

DECREE OF THE IONIAN LEAGUE IN HONOR
OF ANTIOCHUS I, CA 267–262 B.C.

F. PIEJKO

Nos vieilles sciences de l'antiquité ne peuvent se passer de la critique des théories, opinions et hypothèses modernes. (L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure*² [Paris 1962] 418)

WHAT FOLLOWS IS A RECONSIDERATION and a new edition of a Greek inscription already known for more than a century and many times edited. That the constitution of our "classic" text, no. 222 in that admirable, but now increasingly antiquated, corpus, *Orientalis Graeci inscriptiones selectae* (henceforth *OIGI*), was quite accidental and arbitrary has been a fact recognized for decades by such leading authorities as M. Holleaux, Ad. Wilhelm, and notably L. Robert.¹ Although there was only one independent edition, from which all others are derived, the tradition has a rather extensive and involved history, in a large measure predetermined by the first dispositions of Paul Foucart. That explains why our critical apparatus has to be detailed and long.

To replace this inadequate text Robert contemplated for a long time a new edition, but that plan unfortunately has not materialized, and now after his regretted departure the expectation is never to be fulfilled. The newest presentation by H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, although marking decisive progress in its radical suppression of the greater part of the gratuitous patchwork, is still far from satisfactory. Even the negative part of the critical operations (I mean the excision of alien accretions) has not been carried out comprehensively; note, for example, διὰ]ωμεν (4) and τοσοῦτον (5). Much more remains to be done on the positive side because the editors found the restoration problems in many lines too risky and declined to negotiate them altogether. From my own experience with this inscription, extending over a number of years, I may confirm that the task did not prove easy on some points, since these could be clarified only by patient matching with outside *comparanda*. Yet it appears that some relatively simple matters have been thought to pose great problems of scholarship only because of the accident that they seemed to do so to the first editors. Naturally in those times scholars had incomparably more limited materials at their disposal than we now have and no tested methods to enable them to do much better under those conditions. Thus it was almost inevitable that the

¹L. and J. Robert, *La Carie: Histoire et géographie historique* 2 (Paris 1954) 287; *Bull. Ép.* 1959 323, p. 228. Cf. H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* 2 (Bonn 1973) 492.

first editors hinted at some wrong approaches, which continued to baffle their successors. While this presentation consciously builds on the efforts of predecessors, it nevertheless aims to go beyond their legacy.

LEMMA AND TEXT

Stela found in Clazomenae, now presumably lost. Two fragments: one containing 47 lines, complete on the right, broken on the left; the other matching the left side of lines 32–43 in the former.

P. Foucart, *BCH* 9 (1885) 387–394, from a squeeze and copy by P. Fontrier; (T. Lenschau, “De rebus Priensium,” *Leipzig. Stud.* 12 [1890] 11–220, at 193–196; C. Michel, *Recueil d’inscriptions grecques* [Brussels 1900] no. 486; W. Dittenberger, *OGI* [Leipzig 1903] no. 222; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IPriene* [Berlin 1906] no. 507; H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach [above, n. 1] no. 504).²

Cf. B. Haussoullier, *Études sur l’histoire de Milet et du Didymeion* (Paris 1902) 61–69; Ad. Wilhelm, *GGA* (1900) 91; M. Holleaux, “Le Décret des Milesiens en honneur d’Apamé,” *REG* (1923) 1–14, at 4, n. 1; W. W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*² (Cambridge 1951) 450, n. 3; Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte* (Munich 1956) 91–93; W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich 1977) 97–100.³

- (e.g.) τὸν δὲ ἀγῶνα καὶ τὴν θυσίαν]
[καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν πανηγυρίαν συντε]λε[ῖν καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐνιαυ-]
[τὸν (e.g.) Μεταγειτινῶνος μηνὸς τῇ τε]τράδι ἰσταμένου ἵνα τῇ[v]
[ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ Ἄντιοχος ὁ βασιλεὺς] ἐγεννήθη μετ’ εὐφημί-
[ας καὶ ἀγαθῆς τύχης κατὰ πόλεις ἄγ]ωμεν· διδοσθαι δὲ τῷ
5 [πανηγυριζουσῶν πόλεων ἑκάστη] ὅσον καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἀλε-
[ξάνδρου πανηγυρίαν πρὸς τὴν θυσ]ίαν δίδοται. ὥπως δὲ καὶ
[τὴν προαίρεσιν τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν] Ἰώνων περὶ τῶν τιμῶν εἰ-
[δῶσιν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος καὶ ἡ] βασίλισσα Στρατονίκη
[ἐλέεσθαι ἐκ τῶν παρόντων συνέδρ]ων δύο ἀφ’ ἑκάστης πόλε-
10 [ως πρέσβεις, οὓς ἐλομένους πρεσ]βεύσαντας πρὸς τὸν βα-
[σιλέα καὶ ἀσπασαμένους αὐτὸν τ]ό τε νῆφισμα τότε ἀποδοῦ-
[ναι τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν] τῷ πόλεων τῶν Ἰάδων ἐμ-
[φανίσαι, τὴν πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὅ τι ἄ]ν ἀγαθὸν δύνωνται τῷ κοι-

²This text is also produced in a software package by D. F. McCabe, J. V. Brownson, B. D. Ehrman, *Klazomenai Inscriptions: Texts and Lists* (Princeton 1986) no. 001, available on computer diskette or in hard copy.

³The works listed in the lemma will be cited henceforth by author’s name alone or in abbreviated form. Other abbreviations used are RC = C. B. Wells, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven 1934); Habicht² = Ch. Habicht, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*² (Munich 1970, *Zetemata* 14); Holleaux, *Études* = M. Holleaux, *Études d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecques*, 6 vols (Paris 1938–1968); *Delphinion* = A. Rehm, *Das Delphinion des Milet* (Berlin 1914); Herrmann = P. Herrmann, “Antiochus der Grosse und Teos,” *Anatolia (Anadolu)* 9 (1965) 29–160.

- [νῶι περιποιῆσαι. παρακαλείτω]σαν δὲ οἱ πρέσβεις τὸν βασι-
 15 [λέα τὴν προσήκουσαν ἤδη ἐπιμ]έλειαν ποιεῖσθαι τῶν πόλε-
 [ων τῶν Ἰάδων ὅπως εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐλευθέραι οὔσαι καὶ δημο-
 [κρατουμέναι μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολι]τεύονται κατὰ τοὺς πατρί-
 [ους ἐκάστων νόμους· δηλώσουσι]ν δὲ αὐτῶι οἱ πρέσβεις διότι
 20 [ταῦτα ποιούμενος πολλῶν ἀγαθ]ῶν αἷτιος ἔσται ταῖς πόλε-
 [σιν ἅμα τε ἀκόλουθα πράξει τῇ τ]ῶν προγόνων αἰρέσει. παρακα-
 [λείτωσαν δὲ οἱ πρέσβεις βασι]λέι' Ἀντίοχον ἀποφίνασθαι
 [τόπον, ὃς ἂν αὐτῶι κάλλιστος φ]αίνεται εἶναι, ἐν ᾧ τὸ τέμε-
 [νος αὐτοῦ κατασκευασθήσεται] καὶ ἡ πανήγυρις συντελε-
 [σθήσεται. ὅταν δὲ πάλιν συνέλθ]ωσιν αἱ πρεσβεῖαι τῇ πόλιν
 25 [ἐν ἣι θύειν δεῖ τὴν ἐσομένην θυσ]ίαν τῶν Ἀλεξανδρεῶν
 [παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς δήμο]υς τοὺς μετέχοντας τῆς
 [θυσίας, ὅπως κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τὸ τ]οῦ συνεδρίου βουλευσῶνται
 [περὶ τῆς τοῦ τεμένους οἰκοδόμ]ῃς καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς καὶ
 30 [περὶ τοῦ τε ἀγῶνος καὶ τῶν θυσ]ιῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν καθ-
 [ὅτι προέγγραπται, ὥστ' ἐν οἷς δ]ιέησει χρόνοις συντελεῖσθ[αι]
 [πάντα. κυρωθέντος τοῦδε τοῦ ψ]ηφίσ[μα]τος τοὺς συνέδρους τοῦ[ς]
 παρόντας ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων [συ]ντελέσαι θυσίαν τοῖς θε-
 οῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις καὶ τοῖς β[α]σιλευσὶν Ἀντιόχῳ (καὶ Ἀντιόχῳ)
 καὶ τῇ
 βασιλίσσηι Στρατονίκηι καὶ [θῦ]σαι ἱερεῖα τέλεια καὶ στεφα-
 35 νηφορῆσαι τοὺς τε συνέδρου[ς] καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς ἐν
 τῇ πόλει πάντας· ἀνοίξαι δ[ὲ] τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τὰς ἱερεῖας
 τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ ἐπιθύειν ἐπευχομ[έ]νους συνενέγκειν τὰ δεδο-
 γμένα τοῖς τε βασιλευσὶ Ἀ[ν]τιόχῳ καὶ Ἀντιόχῳ καὶ τῇ
 βασιλίσσηι Στρατονίκηι καὶ [πᾶσι τ]οῖς μετέχουσι τῶν τι-
 40 μῶν. ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ εἰστ[ήλ]ῃν τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε καὶ τὰ
 ὀνόματα πατρόθεν τῶν ἡκ[όν]των συνέδρων ἐκ τῶν πόλε-
 ων καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῶι τεμέν[ει] παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν τῶν βασιλέ-
 [ω]ν. ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς δ[ήμ]ους ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις πόλεσιν
 [τ]ὸ τε ψήφισμα τόδε καὶ τ[ῶν σ]υνέδρων τὰ ὀνόματα πατρό-
 45 [θεν καὶ στήσαι ἐν οἷς ἂν τόποις] φαίνηται ἐπιφανέστατον
 [εἶναι. οἷδε συνέδρευσαν· παρὰ Ἐ]φεσίων Ἀρτεμίδωρος Γόργω-
 νος, [-----ca 16----- παρὰ Λε]βεδίων Καπ[νέας? ---

APPARATUS

D = Dittenberger, E = Engelmann and Merkelbach, F = Foucart, H = Hiller von Gaertringen, L = Lenschau, M = Michel, P = Piejko, W = Wilhelm. The supplements by Foucart and followers are noted only when modified.

