

MARIA-ZOE PETROPOULOU

A SELEUCID SETTLEMENT ON FAILAKA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 39 (2006) 139–147

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## A SELEUCID SETTLEMENT ON FAILAKA\*

In this article, I shall make some comments on a Seleucid inscription from the island of Failaka (Ikaros) in the Persian Gulf, concentrating mainly on the date of the text and the character of the settlement to which this text alludes. The inscription was found on the island in 1959.<sup>1</sup>

The editions on which my comments will be based are the one by Ch. Roueché and S. Sherwin-White (1985) and the most recent one by K. Jeppesen (1989). We have to bear in mind the fact that the numbering of lines is different in the two editions, as the gap between the covering letter of Anaxarchus and the letter of Ikadion is considered a line by Jeppesen, and is numbered (line 7 in his edition). Roueché and Sherwin-White do not number the gap. In the following references, the numbers are those of the lines in the two editions. The edition by Roueché and Sherwin-White will be referred to as *Chiron*, whereas the one by Jeppesen as «Jeppesen '89». Here, we present the texts of the two editions.

---

\* This article is an improved version of the paper I submitted for the Master of Studies Examination in Ancient History at the University of Oxford in June 1999. The paper was supervised by Dr Charles Crowther, who kindly encouraged me to publish it. The present version owes much to his comments. I therefore take the opportunity to thank him for his invaluable help during all the stages of my encounter with this inscription. I also thank my DPhil supervisor Prof. Fergus Millar for commenting on a draft of this article.

<sup>1</sup> The editions of the inscription are the following:

- 1) *Editio princeps*: K. Jeppesen, *KUML* (1960), 174–198, whence *SEG* 20.411, with some additional suggestions.
- 2) After revision of the stone in the museum of Kuwait and examination of a squeeze, F. Altheim and R. Stiehl republished the text in *Klio* 46 (1965), 273–281.
- 2a) Jeanne and Louis Robert commented on this in *Bull. Ep.* 1967.651.
- 3) On the basis of examination of the stone, a squeeze and photographs, Charlotte Roueché and Susan M. Sherwin-White published this text in *Chiron* 15 (1985), 13–39, no. 3; see *SEG* 35.1476.
- 4) On the basis of photographs from the Kuwait museum and a facsimile made by Jeppesen, F. Piejko provided another publication of the text in *Cl. & Med.* 39 (1988), 89–116, but his method and conclusions are unconvincing.
- 5) Finally, K. Jeppesen republished the inscription, along with a facsimile and photos, in *Danish Archaeological Investigations on Failaka, Kuwait. Ikaros, the Hellenistic Settlements. Vol. III: The Sacred Enclosure in the Early Hellenistic Period* (Aarhus–Kuwait 1989), 82–114.
- 6) The last edition, on the basis of the earlier publications, is by F. Canali De Rossi, *Iscrizioni dello Estremo Oriente Greco* (I.K. 65) (Bonn 2004) 245–248 nos. 421–422.

Further comments have been made by:

- 1) O. Callot in T. Fahd (ed.), *L'Arabie préislamique et son environnement historique et culturel. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 1987* (Univ. des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg; Travaux du Centre de Recherches sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques 10; Leiden 1989), 139; see *SEG* 39.1560.
- 2) F. Piejko in a footnote in *Cl. & Med.* 42 (1991), p. 138, n. 44. Not valuable at all.

For a summary of the editions of the inscription up to that by Piejko in 1988, see D. T. Potts, *The Arabian Gulf in Antiquity*, vol. II: *From Alexander the Great to the Coming of Islam*, Oxford 1990, 186–193. However, there is no comment on the editions.

