1. Introduction

In 1667, the inscription studied in this paper was presented to the University of Oxford as part of the Arundel marbles by Henry Howard, whose grandfather had acquired the major part of these stones in Smyrna in the early 17th century. Nowadays it is preserved in the store room of the Ashmolean Museum (inventory n. C2-48), where the autopsy of the stone, on which this study is based, took place on 9.12.2014. Unfortunately, there are no records of the circumstances either of its finding or of its purchase.

It was engraved on a marble stele of which the upmost part has broken off. The inscribed part is surrounded by a profiled frame, so we can be sure that the text is complete on the left, right, and bottom side. There are 45 extant lines; how much of the text is missing will be discussed below. The small lacunae in ll. 38–42 which are caused by a fissure in the lower part of the stone pose no problems of understanding and have been restored convincingly based on the readings of earlier editors, the fundamental edition being Petzl’s *I.Smyrna 697* from 1987.

Text

Measurements: h: 157.7; b: top 53.9, bottom 55.4; d: top l. 14.3, r. 12.5, bottom l. 15.8, r. 15.5; h. of lett.: 1.5–2.2.

Editions and translations:

**My warmest thanks go to Charles Crowther for pointing this inscription out to me in the first place, for facilitating the autopsy, for making crucial suggestions for readings, interpretations, and arguments, and for all the rest. Peter Thonemann inimitably helped me solve the central cruxes of the textual interpretation and gave this article its final shape. I am furthermore very much indebted to Robert Parker, Nicholas Purcell, and Ewen Bowie for their substantial and astute comments and criticisms, as well as to Andrew Wilson and Bert Smith who induced practical considerations during the 2016 excavation season of the Aphrodisian palm grove.**

† Tod 1951, 172–173.
Πα(?)πίας δὲ τὸ δ’, [ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ Εὐ]άρεστος τὸ τε ζ’, ἔφ’ οὐ στρατηγυγνότοι· υπέέχοντο σίδε Κλ(αύδιος) Βάσος ἀγνοθήτης

Νεμέσεων στρώσειν τὴν βασιλικήν. Φοῖκος ἔργον ποιήσειν μυ(ριάδες) ζ’, Χερσίφρων ἀσάρχης τοὺς κήπους εἰς τὸν φοινικώνα, Λούκιος Πομπήιος εἰς τὸν φοινικῶνα: μυ(ριάδες) ζ’, Λούκιος Βηστεῖνος τὴν βασιλικὴν στρώσειν τὴν πρὸς τὸ βουλευτήριο καὶ χαλκάς τὰς θύρας ποιῆσειν γάδ." Σμάραγδος πρύτανις ναὸν Τύχης κατασκευάσεσίν ἐν τῷ φοινικῶνῃ. Κλαυδιανὸς πρύτανις χρυσεῖν τὸν ὄροφο τοῦ ἀλιπτηρίου τῆς γερουσίας καὶ οἳ εἰς τὸν χαριστήριον νεώ κείονας σὺν σπειροκεφάλῳ. Νυμφιδία ἀρχιερεία, Κλ(αύδιος) Αρτέμυλλα, Κλ(αύδιος) Πώλλα, Κλ(αύδιος) Νεικήτου, Θευδιανὸς στεφανηφόρος β’, Φλ(αουία) Ἀσκληπιακή, Εἰσίδωρος σοφιστής, Ἀντωνία Μάγνα, Κλ(αύδιος) Αρίστιος. Κλ(αύδια) Λεόντιος Κυμβελλείτας σὺν σπειροκεφάλοις εἰς τὸν φοινικῶνα β’. οἱ τὸτε Ἰουδαῖοι μυ(ριάδες) Α, Κλ(αύδια) Λεόντιος Κυμβελλείτας σὺν σπειροκεφάλοις εἰς τὸν φοινικῶνα ν.β’, Μούρδιος Καικιλιανὸς μυ(ριάδες) Β καὶ ὅσα ἐπετύχομεν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος Ἁδριανοῦ διὰ Ἀντωνίου Πολέμων δεύτερον δόγμα συνκλήτου, καθ’ ὃ δὶς νεώκοροι γεγόναμεν ἀγῶνα ἱερὸν, ἀτέλειαν, θεολόγους, ὑμνοδούς μυ(ριάδες) Α, Κλ(αύδια) Λεόντιος Κυμβελλείτας σὺν σπειροκεφάλοις εἰς τὸν φοινικῶνα Νουμεδικοὺς καὶ χαλκάς τῶν στεφανηφόρων εἰς τὸν φοινικῶνα Νουμεδικοὺς, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πῶλλα, Κλ(αύδια) Πейчас.
Within the lines, there are quite a few punctuation marks, used in particular to separate names and numbers from the preceding or following letters. Puech is the only edition to mark them, but does not give all of them. Here they are given as seen on the stone. **Hedena** are used twice (ll. 13+21) to fill up a line into which the following personal name could not fit completely and thus to avoid the dividing of a name. Numbers are written in the alphabetical system and spelled in full only once, where the largest amount of money mentioned is concerned (ll. 39–40). On three occasions (ll. 23, 30, 42), horizontal lines above the letters clearly designate them as numbers, a common method, but one which is never used for a sum of money in this inscription. The monetary unit of the denarius is automatically implied and made explicit only once with the standard large asterisk symbol (l. 32), probably because this is the only occurrence of a sum of less than 10,000 denarii which could not be represented in the acrophonic way. In order to render a sum of 10,000 a small ‘A’ for ‘1’ is written over an ‘M’, the acrophonic symbol for 10,000, μυριάδες (ll. 26, 27, 30). The same system is implemented for 20,000 given as a small ‘B’ over an ‘M’ (l. 33). A divergent method is used for writing 50,000 and 70,000 (ll. 10+7) where μυριάδες is abbreviated with a small ‘Υ’ over an ‘Μ’ and the ‘Ε’ for ‘5’ and ‘Ζ’ for ‘7’ are put afterwards. Besides these numerical abridgements,abbreviations are used only with the *gentilicia* Flavia (ΦΛ) and Claudius/-a (ΚΛ). There is only one ligature to be found at the end of l. 11.

