εἰρήνην ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς παρέσχεν ἀλλὰ καὶ tax remissions, etc.³¹)

C. B. Welles, *RC* 52, 5 (Eumenes II rehearsing the Ionian League's decree in his honor): διότι τὰς καλλίστας ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐλόμενος πράξεις καὶ κοινὸν ἀναδειξάμενος ἑμαυτὸν εὐεργέτην τῶν Ἑλλήνων — — — ἅπασαν σπουδὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιούμενος, ὅπως οἱ τὰς Ἑλλή-

²⁹) For the stereotyped views of ideal royal virtues see Diod. 1. 70 (esp. 70. 6). Cf. M. Nilsson, *Gesch. der griech. Rel.* II², 390 and *ibid.*, n. 5.

³⁰) Ditt., *OGIS* I, p. 387, n. 15: „indicatur regem ab externi belli periculis et miseriis cives tutatum esse”.

³¹) Even while following the tradition P. Frisch could not resist to compare this passage with *OGI* 219, 13. Prayer and vow formulae may also include invocation of divine help for royal endeavors to assure peace to entire kingdom. E.g. *Letter of Aristaeas* 37: καὶ τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ τὸ χαριστικὸν ἀνατιθέντες, ὃς ἡμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ δόξῃ κρατίστη παρ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην διατετήρηκεν. 45: Εὐθέως οὖν προσηγάγομεν ὑπὲρ σοῦ θυσίας καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν φίλων καὶ ἡῤ-ξατο πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος, ἵνα σοι γένηται καθὼς προαίρη διὰ παντός, καὶ διασώξῃ σοι τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ δόξης ὁ κυριεύων ἀπάντων θεός. All just like *OGI* 219, 20–25. Cf. Jos., *A. J.* 12. 55: καὶ τὸ πλῆθος εὐχὰς ἐποιήσατο γενέσθαι σοι τὰ κατὰ νοῦν καὶ φυλαχθῆναι σου τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ — — — (ὁ προαίρη τέλος also there!). But these were blessings universally desirable. See also L. Robert, *Études anat.*, 257–58.

νίδας κατοικοῦντες πόλε[ις] διὰ παντός ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τῇ βελτίστῃ καταστάσ[ει] ὑπάρχω-
σιν.

L. 3–8. Without some extra effort the syntactic connections between *καθάπερ ἦν δίκαιον* and the sequel are not immediately apparent and the structure of the whole sentence is rather difficult to follow. It is commonly understood that there are two clauses dependent on *ἐξήγησε*: 1) *τὰς μὲν πόλεις* — — *καταστήσαι*, 2) *τοὺς δ'* — — *ἀνακτῆσθαι*. Certainly this makes some sense, but one may still wonder about a possible omission by the engraver of a verb (*ἔσπευσε*), or participle (*σπεύδων*), which was in particular to govern the *ἀνακτῆσασθαι τὴν πατρώϊαν ἀρχήν*. This of course is the allusion to the famous program of Antiochus formulated “right from the outset”, etc., as in *Pomp. Trog. Prol.* 30, cited below, p. 28. N.B.: *qui post regnum acceptum persecutus defectores* ... But the balances in this long and artificial period would be even better restored if we take the last named phrase as dependent upon and continuing lines 3–4: *καὶ προστὰς ἐνδόξου καὶ καλῆς αἰρέσεως*. In other words, with or without an insertion, the phrases between *ἐξήγησε* and *δίκαιον* may be bracketed as hypotactic. The following examples seem to support the considered here interpretation. *OGI* 248, 36: *σπεύσας ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντίοχου καὶ συγκαταστήσας αὐτὸν εἰς τῶν τῶν προγόνων ἀρχήν*. *LW* 419: *καὶ τοῦ δήμου σπεύδοντος ἀνακτῆσασθαι* (scil. *ἀππλοτριωμένην ἱερὰν χώραν*). M. Wörle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 424, N III, 13–15 (Zeuxis to Heraclea): *Σπεύδοντες οὖν αὐτοὶ τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διάθεσιν ἀποκατασταθῆναι καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων τοῦ βασιλέως (A. III) συγκεχωρημένα συντηρηθῆναι* — — —. Of course, *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* here is simply “original”, but the whole context of the “reacquisition” and the “historical perspective” are remarkable and suggest that a similar phraseology was in the back of the writer’s mind. Cf. also our l. 13: *μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς*.

L. 6, 11–12, 14–16. These lines have very striking counterpart in the first decree of Teos (datable in my opinion to about the same time as Ilium)³²) P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965), 34, 9–11: *παραγενόμενος εἰς τοὺς καθ’ ἡμᾶς τόπους ἀποκατέστησε τὰ πράγματα εἰς τὴν συμφέρουσαν κατάστασιν*. This of course means that Antiochus is now establishing his own order in Asia Minor, but “bringing the affairs (kingdom, city) to a better (more brilliant) state, prosperity, original condition”, etc. is also a well-known formula with which kings like to beguile their friends, allies and subjects. It occurs in many variations: *ἄγειν, καταστήσαι, συναύξειν τὰ πράγματα (τὴν βασιλείαν, τὴν πόλιν) εἰς μείζω, λαμπροτέραν, καλλίστην, ἀρχαίαν, τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διάθεσιν, εὐδαιμονίαν, ἐπιφάνειαν*, etc.³³) Cf. the letter of Laodice III to Iasus, G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Annuario Sc. Ital.* 45–46, p. 445, lines 6–11: *τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν ἀνακτησάμενος τὴν τε ἐλευθερίαν ὑμῖν ἀπέδωκεν καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προτέθειται συναύξειν τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ εἰς βελτίονα διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν*.

It will be apposite to add at this juncture that W. Orth, *Machtanspruch*, p. 60, n. 55, affirms that the term *βασιλεία* in territorial sense had not been employed by the Seleucid chancery before Antiochus III (*RC* 36, 11). Assuming that the observation is correct (but if so, the term is equally rare in all dynasties) one can detect in *OGI* 219 at least three examples that lend themselves somewhat to the specified meaning (lines 11, 14, 24). In a way the same may be said of *ἀρχή*, as a synonym of “state”, or “Empire”, of which Hellen-

³²) Cf. *Gnomon* 52 (1980), 258. My comprehensive annotations on these inscriptions are forthcoming in *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten* 210?. Cf. E. Will, *Histoire* ... II² (1982), 114.

³³) Cf. M. Holleaux, *Études II*, 113; *III*, 119. More examples: *RC* 52, 12; *Syll.* 547, 5; 629, 5; *OGI* 194, 5: *πάντας [τοὺς πολίτας καταστ]ησάμενος [εἰς ἀσφάλειαν καὶ] εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν εὐ[δ]αιμονίαν (supplevi)*; 332, 25, 55.

istic kings generally do not speak, but Antiochus III would be again an innovator, as evident in his letter to Teos, Block F, 12 (cf. Orth, *ibid.*, n. 54). The term occurs in this sense in *OGI* 219, 8. If more is needed this also gives us additional points in the confirmation of the later date for the Ilian decree.

But in the political vocabulary of Antiochus III these were more than inane repetitions of trivial formulae. It was an intensely charged programmatic statement, a proclamation of his intense desire to *ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς μείζω καὶ λαμπροτέραν διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν*. The king proposed himself a program of recovering all the territories which his ancestors had once possessed or claimed, and to equal or outshine even the greatest of them. No other of the Seleucids was more conscious of his hereditary “historical rights”, τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς δίκαια, which he emphasized and argued repeatedly and so insistently on various occasions, whether with the Egyptian envoys, or with Euthydemus of Bactria, or during his operations in Asia Minor, or again in diplomatic exchanges with the Romans before the opening of the armed conflict. Our inscription is full of such “Public Relations releases”, yet to my knowledge these facts have never been cast in relief, even by those who rightfully suspected the correct Antiochus.

In ancient sources,³⁴⁾ particularly in Polybius, and in modern treatments of his times the writers emphasize the Seleucid’s ceaseless activity and unstinted expenditure of energy in the realization of his goal *antiquam Imperii formam restituere*.³⁵⁾ The words ἐν ἀρχῇ τε — — προστάς ἐνδόξου καὶ καλῆς αἰρέσεως — — ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχὴν καὶ χρησάμενος ἐπιβολῇ καλῇ καὶ δίκαιᾳ may be compared with the Polybian *τολμὴ καὶ φιλοπονία* (11. 34. 15) and with *ἐδόκει κατὰ μὲν τὰς ἀρχὰς γεγονέναι μεγαλεπίβολος καὶ τολμηρὸς καὶ τοῦ προτεθέντος ἐξεργαστικὸς* (15–37). Theodotus recalls *τὴν πρώτην ἐπιβολὴν Ἀντιόχου τοῖς κατὰ Συρίαν πράγμασιν* (5. 40. 2). Naturally *τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν, ὁ ἀρχαίαν διάθεσιν, καταστήσαι* fits much better a king who can say this (the decree simply echoes the tone from the court) from a *longer perspective* of his own and his predecessors’ reign than one who at Ilium would have to look back to an “antiquity” of a *very recent date* (few months or years). Stressing this policy of Antiochus Max Cary has even a chapter entitled “Antiochus III, Restitutor orbis”,³⁶⁾ which apparently impressed H. Schmitt, the author of the still relatively recent and our best monograph on this ruler, so much that he inscribed “Restitutor Orbis” the second long chapter in his book.³⁷⁾ This is not without some precedents in earlier works.³⁸⁾ We must forego here a systematic

³⁴⁾ E.g. Pol. 5. 67; 11. 34; 18. 51; Livy 33. 38. 1 and 9–14; Appian, *Syr.* 1; 3; 6; C.B. Welles, *RC* 15 (N.B. *πρόγονοι*, which does not occur in this sense before Seleucus II; and especially *οἰκία*, not attested before Antiochus III).

³⁵⁾ M.I. Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW I* (1941, corr. repr. 1953), p. 49: “The dominating ambition of Antiochus III was to restore the early Seleucid Empire to its former greatness”. More on this in the same paragraph *ibid.* and following. Bevan’s fair sketch of his reign does him justice, *The House of Sel. II*, 46: “A restoration of the conditions of things under the first kings of his house was the formula of Antiochus’ policy”. T. Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (1914), p. 165–166: “Perhaps he even dreamt of regaining the whole of Alexander’s Empire, including the possession of Greece and Egypt. The deeds of Antiochus loomed large in the flattery of his courtiers”.

³⁶⁾ *A History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C.*² (1963), p. 69–73. The appellation *Restitutor Orbis* is borrowed from the title of Emperor Aurelian in contemporary coins, inscriptions and documents after his restoration of the unity of the Empire. Its legitimation for Antiochus comes indirectly from ancient historians, especially Livy 33. 38. 1 (quoted below, n. 45).

³⁷⁾ *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos’ des Grossen und seiner Zeit*. Wiesbaden, 1964 (*Historia Einzelschriften*, Heft 6), p. 32–107.

³⁸⁾ E.g. P. Jouguet, *L’imperialisme macedonien et l’hellenisation de l’Orient* (1926, ed. rec. 1961), p. 255–269: “Restauration et chute de l’Empire Séleucide”.

sketch of the king's words and actions in the light of his self-imposed mission, and of the estimates in modern historiography of his achievements and ultimate failure, but shall point out to certain unmistakable parallels, which should leave no doubts in reader's mind how to number the proud Seleucid on the stage.

It has been almost an automatic procedure for anyone who treated of the first years after the death of Seleucus I Nicator, or commented upon our inscription to compare the text of Memnon of Heraclea Ὁ δὲ Σελεύκου Ἀντίοχος πολλοῖς πολέμοις εἰ καὶ μόλις καὶ οὐδὲ πᾶσαν, ὅμως ἀνασωσάμενος τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχήν, πέμπει στρατηγὸν Πατροκλέα σὺν ἐκστρατεύματι εἰς τὴν ἐπὶ τὰδε τοῦ Ταύρου, with OGI 219, 7–8: ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχήν.³⁹⁾ Whatever analogies there might have existed between the respective accessions of Antiochus I and Antiochus III, I submit that these two sources do not complement each other, but should be kept entirely separate and distinct.⁴⁰⁾ Although it is not our purpose to analyze here the sources and events from the first years of Antiochus I something must be said to dispose of him, as we concentrate our attention on his third namesake.

It is indeed a historical fact that Antiochus I, surprised in the Eastern Satrapies by the news of his father's death, encountered considerable difficulties in assuming the possession of the newly acquired extension of the Empire.⁴¹⁾ It is also true that he failed to validate all of his father's claims (in virtue of the victory over Lysimachus), not only in Europe but also in extensive parts of Asia Minor. Furthermore certain cuneiform texts inform us that Antiochus I indeed fought with Ptolemaic forces in Syria.⁴²⁾ But there is absolutely no indication that this has anything to do with a "revolt in Seleucus" awkwardly plastered on him from the Ilian decree by a long procession of modern historians.⁴³⁾ Neither ἀποστάντες τῶν πραγμάτων, nor ἐπιθέμενοι τοῖς πράγμασι can really mean an external attack.⁴⁴⁾ Some Egyptian troubles in Syria and Asia Minor is about all we are al-

³⁹⁾ So already in J. G. Droysen, *Gesch. des Hellenismus*. Hrsg. von E. Bayer (Basel 1953), III, 164, n. 162. Of more recent works cf. e.g. E. Will, *Hist. polit.* I (1966), 122; I² (1979), 140; D. Musti, "Lo stato dei Seleucidi", *Studi classici e orientali* 15 (1966), p. 73. The author was so habituated to the comparison that he inadvertently slips to ἀνακτησάμενος, instead of Memnon's ἀνασωσάμενος.

⁴⁰⁾ The excerpts by Photius is all we have of Memnon, who lived after Caesar but before Hadrian, and therefore was far removed from the times described. For the earlier portion of his work (up to 247/6) he utilized a history of his compatriot Nymphis. See F. Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hist.* 434. 9. 1.

⁴¹⁾ Cf. H. Heinen, *Untersuchungen zur Gesch. des 3. Jhdt. v. Chr.* Wiesbaden 1972 (Historia Einzelschriften, Heft 20), p. 63f. Marred by common misconceptions about OGI 212; 219, etc.

⁴²⁾ S. Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts* (London 1924), p. 156, 10, and K. J. Beloch, *GG* IV, 2, 449. Cf. Smith, 151–154, but adducing l. 22 of our decree for the evidence that the royal couple were at the time in Sardis is gratuitous. Even for Antiochus III no inference can be made from l. 22 on his whereabouts, but Livy 33. 19. 10 tells us that the king ordered the land army to wait for him at Sardis, as he himself progressed with the fleet along the coast. Nevertheless Polyaeus IV, 15 informs us that Antiochus I recovered Damascus from Egypt.

⁴³⁾ One of the most influential accounts is W. Otto, *Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte des 3. Jhdt. v. Chr.* (ABAW, 1928), p. 17ff. Cf. E. Will, I², p. 139–140, and 148 for references to learned discussions of that imaginary revolt under Antiochus I. Some, as W. W. Tarn, *CAH* VII, 701, or E. T. Newell, *W.S.M.*, 155, n. 1, were even able to descry how the rebels held at some point "Apamea and all the elephants there". But G. Corradi, *Studi ellenistici* (Turin 1929), 99 wrote: "Di questa ribellione κατά την Σελευκίδα non ci è conservata nessuna notizia nella nostra tradizione".

⁴⁴⁾ Of course ἐπιτίθεσθαι can mean any attack in any situation (as, *inter alios*, Orth, p. 70, n. 85, argues), but not the whole phrase, and that is the point. For the designation of internal enemy as ἐπίβουλος τῶν πραγμάτων and similar, of which great many examples can be produced, see E. Bickerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* (Paris 1938), p. 4, n. 7. Cf. Strabo 16. 1. 28: Phraates sends away four sons to Rome δαδῶς τὰς στάσεις καὶ τοὺς ἐπιθεμένους αὐτῶ.

lowed in this connection by the evidence for Antiochus I. Certainly the words of the Ilian decree must mean an *internal* rebellion, but we are confronting here a set of events that occurred well over half a century later, and only under Antiochus III. In fine, it is true that Antiochus I had to face a foreign attack in Syria, but his “revolt in Seleucis” is a doublet fabricated from the misplaced document of Ilium.

