

PETER J. THONEMANN

HELLENISTIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM LYDIA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 36 (2003) 95–108

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

HELLENISTIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM LYDIA

I. Inscription from the Cayster valley

| (A) | (B) |
|-------------|------------|
| B AA | B [-] |
| ἐξ Ἐφέσου | ἐξ Σάρδεων |
| στάδια ἐνε- | στάδια τε- |
| νήκοντα | τρακόσια |
| | δέκα |
| (caduceus) | (caduceus) |

The *editio princeps* of this modest opisthographic distance marker from the lower Cayster valley, in *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* VII, 2 (no. 3601), offers no indication of date. In 1995 and 1997 respectively, the stone was placed in the Hellenistic period by Paul Bernard and (independently) David French.¹ This dating is certainly correct, on grounds of lettering, the absence of any mention of Roman authorities, and the use of stades rather than miles to measure distance. The stone appears to be our earliest distance marker from western Asia Minor: ‘milestone’ is technically inaccurate, and we may call it a *dekastadion*.²

‘The meaning of the letters in the top corners above the inscription is not clear to me, but they were evidently accepted abbreviations (perhaps some sort of official system?)’ (French, 192). On face A this abbreviation reads *beta* at top left, double *alpha* at top right: incomplete on face B, but presumably identical. If Roman milestones are anything to go by, we might expect some indication of administrative authority: in the Hellenistic period, this means a monarch, a Β(ασιλεύς). Two *alphas* remain. We expect the name of a king: among those with authority over the Cayster valley in the Hellenistic period were Alexander, Antigonos, Antiochos I, Antiochos II, Antiochos Hierax, Attalos I, Achaios, Antiochos III, Attalos II, and Attalos III. The letter-forms are monumental and undistinctive: *alpha* with horizontal cross-

¹ P. Callieri – P. Bernard, Une borne routière grecque de la région de Persépolis, *CRAI* (1995), 65–95; our inscription is discussed by Bernard at 77–8. D. H. French, Pre- and Early Roman Roads of Asia Minor. A Hellenistic Stadion-stone from Ephesus, *Ark. Derg.* 5 (1997), 189–196 (with photos of squeezes); cf. *SEG* XLVII (1997) 1624.

² French correctly points out that ‘milestone’ is misleading, but his own term, ‘stadion-stone’, is ugly (Callieri and Bernard use the general designation ‘borne routière’ throughout). Three Hellenistic distance markers are known from Macedonia, all of them with distances divisible by 10 stades (*Επιγ. Ανω Μακ.* no. 109: ἐγ Βοκερίας στάδιοι ἑκατόν, perh. early 3rd c. B.C.; *SEG* XXXV (1985) 752, face a: ἐξ Ἰδομενῆς εἰς Δόβηρον στάδιοι εἴκοσι, the numeral missing on face b; *SEG* XLIII (1993) 442: ἐκ Πέλλης στάδιοι εἴκοσι: both these last dated to the 2nd c. B.C.); the Persepolis stone (*SEG* XLV (1995) 1879: late 4th/early 3rd c.?) gives στάδιοι ἐξήκοντα and στάδιοι εἴκοσι. Other literary and epigraphic evidence pertaining to the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. implies not only that standard practice was for distance-markers to fall at 10-stade intervals (F. Salviat – J. Servais, Stèle indicatrice thasienne trouvée au sanctuaire d’Aliké, *BCH* 88 (1964), 267–287, at 272–273), but also that δεκαστάδιον could be used as a technical term for the stones (e.g. *IG* IV² I, 121, 79–80). Hence I urge the adoption of *dekastadion*. Note that the stones from the Cayster valley, Persepolis, and Idomene/Doberos are all opisthographic; thus also a very fragmentary inscription from Pasargadai, which may well be a distance-marker (*SEG* XLV (1995) 1880).

bar and *xi* with central vertical do not require a third-century date, since both are still found on Pergamene inscriptions down to the death of Attalos III.³

French favours a second-century (Attalid) date for our *dekastadion*, Bresson a third-century date (Seleukid, presumably).⁴ If the inscription were Seleukid, the abbreviation could be resolved as β(ασιλευόντων) ἸΑ(ντιόχου καὶ) ἸΑ(ντιόχου), i.e. 209–193 B.C.⁵ However, the abbreviation is not especially obvious (or paralleled), and there is a more attractive solution. If the inscription were Attalid, the authority responsible for road-construction would necessarily be Β(ασιλεὺς) ἸΑ(ττάλος), or more precisely Β(ασιλεύοντος) ἸΑ(ττάλου), no doubt Attalos II or III, during the settled years of the mid-2nd century. Hence I suggest that the second *alpha* is a regnal date: Β(ασιλεύοντος) ἸΑ(ττάλου) α', i.e. 159/8 or 138/7 B.C.

This form of dating is well-paralleled in the Attalid kingdom. A letter of Attalos II to Olbasa is dated to the first year of his reign by a simple *alpha* at bottom right;⁶ on the cistophoric coinage, regnal years are frequently thus dated.⁷ The most compelling parallel, however, comes from the city of Pergamon itself. A large number of brick stamps from the city have survived, many of them bearing the abbreviation AB.⁸ It is generally, and rightly, accepted that the abbreviation stands for ἸΑ(ττάλου) Β(ασιλεύοντος). Further letters are frequently added; occasional instances of month names (e.g. ΜΗ(νὸς) ΠΑΝ(ήμου)) make it clear that these represent dates. Single or double letters represent the regnal year: e.g. AB KE = 25th year of the reign of Attalos. The same abbreviation may have been used on brick stamps outside Pergamon, if Welter's resolution of the abbreviation AB on a stamp from Aigina is correct.⁹ The abbreviation on the milestone from the Cayster valley is of exactly the same type, confirming the attribution to an Attalid king, presumably Attalos II or III.

³ *OGIS* 338, facsimile at *IvPerg.* 249.

⁴ *Ann. Épigr.* (1997), 1440.

⁵ There is no need to consider Β(ασιλευόντων) ἸΑ(ττάλου καὶ) ἸΑ(ττάλου), despite Plut. *Mor.* 490A (on Attalos II and III), ἔτι ζῶν ἐπέθηκε τὸ διάδημα καὶ βασιλέα προσηγόρευσεν, since epigraphic titulature positively contradicts this: see e.g. R.E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom* (Oxford, 1983), 192.

⁶ *SEG* XLIV (1994) 1108 (with day and month following); the same format in *RC* 47 and 65–67. The full dating formula would include the word ἔτους, as in e.g. *TAM* V, I 441, βασιλεύοντος ἸΑττάλου ἔτους β', or *TAM* V, II 1189, βασιλεύοντος ἸΑττάλου ἔτους πρώτου.

⁷ Note especially the first series of dated cistophoroi at Ephesos, with regnal years of Attalos II and III, K, AK, A, B (F. S. Kleiner, *The Dated Cistophori of Ephesos*, *ANSMN* 18 (1972), 17–32, at 18–23), and the cistophoroi of Eumenes III, BA EY A etc. (M. Kampmann, *Aristonikos à Thyatire*, *RN* (1978), 38–42, with references).

⁸ *IvPerg.* pp. 401–416, nos. 652–726. E. Boehringer, in *Altertümer von Pergamon IX: Das Temenos für den Herrscherkult* (Berlin–Leipzig, 1937), 79–81, believed that the abbreviation BA/AB referred to the name of the manufacturer, but this has been convincingly refuted by A. F. Wensler, *Zur Datierung des Temenos für den Herrscherkult in Pergamon*, *AA* (1989), 33–42.

⁹ *AA* (1954), 45–46.