## Chiron

- Ἄναξαρ[χ]ο[ς] τοῖς ἐ[γ] Ἰκά[ρωι] οἰκηταῖς χαίρειν·  
 τῆς ἐπιστ[ολ]ῆς, ἢν *e.g.* ἔγραψε[ν] ἡμῖν Ἰκαδίων  
 ὑπογεγ[ρά]φωμεν ὑμῖν τὸ ἀν[τ]ίγ[ρα]φον.  
 ὡς ἂν [? τάχιστα λάβητε] τ[ὴν ἐ]πιστολὴν  
 5 ἀναγράψα[τε] ? ἐν στήλῃ, ? ταύτ[η]ν δ' ἔκθετε  
 ἐν τῷ ἱερῶ[ι]. ? θρ' Ἄρτ[ε]μισίου [κ]ζ'. ἔρρωσθε.  
*vacat*
- Ἰκαδίων Ἄναξάρχωι χαίρειν· σπεύδει  
 ὁ βασιλεὺς περὶ Ἰκάρου τῆς νήσου  
 διὰ τὸ καὶ τοὺς προγόνους αὐτοῦ ? ἀ[γ]ρ[ο]ῦ[ς]  
 10 ἱερῶσαι καὶ τὸ τῆς <Σ>ωτείας ἱερὸν ἐ[πι]βαλέ[σ]-  
 θαι μεταγαγεῖν. κ[α]ὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν  
 πραγμάτων τα[σ]σομένοις μεταγαγεῖν.  
 ἐκεῖνοι δέ, εἴτ[ε] δὴ δ[ι]ὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκποιῆσαι  
 αὐτοῖς εἴτ[ε] διὰ τ[ὴν] ἄ[λλ]ην γοῦν αἰτίαν,  
 15 [ο]ῦ μετήγαγο[ν]. ἡμῖν δὲ γράψ[α]ντος τοῦ  
 βασιλέως [? σπουδῆ] μετ[η]γάγομεν καὶ  
 κατεστήσαμ[εν] . . . .]Σ ἀγῶνα γυ-  
 μνικὸν καὶ ? μ[ου]σικόν, βο[υ]λόμενοι ἔξαγα-  
 [γ]ε[ῖ]ν κατὰ τ[ὴν] τοῦ βασ[ι]λέως αἴρεσιν καὶ  
 20 τῶν προ[γόνων] αὐτοῦ. καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ  
 νήσῳ κατ[οικ]οῦντων γ' νεωκόρων τε καὶ τῶν  
 ἄλλων ΟΥΔ[. . .]ΟΧ[. . .]ΠΠΠ[. . .]ΟΥ Σωτήρος  
 ΙΑΙ<sup>—</sup>ΟΥ[. . .]ΠΠΠ[. . .]ΣΟΥΣ[. . .]Σ τῆς νήσου συν-  
 οικισθῆγα[. . .] ΣΙ[. . .]Λ[. . .]ΙΟΣ τούτου μὴ προσ-  
 25 πορεύεσθαι [ . ΠΠ . ΠΠΠ . ΛΠ . ΛΠΠ . ]Ν τρόπῳ μηδενὶ  
 ἄλλ' ἐδῶν [ . ΠΠ . ΣΠ . ΠΠΠΠΠ . ]ΑΣ. ἐπιμελὲς [ . ΠΠ  
 οὖν σοι γέ[γ]νοιτο ἵνα τ[ῶν] τ[ε] δικαίων τ[υ]γχάνωσι  
 ἄνθρωπο[ι] ? μηδ' ὑπὸ μ[η]δ[ε]ν[ο]ς ἀδικ[ῶ]νται μηδὲ  
 μετ[ά]γων[ται]. καὶ ἐά[ν] τινες τούτων βούλωνται  
 30 ἐξι[διά]ξουσ[θ]αι ἐν τῇ [ν]ήσῳ[ι] χώραν, παράδει-  
 ξον αὐτοῖς γῆν ἢν] ἐξεργασάμενοι καὶ φυτεύ-  
 [σαντες ἔξουσι] γ' εἰς τὸ πατρικόν. ὑπαρχέτω  
 [δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ] ἀτέλεια, καθ' ὅτι οἱ πρόγον-  
 [οι τοῦ βασιλέ]ως ἐπεχώρησαν αὐτοῖ[ς]  
 35 [? ὄσωνπερ] εἰς τῆ[ν] νήσον ἐξάγουσι· εἰς δὲ  
 [? τόπους τοὺς κατ' Ἄρ]αβίαν μὴ ἐπίτρεπε μη-  
 [δενὶ ? σίτον ἐξάγειν μηδ'] ἄλλο μηθέν. εἰ  
 [δὲ . . . 13/15 . . . τ]ῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων  
 [. . . 12/14 . . . ? -π]ωλίαι, ἵνα μὴ συμβῆι  
 40 [? αὐτοῖς εἰς ἄρρωσ]τίας ἐμπίπτειν  
 [. . . 4/6 . . . σύνταξον] οὖν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν  
 [? ταύτην ἀναγρ]άψαντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῶι  
 [? ἀναθεῖναι. *vac.*] θρ' Ἄρ[τε]μισίου ιζ'. ἔρρωσο.