1 P 2 -ῶνος H: μηνὸς τῇ P 3 ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος F: Ἀντιόχος LMH 4 καὶ ἀγαθῆς τύχης κατὰ πολεῖς P: πάσης καὶ εὐχαριστίας διατελ[ώ]μεν L "Statt διατελ[ώ]μεν erwarte ich ἄγ[ω]μεν" W: διαγ[ώ]μεν DE 5 [πανηγυριζουσῶν πόλεων

ἐκάστη] P: [παρόντων ἐκάστωι τοσοῦτον] F: [πανηγυρίζοντων ἐ. τ.] L 5-6 Ἀλεξάνδρου πανήγυριν πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν P: Ἀλ. ἡμέραν τὴν γενεθλίαν FDH: Ἀλ. τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέραν M: Ἀλ. πομπὴν καὶ θυσίαν Robert, *Bull. Ép.* 1959 323 (p. 288) 7 [τὴν προαίρεσιν L τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν] E [τὰ ἐψηφισμένα ὑπὸ τῶν] Holleaux, *BCH* 48 (1924) 45, n. 3: [φανερὰ ἦι ἡ αἵρεσις F 8 εἰ[δῶσιν L ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος καὶ ἡ] F 9 [ἐλῆσθαι ἐκ τῶν παρόντων συνέδρ]ων P: [ἐλ. δὲ τῶν συνέδρ]ων F: [ἐλ. μὲν ἐκ τῶν συνέδρ]ων M: [αὐτίκα μὲν ἐλῆσθαι ἐκ τῶν ἡκόντ]ων LD: [ἀποδείξαι --- E 10 πρέσβεις L οὓς ἐλομένους P: προτέρον ἤδη πρέσ]β. F 10-11 βα[σιλέα FE βα[σ. καὶ ἀσπασαμένους αὐτὸν τ]ό P: βα[σ. Ἀντίοχον, τούτους δὲ τ]ό FE 12 [ναὶ τῶι βασιλεῖ FL καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν] (vel ἐκτένειαν) E 12-13 ἐμ[φανίσαι, τὴν πρὸς αὐτόν P: ἐμ[φ. αὐτῶι καὶ πράξασθαι ὅτι ἂν] WH: ἐμ [βραχυτάτωι καὶ πράξασθαι ὅτι ἂν] F κοι: KQI in *apographo* 14 περιποιῆσαι P: τῶι πόλει L 15 τὴν προσήκουσαν ἤδη P: Ἀντίοχον ἐπιμ[έλειαν F (πᾶσαν L) 16 τῶν Ἰάδων ὅπως ἂν τὸ λοιπὸν] FMD: ὅπως καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν E: εἰς τὸ P 17 μεθ' ὁμονοίας WHE: βεβαίως ἤδη F 18 ἐκάστων νόμους· δηλώσουσι]ν P: νόμους· ἀποφαινέτωσα]ν edd. 19 [ταῦτα ποιούμενος P: [τοῦτο ποιῶν πολλῶν ἀγαθ]ῶν F (πολλῶν τε L) 20 ἅμα τε P: καὶ ἅμα FE ἀκόλουθα πράξει E, Holleaux, *BCH* 48 (1924) 45, n. 3: ἀκολουθήσει L: ἀκόλουθος τῇ F 21 τὸμ βασι]λεί(α) FL: τὸμ om. P 22 ὅς ἂν αὐτῶι κάλλιστος φ]αίνηται L: οὗ ἂν αὐτῶι κάλλιστον φ. F 23 τε αὐτοῦ ἰδρυθῇται L: τῶν βασιλέων ἀνήσεται Habicht (92) κατασκευασθήσεται P 24 ὅταν δὲ πάλιν συνέλθ]ωσιν P: ἐπειδὴν δε ἐπ[ανέλθ]ωσιν L (ἐ. δ' ἔταν M): ὅταν δ' ἐπ. H 25 ἐν ἡι θύειν δεῖ τὴν ἐσομένην P: ἐν ἡι ἂν συντελέσομεν L 26 παρακαλέσαι P: παρακαλεῖν L 27 θυσίας] πανηγύρεως F θυσίας κατὰ τὸ δόγμα L τὸ δόγμα τὸ τ[οῦ P 28 [περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ τεμένους . . .]ης F ἱεροῦ οἰκοδομ]ῆς L: οἰκοδομ]ῆς *perperam suppresserunt* E 29 *supplevit* F 29-30 κα[θ]ότι F (καθό[τι H: καθ]ό[τι E) κ. προγέγραπται, ὥστ' ἐν οἷς P: κ. γενήσεται καὶ ἐν οἷς F 30-31 συντελεῖσθ(αι) F συντελεῖσθ[αι] P [πάντα· κυρωθέντος τοῦδε P: (κυρωθέντος δὲ Holleaux): [τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐκ τοῦ νῆφισματος F 33 (καὶ Ἀντιόχωι) F (om. *lapicida*) 45 ἐν οἷς ἂν τόποις] P: ἐν χωρίωι ὅπερ ἂν L: ἐν τόποις οὗ ἂν H: ἐν --- ὅπερ ἂν E *post ἐπιφ. puncto distinxerunt edd. omnes.* 46-47 *supplevit P praeter* Γόργω[νος] (F).

TRANSLATION

(Be it resolved), e.g., "to hold games, a sacrifice, and whatever else belongs to a festival, on the] fourth day at the beginning of [the month of, e.g., Metageitnion], so that [throughout the cities we thus] observe [the day on which King Antiochus] was born with a good omen [and as a blessed event]. To apportion to [each city organizing a (local) festival] an amount equal to that customarily distributed [on the occasion of the festival of] Alexander [for the] sacrifice.

In order that [King Antiochus and] Queen Stratonice may know [the resolution of the] Ionian League⁴ concerning the honors, [to elect out of the present] delegates two [ambassadors] from each city, [who upon their

⁴For this instance I prefer this traditional term for the Greek κοινόν. J. A. O. Larsen, *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History* (Berkeley 1966) 117, recommends "commonality."

election having] journeyed to the king [and greeted him] shall deliver [to the king] the present decree [and make due] affirmations [of the loyal attitude] on the part of the Ionian cities [towards him, and also effect any other] boon, such as they might be able, on behalf of the League. The envoys shall appeal to the king [henceforth] to exercise [an appropriate] care of the [Ionian] cities [so that in the] future they, remaining free and democratic, [may continue each under self-government [in internal concord] according to [their own] ancestral [laws]. The envoys [shall] signify to the king that [such a policy will distinguish him] as initiator [of many] benefits to the cities [and that at the same time he will thus follow] the example of his ancestors.

[The envoys shall] ask King Antiochus to indicate [a place, which] seems [to him the most suitable one], where his precinct [will be laid out] and the festival held. [When the deputations] convene [again], the city [where the next] sacrifice of the Alexandraia [is to be offered shall summon the] communities participating in the [sacrifice to hold, pursuant to the decision] of the Council, deliberations [concerning the] construction and the planning [of the precinct], as well as [the games], the sacrifices, and all other matters, as [prescribed, so that all be] duly performed at stated seasons.

[After the ratification of the present] decree the delegates assembled from the cities shall offer an oblation to all gods and goddesses, to the Kings Antiochus (Senior) and Antiochus (Junior) and to Queen Stratonice, and they shall sacrifice victims without blemish. The delegates, as well as others in the city, shall wear festive crowns. The priests and the priestesses shall open their temples and burn incense⁵ and recite vows, that the measures just adopted turn out propitiously to the Kings Antiochus (Senior) and Antiochus (Junior), to Queen Stratonice, and to all those who are included in the honors.

To inscribe in a stele the present decree and the names with patronymics of the delegates who have come from the cities and to set it up in the precinct by the altar of the kings. Likewise the individual communities shall inscribe in their own cities this decree and the names of the delegates with patronymics, [and erect it in whatever places] it [may be] best exhibited. [The delegates: from] Ephesus Artemidorus son of Gorgo[n, ...; from] Lebedus Cap[neus? "

COMMENTARY

1–4 The delegates (σύνεδροι) of the Ionian Confederation, assembled in an unknown city (the stele was discovered at Clazomenae) for the cele-

⁵I take ἐπιθύειν as equal here to ἐπιθυμῆν, as in OGI 332.12 (ἐπιθυέτωσαν λιβανωτόν), 29 (καὶ ἐπιθύοντας τὸν λιβανωτόν), or Diod. 18.61.2. Cf. E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint* (Oxford 1897, repr. Graz 1975), s.v. θυμᾶζειν.

bration of the annual festival for Alexander, are decreeing here the institution of a festival for Antiochus I, to be held on his birthday, as well as other honors for the king, the queen, and their second son, since 267 B.C. the co-regent and heir apparent. It can be determined that there are on the broken-off left side regularly from 24 to 27 (exceptionally 28) letters to be restored. The lines begin with uniform, almost exactly perpendicular breakage; hence the count for the lacunae must be fairly regular.