II. Decree found at Kadiköy

An important honorific decree from SE Lydia for a certain Ἀσκληπίδης Θεοφίλου Περγαμηνός has recently been published by H. Malay.¹⁰ The first eight lines of the decree are almost perfectly preserved, and read as follows:

Γ[ν]ώμη στρατηγῶν καὶ βουλευτῶν· ἐπεὶ Ἀσκλη-
 πίδης Θεοφίλου Περγαμηνός σ[υν]τεθραμμένος Ἀττά-
 λωι τῶι τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφῶι μετήλλαχεν τὸν βίον
 5 πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας παρειαχθέντος χρείας, γεγο-
 νῶς ἄξιός τῆς συντροφίας ἀμενψιμοίρητον ἑαυτὸν
 ἐτήρησεν εὐτάκτως καὶ κοσμίως ἀναστρεφόμενος
 διὰ παντὸς τῆι τε εὐνοίαι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς καιροῖς φανε-
 ρὸν ἑαυτὸν ἐποίει λέγων τε καὶ πράσσων ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως κτλ.

Hereafter, although the stele is complete, the surface is badly worn, and apparently only the last few letters of most lines are legible. However, lines 16–22, at least, are clearly highly formulaic. Malay reads as follows:

[] δόξαν καὶ ἀρετὴν
 [] τὴν] ἑαυτοῦ ἀναστρο-
 [φὴν] τοῦ]ς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγα-
 [θοὺς] -]Σ . . ΜΑΣΙΑΣ τῆς
 20 [] γεγ]ονότων . Ε . .
 [] δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι] καὶ τῶι δήμωι
 [] τοὺς πολ]ίτας καὶ τοὺς

The sequence of thought is fairly clear. The following restoration, drawing on formulaic parallels from contemporary documents of western Asia Minor, ought to give the sense:

[] ἐν οὐδενὶ ἐλλείπων τῶν πρὸς] δόξαν καὶ ἀρετὴν
 [ἀνηκόντων φανερὰς ἐποιήσατο ἀποδείξεις τῆς] ἑαυτοῦ ἀναστρο-
 [φῆς· (e.g.) καλῶς δὲ ἔχον ἐστὶν καὶ δίκαιον τοῦ]ς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγα-
 [θοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τυγχάνειν ἀποδοχῆς καὶ ἐπι]σ[η]μασίας τῆς
 20 [- - - - - καὶ εὐεργετημάτων τῶν γεγ]ονότων [(?) ἐ]ξ [αὐ]-
 [τῶν ἀξίας· ἀγαθῆι τυχῆι· δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι] καὶ τῶι δήμωι
 [ἐπαινέσαι Ἀσκληπίδην ἐπὶ τῆι πρὸς τοὺς πολ]ίτας καὶ τοὺς
 [- - εὐνοίαι, κτλ.

For ll. 16–17, we may compare *I. Ephesos* 6 (2nd c. decree honouring a gymnasiarch), 22–3: ἐν οὐθενὶ ἐνλείπων τῶν πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων. The specific combination δόξα καὶ ἀρετή is found in the contemporary decree of Phrygian Hierapolis honouring the deceased Apollonis, *OGIS* 308, 11–12: [τ]ο[ῖ]ς [πρὸ]ς [ἀρ]ε[τ]ὴν καὶ δόξαν [ἀ]νήκουσιν.¹¹

¹⁰ H. Malay, *Researches in Lydia, Mysia, and Aeolis* (Wien, 1999), no. 182 = *SEG* XLIX (1999) 1540; see further G. Petzl, *Varia Epigraphica*, *EA* 33 (2001), 51–56, at 55–56. Petzl spotted an omission in Malay's text at l. 7 (τῆι τε).

¹¹ As restored by L. Robert, *OMS* V, 353 n. 1, with parallels. The Hierapolis inscription is extremely close to our stone chronologically, geographically, and physically (very similar lettering: compare the facsimile in *Alter-*

For 17–18, compare *MAMA* VI 173 (decree from Apameia for a gymnasiarch, c. 168–158 B.C.), 3–4: ποιησάμενος [τὰς ἀεὶ π]ρεπούσας ἀπο[δε]ίξεις τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀναστροφῆς; for the phrase φανεράς ποιεῖσθαι ἀποδείξεις, compare Welles, *RC* 52 (Eumenes' letter to the Ionian *koinon*, 167/6 B.C.), 16–17: φανεράς πεποιῆμαι τὰς ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀποδείξεις, quoting the Milesian decree *I. Milet* 307, 6–7: τὰς περὶ τούτων ἀποδείξεις φανεράς διὰ πάντων πεποιημένος.

The considerations clearly finish at the beginning of line 18. Lines 18–21 must constitute either a purpose clause of the general type [ἵνα οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τὸν]ς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγα[θούς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τιμῶν],¹² or a formula of conclusion of the general type [καλῶς δ' ἔχοντος τοῦ]ς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγα[θούς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιοῦσθαι];¹³ the following line makes it clear that the latter structure is the correct one. At the end of l. 19, the sequence of letters read by Malay (Σ . . ΜΑΣΙΑΣ τῆς) would be compatible with]ς [τι]μὰς τὰς τῆς [- - ἀξί]ας], assuming a straightforward error of transcription (*tau* read as *iota*). But I should prefer to restore here a rather less common word, [ἐπι]σ[η]μασίας. Only a handful of epigraphical instances are known to me, most dating to the second century B.C., and almost all in a context of civic honours.¹⁴ Note especially an honorific decree from Olymos (*I. Mylasa* 871, 13–15): δίκαιον δὲ καὶ καλῶς ἔ[χον] ἐστὶν τ]οὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τυγ[χάνειν τῆς

tümer von Hierapolis, IV, p. 78). Both begin with a heavily curtailed prescript, γνώμη στρατηγῶν (καὶ βουλευτῶν our inscription; three names Hierapolis)· ἐπεὶ κτλ.

¹² These supplements come from *OGIS* 339 (decree for Menas of Sestos), 86–87, but the formula is banal. In this region and this period compare e.g. *I. Priene* 61 (decree of Magnesia for judges from Priene, early 2nd c.), 12–14: ὅ[πως οὖν καὶ] ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τιμῶν] (τιμῶν] Hiller, corr. Holleaux, *Études* i 305); *Sardis* VII 1, 4 (decree for Timarchos, under Eumenes II), 17–18: ἵνα οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς; *I. Adramytteion* 17 (decree for Pamphilos, under Eumenes II), 18–20: ἵνα οὖν καὶ [ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τιμῶν τοὺς ἀξιό]υς [τῶν ἀνδρ]ῶν; *I. Magnesia* 101 (decree of the Larbenoi – unlocated, but not far from Kadiköy – for judges from Magnesia, second half of 2nd c.), 16: ὅπως οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἡμῶν φαίνεται τιμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας.

¹³ These supplements come from *I. Adramytteion* 16, II (decree for the Andrians, 106 B.C.), 37–38; cf. 16, I (decree for foreign judges from Andros), 7–8: καλῶς ἔχον ... [ἀπο]δοχῆς ἀξιοθῆναι. On this structure with infinitive, see the materials collected by Holleaux, *Études* iii 236–239, and note especially *I. Iasos* 98 (honorific decree, 1st c. B.C.), 26–29: καλῶς δὲ ἔχον ἐστὶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας τῆς καλλίστης ἀποδοχῆς καὶ προτιμῆς διὰ παντὸς τυγχάνειν; Michel, *Recueil* 54 (decree of Themisonion honouring a gymnasiarch, 114 B.C.), 29–32: δίκαιον δὲ ἐστὶν τοὺς οὕτως ἐκτενῶς τε καὶ φιλανθρώπως ἀναστρεφόμενους τυγχάνειν παρὰ τοῦ δήμου τῆς ἐπιβαλλούσης τιμῆς.