Jeppesen '89

- ΑΝΑΞΑΡ[ΧΟΣ ΤΟΙΣ Ε]Ν ΙΚΑ[ΡΩΙ] ΟΙΚΗΤΑΙΣ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ  
 ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΣΤ[ΟΛΗΣ ΗΝ ΕΔΩΚ]ΕΝ ΗΜΙΝ ΙΚΑΔΙΩ[Ν]  
 ΥΠΟΓΕΓ[ΡΑΦΑΜΕΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΤΟ] ΑΝΤ[ΙΓ]ΡΑΦΟΝ  
 ΩΣ ΑΝ [Ε]Υ[ΘΕΩΣ ΛΑΒΗΤΕ ΤΗΝ Ε]ΠΙΣΤΟΛΗΝ  
 5 ΑΝΑΓΡΑΨΑ[ΤΕ ΟΛΗΝ ΚΑΙ Α]Π[Ο]ΛΕΙΠΕΤΕ  
 ΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΙΕΡΩ[Ι ΑΟ ΑΡΤ]ΕΜΙΣΙΟΥ ΚΖ ΕΡΡΩΣΘΕ
- ΙΚΑΔΙΩΝ ΑΝΑΞΑΡΧΩΙ ΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ ΣΠΕΥΔΕΙ  
 Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΙΚΑΡΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΝΗΣΟΥ  
 10 ΔΙΑ ΤΟ [Κ]ΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΡΟΓΟΝΟΥΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΦΙΔ[ΡΥ]ΣΙ[Ν]  
 ΙΕΡΩΣΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΤΗ'ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑΣ ΙΕΡΟΝ Ε[ΠΙ]ΒΑΛΕΣ  
 ΘΑΙ ΜΕΤΑΓΑΓΕΙΝ Κ[Α]Ι ΕΓΡΑΨΑΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΩΝ  
 ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΩΝ ΤΑ[ΣΣ]ΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ ΜΕΤΑΓΑΓΕΙΝ  
 ΕΚΕΙΝΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΤ'[ΟΥΝ Δ]ΙΑ ΤΟ ΜΗ ΕΚΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ  
 15 ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΕΙΤ[Ε ΔΙ']ΗΝΔΗΠΟΤΟΥΝ ΑΙΤΙΑΝ  
 [Ο]Υ ΜΕΤΗΓΑΓΟ[Ν] ΗΜΙΝ ΔΕ ΓΡΑΨ[Α]ΝΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ  
 ΒΑΣΙΛ[Ε]ΩΣ ΣΕ[ΛΕΥ]ΚΟΥ ΜΕΤ[Η]ΓΑΓΟΜΕΝ ΚΑΙ  
 ΚΑΤΕΣΤΗΣΑΜΕΝ [ΤΟΙΣ Θ]Ε[Ο]ΙΣ ΑΓΩΝΑ ΓΥ  
 ΜΝΙΚΟΝ ΚΑΙ Π[ΛΕΟΝ ΣΠΕ]ΥΔΟΜΕΝ ΔΙΕΞΑΓΑ  
 20 [Γ]Ε[Ι]Ν ΚΑΤΑ Τ[ΗΝ ΤΟΥ] Β[ΑΣ]ΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΙΡΕΣΙΝ ΚΑΙ  
 ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟ[ΓΟΝΩΝ] ΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ  
 ΝΗΣΩΙ [Κ]ΑΤ[ΟΙΚΙΩΝ ΤΩ]Ν ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ  
 ΑΛΛΩΝ ΟΥ Κ[ΟΙΝΗ]Σ ΕΤΙ ΕΠΙ [Τ]ΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ  
 ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ [Θ]Ε[ΟΥ Ε]ΣΤΙ[Α]Σ ΟΥΣ[Η]Σ ΤΗΣ ΝΗΣΟΥ ΣΥΝ  
 25 ΟΙΚΙΣΘΗΝΑΙ [ΕΞ ΑΦ]ΙΔ[ΡΥ]ΜΑΤ]ΟΣ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΜΗ ΠΡΟ[Σ]  
 ΠΟΡΕΥΕΣΘΑ[Ι ΤΙ ΤΩ]Ν Ε[ΠΙ]ΑΥΛΙΩΝ ΤΡΟΠΩΙ ΜΗΔΕΝΙ  
 ΑΛΛ'ΕΙΝΑΙ Π[ΑΣΙ ΤΩΝ Τ]Η[Σ] Κ[ΟΙ]ΝΩΝΙΑΣ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΣ ΙΝ'  
 ΟΥΝ ΣΦΙΣΙ[Ν ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΠΙΣ]ΤΩΝ [Τ]Ε <ΤΩΝ ΤΕ> ΔΙΚΑΙΩΝ Τ[Υ]ΓΧΑΝΩΣΙ  
 ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟ[Ι ΜΗ ΠΕ]Ν[Ο]ΜΕΝΟΙ ΑΔΙΚΟΝΤΑΙ ΜΗΔ'Ε[Α]Ν  
 30 ΜΕ[Τ'Α]ΓΩΝ[ΩΝ Ε]ΑΥΤΩΝ ΤΙΝΕΣ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΒΟΥΛΩΝΤΑ[Ι]  
 ΕΞ[ΕΛΕΙΝ ΑΡΓΟΝ] ΕΝ ΤΗ ΝΗΣΩ[Ι] ΧΩΡΑΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙ  
 [ΣΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΗΠ]ΕΙ[ΑΣ ΕΞΕΡΓΑΣΑΜΕΝΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΦΥΤΕΥ  
 [ΣΑΝΤΕΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΙΣ] ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΠΑΤΡΙΚΟΝ ΥΠΑΡΧΕΤΩ  
 [Η ΑΣΦΑΛΕΙΑ ΚΑΙ Η] ΑΤΕΛΕΙΑ ΚΑΘ'ΟΤΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΟΓΟΝ  
 35 [ΟΙ ΟΙ ΤΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕ]ΩΣ ΕΠΕΧΩΡΗΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΙ[Σ]  
 [ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ Τ]ΗΝ ΝΗΣΟΝ ΕΞΑΓΟΥΣΙ ΕΙΣ ΔΕ  
 [ΤΑ ΤΗΣ ΝΗΣΟΥ ΠΕΡ]Α ΒΙΑΝ ΜΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΕΠΕ ΜΗ  
 [ΔΕΝΙ ΜΗΔΕ ΚΑΚΟΥΡΓΗ]Μ'ΑΛΛΟ ΜΗΘΕΝ Ε[Ν]  
 [ΤΗ ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΙΑΙ Τ]ΩΝ Ε[ΠΙ]ΒΑΛΛΟΝΤΩΝ  
 40 [ΤΩΙ ΚΛΗΡΩΙ ΕΚΑΣΤ]Ω' ΙΔΙΑΙ ΙΝΑ ΜΗ ΣΥΜΒΗΙ  
 [ΤΟΥΣ ΟΙΚΗΤΑΣ ΕΙΣ] ΑΙΤΙΑΣ ΕΜΠΙΠΤΕΙΝ  
 [ΕΜΒΑΛΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΙΣ] ΝΟΥΝ ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗΝ  
 [ΣΤΗΛΗΝ ΑΝΑΓΡ]ΑΨΑΝΤΑΣ ΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΙΕΡΩΙ  
 [ΤΩΙ Ε]Ν [ΙΚΑΡΩΙ] ΑΟ Α[Ρ]ΤΕΜΙΣΙΟΥ ΙΖ ΕΡΡΩΣΟ