The first partly preserved lines meet us amid enumeration of the honors voted, for which *θύειν* or *συντελεῖν* would be an appropriate verb in line 1. The possibility *βασίλει-*, invoked with hesitation by the latest editors (I suppose in the dative) does not seem very compelling in this position. Having probably mentioned some preliminary arrangements (e.g., elevation of altars) the prescription continues in the tenor of our restoration (cf. *OGI* 6.22: τὴν δὲ θυσίαν κα[ί] τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τὴν στεφανηφορίαν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν παν[ή]γυριν γινέσθαι αὐτῷ καθ' ἕκαστον ἔ[τος], κα[θ]άπερ καὶ πρότερο[ν] συνετελεῖτο). In any case, it is certain that more than one term was used for the festival⁶ and that its frequency and date were stated. It is supposed that the event was annual. Metageitnion is supplied solely as an example of an Ionian month of adequate length and no more.

The sacrifices and the *agon* will be celebrated in the projected center (lines 23 and 28), whose location is to be determined by the king himself, but from lines 5–6 it is a possible, and from line 25 the necessary, conclusion that the new festival was to be connected somehow (at least temporarily) with the Alexander festival.⁷ A general word for the observation of a holiday, or celebration of a festival is *ἄγειν*, *ἄγεσθαι*; this notion is to be supplied, rather than simply the idea of “spending” a day (*διάγ[ω]μεν*);⁸ cf., e.g., the Maccabees, especially I–II, *passim*; *OGI* 56.5 (εἰς τὴν πέμπτην τοῦ Δίου, ἐν ἧ

⁶The terms *πανήγυρις* (a “general assembly” for festal purposes) and *ἐορτή* (“feast,” “celebration”) came to be used interchangeably and to all practical effects equivalently. Habicht’s theoretical differentiation between them (Habicht² 147), in the sense that festivals in honor of human beings were never called *ἐορτή*, is contrary to the evidence. Not just one new example (266, n. 8), but a great many of the old *testimonia* are in disagreement with that assertion: e.g., Habicht² 155, 254, n. 2; *OGI* 56.33, 44, 56, 57; 90.49; 111.28; 194.28; H. Gauthier and H. Sottas, *Un Décret trilingue en l’honneur de Ptolémée IV* (Cairo 1925) 70, line 6; *RC* 52.51, 53; *PCairZen* 59358; Josephus *AJ* 12.196; Plut. *Arat.* 53.

⁷Cf. Habicht 92. In my opinion the author’s efforts (95–99) to construct direct bridges between *RC* 15 and *OGI* 222 are all in vain because *RC* 15 does not concern Antiochus I (or Antiochus II) in anything at all, but belongs entirely to Antiochus III. Cf. *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 258; *AJP* 108 (1987) 710, n. 4; *Historia* 37 (1988) 152, n. 1. Unfortunately my important paper on “Antiochus III and Erythrae” remains so far unpublished.

⁸It may be additionally observed that *διατελ[ώ]μεν*, rightly condemned by Wilhelm, is out of the question also for the reason that syntactically it would not stand alone, but take an accompanying participle, as it so often does.

ἄγεται τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ βασιλέως), 33, 39, 41, 56, 64; *OGI* 90.46, 47–48, 49, 52; *RC* 52.52.

4–6 Now, as far as the distribution of money or the victims for sacrifices (and communal banquets) are concerned, at this time these were practically *never allotted to individuals* (which condemns all restorations based on that notion) but always to officials representing some component division of a larger body of citizens, which on the city level are usually the representatives of the tribes, φυλάρχαι, ἱεροποιοί, and the like. The arrangements and sacrifices are κατὰ φυλάς. They receive the sums required from a common treasury, or from a special fund reserved expressly for this purpose. *In case of federal festivals the component and subordinate units can only be member cities.* The sacrifices then are κατὰ πόλεις. Evidently the League disposed of some sources of revenue for this contingency.

Some insight into the financing of such festivals is provided by the inscriptions of Ilium for the Ilian League.⁹ The cities there paid regular contributions and were responsible for other expenses, and besides that they were liable to pay interest on their dues in arrears (τόκοι τῆς ἐπισχέσεως). There were also fines exacted for various infractions (e.g., negligent contractors). In a similar manner members of the Nesiotic League paid their assessed dues (σύνταξιν τὴν ἐπιβάλλουσαν) for the Antigoneia and Demetriaia,¹⁰ but evidently also other self-imposed contributions (εἰσφοραί), portions of which were reserved for festivals. From a common fund (τὰ κοινὰ χρήματα) were also provided prizes for athletes.¹¹ The monies managed as perpetual foundations were ordinarily invested in banking and other profitable operations.¹² This should occasion no surprise because all common festivals were originally financed by contributions from their own members, which may be returned to them, at least partially, in another form.¹³ We might assume that similar arrangements obtained in the Ionian League, but one should recall that in a somewhat later period some kings (especially Attalids) used to defray, partly or totally, cities' expenses for the cost of their own cult.¹⁴

⁹The texts are now reproduced by P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion* (Bonn 1975). See on this edition *Bull. Ép.* 1976 566.

¹⁰F. Durrbach, *Choix d'inscriptions de Delos* (Paris 1921–22) no. 13. Unfortunately this important text is too severely damaged to yield much information.

¹¹Durrbach, *op. cit.* 13.12.

¹²See on all this B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* (Leipzig 1914).

¹³Cf. one example from basically the same (in this respect) Mediterranean civilization: Th. Mommsen, *The History of Rome* 1 (tr. W. P. Dickson, reprinted Glencoe, Ill.) 50, on the feast of Juppiter Latiaris: "Each community taking part in the ceremony had to contribute to the sacrificial feast its fixed proportion of cattle, milk and cheese and to receive in return a portion of the roasted victim." Money economy comes much later.

¹⁴E.g., *Syll.*³ (henceforth *Syll.*) 671, 672; *RC* 52; *OGI* 352.80.

Institutionalized largesse and donatives to individuals, as distinct from an invitation to a free repast not directly connected with the cost of public hospitality and victims, are a much later custom. So it must be emphasized that in our decree there can be no question of any handouts to individuals.¹⁵ Let us now review some examples relevant to the lines 4-6:

OGI 6.22-26, quoted above, 131; cf. our line 29. A king's accession to the throne or his birthday was often traditionally regarded and proclaimed as the inauguration of a happy and propitious moment, or period, for the entire kingdom. If my supplement can be accepted as one realistic possibility,¹⁶ it would be not only an adaptation of the ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ formula, but also an allusion to that tradition. Cf. OGI 56.25: ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺν τῇ ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ καὶ τὴν γένεσιν βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου --- συμβέβηκεν γενέσθαι τῇ πέμπτῃ τοῦ Δίου, ἥ καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀρχὴ γέγονεν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις; OGI 90.46; 383.86-87; R. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) (OGI 458) 65 A.4, 8-9, 11-13; cf. *ibid.*, D.40; OGI 493.49-50 (Antoninus Pius; Hellenistic tradition): [ταῖς εὐτυχεσιν]τάταις ἡμῖν καὶ αἰῶνι [παντὶ] αὐτοῦ γενεθλίας ἡμέραις;¹⁷ U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (Leipzig 1912) 490.11 (Pertinax).

The following examples will show that the disbursements for the costs of festival participation are not paid to individuals, but as on the city level they are κατὰ φυλάς, so on the supra-city level they must be κατὰ πόλεις.

Lysimachus: OGI 11 and IPriene 14.17-26 (some restoration):

ιδρύσας-]

[Θ]αι δὲ καὶ βωμὸν αὐ[τοῦ ἐν ἀγορᾷ καὶ θύειν καθ' ἕκασ-]
 20 τον ἐνιαυτὸν τοὺς [ἄρχοντας τοὺς αἰεὶ ἐνεστῶτας κατὰ]
 τὴν πόλιν, καὶ στεφάν[ν]ηφορεῖν το[ύ]ς πολίτας ἅπαν[τας]
 καὶ πομπὴν πέμπε[ιν] τοῖς τε ἱερεῖς καὶ τὰς συναρχ[ίας]
 καὶ τοὺς πολίτας πᾶ[ν]τας τοῖς γενεθλίοις βασιλέως]
 Λυσιμάχου. συνεῖν[αι δὲ καὶ τὸν δῆμον κατὰ φυλάς,¹⁸ δοῦ-]
 ναὶ δὲ τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς δ[ι]ο[ικήσεως εἰς τὰ θύματα τοῖς]

¹⁵The earliest instance known to me refers to grain donatives to individual citizens on the birthday of Eumenes II in Miletus; see A. Rehm, *Didyma* 2 (Berlin 1958) 488. But even in Rome such matters were normally transacted not directly with individuals, but through "economic" and other officers of several tribes. Cf. Cic. Verr. 1.22: *divisores omnium tribuum* were summoned to Verres, when he tried to bribe the citizens.

¹⁶Here it does not matter very much if other possibilities are not excluded, e.g., μετ' εὐφημίας τῆς καθηκούσης; καὶ χαρὰς ἀξίως; καὶ εὐφροσύνης. Cf. I Macc. 8:48: καὶ ἤγανον τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ἡμέραν εὐφροσύνης; II Macc. 10:6: καὶ μετ' εὐφροσύνης ἦγον ἡμέρας ὅκτω ... ἑορτήν. But, although common enough in the Greek Bible, I have not found this last term in accounts of Greek festivals, nor in inscriptions.

¹⁷Restored by L. Robert, "Sur des inscriptions d'Éphèse, xi," *RPhil* 51 (1977) 7-14, with discussion of the terminology for the *felicitas temporum*. Cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1977 424.

¹⁸*Supplevi*. Cf. L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 184: "Je crois que le supplément συνεῖναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς στρατιώταις fait contresens." On this custom see L. Robert, "Sur un décret d'Ilion et sur un papyrus concernant des cultes royaux,"

- 25 ιεροποιοῖς τ[ῶ]μ φυλ[ῶν] ἀργυρίου¹⁹ ὅσον καὶ τοῖς Π[ι]να-
θηναίοις δίδεται.