¹⁴ *I. Ephesos* 202 (letter of Attalos II to Ephesos), 9: δικαίας παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ παρὰ τούτῳ ἐτύγχανεν ἐπισημασίας; *SEG* XXXIX (1989) 1244 (Klaros, decree for Menippos, late 2nd c.), I 6–7: τῆς ἀξίας ἔτυχεν ἐπισημασίας, II 32–3: ἐπισημασίας ἔτυχεν ἀξιοζηλώτου; no doubt a similar phrase at *I. Didyma* 142 (honorific decree, mid-2nd c.), 23–24: [e.g. ἔτυχεν] ἐπισημασίας; *I. Mylasa* 119 (honorific decree, 2nd c.), 2–5: ὅπως οὖν κα[ὶ] ἡ φυλὴ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν [καὶ] ἀξιού[ς] ἐπισημασ[ί]ας καὶ τιμ[ῆ]ς ἀποδεχο[μ]ένη κα[ὶ] τιμῶσα] φαίνεται[α], cf. *I. Mylasa* 120, 7–8 (same wording, ἐπισημασίας unrestored); *TAM* V 1, 48 (Silandos, honorific decree, late 2nd c.), ὅπως ἡ τοῦ δήμου ἐπισημασία εἰς τοὺς εὐ ποιοῦντας εὐκατανόητος πᾶσι γίνηται; *SEG* XXVIII (1978) 1479 (Philai, honours for a phourarch, late 2nd c.), ἐπὶ τῇ γενομένῃ βασιλείᾳ ἐφόδω ἐπισημασίας τετευχῶς; *SGDI* 3720 (honorific tribal decree from Kos), 7–12: ὅπως οὖν καὶ τοὶ φυλῆται φαίνονται ἐπισα[μ]α[ιν]ο[μ]ενοὶ τε καὶ τιμῶντες τὸς ἀγαθὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ... τοί τε λοιποὶ ... θεωρεῦντες τὰν παρὰ τῶν φυλετῶν ἐπ[ισα]μα[σ]ία]ν τε καὶ εὐνοίαν; *Polemon* I (1929), 28–31 (decree of Demetrias, second half of 2nd c.), 21–22: ἵνα καὶ ἕτεροι θεωρ[ο]ντ]ες τὴν γιν[ο]μένην αὐτοῖς (?) ἐπ[ισ]ημασίαν (suppl. *BE* (1930), p. 200). The only instances not to refer to civic honours are *I. Stratonikeia* 512 (late Hellenistic), 6–7: τυγχάνων τῆς παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐπισημασίας; *IG* II² 995 (regulations concerning votive offerings, 2nd c. BC), 5–7: a statue of a divinity is described as τυγχάνων [τῆς ὀφειλομένης αὐτῷ ἀπο]δοχῆς καὶ ἐπισημασ[ί]ας].

ἀρ]ίστης ἐπισημασίας. It seems likely that this is the general structure we have in the Kadiköy decree: certainly the evidence of both inscriptions and literary texts tends to imply that τυγχάνειν ἐπισημασίας/ἀποδοχῆς was the standard phraseology.¹⁵ In l. 20 the genitive [γεγ]ονότων appears to be part of an adjectival clause dependent on ἐπισημασίας (hence my restoration [ἀξίας] at the start of l. 21); I have conjecturally restored [εὐεργετημάτων], which can be readily paralleled.¹⁶ I have no great confidence in my suggestion [ἐ]ξ [αὐτῶν], although again similar cases can easily be assembled: see for instance *SEG XLIV* (1994) 940 (Miletos, decree for C. Iulius Epikrates, 6/5 B.C.), 11–12: τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεινομένω[ν ε]ὐεργεσιῶν.¹⁷

In line 22, the sequence [τοὺς πολ]ίτας καὶ τοὺς is interesting. We appear to have two groups of inhabitants, citizens and others (e.g. τοὺς [παροίκους], τοὺς [ἐν *loco* κατοικοῦντας]; for the latter possibility, compare perhaps l. 11, τοῖς ἐν T[- - -] ἐπιδιδούς), to whom, no doubt, Asklepidēs has shown his goodwill. The posthumous honours thereafter decreed (lines 23–35) are too fragmentary for restoration: perhaps a statue in the gymnasium (l. 24), and certainly, as Malay recognises, annual honours, presumably also at the gymnasium (ll. 27–30, ὅπως διαμένη - - - ΕΠΙΘΥΟΝ - - - [καθ' ἕκαστ]ον ἔτος - - - [τῶι] δήμῳ μηνί), apparently featuring the burning of incense.¹⁸ Annual celebrations of this kind in honour of a living or deceased benefactor are not uncommon, usually occurring on the occasion of the honoree's birthday, or on the date of some significant event which the festival was specifically intended to commemorate.¹⁹ Especially prominent are annual (κατ' ἐνιαυτόν) or monthly (κατὰ μῆνα) honours for Hellenistic kings, widespread in the Attalid kingdom as elsewhere.

Birthday honours for an Attalid king may perhaps be restored in an inscription honouring a gymnasiarch at Thyateira (*TAM V*, 2, 855). Herrmann prints lines 5–8 thus:

¹⁵ Two Polybian examples are significant here. When a man defends others from danger, it is reasonable that he should ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους ἐπισημασίας τυγχάνειν (vi 6, 8); on his embassy to Rome in 168, Attalos hoped to τυχεῖν τινος ἐπισημασίας (xxx 1, 2). Both cases signify civic recognition and honour, in the one case metaphorical, the other literal.

¹⁶ *Syll.*³ 569 (Cos, decree honouring Theukles, end of 3rd c.), 39–41: ὅπως οὖν καὶ ὁ δῶμος ὁ Ἀλασαρνιτῶν ... φαίνεται τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τιμῶν καταξίως τῶν γινομένων εἰς αὐτὸν εὐεργετημάτων (omitted from the *Sylloge* index s.v. εὐεργέτημα); *Syll.*³ 587 (Peparethos, decree honouring Philoxenos, c. 196 B.C.), 17–19: χάριτας ἀπονέμων ἀξίας τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν γινομένων εὐεργετημάτων; *I. Magnesia* 62 (decree of unknown state), 22–23: μεμνη[μένος τῶν γε]γενημένων ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἐπιφα[νειῶν καὶ εὐεργε]τημάτων (ἐπιφα[νῶς εὐεργε]τημάτων Kern, corr. Holleaux, *Études* i 319; cf. *I. Ephesos* 24 B14, τὰς ὑπ' αὐτῆς γεινομένας ἐναργεῖς ἐπιφανείας).

¹⁷ Numerous examples collected and discussed by A. Wilhelm, *Zu einem Beschlusse der Amphiktionen*, *Wiener Studien* 61–62 (1943–1947), 167–189, at 172–174; add *I. Stratonikeia* 512, 24–26: ἀξίως τῶν γεγενημένων [ἐ]ξ αὐτῶν ... ἀδικημάτων.

¹⁸ In l. 28, clearly some part of ἐπιθύω. See e.g. *OGIS* 332 (honours for Attalos III at Pergamon), 11–13, ἐκάστης τε ἡμέρας ὁ στεφανηφόρος καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης ἐπιθυέτωσαν λιβανωτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτήρος τῶι βασιλεῖ; *SEG IX*, 4 (see the following n.).

¹⁹ For birthday honours, compare most notably the decree from Colophon for Athenaios (Holleaux, *Études* ii 51–60; second quarter of 2nd c.), 12–13: ἐν ἧι ἡμέραι Ἀθηναῖος ἐ[γένετο]; *SEG IX*, 4 (Cyrene, posthumous honours for Barkaios, end of 1st c. B.C.), 28–30: [ἐπιθυμι]ᾶν [δὲ αὐτ]ῶι καὶ θύεν τὸς καθ' ἕτος ἕκαστον γυμ[νασιαρχέντας τ]ῶι πέ[μ]πται τῶι Παχῶν μηνός, ἅτις ἐστὶ γεν[έσιος αὐτῶι] ἀμέρ[α]. On birthday honours for kings, see Chr. Habicht, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*² (München, 1970), 148. For sacred days commemorating significant events, L. Robert, *Hellenica* II (Paris, 1946), 59–60.