The most prominent problem in the study of this inscription has been its dating. The lines of the inscription on which one can base an assessment of the date have been eroded at the crucial point – *Chiron*, 6 and 43/Jeppesen ‘89, 6 and 44, whereas most of the name of the month (Ἀρτεμίσιος) is visible in these lines. Several attempts have been made by scholars to read a date – mainly in the last line, of which some traces survive, and then, retrospectively, in line 6. These attempts concerned the year figure, since the reading of the day figure in both lines has remained the same throughout the re-editions of the text; so, the month and day in the last line are Ἀρτεμισίου ιζ’, and those in line 6 Ἀρτεμισίου κζ’. In the course of the attempts to read the year figure, however, the date suggested for the inscription has fluctuated between 243 BC and 167–166 BC. The readings which are described below concern the year figure.

#### My reading of the date

My reading is based on the re-examination of Roueché and Sherwin-White’s squeeze and photographs in the Centre for the Study of Ancient Documents in Oxford; there, I was able to read *omikron*, but was not able to discern a clear letter after the *omikron*. I was also able to see a triangular letter preceding *omikron*, but not a cross-bar in it. In my opinion, then, the Seleucid date should be restored as ΔΟ = Seleucid year 74,<sup>2</sup> i.e. 238/237 BC. If my reading is correct, the Seleucid king ruling in the time when the document was written is Seleukos II (246–225 BC).

#### The other editors

The first editor, K. Jeppesen, suggested ΟΓ or ΟΕ as the reading of the year figure in the contested last line, i.e. year 73 or 75 of the Seleucid era, that is to say 239/8 or 237/6 BC (in the text which he presents, he keeps the reading Γ). Jeppesen identified Ikadion with the person who supported Laodike and her son Seleukos II against Berenike, the second wife of Antiochos II.

The second publication, by F. Altheim – R. Stiehl, did not offer a restored year figure in the last line of the text, where the editors suggested an expansion of the sentence instead: (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) / [Σωτήρος ἢ θεοῦ ἄλλ]λου. [Ἀ]ρτεμισίου ιζ’; ἔρρωσο. However, they restored the number ρμε’ in l. 6 of the text,<sup>3</sup> which corresponds to the Seleucid date 145, so 167/6 BC.