The adjective *πατρῶος* means both “paternal” and “ancestral”. Of course in an appropriate situation *ἀνακτῆσαμενος τὴν πατρῶαν ἀρχὴν* may be said of any king, but the passage in Memnon does not constitute any exact parallel. W. Orth (p. 63, n. 69) is right that Memnon sounds like a characterization of the *entire reign* of Antiochus I, and this forced him to recognize its irrelevance for *OGI* 219, in spite of his choosing to support the wrong Antiochus. On the other hand we have overwhelming indications that the Ilian decree is faithfully echoing the voice of Antiochus III. Thus, we recall that during a later diplomatic interview the king emphatically and deliberately replied to Roman envoys at Lysimachia, who had reproved him for his recent aggrandizements: *Εἰς δὲ τὴν Εὐρώπην ἔφη διαβεβηκέναι μετὰ τῶν δυνάμεων ἀνακτησόμενος τὰ κατὰ τὴν Χερρόνησον καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ Θρᾷκης πόλεις· τὴν γὰρ τῶν τόπων τούτων ἀρχὴν μάλιστα πάντων αὐτῷ καθήκειν* — — —. *αὐτὸς δὲ νῦν οὐ κτᾶσθαι τοῖς Φιλίππου καιροῖς συνεπιθέμενος, ἀλλ’ ἀνακτᾶσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις δικαίοις χρώμενος.*⁴⁵) Cf. Appian, *Syr.* 3: *Θρᾷκην μὲν, τῶν προγόνων αὐτοῦ γενομένην τε καὶ δι’ ἀσχολίας ἐκπεσοῦσαν, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ σχολῆς ὦν ἀναλαμβάνειν.* Should this still fail to carry conviction we can cite two epigraphic instances from the same period. One recording the same operations of 197/6 B.C. concerns the Seleucid acquisition of Iasus, the city which just like Lysimachia had been previously held by Philip V, whose title there, like that of the Ptolemies, was no doubt considered by Antiochus as an encroachment on his own rights. In queen Laodice’s letter to Iasus she refers to the king’s act as *τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν ἀνακτησόμενος*,⁴⁶) but in the light of the currently available evidence we cannot point to any concrete fact of previous Seleucid presence in that city. So far only the Antigonid and Ptolemaic antecedents are known. The other is a more recently published letter of Zeuxis to Heraclea ad Latmum of 197/6 B.C., M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 423, N II, 8–9: *ἀνακχομισμένων ἡμῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὴν πόλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχουσαν τοῖς προγόνοις αὐτοῦ.* These then are the true analogies and parallels, not the irrelevant sentence from Memnon, which has misled so many.

But this is not all. The revolt in northern Syria and the extreme perils from the *ἀποστάται τῶν πραγμάτων* on the further fringes of the Empire and the king’s brilliant success in rising to the demands of the occasion with the help of his friends and troops, blessed by the divine grace, and his consequent restoration of the Empire to its ancient splendor,

⁴⁵) Polybius 18. 51. 3–6. For the entire campaign see Livy 33. 38. 1: *Eodem anno (197/6) Antiochus rex cum hibernasset Ephesi, omnes Asiae civitates in antiquam imperii formulam redigere est conatus.* 33. 40. 4: *ad ea recipienda in antiquum ius venisse.* 34. 58. 4–13, esp. *ita parta ita recuperata.* 35. 16. 5: *eandem de Zmyrna, Lampsaco civitatibusque, quae Ioniae aut Aeolidis sunt, causam ab Antiocho accipite: bello superatas a maioribus, stipendiarias ac vectigales factas in antiquum ius repetit.* It is remarkable here how brutally frank the debaters could be and how little scruples they really had about the “Greek freedom”, whose championing was the pretext raised by both sides for mass propaganda and for the benefit of Greek public opinion. To that extent the protagonists understood each other fairly well!

⁴⁶) “Supplemento epigrafico di Iasos”, no 2 I, 6–8, *Annuario della Scuola Italiana*, 45–46, p. 445. The editor, G. Pugliese Carratelli, erroneously attributed this letter to Laodice II and needlessly reiterated his error in *Annuario* 47–48. Cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1971, 621 (p. 504); 1973, 432. Iasus was acquired directly from Philip V, but Lysimachia only after abandonment by the Macedonians and the Thracian devastations.

etc., all this is consciously recited in the Ilian decree and all this, as we know, were the ambitions or accomplishments of Antiochus the Great. All this appears now so obvious that it must be pronounced as one of inexplicable puzzles of scholarship to account for. How anyone with any presence of Polybius in mind could have ever failed to notice that the allusions in the "Stone of Sigeum" are to a striking degree identical?⁴⁷) Adequate means of verification existed already in 1718, the year when the inscription was brought to England, for scholars could have an easy recourse to Casaubon's edition, but it so happened that although many studies of both texts were made, they were evidently never brought to ultimate confrontation. We shall attempt it here, first by framing a rapid sketch of the background events and then considering some relevant details in comparison.

In 223 at the moment when Seleucus III was assassinated the greater part of the imperial troops were engaged in Asia Minor against Attalus. Over these Achaeus now assumed command, but a substantial army was apparently still left behind in Syria and those summoned Antiochus from Seleucia or Babylon, who was thus made effectively the king.⁴⁸) At first however the actual control of affairs was in the hands of the chancellor, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων*, Hermias. Achaeus was left with supreme authority beyond the Taurus, Molon was appointed the governor general of the Upper Satrapies and satrap of Media, while his brother Alexander of Persis.

Very soon, however, Hermias' strong drive for power antagonized other dignitaries of the Empire who felt threatened, and that might be the possible cause that Molon (seconded by his brother), on the example of governors of Bactria and Parthia, defected and proclaimed himself king in 222 B.C. When against the advice of the popular general Epigenes, who urged that the king should appear at the head of the army, two successive expeditions, the first one led by Xenon and Theodotus, the second by Xenetas, were dispatched by Hermias and both defeated in turn, the Crown Council reverted to the original plan. The simultaneous operations under way on the southern border were temporarily halted. However, before the king could set out a widespread discontent arose among the forces concentrated at Apamea in Syria over their pay, much in arrears at this time. Hermias who was a man of considerable means (presumably amassed in the state service) offered to satisfy the demands of the soldiery on the condition that Epigenes be removed from the command of the expedition, to which the young king reluctantly consented. All the malcontents returned to allegiance except the contingents from Cyrrhastica, which might have been the province Epigenes governed himself.⁴⁹) He was forthwith accused of collusion with Molon and put to death. In a swift campaign of 221/0 the royal army, this time accompanied by the king, was completely successful and the usurper with his nearest adherents committed suicide. In the regions affected by the recent rebellion the authority

⁴⁷) So essentially 5. 40–87; 7. 15–18; 8. 15–32; 10. 27–31; 18. 51–52; 37. 48–49. Orth is aware of these Polybian parallels (of which I have been preaching to some and sundry since 1971) but only to discard them. It is not quite right to say that in *OGI* 219 there "findet sich nicht die geringste Spur" (Orth, p. 68) of the Eastern *anabasis*. Lines 8–16 allude to it. Pol. 11. 34. 14–16: *καὶ συλλήβδην ἡσφάλιστο τὴν βασιλείαν* compares directly with *OGI* 219, 11: *καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν διάθεσιν κατέστησεν*, and with 13–14: *καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς μείζω καὶ λαμπροτέραν διάθεσιν ἀνήγαγε*. The same passage, especially line 7: *ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχήν*, may also be compared directly with Pol. 11. 34. 14: *τοὺς ἄνω σατράπας ὑπάρχοντας ἐποίησατο τῆς ἰδίας ἀρχῆς*.

⁴⁸) Eusebius, *Chron.* (Schoene) I, 253; Jerome, *In Dan.* 11. 10.

⁴⁹) E. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus I* (1902). E. Will, "Les premières années du règne d'Antiochos III (223–219 av. J.-C.)", *REG* (1962), 72–129. *Histoire IF* (1982), p. 20.

of the new king was restored. Presently on his way home high courtiers accused Hermias of plotting against the king and with royal connivance dispatched him.

In 220 B.C. when Antiochus was still in the East Achaëus, instigated by the Alexandrian court, assumed at Laodicea ad Lycum the royal title and was intent to march on Antioch and seize Syria. In his calculations he counted on support from the disaffected Cyrrethians, but this plan proved vain in the face of unwillingness of his troops (as it was with Molon) to oppose their legitimate sovereign. In the meantime the Cyrrethians were attacked and for the most part exterminated, while the rest returned to loyalty. Since Achaëus was now checked in his designs Antiochus was free to give attention to the Egyptian frontier, where he met his disaster at Raphia in 217. Nevertheless he was able to secure Seleucia, held by the enemy since 246, which was not a small gain. The years 216–213 were devoted to the dealing with Achaëus, who still had partisans in Syria and even in Antioch.⁵⁰⁾ The apostate was captured, mutilated and executed in Sardis. Then in 212–205 follows the famous *anabasis*, which contributed so much to the king's self-esteem and to his reputation among his contemporaries.⁵¹⁾ In 204/3 he was in Caria, but I think not in Teos yet. In 200 follows the battle of Panium and the annexation ("reacquisition" from the official perspective) of southern Syria. Ca. 198 Antiochus probably invaded Attalid territories.⁵²⁾

The year 197/6, after many other coastal cities, brought his power to bear on Ilium. Smyrna, Alexandria Troas and Lampsacus, encouraged by Attalus and Romans obstinately refused liberation from Antiochus. As a member of the Ilia League Lampsacus had an indirect claim to "consanguinity" with the Trojan descendants in Rome. However in 196 the envoys of that city were unable to have recourse to Ilium for seconding their addresses to the Senate, but had to apply in a roundabout way to the less qualified Mas-silia instead. Some scholars have correctly concluded that the most obvious mediation, the one from Ilium, was at that time not available simply because that city was already in the hands of Antiochus. That deduced fact stood firm enough (cf. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 293), but now OGI 219 can be proffered as a concrete documentation and a decisive, if much belated, confirmation of this sagacious inference. Moreover, there can be no longer any doubt that Welles, RC42 (Frisch, *Iliion* 37) belongs to Antiochus III, and it is high time to stop copying question marks and repeating "perhaps" and "probably".⁵³⁾

L. 4–12. ἐξήτησε τὰς μὲν πόλεις τὰς κατὰν Σελευκίδα περιεχομένας ὑπὸ καιρῶν δυσχερῶν διὰ τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῶν πραγμάτων εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν εὐδαιμονίαν κατὰσῆσαι, τοὺς ἐπιθεμένους τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπεξελθὼν — —. The ἀποστάντες τῶν πραγμά-

⁵⁰⁾ See Polybius 8. 17. 10–11.

⁵¹⁾ Pol. 11. 34. 14–16: διὰ γὰρ ταύτης τῆς στρατείας ἄξιός ἔφανε τῆς βασιλείας οὐ μόνον τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην. Cf. Appian, *Syr.* 1.

⁵²⁾ Cf. e.g. E. Badian, "Rome and Antiochus the Great", now in his *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (1964; orig. 1959), p. 114–115. Similar ideas in H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen*, 85, 269–270; 273–276, who locates the area in the Hellespontine Phrygia. M. Holleaux, however, argued *Études III*, 33–335, for the attack on Pergamene kingdom only in connection with the expedition of 197 B.C.

⁵³⁾ The inscription fragment from Ilium relating to an oath taking is since 1975 a settled problem, not as Orth, p. 69, n. 84 still met it. It belongs to a treaty between Antiochus III and Lysimachia and contains not "einen Eid der Ilienser auf Antiochus III", but a reference to an oath of Antiochus for his partners. Some years ago this fragment had been luckily connected with a substantial new addition. Both together now in P. Frisch, *Iliion*, no. 45, but contested, see above, n. 24 (end).

των, the rebels against the legitimate royal authority are certainly Molon^{53a)} and Achaeus, including their parties, but οἱ ἐπιθέμενοι τοῖς πράγμασι, the conspirators against the realm, may also include Epigenes and Hermias, at least in the official version of the cause of their demise. The cities in the Seleucis, in North Syria, affected by the καιροὶ δυσχερεῖς and the rebellion are precisely those involved in the mutiny of the Cyrrhestan troops, which broke out at Apamea, the central military base of the Empire, and one of the four representative members (*tetrapolis*) always counted to Seleucis (Strabo XVI, C 750).

The situation was very grave because the mutineers were in communications with the insurgents in the East and in Asia Minor, of whom at least Achaeus⁵⁴⁾ was directly encouraged by the Egyptian prime minister Sosibius. Polybius (5. 50. 8) expresses himself in similar terms how much under the circumstances Antiochus was dispirited by the commotion (τὸ γεγονός κίνημα διὰ τὸν καιρόν). Book Five is full of references to the ἀπόστασις from the Empire. 41.1: Molon and Alexander are scheming to draw Achaeus into their already conceived plan of ἀφίστασθαι. 41.6: The Crown Council deliberates περὶ τῆς τοῦ Μόλωνος ἀποστάσεως. 42.1: Hermias charges Epigenes πολλὴν ἔφησεν αὐτὸν ἐπίβουλون (cf. ἐπιέμενοι) ὄντα καὶ προδότην τῆς βασιλείας — — — σπουδάζοντα μετ' ὀλίγων ἐγγχειρίσαι τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σῶμα τοῖς ἀποστάταις. 42.7: Ptolemy in a letter to Achaeus⁵⁵⁾ αὐτὸν παρακαλεῖ πραγμάτων ἀντιποιήσασθαι καὶ φησὶ καὶ χρήμασι χορηγήσειν πρὸς πάσας τὰς ἐπιβολάς, ἐὰν ἀναλάβῃ διάδημα καὶ φανερός γένηται πᾶσιν ἀντιποιοῦμενος τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἣν τοῖς πράγμασι ἔχειν αὐτὸν καὶ νῦν. 45.6: Hermias argued φήσας δεῖν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστάτας στρατηγούς πολεμεῖν, πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς αὐτὸν ποιεῖσθαι τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὰς ἐπιβολὰς καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν ὄλων ἀγῶνας. 50.8: Dissatisfaction of Cyrrhestans deteriorates into an open mutiny: οὗτοι δ' ἑστασίασαν καὶ σχεδὸν εἰς ἐξακισχιλίους ὄντες τὸν ἄριθμον ἀπέστησαν. 50.9: Hermias temporarily asserted himself against growing opposition: τοὺς μὲν φίλους διὰ τὸν φόβον, τὰς δὲ δυνάμεις διὰ τὴν εὐχρηστίαν ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν πεποιήμενος. N.B. the distinction and due credit to each of the partner elements of power in Hellenistic monarchies, the King, the Council of Friends, and the Troops in our lines 9, 15–16 and 44–45. The prominent role of the same is stressed in the decree for Antiochus III from Teos, where Antiochus ἐπεδήμησε — — — ἐν τῇ πόλει μετὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν ἀκολουθουσῶν αὐτῷ δυνάμεων and the city decided to honor him ἀκόλουθον τῇ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν [φίλων] εὐνοίαι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον καὶ τῇ παρ' ἡμῶν πρὸς τε τὸν βασι[λέα καὶ] τοὺς φίλους

^{53a)} Molon proclaimed himself king. See now Th. Fischer, *Molon und seine Münzen* (222–220 v. Chr.). Bochum, Brockmeyer, 1988 (Kl. Hefte der Münzsammlung RUB, 9).

⁵⁴⁾ Achaeus was a scion of the cadet branch of the Seleucid family, sprung from Achaeus, an obscure son of Seleucus Nicator. So Beloch, *GGIV*, 2, 204, but cf. G. Corradi, *Atene e Roma* 8 (1927), 221. The elder Achaeus appears in an inscription from 268/7 B.C. published by M. Wörle, *Chiron* 5 (1975), 59–60, but there is no indication of his relation to the ruling house. Cities were named after him, Strabo 11. 10. 1; Appian, *Syr* 57; Pliny 6. 48 (Beloch IV, 1, 257, n. 4). Some of the usurper's coins featured horse's head (one of the common devices of Seleucus I and Antiochus I) and the Seleucid anchor. Evidently he thus wished to emphasize the legitimacy of his claims. See Schmitt, *Untersuchungen* ..., 170, n. 2; 187 (10). Indeed, had he not declined the diadem in favor of Antiochus, he, rather than A., might have been the heir to the entire kingdom (Pol. 4. 48. 10). For illustrations see E. T. Newell, *WSM* (1941, repr. 1977), Pl. LX, 1–2; Ch. Seltman, *Greek Coins*² (1965), Pl. LII; and N. Davis–C. M. Kraay, *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: the Portrait Coins and History* (1973), no. 67. On the settlement of Sardis after his fall see now my study in *AJPh* 108, 707–728 (P. 727, better: Βασιλ[έα Ἀντίοχον βασιλέως Σελεύκου] | οἱ ἡγεμόνες μετὰ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοὺς στρατιω[τῶν, αἰ[ρ]έσεως ἔνεκεν καὶ ἀνδραγαθίας]. Cf. *OGI* 219, 2–3, 4, 34, 36–37).

⁵⁵⁾ Although considered a forgery by Polybius this letter was probably genuine. So H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen*, 161–164; cf. E. Will, *Hist.* II², 25.

αὐτοῦ ἐκτενεῖται.⁵⁶⁾ The same most probably followed in Iasus, *OGI*237, after the last remaining word: εἰ[τ]εν.