L. 1: my conjecture; Selden: ΙΑΣ; Prideaux: ὌΡΙΑΣ; Petzl: ΡΙΑΣ.
L. 2: Boeckh and most of the subsequent editors have δὲ τὸ δʹ (?); Selden: δὲ τὸ; Prideaux, Mattaire, Chandler: δὲ τὸ σ; Boeckh was the first to restore the name as Εὐάρεστος, Petzl conjectured the magistracy [ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ] on the basis of *I.Smyrna* 771 and 773.
L. 18: καὶ οἳ: Selden; Boeckh: καὶ τὸν; Petzl: καὶ ΟΙ.
L. 30: τότε: my tentative emendation for ποτε (lapis).
L. 31: ΔΙΚΗΝΟΣ: Selden ΔΙΚΗΝΟΣ; Boeckh ΔΙΚΗΝΟΣ?; Petzl ΔΙΚΗΝΟΣ; Puech ΔΙ+ΗΝΟΣ.
L. 42: Bowie and Hirt 2010, 98 read the last numeral as Ζ = 7, but the extant traces look very similar to the digamma at the end of l. 2.

**Translation**

but *Papias* for the fourth time; [Eu]arestos [the one in charge of the sanctuary] for the sixth time; under whose tenure of generalship the following promised: Cl(audius) Bassus, president of the games of the Nemeseis, to pave the basilica, Fuscus to make a construction worth 70,000, the *asiarchēs* Chersiphron the gardens for the palm grove, Lucius Pompeius for the palm grove 50,000, Lucius Vestinus to pave the basilica near the council-chamber and to have the doors made brazen, the *prytanis* Smaragdos to build a temple of Tyche in the palm grove, the *prytanis* Claudianus to gild
the ceiling2 of the aleiptērion3 of the gerousia; and the following for the
thank-offering shrine a pillar with capital
and base4: the archiereia Nymphidia,
Cl(audia) Artemylla, Cl(audia) Polla,
Claudia daughter of Niketes, Theudianos
twice stephanēphoros, Fl(avia) Asklepiake,
the sophist Isidoros, Antonia
Magna, and Cl(audia) Aristion; Albidia
Magna 10,000, Cl(audia) Hedeia 10,000, Cl(audia) Charis
10,000, Cl(audia) Leontion 10,000, Cl(audia) Aurelia
52 pillars from Kybelia5 with
capitals and bases for the palm
grove, the Iudaioi who were present at that time 10,000,
Metrodoros Licinus son of Nikanor for
the palm grove 7,500 denarii, Murdius
Caecilianus 20,000; and as much as we obtained
from the Lord Caesar
Hadrian through Antonius Polemo:
a second decree of the Senate
through which we have become twice neōkoroi,
a sacred contest, tax exemption, theologoi,
hymnōdoi, one million and five
hundred thousand, for the aleiptērion
72 pillars from Synnada,
20 Numidian, 6 of porphyry.
Also, the sun-terrace in the gymnasium
was equipped by Sextus

2 In my opinion, it is more likely that the ceiling inside (as Pont 2008, 161 renders it) and not the roof outside (as the majority of the translators have understood it, e.g. l.Smyrna II,1, 194; Puech 2002, 398; Gibson 2005, 75; Thomas 2007, 130; Bowie 2012, 256) was gilded; ὄροφος is simply an alternative form for ὀροφή (LSJ s.v.) which can designate both; clear examples where it undoubtedly refers to a ceiling are MAMA VI 264 l. 8 (1st c. AD; transl. IJO II, 349 n. 168) and Luc. Dom. 7–8 (he even speaks of golden decorations on the ceiling). Another example of the gilding of an aleiptērion stems from Sardis from AD 211 (Herrmann 1993, 234), where it is referred to as an ἔργον (l. 14). This rather general term need not necessarily refer to a whole building, but can here be understood as ‘monument’ and it is likely that it was its ceiling again which was gilded (Herrmann 1993, 235: ‘«Vergoldung» bestimmter Architekturelemente’; Pont 2008, 166–167).

3 All the attestations of aleiptēria in Pont 2008.

4 This translation for σπειροκέφαλον is corroborated by Flemberg 1996 who collects all the parallel passages from other epigraphical material.

5 The otherwise unattested Κυμβελλείτας is likely to be connected with the village Kybelia ca. 60 km west of Smyrna in the vicinity of which there was a millstone quarry (Str. XIV 1,33), Petzl 1990, 376, and not with the Phrygian Kybele mountains as previously held. On the distribution patterns of marble in Roman Asia Minor see Russell 2013, esp. 146–151.
The inscription as it survives today can be divided into three sections: ll. 4–33 catalogue 23 individuals and one group of people who, during someone’s tenure of generalship, promised to make financial contributions (only on two occasions is the destination for the money specified: ll. 9–10 and 31–32 for the palm grove) or to provide for architectural elements (ll. 7–8 gardens, ll. 12–13 brazen doors, ll. 14–15 a temple, ll. 19–20 and ll. 28–29 pillars) or their embellishment (ll. 5–6 and l. 11 the pavement of a basilica, ll. 16–17 gilding of a ceiling). The noticeable accumulation of the gentilician ‘Claudius/-a’ makes it probable that most of the families of these individuals had already been granted Roman citizenship under the reign of or were freedmen of Tiberius or Claudius and are thus to be considered as part of the longer-established civic elite with close contact to the Roman authorities. Also, the offices mentioned in the inscription (asiarchēs l. 7, prytanis l. 14+16, archiereia l. 20, stephanēphoros l. 23, archiereus l. 45) suggest that the donors are a representative cross section of the city’s elite in the first half of the 2nd c. AD. Claudia Polla (l. 21) might be identical with or closely related to Claudia Polla Quintilla who was honoured by the council and citizens of Sardis in AD 126/7 after having discharged the priesthood of Artemis and shown herself munificent towards the city. Artemylla (l. 21) is a very rare name otherwise attested only in the fragmentary apocryphal Acta Pauli from the 2nd c. AD and now also in one other inscription from Klaros (Ulpia Artemylla). The name Albidia (l. 25) is possibly of Etruscan origin from the same stem as the more common Albinius, but might as well be derived from the Smyrnaean phylē Albēis (see fn. 26). Claudia Hedeia (l. 26) might be of the same family as a Κλα̣υ̣δί[α] Ἡ̣δ̣ῆ̣α̣ from a 1st c. AD Chian inscription.

