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Nicholas Milner has recently published a Hellenistic text from Boubon which contains part of a treaty relating to the Kibyrate Tetrapolis. Milner’s text runs as follows:

```
[S]Ο[ ]O[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[πρὸς Oἰνοά νδος - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -]
εὐσεβοῦντες και] λόγῳ καὶ ἔργοις καὶ ὑπάλληλοις, σπουδῆς καὶ]

5 [φιλοτιμίαις μὴθεν ἐλλίποντες κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἡμῶν]
[αὐτῶν, διατηρήσοντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τοὺς καὶ]
[νοῦς σωτήρας καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοοῦν· τε καὶ συμμαχεῖ,
[μηθὲν ὑπεναντίον πράσοντες τοῖς ἑκείνων δόγμασιν].

[ομοῦνται δ' αἱ διαλαξομεναι τέσσαρεις πόλεις δι' ἐντόμων]
[νοεματον - - - c.7 - - τοὺς ὁρκοῖς τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον]
[τρόπον . . . ]
```

The reconstruction of the text is based on the view that it is an oath (158), and Milner therefore restores in two places the first person plural (line 3: βοιηθήσομεν and line 5: ἡμῶν), although there is no other indication in the preserved text that this is necessary. The participants to the treaty undertake to uphold their treaty with Rome and to do nothing contrary to the senatus consultas (lines 6–8: διατηρήσοντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τοὺς καὶ σωτήρας καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοοῦν· τε καὶ συμμαχεῖ, μηθὲν ὑπεναντίον πράσοντες τοῖς ἑκείνων δόγμασιν). As far as we know, of the four cities of the Tetrapolis only Kibyra possessed a treaty with Rome. Milner therefore concludes that the Kibyrates must be the subject of the plural participles and the restored first person main verb in line 3. The three cities which have been reconciled (αἱ διαλαξομεναι τέσσαρεις πόλεις) and which, as participants to the new treaty, are required to swear the oath (line 9), are therefore the remaining three cities of the Tetrapolis, Boubon, Balboura and Oinoanda. The substance of their oath, however, lies in the air, and their relationship to the postulated oath of the Kibyrates remains unclear.

This does not seem to be the most likely explanation of the new text. The normal model for a documentary treaty and the accompanying oath is that the treaty terms are listed in detail and are then followed by the oath, which is normally composed in the first person singular, i.e. suitable for each individual swearer of the oath, whether all the citizens or representatives of the participant communities. The text of the oath then normally refers back to the terms described in the foregoing text. It is therefore difficult to imagine what the oath of the three cities can have referred to, if what we have in the preserved text is itself the oath of the Kibyrates; or indeed, why another – presumably substantively different – oath should be appended at all. If different oaths were foreseen, we would expect the provision for both oaths to be in the same place in the text, after the listing of the terms of the treaty.

2 E.g. I. Milet I 3, 150 line 109: ὡ δὲ ὅρκος ἐστώ ὅδε ναυαί ἐμμενόν τοῖς ὑμολογημένοις εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον etc.
I wish to suggest that the nature of the text has been misunderstood and as a result wrongly restored. What we have here is not an oath, but a normal listing of the agreed terms of the treaty expressed in the third person plural (or appropriate participial constructions), to which the necessary oath or oaths were appended. The restorations I suggest are only exempli gratia. Line 3 is obviously critical, where Milner has restored the participle εὐσεβείτωσαν, which in intransitive use is rare and in a treaty, as far as I can see, unparalleled. It will then be necessary to assume that the main verb disappears. It will then be necessary to assume that the main verb (e.g. συνθήκας ἐποίησαντο) was placed in the lost portion of the text. This seems in principle unproblematical. In line 5 Milner has restored the first person plural pronoun ἡμῶν, which was necessitated by his first person plural verb supplement to line 3, but since this has disappeared, we need something like κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἑαυτόν] καὶ διατηρο[ύντες etc. I can find no parallel for the restored τοὺς ὀρκο[υς] in line 10, nor for the restored τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον | τρόπον .] in lines 10–11. Not only is this unparalleled, but it makes no sense, since the function and validity of the oath was not dependent on the manner of its swearing but on the precise text, which is usually given in full. Since Milner also allows the possibility of the normal and expected τὸν ὄρκον τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον, it seems perverse not to restore it here. It seems more usual to use a third person imperative for the instruction to swear, so line 10 [ὁμότοσον] for [ὁμοῖόνται].