But in his success Antiochus was aided not only by his friends and armed forces but also by τὸ δαιμόνιον εὖνουν καὶ συνεργόν (line 10). That patron deity was the divine Providence in general, but above all Apollo, proclaimed it seems since Antiochus II, his grandfather's reign (*RC*22), and more consistently since the first years of his father Seleucus II (*OGI*212; *RC*22), as the divine ancestor of the royal house. That doctrine, now official, comes to the full expression in quite similar words at Iasus, *OGI*237, 5: ὁ τε θεὸς ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ γένους τῶν βασιλέων συνεγμεμαρτύρηκεν τῶν βασιλεῖ (cf. l. 10: συνεργόν)⁵⁷⁾

Resuming our analysis we pause at Polybius 5. 54. 13. End of the *Μόλωνος ἀπόστασις* and the subsequent *διόρθωσις καὶ κατάστασις* of the conditions there (cf. *OGI*219, 5, 12). 55.1: Expedition against Artabazanes and other dynasts ἵνα μήτε συγχορηγῇν μήτε συμπολεμῇν τολμῶσι τοῖς ἀποστάταις γινομένοις. 55.5: In the event of the king's death Hermias hopes κύριος ἔσεσθαι τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτός, i.e. he was in effect ἐπιθέμενος τοῖς πράγμασι. 56: Apollonophanes and other φίλοι, insecure from Hermias, win the king to a conspiracy against the chancellor's life. The danger to Antiochus and to his φίλοι is represented in 56.3, 6, 10. In 56.14 the king's πράξεις and ἐπιβολαί against Hermias win him general approbation. This was his full emancipation from tutors. 57. 2–4: During the king's absence

⁵⁶⁾ P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965), Block B, 22–24; 92–94, which I date to 197/6 B.C. The same triad appears in the decree for A. III, Engelmann – Merkelbach, *Erythrai* I, no. 30, 27–28, which I renumber and venture to restore: καὶ συνησθέντες αὐτῶι ἐπὶ τῶι ὑγαίνειν καὶ ὅτι τὰ λοιπὰ πράσσει κατὰ γ[νώμ]ην, αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ φίλοι καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις. (Cf. *OGI*219, 43–45). Lines 38–39 may be restored: νῦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος παραγενόμενος [μετὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους ὑπέσχετο τὴν δημοκρατίαν σ]υνδια[φύλλασσεν ἡμῖν. On all this see Habicht, "Herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenist. Monarchien", *Vierteljahrsschrift für Wirtschaftsgesch.* 45, 1 (1957). F. W. Walbank, *Hist. Comment. on Polybius I* (to 5. 50. 9) compares this passage with our inscription, although in its old chronological frame.

⁵⁷⁾ Recourse to divine help in time of crisis is a universal phenomenon in human race, especially in antiquity. Military leaders often claim to have a special relationship with deities. Alexander and Scipio believed or exploited this expectation to an unusual degree. Cf. H. Bengtson, *Kl. Schriften*, 411–415. Lesser figures did the same on more ordinary scale, cf. e.g. Plut., *Fab. Max.* 4; *Sert.* 11, 12, 24. The address of Scipio to troops before Zama, Pol. 15. 8. 2. belongs to military commonplaces.

All armies go to battle with their tutelary gods and trust to be favored by Yahweh Sebaoth, Athena Promachos, Michael Archangel, etc. Gods are partial to those who succeed, and success is a visible proof of righteousness of one's cause and of god's favor. Not only Antiochus could argue in that vein, but Messala does the same in his letter to Teos, R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents*, no. 34, 11–14 (note δαιμόνιον there). Like Antiochus, Flamininus also made an intense propaganda of divine collaboration. Cf. Plut., *Flam.* 22. 10b: καὶ θεοῦ συνεφαπτομένου. Still later Sulla Felix was a favorite of Fortuna, quite in the Hellenistic tradition. A. is now reassuring himself, his courtiers, his troops and partisans, because he knew he was on a dangerous course. As successes fortified confidence in divine help, misfortunes could easily provoke an ancient man to fear that the favor of deity had deserted him. Helplessness, irresolution, and superstitious despondency attended defeats of characters like Philip V, Antiochus, Perseus, Pompey, or even the stout Mithridates, all of whom perceived their setbacks as δαμονοβλάβεια. As Socrates before, A. enjoyed a close intimacy with his δαιμόνιον, but in bad fortune he felt the deity reversed himself and was determined to punish him. Cf. Appian, *Syr.* 28: νομίσας αὐτῶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐπιβουλεύειν. Cf. *ibid.* 29 and Pol. 21. 13. 2. On this Holleaux, *Études III*, 262–263. The Romans, on the contrary, were increasingly elated. Diod. 28. 3: τοιγαροῦν ὥσπερ ἀπὸ παραγραφῆς τῶν ἰδίων πράξεων ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἔωρον τὰς αὐτῶν βασιλείας (Ph. V and A. III) ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου προαγομένας, but the righteous Romans συμμάχους εἶχον τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν ἀπάσαις ταῖς ἐπιβολαῖς.

F. Cumont, *Les religions orient.*⁴ (1929), 262, n. 79, thought that Seleucids believed in Chaldean astrology with its strong emphasis on fatalism, but that should not be stressed for the earlier rulers, even if Berossus did write for A. I.

in Atropatene Achaeus advances with Egyptian support ἐλπίσας φθάσειν ἐμβάλων εἰς Συρίαν καὶ συνεργοῖς χρησάμενος Κυρρησταῖς ἀποστάταις γεγονόσι τοῦ βασιλέως ταχέως ἂν κρατῆσαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν πραγμάτων (cf. OGI219, 4–6). He marched on toward Syria (Pol. 57.7), but was obliged to turn back from Lycaonia. 58.2: Antiochus ἐνέδωκε τοῖς φίλοις διαβούλιον on the operations in Coele Syria. 66.3: He anxiously watches northern Syria σπεύδων δὲ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἀποσπᾶσθαι τῶν οἰκείων τόπων, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ Σελευκείᾳ ποιήσασθαι τὴν τῶν δυνάμεων παραχειμασίαν διὰ τὸ προφανῶς τὸν Ἀχαιὸν ἐπιβουλεύειν μὲν τοῖς σφετέροις πράγμασι, συνεργεῖν δὲ τοὺς περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον ὁμολογούμενως (cf. OGI219, 7). 67. 13: Achaeus protected by Egypt proves a stumbling block in peace negotiations. Ἀντίοχος δὲ καθάπαξ οὐδὲ λόγον ἠνείχετο περὶ τούτων, δεινὸν ἡγούμενος τὸ καὶ τολμᾶν τὸν Πτολεμαῖον περιστέλλειν τοὺς ἀποστάτας καὶ μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι περὶ τίνος τῶν τοιούτων. 87. 2: After Raphia Antiochus ἐφοβεῖτο δὲ τὸν Ἀχαιὸν μὴ συνεπίθῃται τοῖς καιροῖς. 8. After the peace treaty Antiochus resumes his plan against Achaeus. 8. 17. 10: Achaeus besieged in Sardis is thinking of escape and of a clandestine appearance in Syria to start uprising there, while the king was still at Sardis. He counted on support and popularity (μεγάλη ἀποδοχή) in Antioch, Coele Syria and Phoenicia. Quite explicit is also the parallel to our lines 3–8 in *Pomp. Trog. Prol. 30: Transitus deinde ad res Antiochi qui post regnum acceptum persecutus defectores in Mediam Molonem, in Asiam Achaeum, quem obsedit Sardibus, pacata superiore Asia Bactris tenus in bella Romana descendit.*

But those were not the only ἀποστάται with whom Antiochus had dealt successfully before his latest enterprises beyond the Taurus. The whole eastern expedition of 212–205 had an ostensible purpose to win back the provinces lost under his predecessors, and here Antiochus' gains were more impressive than solid, but although not a complete success it was in a sense a "restoration of the ancestral kingdom". The recalcitrant rulers of Parthia and Bactria and an Indian prince were forced to offer at least a token submission as vassals of Antiochus, who now became a Great King, presiding over a loose conglomerate. Appian, *Syr.* 1 stresses this achievement: ἐσβαλὼν ἐς Μηδίαν τε καὶ Παρθυηνὴν καὶ ἕτερα ἔθνη ἀφιστάμενα ἔτι πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα δράσας, καὶ μέγας Ἀντίοχος ἀπὸ τοῦδε κληθεὶς — — — καὶ μικρὸν οὐδὲν ἐνθυμούμενος κτλ.

From his dealings with Euthydemus we know very well that "apostasy" was the formal charge levelled against the rulers of the states (officially "satraps") formed at the expense of the Seleucid satrapies. Euthydemus faced the accusation by replying resolutely that he was by no means a rebel against the legitimate sovereign, but that he himself had won Bactria by destroying rebels. Pol. 11. 34. 2: γεγονέναι γὰρ οὐκ ἀποστάτην τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων ἀποστάντων ἐπανελῶμενος τοὺς ἐκείνων ἐκγόνους οὕτως κρατῆσαι τῆς Βακτριανῶν ἀρχῆς. Similar arguments were probably proffered by the Parthian Arsaces. Cf. Strabo 11. 9. 2: Νεωτερισθέντων δὲ τῶν ἔξω τοῦ Ταύρου διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἄλλοις εἶναι τοὺς τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Μηδίας βασιλέας τοὺς ἔχοντας καὶ ταῦτα, πρῶτον μὲν τὴν Βακτριανὴν ἀπέστησαν οἱ πεπιστευόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἔγγυσ αὐτῆς πᾶσαν, οἱ περὶ Εὐθύδημον. Appian, *Syr.* 48: Παρθυαῖοι τε προαποστάντες ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Σελευκίδων ἀρχῆς. 65: καὶ Παρθυαῖοι τῆς ἀποστάσεως τῆς τότε ἦρξαν (against Seleucus II) ὡς τεταραγμένης τῆς τῶν Σελευκίδων ἀρχῆς. Justinus echoes the same theme, 41. 4. 5: *Quod exemplum* (of Bactria) *secuti totius Orientis populi a Macedonibus defecere.* And 9: *Arsaces cum Seleuco* (II) *rege, ad defectores persequendos veniente, congressus victor fuit.*⁵⁸⁾ Antiochus III made a prompt settlement with

⁵⁸⁾ Actually it was not Arsaces who initiated the defection, but the rebel governor Andragoras, who still under Antiochus II had detached Parthylene from the Seleucid dominions. See the references in E. Will, *Histoire ...* I² (1979), 287–288.

the successor of his father's adversary (Just. 41. 5. 7). Cf. also Plut., *Cato Maior* 12. 2: A.III *τὴν γὰρ Ἀσίαν ὅσῃν ὁ νικᾶτωρ Σέλευκος εἶχεν ὀλίγον δεῖν ἅπασαν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνεληφώς, ἔθνη τε παμπόλλα καὶ μάχμα βαρβάρων ὑπήκοα πεποιοῦμενος*. All this counted as his great effort to *ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχήν*.

It is clear that these extensive coincidences between the inscription (supported by other inscriptions of A.III) and the text of Polybius with later historians (some ultimately deriving from him) are so vivid as to render the identity of the facts incontestable. Even if one wished to subject this conclusion to an additional test and look for possible discrepancies they would not be easy to detect. At most a question might be raised whether the disturbances caused in northern Syria by dissatisfied soldiers really coincide with the area of the Seleucis in the inscription. Polybius, following an unusually well informed source, speaks of the first troubles in Apamea, then of Cyrrhestans, Syria, Phoenicia, Apamea, Seleucia and Antioch, as all looming large in the plans of Achaeus. Thus we are allowed to infer that the mutiny was wide-spread, but mainly confined to the localities of northern Syria, where everyone agrees Seleucis was situated.⁵⁹) However this may be, it is a curious fact that in the text of the Achaean historian, as we now have it, the name Seleucis does not occur, although in the preserved portions there was no lack of opportunity to employ it.

In historical geography this term offers a number of difficulties, which for the purpose at hand it will not be necessary to tackle more exhaustively.⁶⁰) It is natural enough to think that, even if not actually attested for his reign, the name may have existed already under Seleucus I, when he first acquired that region after Ipsus, signifying something like "the country of Seleucus". After the redating of the here discussed inscription, OGI 229, from the beginning of the reign of Seleucus II Callinicus, represents our oldest testimony. Obviously the name must have been current at least as far back as Antiochus II. The decree of Ilium now takes the second place chronologically, but the region, although not explicitly named, is no doubt implied also in the decree for Antiochus III from Teos, where the three cities of that "tetrapolis": Antioch on the Orontes, Seleucia in Pieria, and Laodicea on the Sea, are granted a *sympoliteia* with Teos. The motive invoked was to honor the king for whom these are *ἐπώνυμοι πόλεις τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως προγόνων*; among them, however, Apamea is conspicuously absent.⁶¹) If this omission was deliberate I wonder if the explanation may not lie in the disgrace for siding with the mutiny over twenty years ago, rather than in the obscure matters of the "ancestor policy", as has been suggested. In any case we note that not only in Teos, but also at Ilium, the local formulators of decrees were well aware that Seleucis, the heart of the kingdom, was prominent in the royal concerns.

Due to somewhat confused nature of our sources the question of the tetrapolis in Seleu-

⁵⁹) I assume that meant *Σελευκίς χώρα*, or *γῆ*, rather than *Σελευκίς Συρία*, or *μερίς*, as Musti (p. 64) would elicit from Strabo 16. 2. 2, regardless of whether the name derives from Seleucus oder Seleucia. The formation of territorial names derived from the owner city in -ia, -is, where *χώρα* is implied whenever the name is not yet fully substantivized, is extremely common: Ilias, Samia, Prienis, Pedasis, Megaris, etc. Plut., *Demet.* 47. 2 for Cilicia: *τῆς χώρας οὐσης ὑπὸ Σελεύκου τότε* suggests that the king's name may be the true etymon for the whole country. The territory of Seleucia may of course be also named on the familiar pattern, but that may have no bearing on the question of the larger Seleucis. These points do not seem to be sufficiently differentiated by Musti.

⁶⁰) The discussion and references in A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*² (Oxford 1971), p. 241–242 and n. 21; also D. Musti, *Studi class. e orient.* 15 (1966), p. 61–81, which now should be read with all the necessary reservations about the inscriptions being redated. Cf. H. Seyring, *Syria* 47 (1970), 290–311. Clear outline maps contributed by G. Tchalenko, but the extent of the Seleucis toward the north is not indicated.

⁶¹) Block IID, 90–104. Commentary *ibid.*, p. 79–84.

cis and of the original extension of the satrapies in northern Syria is debated, but the best authorities tend to agree that the four satrapies of Strabo (cf. *RC* 70, 7) cannot be coextensive with the original administrative divisions of the Seleucis. On this essential point W. Otto, A. H. M. Jones and D. Musti, all of whom appear to have studied the question with care, are in complete agreement. Seleucis in the wider sense would embrace all the northern Syria from Amanus, –perhaps including Commagene–southwards. Even if other scholars object that Commagene should be excluded, most seem to agree that Cyrrhestica was comprised.⁶²⁾ In any event, whether or not Cyrrhestica should be counted as a part of the larger Seleucis, the disturbances did begin in Seleucis (Apamea) and spread to the neighboring districts of north Syria, i.e. they were largely confined to Seleucis.⁶³⁾

This settled, I should not bypass this opportunity without throwing a mite to the vexed question of Cappadocia Seleucis in Appian, *Syriaca* 55. There should be little doubt that such a country never existed and the whole matter rests on a slight textual corruption (the possibility Musti considered, but without adjudication), probably committed by Appian or his copyists, if not already by A.'s source. Instead of *καὶ τῆς Καππαδοκίας τῆς Σελευκίδος λεγομένης* we should read *καὶ τῆς Καππαδοκίας καὶ τῆς Σελευκίδος λεγομένης*. This was in fact the text emendation already proposed by Th. Sokoloff, and I believe it is good, even if his location at Seleucia on the Euphrates is indeed unthinkable.⁶⁴⁾ The argumentation relies mainly on the fact that while the Syrian Seleucis is well known from both literary and epigraphical sources, and confirmed by later numismatic evidence, that "Cappadocian Seleucis", or "Seleucid Cappadocia" is as a fixed geographical name an isolated anomaly known only to Appian, and is difficult to explain. Why should we have two districts under the same rule in such a close proximity (but apparently not contingent, if Commagene be not counted to Seleucis), designated by a common denominator and yet kept apart? To be sure there are somewhat analogous cases, such as that of Cilicia and the Cappadocian prefecture of Cilicia, but those names apparently go back to a common ethnic background and do not occur in the same kingdom. In any event the situation is different with names of old, but divided by state boundaries, historical regions. Within the confines of the same kingdom similarly named and recently created districts or provinces, would be certain to cause serious administrative problems. It is difficult to perceive any reason, or advantage, in such a nomenclature. Furthermore Appian's enumeration is neither systematic nor complete, and in general his reputation as accurate historian is not above suspicion. Nor is there any objection to the emendation in the fact that the Syrian

⁶²⁾ This assumption derives primarily from Strabo 16. 2. 8 (C 751) and from the designation of Nicopolis, a city in Cyrrhestica, as *τῆς Σελευκίδος* on Imperial coins. Likewise Ptolemy 5. 15. 15 counts Gephyra, Gindarus and Imma to Seleucis, and Strabo considers Gindarus to be the "acropolis" of Cyrrhestica. Cf. W. Otto, *Beiträge* (BAW, 1928), p. 38, n. 3; Jones *CERE*², p. 450, n. 21; Musti, *op. cit.*, p. 64; 80.