Whereas the originally prospective aspect of these promises is clearly indicated by the fact that all verbal forms used are dependent future infinitives (ll. 5, 11 στρώσειν, ll. 6, 13 ποιήσειν, l. 15 κατασκευάσειν, ll. 16–17 χρυσώσειν), the benefactions in the second part (ll. 33–42) have already been received (ll. 33–34 ὅσα ἐπετύχομεν, l. 37 γεγόναμεν). Through the intervention of Antonius Polemo, Hadrian has not only given his approval to a senatus consultum awarding a second neōkoria to the city, but also granted a sacred agōn, exemption from taxes, theologoi and hymnōdoi, as well as a large amount of money and as many as 98 pillars of precious marbles and porphyry.

---

6 On subscription lists in the Greek world see Migeotte 1992; Chaniotis 2013; Ellis-Evans 2013.
7 This and the following is intended to complement the prosopographic and onomastic information gathered by Petzl 1987, 193–197.
8 LGPN V.A s.v. 28 and I.Sardis VII 1, 52 I.
9 LGPN V.A s.v.; Ferrary 2014, 277 n. 43 l. 14.
10 Schulze 1933, 118–120.
11 SEG XV 532 ll. 1–2.
12 Compare I.Smyrna 696, which announces the names of the people who had fulfilled their promised contributions to the renovation of the port.
13 Note the use of the first person plural expressing the feeling of a Smyrnaean civic identity.
14 For Polemo see Puech 2002, 396–406; Quet 2003, 401–443; a discussion of material that sheds new light on the genealogy of Polemo can be found in Thonemann 2004, 144–150.
16 Keil 1908, 104–105 with fn. 9 refers the sum of money to the sacred games and the imperial cult in general; Burrell 2004, 44 thinks it is ‘remote’ to refer it to the gymnasion only; Price 1984, 129 fn. 159 connects it with the building of the imperial temple. For a good overview of columns donated to baths/gymnasia see Pont 2010, 135–140; Thonemann 2015, 160–164 discusses another imperial grant of Phrygian marble from the late Antonine period.
The third section (ll. 43–45), connected with a simple δὲ καὶ, mentions a donation which has already been carried out as well: the archiereus Sextus has furnished a special room in the gymnasium. This Sextus is very likely to be identical with the stephanēphoros Pom[peius] (Pom[ponius]? Pom[peianus]?) Sextus on Smyrnaean coins under Hadrian bearing an image of the second neōkoria temple on their reverse.¹⁷

The references to the agōnothetēs of the Nemeseis (ll. 4–5) and especially to the second neōkoria, which Hadrian awarded to the city by mediation of Antonius Polemo, clearly indicate that this inscription was put up in the city of Smyrna.¹⁸ The granting of the second neōkoria took place in AD 124 as is attested by I.Smyrna 594, a presumably imperial letter confirming this special honour and mentioning the Roman consuls in office in AD 124.¹⁹ So this date is undoubtedly to be regarded as terminus post quem for our inscription.²⁰

2. Problematic Readings

In l. 1, the remaining letter traces have been read as ΙΑΣ by all scholars since the first edition. There is also a vertical stroke visible left of the Ι, which Prideaux rendered as Ρ,²¹ but as there is very little space between them, it is more likely to be the right vertical hasta of a Π, Μ, Ν, or Η. The following δὲ τὸ δʹ (l. 2) is best to be understood as ‘but ... for the fourth time’ referring to the tenure of office of the individual mentioned directly before.²² Interpreting thus the letters of l. 1 as the ending of a personal name in the nominative (as Euarestos in l. 2), one tentative restoration could be Παπίας, a fairly common name in Asia Minor and attested seven times in Smyrna in the imperial period.²³

Furthermore, there are two other instances in the inscription where the reading is unclear. Over the last part of the name Μητρόδωρος Νεικάνορος in l. 31, a word has been scribbled in between the lines, probably after the engraving of the main inscription.²⁴ Selden and Chandler read it as ΔΙΚΗΝΟΣ, but according to the findings of the autopsy the Δ could as well be a Λ or an Α. This addition is best explained as a subsequent distinction in order to avoid ambiguity. It might be a profession,²⁵ an office, a third personal name of Metrodoros or a second one of his...

¹⁸ This was already seen by the inscription’s first editor Selden and corroborated convincingly by Boeckhardt II 3148 against Reinesius who tried to allocate it to Corinth. Cults for a double incarnation of Nemesis are admittedly attested elsewhere as well (Halicarnassus: CIG II 2663; Thasos: IG XII 8, 373; Panamara: I.Stratonikeia I 175), but the goddesses of Smyrna certainly enjoyed the most prominent position amongst these, came to have games in their name, and even featured on the city’s coins later on; see Paus. VII 5,3; Cadoux 1938, 220–222; Robert 1969a, 1401; Tataki 2009, 642; Kuhn 2012; for material on Nemesis in general see Hornum 1993.
¹⁹ Keil 1908, 110; Degrassi 1952, 36; Halfmann 1986, 200.
¹⁰ As in I.Smyrna 771 l. 33; 772 ll. 8+11; 773 ll. 6+8. The δὲ only makes sense if that person was given here as the last of a pair or board of magistrates and the other one(s) mentioned before him were holding the office for the first, second, or third time only. It is most probable that this is the board of ταμίαι attested in I.Smyrna 771 ll. 16–17, 772 ll. 7–8, and possibly 773 l. 2.
²³ LGPN V.A s.v.; there is of course a dozen other possibilities for names ending in -πιας, -μιας, -νιας.
²⁴ See figs 1 and 2.
²⁵ A parallel for such a case can be seen in an inscription found at Notion where ἰατρός is added above a name (JÖAI VIII 1905, 165,2 ll. 8–9).
father, or a demotic referring to a Smyrnaean phylē.26 Boeckh’s conjecture [Λαο]δικηνός can be ruled out because there are no traces on the stone before these letters and the standard ethnic for people from Laodikeia is Λαοδικεύς.27 I want to suggest the new reading Λικῆνος as a rendering of Latin Licinus, which occasionally occurs as a cognomen as well.28

