

JOHN MA

DATING THE NEW DECREE OF THE CONFEDERATION OF ATHENA ILIAS

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 40 (2007) 55–57

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## DATING THE NEW DECREE OF THE CONFEDERATION OF ATHENA ILIAS

*For Peter Derow (1944–2006)*

*In memory of conversations on this and other topics*

A recently published stele from the Troad contains a new decree from the Confederation of Athena Ilias for Antikles Alexandrou, of Lampsakos, gymnasiarch of the festival of the goddess, the Panathenaia (T. Özhan, M. Tombul, *Ep. Anat.* 36 (2003), 109–13). The decree received commentary from Ph. Gauthier (*BE* 2004, 267, adducing the necessary parallels in *I. Ilion* and the treatment of the Confederation in L. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (1966), chap. 3) and Chr. Habicht (*Ep. Anat.* 27 (2004), 91–4, noted in *BE* 2005, 394). Habicht notably identified one of the *synedroi* sent by the Confederation, Pythodoros Metrodorou of Lampsakos, with the Pythodoros sent by Lampsakos to defend its independence against Antiochos III at the conference in Lysimacheia in winter 197/6 (Pol. 18.56, cf. Liv. 33.38.1–7).

Özhan and Tombul date this decree on palaeographical grounds to the early second century BC. This date can be corrected and refined. One of the agonothetes is Zoilos Menestratou, of Rhoiteion (lines 3–4). However, Rhoiteion was abolished as a *polis* when it was granted to Ilion by the settlement of 188.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the decree dates before that year.

Is further precision possible? *I. Ilion* 10 (same document: *OGIS* 444, *IGR* 4.197) concerns the reorganization of the festival. It dates to 77 (year 9 of the Sullan era). I shall assume the following: that this agreement was passed in a year when the Panathenaia were being celebrated; that these were the Greater Panathenaia (attested in the new decree, also in *I. Ilion* 2, 10 and 12), celebrated on a penteteric basis. If these assumptions are correct, we can propose possible dates for the new decree, since it was passed during a celebration of the Greater Panathenaia (lines 5–6). These would have been celebrated in 189, 193, 197. It is difficult to date the newly published decree to any of these years. The first reason is the presence of an Abydene agonothete. As Habicht points out, the city was captured by Philip V after a terrible siege, in 200. Even though the city was granted its freedom in 196 by a *senatus consultum*, along with other places taken by Philip V, and was used as a base by Antiochos III in spring 196 (to attack Lampsakos, and to cross into the Chersonese), its existence as a fully functioning *polis* and participant in the festivals of the Confederation of Athena Ilias seems doubtful to me.<sup>2</sup> The second reason is the troubled geopolitical situation in these years, marked by the great sweep of Antiochos' campaign (197–6), the build-up to the Roman-Syrian War (when Lampakos had been under military pressure from the Seleukid king since 197), and the aftermath of the Seleukid defeat. The year 201 is unlikely, since Philip V was active in the Propontis in 202 and in 200.<sup>3</sup> 205, 209, 213 are possible dates; 217 is not, because in that year the Troad was ravaged by the Aigosages, a Celtic band brought over by Attalos I (Pol. 5.78.6; 5.111.6). The year 221 falls in the time of Achaios' governorship

<sup>1</sup> Liv. 38.39.10; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (1950), 2, 950. Rhoiteion: L. Robert, *Etudes de numismatique grecque* (1951), 9–10, *Monnaies grecques en Troade* (1966), 19 n. 1; J. M. Cook, *The Troad* (1970), 79–88, 364.

<sup>2</sup> Pol. 18.2.4; Liv. 33.30.3; 33.38.8–14.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to the references above, E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* (éd. 2), 2 (1982), 121–3, 132–3.

of cis-Tauric Asia Minor, aggressively directed against Attalos I; the years 225, 229, take us to the obscure years of Attalid ascendancy in Western Asia Minor.

Now the precision of these dates is spurious, because the anchoring point of 77 for a celebration of the Greater Panathenaia is in fact not secure. But the chronological exercise is useful, because it helps us map possible dates against the eventful political history of the very late third and very early second centuries. What is difficult is to guess how war and unrest affected the rhythm of a regional festival such as the *panegyris* of Athena Ilias, with its athletic and economic activities, lasting at least sixteen days (the new decree was passed on the sixteenth day; I am not sure whether the proclamation of honours for the gymnasiarch was made at the gymnastic agon of the same Panathenaia, or the following). If the decree dated to the 190s, this would mean that Abydos, whatever its actual state of repair and population, was again participating in “federal” festival life; Lampsakos, recalcitrant to Seleukid pressure, could nonetheless send an agonothete and *synedroi* to the festival, perhaps allowed to do so as a conciliating gesture by the Seleukid king. If the decree dated to c. 221, the festival in the Troad would have been celebrated in spite of Achaios’ war of Seleukid reconquest – which we know affected in some way Ilios, Lampsakos and Alexandria Troas.<sup>4</sup> Either of these two dates would imply a regional festival life unimpeded by war. However, this is not the picture which the epigraphical evidence generally suggests: Chr. Habicht has recently discussed the interruption of festivals and rituals that resulted notably from international military conflict.<sup>5</sup>

My feeling is therefore that this decree belongs with the other late third century documents of the Confederation: *I. Ilios* 2, a decree for the gymnasiarch Kydimos Kydimou of Abydos (likely to be dated before 200, because of the history of Abydos discussed above); *I. Ilios* 5, a list of debtors of the *panegyris* (including Myrleia, destroyed in 202 by Philip); *I. Ilios* 6, a similar list; and perhaps *I. Ilios* 3, a decree for an *agoranomos* of the *panegyris* (on the last two, see P. Frisch’s discussion in his edition; *I. Ilios* 11 is more doubtful). The context, or contexts, for these documents are likely to lie before 222 (accession of Antiochos III in 222, followed by Achaios’ offensive), or in the years between 216 (end of Achaios’ principality, destruction of the Aigosages) and 202 (irruption of Philip V, destruction of Myrleia). The palaeography of these documents forms a loose group, characterized by an broken-barred alpha and a theta with a central dash rather than a dot,<sup>6</sup> which confirms the assignment of the new decree to the late third century.