Seleucus II in Ilium:²⁰ OGI 212.16–19 (my supplements):

καὶ δίδοσθαι τοῖς [α]ύ-
[τῶν] φυλάρχαις εἰς θύματα ὅσων καὶ ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς
[θυσίαι] δίδονται· συνελθέσθω καὶ ἡ σύνοδος τοῦ δήμου
[κατὰ φυλὰς καὶ θυέτωσαν βασι]λεῖ Σελεύκω.

Frisch (above, note 9) 52.17–20: τοὺς δὲ τραπεζίτας διδόναι ἐκάστου ἔτους ἀπὸ
τῆς προσόδου --- [τοῖς ἀφ' ἐκάστης] φυλῆς αἰρεθησομένοις φυλάρχαις κατὰ φυλὴν
δραχμὰς ἐκα[τὸν] εἴκοσι καὶ ἑ[πτὰ] τριῶβλον.

Antiochus III in Teos: Herrmann 37. Block II D, lines 17–24: τὸ δὲ ἐσόμενον
ἀνάλωμα[α καθ' ἑκαστον] ἄνδρα τάξαι μὲν [τὸν] δήμον [ἄ]π[α]ξ ἐν ταῖς [πρώταις ἀρχ-
α]ιρεσίαις· τοὺς δὲ ταμίας τοὺς ἐκαστότε γιν[ομένους] διδόναι τοῖς τῶν συμμοριῶν προσ-
τάταις τὸ ταγὲν ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως, --- λαβόν[τας τὴν ἀπογ]ραφήν --- τῶν ---
[πολιτῶν] (my restorations).²¹ The total cost will be prorated by the number of
the anticipated participants and the money will be again disbursed to the heads
of the *symmoriai* (presumably local equivalent of tribes), not to individuals.

Athenaeus, brother of Eumenes II in Colophon. Holleaux, *Études* 2.59.11–17:

τὸν γυμνασιάρχον
[τὸν ἐκαστότε γινόμε]νον, ἐν ᾗ ἡμέραι Ἀθήναιος ἐ-
[γένετο, θυσίαν συντ]ελεῖν καὶ διαδρομὴν τῶν νέων
[καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων Ἀθη]ναίωι, συντελεῖν δὲ ἐν τῇ αὐ-
[τῇ] ἡμέραι καὶ τῶν παιδονόμον ἀγῶνα παίδων, δίδου-
[σθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς]²² ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκονόμου εἰς τε τὴν θυσίαν
καὶ τὴν διαδρομὴν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ὃ ἂν ὁ δῆμος τάξῃ

Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Wells (New Haven, Conn. 1966, *American Studies in Papyrology* 1) 175–211, at 185. In OGI 219.31 (Antiochus III) I see an engraving error: καὶ συνιόν[τες κατὰ φυλ(α)]ς. For Syll. 372.28/29 I supply ποεῖν δὲ [καὶ συνόδους κατὰ φυλὰς] ---.

¹⁹For ἀργύριον (my emendation).

²⁰I have completed studies of OGI 212 and 219 (forthcoming in *Classica et Mediaevalia* and *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, where the necessity of attribution to Seleucus II and Antiochus III respectively is fully demonstrated. My views on these matters were repeatedly communicated to various persons and scholars before the appearance of Frisch (above, n. 9) and Orth. In the latter the attribution of OGI 212 is stated correctly (47), but OGI 219 is still presented in the traditional and much confused fashion. Cf. *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 255–261; *Historia* 37 (1988) 162, n. 29.

²¹My comprehensive annotations on the inscriptions of Antiochus III in Teos are forthcoming in *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten*.

²²The plural stands for παιδονόμος and γυμνασιάρχος. They (officials, not individuals) are to receive the money for the cost of participation in the three age groups. The gymnasiarch is in charge of the older two.

Attalus III, OGI 332.39-42: καὶ θ]ς[α]ι τοὺς πολίτας πανδημεὶ κατὰ φυλάς, παρασχόμε]ν[ω]ν τῶν φυλάρχων θύματα· δοθῆναι δὲ εἰς ἐκάστην φυλὴν [ε]ἰς [αὐτὰ ἐξ ἱερῶν καὶ]ἰ πολιτικῶν προσόδων δραχμὰς εἴκοσιν. For the distribution specifically κατὰ πόλεις we may compare a decree of the same Ionian League for Eumenes II that is similar to an extent (in respect to cultic honors and phraseology) but a century later; it is closely paraphrased in the king's letter of acknowledgment: ἀναγγεῖλαι τε τὰς τιμὰς ἐν τε τοῖς ὑφ' [ὕ]μῶν συντελουμένοις ἀγῶσιν καὶ κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ἐν τοῖς τιθεμένοις ἐν ἐκάσῃ (RC 52.27-29). For the restoration of "each city" in our lines 5 and 18, note also our line 9.

We can see that parallel to the federal celebration in one city all member cities held at the same time their own separate festivals. This is exactly what may be presumed about OGI 222; cf. RC 52.51-54: ὅπως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει τῶν Πανωνίων ἡμέραν ἐπάνωμον ἄγοντες ἡμῖν ἐπιφανέστερον τὴν ὅλην ἑορτὴν συντελῇτε. We also note that the traditional festival of the Panionia was expanded and enhanced by an added day for the celebration of the King's Day for Eumenes. However, since a royal birthday could be a purely conventional affair, a similar arrangement is conceivable in case of the Ionian Alexandreia and the public birthday for Antiochus I. So it is with official observance of many birthdays in our own times. But in general κατὰ πόλεις was a quasi-technical term of administrative and political language for the designation of individual cities within a country when regarded as a whole. So, e.g., in a treaty between the Boeotian and Phocian κοινά: L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche* (Florence 1967-1976) II no. 83.9-10: ἀρχεῖα τὰ τε κοινὰ καὶ τὰ κατὰ πόλεις; 13-14: τὰ κατὰ π[ό]λεις ἀρχεῖα; Augustus *Rex Gestae* 9: καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ καὶ κατὰ πόλεις σύνπαντες οἱ πολεῖται ὁμοθυμα[δὸν] συνεχῶς ἔθυσαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς σω[τ]ηρίας. Hence one may well supply in *Syll.* 435.92 (H. H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* 3 [Munich 1969] no. 476) συμπράσσειν κατὰ τὰς πόλεις τοὺς ἄρχοντας. In I Macc. 1:51 Antiochus IV ἔγραψεν πάσῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ ... καὶ ἐνετείλατο ταῖς πόλεσιν Ἰούδα θυσιάζειν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ πόλιν. Cf. OGI 56.57-58: συντελεῖν --- ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἱεροῖς ἐν τῷ Τυβὶ μηνὶ ἑορτὴν καὶ περίπλουν. In OGI 383.93-97 Antiochus of Commagene prescribes commemorative festivals in his own honor for the βασιλείας δὲ πληθος --- κατὰ κόμας καὶ πόλεις --- ὡς ἤρμοζεν ἐκάστοις. For τῶμ ... πόλεων ἐκάσῃ, besides OGI 222.9 cf. also RC 52.18, 21, 29, 44, 70. Note the interlocking chain of the idea of πανήγυρις in our lines 1, 5, 6.

6 The purpose is usually expressed by εἰς, as in line 5, but see also II Macc. 3:3: τὰ πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας τῶν θυσιῶν ἐπιβάλλοντα δαπανήματα; 3.6: πρὸς τῶν θυσιῶν λόγον; 9.16: τὰς δὲ ἐπιβάλλοντας πρὸς τὰς θυσίας συντάξεις.

8 The articles are often included here. Frisch no. 36 (I restore): ἵνα δὲ καὶ ἡ βασιλίσ[σα] Λαοδίκη καὶ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος καὶ Ἀντίοχος ὁ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ

καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς Ἀλέξανδρος εἰδῶσιν --- ; cf. Herrmann 40.107–108, quoted below.

10–14 All speculations on the qualifications of and reasons for the supposed double embassy turn out to be entirely a figment of scholarship, an imaginary, non-existent problem. Past participles for anticipated future actions happen to be a tediously common construction, which no one who has read any comparable Greek texts with attention can avoid having encountered, yet none of the investigators (including myself for some time) was able to free himself from the insidious spell of the suggested wrong association. This tells us something about how difficult it may be to break away from the power of habituation, and to exercise an independent critical judgment. Today the number of examples for the ambassadorial routine in the appointment of envoys, who are charged (οἵτινες αἰρεθέντες, ἐλόμενοι, παραγενόμενοι, ἀφικόμενοι, πρεσβεύσαντες, etc.) to deliver the message or decree, greet the king, congratulate him (ἀσπασάμενοι, συνησθέντες), make assurances of the good will (ἀπολογισάμενοι, ἐμφανίσαντες τὴν εὖνοιαν), carry out any special charges, etc., is considerable. So everything here is now very simple and a few examples should suffice.

OGI 219.42–46 (my revision; see above, note 19):

ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτὰς ἐκ πάντων Ἰλιέων ἄνδρας τρεῖς οἵτινες
ἀσπασάμενοι αὐτὸν παρὰ τοῦ πλήθους καὶ συνησθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὑ-
γαίνειν αὐτόν τε καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσαν Λαοδίκην
καὶ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις ἀποδώσουσιν τὴν ἐμφισμένην τι-
μὴν καὶ ἀπολογισάμενοι τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὖνοιαν κτλ.