Another difficult part is found after the donation of the prytanis Claudianus in ll. 18–20: καὶ ΟI εἷς τὸν χαριστήριον νεώ κείονα σὺν σπειροκεφάλῳ. The rather odd form νεώ is commonly perceived as the Attic accusative form of ναός missing a ν at the end. Despite the fact that the regular form ναόν appears just five lines above this seems plausible and is attested in more or less contemporary literary and epigraphic sources, too.29 Furthermore, the use of the definite masculine article τὸ clearly shows that χαριστήριον is used here as an adjective which needed to be followed by a noun.30 That this noun is best to be seen as indicating a construction is corroborated by the other instances in the inscription where columns are donated31 as well as by the use of εἰς marking the purpose of a donation. Admitting the scarcity of evidence for an actual ‘thank-offering temple’, one might suggest a shrine specifically dedicated to thank-offerings as part of a building rather than a whole building.32

As for the ΟI, a variety of possible readings can been offered.33 Boeckh renders it as <τ>όν which, even if one admits the omission of a τ, can in no way be brought in line with the stone, which clearly reads ΟI. Furthermore, such an attributive position of the designated purpose of the donation has no parallels in the inscription and does not match its overall rather pragmatic catalogue style.34 Burrell assumes that OI stands for an amount of money ‘towards the column with its base and capital for the thank-offering “temple”’.35 But this seems rather unlikely, because, first, in every other occasion the given sum is written at the very end of the donation and, second, in this instance it seems grammatically too odd to relate the εἰς to both column and temple. Furthermore, all the other numerals in the inscription stand between punctuation marks, and there is no plausible amount that could be made up of the given letters: ΟI (70+10)

26 Only six of the phylai of Smyrna are attested: Albēis, Ammōnis, Artemeisias, Thēssēis, Lētōis, and Mētrois (Jones 1987, 302–303).
27 E.g. I.Smyrna 689 col. III ll. 35, 44, I.Ephesos 1605 l. 2, I.Tralleis 111 l. 2, I.Lasos 196 l. 8, I Didyma 148 l. 16.
28 Salomies 1987, 33; on the interchangeability of ι and η see Brixhe 1987, 47–48.
29 One very solid parallel is IP II 276 (Hadrian’s letter to the Pergamenes from AD 135/136 regarding their request of a third neōkoria) where both νεώ (l. 12) and ναόν (l. 18) appear in the same paragraph, see Müller 2009; νεώ also in D.S. XVI 58; Str. XVII 1,43; Ph. spec. leg. I 66; J. bell. jud. IV 4, VII 135, 160; c. Ap. I 228; LXX 2. Macc. VI 2, IX 16, X 3, XIII 23, XIV 33.
30 And not as a noun itself which would have been neuter and thus required the article τὸ, as e.g. Thomas 2007, 130 (‘for the thanks-offering’) or Gibson 2005, 75 (‘for the purpose of a thank-offering’) take it. This also rules out other possible readings of νεω as a dative singular νεός, a dual form of the adjective νέος, or the admittedly attractive νεῶ<ν> ‘of the young men’ (Thomas 2007, 130).
31 Ll. 28–30: κείονας Κυμβελείτας σὺν | σπειροκεφάλοις εἰς τὸν φοινεῖκονα; ll. 40–41: κείο̣ν̣ας εἰς τὸ | ἀλειπτήριον.
32 LSJ s.v. A II.; Pont 2010, 34, who however understands the shrine itself as the thank-offering.
33 I will not discuss here forms that can be ruled out as impossible to fit in grammatically such as the elided neuter plural accusative of the indirect interrogative pronoun οί, the relative adverb οί, and the personal pronoun masculine dative singular οί.
34 Especially the first half of Claudianus’ donation (τὸν δροφὸν τοῦ ἀλειπτήριον τῆς γερουνίας) speaks against such an attributive solution.
35 Burrell 2004, 45.
can be ruled out and ΘΙ (19), being the only other possible reading of the numbers, would be embarrassingly small compared to the other considerable donations and is further very unlikely given that in all other instances the decimal number is in the first position. Selden already offered the simplest solution in referring it to the following list of nine individuals: ‘Et alij in templi puluinar’ and if one understands that each of the nine donated one column this reading appears as the most plausible solution.36

3. General nature of I.Smyrna 697

This inscription has unanimously been interpreted as a subscription list,37 but the extant list might indeed not have constituted the essential defining part of the inscription. It has remained unanswered why the considerable imperial benefactions are listed in such an oddly perfunctory way only after the individual promises. What is further unusual is the use of the nominative Εὐάρεστος (l. 2) in the alleged dating formula at the alleged beginning of the inscription.38 There are good parallels for the mention of magistrates and their offices in the nominative from Smyrna: I.Smyrna 771–773 (and possibly also in the more fragmentary I.Smyrna 774–776). The list of donations is unique to our inscription, but what gives the important clue for a new interpretation is indeed the occurrence of Euarestos in the office of ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ at the end of I.Smyrna 771. This inscription is fully preserved and represents a dedication to Heracles Hoplophylax by the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων, the chief magistrate of Smyrna, very likely at the end of his tenure of office.39 After his very brief and formulaic dedicatory text in larger letters (ll. 1–6: [.] Γέσσιος Φλάκκος στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων Ἡρακλεῖ ὁπλοφύλακι) follows a short dating formula mentioning only the stephanēphoros in the genitive (ll. 7–11) and then a longer list of magistrates in the nominative, the last of which is our Euarestos as ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ for the seventh time. That such an end-of-office-dedication could take on honorific features is suggested by I.Smyrna 772, where the kinship of the dedicating official with senators, consuls, high priests, stratēgoi, and stephanēphoroi is highlighted just as it would be in more standard honorific inscriptions. As Euarestos appears in the nominative with a subsequent count of office years, it is legitimate to conjecture that our ‘subscription list’ was in fact also an end-of-term-dedication of the Smyrnaean chief magistrate. The monument of I.Smyrna 771 (h: 100 cm; b: 22 cm; d: 20 cm) apparently was a base for a statuette40 without containing any more information about the period of office of the stratēgos; I.Smyrna 697 (very similar in lettering and height of letters: 1.5–2.5 cm in both cases) was a larger monument (h: 157.7 cm; b: 53.9–55.4 cm; d: 12.5–15.8 cm; not necessarily a statue base, more likely a dedicatory stele) incorporating, after the common listing of co-magistrates in the nominative, a kind of rendering of account of what good had happened under the