- 5 [- - - - -]ε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως
 [- - - - - καθ' ἕκαστον] μῆνα θυσιάσας μὲν ἐκΤΙ
 [- - - - - δι]απρεπεστέρως τῆι τε
 [πόλει? - - - - - ἐπι?]δόσει λαμπρότερον (κτλ.)

As Robert saw, we are dealing with monthly honours for a Hellenistic king, no doubt on his birthday.²⁰ The date of the birthday of Eumenes II is known from *I. Didyma* 488, 8–10: ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ Ληγαίῳ τῆι ἕκτῃ, ἐν ἣι ἐγένετο ὁ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης. This date, the sixth of the month, is also found in an inscription from the gymnasium at Kos, where an annual procession in honour of Eumenes fell on the sixth of Artemision in the Koan calendar.²¹ At the end of l. 6 of our inscription, the transcription of Radet and Lechat in the *editio princeps* reads EΚΤΙ; Robert (176 n. 1) suggests restoring θυσιάσας μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων (presumably with line break after τῶν). This is not impossible, but we might perhaps prefer to read ἕκτῃ[ι]. In this case, on the sixth of each month a sacrifice would have been offered to our anonymous king in the gymnasium at Thyateira. I suggest that the sacrifice marked the birthday of Eumenes II, and consequently restore in ll. 5–6 βασιλέως | [Εὐμένους].

Malay attributes the decree in honour of Asklepiades to the city of Philadelphia. This is justly questioned by Petzl, on historical and topographical grounds. The inscription must date to the final years of the reign of Eumenes II, but Philadelphia was only founded under Attalos II,²² who in the Asklepiades inscription is still Ἀττάλωι τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφῷ. Moreover, ‘Die Stele wird derzeit in Kadıköy, rund 35 km südöstlich von Philadelphia-Alaşehir, aufbewahrt; es wurde mir mitgeteilt, daß ihr eigentlicher Fundort das Dorf Derbent, einige Kilometer südöstlich von Kadıköy, sei’ (Petzl, 56). No doubt Petzl is correct to argue that the territory of Philadelphia, or rather a putative predecessor on the site of Philadelphia, could hardly have extended this far south-east. His own solution is to attribute the stone to Apollonia on the Maeander, a little more than 11 miles to the SE of Kadıköy,²³ since Apollonia was already in existence before the extension of the Attalid kingdom in 188. The suggestion is neat, and may be right. However, his note on the date of the foundation of Apollonia perpetuates an old error, which I take the opportunity to correct here.²⁴

The numismatic evidence that the city known in the imperial period as Tripolis once bore the name Apollonia was assembled by Imhoof-Blumer: his arguments are decisive and have been universally accepted.²⁵ A decree discovered on Chios, a *pierre errante* presumably to be

²⁰ L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), 175–176, restoring κατὰ μῆνα: Herrmann’s καθ’ ἕκαστον] μῆνα comes from the decree for Menas of Sestos, *OGIS* 339, 35–36: ἐν τε τοῖς γενεθλίοις τοῦ βασιλέως (Attalos II or III) καθ’ ἕκαστον μῆνα θυσιάζων ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου.

²¹ *Syll.*³ 1028 = *LSCG* 165, now M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Roma, 1993), ED 45. See further Habicht, *Gottmenschentum* 125–126. Eumenes’ birthday may also have been celebrated in the gymnasium at Andros, but it is not certain to which king this inscription pertains: *IG XII Suppl.*, p.124 no. 250 (with L. Robert, *Hellenica XI–XII* (Paris, 1960), 116–125), 7: ἐν τε τῆι γενεθλίῳ τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμέρα συντελουμένης πομπῆς καὶ θυσιᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου.

²² Stephanos, s.v.1, πόλις Λυδίας, Ἀττάλου κτίσμα τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου: see further L. Robert, *OMS* V 340–1.

²³ I take the distance from a milestone found to the SE of Kadıköy, a *Tripolis Mi XI*: see M. Christol – Th. Drew-Bear, *Anatolia Antiqua – Eski Anadolu III* (Paris, 1995), 86.

²⁴ Petzl, 56 n. 36: Dieses wird klar durch die um 200 v. Chr. zu datierende Inschrift A. Rehm, *Milet I 3* (Delphinion), Nr. 74.

²⁵ F. Imhoof-Blumer, *Lydische Stadtminzen* (Genf, 1897), 37–39.

attributed to Apollonia on the Maeander, may document the existence of the city already in the early third century B.C.:²⁶ the inscription honours a certain Mardonios son of Aristomachos, perhaps a land-owner of Persian descent, who assisted ἐν τῇ συνοικισίᾳ τῆι κοινήι τῆς τετραπόλεως.²⁷ It is not impossible that the synoikism referred to is precisely that which gave rise to the city of Apollonia itself.

A very fragmentary document from Seleukeia/Tralleis may support the hypothesis of a third-century foundation for Apollonia. Too little survives of the royal letter *I. Trall.* 17 for extensive restoration. However, three personal names allow the general context to be determined: Ἀριστέα[ς (l.1), presumably an ambassador, perhaps the Aristes of *I. Milet* 143 A6, attested as ambassador to Miletos in 218/7; Ἀντιόχου (l. 4), no doubt Antiochos III; Θεμιστοκλεῖ τῶι στρατηγῶι (l. 9), no doubt the Themistokles of Polybios v 77.8, στρατηγός of Achaios in Mysia in 218. The chronological coherence of the three names is satisfying. Piejko's suggestion that the letter is to be attributed to Eumenes II may be rejected; preferable by far is Ma's tentative but attractive suggestion of that the author of the letter is Achaios.²⁸ In l. 7,]ΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑΙΣΥΝΤΟΙΣ[is problematic. Either we have a god and a relative clause, Ἀ]πόλλωνι αἰ̄ σὺν τοῖς, or a settlement, Ἀ]πολλωνία σὺν τοῖς. In point of syntax the former seems to me extremely unlikely, and no plausible restoration has been suggested.²⁹ This being the case, the 'Apollonia' mentioned is most likely to be the city on the Maeander, close neighbour of Tralleis, although the context is indeterminable.

The only absolutely unambiguous piece of epigraphic evidence for the existence of Apollonia on the Maeander is *Milet* I 3 (Delphinion) 74.³⁰ L. and J. Robert invoked the date of this inscription, c. 200 B.C., in arguing that Apollonia could not be an Attalid foundation;³¹ this date is repeated by Petzl. However, the dating was made (or rather implied) by Rehm solely on the basis of letter forms, and to my mind it is historically impossible. The Milesian document reads (ll. 2–4) [Π]α[σ]ικράτης Παιωνίου Ἀπολλων[ι]άτ[ης | ἀ]πὸ Μαιάνδρου, γυνὴ τούτου Δημό[λα | Με]νεμάχου Τραλλιανή. The ethnic Τραλλιανή rules out a date 'c. 200', since Tralleis did not exist at that time: between c. 260 and (say) 190 it carried the name Seleukeia.³² A possible period of reversion to her former name has been conjectured by

²⁶ The decree was attributed to Apollonia on the Maeander by L. Moretti, *Epigraphica* 18: A proposito di Apollonia al Meandro, *Riv.Fil.* 107 (1979), 295–300; L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Athènes, 1987), 342–349, argues that the stone is a *pierre errante* (at 345–7).

²⁷ For another possible Hellenistic survival of the old Persian landowner class in this part of Asia Minor, see *SEG XXXV* (1985) 1395, from the region of Laodikeia: Νικόπολις Μιθραβωγου (not in *I. Laodikeia*); north of Apollonia/Tripolis, in the upper Kogamos valley, a Μίθρης Ἀρτέμωνος in the 1st c. A.D.: *SEG XLIX* (1999) 1631.

