

R. MALCOLM ERRINGTON

A HELLENISTIC TREATY FROM BOUBON

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 43 (2010) 131–134

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A HELLENISTIC TREATY FROM BOUBON

Nicholas Milner has recently published a Hellenistic text from Boubon which contains part of a treaty relating to the Kibyrate Tetrapolis¹. Milner's text runs as follows:

[- -----]Σ[.]Ο[- -----]
 [- ----- πρὸς Οἰνοά[νδοις -----]
 [- - - c.8 - - εὐσε]βῶντες τοῖς κ[αιροῖς βοιηθήσομεν, ἀγω]-
 [νιζόμενοι καὶ] λόγῳ καὶ ἔργοις καὶ ὀπλ[οις, σπουδῆς καὶ]
 5 [φιλοτιμίας μ]ηθὲν ἐλλίποντες κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἡμῶν]
 [αὐτῶν, διατηρο]ῦντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους το[ὺς κοι]-
 [νοὺς σωτήρας] καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοιάν τε καὶ συνμα[χίαν],
 [μηθὲν ὑπεναντ]ίον πράσοντες τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμ[ασιν].
 [ὁμοῦνται δ' αἱ διαλ]λασ[σό]μεναι τρεῖς πόλεις δι' ἐντόμ[ων]
 10 [νεοκαύτων - - c.7 - - τοὺς ὄρκο]υς τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον]
 [τρόπον . . .]

The reconstruction of the text is based on the view that it is an oath (158), and Milner therefore restores in two places the first person plural (line 3: βοιηθήσομεν and line 5: ἡμῶν), although there is no other indication in the preserved text that this is necessary. The participants to the treaty undertake to uphold their treaty with Rome and to do nothing contrary to the *senatus consulta* (lines 6–8: [διατηρο]ῦντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους το[ὺς κοινοὺς σωτήρας] καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοιάν τε καὶ συνμα[χίαν | μηθὲν ὑπεναντ]ίον πράσοντες τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμ[ασιν]). As far as we know, of the four cities of the Tetrapolis only Kibyra possessed a treaty with Rome. Milner therefore concludes that the Kibyrates must be the subject of the plural participles and the restored first person main verb in line 3. The three cities which have been reconciled (αἱ διαλ]λασ[σό]μεναι τρεῖς πόλεις) and which, as participants to the new treaty, are required to swear the oath (line 9), are therefore the remaining three cities of the Tetrapolis, Boubon, Balboura and Oinoanda. The substance of their oath, however, lies in the air, and their relationship to the postulated oath of the Kibyrates remains unclear.

This does not seem to be the most likely explanation of the new text. The normal model for a documentary treaty and the accompanying oath is that the treaty terms are listed in detail and are then followed by the oath, which is normally composed in the first person singular, i.e. suitable for each individual swearer of the oath, whether all the citizens or representatives of the participant communities. The text of the oath then normally refers back to the terms described in the foregoing text.² It is therefore difficult to imagine what the oath of the three cities can have referred to, if what we have in the preserved text is itself the oath of the Kibyrates; or indeed, why another – presumably substantively different – oath should be appended at all. If different oaths were foreseen, we would expect the provision for both oaths to be in the same place in the text, after the listing of the terms of the treaty.

¹ Nicholas P. Milner, A Hellenistic Treaty from Boubon, in: Christof Schuler (ed.), Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien. Eine Zwischenbilanz (Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris Nr. 25), Wien 2007, 157–164.

² E.g. I. Milet I 3, 150 line 109: ὁ δὲ ὄρκος ἔστω ὅδε: *vacat* ἐμμενῶ τοῖς ὁμολογημένοις εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον etc.