⁶³⁾ See Bevan, *House of Sel. I*, 218 on the basis of Pol. 5. 57. 4. When Achaeus contemplated invasion of Syria he was counting on support of the Cyrrhestans. After crossing the Amanus Cyrrhestica would be the first region on his way, Plut., *Demet.* 48. 6. The whole country was thickly settled with military colonies.

⁶⁴⁾ See on this D. Musti, *op. cit.*, p. 65, n. 8. We cannot consider here the question what and when Seleucus obtained in Cappadocia. Cf. Bevan, *op. cit.*, I, Appendix D, p. 323; Th. Reinach, *Mithridates Eupator*, deutsch von A. Goetz (Leipzig 1895), p. 25, n. 2; E. T. Newell, *WSM*, p. 239. Diodorus says that Cappadocia was soon able to assert her independence during the contest between Antigonos and Seleucus (31. 19. 5. Cf. 20. 113. 4). Cataonia was held by S. in 286 B.C., Plut., *Demet.* 48. 1. One may understand the logic of viewing this part of Cappadocia as "Seleucid", but such a name is nowhere else attested, and the confusion with the other Seleucis would be intolerable.

Seleucis would be already included in the sweep *τῆς μετ' Εὐφράτην Συρίας ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ*. In the passage taken as a whole Appian is not keeping to any particular order, thus for example Phrygia is also mentioned twice.

It is remarkable, however, that Strabo (16. 2. 2) also uses a similar participle as Appian: *τὴν τε Κομμαγενὴν καὶ τὴν Σελευκίδα καλουμένην τῆς Συρίας*, and again Eustathius reproduces exactly Appian's qualification: *Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι μερὶς ἐστὶ Συρίας ἀρίστη ἢ λεγομένη Σελευκίς*.⁶⁵ It transpires that it was an established habit of geographers and historians to call by such participles the reader's attention to the name, especially when anticipated to be unfamiliar, but inasmuch as this stylistic device was very much in use we cannot press these coincidences beyond a certain point.⁶⁶ Evidently this distinguishing participle belongs habitually to the Syrian Seleucis, but it would be no less proper to many other names, whenever the writer felt necessary to add an explanation "the so-called", "as they call it", or "as it is called". In a long string of enumerative conjunctions one *καὶ* might have been easily omitted and, since the result raises no immediate questions of comprehension or syntax, it has been passed on unnoticed. The whole seemed to accord well enough with the familiar type of geographic names where a qualifying adjective sets apart a limited area from a larger country, to mention only Media Atropatene, Cilicia Aspera, Cappadocia Pontica, Syria Palaestina, Gallia Narbonensis, or Mauretania Tingitana.⁶⁷

I believe we have in Eustathius *Commentarii* yet another and a very much similar case where *καὶ* has been omitted twice.⁶⁸ Instead of *Κομμαγενὴ Καππαδοκία* ("Commagenian Cappadocia"?) and in the same passage *Κομμαγενὴν Καππαδοκίαν* it is clear that we ought to insert *καὶ* as a diaeresis between the two countries, obviously confused in Byzantine learning, or in the text transmission. The latter sentence should read: *Σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι περὶ τὴν Κομμαγενὴν (καὶ τὴν) Καππαδοκίαν καὶ ἡ Μελιτηνὴ κεῖται, καὶ τὸ λεγόμενον Ἀμανὸς ὄρος*. If we now turn to the text of Dionysius Periegeta⁶⁹ we find in the verse 877 an announcement of a description to follow: *Κομμαγενῶν ἔδος, Συρίης τε πόλεις*.⁷⁰ Yet the text goes on to describe the cities of Syria, but makes no further mention of Cappadocia. Therefore it appears that Commagene described in terms of Cappadocia is the learned bishop's own elaboration, in which the necessary *καὶ* has been omitted. But Dionysius in fact uses *τε* to keep Commagene distinct from the rest of Syria. Strictly speaking in a work which was a kind of a *periplus* no detailed mention of inland regions was necessary, but Dionysius had used for his work sources from the time of Augustus when a king of Cappadocia, Archelaus, ruled also over Cilicia Aspera, which fact may have contributed to a later extension of the name Cappadocia, similar to what happened with the Galatians of the St. Paul's Epistle.

If we now combine the data from Strabo, Appian and Eustathius we see that geographi-

⁶⁵ See Eustathii *Commentarii*, ad lineam 921, in K. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores II* (1861).

⁶⁶ In various *horothesia*, descriptions, or references to geographical elements, the participles *λεγόμενος*, *καλούμενος*, *προσηγορεύμενος*, *ὠνομαζόμενος*, *ἐπικληθεὶς*, and others of the same sense, recur with great frequency in almost any kind of text (e.g. Polybius, Diodorus). Cf. e.g. Holleaux, *Études II*, 180, 14: *Μυσίας τῆς καλουμένης Ἀββατιδος*.

⁶⁷ With the problem of Cappadocia and Seleucis in Appian, *Syr.* 55 may be compared the same author's *Mithrid.* 117: *Παλαιστίνης δὲ ἡ νῦν Σελευκίς*, manifestly another corrupt passage. Cf. on this A. Dreihzehnter, *Chiron* 5 (1975), 220–221, notes 46–49.

⁶⁸ Eustathii *Commentarii* in Müller, *GGM II* (1861), ad l. 877.

⁶⁹ A geographic versifier at the time of Hadrian, to whom Eustathius wrote his *Commentaries*.

⁷⁰ Dionysii *Orbis descriptio*, *GGM II*, l. 877 (p. 158).

cal descriptions, no matter whence they depart, tend to pause either in Cappadocia or in Cilicia, before turning to Commagene, Seleucis, or Syria in general. In the same paragraph Eustathius also mentions Seleucis, and he amplifies that some divide Syria into five parts: Commagene, Seleucis, Coele Syria, Phoenicia, and Judaea. In the excerpts from Memnon of Heraclea, where it is stated that after the peace of Apamea Antiochus III ruled over Commagene, Syria and Judaea,⁷¹⁾ we find another indirect confirmation that Commagene belonged to the countries of Syrian, rather than of Cappadocian, description. Thus we can to an extent control and correct both Appian and Eustathius by Strabo and Dionysius and this, I suppose, frees us for good from “Cappadocia Seleucis”.

L. 12–16. The fact that Memnon (*Fr. Gr. Hist.* 434. 9. 1) also uses the designation ἐπὶ τὰδε τοῦ Ταύρου does not prove anything for Antiochus I because this geographic term was used indiscriminately for many generations, as is well attested.⁷²⁾ Naturally the complementary opposition was “the other side of the Taurus”, τὰ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ταύρου. The expression compares with the decree from Teos⁷³⁾ in *Anadolu* 9 (1965), p. 34, 8–11: καὶ πρότερόν τε ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ταύρου πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐγένετο παραίτιος ἡμῖν καὶ παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς καθ’ ἡμᾶς τόπους ἀποκατέστησε τὰ πράγματα εἰς τὴν συμφέρουσαν κατάστασιν. That was, as already noted, a polite manner of saying that having appeared with a strong army and fleet the king is successfully confirming, or re-establishing Seleucid supremacy in the seaboard places on his way. All this happened partly spontaneously, or under various forms of pressure, persuasion, and promises by royal plenipotentiaries, sent beforetime to prepare the reception (παρουσία, ἐπιδημία) of the king with the entire court and the armed forces.⁷⁴⁾ The news alone about the armed progress of the expected visitors usually proved persuasive enough, and only in few cases proper welcome had to be preceded by a show of force. Sometimes the final arrangements before the “advent”, and “sojourn” were worked out with the city delegation invited to appear at the court by previous letters and envoys.⁷⁵⁾

The natural result of such procedures in this single-minded program is that, however much the understandings reached with individual cities might vary, they still tend to fol-

⁷¹⁾ F. Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hist.*, 434. 18. 5, and 9.

⁷²⁾ E.g. *OGI* 229, 2, 13; Polybius (B.-W.), index s.v. Ταῦρος. In Latin it was *Asia cis Taurum*, or *Asia intra finem Tauri montis* (Just. 27. 2. 6); the other side being *ultra Tauri iuga* (Livy 37. 53. 25).

⁷³⁾ I date the acquisition of Teos, together with Ilium, *eodem anno* 197/6, against Herrmann's more problematic 204/3 B.C. This takes care of Orth's scruples, p. 68. See above, n. 32.

⁷⁴⁾ Cf. Livy 33. 20. 7: royal envoys are dispatched to Rhodes to announce *adventum regis* (probably “in these regions” generally, rather than to Rhodes specifically). See Livy 33. 29.7 for the Roman view of *in Asiam adventus eius* (i.e. in A. Minor). Orth, p. 48, n. 19, misses the whole point of the *παρουσία*, the expected royal arrival in state to Ilium. At the time under consideration Antiochus might have been staying at Ephesus. Certainly his envoys would not be “ordered about” to participate in exclusive civic ceremonies, as Orth, p. 44, n. 3, protests. That was in fact a courteous invitation and a very high distinction expected and sanctioned by a universal and long-standing custom for important and friendly envoys and *theoroi*.

⁷⁵⁾ Cf. Teos, Block B, 21: ἐπιστεῖλας δὲ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ὑπέλαβε δεῖν πέμψαι [πρὸς] αὐτὸν πρεσβείαν ἢ συνλαλήσει περὶ ὧν ἔρη πεπεισθαι καὶ τῷ δήμ[ω] συμ[φέρειν]. For such prearranged “talks” and negotiations by letters with city representatives cf. RC 9, 3–4 (the extant names I take for sons of A. III); RC 15 (A. III): ὧν συλλελαλήκαμεν; *OGI* 237 (Iasus): γέγραφε πλεονάκις τῷ δήμῳ. The second column of the new inscription from Iasus (*Annuario* 45–46, p. 447) begins with the end of a clause providing for sending out an embassy, or listing its members by names, which I believe can be restored: καὶ τὸν δεῖνα] Ἀριστολόχ[ου ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῇ συμφερόντων τῷ βασι]λεῖ διαλεξόμενος. Whether the letter to Ilium, RC 42 (Frisch, *Ilion*, 37) preceded or followed the *παρουσία* cannot be determined on the currently available evidence.

low certain models. Ilium belongs to the category of cities won over by an advance embassy (l. 21). This must have occurred still in the fall of 197 B.C. Recognizing the inevitable many cities tried to make the best out of their submission and often made direct appeal for a favorable treatment, spelled out in a variety of formulae or more concrete expressions. Thus the Erythraeans pleaded pathetically, *RC* 15, 10–12: *φιλικῶς αὐτοῖς διακεῖσθαι καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήκουσι συναυξέειν τὰ τῆς πόλεως*. Not infrequently the liberator king made promises in the same terms, cf. e.g. *RC* 42 (treated below here, p. 47f.), or *Anadolu* 9, p. 42, 14–16. But these were very elastic phrases of which many uses could be made, as in *OGI* 219, 33. Only enemies of Antiochus had a bad name for all these arrangements, but needless to say any adverse sentiments in the affected cities had a chance to come to a public expression only when new liberators appeared.

L. 16–20. *ὅπως οὖν ὁ δῆμος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρότερόν τε, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν παρέλαβεν τὴν βασιλείαν, εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας κτλ.* Ilium is anxiously reviewing the past, scanning for any events which it might be now advantageous to bring out in dealing with the new situation. The Attalid connection, formed at an earlier period, is passed over in silence. In Teos the gracious benefactor Antiochus could be expressly contrasted with the ruthless fiscal exactor Attalus, but not before the liberating “sojourn” was already the fact. We may recall that, like many other cities in this region, Ilium had been first acquired by Attalus I from Antiochus Hierax. After the death of Seleucus II and his elder son Seleucus III it was Achaeus who quickly drove the Pergamenian dynast back and re-established the Seleucid authority. It was probably under such circumstances that the news of accession of Antiochus III were relayed to Ilium. Thereupon, as an expression of loyalty, it was understood that public ceremonies for the *παράληψις τῆς βασιλείας* would be appropriate.

Ilium was not the only place where such solemnities were held for the occasion, when loyalty to the Seleucid house needed to be publically reaffirmed. C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence*, p. 279, printed a small, poorly preserved and inadequately treated fragment from the Carian Hieracome, which, as the new honors are being decreed for Antiochus (presumably the Third), makes also an allusion to similar honors once voted on his accession, just as at Ilium. Since the whole is constructed on the basis of very much used formulaic material I think it is amenable to this restoration:

--- --- --- ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ πρότερόν]
 τε καλῶς ἐτιμήθη διὰ ταῦ[τα καθ' ὃν καιρὸν παρέλαβεν]
 τὴν πάτριον βα[σι]λείαν καὶ [νῦν ἔδοξε στεφανῶσαι αὐ-]
 τὸ[ν] στεφάνῳ [τε χρυσῶν ἀριστείῳ καὶ εἰκόνι χρυσοῦ?]
 4 σκήπτρον ἐχούσῃ κο[σμήσαι, καὶ θυσίαν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ]
 συντελεῖν καθ' ἑ[κ]αστον ἐνιαυτὸν τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ]
 [τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ εὐχὰς ποιήσασθαι καὶ τὰλλα νομιζό-]
 μενα δι[ιεξάγειν καὶ πομπεύειν καὶ βασιλεῖα Ἀντίο-]
 8 χον [τιμῆσαι πάσαις ταῖς προσηκούσαις τιμαῖς ---]

It would be out of place and much too involved and tedious to give here a detailed exposition of parallels and a full rationale for this restored text. For the purpose of this commentary it will be sufficient to say that it has very close affinity with a numerous class of honorific inscriptions in general and, in some other respects, with those of Antiochus III in particular, especially *OGI* 219, 16–21, 25–30.

But in 220 when Achaeus severed his allegiance to Antiochus the city of Ilium became thus detached once more, and in 218 Attalus was able to confirm there his own authority

at the expense of the usurper.⁷⁶) In 216 with the help of Alexandria Troas Ilium repelled an attack of the Aegosagae Galatians.⁷⁷) When Antiochus entered with Attalus into an understanding against their common foe (*κοινοπραγία*) the ally's encroachments in the Hellespontine region must have been tolerated as a *fait accompli*, even after 213, especially since no real alternatives seemed possible for the time being. In the peace of Phoenice in 205 Ilium may well have been adscribed to the treaty as Pergamene ally.⁷⁸) Hence it seems that immediately before 197 Ilium had been effectively in the Pergamene orbit of influence. Along with Teos it could be among those cities which a few years later Antiochus offered to restore to Eumenes as a price for his cooperation, or neutrality, in the approaching Roman war.

It is not clear when the priesthood for Antiochus was invested (most probably without a temple), and whether it continued without a lapse under Attalus. More likely this installation was one of the very first acts after the last changeover to Antiochus. In Teos a priest of Antiochus is also mentioned, but as in Ilium only on the occasion when his public appearance is called for (Block II, 13). At any rate it is extremely improbable that such priesthoods could have been established under Attalus, but once in existence they might have been tolerated. The Ilians were able to recall their good relations with the king's father Seleucus II, whose presence both in the Troad generally and in Ilium particularly (wrongly negated by some scholars) is sufficiently well attested by coins and inscriptions.

In this context an earlier Roman contact with Seleucus and a concern for local descendants of their common Trojan ancestors ca. 245–240 B.C. is perfectly *conceivable as a historical possibility*, although so hotly denied by Holleaux and certain other scholars. Of

⁷⁶) Polybius 5. 77. 78. Niese, *GGMS* II, 642, thought that since 220 Antiochus left Attalus free hand in the Hellespontine area when they both faced the common enemy Achaeus, and that after the death of Attalus in 197 the Seleucid king meant to resume his rights there. A dated inscription found near Balıkesir in Mysia shows that in 209 B.C. Antiochus must have held some land in that region. See H. Malay, *Ep. Anat.* 10 (1987), 7–15. The edition would stand improvements.

⁷⁷) Polybius 5. 111. 2f.