36 For the use of the deictic formula καὶ ὅς which connects without any problems to οἶδε in l. 4, see Kühner and Gerth 1904, 228 (§ 516, 4). Most scholars until Boeckh followed Selden in that respect, as does still Thomas 2007, 130: ‘and the following persons for the thanks-offering (charistērion) of young men, a column with coiled base-mouldings’; similarly in Barresi 2003, 445. In the presentation of this paper in the Oxford Epigraphy Workshop in February 2016, Charles Crowther also strongly spoke in favour of this reading.
38 Migeotte 1992, 207.
40 Petzl 1987, 269.
tenure of office of the dedicating magistrate (thus assuming an honorific function as tangible in I.Smyrna 772).\(^{41}\) So the relative clause starting in l. 3 and structuring the whole remaining text is not referring to Euarestos, but to the στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων mentioned in the lost beginning of the inscription.\(^{42}\) It is likely that the list of donations promised by individuals and a group of Iudaioi was an answer to a call for subscriptions issued by the for us anonymous στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὅπλων who set up the dedication, in the sense that its commemoration on marble aims at highlighting the achievement of the latter in generating such an impressive amount of civic energetic participation.\(^{43}\) But what is more important, such an interpretation of the monument makes better sense of the perfunctory mention of Hadrian’s donations in connection with the second neōkoria grant. They are mentioned here because they took place during the term of office of the στρατηγὸς, so they shine a positive light on his reign; but at the same time, if he had not been involved in the brokering especially of the neōkoria grant, which did not fall in his area of responsibility\(^{44}\) and which is clearly presented as an achievement of Polemo everyone would have been aware of, it would not have been decent for him to overemphasize it in his end-of-term-dedication to Heracles.\(^{45}\)

To understand I.Smyrna 697 not as an official subscription list, but a dedication focused on an individual also helps to explain the summary and often unspecified nature of the text, the list within the list (ll. 18–25), the slightly odd grammar (often no future infinitive, but just the promised object or sum of money), the different spellings of αἰλιπτηρίον in l. 17 and l. 41, or the inconsistent rendering of numbers. The most likely place of erection of the stele would then surely have been the Smyrnaean stratēgeion which was labelled as a Herakleion by Aristides (or. 40, 13). Thus, it has been brought home once again that it is of the greatest importance to study inscriptions not as mere text documents, but to perceive them as physical monuments which they doubtlessly were for the ancient viewer, too.\(^{46}\)

4. Commentary

Οἱ ποτε Ἰουδαῖοι

The passage of the inscription that has received probably the most scholarly attention is οἱ ποτε Ἰουδαῖοι in l. 30, a phrase which in this form is attested only here.\(^{47}\) Its precise meaning has been subject to controversial debates. The explanation of the earlier editors, that a group of apostate Jews was meant, has justly been criticised as being too odd a fact to be emphasised in a public in-

\(^{41}\) I owe this brilliant idea to Peter Thonemann.

\(^{42}\) Thus, it would become doubtful whether the surely minor office of the ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, which is mostly mentioned at the very end, should be seen as part of the stratēgoi collegium, as Petzl 1987, 193 holds.

\(^{43}\) Whether the latter ever fulfilled their promises was of no importance at the moment of the engraving of the stone.

\(^{44}\) Jones 1990, 71 gives grain supply and bread price as the main responsibilities.

\(^{45}\) If it had been an official document it would have given more relevant details such as how many theologoi and hymnōdoi were granted, what were their duties, what exactly was the tax exemption referring to, how and how often were the sacred games to be carried out. One must assume that official documents connected with Hadrian’s benefactions had been proudly published in full extent in inscriptions around the city. I.Smyrna 697 clearly does not belong to this category of official documents.

\(^{46}\) See Cooley 2012 on the notion of document vs. monument.

\(^{47}\) Harland 2003, 202; it is also the only extant example of a group of Iudaioi making a donation in the common interest of a city, Ameling 2004, 178.
scription and has thus received less support recently.48 Another possible solution is to interpret it as referring to immigration to Smyrna from Judaea, but understanding it as ‘those formerly of Judaea’ or something similar49 appears as rather odd as well, as they would always remain people from Judaea, geographic origin not being something one could simply cast off. As a third possibility it has been suggested that the donors could have been members of some sort of association which had been dissolved between the promise and the erection of the inscription.50 One has to admit that this seems very artificial, as a Jewish community in Smyrna is attested at least until the 4th c. AD and, in addition, there is no evidence of a Judean association of any sub-organisational level at any point.51