I wish to suggest that the nature of the text has been misunderstood and as a result wrongly restored. What we have here is not an oath, but a normal listing of the agreed terms of the treaty expressed in the third person plural (or appropriate participial constructions), to which the necessary oath or oaths were appended.³ The restorations I suggest are only *exempli gratia*. Line 3 is obviously critical, where Milner has restored the participle εὖσε]βοῦντες, which in intransitive use is rare and in a treaty, as far as I can see, unparalleled. He allows, however, that his dotted beta could be a theta, which would allow the reconstruction: βοιη]θῶντες τοῖς κ[οινοῖς πράγμασιν, ἄγω]- etc.⁴ This has the advantage that the equally unparalleled first person plural for the restored main verb disappears. It will then be necessary to assume that the main verb (e.g. συνθήκας ἐποιήσαντο) was placed in the lost portion of the text. This seems in principle unproblematical. In line 5 Milner has restored the first person plural pronoun ἡμῶν, which was necessitated by his first person plural verb supplement to line 3, but since this has disappeared, we need something like κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἑαυτ]ῶν καὶ διατηρο]ῦντες etc. I can find no parallel for the restored τοὺς ὄρκο]ς in line 10, nor for the restored τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον | τρόπον . .] in lines 10–11. Not only is this unparalleled, but it makes no sense, since the function and validity of the oath was not dependent on the manner of its swearing but on the precise text, which is usually given in full. Since Milner also allows the possibility of the normal and expected τὸν ὄρκο]ν τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον], it seems perverse not to restore it here. It seems more usual to use a third person imperative for the instruction to swear, so line 10 [ὀμνύτωσαν] for [ὀμοῦνται].⁵

My new text therefore reads as follows:

- [- - - - -]Σ[. .]Ο[- - - - -]
 [- - - - - πρὸς Οἰνοά[νδοις - - - - -]
 [- - c.8 - - βοιη]θῶντες τοῖς κ[οινοῖς πράγμασιν, ἄγω]-
 [νιζόμενοι καὶ] λόγῳ καὶ ἔργοις καὶ ὄπλ[οις, σπουδῆς καὶ]
 5 [φιλοτιμίας μ]ηθὲν ἐλλίποντες κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἑαυτ]-
 [ῶν καὶ διατηρο]ῦντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους το[ὺς κοι]-
 [νοὺς σωτήρας] καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοϊάν τε καὶ συνμα[χίαν],
 [μηθὲν ὑπεναντ]ίον πράσσοντες τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμ[ασι].
 [ὀμνύτωσαν δ' αἱ διαλ]λασσ[σόμεναι] τρεῖς πόλεις δι' ἐντόμ[ων]
 10 [νεοκαύτων - - c.7- - τὸν ὄρκο]ν τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον].

Milner has, it seems to me, rightly indicated the historical context of the new text as being concerned with the early stages, perhaps even the foundation, of the Kibyrate Tetrapolis in the years following the forced withdrawal of Rhodes from its recently acquired territories south of the Maiander after 167 B.C.⁶ Important factors for the participants of the new inter-city treaty, explicitly mentioned, were the existing good will towards the Romans, the treaty with them (line 7) and the otherwise unspecified *senatus consulta* (line 8). These can, however, hardly be the *senatus consulta* concerning the Rhodian withdrawal and the liberation of Kaunos and Stratonikeia, as Milner suggests (162), since those cannot have concerned details of affairs in the Kibyrtis. The

³ So also A. Chaniotis, *Mnemosyne* 63 (2010) 676, without argument.

⁴ Cf. Syll.³ 742 line 10 (Ephesos): ἐσχηκῶς καιρὸν πρὸς τὸ βοηθεῖν τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμασιν.

⁵ Chaniotis, loc. cit. (n. 3) suggests: [ὀμοῦνται/ῶμοσαν δ' αἱ - - -] τρεῖς πόλεις δι' ἐντόμ[ων | νεοκαύτων πρὸς . . ca.11 . .] τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον ὄρκο].