⁷⁸) Without having studied this question in depth I confess to some reluctance about outright rejection of the historicity of this adscription, but Ch. Habicht, *Studien zur Gesch. Athens in hellenist. Zeit*, Göttingen 1982 (Hypomnemata, 73), p. 138–142, again pronounces vigorously for the deletion of Ilium and Athens from the list of the *adscripti*, essentially with no new arguments. Yet by 197 B.C. the *syngeneia* was an incontestable historical fact, from which practical political consequences were drawn. It was on this ground that Lampsacus asked for adscription to the peace treaty with Philip, *Syll.* 591, 63–65. It is true that in those few intervening years the face of the Mediterranean world had been changed very profoundly, but would it be so revolutionary to assume the currency of similar ideas in 205 B.C.? Ilium was at that time under protection of Attalus and like Lampsacus it was not in a state of war with Philip. For such purposes Ilium was as “sovereign” in “international law” as were Ukraine and Belorussia voting in the United Nations. In 195 Flamininus consciously boasted, in his two Delphian dedications, of his own descent from Aeneas, *Plut., Tit.* 12. If we believe anything at all about the *vetus epistula* in Suetonius, *Vita Claudii*, such notions could have been well in the air already under Seleucus II. See the conspectus and references in H. Schmitt, *Staatsvertr. III*, p. 283–284. The Trojan consanguinity was officially recognized by Rome in the dedition of Segesta, 262 B.C. Of course the importance of that fact should not be exaggerated in the light of later development of the legend, but rather taken in the vast context of traditional, often patently impossible, *συγγενεια* of the Greek world. Cf. F. P. Rizzo, *Studi ellenist.-romani* (Palermo, 1974), 15–43. The assumption of continuous Attalid control before 197 reduces the number of changeovers, which perplexed Orth, p. 68–69. The peripeties of many cities (to mention only Athens in the 3rd cent., or Lysimachia in the decades preceding the peace of Apamea) demonstrate vividly enough that frequent changes of affiliation with monarchies and other foreign powers was nothing unusual for the period under discussion.

Die Kontrolle bei dem Zensus hieß anderseits offiziell „Epikrisis“¹⁾, und die Schätzung selbst wurde demgemäß öfters als „Epikrisis“ bezeichnet.²⁾ Das Ergebnis der Epikrisis wie die Bezeichnung *ἐπικριμένος* u. dgl. wurde seinerseits nur in den Zensusakten angegeben (vgl. § 10). Der Zusammenhang zwischen beiden Prüfungen ist somit unverkennbar. Die ägyptische Epikrisis stellte nur eine Ergänzungskontrolle der Zensusakten dar, die zwischen den Schätzungen für bestimmte Bevölkerungsgruppen vorgenommen wurde.³⁾ Das bestätigt jetzt Lond. 1600b (s. Beilage), wo der Deklarant ausführt: [δ]ηλῶ ἐμὲ ἐπικρίσθαι τῇ κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφῇ . . . συναπογεγραμμένῃ καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἐπικρινομένου μητρὸς. Damit findet seine Erklärung auch der an sich befremdliche Umstand, daß die Epikrisis in verschiedenen Gauen zu verschiedener Zeit eingeführt wurde: 54/5 in Arsinoe⁴⁾, 64/5 in Hermupolis⁵⁾, 72/3 für die „vom Gymnasium“ in Oxyrhynchos.⁶⁾ Das wird durch lokale Verhältnisse bedingt sein, wie die ägyptische Epikrisis überhaupt nicht vom Präfekten, sondern durch die Strategen jedesmal angeordnet wurde.

7. Οἱ ἀπὸ μητροπόλεως.

Eine solche Anordnung ist auf einem unedierten Straßburger Papyrus (Gr. 185) erhalten, den ich hier nach Wilckens (vorläufiger) Kopie verwenden möchte.⁷⁾

Ἀντώνιος Πτολεμαῖος στρατηγὸς Ἑρμοπολ(ίτου).

Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως εἰς τοὺς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα-
εἰς προσβαίνοντες ἀφήλικες ἐν [. ὁμοίως]⁸⁾
καὶ <οἱ> ἀπὸ τάγματος τοῦ γυμνασίου εἰ[.] ἐ-
5 πικρίνεσθαι, εἰ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γονέων [τὸ μητροπ]-
λιτικὸν γένος σώξουσιν, οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ γυμ[νασίου, εἰ] ἀ-
π' αὐτοῦ τοῦ τάγματος εἰσι. Πρὸς τὴν []
τούτων ἀναγκαι[ό]τατον ἔ[σ]ται καὶ α[ὑπ] ἀν-
δρῶν ἀξιοχρεὼν γενέσθαι ἐτῶν ο . [].

Vom Rest sind nur einzelne Buchstaben erhalten.

1) BGU II 484 (Arsin. 201/2): διάστωμα πρὸς ἐπικρίσιν κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφῆς. Vgl. Bad. 75b: die Eidesformel beim Zensus: μηδὲ τινα ἀντιπαραστή(σαι) τῇ ἐπικρίσει.

2) Ostr. Brux. 14 (J. 33); Hamb. 60 (J. 90); Lond. III 915 Verso (J. 160); Mitt. Chr. 91 c. I l. 21 (II. Jahrh.). Zu Wilck. Chr. 218 l. 31 (J. 132) vgl. Groningen a. a. O. 133.

3) Vgl. Wilcken, Grundz. 201.

4) P. M. Meyer, Heerwesen (1900) 116 ff. Wessely, Stud. Pal. IV p. 61.

5) Amh. 75; Ryl. 102 l. 30.

6) Oxy. II 257; X 1266; XII 1452; PSI V 457

7) Zit. schon Wilcken, Grundz. 200.

8) ὁμοίως und <οἱ> von mir ergänzt.

νοὺς testifies irrefutably against Seleucus I in *OGI* 212, so can ἀδελφή βασίλισσα be now singled out as one incontrovertible proof that *OGI* 219 cannot belong to Antiochus I. This is indeed the litmus paper of our inscription. In 1966 Louis Robert wrote probably without the immediate knowledge of the new finds from Teos (published only in 1967) and from Iasus (published 1969). But it would not be wrong to say that, although this new accession of information is so supremely important, it was not an absolute *conditio sine qua non* for the correct solution of the problem. Unfortunately the way led through the *silva horrida* of the tradition and the best scholar of our present generation was content to leave the matters relatively at rest, and died in 1985 without another comment on the question.⁸¹⁾ The discovery of the Nehavend exemplar of the edict of Antiochus III from 193 B.C. was already begging (or should have been) some urgent questions.

Although the words ἀδελφή, ἀδελφός came to be regarded at many Hellenistic courts as honorific titles for the queen and for the king in relation to each other, but especially for the queen, originally it was more than a title. As in many other languages, in Greek the terms “brother”, “sister” may in fact include further blood relationship, even more distant cousins.⁸²⁾ Linguistically the first precedent of Arsinoe II and Ptolemy II needs no comment, but even the next Ptolemaic ἀδελφή βασίλισσα and her *frater* cannot yet be cited for proof that this has become now a pure metaphor. Since Berenice II was the daughter of Magas of Cyrene and of Apama, daughter of Antiochus I, the pair were in fact not too distant relations. Magas in turn was the son of Berenice I from her previous marriage before she met Ptolemy Soter. This Berenice was thus the common grandmother of Ptolemy III and Berenice II, i.e. the couple were in reality cousins.⁸³⁾ Even Cleopatra Syra, daughter of Antiochus III, and Ptolemy V, often adduced as ultimate proof of merely conventional use of the word in question, are also a false example because this royal couple were likewise related, as both of them traced their descent partly to Antiochus I, grandfather of the heroine of the *Coma Berenices*, who in her turn was the grandmother of Ptolemy V.⁸⁴⁾ If Beloch and the consensus are right that the elder Achaeus was a younger son of Seleucus I (and not a more distant relative) at least two cases of cousin marriages had occurred in the Seleucid dynasty before Antiochus III. The first pair would be Antiochus II and Laodice I, daughter of Achaeus the Elder,⁸⁵⁾ and the next one Seleucus II and Laodice II, daughter of Andromachus, son of Achaeus the Elder. Still we find nothing of any ἀδελφή in the sources for those times. Superfluous to emphasize, by the time of Antiochus the Great all the major Hellenistic dynasties were related to each other, and Antiochus was related not

⁸¹⁾ The incidental references to “des sacrifices pour Antiochos I^{er} (*OGI* 219, 32)”, *BCH* 109 (1985), 480, republished in his *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1987), 534, simply reflect the position once taken, but without new thinking.

⁸²⁾ Cf. however Abraham and Sara, Isaac and Rebecca. In later Hellenistic times it might be a title of almost common courtesy, as e.g. in *Tobit*, passim. In 6. 19 ἀδελφή clearly means “kinswoman”, but in 7. 12; 15; 84 ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή means man and wife, yet in 6. 19 it was revealed that they were in fact related: *ὅτι ἔστιν αὐτῷ ἀδελφή ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*.

⁸³⁾ See Catullus, *Coma Berenices* 22 (after Callimachus): *fratris cari flebile discidium*. Cf. A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Lagides IV*, index, s.v. “Berenice II”.

⁸⁴⁾ E.g. J. A. Letronne, *Recueil des inscr. gr. et lat. de l'Égypte I* (1842), p. 10: Cleopatra “cette princesse fille d'Antiochus, n'était parente d'Épiphanes à aucun degré”. E. Breccia, *Diritto dinastico*, p. 159: “Cleopatra Sira ... non aveva col marito alcun vincolo di parentela”. The words “aucun” and “alcun” are obviously false. So is Beloch, *GG IV*, 2, 131: “Erst Ptolemaeos Epiphanes' Nachkommen standen in *συγγένεια* mit dem Seleukidenhause.”

⁸⁵⁾ Th. Sokoloff, wholesale contradicted by Holleaux, *Études III*, 381, n. 2, was not so utterly wrong in his presumption that the title ἀδελφή does reflect a degree of consanguinity, after all.

only to Ptolemies, Antigonids, and Attalids, but also to the Iranian rulers of Cappadocia and Pontus.⁸⁶) The first incontestable instance of “adelphic” titulature in the Seleucid dynasty rests on cognate relationship. Laodice was daughter of Mithridates II of Pontus and of a sister of Seleucus II, that is to say Antiochus and Laodice were first cousins. In later times both in Egypt and in Syria *ἀδελφή* became a stereotyped conventional title of formal courtesy to queens, but by then the title was seldom far removed from real “lifestyles” anyway. It is wrong to argue anything for Seleucus I from the fact that Livy 38. 15. 5 calls Apama *soror Seleuci regis*, as Orth (p. 72) does. As has been recognized that is an obvious anachronism, for Livy is unconsciously following the conventions of later and his own times.

L. 21–23. *τὴν τε παρουσίαν* — — —. “Arrival”, “appearance”, “presence”, “sojourn”, in the common sense, but the term here has also a more formal connotation of an “advent”, and as such it was often an occasion for public festivities and solemn religious ceremonies. A *παρουσία*, or (*παρ*)*επιδημία* (the words *per se* are indifferent) might have primarily a religious significance, as *ἐπιφάνεια* had with gods.⁸⁷) An effusive demonstration of public enthusiasm in a *παρουσία* was often practiced as means of converting uncertainties, and sometimes licences, attending the arrival of a king with the court and soldiers, to an orderly solemnity well calculated to conciliate him.⁸⁸) Still worse things might be expected on arrival of a conqueror, therefore an enthusiastic public reception in accordance with the already existing customs was a common remedy, and, from our point of view, a magnificent pious comedy. This of course does not rule out a possibility that the dominant feelings of the moment might have been quite sincere, but only few years later the Romans were received with no less enthusiasm (Justinus 31. 8; Livy 37. 37. 3), whose sincerity no one questioned. We possess now quite extensive records of such a public welcome for Antiochus III in 197/6 from several cities, notably Iasus, Teos, Erythrae, and Ilium.

L. 23–25. *καὶ γίνεσθαι τὰ τε ἄλλα ἀγαθὰ τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ τῇ βασιλίσσει πάντα, καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῖς διαμενεῖν λαμβάνουσαν ἐπίδοσιν*,⁸⁹) *καθάπερ αὐτοὶ προαιροῦνται*. Traditional formula. As a rudimentary custom prayers, vows and sacrifices

⁸⁶) Ardys and Mithridates may possibly be sons of Ariarathes of Cappadocia and of the Seleucid princess Stratonice, daughter of A. II, therefore cousins of A. III. Or, perhaps royal princes of Pontus and relations of queen Laodice, and more distantly his own. Polybius calls M. *νιός τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ* (scil. Ἀντιόχου) *κατὰ φύσιν*. More on this in my unpublished paper on “Antiochus III and Athymbra”.

⁸⁷) The notion is still preserved in the Christian Advent. See A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*. Tr. by L. R. M. Strachan (1937), index, s.v. *παρουσία*. Cf. M. Nilsson, *GGR* II², 184. On this “advent” and its collateral, “reception” (*ἀπάντησις*, *ὑπάντησις*), L. Robert, *Documents d’Asie Mineure* (1887), 467–486, passim.

⁸⁸) A detailed scrutiny of the festivities in 291 of 290 B.C. for the *παρουσία* of Demetrius with his *φίλοι* and troops to Athens, Athenaeus 6. 62–63, is very instructive. See the analysis in L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains* (1957), p. 182–187. Cf. the reception for the conquering Ptolemy III in Seleucia and Antioch in the Gurob Papyrus studied by Holleaux, *Etudes III*, 281–310. My edition appears in *APF* 36 (1990). For Attalus in Athens as honored foreign guest see Pol. 16. 25. 1–9. Fictitious *παρουσία* of Alexander to Jerusalem, Jos., *A.J.* 11. 328. Justinus 24. 3. 4: *adventus* of Ptolemy Ceraunus to Cassandrea. Livy 23. 7. 11–12; 23. 10. 7: Hannibal’s festive *adventus* in “liberated” Capua. 35. 43. 7–9: “liberator” Antiochus in Lamia, *exceptus ingenti favore multitudinis cum plausibus, clamoribus et quibus aliis laetititia vulgi significatur*. The custom was still much in vogue in later times, as in Tacitus, *Ann.* 6. 42 (Seleucia ad Tigrim): *Tum adventantem Tiridaten extollunt veteribus regum honoribus et quos recens aetas invenit*.

⁸⁹) In the light of this I restore *Syll.* 352, 7–8: *καὶ εὖχεσθαι καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐπ[ίδουον γίνε]σθαι Ἀθημητρίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ*. (L. 4 ought to be *τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν πόλιν*], not *ἐνθάδε*).

for kings in established places of cult are of extremely great antiquity in the Orient. According to forms developed in Hellenistic kingdoms one prayed that gods grant the king and his family success, health, power, victory over enemies, and guarantee of peace to his subjects, and that the kingdom might last, flourish, prosper, and grow "as the king wished himself and we too pray to the gods", and that among all other blessings it might endure for children's children forever. In RC 5, 9–12 Seleucus I is "modestly" hinting at those traditional prayers, which he expects to be performed in his intention and for the city: *ἵνα ἔχητε σπένδειν καὶ χρᾶσθαι ὑγιαίνοντων ἡμῶν καὶ εὐτυχούντων καὶ τῆς πόλεως διαμενούσης σώας, ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι καὶ ὑμεῖς εὖχεσθε*.⁹⁰) Similar in *Anadolu* 9, p. 40, 107–112: [καὶ] *συνησθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὑγιαίνειν αὐτοῦς [καὶ] πράσσειν ὃν τρόπον [αὐτ]οὶ τε βούλονται καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχόμεθα*. Compare furthermore OGI 56, 19: *ἀνθ' ὧν οἱ θεοὶ δεδώκασιν αὐτοῖς εὐσταθοῦσαν τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ δώσουσιν τᾶλλα ἀγαθὰ πάντα εἰς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον*. OGI 90, 35: *ἀνθ' ὧν δεδώκασιν αὐτῷ οἱ θεοὶ ὑγίαν νίκην κράτος καὶ τᾶλλα ἀγαθὰ πάντα, τῆς βασιλείας διαμενούσης αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον*. OGI 168, 54 (partem supplevi): *οἱ ὑ δια]λείπομεν εὐ[χόμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις ὅπως διδῶσιν ὑμ]ῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑγίει[αν μορφή]ν εὐηγρίαν ν[ίκην κράτος ---*. OGI 332, 32: *καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τὰς ἱερε[ί]ας ἀνοίξαντας τοὺς ναοὺς τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐπιθύοντας τὸν λιβανωτὸν εὖχε[σ]θαι νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον διδόναι βασιλεῖ Ἀττάλῳ Φιλομήτορι καὶ Εὐεργέτῃ ὑγίαν σωτηρίαν νίκην κράτος καὶ [ἐπὶ γῆ]ς κα[ὶ κατὰ] θά[λατταν] κ[α]ὶ ἀρχοντι καὶ ἀμυνομένῳ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ διαμεν[ε]ῖν [εἰς] τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα ἀβλαβῇ μετὰ πάσης ἀσφαλείας*.