Looking at parallels for the attributive usage of particles and adverbs, the comparison with the widely used phrase οἱ νῦν/τότε ἄνθρωποι (‘the people that are now in the world/the people that were there at the past time of which someone is speaking’) is apparent. The same construction is also well attested for peoples: οἱ τότε Ἀθηναῖοι/Ἀττικοί, οἱ τότε Ῥωμαίοι, οἱ τότε Λακεδαιμόνιοι, and in one instance even as τῶν τότε Ἰουδαίων.52 This τότε merely refers back to the narrative time (the Athenians, Romans etc. at a certain time in history) and does not imply a change in the nature of the groups. There are further good epigraphic parallels for this construction: ἐπιμελησαμένου τῆς κατασκευῆς καὶ ἀναστάσεως τοῦ ἀνδριάτος Αὐρ. Εὐόδου βʹ τοῦ ὑιοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοῦ τότε βουλάρχου (IG XII 7, 271 ll. 7–11, from Minoa on Amorgos, 3rd c. AD) and τοῦ τότε ἡγεμόνος Ἰουλίου Φρούγ(ε)ι (TA M II 905 col. IV 15 l. 69 and col. V 17 l. 31–32, from Lydian Rhodiapolis, 152/153 AD). Given the possibility that the mason committed the slip of reading the Ι of OI in his sketch together with the following Τ as a Π, I want to offer the conjecture τότε instead of ποτε and render the passage as ‘the Iudaioi that were present at the time of the promise’53 with ὑπέσχοντο (l. 3) as the time which is referred to. Such an elliptic construction is admittedly still a little bit bumpy, which however does not have to be taken as too great an objection given the overall catalogue style of the inscription with its formal and stylistic inconsistencies; it would appear as less constructed than the solutions brought forward so far and, what is more, the inscription’s first editor Selden (Reinesius, Prideaux and Mattaire following him closely) already hinted in this direction by translating it as ‘qui nuper affuere Iudaei’. In the context of the original list of donations such a reading could be explained as follows: all the members of the Smyrnaean group of judaioi that were present at the time the promise was made – and only those – were obliged to contribute, thus individuals who joined the community

48 For a detailed bibliography on the different arguments see Ameling 2004, 179 esp. notes.
50 Cohen 1999, 78 supported by Ameling 2004, 179 n. 132; Ewen Bowie suggested to me the attractive new interpretation that the Jewish community could simply have changed its formal name since the promise (‘those who were then (formally called) Iudaioi’), but in that case one cannot easily find a reason why they did not give their new name as well.
51 Gibson 2005, 78.
52 Ἀθηναῖοι/Ἀττικοί: e.g. Pl. Ti. 27b; D.H. Dem. 31; Str. VIII 1,2; Ῥωμαίοι: e.g. D.H. III 21,7, V 48,1, VIII 78,5; Str. V 3,2; Plu. Pomp. XVI 2; Λακεδαιμόνιοι: e.g. D.S. XV 1,3; Ἰουδαίοι: Origenes Cels. VII 26.
53 I leave the Greek term untranslated to avoid anachronistic connotations, but tend to follow Williams 1997, 249–262, who concludes in her discussion of the meaning of ‘Iudaioi’ in Graeco-Roman inscriptions that it is a religious denomination which was ‘used with pride by both those born as Jews and those converted to Judaism’ (257). Kraemer 1989, 35–53 stresses the ambiguity of the term which could be applied in different instances to designate ethnicity, religion, or geographic origin. Mason 2007, 511 argues in favour of an ethnic-geographical meaning.
later on could not be made liable for the payment but on the other hand could not either claim a share in the honour of contributing to the embellishment the city.\textsuperscript{54} The fact that no names are given suggests that the control of the procedure was left to the community itself.\textsuperscript{55}

That the Jewish community of Smyrna was willing to participate in traditional forms of behaviour of the Greek citizens from the early imperial period on is illustrated by three funerary inscriptions (\textit{I.Smyrna} 295–297) using the standard Smyrnaean formula attested in more than 100 Greek grave monuments. \textit{I.Smyrna} 295 even exhibits a certain self-confidence in allocating a share of the fine for grave violation ‘to the \textit{ethnos} of the \textit{Iudaioi}’ (ll. 8–9).\textsuperscript{56} Whether this refers to the whole people of the \textit{Iudaioi}, i.e. it was to be sent to Jerusalem, or, more likely, to the local community\textsuperscript{57} – it is remarkable inasmuch as usually only the Roman Imperial Treasury or Smyrnaean civic bodies are named as recipients of the grave fine.\textsuperscript{58} The person who put up this inscription is the \textit{archisynaq\ägos} Rufina, who calls herself Iudaia. Now, it is possible that she is identical with the \textit{stephanèphoros} Rufina mentioned on Smyrnaean coins shortly after AD 138.\textsuperscript{59} Further, the Rufina of the coins is the daughter of Fuscus, who in turn might be identical with the wealthy individual from our \textit{I.Smyrna} 697 l. 6.\textsuperscript{60} This could be seen as a further illustration of the Jewish community’s close ties even with the high ranks of society and would further provide a nice explanation for the self-confident mention of the \textit{Iudaioi} as recipients of the grave fine in \textit{I.Smyrna} 295.\textsuperscript{61}

Furthermore, the community seems to have taken on an organised institutional form from the early imperial period onwards, as \textit{I.Smyrna} 296 demonstrates where there is mention of a ‘\textit{grammateus} of the people (\textit{laoû}) in Smyrna’ (ll. 2–3).\textsuperscript{62} The situation is similar for other communities in the province of Asia, where \textit{Iudaioi} were able and willing to visibly participate in Greek civic life: in Miletus and Aphrodisias they had reserved seats in the theatre,\textsuperscript{63} synagogue buildings are attested in Priene (probably from the 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. AD) and Carian Hyllarima (early 3\textsuperscript{rd} c. AD).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{54} This very purpose of the original list of donations underlying \textit{I.Smyrna} 697 as a twofold control mechanism is also argued for by Ameling 2004, 178.
  \item \textsuperscript{55} See also Migeotte 1992, 208.
  \item \textsuperscript{56} Two similar cases from Nicomedeia: \textit{IJO} II, n. 157+158.
  \item \textsuperscript{57} Ameling 2004, 191; Gibson 2005, 73 with fn. 27; Harland 2009, 146.
  \item \textsuperscript{58} \textit{I.Smyrna} II, 1, 69–70; Gibson 2005, 72–73 accentuates a possible euergetic dimension of grave fines.
  \item \textsuperscript{59} The dating of \textit{I.Smyrna} 295 would allow for that (‘probably 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD’, Broothen 1982, 5); on the coins: Klose 1987, 74. A parallel case for a female Greek benefactor of a Jewish community can be found in Acmonoeia (Julia Severa, 50s–60s AD, \textit{IJO} II, n. 168); on the rather narrow range of offices held by women in the Roman period see van Bremen 1996, 41–81; on Jews holding civic offices see Trebilco 1991, 174–175.
  \item \textsuperscript{60} \textit{I.Smyrna} II, 1, 193.
  \item \textsuperscript{61} Trebilco 1991, 32: ‘In Smyrna in particular, the Jewish community seems to have been a significant element in the city, to have had considerable interaction with Gentiles and to have had contacts in high places in the city’; Harland 2009, 150–151 lucidly points out the aspects of competitive euergetism and identity issues involved in \textit{I.Smyrna} 697, but goes astray in calling the \textit{theologoi} and \textit{hymnōdoi} ‘donors’ in competition with the \textit{Iudaioi}.
  \item \textsuperscript{62} The use of the term \textit{laoû} as well as the name Iustus which is often seen as a translation of Hebrew ‘\textit{Zadok}’, clearly speak in favour of the Jewish background of the inscription, Ameling 2004, 193.
  \item \textsuperscript{63} \textit{Milet} VI 2, 940 III; Aphrodisias: Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, 132; Ameling 2004, 113: ‘Darstellung der jüdischen Gemeinde als integraler Teil eben dieser Stadt konnte so geleistet werden’.
\end{itemize}
not to speak of the prolific centre of Jewish life that Sardis undoubtedly was during the whole period of Roman rule.\(^{65}\)