⁶ Strabo xiii 4.17 (631 C.).

senatus consulta mentioned in the treaty must be rather specific decisions relating to the cities of the Kibyris. Theoretically possible is the interpretation that their mention here merely reflects a general recognition that *senatus consulta* were critical and needed to be obeyed. However, none of the parallel passages cited by Milner⁷ explicitly mentions *senatus consulta*, which by their nature were concerned with specific problems. Passages referring to a general wish to conform to Roman policy seem to be always expressed in much more general language.⁸ I therefore much prefer the first alternative, even though we have no further information about the *senatus consulta* concerning the Kibyris.

Given that Milner's reconstruction of the text is unsatisfactory, his argument about Kibyra's being the only possible subject for the named "upholders of the treaty" with Rome is leaden. According to my reconstruction, the three "reconciled" cities all swear to uphold the conditions listed in the text of the treaty. This means, they all swore to all the terms listed. Therefore, since only one *symmachia* is named, we must conclude that the participants to the new treaty considered themselves bound by the treaty which Rome had made with their leading city, Kibyra, as well as "the *senatus consulta*". These may well have treated detailed problems of the area, as seems to have happened at Antiocheia on the Maiander.

Which were the three cities involved, which are described as "reconciled"? I agree with Milner that we do indeed seem to have a document associated with the foundation of the Kibyrate Tetrapolis, and which originally illustrated how it came into being. Here I would like to be more precise and see two alternative scenarios. (a) Three cities, Boubon, Balboursa and Kibyra came together under the leadership of Kibyra and settled, perhaps with Roman help – ? the *senatus consulta* – outstanding local problems, which had caused irritation between them. Thereafter they approached Oinoanda and made a joint agreement integrating Oinoanda into their association and so creating the Tetrapolis. This would perhaps explain why only Oinoanda is explicitly mentioned in the substantive part of the treaty's text in line 2 (unless this is merely a result of the breaking of the stone). (b) Alternatively, as Milner suggests, the "three cities" are Oinoanda, Balboursa and Boubon, and they were named in the lost upper part of the document, where the name of Oinoanda (officially "the Termessians by Oinoanda")⁹ is partially preserved (line 2); they thus exclude Kibyra, and the purpose of the treaty will be that they are joining with Kibyra to form the tetrapolis; thereby they agree to uphold the terms agreed with Kibyra (here listed), which include respecting all aspects of the existing relations with Rome. In this case we would expect that the oath of Kibyra would be included on the lost lower part of the stone along with the oath of the "three cities". The second alternative is perhaps to be preferred.

⁷ 160, ad loc.

⁸ E.g. IosPE I² 402 lines 27–28: μηδὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῖς πρασσόντων; J. Reynolds, Aphrodisias and Rome 1, lines 10–12: [ὅ]πῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ μηθὲν ὑ<π>εναντίον [π]ράξειν μήτε Ῥωμαίοις μήτ[ε] αὐτοῖς; IG XII 6,1,6, lines 23–26: συνήδεσθαι μὲν Ἀντι<ο>χεῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι προσορισμῶ[ι τῆς χώρας] καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ διὰ τῆς τῶν προσόδων ἐπ[αυ]ξήσεως δυνατωτέρους [α]ὐτ[ο]ὺς γεγονέναι] εἰς τε τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐξυπηρετεῖν φι[λοδόξως καὶ τοῖς ἀεὶ εὐεργετεῖν προαιρου]μένοις εὐχαρίστως ἀπαντᾶν ἐν παν[τὶ καιρῶ].

⁹ See now D. Rousset, De Lycie en Cabalide. La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda (Fouilles de Xanthos X), 2010.

Özet

Makalede, Boubon'da bulunarak ilk kez N. Miller tarafından yayınlanan (bk. "A Hellenistic Treaty from Boubon", *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien. Eine Zwischenbilanz* (ETAM 25), ed. Christof Schuler, Wien 2007, 157–164) üzerinde yeni yorumlar yapılmaktadır. Yazara göre bu fragmentte, Milner'in düşündüğü gibi, Kibyatis'deki Tetrapolis adlı birliğin kuruluşuna ilişkin yemin metni değil, antlaşma metni yer almaktadır.

Berlin

R. Malcolm Errington