L. 27. καὶ τῇ Νίκῃ καὶ τῷ Διί. The Victory here is not really a "cult" established for anything particular, as Frisch speculates. Zeus and Nike are patron deities of successful military enterprises,⁹¹) and the city takes advantage of this convenient abstraction for a good omen, a "godspeed" and a "motto" to the present royal campaign conducted under the sign of the goddess of Victory, daughter of Zeus. For, although in most cities the offi-

⁹⁰) Seleucus has also in mind another formula: *εὖχεσθαι ὑπὲρ ὑγείας καὶ σωτηρίας τοῦ τε βασιλέως* (optional his *πράγματα* and family) *καὶ τῆς πόλεως*, or *τοῦ δήμου*. A. Rehm, *II Didyma*, no. 424, 21A, spoiled this to the incomprehensible: *καὶ ὑμεῖς (π)ισ(τ)ὰ? ἔχετε*, which is finding little favor. See e.g. P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9, p. 85; W. Orth, p. 29, n. 66. W. Günther, *Ist. Mitt.* 27–28 (1977–78), 265 has lately proposed *διαμενούσης, ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι καὶ ὑμεῖς. εἰσδέχε(σθ)ε*, which is scarcely an improvement. Evidently the engraver, if not his modern copy, had omitted something. I conjecture: *ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι καὶ ὑμεῖς (εὖχεσθε: ὑμ)εῖς δ' ἔχετε τὰ ἐπεσταλμένα κτλ.* This involves an addition, yes, (of the presumably omitted part), but no tampering with the attested letters.

Incidentally I have been convinced since 1970 that the "Osiris" in this inscription is just another obstinate phantom of scholarship. To me the name simply reads *Ὀ[π]ιδος* (not contradicted by the photograph, kindly lent to me from the German Archaeological Institute in Munich; nor by the Haussoullier's squeeze in Paris, graciously examined at my request by Prof. and Mme. Robert). Unfortunately there was no chance to write the article I had once contemplated. Cf. *Classical Review*, N.S. 23 (1973), p. 218 and *Bull. Ép.* 1980, 456. *Ὀδύς* (*Ἦψ*), as hypostasis of Artemis, is by no means limited to Peloponnesus, but is a figure of universal Greek mythology and belongs to the Apollinian circle. Like Leto and Hecate she is in various local cults related, associated, or identified with Artemis. Seleucus is not making in Miletus a propaganda for the still exotic Pharaonic god, but behaving as a cultured Greek among Greeks. When the time was ripe for wider reception of Egyptian gods among Greeks, Osiris was at first supplanted by Sarapis, ultimately to re-emerge in his own person. Osiris seldom stands alone without other Egyptian deities, and (I must insist) Soteira there is not Isis.

⁹¹) Cf. Alexander's habits in these matters, L. Cerfaux et J. Tondriau, *op. cit.*, 10. 126. M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, 2 vols., indexes: Zeus and Nike were honored and invoked by soldiers at all times and on all occasions. It is worth nothing that *ἀνδραγαθία* (OGI 219, 34) is above all a military virtue. Cf. OGI 332, 22 and this paper, n. 54 (end).

cial polite parlance avoided a too obvious emphasis on the blunt military demonstration under way, a realistic cognizance of the true nature of the “visit” and “setting the things aright” was taken nevertheless. Victory is allegorized as another of divine powers watching over the martial king. Cf. the *νίκη* in the prayer formulae just cited above. The personified Nike appears with Zeus Soter in the thanksgiving celebrations in *I. Priene* 11, 29 after the liberation from a local tyrant, and at Cos after the defeat of the Galatians in Delphi, *Syll.* 398, 33.

L. 31–32. *καὶ συνιόντες κατὰ φυ|λ|ας*. For basic information Robert’s discussion of this custom may be read with much profit⁹²) but his *κατὰ τὰς οἰκίας*, suggested “je crois plutôt”, is presented perhaps not so decisively as to be admitted without further scruples to the text, as Frisch does. Although at first look it would seem to meet all the critical requirements, I think that actually is not the case. Dittenberger followed here Boeckh, but Robert has demonstrated that the old supplement is false (*Essays Welles*, 184). Yet the phrase which the last named scholar seemed to favor does not provide the solution. Robert has pointed out correctly that the lacuna must be filled with a distributive phrase, and that the most obvious restoration *κατὰ φυ|λ|ας* would encounter the difficulty of disagreeing with the syllabic division, otherwise rigorously observed.

Yet, keeping a holiday privately at home could not be much of a “gathering” for citizens and the general *stephanephoria* for citizens and metics. All the prescriptions for domestic holiday-making usually follow the prescriptions for the citizen assemblies in public by tribes. But a domestic holiday can hardly be a *σύνδοχος*, *συνεῖναι*, or *συναγωγή*, and it has its own phraseology, closely paralleling the prescriptions in Teos, *Anadolu* 9, p. 37, 24–25: *θεῖν δὲ καὶ εὐρτάζειν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας τοὺς οἰκοντάς] τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις οἴκοις ἐκάστους κατὰ δύν[αμιν*. But the examples for *συνεῖναι* (including synonyms and equivalents like *συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι*) *τοὺς πολίτας*, or *τὸν δῆμον* do by all means require *κατὰ φυλάς* because this is how Greek communities normally functioned on such occasions in religious and civic life, as Robert himself has brought out so well. Neither *κατὰ τὰς πλατείας*, nor Robert’s *οἰκί]ας* would satisfactorily agree with *συνιόντες*. A better opportunity for gathering might have been afforded by *κατὰ γειννί]ας*,⁹³) but, as we shall presently see, there is no compelling reason why the usual routine should not be followed here.

The examination of the photograph confirms that the beginning of the line is indeed intact, but only *ΑΣ* stands there. Yet, however much one hesitates (by all methodical principles) to resort to invocation of engraving errors as expedient, there are several converging indications that this is indeed the case. Thus, not counting this instance, there are at least

⁹²) *Essays Welles*, 184–192. Cf. L. Robert, *Études anat.*, 180.

⁹³) So the example from Commagene, *OGI* 383: *συναγωγὰς καὶ πανηγύρεις καὶ θυσίας* — — *κατὰ κώμας καὶ πόλεις* — — *κατὰ γειννίαν*. No *φυλαί* because the prescription concerns a supra-local level, the entire kingdom. On city level the normal arrangement is invariably *κατὰ φυλάς*, of which the only exception known to me is *κατὰ συμμορίας* from Teos. Its precise relation to the tribes is a matter of conjectures. Certainly Prof. Ebert’s suggestion *κατὰ φρατρί]ας* would well satisfy the sense and the syllabic division without correction, but it is not only isolated but also invalidated by P. Frisch, *Iliion* 52, 19, which clearly favors the remedy I propose. We meet with a more mixed arrangement in the cosmopolitan city of Imperial Rome, Jos., *Bell. Jud.* 7. 73: *τρέπεται δὲ τὰ πλήθη πρὸς εὐωχίαν, καὶ κατὰ φυλάς καὶ γένη καὶ γειτονίας ποιούμενοι τὰς ἐστιάσεις εὐχοντο τῷ θεῷ σπένδοντες αὐτὸν τ’ ἐπὶ πλείστον χρόνον ἐπιμεῖναι Οὐδεσπασιανὸν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίᾳ, καὶ παισὶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἐκείνων δεῖ γινομένοις φυλαχθῆναι τὸ κράτος ἀνανταγώνιστον*. The burning of frankincense before house doors (also discussed in *Bull. Ép.* 1967, 120), may perhaps be conceived as taking place *κατ’ οἰκίας*, but the point is that this was never prescribed with the verb *συνεῖναι*, or its near equivalents.

seven other errors of engraving and three of them demonstrating the stonemason's absent-minded propensity, in two cases to crossing his lambda into alpha (9, 32), and in one instance omitting to do so (41), probably a psychological "hypercorrection" for the two earlier errors.

To the attention already distracted by this habit the case in question was particularly treacherous because in the group $\Phi\Upsilon\Lambda\Lambda\Xi$ two contradictory operations, in tracing two similar but distinct letters, were required. The intervention of word-division was surely an unfavorable factor: one look-alike letter simply slipped out from the engraver's consciousness, or was crossed too soon, with the same result. This conjecture is borne out by closer observation of the errors in lines 7: $\Pi\text{PATMA}\Sigma\text{I}$, 9: $\Lambda\text{AB}\Omega\text{N}$, 30: $\Lambda\Lambda\Lambda\Omega\text{I}$, 32 (next to the word in question): $\Sigma\text{YNTEAEIT}\Omega\text{EAN}$, and 41: $\text{I}\Lambda\text{I}\Lambda\Lambda\Lambda$. All these errors have one common denominator: the trouble with (superfluous, or insufficient) horizontal or perpendicular dashes, which form the distinguishing elements among several letters of partly similar design.⁹⁴) This type of error is fairly common in inscriptions of all times, and every modern writer will recall from his own experience how often he automatically crossed an I into t, repeated or omitted letters or syllables at word division, etc. I should think all this makes a convincing case and do not hesitate to read $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\langle\lambda\rangle\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.

Moreover, since the custom and the phraseology are now fairly well known, I believe it is possible to detect and restore the $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ formula in several old and new inscriptions, which it may be convenient to register here. Taken together they derive elucidation and support from one another and they supplement Robert's repertory in *Études anatoliennes* and *Essays Welles*. They are:

A liberation festival in Priene, ca. 297 B.C., *I. Priene* 11, 29–30: $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu$] $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\omicron$.

Birthday of Lysimachus, *I. Priene* 14, 23 (*OGI* 11): $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. Cf. L. Robert, *Études anat.*, 184: "Je crois que le supplément $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\tau\alpha\tau\iota\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$] fait contresens". After this public prescription there follows a domestic one, *I.* 30–31: $[\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\eta\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}] \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\eta\ \chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ [\delta\upsilon\acute{\nu}\alpha\mu\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \beta\omega\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \iota\delta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma]\theta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\mu\ \beta\alpha[\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \Lambda\upsilon\sigma\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omega\iota$.

Honors for Lysimachus in Samothrace, *Syll.* 372 (end): $\kappa\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ [\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \text{---}]$.

Honors for Seleucus II at Ilium, *OGI* 212, 18–19: $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ [\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \Sigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\chi\omega\iota$.

Honors for Laodice III at Iasus, *Annuario* 45=46, p. 448, 30–32: $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\ \tau\eta\eta\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\phi[\alpha\eta\eta\phi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\nu\varsigma]\ \kappa\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\varsigma}[\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. The follows a prescription for private holiday-making, 34–36: $\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\ \tau\eta\eta\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\eta\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\theta\omega\acute{\varsigma}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\] \eta\iota\ \delta\upsilon[\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\text{---}\sigma\tau\omega\iota$.

Honors for Antiochus III, Engelmann-Merkelbach, *Erythrai I*, 31, 6–11: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\eta\eta\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\cdot\ \delta\epsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\chi\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\eta\]\ \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau[\acute{\omega}\iota\ \delta\eta\mu\omega\cdot\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\tau\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma\ \pi[\rho\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ [\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\xi}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omicron]\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \tau[\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\Lambda}\nu\]\tau\iota[\acute{\omicron}\chi\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\cdot\ \acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\omega\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\]\delta\eta[\mu\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\eta\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\iota$

⁹⁴) Some outside examples: *OGI* 56, 45: ΠOAOY ; *OGI* 326, 9: $\kappa\alpha\iota\langle\lambda\rangle\acute{\alpha}$, stone $\Lambda\Lambda$; *I. Magnesia*: 2: $\text{AY}\Sigma\text{ANIOY}$; Sherk, *Roman Docs.* 22, 17: AIAKATEXOCIN ; 30: CYNKAHTON ; 31: BOYAH ; L. Moretti, *Iscr. stor. ellen.* 16, 25: AAXIMAXON ($\text{A}\lambda\kappa\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\nu$); Schmitt, *Staatsvertr. III*, 428, 10: AIAAYCEQN ; Frisch, *Ilium* 52, 5, and 9: $\Phi\text{I}\Lambda\Lambda\text{N}\Theta\text{B}\Omega\text{P}\epsilon\text{I}\text{TAI}$, $\Phi\text{I}\Lambda\Lambda\text{N}\Theta\text{B}\Omega\text{P}\text{IIAI}$.

καὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ θύειν κατὰ δύναμιν οἴκου ἐκάστους καὶ πάν]τες σ[τεφανηφορεῖτωσαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρῃ ταύτῃ. Cf. OGI 219, 19–32.

L. 35. στήσαι δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα χρυσῇν ἐφ' ἵππου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. Statues in chief temples of a city are high distinctions, but that was a profane honor (εἰκόν), not a cult statue (ἄγαλμα); no "Kultbild", as Orth writes, p. 67. Of course, as in many other cases with statues and stelae the phrase ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ does not necessarily mean "inside the temple building", "in the shrine", but simply "in the sacred precinct". Τερὸν here has the original etymological force of a "sanctuary", a "consecrated place".⁹⁵) During his memorable progress many cities voted for Antiochus both profane and religious statues, which could be set in various places. Thus three cult statues were decreed by Teos alone, but in addition to this the Teians dedicated an ordinary non-cultic gilded figure, such as we meet in Ilium, and this can certainly be recognized also in Erythrae.⁹⁶) An earlier bronze(?) statue, probably pedestrian, erected on the temple grounds of Athena Ilias, may likewise be surmised for Seleucus II, the father of Antiochus III.⁹⁷) But this was not an honor exclusively reserved for royalty, as it continued from time to time to be accorded to private individuals of high station as well.⁹⁸)

L. 37–38. εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα. It is really an exaggeration to say that σωτήρ is an epithet, or that it should imply cult honors.⁹⁹) In the sense defined by Habicht the word is not a true epithet, although such is also Habicht's suggestion. It is worth noting that here it does not stand alone but forms a part of the much hackneyed hendiadys εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ, which goes a way back to a good pre-Hellenistic usage, and ordinarily has no cult significance.¹⁰⁰) It is precisely for this old tradition that these words are by far preferred in

⁹⁵) See the references in Orth, p. 46, no. 10.

⁹⁶) Teos, Block I, 45–47: ἀγάλματα μαρμάρινα ὡς κάλλιστ[α καὶ ἱε]ροπρεπέστατ[α] τοῦ τε βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐ[τ]οῦ βασιλίσσης Λαοδίκης. Block IID, 31–33: ἀ[ναθεῖναι δ'] ἄγαλμα χαλκοῦν ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ ὡς κάλλιστον [τοῦ βασιλέ]ως. Block F, 8: καὶ εἰκόνη χρυσῇ. It is not clear, however, whether in this case it is a statue or rather an annual tribute like an *aurum coronarium* mentioned in the same passage. Erythrai I, no. 30, 19–21 (supplevi): καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτόν τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου στεφάνῳ [ι χρυσῷ τῷ ἀριστείῳ καὶ εἰκόνη χρυσῇ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας] τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμ[ον].

⁹⁷) Frisch, *Ilion*, no. 38, 3–5 (supplevi): καὶ στήσαι [αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα χαλκῇν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἔχουσαν βῆμ]α τοῦ λευκοῦ [λίθου]. The base of that statue was inscribed, *Ilion*, no. 62, as cited above in n. 79.

⁹⁸) E.g. *Ilion*, no. 2, 47–52.

⁹⁹) So Frisch, ad lineam, after Habicht, but cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1974, 402: "et nous soulignons que le titre de σωτήρ n'implique nullement un culte".