Apart from the willingness to integrate themselves into and interact positively in day-to-day life with the Greek civic bodies in which they lived, the Iudaioi in the province of Asia might have further been motivated to display their goodwill and munificence towards the Greek communities by the following two causes: first, there had been a wide-spread insurrection of Jews in Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia, the so-called Diaspora Revolt against local and Roman authorities in 115–117 AD, which was quelled just before Hadrian took over power.\(^{66}\) Whereas in Asia nothing of the kind is recorded, alert awareness of these events must have been prevalent both among Romans and Iudaioi there as well.\(^{67}\) Another reason surely was the increasing (negative) attention of provincials and consequently of the Roman authorities that early Christians attracted especially in Asia Minor.\(^{68}\) In the perception of Greeks and Romans, Christians could easily be linked with the Iudaioi due to their common cultural origins and their status as religious minority groups, and growing animosities towards the former are very likely to have put the latter to eagerly demonstrate their loyalty to the rulers and clearly dissociate themselves from the Christian agitators.\(^{69}\) In such a context, the dedication of 10,000 denarii by the Smyrnaean community of Iudaioi appears less outlandish and helps on the other hand to support the claim that in the province of Asia in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD ‘a tradition of tolerance and positive interaction was established between the city and its Jewish community’.\(^{70}\)

Φοιν(ε)ικών

A prominent feature in the list of promised benefactions of \textit{I.Smyrna 697} is the establishment of a φοινικών (‘palm grove’), mentioned in ll. 8, 9–10, 15–16, 29–30, and 32. The little extant literary evidence mentioning φοινικῶνες suggests that they existed as agricultural units in far off places such as Judaea, Arabia, Egypt, or Ceylon,\(^{71}\) whereas they must have been perceived as something very exotic in a Greek city. Might it be the case that the appearance of the group of Smyrnaean

\(^{64}\) Priene: \textit{IJO} II, 172–174; Hyllarima: \textit{IJO} II, n. 20.


\(^{67}\) As the mention of the events in Cyrenaica in Artemidor. IV 24 shows.

\(^{68}\) Leading ultimately to executions of Christian martyrs as attested in Smyrna through the martyrdoms of Polycarp in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD and Pionius in AD 250; see Lane Fox 1986, 460–492. Official reactions by the Romans regarding the status of Christians, such as the two letters between Trajan and Pliny (\textit{ep}. X 96–97) or the letter by Hadrian to the proconsul of Asia in AD 122/3 (\textit{Justin. Apol}. 168//\textit{Euseb. HE} IV 9), are clear signs of an anti-Christian atmosphere amongst the provincials at that time.

\(^{69}\) While it is important to acknowledge the inherent anti-Jewish tendencies in the narratives of early Christian writings (the most important sources for the relation of Jews and Pagans in Asia Minor), their depiction of the Jews as working closely together with the Romans and Greeks (and against the Christians) is supported by the epigraphic findings as well, Lane Fox 1986, 428–434.

\(^{70}\) Trebilo 1991, 184.

\(^{71}\) Str. XVI 2,41, 4,18; D.S. III 42,2; \textit{J. bell. Iud}. I 18,5, II 9,1, IV 8,2; \textit{Ael. nat. XVI} 18. Furthermore, φοινικῶνες appear regularly in Egyptian papyri, often in an abbreviated form, in documents of commercial or hereditary matters: e.g. \textit{P.Enteux}. 18,3, 64,7; \textit{P.Amh}. 2,31,3; \textit{O.Bodl}. 2,948,3; \textit{O.Stras}. 1,772; \textit{P.Col}. 10,284. In most of these cases the palm grove was private property, only for Thebes (and in one instance for Apollonopolis, \textit{SB} 22,15505) is there evidence of sacred groves (φοινικῶνες ἱερατικοί: \textit{O.Bodl}. 2,647,5, 3,957,2, 2,958,2, 2,961,1, 2,964,2–3; \textit{O.Heid}. 173,2; \textit{O.Leid}. 64,2, 66,2; \textit{O.Wilb}. 73,2; \textit{O.Wilck}. 369,2, 397,3, 494,1).
Iudaioi in I.Smyrna 697 was somehow also connected with the choice of this peculiar urbanistic feature, as they might have been seen as experts in the plantation of palms?