Herrmann 40.107–113:

ἵνα δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ
[βασιλίσσα [Λ]αοδίκη εἰδήσωσι τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ [δ]ήμου ἀποδεί-
ξαι πρεσβευτὰς τρεῖς ἤδη οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸ
[μὲν ψ]ήφισμα τόδε ἀποδώσουσι καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου
[αὐτ]οὶ τε βούλονται καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχόμεθα καὶ ἐμφανίσαν-
τες τὰς [τι]μὰς τὰς ἐψ[η]φισμ[έ]νας καὶ δ[η]λώσαντες αὐτοῖς [δ]τι²³

Cf. Syll. 370.41–48, whose passive participle, so far as I know, no one before has invoked for comparisons; Syll. 590.25–37: ἐλέσθαι πρεσβευτὰς ---, τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθέντας ἀφικόμενους ἀπολογίσασθαι --- καὶ παρακαλεῖν καὶ ἀξιοῦν --- καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀκόλουθα πράξαντας; Syll. 644.22–27: τοὶ ἄγγελοι τοὶ εἰρημένοι --- ἀφικόμενοι --- παρακαλεῦντον αὐτῶν --- δηλοῦντες αὐτῷ ὅτι ταῦτα πράξας χαριεῖται τῷ δάμῳ; Syll. 700.40; *Delphinion* 146.79–83, quoted below (140); Engelmann and Merkelbach 1.122.49–52: χειροτονῆσαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτὰν ἐκ πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν, τὸν δὲ ἀγρ[ε]θέντα τό τε ψάφισμα ἀνενέγκαι πρὸς Ἑρυθραίοις καὶ ἐμφανίσαντα{ς} περὶ τὰς

²³The text breaks off, but we may fairly expect something about εὖνοια and παρακαλεῖν, as so often in dispatches of embassies, or something parallel to our lines 18–20.

εὐνοίας, ἃς ἔχει ὁ δᾶμος πρὸς αὐτοῖς --- παρακάλην. See also J. Crampa, *The Greek Inscriptions* (Lund 1969 and Stockholm 1972, *Labraunda* 3.1) no. 6 and *IPriene* 14.

13 The fully worded phrase would be: εὐνοίαν --- ἦν ἔχοντες διατελοῦσιν, τὴν πρὸς (εἰς) αὐτόν, for which, however, there is no room, but ἦν ἔχουσιν remains a distinct alternative. In any case this involves only minor details; the fundamental idea is not in doubt.

14 On περιποιεῖν see J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon* 1 (1983) 203, n. 1; 239, n. 1. Cf. also Aeschines *De falsa leg.* 104: ἀφίγμεθα δ' ἡμεῖς ἔχοντες τοῦ δήμου ψήφισμα ἐν ᾧ γέγραπται πράττειν δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις καὶ ἄλλ' ὅ τι ἂν δύνωνται ἀγαθόν. Even by this time it is a well fixed phrase, but we are already on the threshold of the Hellenistic age in any case.

15 The most common adjectives qualifying ἐπιμέλειαν are πᾶσαν, προσήκουσαν, καθήκουσαν, ἐνδεχομένην, ἐπιβάλλουσαν, δέουσαν. Of course it is not impossible to supply also: τὸν βασι[λέα Ἀντίοχον τὴν πᾶσαν ἐπιμ]έλειαν ποιεῖσθαι, but the presence of the article before the title renders the omission of the royal name quite probable. The second point is that the 23-letter supplement would be shorter by one from the ascertained minimum norm at the beginning of line. Cf. further *Delphinion* 141.22: ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήσασθαι --- τὴν προσήκουσαν; Schmitt, *Staatsverträge* . . . 3, no. 523.24-25: ὅπως τυγχάνη τῆς προσηκούσης ἐπιμελείας; *OGI* 339.47-48: τὴν καθήκουσαν εἰσενέγκατο ἐπιμέλειαν; *RC* 52.32-35: παρακαλεῖν [ἐ] με θεωροῦντα] τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ πλήθους τὴν κ[αθήκουσαν πρό]νοιαν ποιεῖσθαι δι' ὃν τό κοινὸν τῶν Ἰ[ώνων ἐπαυξηθί]σεται; M. Wörle, "Inscriptionen von Herakleia am Latmos I: Antiochos III., Zeuxis und Herakleia," *Chiron* 18 (1988) 421-476, at 424 (N IV.7-9 [Zeuxis to Heraclea ad Latmum]): καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις φροντισόμεν ἵνα ἐμ μηθεὶ τῶν δυνατῶν καὶ καλῶς ἔχόντων ὑστερήτε, ἀλλὰ τύχητε τῆς προσηκούσης ἐπιμελείας.

Professions of this kind (re-establishment or confirmation of liberty, ancestral constitution, gratitude for protection and care, *concordia ordinum*) are commonly voiced in recently conquered cities, or where royal authority has just been confirmed. Cf. *OGI* 6.14-17 (Antigonos I): συνησθῆναι δὲ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ἐλεύθε[ρ]οι καὶ αὐτόνομοι ὄντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ [εἰς] τὸ λοιπὸν διάξουσιν. *IG XII Supp.* 168 (Antigonos Gonatas²⁴ conquers Ios);

²⁴The attribution varies from Monophthalmus to Doson. I follow in the main the argumentation of Habicht (65-73), but take the εὐαγγέλια (73) for the news of victory. Guided by the editor's information that the stone is broken on all sides and his long restoration of some lines I understand the tenor of the beginning: [ὁ δεῖνα Ἀρχε]δάμαντος εἶπε· πρυτάνεις ἐπεψήφισαν Καλλ[-----^{ca}25----- ἐπειδὴ πρότερον μὲν Δημήτριος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ βασιλέως πολλῶν καὶ] [μεγάλαν ἀγαθῶν] αἰτίους γεγένηται τῇ π[ό]λει, νῦν τε Ἀντίγονος ὁ βασιλεὺς μάχῃ νικήσας τοὺς ὑπεναντίους καὶ παραγενόμενος αὐτὸς πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν τε] [ἐλευθερίαν ἀπέ]δωκεν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἰητῶν καὶ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς πατρί[ους ἀποκατέστησεν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται ὥπως μεθ' ὁμονοίας] [πολιτεῦναι νόμ]οις χρώμενος τοῖς πατρίους. This interpretation is

the text is severely damaged and very inadequately published, but I believe it is possible to recognize in lines 2–4: τήν τε ἐλευθερίαν ἀπέδωκεν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἰητῶν καὶ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς πατρίο[υς ἀποκατέστησεν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται ὅπως ὁ δῆμος μεθ' ὁμονοίας πολιτεύῃ νόμοις χρώμενος τοῖς πατρίοις; 11–12: ὅπως δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐλευθέραν καὶ δημοκρατουμένην τήν πόλιν φυλάσσωμεν ὁμοο[υ]ντες καὶ ἀστασίαστοι [δ]ντες. Cf. OGI 234.19–22: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ εὐεργέτα Ἀντιοχέων εὐλόγηκε εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ διότι τὰν δαμοκρατίαν καὶ τὰν εἰρήναν<αν> τοῖς Ἀντιοχεῦσιν διαφυλάσσει κατὰ τὰν τῶν προγόνων ὑφάγησιν; OGI 237 (Antiochus III conquers Iasus): Apollo in an oracle seconds the king in his efforts to establish the internal concord.

Inevitably such problems arise from the dynamic tensions of inner Greek politics, where faction strife was almost an endemic fact of life. Not infrequently a change of regime brought about a return of previously exiled opponents and that often proved to be a source of new conflicts. Therefore tranquillity and concord were the most desirable ideals of civic life; cf. Syll. 398.25; Dem. 17.8: ἐλευθέρους εἶναι καὶ αὐτονόμους τοὺς Ἕλληνας; 17.10: τὰς πολιτείας τὰς παρ' ἐκάστοις οὕσας; Arrian *Anab.* 1.18.2: τὰς μὲν ὀλιγαρχίας πανταχοῦ καταλύειν ἐκέλευσεν δημοκρατίας δὲ ἐγκαθιστάναι καὶ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς σφῶν ἐκάστοις ἀποδοῦναι; Syll. 434/5.14–16: καταλύειν ἐπιχειροῦντας τοὺς τε νόμους καὶ τὰς πατρίους ἐκάστοις πολιτείας; RC 52.68–72: τὰ δὲ κατὰ μέρος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς εὐνοίας κοινῇ τε πρὸς πάντας ὑμᾶς καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην πόλιν ἀκηκοότες οἱ πρεσβευταὶ δηλώσουσιν ὑμῖν; Syll. 644.26–27: δηλοῦντες αὐτῷ ὅτι ταῦτα πράξας χαριεῖται τῷ δήμῳ; Syll. 645.78–80: δηλοῦντας αὐτῷ ὅτι τύχων τούτων ὁ δᾶμος χάριτας ἀποδώσει αὐτῷ ἀξίας τῶν εὐεργετημάτων.

It seems that some power (quite likely Egypt) attempted to liberate the Ionian cities from Antiochus I. That attempt apparently failed and here they are falling back in line and dutifully expressing their satisfaction in the *status quo* and the hope that they will continue to be free and autonomous and live according to their own traditional laws under the same Seleucid protection. Or the cities may have been wavering after some reversal to the Seleucid cause (e.g., the battle of Sardis), but subsequently Antiochus may have proven himself, or scored an important-looking victory elsewhere, and the loyal cities offer the traditional congratulations. In other words this is a prudent expression of enthusiastic docility and submission to the Seleucid regime.²⁵

still compatible with the incontestable attribution of IG IX.4 566 (a much mutilated inscription from Delos) to Monophthalmus and Poliorcetes. Indeed we meet there with a mention in lines 10–12 of a πολιτεία δημοκρατου[μένην] and living ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ τῇ πόλει ὁμο[υ]νο[υ]ντες. A propagandistic precedent of a similar nature might have been evoked or imitated in the decree from Ios, but without other indications that has no decisive proof value for the attribution. It was a threadbare political phraseology of that period, as “freedom” and “democracy” still are in our own times.

