

JOHN MA

RC 38 (SELEUKID LETTER TO AMYZON) AGAIN

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 35 (2003) 43–45

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

RC 38 (SELEUKID LETTER TO AMYZON) AGAIN

The spread of interest into matters Anatolian, Hellenistic and Seleukid is to be applauded, a reflection of the new material appearing in this field – a phenomenon which *Epigraphica Anatolica* has done much to foster. B. Dreyer’s article on the marvelous new “three kings” inscription is a welcome example of this trend: “Der ‘Raubvertrag’ des Jahres 203/2 v. Chr.: das Inschriftenfragment von Bargylia und der Brief von Amyzon”, *EA* 34 (2002), 119–38. I can only wish I had the occasion to read carefully this paper before writing the afterword to the very recently published paperback edition of *Antiochos III and the cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford, 2002), where I produce my own version of this text (deeply indebted to thoughts by A. Meadows and C. Crowther), with some thoughts on historical context (which I still hold to be unclear).

There is a small oversight in Dreyer’s paper that should be pointed out. This concerns the authorship of the Seleukid letter to Amyzon, C. Welles, *Royal Correspondence* no. 38 (same document in *Antiochos III*, no. 5, with different text). This letter was earlier assigned to Antiochos III, who supposedly recommends (among other things) that the Amyzonians keep faith in the gods and in him, and hence expect benevolence from the gods (lines 7–9):

διαφυλάσσουσι γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τ(οὺ)ς
[θεοὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς πίστιν, εἰκὸς παρ’ ἐκείνων καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ-
[ασθήσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν καὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκοτα·

Such are the restorations proposed by A. Wilhelm (reproduced in *Akademieschriften* 2, 39–56) and followed by C. B. Welles, and the Roberts (J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d’Amyzon* (1983), no. 9).

In 1995, P. S. Derow, A. R. Meadows and I¹ reattributed this *Amyzonbrief* to Zeuxis, on the basis of parallels, in expression and in tone, with a letter of Tlepolemos to Kildara (*SEG* 42.994, lines 15–16 [τά τε παρ’ ἐκείνων ὑμῖν ὑπάρξει φιλόανθρωπα· ἡμεῖς δὲ . . .]ροι ἐσόμεθα πρὸς τὸ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ὑμῶν . . .]). Zeuxis (I restored the text to read) invited the Amyzonians to keep [good dispositions] towards the kings, Antiochos III and Antiochos the son; in return, they could expect benefactions from them (the kings) and from himself. In our deliberately conservative text:

διαφυλάσσουσι γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τ(οὺ)ς
8 [βασιλεῖς εὖνοιαν ? παρ’ ἐκείνων καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ-
 [c. 17 κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκοτα

Dreyer now proposes to reassign the *Amyzonbrief* to Antiochos III (pp. 131–5). Somewhat surprisingly, in doing so, Dreyer resurrects Wilhelm’s arguments in favour of the latter’s restorations. These arguments are obsolete since 1949. In support of his view that the letter enjoined continued faith in gods and king (see text above), Wilhelm adduced *OGIS* 224, the

¹ J. Ma, P. S. Derow, A. R. Meadows, *RC 38 (Amyzon) reconsidered*, *ZPE* 109 (1995), 71–80.

prostagma found at Dodurga² (and concerning cult for Laodike, and specifically its mention at lines 27–8 of high-priests of the [gods and of] us, τοὺς τῶν [θέ]ων καὶ ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεῖς. Dreyer quotes this argument approvingly, and argues at great length (p. 135, n. 83, if I understand this footnote correctly) against the restoration which is indeed standard for the Laodike *prostagma*, since Welles, *RC* 36–37: τοὺς τῶν [προγόν]ων καὶ ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεῖς. This is the restoration which I reproduced in my text of the *prostagma* (*Antiochos III*, no. 37).