J. and L. Robert did not consider the edition in *Klio* as generally reliable, and in the *Bull. Ep.* of 1967 they criticised the poor Greek of the restorations. As regards the last line, they thought that if we were supposed to believe that a year figure does not exist in this line, the most plausible restoration would be (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) / [τῆς Ἀρτέμι]δος. In this context, the Roberts had the occasion to make an observation which would be decisive for the reading of the date of this particular text: in the Seleucid system of dating, the order of the numbers in year dates is the reverse of that used in the rest of the Greek world; namely, the units precede the tens, which precede the hundreds.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, J. and L. Robert proved that neither the dating of the edition in *Klio* nor that by Jeppesen could be correct.

<sup>2</sup> The year 1 of the Seleucid era is 312/11 BC. See E. J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London 1980 (1968), 71.

<sup>3</sup> In *Bull. Ep.* 1967, p. 557, there is a misprint and the date is quoted as ρμ’.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. the epigraphical dossier in J. T. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford 1999: letter of Antiochos III to the Sardians: date θq’ = 213 BC (pp. 284–5), letter of Laodike: date θq’ = 213 BC (p. 286), letter of Antiochos III to Zeuxis: date γp’ = 209 BC (pp. 289–90), letter of Zeuxis to the Amyzonians: date θp’ = 203 BC (p. 292).

The edition by Roueché and Sherwin-White contained the suggestion of a new date: the editors read the same signs as Jeppesen in the last line, but they interpreted them as representing the letters ΘΡ = Seleucid year 109 = 203/2 BC. Roueché and Sherwin-White were aware of the point made by Robert with regard to the Seleucid method of dating.

In his 1988 re-edition, Jeppesen re-interpreted the letter traces in the last line, which he had originally thought to be a Γ, and which Roueché and Sherwin-White took as a P, as “blemishes in the surface of the stone” (p. 85). He insisted, however, on the reading of the previous letter as *omikron* and did not accept the reading of *theta*, suggested by Roueché and Sherwin-White. Instead, he paid attention to the traces preceding the *omikron*, which in the first edition he had regarded as belonging to the previous word, and which Roueché and Sherwin-White did not consider to be letter traces.<sup>5</sup> In his new version, Jeppesen interprets these traces as A or Δ, so the figure should be read (in the Seleucid way) as AO or ΔO. In the text which he presents he prefers the reading A and, accordingly, in his translation, he gives the (Seleucid) year 71, i.e. 241/0 BC.

Finally, O. Callot dated the text to 203/2 BC, following Roueché and Sherwin-White.

Of the readings of the date listed above, I agree with one of those given by K. Jeppesen in his second edition of the inscription, namely ΔO in the last line of the text.

In fact, this dating has found its supporters in an article by L. Hannestad and D. Potts.<sup>6</sup> The authors think that “a date around 243, 241/40 or 238/7 accords well with the archaeological finds” (p. 103), whereas a much later dating (like the one suggested by Roueché and Sherwin-White) would be less compatible with the archaeological material. Besides, the available literary references to Ikadion agree with our date.<sup>7</sup> The rareness of the name makes it very unlikely that these references concern another Ikadion.

A change in the reading of a particular date can influence our understanding of the policy of a specific Seleucid king. But a change of date cannot influence the question of *what* this policy was. In fact, the answer to this question must be determined by the reading of the text as a whole. That is why I will next comment on some differences in the readings given by the two principal editions, which I have cited. These differences seem to me crucial, if we are going to extract historical information from such a damaged inscription.

*Chiron*, 9/Jeppesen '89, 10. My reading: As far as I can see on the squeeze and the photos, the traces are the following: traces of a triangular letter, followed by a space too damaged for me to see anything; then, an upright hasta, traces of a circular letter, an *upsilon*, and a *sigma* (Α,|Ϝζ). These traces are more compatible with Roueché and Sherwin-White's restoration.

The others: The difference in the editions presented lies in the last word of the line. Roueché and Sherwin-White restore this as ἀγρούς, whereas Jeppesen suggests ἀφίδρουσιν, for which he gives a detailed set of supporting arguments. According to Jeppesen, the word as found in the sources means the transference of a mother cult or of its material to a new place, so that the identity and the sanctity of the *old* are transmitted to the *new*. Jeppesen does not agree with the

<sup>5</sup> They do acknowledge triangular traces, but they think that these are too close to the *theta* and cannot belong to a separate letter. In their text they place a *vacat* before the date (p. 29 of their edition).