¹⁰⁰) E.g. Diod. 16. 20. 6 (Dio in Syracuse, 357 B.C.): ἐτίμησαν τὸν εὐεργέτην ὡς μόνον σωτήρα γεγονότα τῆς πατρίδος. If Plut., *Dio* 46. 1 must be emended, I would suspect εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα καὶ θεὸν γεγονότα τῆς πατρίδος, rather than Ziegler's rhyming πατέρα καὶ σωτήρα. Cf. Habicht, *Gottmenschen*, p. 9, n. 2–3. Memnon of Heraclea, *F. Gr. Hist.*, 434. 3, writes that Timotheus was so popular ὡς μηκέτι τύραννον ἀλλ' εὐεργέτην αὐτόν, οἷς ἔπραττε, καὶ σωτήρα ὀνομάζεσθαι. Cf. Demosth. 18. 43: Thessalians and Thebans φίλον εὐεργέτην, σωτήρα τὸν Φίλιππον ἡγούντο. Hellenistic and Roman combinations of these two epithets are extraordinarily common. In Teos, Block B, 20–22 we read: ἵνα γενομένης ἐπαυξήσεως τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν μὴ μόνον εὐεργεσίας λάβῃ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τῆς τοῦ δήμου, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωτηρίας. Literally "the inscription", as in Ilium, or simply "the title". In the second column of the decree from Iasus I supply lines 4–6: ἐπηγήσθαι] βασιλέα μέγαν Ἀντίο[χον διδοῖ εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ] γέγονεν καὶ φύλαξ [ἐσ]τιν [τῆς πόλεως]. The same words εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα are inscribed in a private dedication of a statue to A. III by Mippus, one of his high courtiers. See the ed. improved by Holleaux in Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Delos*, no. 59 (cf. *ZPE* 44, 1981, 106, n. 2). How commonplace this has become cf. *N. T. Luke* 22. 25: οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. Cf. also Diod. 37. 26.

the initial stages of the formation of cult epithets, usually σωτήρ. For us it is more than of antiquarian interest to realize that this partly preserved word (l. 38) may be the ultimate culprit in the "historic" error we are dealing with. The first Seleucids used no official cult epithets in their life-time, and the coins stamped *ANTIOCHOY ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ* are all posthumous. Antiochus III was welcomed as *Εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ* in more than one city.¹⁰¹⁾

L. 41. Robert, *Essays Welles*, p. 182, n. 41 approves the editors' idea and construction, but condemns their wording and rightly observes that the "herald of the Council and of the People" has no place at the federal festival of the Ilian Confederation. Since l. 38–39 already make the *agonothetes* and the *synedroi* responsible for the proclamation of the honor, the actual "crying" would have to be done (as it frequently is) by a *keryx*, or *grammateus*. The choice will be conjectural, but the latter is attested as federal magistrate in Frisch, *Iliion* 5, 6. We see there five *agonothetai*, one from Ilium and four from other member cities, and, yes they have a secretary. The singular *agonothetes*, who in l. 39 takes the over-all supervisory responsibility, is of course the representative of Ilium.¹⁰²⁾ But although the city and the Confederation have each their own functionaries one should not forget that Athena was first and above all the city-goddess of Ilium before she became the patroness of the Ilian Confederation. *OGI* 212 and 219 both testify that a degree of close cooperation and partial overlapping between the two bodies is taken for granted. The same kind of interdependence may be detected between Priene and the Panionium in *OGI* 215, 4 (*I. Priene* 12) and between the Ionian League and an unknown city, where *OGI* 222 was passed. It seems all cities situated in proximity to any "Federal" shrine always had a chance to exercise over it a degree of control not possible to other members of the same league.¹⁰³⁾

L. 42. Although the language of *ἐλέσθαι ἐκ πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν* is often employed for election of all manner of commissions charged with specific tasks on city level, for outgoing embassies one preferred the ethnic without the article. But *τῶν πολιτῶν* instead of *Ἰλιέων* would make the line a little longer, and the example of *OGI* 11, 7–11 (*I. Priene* 14) shows that this is no less appropriate for an embassy. However, since all the lines that follow immediately seem to be slightly shorter from the preceding ones, no positive arguments may be urged either way on this condition.

L. 43. Both *παρὰ τ[οῦ δήμου]* and *πλήθος* (lit. *populi*) are perfectly good and widely used at this juncture, but *πλήθος* seems to be a little more favored and a longer word is desirable. Cf. A. Rehm, *Delphinion* 146, 82; *OGI* 229, 10, and especially *RC* 15, 5–8 (A. III): *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀπολογισάμενοι περὶ τε τῆς εὐνοίας ἦν διὰ παντὸς εἰσέχκατε εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν*

¹⁰¹⁾ Sardis, Iasus, Teos, Erythrae, Ilium and more.

¹⁰²⁾ See L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, 182.

¹⁰³⁾ Prof. Ebert of Halle has made a keen observation that the very object of the announcement ought to be expressed, e.g. *[τῆς τε εἰκόνης καὶ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς]*, which (even with my *τε*) is rather too short. More adequate for length would be *[τῶν δεδομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τιμῶν]*, but cf. 45–46. Attractive as this idea certainly is, it entails the difficulty that the usual object of such proclamations are *αἱ* (*ἐψηφισμένοι, δεδομένοι*) *τιμαί*, or *ὁ* *τε στέφανος καὶ ἡ εἰκών*, or *ὅτι στεφανοὶ ὁ δῆμος κτλ.* Normally it is in the context of contracting and physical setting up, and/or general supervision, where we find "statues and inscribing" (*ἀναγραφῇ*). On the other hand many good parallels do indeed support the notion that one should expect in the lacuna an official who does the announcement (*Syll.* 656, 30), and who is not always a *keryx*. Of course some flexibilities in the formulae are possible, but more conservative approach would be to consider either an inadvertent omission (cf. 22), or an expression of "the honors" in l. 38: *ἀναγορεῦσαι δὲ καὶ ἐμ [Παναθηναίους τὰς τιμὰς (or ταῦτα) ἐν τῷ]*, which can still be accommodated and does not obviously disturb the syntax. Or, perhaps a compromise in l. 41, e.g. *τὴν ἀναγγελίαν ποιουμένους [τῶν ἐψηφισμένων διὰ τοῦ γραμματέως?]*, or *[καὶ δηλοῦντας ὧν ἕνεκεν τετίμηται?]*. Cf. *I. Priene* 8, 32; 18, 9–10.

οἰκίαν καὶ καθόλου περὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας τοῦ πλήθους. RC 22, 14: ἀποδεξάμεθα τὴν αἵρεσιν τοῦ πλήθους. RC 52, 32–33 (Eumenes II): παρακαλεῖν τ[έ] με θεωροῦντα] τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ πλήθους. Syll. 581, 93, 95; ὁ δὲ αἰρεθεὶς (envoy) ἐμφανίζετω τὰν εὐνοίαν τὰν ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῖς παρὰ τῷ πλήθει.

L. 44. Seeing that the queen's name in lines 22 and 23/24 is not spelled out we have no firm guidance what to expect here. But since she was already mentioned twice before and "the children" not at all, I feel it is advisable not to exceed the limits of the precedents, and instead of τὰ τέκνα I restore Λαοδίκην. Other inscriptions from the record of Antiochus III show that there was no established "protocol" in such matters. Naturally the bulk of them take cognizance not only of the principal agent, the king, but some are conscious of the fact that the queen had an active personality and a role of her own in furthering the policies of her royal spouse.¹⁰⁴ We can also find some recognition for the Crown Prince Antiochus (βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος, 209–193 B.C.).¹⁰⁵ Even his two younger brothers do not go completely without a separate mention under their own names.¹⁰⁶ The rest of the royal children are at best included in the collective τὰ τέκνα, or τὰ παῖδια.¹⁰⁷ There is also to consider that observable tendency of style which favors variation, to the effect that in multiple references the royal title alone, when preceded by article but followed by no personal name, was sufficient for identification. This may be interchanged with pronouns, or with the title accompanied by personal name, as here restored.

L. 45. ἀποδώσουσιν. Holleaux's line is slightly out of proportion with other lines in this section, although some shorter lines do occur even at the top. With this verb substituted the pronoun (already repeated far too often, but such repetitions were not deemed intolerable in "official" Greek, as e.g. OGI 229, 99–100: αὐτοὶ five times) is not absolutely necessary. Cf. *Anadolu* 9, p. 40, line 100; *J. Priene* 14, 9 (OGI 11); Syll. 370, 54; 700, 42; L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner*, no. 54, 22–26: ἐλῶσθαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις πέντε οἵτινες ἀφικόμενοι τὰς τιμὰς τὰς ἐψηφισμένας ἀποδώσουσιν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν τὴν εὐνοίαν παρέχειν τῇ πόλει.

L. 47. At first sight one gains an impression that Holleaux might have been right with his concept of the οἰκία, but a closer scrutiny of his text raises unsurmountable difficulties. As exemplified by the new inscriptions from Iasus and Teos, to which I add Erythrae (RC 15), the words οἶκος and οἰκία are particularly characteristic of Antiochus III, and before his times they are not at all attested in Seleucid royal letters. Prior to that time the idea of dynastic loyalties used to be conveyed not by references to the "House", but various circumlocutions, among which τὰ (ἡμέτερα, τοῦ βασιλέως) πράγματα was pre-eminent. Cf. for instance RC 12, 11; 22, 8; 31, 20; 44, 2; 45, 7; and OGI 229 *passim*. At present when the necessity for reclassification of OGI 219 and RC 15 may be stated as plainly manifest Holleaux's restoration would seem for reasons he could not have anticipated,

¹⁰⁴ Note her role in Sardis, Iasus, Teos, and the remarks in *Bull. Ép.* 1971, 621.

¹⁰⁵ E.g. RC 32 and the inscribed base of a statue from Claros, quoted by L. Robert, *Nouv. inscr. de Sardes I* (1965), p. 18. C. H. Kraeling, *AJA* (1964); cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1965, 436. (I think this stela was set up by Menedemus of Alabanda, an officer of A. III and subsequently his governor general, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄνω σατραπειῶν, L. Robert, *Hellenica VII*, 7, line 7). This prince is also well attested as co-regent, e.g. J. & L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon I* (1983). Cf. *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 616.

¹⁰⁶ I surmise they both appear in RC 9, the inscription (in my opinion) from the reign of Antiochus III. Cf. now also M. Wörle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 422, N 1, 3.

¹⁰⁷ OGI 237 and a *phyle* inscription from Iasus, *Annuario* 39–40 (1963), p. 578. (The experiments on this text in *GRBS* 13, 1972, p. 175, have no value). In another inscription from Antioch on the Orontes, alluded to in *Bull. Ép.* 1965, 436, Ἀντίοχος ὁ υἱός is distinguished from τὰ παῖδια.

doubly attractive. Yet the fact is that practically all the epigraphic allusions to the "House" are made by members of the dynasty concerned, and even so such references are few in number and for the most part of a later date.¹⁰⁸⁾

It is true that Polybius uses the simple word *οἰκία*, or *ταύτη ἡ οἰκία* in the sense of dynasty, for Antigonids, Ptolemies and certain other ruling houses. Also *ἡ τῶν Μακεδόνων οἰκία*, *ἡ τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ βασιλέων οἰκία*, and such locutions as *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας βασιλεῖς*, *οἱ τῆς Συρίας βασιλεῖς*, but the use of the "royal" adjectives is not much in evidence at this time. To be sure Diodorus writes occasionally *ἡ βασιλικὴ οἰκία* (18. 57. 4), but this is not necessarily the prevalent early Hellenistic idiom, which would probably be more in conformity with such expressions as *ἡ τῶν ἐν Πάφῳ βασιλέων οἰκία* (20. 21. 3). *Syll.* 685, 95: *τὴν Πτολεμαϊκὴν οἰκίαν* dates from 139 B.C. and is not a honorific decree, nor a document addressed to Ptolemy VI. In view of *OGI* 219, 27 and *OGI* 237 (cf. *OGI* 212, 14) *τὸ γένος τῶν βασιλέων* would come closest to this dynastic notions appropriate for outsiders, or possibly *τὴν τῶν βασιλέων*, or *βασιλευόντων, οἰκίαν*, which however is difficult to fit. In all other cases of honorific inscriptions *ἡ βασιλικὴ οἰκία* belongs invariably to the *adulatio Graeca* of Roman emperors. Likewise the turns of *(σύμ)παντος οἴκου*, or *πάσης τῆς οἰκίας* are totally strange to the Hellenistic formal usage: they are entirely Roman!

This forces abandonment of Holleaux's supplement¹⁰⁹⁾ and brings us back to the notion of *τὰ πράγματα*, so strongly emphasized in *OGI* 229, e.g. l. 7: *ἐτίμησεν τῇ πόλιν ἡμῶν διὰ τε τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὐνοίαν καὶ φιλοπονίαν ἣν ἐπεποίητο εἰς τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸ τὸμ πατέρα αὐτοῦ θεὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ τ.λ.* These words may be restored in the decree P. Frisch, *Ilion*, no. 38, 6–8: *ὅτι στεφανοῖ ὁ δῆμος βασιλέα Σέλευκ[ον βασιλέως [Ἀντίοχου, ἵνα φανερόν ἦι, ὅτι εἰς τὰ πράγματα τὰ τοῦ βασι]λέως ἀεὶ τὴν [αὐτὴν ἔχοντες διατελοῦμεν αἰρέσιν. Cf. M. Wörle, Chiron 18 (1988), 423, N I (A. III to Heraclea ad L.), 14–15: Ποιούμενους δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν διὰ τῶν [ἔργων τὰς προ]σηκούσας ἀποδείξεις τῆς εἰς τὰ πράγματα ἡμῶ[ν εὐνοίας] — — —. OGI 219, 7, 10, 14, 24. RC 31, 18–20 (A. III to Magnesia on M.): διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν ἣν τυγχάνει (scil. ὁ δῆμος) ἀποδεδεγμένους εἰς τε ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰ πράγματα.* In spite of the *οἰκία* innovation in the official terminology under Antiochus III the employment of *τὰ πράγματα* continues in the old sense down to the end of the dynasty.¹¹⁰⁾

L. 48–49. Here we are at the end of this windy rhetorical period and nothing substantial could have been added to the message. Toward the conclusion of official communications (or at appropriate moment within them) it was an approved chancery style to offer (*πειρασόμεθα*) or to request (*παρακαλεῖν*) *καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ (παρ)αίτιον γίνεσθαι*, especially if it had not been already mentioned above, but this could be said more than once in the same communication. Like *εὐνοία* it could be offered, or requested, often at the same time. The formula appears very commonly in the "ambassadorial routine", e.g. *OGI* 332, 51–56; 353, 57–63; *Syll.* 700, 40–45; Jos., *Antiq. Iud.* 14. 155; 254 (the lan-

¹⁰⁸⁾ For the Attalid usage see *OGI* 331, 22 (*RC* 65, 18); *RC* 66, 6.

¹⁰⁹⁾ *Études III*, 118: "Je suis bien loin de prétendre que ces restitutions doivent être toutes tenues pour certaines, mais comme le dit M. Dittenberger à propos de cette même inscription 'supplementa mea sollemni talium decretorum usui magis respondere vix negaveris'". Alas, it is precisely that *sollemnis usus*, which condemns *τὴν πᾶσαν βασιλικὴν οἰκίαν*, nowhere to be found among the inscriptions of this period. Cf. *OGIS II*, index, s.v. *οἶκος*.

¹¹⁰⁾ See e.g. *RC* 12, 11; 22, 8; 31, 20; 44, 2; 45, 7. So it is in other kingdoms, e.g. *OGI* 102; *τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πράγματα*; 329: *διὰ τὸ εἰς τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πράγματα καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ἀνεστρέφεσθαι*.

guage is highly “idiomatic”; the question of authenticity of the cited documents is irrelevant). The same routine occurs in the decree for Antiochus III from *Erythrai I*, no. 30, 24–26, which I restore: *καὶ ἐμφανίσαντες ἦν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτόν τε τὸν βα[σιλέα καὶ [τὰ πράγματα εὖνοιαν παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτόν – – – ἀεὶ τινος] ἀγαθ[οῦ γίνεσθαι αἴτιον.*

Sometimes assurances were added, that when the object of this polite request will be graciously granted, the benefactor will thus have done something honorable, will follow the example of his own ancestors, or that he may count on further marks of honor, gratitude, or reciprocation, etc. See for instance Le Bas-Waddington, *Inscriptions II*, no. 64, 9–12: the envoys requested *καὶ ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθῷ παραίτιους γενέσθαι τῷ δάμῳ, καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα ποιήσαντες ἀκόλουθα πράξομεν τῷ τε [συγγενείαι] – – – καὶ τὰ μέγιστα χαρίόμεθα τῷ δάμῳ.* The reply in lines 18–19 promises *καὶ πε[ρ]αίτιος ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθῷ παραίτιοι γίνεσθαι τῷ δάμῳ.* Same formula with the “gratification” assurances in nos. 72, 10; 73, 9, 18–19; 74, 11–12.

This general formula of obligation, or however we call it (“your gracious compliance will oblige, please, us greatly”) is most commonly used with routine requests, e.g. asking another city to assign a suitable spot for setting up a stela, or carry out its part in honoring someone else, often a citizen of the addressed city. But, as evident from other examples, this is not the only occasion for its use. *Syll.* 644, 22: *τοὶ ἀγγελοὶ τοὶ εἰρημένοι ποτὶ βασιλῇ Ἀντίοχον ἀφικόμενοι καὶ Εὐδαμον παρακαλεῦντον αὐτό[ν] συνεπιμεληθῆ(ε)ιν – – – δηλοῦντας αὐτῷ, ὅτι ταῦτα πράξας χαριεῖται τῷ δάμῳ.* L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner* 95, 45: *διότι τοῦτα πράξας ἔσται πᾶσι κεχαρισμένος.* L. Moretti, *Iscr. stor. ellenist.*, no. 77, 13: *καὶ ταῦτα ποιῶν (rex Ptolemaeus) εὐχαριστήσῃ τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς.* A reciprocation for such an obliging compliance could be promised also in terms of further expressions of gratitude to follow, but the full formulae are for the most part too long to be considered here. A very good, if somewhat curt, alternative would be *συμβαίν[οντος γὰρ τούτου χάριτας ἀξίας ἀπολήψηται]*, or *τιμηθήσεται παρὰ τοῦ δήμου.* Cf. *RC* 52, 36–37: *οὕτω γὰρ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μετὰ πάν[των τεύξεσθαι τ]ῶν εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων.* Similar in lines 39–40 (Eumenes quotes extensively from the decree in his honor).