As I attempted to make clear in republishing both the *Amyzonbrief* and the Laodike *prostagma*, Welles' text for the *prostagma* is secure. Two parallel copies have been found in Iran, in 1949 at Nihavend and in 1967 at Kermanshah. For economy's sake, I might quote my commentary (ad *Antiochos III*, no. 5) where I explained this situation (the bibliographical references are adjusted): “the text should read τῶν προγόνων καὶ ἡμῶν, in relation to a high priest of Antiochos III and his ancestors (document 37; [L. Robert, *Inscriptions séleucides de Phrygie et d'Iran, Hellenica* 7 (1949), 5–22; *Encore une inscription grecque de l'Iran, CRAI* 1967, 281–297]).” To be more precise, in the Nihavend text, the high-priests are those τῶν προ[γόνων] καὶ ἡμῶν, and in the second version, from Kermanshah, the high-priests are those τῶν προγόνων καὶ ἡμῶν.³ Welles' restoration is absolutely certain, since it is confirmed by parallel texts of the same *prostagma*, one partially preserved and one completely preserved. Hence there is no evidence for Antiochos III or Seleukid officials putting the king and the gods in parallel, and Wilhelm's argument for attributing the *Amyzonbrief* to Antiochos III is not valid.

To attribute the letter to Antiochos III, the only arguments left are considerations such as Dreyer proposes on Zeuxis' position and (lack of) authority to write such a letter (p. 134). But the letter of Tlepolemos (*SEG* 42.994) at least offers a plausible parallel for Zeuxis. Another such parallel can be found in *OGIS* 229 (same document *I. Magnesia am Sipylos* 1, *I. Smyrna* 573), lines 16–18. The *demos* of the Smyrnians, which professed *ca.* 242 to represent locally the interests of Seleukos II, sends envoys to the colonists and troops at Magnesia under Sipylos:

ἐπαγγελλόμενοι διατηρούντων αὐτῶν τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ φίλον
 ἡγουμένων ὑπάρξειν αὐ-
 τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Σελεύκου πάντα τὰ φιλόανθρωπα καὶ καλῶς
 ἔχοντα καὶ ἀποδοθήσεσθαι χάρι-
 τας αὐτοῖς ἀξίας τῆς αἰρέσεως:

² This village appears on sheet CII (Afiun Karahissar) of R. Kiepert, *Karte von Kleinasien*, 1:400 000, in 24 sheets (Berlin, Riemer, 1908), and on sheet 6 of A. Philippson, *Topographische Karte des Westlichen Kleinasien*, 1:300 000, sheet 6. The coordinates are 29° E 32' 37° N 22'. This place appears as Dodurcular on Sheet 2 (Izmir-Eskişehir-Denizli-Afyon-Bodrum-Fethiye) of the *Karayolları haritası Türkiye (Türkiye resmi Karayolları Haritası) / Reisekarte Türkei (Offizielle Strassenkarte der Türkei)*, 1:500 000, by Kartographischer Verlag Reinhard Ryborsch, Oberhausen bei Frankfurt am Main, 1994, in collaboration with the Turkish Ministry of Defence. I have used this modern map for the attribution in *Antiochos III*, no. 37 (I believe this attribution is followed by H. Müller, *Der hellenistische Archiereus, Chiron* 30 (2000), at p. 547). However, in April 1997, I heard the name “Dodurga” is still used in the *santral garajı* of Denizli; unfortunately, I did not take the chance of the minibus trip to see the site where the Laodike *prostagma* was found, or check the village name *de visu* (the Ryborsch map is occasionally inaccurate).

³ On the *prostagma*, and the status of the “high priest”, see now H. Müller, *l. c.*, 519–42.

“with the promise that if they (the colonists) preserve the affairs and keep the same enemy and friend (as Seleukos II, and perhaps as the Smyrnians, since their interests are linked), there will be for them from the *demos* (of the Smyrnians) and from king Seleukos all advantages and fine things, and there will be return to them marks of gratitude worthy of their attitude”.

Both the example from Kildara and from Smyrna suggest that the phrase “from X and from the king” / “from the king and from X” is used by representants of the king in local negotiations. This phenomenon, combined with the prominence of Zeuxis at Amyzon, perhaps still might make authorship by Zeuxis more likely, and more intriguing, at least in my view.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

John Ma