<sup>6</sup> Temple Architecture in the Seleucid Kingdom, in P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Petersen, L. Hannestad, and J. Zahle (eds.), *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization, 1), Aarhus 1990, pp. 91–124.

<sup>7</sup> See *FGrH* 260 F 43 (Porphyry); also Hieronymus, in his *Commentary on Daniel* 3.11.6, *CCL* 75 A, p. 903.

restoration ἀγρούς because, as he says, the simple consecration of land is something of a “modest level” (p. 93) and, anyway, what is needed here is a word that would be easily recognisable, just as the word ἀφίδρυσιν is.

An even more problematic point concerns the syntax of lines *Chiron*, 22–3/Jeppesen ’89, 23–4 and the following infinitive συνοικισθῆναι, *Chiron*, 23–4/Jeppesen ’89, 24–5. My reading: The infinitive συνοικισθῆναι is visible on the stone, and both editions accept its existence. I was not able to supplement the gaps, but I think that the words νεωκόρων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων do not necessarily belong to the infinitive συνοικισθῆναι. Our understanding of the text calls for such a connection, but this leads to problems in the syntax, like Jeppesen’s awkward sole infinitive (see below).

The others: Jeppesen suggests that the infinitive συνοικισθῆναι “must be understood in relation to the earlier reference to the inhabitants” (p. 98), that is the *neōkoroi* and the others. In his translation, he starts a new sentence with the infinitive in the future (“they shall be resettled”, p. 103).

The same assumption about the subject of συνοικισθῆναι is made by Roueché and Sherwin-White, who include “the *neōkoroi* and the others” in the subject of the infinitive (p. 35). So, their translation is “they were included in the settlement” (p. 16), and in their *epigraphic commentary* they draw our attention to συνοικισθῆναι as denoting “repeopling and reconstruction of a place” (p. 24). They support the meaning of the infinitive by referring to *F. Amyzon* by J. and L. Robert.<sup>8</sup>

Roueché and Sherwin-White left spaces unrestored in their lines 22–4, but this prevented them from making syntactically unlikely restorations, like Jeppesen who left the infinitive συνοικισθῆναι standing alone without governing verb.

The anomaly in the syntax becomes even more apparent in the next lines, where another infinitive, μὴ προσπορεύεσθαι occurs, *Chiron*, 24–5/Jeppesen ’89, 25–6.

My reading: The words μὴ προσπορεύεσθαι are clearly visible on the stone, and I agree with the interpretation of προσπορεύεσθαι as «encroach upon» given by Roueché and Sherwin-White.<sup>9</sup> As I was not able to trace any more letters following the infinitive and before τρόπωι μηδενί, my comments only concern the general meaning up to προσπορεύεσθαι: I consider the two infinitives συνοικισθῆναι and μὴ προσπορεύεσθαι to be governed by a verb denoting a decision made by the king. The first infinitive would refer to the decision of a συνοικισμός in the sense which I specify below. The second infinitive would refer to a royal prevention from a transgression. I find it possible that the two infinitives have the same subject.

If both infinitives had the same subject, and, indeed, one denoting a group different from the «*neōkoroi* and the others» (as I have previously suggested with regard to συνοικισθῆναι), there would be a stronger contrast between the group who last participated in the creation of the city (συνοικισθῆναι), and the «*neōkoroi* and the others» whose rights would be transgressed (προσπορεύεσθαι) by that group. In my opinion, then, what we should look for in the lines *Chiron*, 23–5, is a verb of decision and a group of people (στρατιῶται?).

The others: Abruptly, Jeppesen (p. 103 in his edition) translates μὴ προσπορεύεσθαι as impersonal, and he thinks that it refers to the rural landowners whose right to property “must not be expropriated” (p. 98).

<sup>8</sup> *Fouilles d’Amyzon en Carie*, tome I: *Exploration, Histoire, Monnaies et Inscriptions*, Paris 1983, 188.

<sup>9</sup> Their p. 25, see also Jeppesen ’89, p. 98.



In their translation, Roueché and Sherwin-White use a general «they» as the subject of μὴ προσπορεύεσθαι (p. 16), and in their *historical commentary* they presume that the infinitive refers to the protection of the rights of the local inhabitants, but they put the word «local» into brackets (p. 35).

It is worth dwelling a bit on the infinitive συνοικισθῆναι. It is true that a great variety of cases of συνοικισμός is cited in the previously mentioned work by J. and L. Robert. On p. 188, the following definition is given:

Le “synécisme” est normalement la création d’un centre urbain grâce à la population de villages dans une région qui vivait dans le système des villages, κατὰ κόμας. Un autre sens de *syn-oikismos*, celui du décret d’Amyzon, est “repeuplement” d’une ville abandonnée ou meurtrie, que le dépeuplement ait eu lieu récemment ou qu’il remonte à plus ou moins longtemps.