²⁵Orth (52–55) gives a couple of good observations on court-inspired decrees from pathetically docile “free cities.” On OGI 222, p. 99: “Die politische Absicht des Dekrets

18–20 The most common form is ταῦτα πράξας,²⁶ but that is too short, whereas the present participle ποιούμενος seems better suited to express the idea of continuous care. An exaggerated and not quite relevant importance used to be attached to the expression ἀκόλουθα πράσσειν τῇ τῶν προγόνων αἰρέσει, or rather to a single word isolated from the whole phrase. There are indeed sporadic cases of a very loose speech, where among the πρόγονοι only father may be found, but that stems from a careless application of the general formula to a specific case, where logically it may be inappropriate.²⁷ Such phenomena should occasion less surprise when we recall that even today in highly developed and precise languages the everyday speech tolerates all manner of vague and ambiguous expressions of the type “people say,” when in fact the speaker may know only one person who may have said what is being alluded to. In *Syll.* 390.23–24 the probable implication is that in honoring his deceased father the king is dutifully fulfilling the universal moral obligation (piety) of honoring one’s ancestors. In Polybius 21.21.4 and 24.6.6 Eumenes II, exploiting this quality of language, gives a more ample valuation to his own deserts than he can really substantiate. Elsewhere father and grandfather conjointly appear to be sufficient for the notion of πρόγονοι. ἀκολουθεῖν τῇ τῶν προγόνων αἰρέσει is a very trivial and trite formula, whose etymological significance has been quite blurred by overuse.²⁸

On the other hand every honorand has esteemed ancestors worthy of emulation, not only kings, and not all royal ancestors needed to be kings. In *RC* 52.15–16 Eumenes II accepts homage for his conduct ἀκολούθως τῇ

liegt nicht in Dank für erwiesene Wohltaten, sondern in den Versuch einen Rest von Selbständigkeit zu bewahren.” With our present scanty documentation for this extremely obscure period any attempt at clearer definition of possible circumstances would of necessity venture on uncertain grounds and offer hardly more than a tissue of combinations, theories, and hypotheses.

²⁶E.g., *Syll.* 644.22–27: τοὶ ἄγγελοι τοὶ εἰρήμενοι . . . ἀφικόμενοι . . . παρακαλεῦντον αὐτὸν[ν] . . . δηλοῦντες αὐτῷ ὅτι ταῦτα πράξας χαριεῖται τῷ δάμῳ. As an alternative for lines 19–20 one might well consider [ταῦτα πράξας πολλῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος ἔσται ταῖς πόλεσιν ἕμα τε καὶ ἀκολουθήσει τῇ . . .

²⁷Tarn (450, n. 3) emphasizes that *Syll.* 434/5.16–17 (ἀκολούθως τῇ τῶν προγόνων . . . προαιρέσει) can mean only father and no one else for the “ancestors.” He terms this a unique, if entirely exact, parallel to our case.

²⁸Cf. Holleaux, *Études* 2.114: “ἀκόλουθα πράσσειν τῇ τινος προαιρέσει (αἰρέσει) est, comme on sait, une formule banale dans l’épigraphie hellénistique.” All the pseudo-genealogical constructions for early Seleucids, based on, e.g., *RC* 15, are completely imaginary. Such views were held *inter alios* by Haussoullier 58–59; Dittenberger, *OGI* no. 223, n. 7; notably Rostovtzeff in the much cited article “Πρόγονοι,” *JHS* 55 (1935) 56–66, and it seems to be vaguely implied in V. Ehrenberg, *The Greek State*² (London 1969) 160. To me the author of *RC* 15 is beyond valid dispute Antiochus III. He does not refer to Alexander and Antigonos as his ancestors, but places these and other unnamed rulers beside his own ancestors. Note line 23: καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι, i.e., they are not identified with Alexander and Antigonos. That was unavoidable in a rapid review of the past status of the city. Cf. above, n. 7.

τοῦ πατρὸς προ[α]ίρέσει. In Panamara Philip V was praised διότι πρόνοιαν ποιεῖται [τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῇ πατρὸς αἰρέσει πράσων] ἀκόλουθα, the allusion to the earlier visit of Antigonos Doson (Holleaux, *Études* 4.205). However, in a strict application one observes distinctions among the generations of the present ruler, of his γονεῖς, and finally of his πρόγονοι.²⁹

For the automatic use of the formula at this juncture, see *Delphinion* 141.35–37, 40–47: παρακαλεῖ δὲ ὁ δῆμος Κιανοὺς μνημονεύοντας τῶν γινομένων αὐτοῖς φιλανθρώπων τὴν τε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσέβει(ι)αν διατηρεῖν --- ἐπακολουθοῦντας τῇ τῶν προγόνων αἰρέσει. οὕτω γὰρ --- ὑπάρξει αὐτοῖς κτλ.; *Delphinion* 146.79–84: ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις, οἵτινες ἀφικόμενοι εἰς Μίλητον --- τὴν παρὰ τοῦ πλήθους εὐνοιαν ἐμφανιοῦσι Μιλησίοις, ἣν ἔχει πρὸς αὐτοὺς, καὶ παρακαλέσουσιν φίλους καὶ οἰκείους ὑπάρχοντας τοῦ δήμου διὰ προγόνων καὶ αὐτοῦ περιποιεῖν τῇ πόλει πάντα τὰ εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήκοντα, δηλοῦντας ὅτι --- . This is followed by a promise of reciprocation, while in our case we have the polite affirmation that royal graciousness will not only be appreciated, but be consistent with the good precedents set by his own line; cf. *RC* 52.30–37. Most probably in his earlier promises Antiochus had made some half-formulaic references to following precedents, probably of his own father's, and that may be now re-echoed by the decree and still further diluted by the totally careless application of the worn formula.

In later times Antiochus III was very insistent on following in the footsteps of his ancestors, and this to a remarkable degree has found reflection in decrees in his honor in various cities (Delphi, Iasus, Teos, Ilium). Cf., e.g. his third letter to Teos, Herrmann 158.27 ff. (I restore): κ[α]θάπερ ἀξιοῦτε, τῇ [τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων ὑφηγ]ήσει κατακολου[θοῦντες, πειρασόμεθα ὑμῖν συ]νπράσσειν καὶ τὴν [ἐλευθερίαν καὶ αὐτονομίαν] καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ δεδομέ[να ὑμῖν τίμια καὶ τὰ φιλάνθρωπα συνδιαφυλάσσειν; *OGI* 332.51–56 (Attalus III), with additional restoration: [ἵνα δὲ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰδῇ] τὰ ἐψηφισμένα τῷ δήμῳ ἀποδώσειν αὐτῷ τοὺς ἄρχον[τας (or πρεσβευτ]ᾶς) τὸ ψήφισμα κ[α]ὶ παρακαλ[έσαι αὐτὸν] εὖνουν [ὄντα] καὶ ε[ὐε]ργέτην τοῦ δήμου, συντηροῦντα τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν διὰ προγόν[ων (N.B.) φιλανθρωπι]ᾶν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν [ἀ]εὶ τινος [ἀ]γα[θ]οῦ παραίτ[ι]ον γίνεσθαι, αὖξον[τ]α τὸν δῆμον ὅπως εἰς βελτίονα καὶ εὐδαιμονεστέραν π[α]ραγίγηται κατ[ἀ]στασιν τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ πολιτεύματος.³⁰ I think something comparable should be expected in the charge given to the Ilian am-

²⁹The distinction is carefully maintained in many cult arrangements: *OGI* 56.20; Gauthier-Sottas (above, n. 6) inscr. I 30–36 (M. Vandoni, *Feste pubbliche e private nei documenti greci* [Milan 1964, *Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità* 8] no. 2); *OGI* 90.36–37; *SEG* I 366.26–33. Orth (100–102) gives a good summary of views and studies on the whole question, but considerable deductions have to be made on account of the traditional treatment of certain misplaced inscriptions.

³⁰As Dittenberger conjectures (n. 42) the magistrates of Pergamum may have functioned as an embassy to Attalus, who of course resides in the same city and is back from an expedition. More on this L. Robert, *BCH* (1984) 472–479, now in his *Documents de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1987) 522–535. The copy's ΛΣ suggests the accusative, so I supply

bassadors to Antiochus III (*OGI* 219.48–49) who παρακαλουσ[ιν αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ αἴτιον γίνεσθαι ἡμῖν· συμβαίν[οντος γὰρ τούτου εὐχαριστήσῃ τῷ δήμῳ]. One can trace this routine in many other decrees, as in *Syll.* 644.22; *IMagn* 15 b.7; 32.18–20; 97.7 ff.: πρεσβευτὰς --- οἵτινες ἀφικόμενοι --- καὶ π[αρακαλ]έουσιν Μάγνητας συγγενεῖς δ[ντα]ς καὶ φίλους τοῦ δήμου διὰ προγόνων τήν τ[ε πᾶσα]ν σπουδὴν καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήσασθαι; 21: δηλοῦντας αὐτοῖς, διότι ταῦτα ποιησά[ντες ἀκόλου]θὰ τε πράξουσιν. See Michel, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques: Supplement* (Brussels 1912) no. 1475.25.

20 For demonstration of the usage of ἅμα τε see to LSJ, A. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexikon* (Berlin 1956–1975), and J. I. McDougall, *Lexicon in Diodorum Siculum* (Hildesheim 1983).

21 βασι|λέι' Ἀντίοχον is a not uncommon alternative orthography, with simple elision.³¹ For the whole phrase see also our line 14.

23 The need for a long verb is perfectly answered by κατασκευασθήσεται. Cf. refs. s.v. τέμενος in McDougall (see above, 20).