²⁸ J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1999), 57 and 269, criticising F. Piejko, Letter of Eumenes II to Tralles Concerning Inviolability and Tax Exemption for a Temple. After 188 B.C., *Chiron* 18 (1988), 55–69.

²⁹ Piejko's reconstruction at *op. cit.* 64–5 – where read αἰ̄ for αἰ̄ *passim* – is scarcely Greek.

³⁰ The connection was made by K. Regling in a short note in *Phil. Wochenschr.* 46 (1926), 430, 'Apollonia-Tripolis am Mäander'.

³¹ L. and J. Robert, *La Carie II: le plateau de Tabai et ses environs* (Paris, 1954), 239 n. 2, 241. Again at *Documents* 343, 'vers 200 a.C.'.

³² For the evidence, see G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1995), 265–268. The latest clearly datable instance of a Trallian calling himself Σελευκεύς is in 194/3 B.C.: M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 437.

Günther, on the basis of the presence of a Διονύσιος Ἰατροκλείου Τρα[λλιανός] on a list of citizenship grants which on paleographic grounds he is unwilling to date before 260 or after 188.³³ However, Habicht noticed a neat prosopographical link with an Abderitan honoured as a *proxenos* at Eretria in the first half of the 3rd c.:³⁴ a date for the Milesian citizenship grant before 260 ought to be preferred. This putative reversion to the name Tralleis rejected, *Milet I* 3 (Delphinion) 74 ought to date after the reversion of Seleukeia to her former name, presumably shortly after 190 B.C. The Chian inscription, and perhaps *I. Trall.* 17, remain our only possible testimonia for a pre-Attalid Apollonia on the Maeander.

None of this is to say that our decree might not be of Apollonia on the Maeander; chronologically this remains quite possible. However, the findspot of the inscription remains a problem, since there is absolutely no reason to suppose that the territory of Apollonia extended this far into the hills to the NW of the city: nor is it easy to explain why the Asklepidēs decree should have been set up so far from the urban centre. The inscription could be a *pierre errante*; but the stele is not a small one, and dislocation not to be assumed without good reason.

I should prefer to see the inscription as the product of one of the many κατοικίαι in the territory of the future Philadelphia, of which a number are attested in the upper Kogamos valley.³⁵ One particular village may perhaps be felt to have a particularly strong claim. In the upper Kogamos, near the (now defunct) village of Davasli, Georges Radet discovered an decree of the Imperial period which he believed to have been passed by οἱ κά[τοικοι] | [οἱ ἐν] Κ[αλλατ]άβοις, corrected by Karl Buresch to οἱ κά[το]ικ[οι] | [οἱ ἐν] Ἰάβοις, and finally by L. and J. Robert to ... οἱ ἐν Τ]άβοις.³⁶ A Lydian Tabai is mentioned by Stephanos, *s.v.*, who speaks of *three* towns called Tabai, one in Lydia, one in Caria, and one in the Rhodian Peraia. The latter two are no doubt one and the same, the important town that gave its name to the Tabai plateau in Eastern Caria; Tabai τῆς Λυδίας was originally believed by L. and J. Robert also to pertain to this town.³⁷ However, the existence of a second Tabai in Lydia was finally proved beyond doubt by the great Ephesian *conuentus* list, in which a community known as the Τάβηνοί are listed under the Sardian *conuentus*.³⁸ Hence the restoration [οἱ ἐν Τ]άβοις in Radet's inscription may reasonably be sustained; the general location of the town should be

³³ W. Günther, Milesische Bürgerrechts- und Proxenieverleihungen der hellenistischen Zeit, *Chiron* 18 (1988), 383–419, at 397f. = *SEG XXXVIII* (1988) 1198. Ma, *op. cit.* 48, thinks that this putative reversion to the name Tralleis attests 'local vitality'.

³⁴ Chr. Habicht, Sosikrates von Abdera, *ZPE* 77 (1989), 94.

³⁵ W. Leschhorn, *Antike Ären: Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros* (Stuttgart, 1993), 335–343; G. Petzl, Neue Inschriften aus Lydien (I), *EA* 26 (1996), 1–29, at 1–8 (Kapolmeia); see now also *SEG XLIX* (1999) 1631, an honorific inscription of οἱ κάτοικοι (village unnamed) for the emperor Claudius. See in general C. Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* (München, 1998).

³⁶ G. Radet, Notes de Géographie Antique (I), Cydrara et Callatebi, *BCH* XV (1891), 373–380; K. Buresch, *Aus Lydien* (Leipzig, 1898), 209–211; L. and J. Robert, *La Carie II*, 83 n. 3, with some diffidence: 'on pourrait songer à ...'. For the precise provenance of this stone, see J. G. C. Anderson in *JHS* 18 (1898), 88–89 (opposite bank of the Kogamos from Baharlar); Anderson, like Keil – Premerstein, read]λβοις rather than]αβοις, but commented 'the letter before B is apparently Λ, although it might possibly have been Α (considering the way in which parts of letters have disappeared)' (88 n. 4).

³⁷ *La Carie II*, 82–3, 87–8; Tabai τῆς Περαίας is discussed at 93–4.

³⁸ Chr. Habicht, New Evidence on the Province of Asia, *JRS* 65 (1975), 64–91 = *I. Eph.* 13, I 24.

indicated by the findspot of that inscription, in the neighbourhood of the Turkish town then known as Davasli – conceivably a survival of the ancient toponym.³⁹

Did the Lydian κατοικία exist in the pre-Roman period? The name Tabai is indigenous, as Stephanos recognises (καλέσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ πέτρας οἰκεῖσθαι· τάβαν γὰρ τὴν πέτραν Ἑλληνες ἔρμηνεύουσιν). More significantly, in the course of his description of the march of Xerxes from Kelainai to Sardeis, Herodotos (vii 31) mentions a site Καλλάτηβον πόλιν, which one passes on the road between the Maeander crossing at Kydrara and Sardeis. The toponyms (and likely locations of Tabai and Kallatebos) are similar enough to make identification plausible, if scarcely certain.

It seems possible, then, that the decree for Asklepidēs, discovered in the upper Kogamos valley at most a mile or two upstream from Davasli/Tabai/?Kallatebos, may be our first Hellenistic inscription from Lydian Tabai, shortly to be reduced to a κατοικία by the foundation of neighbouring Philadelphia. Geographically the attribution may be felt to be more satisfactory than either Apollonia or Philadelphia, both of which require assuming unnecessary lapidary mobility.⁴⁰

Provenance aside, the main interest of the decree from Kadiköy lies in the name and designation of the honorand, Ἀσκληπίδης Θεοφίλου Περγαμηνὸς συντετραμμένος Ἀττάλωι τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀδελφῷ (ll. 1–3). The explicit designation of Asklepidēs (known already from an honorific inscription from Thessalian Larisa, dated to 170 B.C.) as a σύντροφος of the future king Attalos II brilliantly confirms Habicht's conjectural stemma of this important Pergamene family.⁴¹ Our decree does not specify the nature of his services to the community at Kadiköy (πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας παρεισχημένος χρείας, l. 4); we might reasonably assume that for at least part of his career, presumably in the 160s B.C., Asklepidēs filled some post in the royal administration with particular responsibility over the area of SE Lydia in which he received posthumous honours.

Hence it is all the more interesting to find that an Ἀσκληπιιάδης did indeed serve as an Attalid official in Lydia precisely during the reign of Eumenes II. *SEG* XLVI (1996) 1519 records the petition of one Kadoas, priest of Apollo Pleurenos on the banks of Gygaia Limne (north of Sardeis), to an Attalid *archiereus*, Euthydemos, concerning the erection of a *stèle* in the sanctuary listing the *mystai* of Apollo.⁴² Euthydemos is requested to write to Ἀσκληπιιάδ[η] τῷ οἰκονόμῳ ἵνα παραδείξῃ μοι τόπον ἐν ᾧ σ[τ]ήσω τὴν στήλην (ll. 13–15). Since Asklepiades is to be responsible for practical arrangements on the ground, his post of

³⁹ *BE* (1976) 595, at p. 534.