There follows a number of examples illustrating the second sense of the word.

From this citation, it is obvious that Roueché and Sherwin-White chose the second sense of the word in their edition (as they specify on their p. 24). As we have said, their translation of συνοικισθῆναι does not exactly fit this interpretation, but if we follow the editors with good faith, it seems that they wanted to talk about a re-peopling of the island, in which “the *neôkoroi* and the others” would participate. But even before the date of this letter, we do not have evidence for the existence of a city on the island. How, then, can we talk about re-peopling of a city?

The only evidence suggesting the possible existence of a corporate body on the island is the cult of a goddess, whom the Greeks identified with Artemis, and for whom the name «Soteira» has been accepted. This cult would be centered around a great temple with its servants, apparently the *neôkoroi* of our text. Roueché and Sherwin-White accept that before the arrival of Greeks, the indigenous population “was centred round a sanctuary” (p. 31), and that the site where our inscription was found shows an arrangement of that type too. But no one is sure about the exact location of the pre-Greek sanctuary. Furthermore, we cannot tell with certainty to what extent this pre-Greek sanctuary was an *urban* centre or not.

Are we, then, allowed to suppose that such a religious, maybe *urban*, centre, had declined by the time when the letter was written, and that the king decided to restore it in a new form, maybe that of a Greek *polis*?

Indeed, Jeppesen suggests that a common hearth lost its significance, according to the restoration he proposes: οὐ κ[οινῆ]ς ἔτι ... [ἐ]στ[ί]α[ς] οὐσ[η]ς τῆς νήσου. Jeppesen seems almost to have caught a central point of the king’s policy: he thinks that a common hearth lost its significance during the reigns of Antiochos I and Antiochos II, and that Seleukos II undertook to revive it (p. 98). Jeppesen uses the word συνοικισμός for this revival, but with no definition and with no reference to the Roberts’ definition. So, Jeppesen seems to accept a kind of re-peopling, though he does not clearly specify what is meant by a «common hearth». He simply mentions the possibility of the word «hearth» being connected to the word ἀφίδρυσιν, which he had previously restored.<sup>10</sup>

The various editors of this inscription have made valuable observations. However, I suggest that the first sense of συνοικισμός as given by J. and L. Robert is the key to the policy of the Seleucid king. What is happening here is not a re-peopling of the place. The notion of re-peopling

<sup>10</sup> In my opinion, where Jeppesen seems to be wrong is in the interpretation of the king’s intention: he thinks that Seleukos II strengthened the authority of the common hearth in order to express the suzerainty of the Seleucid administration on the island.

implies that it is the same settlement, which was peopled-depopulated-repeopled. Since we do not know the exact character of the island's temple-centred area<sup>11</sup> before the letter was written, we cannot be certain that the Seleucid king saw a continuity between the settlement before the act of *synoikismós* and the one after that. However, since the king undertook a *synoikismós*, it means that the previous settlement was not so concentrated, and the king wanted to revive it. Therefore, I think that what is at issue in this letter is an order for the creation of a city from the beginning. The people of the island had been scattered in small settlements of village type, until the king decided to *create* a city on the island. Thus, the Seleucid kings' policy of creating cities is evident once more.<sup>12</sup>

Of course, we cannot know if the king's plans for an urban centre involved the creation of a Greek city, a *polis*. Indeed, we do not have any traces of a *polis* on the island. In these terms, we may wonder if the city which the king was going to create was to be a Greek *polis*. The fact that the inscription with the order for *synoikismos* stood in front of a temple, which can have sheltered the old, indigenous cult of Soteira, would suggest a different sort of policy. The king may not have wanted to break the link with the pre-Greek cult and the pre-Greek organisation of Ikaros; he may have wanted to seem lenient as far as town-planning was concerned, and to create a peculiar type of *polis*, where the old would coexist with the new; the servants of the gods would still be responsible for the temples, and along with them, the community on the island could continue to live its life without radical changes; but, on the other hand, the Greek *agôn*, whose establishment is mentioned earlier (*Chiron*, 17–8, Jeppesen '89, 18–9) would give the place a Greek aspect.<sup>13</sup>

Independently of the religious policy mirrored in the case of Failaka, the decision of the Seleucid king (= Seleukos II) to give a remote area some Greek characteristics (*agôn*, temple-architecture) can be considered part of the reinforcement-policy adopted by the Seleucids: namely, wherever a territory's inhabitancy should be strengthened, new populations were moved from the densely inhabited Greek cities to the areas in need of people.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> We avoid using the term "temple-state", whose use has been criticised by S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt in their work *From Samarkand to Sardis. A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, London 1993, 59–61.