In this period, the Confederation was extremely active (as the new decree confirms) and extended its catchment area beyond the Troad, as L. Robert observed on the debtor list (*I. Ilios* 5): it involved member cities from the Propontis (Parion and, interestingly, Myrleia and Kalchedon).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (rev. ed. 2002), 56 n. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Versäumter Götterdienst, *Historia* 55 (2006), 153–67.

<sup>6</sup> *I. Ilios* 5, 6 show these traits. *I. Ilios* 2 has a theta with central dot; generally might be earlier (airy, beautiful, monumental script). The new decree shares a small, pendent omega with *I. Ilios* 6. Sigmas are divergent-branched in *I. Ilios* 5, but straight-branched in 2, 6, and the new decree. Note the photograph of a squeeze of *OGIS* 219 in *ZPE* 124 (1999), 82, with notes on palaeography.

<sup>7</sup> *Monnaies grecques en Troade*, 32. On festivals in the Hellenistic period, see now R. Parker, New ‘Panhellenic’ Festivals in Hellenistic Greece, in R. Schlesier and U. Zellmann (eds.), *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (2004), 9–22; C. Vial, A propos des concours de l’Orient méditerranéen à l’époque hellénistique, in F. Prost (ed.), *L’Orient méditerranéen de la mort d’Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée* (2003), 311–328.

This festival activity fits in with an insight often propounded by Peter Derow in his teaching<sup>8</sup>: the last years of the third century BC saw a striking intensification of inter-polis contact, in the form of festival life and diplomatic activity – a development in which Derow was inclined to read a renewed and increased expression of pan-Hellenic identity, through political and cultural forms, in response to the particular événementiel context, especially the First Macedonian War.

On another point of interest, the two decrees for gymnasiarchs of the *panegyris* (*I. Ilios* 2 and the new decree) contain among the earliest references to honorific statues for gymnasiarchs<sup>9</sup> – not in the context of a city, but of a federal festival; this is interesting both for our understanding of the workings of the festival, and for the history of the honorific statue habit. The statues are to be set up in the shrine of Athena at Ilios; in the new decree (lines 57–8), as in *I. Ilios* 2 (lines 56–7), the *synedroi* decree that the Ilians are to be asked to designate (παράδειξαι) a spot in the shrine. As L. Robert pointed out, the verb indicates the authority which the Confederation wields over public space in the shrine, even though it is located in the city of Ilios; in contrast, the *synedroi* ask the Abydenes to grant (δοῦναι) a spot in their city for the stele inscribed with the decree honouring their citizen Kydimos, and the Lampsakenes to make sure that the stele with the decree for Antikles is set up in the finest spot possible.<sup>10</sup>

### Özet

Bu makalede, T. Özhan ve M. Tombul tarafından *Epigraphica Anatolica* 36, 2003, s. 109-113’de yayımlanan ve daha sonra Chr. Habicht tarafından *Epigraphica Anatolica* 27, 2004, s. 91-94’de yeniden yorumlanan bir yazıtın tarihlendirilmesi ele alınmaktadır. Bilindiği gibi, Panathenaia Festivali’nin yöneticisi olan Antikles adındaki bir Lampsakos’unun Athena İlias Konfederasyonu tarafından onurlandırıldığı bu dekret Özhan-Tombul tarafından İ.Ö. II. yüzyıl başlarına tarihlenmişti. John Ma, bölgede bulunan diğer bazı yazıtlardan ve tarihi olaylardan yola çıkarak bu yazıtın, Athena İlias Konfederasyonu’nun daha aktif olduğu İ.Ö. III. yüzyıl sonlarına tarihlenmesi gerektiğini öne sürmektedir.

Oxford

John Ma

<sup>8</sup> See P. Derow, The arrival of Rome: from the Illyrian Wars to the fall of Macedon, in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Blackwell Companion to the Hellenistic World* (2003), 51–70.

<sup>9</sup> Other early statues for gymnasiarchs: *IG XII* suppl. no. 122, a decree of Eresos for the gymnasiarch Aglanor, is dated between 209 and 204 (my thanks to S. Skaltsa for this reference); the statue of the Xanthian gymnasiarch Lyson dates to 196: *SEG* 46.1721, from Ph. Gauthier, Bienfaiteurs du gymnase au Létôon de Xanthos, *REG* 109 (1996), 1–34; the statue base and decree for the Kolophonian gymnasiarch Euelthon dates to the very late third or very early second century: Ph. Gauthier, Un gymnasiarque honoré à Colophon, *Chiron* 35 (2005), 103–11; Sosilos Dorieos, whose statue (bronze, full-size, naked, wielding a *rhabdos*) was set up in the late third century with a succinct inscription in the gymnasium at Delos, was probably a gymnasiarch: *IG XI.4.1087*, with D. Knoepfler, *Études déliennes* (1973), 233–7, A. Jacquemin, *BCH* 105 (1981), 155–7, C. Vial, *Délos indépendante* (1984), 241, J.-Ch. Moretti, *BCH* 121 (1997), 125–51, Chr. Schuler, Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit, in D. Kah, P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasium* (2004), 163–91, at 169 n. 35.

<sup>10</sup> *Monnaies grecques en Troade*, 29–30.