⁴⁰ Other settlements in this region are even more obscure. For Apollonoshieron and the Byzantine town of Aetos, possibly to be located in the region of Kadiköy, see Buresch, *Aus Lydien* 206–208.

⁴¹ Chr. Habicht, Athens and the Attalids in the second century B.C., *Hesperia* 59 (1990), 561–577, at 565–7.

⁴² On this inscription see now B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (Oxford, 2002), 50–55 (with 46–50, on the nature of the *archieiria*). Dignas believes, with many others, that the petition of Kadoas allows us to redate *SEG* XXXII (1982) 1237 (honorific inscription for Euxenos of Sardeis) to the Attalid period. However, the dating formula of the latter document, ἔτους ζ', clearly demands a date in the first century B.C.: this cannot possibly be a regnal year since it lacks the name of the king. *TAM* V 1, 543, dated ἔτους γ', is not a legitimate parallel (despite H. Müller, *Chiron* 30 (2000), 525 n. 31), since this inscription is by no means securely dated to the Attalid period: indeed I should prefer a date of 29/8 B.C. (Actian era), which is compatible with the letter forms and permits an attractive prosopographical link (Iollas son of Metrodoros, *Sardis* VII 1, 8, ll. 20 and 23: ambassador to Rome in 5 B.C.).

oikonomos (whatever that involved) appears to be a local one. Some corroboration is provided by a fragmentary royal document from Sardeis under Antiochos III, with an unrestorable reference to τῆι περὶ Σάρδεις οἶκον[ο]μία[ι] (*SEG XXXIX* (1989) 1289); an administrative subdivision, based at Sardeis and encompassing the shrine of Apollo Pleurenos, could quite easily have extended as far up the Kogamos valley as Kadiköy.⁴³ Hence I suggest that the honours for Asklepidēs at Kadiköy were consequent upon his role in the Attalid local administration, as *oikonomos* of the region around Sardeis.

But the prosopographical connection does not exhaust the interest of the phrase. The compendious designation of Attalos as ‘the brother of the king [Eumenes]’ is paralleled in the decree for Kephisodoros from Apameia, in the course of which the honorand dedicates ἀγάματ[α βασιλέως Εὐμένους καὶ] Ἀττάλου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως (*MAMA VI* 173, 10–11).⁴⁴ These two formulations present a surprising contrast with another recently published decree for a royal friend, Pamphilos son of Artemidoros, from the city of Adramyttion in the Troad,⁴⁵ in which Attalos lacks further definition as ‘brother of the king’, but is designated by name alone: τοῖς τε τοῦ βασιλέως πράγμα[σι καὶ τοῖς] τῆς βασιλίσσης[ς καὶ Ἀ]ττάλου, ll. 11–12; πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα καὶ [τὴν β]ασίλισσαν καὶ Ἄτταλον, ll. 23–24.⁴⁶ That in the Adramyttion decree it is made clear that Attalos is part of the royal family does not make the lack of titulature any the less surprising, since in the latter part of the reign of Eumenes II there were *two* Attaloi in the royal house, Attalos II and the young Attalos III.

Hence I suggest that the differing titulature of Attalos II, name alone at Adramyttion, full title at Tabai and Apameia, has chronological significance: the birth of the future king Attalos III, c. 168 B.C.,⁴⁷ in adding a second Attalos to the court, made necessary a formal, titular distinction between the two. The Adramyttion decree for Pamphilos, which mentions the king’s brother Attalos by name alone, ought then to have been passed *before* the birth of

⁴³ The later Roman *conuentus* of Sardeis initially extended as far as Apollonia/Tripolis, including the region of Kadiköy. I hope elsewhere to explore the extent to which the administrative subdivisions of the Roman province of Asia preserved or adapted Attalid structures. See provisionally W. Ameling, *Drei Studien zu den Gerichtsbezirken der Provinz Asia in republikanischer Zeit*, *EA* 12 (1988), 9–24, at 14–18.

⁴⁴ The phraseology of the Apameia decree is careless: one would expect τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως (but cf. *I. Labraunda* 3, 5: Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου). Attalos appears not to have taken the royal title until the last year of Eumenes’ life: J. Hopp, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden* (München, 1977), 3–15. *IG II²* 953 has now been shown to refer to Eumenes’ assumption of the throne, rather than its transfer to Attalos: *SEG XLII* (1992) 737.

⁴⁵ E. Schwertheim, *Ein neues hellenistisches Ehrendekret aus Adramyttion*, *EA* 9 (1987), 37–44; J. Stauber, *Die Bucht von Adramytteion II* (*IGSK* 51, Bonn, 1996), no. 17; both date the inscription 168–160/59 B.C.

⁴⁶ It is notable that there is no mention of Philetairos nor Athenaios. However, it is clear that from the 180s onwards Attalos was far more heavily involved in the kingdom’s affairs than his two younger brothers: he is already singled out from them in *OGIS* 248, 37–41 (of 175/4 B.C.); *OGIS* 308, 14 (after 184 B.C.). Hence I should be inclined to suppose that the brother of Eumenes responsible for the συνοικισμός of Apollonis (*TAM V*, 2, 1187) is Attalos. In this inscription the honorand’s designation, restored by Keil υἱ]ὸν βασιλέως [Ἀττάλου], could equally well be ἀδελφ]ὸν βασιλέως [Εὐμένου] or τ]ὸν βασιλέως [ἀδελφόν]. The phraseology of this inscription makes it clear that the synoikism was regarded as a joint venture of Eumenes and his brother ([συνεκτελέ]σαντα τὴν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ [βασιλέως Εὐ]μένου πρόθεσιν, 4–6); thus also, presumably, Dionysopolis in Phrygia (Stephanos, *s.v.*, κτίσμα Ἀττάλου καὶ Εὐμένους), and Mernouphyta (*TAM V*, 2, 959, assuming – as seems reasonable – that the plural βασιλέων is anachronistic).

⁴⁷ R. E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom* (Oxford, 1983), 189–194.

Attalos III (before 168); the Apameia decree for Kephisodoros, which designates Attalos II as ὁ ἀδελφὸς βασιλέως, was passed *after* that date (c. 168–158).⁴⁸

This dating for the Apameia decree has an interesting consequence: that the war in which Apameia was required to provide food for a division of Attalid troops (l. 13) would necessarily date to the last decade of Eumenes' reign. No doubt the context is the Galatian war of Eumenes II (c. 167–165 B.C.), as already suggested by Robert.⁴⁹

A Galatian incursion into Lydia may well be attested in a fragmentary Hellenistic decree for a royal official, also published by Malay.⁵⁰ His text reads as follows:

| | | |
|----|------|----------------------------|
| | [| στρα]τηγὸς καὶ εὐεργέ- |
| | [της | κ]αὶ τοῖς Μυσοῖς |
| | [| -]ΕΔΩΝ κατασταθεῖς |
| | [| ἐπιστ]άτης τοῦ τόπου ν. |
| 5 | [| β]ασιλέως καὶ ἡμῶν |
| | [| -]ΤΟ πλείονας τῆς |
| | [| -]ΤΕΤΗΙΕΦΟΔΩΙΤΩ[.] |
| | [| δι]ᾶ τὴν πᾶ[σαν] σπου[δὴν] |
| | [|] τῶν ἀνωχύρων [|
| 10 | [| -]ΤΟΥΣΟΣ[- |