Further light can be shed on the nature of the Smyrnaean palm grove through the donations promised specifically for it (gardens l. 8, a temple of Tyche\textsuperscript{72} l. 14, 52 pillars ll. 28–29, and 57,500 denarii ll. 10+32) and through the parallel with the – to our knowledge – only other attested palm grove in a Greek city.\textsuperscript{73} In Aphrodisias, there is epigraphic evidence for a palm grove from the 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD (in the alternative form φοινεικοῦς\textsuperscript{74}, IAp\textsuperscript{h} 2007 12.204 l. 15, an honorific inscription for an individual who donated a group of statues for the palm grove according to his earlier promise) and from the mid 5\textsuperscript{th} c. AD (in the later form φυνικόεις, IAp\textsuperscript{h} 2007 4.202 l. 3). The original place of erection of IAp\textsuperscript{h} 2007 4.202 I, together with recent palaeobiologic findings confirming the existence of palms in the so-called South Agora and the excavation of plantation trenches there in 2012 indicate that the Aphrodisian φοινεικός was located exactly in this area of the city, which should better be referred to as South Park now.\textsuperscript{75} As one part of this architectonic structure, the Stoa of Tiberius, is safely dated to the early imperial period and it appears that the whole area was designed together as a unit, the palm grove of Aphrodisias almost certainly antedates I.Smyrna 697 and is thus very likely to have served as a model incurring the jealousy of the bigger and more important city of Smyrna.\textsuperscript{76} The area of the Aphrodisian palm grove, with its extraordinary 175 x 25 m pool and, from the times of Hadrian on, situated right in front of the lavish complex of the Hadrianic Baths, takes thus shape as a public space for leisure endowed with statues.\textsuperscript{77} Such parks with trees and architectonic decorations were very popular in Rome (e.g. the Porticus of Pompey, Horti Sallustiani, Horti Luculliani),\textsuperscript{78} from where the original idea for the palm grove of Aphrodisias probably took inspiration.\textsuperscript{79} Just as the latter, the Smyrnaean grove is likely to have been planned as surrounded by a portico with columns. But whereas the one in Aphrodisias was designed as public urban space focusing on monumental water display, the Smyrnaean grove seems to have been intended more as a park proper with space for gardens and a temple.

Next to emulation of the Aphrodisians and the possible involvement of the community of Iudaioi, another probable explanation for choosing a palm grove for Smyrna might be found in its connection with the cultivation of balsamum,\textsuperscript{80} as the Greek word for the product of the most prominent members of this plant family (Balsamodendron myrrha and Balsamodendron opobalsac-
mum) is indeed σμύρνα. We might see here a playful expression of Smyrnaean civic identity fitting in nicely with the call for subscriptions underlying I.Smyrna 697.

The establishment of a public palm grove in Smyrna, probably in close vicinity to or as part of a bath or gymnasium complex as in Aphrodisias, has thus to be regarded as a highly luxurious and extraordinary undertaking demonstrating the large scale of efforts and expenses some citizens were ready to contribute to the embellishment of their city. As modern İzmir is covering most of the ancient city of Smyrna, only a part of the agora has been excavated up to date, and the remains are very likely to date after the devastating earthquake of AD 178, we are unfortunately not able to say more about the possible location of the palm grove and the other structures mentioned in the inscription. If this urbanistic project was ever finished or even carried out (and the donors ultimately fulfilled their promises) is highly doubtful, as Aelius Aristides did not say a single word about a palm grove in his five Smyrnaean orations 17–21 (157–178 AD), in which he describes and praises the city and its features in great detail.

It has been noted how important a role the awarding of the neōkoros title with all the accompanying privileges as well as the actual physical aspect of the cityscape must ultimately have played for the cities of the province of Asia. After all, Smyrna was only the second city in the whole empire, after Pergamum, to which the special honour of a second neōkoria was granted; the more prominent Ephesus gained this favour only seven years later in AD 131.

Next to offering a new interpretation of the general nature of I.Smyrna 697 as a dedicatory inscription, not a subscription list, this analysis has also added yet another facet to the well-known inter-city rivalry of Western Asia Minor in the 1st–2nd c. AD, including even smaller cities such as Aphrodisias which never became raised to the status of neōkoros, and occasioning individual Smyrnaean citizens to contribute considerable amounts of money to establish a luxurious, exotic palm grove and even prompting the participation of minority groups such as the Iudaioi.

---

81 Cadoux 1938, 31 already hinted at a possible etymological connection between the city’s name and the plant; see also Plu. Ant. 36, where the part of Judaea which Antony gifts to Cleopatra is identified as τῆς τε Ἰουδαίων τὴν τὸ βάλσαμον φέρουσαν.
83 Between 1932 and 1941, the first professional excavations in Smyrna on the confined area of the old cemetery of Namazgah, by then out of use, brought to light the city’s agora, Naumann and Kantar 1950; ongoing work has only been taken up again in 1997 now including parts of the quarter Basmane and the castle hill Kadifekale (Greek Pagos), on the slopes of which the ancient theatre has been located, but not yet excavated, Ersoy and Laugier 2011; for the most recent excavation reports see Taşlıalan, Drew-Bear, et al. 2006 as well as Kohl and Ersoy 2011.
85 Similar public efforts in the context of neōkoria grantings are attested for Ephesus (under Domitian) and Pergamum (under Trajan) as well, Pont 2010, 284.
86 Burrell 2004, 66–67; the ‘precedent for multiple neokoriai’ was Pergamum, which received its second title under Trajan (ibid., 22–30) and which had also been the first provincial city ever to be granted an imperial temple under Augustus (ibid., 17–22).
87 See e.g. Merkelbach 1978; Heller 2006; Guerber 2009; Kuhn 2013.
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Özet

Yazar bu makalesinde, I.Smyrna, no. 697’de yayınlanan bir yazı ele alınarak metindeki tartışmalı ve anlamı net olmayan bazı kısımlar için çözümler önererek ve bir bütün olarak yazının niteliği ve özellikle son kısımda tuhaf ve baştan savma bir şekilde ifade edilen imparatorluk nimetleri üzerine, Smyrna’dan bugüne kadar gözden kaçan paraleller ışığında yeni yorumlar getirmektedir. Makalede bundan başka, yazıtta zikredilen bir Yahudi grubunu ve birkaç kez sözü edilen bir palmiye koruluğunu, Aphrodisias’ta kazıları süren bir başka palmiye koruluğunu, Aphrodisias’ta kazıları süren bir başka palmiye koruluğunu ışığında incelemektedir.

Makalede ayrıca, yazıtın yeni bir metni, apparatus ve İngilizce çeviri ile birlikte yer almaktadır.
Fig. 1. *I.Smyrna 697* detail of ll. 29–33; © by the author

Fig. 2. *I.Smyrna 697* detail of ll. 30–31; © by the author