24–25 This is the most difficult passage in the entire inscription, but after long trials I am at last fairly confident that the correct solution has been found. Although the foregoing line spoke of just one embassy to Antiochus, composed of two-man representations from each city, it would seem on the surface that the most natural assumption should be that αἱ πρεσβείαι are those representations from individual cities. Consider, e.g., ἐπειδὴν δὲ καταλείπ[ω]σιν αἱ πρεσβείαι τὴν πόλιν [τὴν (e.g.) τῶν Κλαζομενίων μετὰ τὴν θυσίαν], but the employment of the plural article would be rather untypical and without it the phrase is too short. Another question arises why the returning ambassadors could not by themselves “summon” their respective governments to begin the necessary deliberations at home (it is the only possible place of their return, because the present convention is already at the end), but all that must be done by the city where the next Alexander

ἀρχοντ[ας]; also ἀῤξον[τ]α. For the palaeography see *OGI* 332, prelim. note: “ξι ubique E est.” Cf., in a similar context, *RC* 52.32–36, esp. δι' ὧν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰώνων ἐπαυξηθή[σ]εται τε καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῇ ἀρί[σ]τη καταστάσει ὑπ[α]ρξεί; *ASAtene* 45–46, p. 445, 9–11: καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προτεθεῖται συναῤξειν τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ εἰς βελτίονα διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν; *IMagn* 50.26–29: καὶ τὴν π[ρὸς τὴν πόλιν] αὐτ[ῶν] προ[υ]πάρχουσιν φ[ι]λ[ί]α[ν] [ἐν παντὶ καιρ]ῷ διατηρ[ῶ]ν (my restoration) ἐπὶ πλείον ἀῤξων, καὶ ἐπαχ[ο]λουθῶν τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις; *OGI* 51.8–10: φιλανθρώπως ἅπαντα χρῆται --- εἰς τὸ συναῤξεσθαι τὸ τεχνίτευμα.

³¹ Although confessing to their inability to decide the case, Engelmann and Merkelbach do refer for this orthography to Schweitzer, *Gramm. der perg. Inschr.* 44, and K. Meisterhans and E. Schwyzler, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (Berlin 1900) 45. In an Attic inscription of 289/8 B.C., *Syll.* 371.36/37: βασιλέι[α] Αὐδωλέοντα, the restored (correctly?) alpha may have been also deliberately omitted in elision. Besides that, the inclusion or omission of iota between vowels in many words is a widespread phenomenon in Hellenistic spelling; e.g., *Syll.* 709.16: τοῦ μὲν βασιλεῖος; *OGI* 219.30: ἱερείων for ἱερέων.

festival was to take place. Such solicitous and lavish honors, and yet so strangely deflated by almost disdainful procrastination in carrying them out. Why such a dilatory and inefficient procedure? Since there is no room for the indication of futurity, which is essential in such expressions, I assume that no city was listed by name in line 25. The sole name that could fit, but only at the cost of omission of the almost indispensable future participle, would be Teos ([τὴν Τηίων ἐν ἧι θύειν (ἄγειν) δεῖ τὴν θυσίαν τῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων]). This does not sound completely satisfactory, however, although it is not absolutely intolerable.

The whole *modus operandi* of the Alexander festival at the time in question remains largely unknown to us, but one might readily assume that in a rotating an annual festival each year's convention should have designated the place of the subsequent one. Yet, it would seem that this time the choice may also have depended on the royal wishes, or the city did not need to be named because it was already predetermined by a fixed order of rotation. But even if the federal festival for Alexander was rotating on an annual basis, there must have already existed one permanent *temenos*, located presumably in the same place where we find it in Strabo's time. In any event, subsequent to the present decree the Ionian Alexander festival was fixed at Chalcis (or Chalcideis), between Teos and Clazomenae.³² Since it must still take some time before the just-projected enclosure for Antiochus will be completed, the new festival will continue (at least for the immediate future) to be attached to the Alexander festival. Or, as noted above, it is not impossible that this connection could be permanent.

Something analogous may be noticed in the management of the Panionia, whose place of celebration was not limited to the federal center of the Heliconian Poseidon in the territory of Priene, but was held in other member cities in turn; see *RC* 52.61–62. For line 25 cf. Polybius 30.25.1: ἐξέπεμψε πρέσβεις καὶ θεωροὺς εἰς τὰς πόλεις καταγγελοῦντας τοὺς ἐσομένους ἀγῶνας; R. Herzog and G. Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* (Berlin 1952, *AbhBerl* 1) no. 7.6–7: τοὺς ἀγῶνας τοὺς ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει ἐσομένους; *OGI* 130.12–13: πρὸς τὰς θυσίας καὶ σπονδὰς τὰς ἐσομένας ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ; W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions. Sardis VII.1* no. 4.22: ἐν τοῖς ἀχθησομένοις Διονυσίοις; M. Vandoni (above, n. 29) 6.33: εἰς τὰς ἀχθησομένας κατ' ἔτος ἄλλας ἡμέρας δύο; *SEG* I 366.29: καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἃς ἔδει συντελέσαι. V. Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae* (Berlin 1969) 136.10–12: καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τοῖς δέονσι χρόνοις ἐπιτελεῖν; Polyb. 4.35.2: κατὰ γάρ τινας θυσίας ἔδει τοὺς μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡλικίαις πομπεύειν; Plut. *Lyc.* 12.5: μὴ θύσαντος ἦν ἔδει θυσίαν; Luke 22:7: ἦλθεν δὲ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων ἣ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα. Cf. further our line 30.

³²Strabo 14.1.31: ὑπέρκειται δὲ τῶν Χαλκιδέων ἄλσος καθιερωμένον Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Φιλίππου, καὶ ἀγὼν ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἴωνων Ἀλεξάνδρεια καταγγέλλεται, συντελούμενος ἐνταῦθα.

We know, however, that sometimes delegations to festivals may be called *θεωροὶ καὶ πρεσβευταί*, which I believe opens the real gate to the solution. Cf., e.g., Polyb. 28.19.3: ἦσαν δὲ τότε παρὰ μὲν τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν πρεσβείαι διτταί, μία μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν φιλανθρωπῶν ἀνανεώσεως ... ἄλλη δὲ περὶ τοῦ τῶν Ἀντιγονείων ἀγῶνος; Polyb. 30.25.1, quoted in the paragraph above; L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche* (Florence 1967–1976) II 78.12; Josephus *AJ* 16.140 (dedication ἀγών in Caesarea): συνελθόντος δ' εἰς τὴν πόλιν ὄχλου πλείονος κατὰ θεορίαν καὶ πρεσβείας.

If so, we are clearly concerned *not with the return of the embassy* sent to King Antiochus, whose members are consistently called *πρέσβεις*, *but with the assembling of the deputations* from the member cities for the next festival. The reason that the final deliberations in plenary assembly had to be reserved till the next convention for the Alexandria seems to be that the governments back home had to be consulted and the local potential evaluated. All that may have simply exceeded both the mandates and the abilities of the delegates currently present. That would be a reasonable cause for adjournment. Any gathering, and very often religious assemblies, may be referred to in terms such as *σύνοδος*, *συνόδους ποιήσασθαι*, and *συνελθεῖν*. The expression *πάλιν συνελθεῖν*, for any purpose under appropriate circumstances, is idiomatic, and it often applies to populace dispersed by war who return when conditions return to normal and the city is “resettled,” as, e.g., in Josephus *AJ* 12.139: τῶν διεσπαρμένων ... *πάλιν συνελθόντων*.

A valuable additional clue is provided by the verb *βουλευσῶνται* in line 27. Deliberations do not take place when the parties are dispersed and scattered, but when they are assembled in one place. When we check *βουλεύεσθαι* for its most commonly recurrent context in Greek narratives, such as Polybius and Diodorus (whose language, as is known, very closely reflects the official style of Hellenistic inscriptions), it is remarkable how frequent are phrases with words of “assembling” for the purpose of “deliberations,” which may result in a “resolution,” which in turn may be “ratified.” Indeed all these elements may be found in lines 25–31, even if the “ratification” concerns only “the present decree,” and not any one to be passed only in the future. Cf. Polyb. 4.7.5: ὁ δ' ἂν τοῖς συνελθούσι βουλευσαμένοις δόξῃ τοῦτ' εἶναι κύριον; 4.22.2; 5.2.1: ἐπειδὴ συνήλθον αἱ δυνάμεις ... ἔδοξε; 5.28.3; 5.63.1–2; 5.74.4; 5.75.10: ταχὺ δὲ συναθροισθεῖσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὗτοι μὲν ἐβουλευσάντο; 14.9.1; 21.16.10; 22.9.14: Achaean federal assembly καὶ τότε μὲν περὶ τούτων βουλευσάμενοι διέλυσαν εἰς τὰς ἰδίας ἑκάστοι πόλεις; 27.8.6: ὁ στρατηγὸς συνήγε συνέδριον ... ἐβουλευόντο περὶ τῶν προσπεπωκότων. ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ...; 28.19.1; Diod. 2.24.8: συνελθόντες ἐβουλευόντο κοινῇ περὶ τοῦ συμφέροντος ...; 2.41.4; 11.15.2: ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς πάντας τοὺς ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας τεταγμένους συνεδρεῦσαι καὶ βουλεύσασθαι; 13.100.7: συνήλθον εἰς Ἐφεσον, καὶ βουλευομένοις αὐτοῖς ἔδοξεν; 14.82.2: συνέδριον κοινὸν ἐν τῇ Κορίνθῳ συστησάμενοι τοὺς βουλευσομένους ἔπεμπον; 16.25.1; 16.32.2: συνελθόντες ... ἐβουλευόντο.

27 Cf. *Syll.* 150.22–24: π[έ]μψαι δὲ καὶ συνέδρο[ς] τῶν πό[λ]εων ἐκάστην ἐς τὸ συ[νέδριον τῶν συμμάχων] κατὰ τὰ δόγματα τῷ συμμάχῳ[ν]; 151.34; κατὰ τὰ δόγματα] τὰ Ἀθηνα[ί]ων; 283.13: κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων; Acts 16:4: φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα.