The honorand appears to have assisted the (unknown) community in the course of an enemy assault: no doubt Malay is correct to read in l. 7 ἔν] τε τῆι ἐφόδωι τῶ[ν].⁵¹ The πᾶσαν σπουδὴν in the following line is what the honorand showed during the attack; a close parallel at Elaia, in the immediate aftermath of the war with Aristonikos: [ὄμ]οίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τ[ῶι πολέ]μωι τῶι πρ[ὸς Ἄρ]ιστόνικον τῆ[ν πᾶσα]ν εἰσφερό[μενος σ]πουδὴν μεγάλο[υς ὑπέ]-στη κινδύ[νους].⁵² Although the precise phraseology of the Ayvatlar decree cannot be determined, the restoration διᾶ τὴν πᾶ[σαν] σπου[δὴν] is unlikely to be right: the *alpha* is more likely to be the end of the previous clause, followed by the honorand's actions, τὴν πᾶ[σαν] σπου[δὴν] | εἰσφερόμενος, προσφερόμενος or similar.⁵³

⁴⁸ This fits with our decree for Asklepidēs, which must in any event date after 170 B.C. However, the situation is here slightly different, since Attalos is not introduced as part of a royal group (as in the Adramyttion and Apameia decrees), and hence some further definition was in any case necessary, as in e.g. *IG II² 905, 9*: Φιλέταιρος ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως Εὐμένους ἀδελφός.

⁴⁹ L. Robert, *Hellenica XI–XII* (Paris, 1960), 124 n. 6.

⁵⁰ Malay, *Researches* no. 179 = *SEG XLIX* (1999) 1552, from Ayvatlar, in the upper Hermos region. The bare mention of τοῖς Μυσοῖς in l. 2 is not especially helpful: a dedication of the 2nd c. B.C. from this general region by one Κλέων Ἀττίνου ἡγεμῶν Μυ[σῶν] (*TAM V* 1, 690, Gordos). See further on 'Mysians' in this region P. Debord, *La Lydie du Nord-Est, REA* 87 (1985), 345–358, at 348–9 (the unpublished document he mentions containing an artisan who calls himself Μυσός is now *SEG XLI* (1991) 1037). It is unclear whether our inscription is Attalid or Seleukid: *Chiron* 32 (2002), 225 n. 151.

⁵¹ *Syll.*³ 398, 7–8, ἐν τῶι τῶν βαρβάρων ἐφόδωι (the Galatians' attack on Delphi); thus also no doubt *CID IV: Documents Amphictioniques* 13, 7, τᾶς] ἐφόδου τῶν βαρ[βάρων]. In our Ayvatlar inscription the restoration τῶ[ν] | βαρβάρων] seems likely enough.

⁵² *Syll.*³ 694, 15–17; on the provenance, see L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, 477–484.

⁵³ See on this idiom the materials collected by M. Holleaux, *Études* ii, 87–88, apropos of another decree honouring an Attalid official, in the Hellespontine region: διατελεῖ τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν καὶ εὐνοίαν προσ-

We appear to have the beginning of the decree (*vacat* above l. 1), hence requiring a very short prescript before the beginning of the considerations; presumably there is no regnal date, and we begin with a decision formula (γνώμη, ἔδοξεν *vel sim.*). The actions of the official concerned are unrecoverable. He appears to have held a number of different posts in the region. In lines 4–5 we have a post held by the official (ἐπιστ)άτης τοῦ τόπου,⁵⁴ followed by the words β]ασιλέως καὶ ἡμῶν: no doubt the sense is [τὴν τε ἀναστροφὴν ἐποιήσατο ἀξίαν τοῦ τε β]ασιλέως καὶ ἡμῶν. Compare *OGIS* 329 (decree for an Attalid *epistates* at Aigina), 20–22: τὴν τε ἄλλην ἀναστροφὴν πεποιημένος εὐσχημόνως καὶ ἀξίως τοῦ τε βασιλέως καὶ τῆς πόλεως.⁵⁵

III. Decree of Tabala

Malay, *Researches* no. 181 = *SEG XLIX* (1999) 1694 is a fragment of an honorific decree from Tabala in Lydia, dated to the 22nd year of (presumably) the Sullan era, 63/62 B.C.

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | [ἔτο]υς κβ' · ἔδοξε [τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῶ] |
| | | [δήμω γ]νώμη στρατ[ηγῶν καὶ γραμμα]- |
| | | [τέως τ]οῦ δήμου · ἐπ[εὶ name] |
| | | [. .]νίου τῶν πολ[ιτῶν ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ] |
| 5 | | [ἀγ]αθὸς καὶ γενό[μενος] |
| | | [.]A τῶ δήμω πεπο[ιημένος] |
| | | πολλοῖς καὶ μεγά[λοις] |
| | | [. .]ΖΩΝ διὰ παντὸς [ἀνα]- |
| | | [στ]ρεφόμενος ἀξίως [] |
| 10 | | [τ]ῶν π[ρ]ογόν[ων] |
| | | ----- |

In ll. 4–5, the sequence [ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγ]αθὸς καὶ γενό[μενος seems to me highly unlikely, whatever one supposes to have followed. The phrase ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός is attributive; the second καὶ should connect to another attribute of similar type. The restoration καὶ γένο[υς (e.g.) πρώτου presents itself; compare *TAM V* 1, 514 (Maeonia): ἀνδρὸς καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ γένους πρώτου.

The following phrase is less straightforward. Either we have something performed by his *genos* for the *demos* (i.e. γένο[υς (?) πρώτου καὶ -]α τῶ δήμω πεπο[ιηκότος / πεπο[ιημένου, or something performed by the honorand himself (i.e. γένο[υς (?) πρώτου, -]α τῶ δήμω

φερόμενος; in *MAMA VI* 173 (Arameia), 8–9: [τὴν τε πᾶσαν] ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν σπουδῆν τε καὶ φιλοτιμίαν προσ[φερόμενος].

⁵⁴ I have not found a precise parallel. The post of *epimeletes* is, of course, common in all the major Hellenistic kingdoms: numerous examples collected by Holleaux, *Études* iii 217–219, 253–254. At Neonteichos and Kiddoukome, a Seleukid ἐπιμελητῆς τοῦ τόπου (*I. Laod.* 1, 4).

⁵⁵ Thus also *IG XII*, 9, 900B (contemporary Euboian inscription for a Ptolemaic functionary), 6–7: τὴν τε ἀναστροφὴν ἐποιήσατο ἐν τῇ ἐπιδημίᾳ ἀξίως τοῦ τε πέμψαντος βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως; *TAM IV* 1, 2 (honours for ambassadors from Prouusias), 9–11: [ἐποιήσαντο δὲ τῆ]ν ἀναστροφὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ τε βασιλέως Π]ρουσίου καὶ τῆς ἡ[μετέρας πόλεως].

πεπο[ιημένος/πεπο[ιηκώς].⁵⁶ The first of these options is certainly the correct one, as is clear from the perfect tense; the benefactions to the *demos* took place in the past. Thus, at Patara, Claudia Anassa was γένους ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, πόλλα παρασχομένην τῇ πατρίδι (*SEG XLVI* (1996) 1715, 8–9: no connective, present participle), while, at Xanthos, Veranius Tlepolemos was προγόνων δὲ ἐπιφανῶν καὶ πολλὰ τῇ π[ατρί]δι παρεσχημένων (*TAM II* 1, 288, 13–14: connective καί, perfect participle).⁵⁷

It remains to find a construction for the dative τῷ δήμῳ. An obvious solution would be τὰ συμφέροντα, but this seems to give us too long a line – unless we were to restore, e.g., καὶ γένο[υ]ς ἀεὶ τὰ συμφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ πεπο[ιηκός, καὶ αὐτὸς κτλ.]. For this kind of formulation, compare *MAMA VIII*, 408 (Aphrodisias), ἀνὴρ τῆς πρώτης τάξεως καὶ γένους πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἐν πᾶσι παρεσχημένου τῇ πατρίδι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡλικίας νεικήσας, etc.; for the precise wording here, *MAMA VI*, 173 (Arameia), 9: [πράσσω]ν ἀεὶ τὰ συμφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ; *IG XII*, 6, II 1218 (Icaria, late 2nd c.), 7–8: λέγων καὶ πράσσω ἀεὶ τὰ συμφέροντα πᾶσιν ἡμῖν.