Finally the “moral reward” may be conceived in the satisfaction of the benefactor in the continuation of his own and his ancestors’ record. Cf. A. Rehm, *Delphinion* 141, 40–47: *παρακαλεῖ δὲ ὁ δῆμος Κιανούς – – – τὴν οἰκειότητα ἐπὶ πλεῖον αὔξειν ἐπακολουθοῦντας τῇ τῶν προγόνων αἰρέσει, οὕτω γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ δήμου πολλῶι μᾶλλον ὑπάρξει αὐτοῖς πάντα τὰ φιλόφρονα κτλ.* Similar in *Delphinion* 146, 79–87. Cf. also *OGI* 222, 9–20 (*Erythrai*, no. 507), especially 19–20, which I slightly modify: *[ταῦτα ποιοῦμενος πολλῶν ἀγαθ]ῶν αἴτιος ἔσται ταῖς πόλε[σιν ἅμα τε ἀκόλουθα πράξει τ]ῇ τῶν προγόνων αἰρέσει.* Perhaps *συμβαίν[οντος γὰρ τούτου ἀκολουθήσῃ τῇ (τοῦ) πατρὸς αἰρέσει]* might still pass the muster for excessive length, if the necessary omission of the article is tolerable.

It is interesting to add that the equivalents of our genitive absolute are often employed at the conclusion of real petitions and applications of all sorts, where the petent anticipates a favorable result of his addresses. E.g. *OGI* 139 (end): *τούτου δὲ γενομένου ἐσόμεθα καὶ ἐν τούτοις – – – εὐεργετημένοι.* Similar in Hunt-Edgar, *Sel. Pap.* II, no. 272 (end) and Jos., *A. J.* 12. 261: *γενομένου γὰρ τούτου – – –.* This is also suitable for mildly worded ordinances, as in *Syll.* 543, 7: *τούτου γὰρ συντελεσθέντος.* All considered the “gratification” formula seems to be the best choice. Of course it is well understood that the Ilian envoys were charged to make a representation in the sense: *δηλώσουσιν γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι συμβαίνοντος τούτου χαριεῖται τῷ δήμῳ*, but the verb of “demonstration” is already implied in the “address” (43) and the “exhortation” (48).

In the last line the extent of the left hand lacuna (ca. 11 letters) can be calculated quite

accurately from the relative position of the preserved letters to those in the line above. However in the light of *OGI* 222, and that several times mentioned fragmentary decree from Erythrae (which, although so cruelly damaged, is still remarkably “perspicuous”), and the honors for Eumenes II, as reflected in *RC* 52, where the decrees still continue at great length even after the deployment of equivalents to our closing formulae, a question may perhaps arise whether the Ilian decree could not possibly have continued on another stela. In all probability the last line was quite sufficient to conclude this fulsome flattery, and the public act of submission, with another ready-made phrase of traditional Greek diplomacy.

* * *

Perhaps the apt way to sum up our exposition is to translate from Preuner: “But in reality it is plain that we are concerned here with Antiochus III, for which Brückner also takes the script in the field.”¹¹¹⁾ If we should discount those first essays of 1904, the distance of more than sixty years that has already elapsed since 1926, when the above-cited conclusion was written, is perforce the measure of absolute retardation in the study of this inscription. As a historical document it came dangerously close to being permanently relegated to a false place, and each repeated assertion seemed to add new sanction to the original misunderstanding. This case shows well how habituation and complacency can fatally influence all subsequent thinking to a mere “conditioned reflex” and how smugly an “established tradition” can be maintained even against the accumulation of facts. If by the documentation and criticism possible in the early eighteenth century the first attribution is perfectly understandable, and if we still must make reasonable allowances for the conditions of scholarship in the next century, today neither the venerable antiquity of the tradition, nor rather perfunctory invocation of “safe” opinions, can really be offered as critical investigation of facts. The facts are already so abundant and so unequivocal that they settle the debate without appeal and for all times.¹¹²⁾ No less than this affirmation can now be made with full confidence and without fear of valid contradiction.

Perhaps that symplegma with *OGI* 212 is partly to be blamed, but the latest published study shows clearly that these texts can be separated and the judgment still continue in the inert old routine, determined by the sheer weight of the tradition. On account of poor preservation the discrimination of relevant factors in *OGI* 212 was considerably more difficult and still further complicated by a faulty supplement, in circulation since 1937, but challenged nineteen years later, although apparently without immediate influence on further studies.

Both inscriptions examined impartially in their turn reappear in the same connection as before, but in a totally different setting. It was a great injustice to the historical memory of Antiochus called the Great that this, until quite recently, the most comprehensive inscription concerning him, preserved as inscriptions come to us, in almost a perfect condition, and well-known for more than two and a half centuries (in time for all those modern standard works), written in familiar and legible Greek, and displayed to visitors in full

¹¹¹⁾ “Hier scheint es sich aber in der Tat um Antiochos III zu handeln, wofür Brückner auch die Schrift ins Feld führt”, *Hermes* 61 (1926), p. 118.

¹¹²⁾ May I be allowed just to mention that two authoritative scholars (Princeton and Harvard) when asked to read an earlier draft of this study both privately signified their ready assent with the main argument, i.e. the re-attribution. I am not quite sure if they would care to be cited here by name.

II. LETTER OF ANTIOCHUS III TO ILIUM. Ca. 197 B.C.

Cf. R. Laqueur, *Quaest. epigr.* (1904), 101; Ad. Wilhelm, *Anzeiger Akad. Wien* 57 (1920), 49; D. Magie, *Roman Rule* (1950), 947–48; F. Ceruti, *Epigraphica* 17 (1955), 125–126; H. Schmitt, *Untersuch. zur Gesch. Antiochos' des Gr.* (1964), 293; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch* (1977), 68, 69, n. 84.

----- ὁμοίως
 τε πρὸς τὸ σ[υ]γκατασ[κε]υάζειν ὑμῖν πάν-
 τα τὰ πρὸς ἐπιμέλειαν κ[αὶ] πρόνοιαν ἀνή-
 κοντα· πειρασόμεθα γὰρ οὐ μόνον τὰ δι-
 ᾧ προγόνων προϋπηργμ[ένα] εἰς τὸν δ[ε]ῖ-
 5 μον συντηρεῖν, ἀλλὰ κ[αὶ] ἵνα τῶν πρὸς
 δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκ[όντων] μηθενὸς
 ὑστερήτε ποιείσθαι τ[ῇ]ν προσήκου-
 [σαν] καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίαι ἐκ[ά]στου πο-
 [λυωρίαν]· ἐπιμ[ύ]νουμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ [ἄλλα]
 10 [πάντα? -----]

The essential comments have already been made by Welles and are partly reproduced by Frisch. Since Brückner thought that not only Antiochus III, but also a Roman official is possible as author, all editors are wont to state their attributions with a question mark. But for the latest editor it was entirely safe to remove all doubts because H. Schmitt had already well placed the letter within the frame of events at Ilium and in the Troad, which took place in the fall of 197 B.C.¹⁾ So did also P. Herrmann in the commentary to his Teian inscriptions.²⁾

²⁾ "Antiochos der Grosse und Teos", *Anadolu* 9 (1965), published 1967, p. 89.

Welles thought that *τε* should be a finite verb ending, but as Frisch also observes, the message under consideration employs phrases comparable to those in the first (as placed in Herrmann's edition) letter of Antiochus III to Teos.³⁾ Everyone will agree that the Teian text may indeed be adduced for the interpretation of our document. I quote with own additions for l. 12: (τιμᾶς) τὰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁμοίως πολλῶι προθυμότερους παρ-
 ρασκ[εῦά]ζ[οντας εἰς] πᾶν τὸ συμφέρον συνκατασκευάζειν τῇ πόλει καὶ μὴ μόνον συν-
 τηρεῖν τὰ ὑπο]κείμενα ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅς' ἂν ἀνήκη πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν σ[υναύξε]ιν ὑμῖν
 κα[ὶ κοινῇ] καὶ ἰδία ἐκάστου ποιεῖσθαι τὴν προσήκουσαν πολυ[ωρίαν].

Not much different, I think, is the wording in the letter of Lysimachus to Priene, RC 6, 16–20, which I propose to read and restore:

[Βουλόμενοι μὲν καὶ κοινῇ] πάντων καὶ ἰδία
 [ἐκάστου ὑμῶν πολυωρεῖν ἐπιμ]ελὲς δὲ ἡμῖν
 [ἔσται τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν, καθάπε]ρ καὶ πρότερον,
 [εὐεργετεῖν· συγχωροῦμεν οὖν, ὧ]σπερ ἡξίω[σαν]
 [οἱ πρεσβευταὶ - - - - -]

The turns of the hackneyed phrases in the letter to Ilium show a marked affinity with the routine diplomatic language, above all with other letters of Antiochus III. Such are the assurances to the recently conquered Amyzon in C. B. Welles, 38, 1–3: ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας [τυγχάνομεν εὐεργετοῦντες (if not πολυωροῦντες) ὅσοι α]ὐτοὺς πιστεύσαντες ἡμῖν ἐνεχείρισαν, τὴν πᾶσαν αὐ[τῶν ποιούμενοι πρόνοιαν; 8–9 (I restore): πάντα συνκατα-
 σκευ[ασθήσονται τὰ πρὸς ἐπιμέλειαν κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήγοντα.⁴⁾ A. III to Heraclea ad Latmum, M. Wörle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 422, N I, 8–9: θέλοντες δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὰ λοιπὰ πολυ-
 ωρεῖν ὑμῶν τὰ τε ὑπὸ Ζεῦξιδος συγχωρηθέντα ὑμῖν κυροῦμεν.

Assurances of similar kind were also made by other overlords and conquerors, including Romans. The Scipios wrote in such vein to the people of Heraclea ad L. in 190 B.C., R. K. Sherck, *Roman Documents*, no. 35, 8–10: καὶ πειρασόμεθα παραγεγονότων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέρα[μ πίστιμ] πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐνδεχομένην, ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ παρα[ίτιοι γεν]όμενοι. The same is related by Memnon concerning his native city Heraclea Pontica about the same time, F. Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hist.* 434, 18. 6: διαπρεσβευσάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων στρατηγούς - - - ἐπιστολῆς φιλοφρονούμενοι ἔτυχον Ποπλίου †Αἰμυλίου (prob-
 ably corrupted for Κορηλίου) ταύτην ἀποστείλαντος, ἐν ᾗ φιλίαν τε πρὸς αὐτοὺς τῆς συγ-
 κλήτου βουλῆς ὑπισχνεῖτο, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, προνοίας τε καὶ ἐπιμελείας, ἐπειδὴν τινος δέοντο, μηδεμιᾶς ὑστερεῖσθαι.

We recognize here not only the small-change courtesies, bouncing back and forth in so many inscriptions and in other documents of A. III, such as τὰ εἰς (πρὸς) τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήγοντα,⁵⁾ but also the rationalization of the present and future favorable policy from the example of the king's ancestors. Antiochus III, as we learn from many epigraphical and literary testimonies, entertained a heightened consciousness of the merits of his own πρόγονοι, evidenced not only in general invocation of precedents created by them, but no less in citing their accomplishments in particular areas, as historical justification of his

³⁾ *Anadolu* 9, p. 42, lines 12–15.

⁴⁾ *Gnomon* 57 (1985), 610.

⁵⁾ E.g. J. Crampa, *Labraunda I*, no. 4, 16; *OGI* 219, 33; *RC* 15, 12 (which I assign to A. III); *RC* 52, 20, 37, 44–45.

his own claims and actions.⁶⁾ Except for his elder brother all Seleucid kings before A. III are attested in the Hellespontine area—it was no empty phrase.

L. 7. For *ύστερητε*, in addition to the above quoted passage from Memnon, one should also keep in view the usages of its compounds, on which Welles, *RC* p. 341, comments. It is interesting to note that *καθυστερείν* occurs in a fragment of a letter from a king Antiochus to Ephesus concerning Cyme, *RC* 17. Perhaps: *Βουλόμενοι ούν | έν ούδενι καθυστερείν και μηδεμ[ι]ας λείπεσθαι τής τών αυτοίς χρησίμων | έπιμελείας*. On the basis of script characters Dittenberger was undecided, but placed it among the inscriptions of A. III. Welles was inclined to date it by A. II Theos, if not by his predecessor, but E. L. Hicks in his first edition had assigned it to A. III (see notes to *OGI* 242). Personally I think the elongated, tall and proportionally narrow forms render the later date more likely than hitherto allowed (N.B. the shape of N), but neither the contents of this little fragment, nor the verb in question, afford any more reliable criteria.

L. 9. Frisch says that he was able to distinguish on the squeeze an oblique hasta before *-ροῦμεν*, which should exclude Wilhelm's *συνχωροῦμεν*. Perhaps yes, but the restoration simply looked too good to be discarded on a tangent. Our examples do show that this verb is very much expected here. Cf. furthermore *RC* 15, 27: *συνχωροῦμεν τών τε άλλων άπάντων*; *RC* 64, 11–13, *συνχώρησα* — — — *και τά άλλα δέ πάντα τίμια και φιλάνθρωπα*: J. Crampa, *Labraunda* I, 3, 14: *τά λοιπά τά έπιχωρουμένα πάντα*; 15–16; *πειρασόμεθα συνκατασκευάζειν ύμιν* — — — *όσα προς τιμήν και δόξαν άνήκει*; Sherk, *RD* 35, 10: *συνχωροῦμεν* — — —; 13; *και έν τοίς άλλοις*.

However, the parallel from *Chiron*, cited above, p. 48 happily decides for *έπικυροῦμεν* in a not much different sense.

Some scholars believed that there is still another epigraphic document testifying to the supremacy of A. III in Novum Ilium,⁷⁾ but the small fragment thus suspected turned out to be merely deposited at Ilium and concerns that city in nothing. It belongs to the treaty of A. III with Lysimachia.⁸⁾

Among literary testimonies we have a notice in Livy 35. 43. 3 (surely from Polybius) of Antiochus' sojourn, who like Xerxes⁹⁾ sacrificed to Athena Ilias before embarking to his defeat in Greece. Evidently in the mighty contest of Europe with Asia the goddess sided consistently with Europeans. Alexander had also sacrificed to Athena of Ilium and borrowed the sacred armor from her temple, which was to protect him in all his battles.¹⁰⁾ Justinus tells us how L. Scipio, the leader of the descendants of ancient Trojans, offered there on his crossing to Asia in 190 B.C. a splendid sacrifice amid joyous acclamations of the populace. Great many of them must have made the crowds, which but a few years past had

⁶⁾ Of course anyone, not only kings, may refer to some good record *διά προγόνων*, as in *Labraunda* I, no. 1, 3, but there is a good reason to believe that the king is invoking his own ancestors, not those of his addressees, just as he does in many other of his messages.—One new instance, M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 423, N II (Zeuxis to Heraclea ad L.): *άνακεκομισμένων ήμῶν τῷ βασιλεί την πόλιν έξ άρχής ύπάρχουσαν τοίς προγόνους αυτού*.

⁷⁾ A. Brückner in W. Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion II* (1902), p. 448, no. III. Cf. H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen*, p. 293, n. 4.

⁸⁾ Another and much larger fragment of that treaty was published in 1975. Both parts now in Frisch, *Ilion*, no. 45 with references to earlier publications. W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch*, still repeats the old conjectures. The attempt by J. L. Ferrary and Ph. Gauthier, *Journal des Savants* (1981), 327–345, to discredit both the attribution and the connection I find (*Historia* 37 [1988], 151–165) debatable.

⁹⁾ Herod. 8. 43; Xenophon, *Hellenica* 1. 4.

¹⁰⁾ Arrian, *Anab.* 1. 11; Diod. 17. 17. 6; Plut., *Alex.* 15.

welcomed Antiochus, as we can still read in their effusive decree, *OGI* 219.¹¹⁾ But such are the ways of the world; new benefactors and liberators come along, conquer, and have to be greeted and thanked. The causes of defeated rivals are fortunate enough if they can leave to posterity any record of their existence at all. Such are the inscriptions of Antiochus the Great being now recovered from the soil and from some books.

¹¹⁾ Cf. Livy 37. 37. 2; Justinus 31. 8. 1–4.