My new text therefore reads as follows:

```
[- - - - - - - - - - - -]Σ[. .]Ο[- - - - - - - - - - - - -]
[- - - - - πρὸς Οινο[ό]δοις - - - - - - - - -]
[- - c.8 - δοι[ν]θούντες τοῖς κ[αινοίς πράγμασιν, ἄγω]-
[νι[ζόμενοι καὶ] λόγω καὶ ἔργοις καὶ ὑποθέσεις καὶ]
5 [πιλοτιμίας μ]ήθεν ἐλλίποντες κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἑαυτο]-
[καὶ διατηρούντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους το[ὺς καὶ]-
[νοὺς σωτηράς] καὶ εὐφρόντες εὐθύνον τε καὶ συμμα[χίαν].
[μήθεν ὑπεννατ[σ]όμενον πάντως τοι[ς ἐκεῖνοι δόμημα[σιν].
[ὁμότοσαν δ’ αἰ διαλέξασθαι] μενει τρεῖς πόλεις δι’ ἐντόμ[οιν]
10 [νεοκαύτων - - c.7] - τὸν ὄρκον τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον.]
```

Milner has, it seems to me, rightly indicated the historical context of the new text as being concerned with the early stages, perhaps even the foundation, of the Kibyrate Tetrapolis in the years following the forced withdrawal of Rhodes from its recently acquired territories south of the Maiander after 167 B.C. Important factors for the participants of the new inter-city treaty, explicitly mentioned, were the existing good will towards the Romans, the treaty with them (line 7) and the otherwise unspecified senatus consultum (line 8). These can, however, hardly be the senatus consultum concerning the Rhodian withdrawal and the liberation of Kaunos and Stratoni, as Milner suggests (162), since those cannot have concerned details of affairs in the Kibyritas. The

---

3 So also A. Chaniotis, Mnemosyne 63 (2010) 676, without argument.
4 Cf. Syll. 742 line 10 (Ephesus): εὐσεβείς κακον τῷ βοηθεῖν τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασιν.
5 Chaniotis, loc. cit. (n. 3) suggests: [ὁμοῖόταται/ὁμοίοσθον δ’ αἰ - - -] τρεῖς πόλεις δι’ ἐντόμ[οιν] νεοκαύτων πρὸς . . . καί11 . . τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον ὄρκον.
6 Strabo xiii 4.17 (631 C.)
senatus consulta mentioned in the treaty must be rather specific decisions relating to the cities of the Kibyratis. Theoretically possible is the interpretation that their mention here merely reflects a general recognition that senatus consulta were critical and needed to be obeyed. However, none of the parallel passages cited by Milner explicitly mentions senatus consulta, which by their nature were concerned with specific problems. Passages referring to a general wish to conform to Roman policy seem to be always expressed in much more general language. I therefore much prefer the first alternative, even though we have no further information about the senatus consulta concerning the Kibyratis.

Given that Milner’s reconstruction of the text is unsatisfactory, his argument about Kibyra’s being the only possible subject for the named “upholders of the treaty” with Rome is leaden. According to my reconstruction, the three “reconciled” cities all swear to uphold the conditions listed in the text of the treaty. This means, they all swore to all the terms listed. Therefore, since only one symmachia is named, we must conclude that the participants to the new treaty considered themselves bound by the treaty which Rome had made with their leading city, Kibyra, as well as “the senatus consulta”. These may well have treated detailed problems of the area, as seems to have happened at Antiocheia on the Maiander.

Which were the three cities involved, which are described as “reconciled”? I agree with Milner that we do indeed seem to have a document associated with the foundation of the Kibyrate Tetrapolis, and which originally illustrated how it came into being. Here I would like to be more precise and see two alternative scenarios. (a) Three cities, Boubon, Balboura and Kibyra came together under the leadership of Kibyra and settled, perhaps with Roman help – ? the senatus consulta — outstanding local problems, which had caused irritation between them. Thereafter they approached Oinoanda and made a joint agreement integrating Oinoanda into their association and so creating the Tetrapolis. This would perhaps explain why only Oinoanda is explicitly mentioned in the substantive part of the treaty’s text in line 2 (unless this is merely a result of the breaking of the stone). (b) Alternatively, as Milner suggests, the “three cities” are Oinoanda, Balboura and Boubon, and they were named in the lost upper part of the document, where the name of Oinoanda (officially “the Termessians by Oinoanda”) is partially preserved (line 2); they thus exclude Kibyra, and the purpose of the treaty will be that they are joining with Kibyra to form the tetrapolis; thereby they agree to uphold the terms agreed with Kibyra (here listed), which include respecting all aspects of the existing relations with Rome. In this case we would expect that the oath of Kibyra would be included on the lost lower part of the stone along with the oath of the “three cities”. The second alternative is perhaps to be preferred.

---

7 160, ad loc.
9 See now D. Rousset, De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d’Oinoanda (Fouilles de Xanthos X), 2010.
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