At the start of l. 8, on the photo provided by Malay, an *iota* is clear before the *zeta*, and before the *iota* a round letter. The present participle of σφίζω (or a compound) seems inevitable. I would restore here δια[σ]φίζων διὰ παντὸς [τὴν πίστιν]. See J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1982), no. 30 (late Republican), 8–10: πίστεις ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς διατηρήσαντα; *IGRR IV*, 471, 6–7: συμφυλάξαντα [τὴν πίστιν] ἀξίως τῆς πατρίδος; *IGRR IV*, 298, 5–7: συντη[ρήσαντα τὴν ἐγκεχειρισθεῖσαν] πίστιν ἀξίως τῆς [πατρίδος] (both these last as restored by L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes*, 54; both apparently 1st c. B.C.); *I. Ilion 73* (80 B.C.), 10–11: [τὴν ἐγκε]χειρισμένην ἐατῶι πί[στιν ... διατηρεῖ]; now the Pergamene decree for Menodoros (late 2nd c.), *Ann. Ép.* (2000) 1377, 23–24: [διετήρη?]σεν τὴν ἐγκεχειρισθεῖσαν αὐτῶι πίστιν. For the use of σφίζω in this sense, see *Aphrodisias and Rome* 3, 36–38, σωζομέν[ης] τῆς ἐμῆς πίστ[ε]ως.

In *Aphrodisias and Rome* 30, we find the phrase ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κινδύνων σεσωκότα τὴν πατρίδα (ll. 2–4); here I should similarly restore in ll. 6–7 [ἐν] πολλοῖς καὶ μεγάλ[οις κινδύνοις]; καιροῖς is possible but not preferable.

In ll. 8–10, the honorand has behaved in a manner worthy of two groups of people, of whom the second consists of his πρόγονοι; the expected contrast is between himself and his ancestors (more so than, say, the city and his ancestors), and I suggest ἀναστ[ρεφόμενος] ἀξίως [αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς τῶν π[ρ]ογόνων e.g. ἀρετῆς]; compare *SEG XLVI* (1996) 1721 (Xanthos), 10–11: ἀξίως αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων ἀναστροφῆς.

⁵⁶ I take it as certain that we have a part of ποιῶ. The *alpha* at the start of the line must be the end of a neuter plural direct object in the accusative. Hence Malay's alternative suggestion that we may have πεπο[λιτευμένος] or πεπο[λιτεύεται] does not appeal, since a qualifying adverb would then be expected (ἐνδόξως, διαφερόντως).

⁵⁷ I give a illustrative selection of examples of this perfect participle. At Aphrodisias, *MAMA VIII*, 410, 3–4: προγόνων ὑπάρχων καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ φιλοδοξίαις γεγονότων; 482, 9–12: γένους πρώτου καὶ ἐνδόξου καὶ τὰς μεγίστας λειτουργίας λειτουργηκός; several instances of γένους συνεκτικός τὴν πόλιν, προγόνων συνεκτικόν τὴν πατρίδα (L. Robert, *Hellenica XIII* (Paris, 1965), 213). See also *I. Knidos* 52, 3–4: προγόνων ὑπάρχουσα πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα τὰν πόλιν εὐεργετηκός; *I. Stratonikeia* 1331, 2–8: προγόνων ... πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα συνκατεργασμένων [ἀγ]αθὰ τῷ δήμῳ; especially *TAM II* 1, 147 (Lydia), 5–14: γονέων καὶ προγόνων ἐνδόξων, πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ λειτουργίαν τῇ πόλει φιλοτείμως τετελεκότων καὶ πρεσβείας μέχρι Ῥώμης δω]ρέαν καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνο[υ]ς, ἐ]ξ ἰδίας δὲ καὶ ἔργα τῇ πόλ[ει] πεποιημένων, τετιμη[μέ]νων ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως καὶ εἰκόσιν. In *SEG XLIV* (1994) 1162 (Boubon), a mixture of perfects and aorists: προγόνων πρωτευσάντων ... ἀρξάντων ... πεποιημένων, etc.

The whole document, then, I would restore as follows:

[ἔτο]υς κβ' · ἔδοξε [τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῶ]
 [δήμῳ γ]νώμη στρατ[ηγῶν καὶ γραμμα]-
 [τέως τ]οῦ δήμου · ἐπ[εὶ name]
 [.]νίου τῶν πολ[ιτῶν ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ]
 5 [ἀγ]αθὸς καὶ γένο[υς ἀεὶ τὰ συμφέρον]-
 [τ]α τῶ δήμῳ πεπο[ιηκότος, καὶ αὐτὸς (?) ἐν]
 πολλοῖς καὶ μεγά[λοις κινδύνοις δια]-
 [σ]ώζων διὰ παντὸς [τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἀνα]-
 [στ]ρεφόμενος ἀξίως [αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς]
 10 [τ]ῶν π[ρ]ογόν[ων e.g. ἀρετῆς - - -]

All Souls College, Oxford

Peter J. Thonemann

Özet (Inscriptions from Konya)

Yazar, B. H. McLean'in Konya Arkeoloji Müzesi'ndeki yazıtları konu alan katalogundaki (BIAA monograph 29, 2002) bazı yazıtların okunuşları üzerinde düzeltmeler ve yorumlar yapmakta ve bazıları için yeni tamamlamalar önermektedir.

Özet (Hellenistic Inscriptions from Lydia)

Makalede, Lydia'da bulunarak yayımlanmış olan 3 Hellenistik yazıt üzerinde farklı yorum ve tamamlamalar önerilmektedir:

I- Kaystros (Küçük Menderes) Vadisi'nde bularak yayımlanan (*IvEphesos*, 3601) ve ön ve arka yüzlerinde Ephesos ve Sardeis'e olan uzaklıklar verilen bir yazıtta B ve AA şeklinde kısaltmalar bulunmaktadır. 10 *stadion* aralıklarla dikildiğinden dolayı bu mesafe taşlarına *dekastadion* adının verilmesini öneren yazar, bu taş üzerindeki kısaltmaların tarihleme amacıyla kullanıldığını ve *B(asileuontos) A(ttalou) A* („*Attalos'un krallığının birinci yılında*”) şeklinde okunması gerektiğini belirtmekte ve yazıtın İ.Ö. 159/8 ya da 138/7 yıllarından birine ait olduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

II- Bu bölümde, H. Malay tarafından Buldan'ın Kadıköy köyünde bulunarak yayımlanan (*Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis*, no. 182) bir onurlandırma dekreti ele alınmakta ve farklı yorum ve tamamlama önerileri getirilmektedir. Yazar, Malay tarafından Philadelphia'ya atfedilen bu yazıtın Apollonia (Tripolis) kökenli olduğunu iddia eden G. Petzl'a (*EA* 33, 2001) da karşı çıkmakta ve Apollonia sınırlarının bu kadar kuzeybatıya uzanamayacağını ileri sürmektedir. Ona göre bu yazıt, sonraları Philadelphia sınırları içinde yer alacak olan çok sayıdaki küçük yerleşimlerden (*katoikia*) birine ait olmalıdır ve bunun için en uygun aday, adı bazı antik yazar ve yazıtta geçen, Lydia'nın Tabai adlı yerleşimidir.

III- Yazar, yine H. Malay tarafından Tabala'da bulunarak yayımlanan (*Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis*, no. 181) bir dekret fragmentini ele almakta ve diğer paraleller ışığında bazı tamamlamalar önermektedir.