28 Lenschau's οἰκοδομῆς is irreproachable and should be retained against the capricious suppression in the last text edition. The condemnation stems from a partly misapprehended remark of Holleaux (now *Études* 3.101). The French scholar merely observed (after Dittenberger, note 13) that οἰκοδομή was condemned by Atticists, and that it takes place of the Attic οἰκοδομία, the form consistently employed at Miletus. Holleaux correctly stated that the word in question does not occur in what is now *Didyma* (see above, note 14) 2.480 (cf. *ibid.* 479). No rejection of Lenschau's restoration was intended, or implied in the statement: "A la vérité, οἰκοδομή paraît être employé, contrairement à l'usage attique, au sens de οἰκοδομία dans le décret des Ioniens pour Antiochos I^{er}." Indeed the word is very firmly rooted in Hellenistic usage. A few references at random: Diod. 26.8; Memnon 28.11 (*FGrHist* 434); Strabo 15.739c; Josephus *AJ* 11.174; Vandoni (above, note 29) no. 6.23; 7.22. The word is very common in the Septuagint, e.g., Esdras 1.2.26: ἡ οἰκοδομή τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

29–31 καθότι προέγραπται is a fixed phrase, as in, e.g., M.-T. Lenger, *Corpus des ordonnances des Ptolemées*² (Brussels 1980) 21.5. There is no need to postulate any restoration at the end of the line because καθότι, being a compound word, may be decomposed to its original elements and thus our copy remains scrupulously respected. In the next two lines I assume the disappearance of one or two letters (the possibility also considered by Engelmann and Merkelbach) rather than an irregular division, and regard the supplement as ordinary restoration, without resorting to editorial corrections. The "appointed times," "stated season" for festivals are often expressed as δέοντες, καθήκοντες καιροί or χρόνοι; cf., for example, *Syll.* 390.35: ἀποστέλλειν εἰς τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι καιροῖς; *RC* 36.21–22: συντελεῖσθω πάντα τοῖς προγεγραμμένοις ἀκολουθῶς; *RC* 67.9–10: διαταξάμεθα δὲ --- καὶ περὶ θυσίῳ καὶ πομπῳ καὶ μυστηρίων --- ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι καιροῖς καὶ τόποις; Mark 13:4: ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα.

31–40 Cf. F. Bechtel (ed., H. Collitz), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (Göttingen 1884–1915) 3720.13: κ[λ]υρωθέντος το[ῦδ]ε τοῦ παφίσματος. Nearly identical phrases in *IG* XII 1.2; L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta* (Amsterdam 1969–) 1.42 (top); *Études anatoliennes* (above, note 18) 462, incr. 8–9; *Bull. Ép.* 1979 471; *Syll.* 1023.18–19. See also our lines 11, 40, 44.

By the time this stela was engraved all the religious ceremonies prescribed in lines 31–35 had already been performed. The futurity is the

perspective from the standpoint of drafting and voting. We do not know how many σύνεδροι came from each city (cf. line 9), but the prevailing arrangement in federal organizations was that one or two delegates, with full powers, represented a member city. But they could be accompanied by an additional number of delegates without full rights, and in loose speech all may be called σύνεδροι.³³

It is obvious that the "federal" business is very closely interrelated with the sphere of authority that properly belongs to the host city. Such are the prescriptions of the στεφανηφορία and the ceremonies after the ratification of the decree. A similar tendency may be observed in the functioning of other leagues, e.g., the city of Ilium had an authority to confer honors at the federal festival of the Panathenaea and in the temple of Athena Ilias, which belonged to the Ilian League, but originally were local civic institutions. The city of Priene confers honors in the federal Panionium. It is useful to keep these facts in mind against certain tendencies in some recent scholarship to rigidly formalistic classification of city and federal spheres. It has been properly recognized as progress that these two spheres have been distinguished, but this distinction should not be regarded as obtaining always in all circumstances.

The ceremonies prescribed upon the ratification of the present decree have many analogies in similar procedures in the ratification of treaties between cities, of which a great many examples may be found in *Delphinion*, or in Schmitt, *Staatsverträge* . . . 3. Other occasions may be the arrival of an honored embassy, or θεωρία, a consecration of a temple, a thanksgiving to gods for a victory (εὐαγγέλια, χαριστήρια, νικητήρια), or the arrival in state of the sovereign (παρουσία, *adventus*), or a similar reception of a foreign conqueror, or of a particularly honored foreign guest monarch (e.g., Attalus I in Athens). No special significance attaches to the expression συντελεῖν θυσίαν τοῖς θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις. This is just a banal formula for solemn festivity and has little to do with the particularized cult of Πάντες Θεοί, known from several places, e.g., Ilium.

Engelmann and Merkelbach suggest that πᾶσι τοῖς μετέχουσι τῶν τιμῶν extends to embrace royal φίλοι, and that interpretation should in a sense be correct. But properly speaking all the participants in the honors have already been mentioned by name. Whoever else may have been intended I surmise that the whole phrase is no more than an empty rhetorical pleonasm. To be sure, the "friends" and the "troops" are several times respectfully named during the famous progress of Antiochus III in 197/6, in Teos, Ery-

³³ Aeschines *De falsa legatione* 116: δύο γὰρ ψήφους ἕκαστον φέρειν ἔθος in the Delphic Amphictyony; Syll. 435.48-50: χειρωτο[ν]ῆσαι δὲ καὶ συνέδρους [δύο τὸν δῆμον] . . . οὔτινες μετὰ τε Ἀρέως [καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων ἀ]ποστελλομένων συνέδρων βουλευσονται περὶ τῶν κοινῇ συμφερόντων in the new Hellenic League. Cf. V. Ehrenberg, *The Greek State*² (London 1969) 110.

thrae (so I restore), and Ilium, but the context there is not exactly identical with the case under discussion.³⁴

40–43 The subject of ἀναγράφαι is of course the Ionian League. All such infinitives depend on the lost ἔδοξε or δεδόχθαι. Our imperfectly preserved exemplar gives us no clue as to the city where the present congress of the Alexander festival was convening and the decree passed. An earlier Ionian decree for Hippostratus, *Syll.* 368 (στρατηγὸς τῶν πόλεων τῶν Ἰόνων under Lysimachus [289/8 B.C.]), makes us acquainted with the custom of engraving “federal” decrees in all individual cities of the League. The exposition of the stelae in the federal center dedicated to the royal cult, παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν τῶν βασιλέων, is also prescribed in the decree of the Islanders for Antigonos and Demetrius: Durrbach (above, note 10) 13.44–45.

45–46 A verb is required to complete the sentence: ἐν οἷς ἂν τόποις φαίνεται ἐπιφανέστατον εἶναι, as, e.g., above, line 22. Cf. also *Syll.*, index, s.v. ἐπιτήδειος, which in reference to τόπος is practically equivalent to ἐπιφανέστατος; *Syll.* 502.35: ὅθεν αὐτῷ εὐκαιρον φαίνεται εἶναι; L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche* (Florence 1967–1976) I 61.20: ὅπου ἂν δοκεῖ ἐν καλλίστῳ εἶναι. The same *ibid.* II 83.21.

46 At this point the expected formula is οἶδε ἡρέθησαν (ἀποδείχθησαν), or the pronoun is omitted altogether. Cf. *Syll.* 36.24–27; 426.50. Another possibility is simply a noun specifying the function to which the appointment has been made, e.g., θεωροὶ καὶ πρεσβευταί. The exact wording, however, is relatively unimportant as long as we recognize the idea to be supplied.

47 There are very few Greek names beginning with Καπ- and they were not in common use. Since names deriving from the national appellation of the Cappadocians could hardly be considered at this early date, we are practically left with Κάππαρις, a good Greek name,³⁵ and the considerably more common class of derivatives from “smoke”: Καπανεύς, Καπνός, Καπνέας, Καπνᾶς.³⁶ These come from the bee-keeping industry, from smoking beehives during collection of honey.³⁷

³⁴In Engelmann and Merkelbach 1 no. 30.36–38 (renumbered) I restore: νῦν τε ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος παραγενόμενος [μετὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους ὑπέσχετο τὴν δημοκρατίαν σ]υνδια[φυλάσσειν ἡμῖν, καὶ συνεχώρησεν ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους εἶναι. Cf. above, n. 7, end, and n. 24, end.

³⁵L. Robert, *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure* 1 (Paris 1963) 78: “c’est tout simplement ‘le câpre,’ ou ‘le caprier,’” i.e., caper.

³⁶L. Robert’s index, *op. cit.*, lists Καπνᾶς, Καπνός, Καπανεύς; cf. *id.*, *Documents* . . . (above, n. 30) 52: “À Smyrne même les inscriptions font connaître un surnom Καπανᾶς tiré d’une farine”: as if “Dusty” (but really “Smoky”).

³⁷Robert, *Bull. Ép.* 1981 392. However it may be noteworthy that, although extremely rare, names like Καπίων, Κάπων, or a derivation from κάπηλος and κάπρος, are also conceivable.

It would be interesting to know which of the Ionian cities remained for the moment loyal to Antiochus I, and which were lost, but unfortunately the text fails us at this point. We know, however, that in 262 B.C. Ephesus became Ptolemaic, which establishes the *terminus ante quem*, just as the date for the co-regency of Antiochus, 268/7, determines the *post quem* (Habicht² 91).

Summing up, one may say that as a result of this study we now have an integrated text of practically all the partly extant lines, restored as rigorously as it can be. I believe that *inter alia* two sensitive nodes of the textual problems have been solved. In lines 9–14 there is only one embassy to the king in question, as one would normally expect. The “embassies” in lines 24–31 are future deputations from the member cities for the celebration of the next festival of Alexandria. They are to deliberate on the execution of the present decree, which is a document of reaffirmation of the Seleucid control (at least for the time being) over the Ionian cities, and not of its relaxation. It is hoped that these improvements in the text may permit more precise consideration of its possible historical implications.

UTICA, NEW YORK