<sup>12</sup> On the creation of cities by the Seleucids, see F. W. Walbank, *The Hellenistic World*, London 1992 (1981), ch.7 "The Seleucids and the East". Also G. M. Cohen, *The Seleucid Colonies*, Historia-Einzelschriften, 30, Wiesbaden 1978, mainly pp. 14–19 and 87–89 (on p. 89, see the characteristic passage from Libanius). Cohen has an appendix on the dossier from Failaka (pp. 42ff.), but it is based on the Altheim–Stiehl edition. See also G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford 1995.

The only exception in the hellenistic world in terms of urbanisation is the Ptolemaic kingdom. The Ptolemies did not want to spoil the agricultural 'vocation' of Egypt, since their main source of income was Egyptian agriculture. This vocation, though, was closely connected to the non-urban character of the place. See Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique*, II, 408.

<sup>13</sup> L. Hannestad and D. Potts do not share this view. They think that, in contrast with the general lack of an official programme of Hellenisation in the religious sphere on the part of the Seleucids, the case of Failaka indicates the adoption of an Hellenising religious transformation by Seleukos II: The authors compare the two temples of the enclosure with the ones in Ai Khanoum. The Failaka temples are basically Greek with a few non-Greek elements, whereas the two temples in Ai Khanoum are non-Greek with Greek elements: *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp.104, 123.

<sup>14</sup> See P. Briant, Colonisation hellénistique et populations indigènes, II: renforts grecs dans les cités hellénistiques d'Orient, in *Rois, tributs et paysans: études sur les formations tributaires du Moyen-Orient ancien* (Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne, 43), Paris 1982, pp. 263–279. Briant provides us with a brief survey of the reinforcement-policy of each of the Seleucids, among which is the one of Seleukos II (p. 277). See also *id.*, Colonisation hellénistique et populations indigènes: la phase d'installation, in *ibid.*, pp. 227–262, especially p. 256 on *synoikizein-synoikismos*.

The difficulties in reading this text do not obscure its general importance. It is clear that the Seleucid king showed an interest in this island, not only in terms of its constitutional renewal, but also in terms of the rights of its inhabitants. I do not think the text supports the view that the rights given by the king concerned the temple-staff exclusively, and that the main purpose was the establishment of good relationships with the local religious aristocracy.<sup>15</sup> The terms used in the text (νεωκόρων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἄνθρωπο[ι]), do not show a bias in favour of the religious personnel.

The Greek settlement on Ikaros seems to have been something more than a garrison and something less than a *polis*. This document may bring into relief the policy of the Seleucids when they dealt neither with villages nor with Greek cities, but with semi-urbanised areas. It may suggest that they respected the pre-existing organisation, but without leaving the area uncontrolled. Ikaros incorporated Greeks by including them in the native environment. But Greeks also incorporated the local cult in their enclosure, so that both populations could be equally represented in the protected area destined for all.

### Özet

Makalede, İnan Körfezin'ndeki Failaka (İkaros) adasında 1959 yılında ele geçen ve birçok kez yayınlanmış ve tartışılmış bulunan, Suriye krallığı ile ilişkili bir Hellenistik yazıt yeniden ele alınmaktadır. Yazar, Suriye krallığına ait iki bürokratin yazışmasını kaydeden bu yazıtın İ.Ö. 238/7 yılına (Seleukos II dönemi) tarihlenmesi gerektiğini ve Ikaros adasında bulunan ve bu yazıtta sözü edilen yerleşimin garnizon ile *polis* arası bir büyüklükteki bir Suriye iskanı olduğunu ileri sürmektedir.

Athens

Maria-Zoe Petropoulou

---

Starting from the study of OGIS 233, L. Robert also refers to the will of the Seleucids “d’installer de citoyens des vieilles villes grecques en Phrygie et en Pisidie et jusque dans la région du golfe Persique”. Unfortunately, the writer does not give specific evidence for the last point. The quotation is from *Laodicée du Lycos: Le Nymphée. Campagnes 1961–1963*, par J. des Gagniers, P. Devambez, L. Kahil, R. Ginouvès, relevés et plans de H. Schmidt, avec des études de L. Robert, Québec–Paris 1969, p. 330.

<sup>15</sup> Thus, J. F. Salles, The Arab-Persian Gulf under the Seleucids, in A. Kuhrt – S. M. Sherwin-White (eds.), *Hellenism in the East*, London 1987, 75–109.