



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Ch. V. Crowther **The Chronology of the Iasian Theatre Lists: Again**

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **25 • 1995**

Seite / Page **225–234**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1033/5400> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1995-25-p225-234-v5400.5

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

CH. V. CROWTHER

The Chronology of the Iasian Theatre Lists: Again¹

In a discussion of the lists of contributors to the Dionysia at Iasos² L. MIGEOTTE has questioned some of the conclusions that I reached about the inter-relationships of the various series of lists in my own discussion in BICS 37, 1990.³ MIGEOTTE's very detailed treatment of the content of the lists makes an important contribution to our understanding of them in their appropriate context, but his criticisms of my attempt to set the lists in order seem to me, in certain respects, misdirected and, in others, potentially misleading. I take this opportunity to correct his findings, while at the same time updating my own.

I deal first with generalities, and proceed thence to examine the specific criticisms that MIGEOTTE makes of my arguments. Finally, I consider briefly the additional evidence provided by a group of new inscriptions published by G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI,⁴ which MIGEOTTE notices, but does not exploit.

1. MIGEOTTE disavows primarily chronological concerns for his discussion – whose importance, indeed, lies elsewhere – but offers a number of chronological notations concerning the theatre lists of his «first period» (I. Iasos 160–166) and a continuous discussion of the chronology of the «second period» texts (I. Iasos 167, 170–218). The essential content of each of the lists is summarised in separate tables for the first and second period texts. MIGEOTTE numbers the documents of the second group from 1 to 50, partly on the basis of their relative chronology, partly on other, unspecified, grounds. The connections that MIGEOTTE allows between these texts are only those that he considers evident or plausible, and he de-

¹ The following abbreviated references are used in this paper: I. Iasos = W. BLÜMEL, *Die Inschriften von Iasos*, Bonn 1985; LB-W = PH. LE BAS – W. H. WADDINGTON, *Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Grèce et Asie Mineure*, 1870; DIOGS = G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, *Decreti di Iasos in onore di giudici stranieri*, RAL 44, 1989 (1991), 47–55; Iasos I = CH. V. CROWTHER, *Iasos in the Early Second Century B.C.: A Note on OGIS 237*, BICS 36, 1989, 136–138; Iasos II = id., *Iasos in the Second Century II. The Chronology of the Theatre Lists*, BICS 37, 1990, 143–151.

² De la liturgie à la contribution obligatoire: le financement des Dionysies et des travaux du théâtre à Iasos au II^e siècle avant J.-C., *Chiron* 23, 1993, 267–294.

³ Iasos II.

⁴ DIOGS.

clines to go further («à tout prix») in attempting to recover inter-relationships between groups of texts and to evaluate exactly («précisément») the intervals that separate them. MIGEOTTE is nevertheless able to provide an estimate, to within five years at either limit (180–185 to 120–115 B.C.), of the length of time covered by the second period texts.

Since MIGEOTTE evidently – indeed, explicitly – has my work in mind in setting the limits beyond which he is not prepared to venture in his own, it will be helpful for me to set out the principles upon which I based my own arrangement of the lists. My purpose was to provide a relative chronology, based on stephanephorate years, for the Iasian theatre lists that I hoped would be of some value in helping scholars to establish dating ranges for other, both old and new, Iasian inscriptions belonging to the same general period. I was able to attach my relative chronology to an absolute chronology because of the coincidence in stephanephorate years between one of the earliest lists (I. Iasos 162) and the now well-known letter of Laodike to Iasos (I. Iasos 4), whose date can be fixed within close limits on independent grounds.⁵ My chronological list begins with three precise dates based on this correlation and subject to the same qualifications as the correlation itself, but every subsequent date offered for each list is an «earliest» date – in other words, a *terminus ad et post quem*, which, because of the gaps in our documentation, effectively becomes a *terminus post quem* for all but the earliest of the lists.

My discussion carries the explicit qualification that these «earliest» dates are likely to be increasingly earlier than actual dates as my list proceeds. I do not see how MIGEOTTE can maintain that my termini are likely to be used as fixed dates when they are repeatedly so qualified; indeed, it seems to me that MIGEOTTE's own tabulation of the second period lists is more likely to mislead unguarded readers, since the grounds on which it is constructed are not made explicit. I cite two cases below in which such a misunderstanding is invited by MIGEOTTE's discussion.

To summarise: my suggested chronology for the theatre lists after I. Iasos 162 is a relative chronology in which absolute dates are attached to individual texts only and explicitly as earliest dates or limits for their actual dating. MIGEOTTE, in contrast, offers an estimate for the length of the period covered by the second group of lists which at least pretends to absolute limits: ca. 185–180 to ca. 120–115. This estimate may well be correct; certainly, it is compatible with my own results, which suggest a *terminus post quem* of 187/6 for the earliest of the second period lists (I. Iasos 170) and a *terminus post quem* of 134/3 for what I take to be the latest of the surviving lists (I. Iasos 214). But I do not see how MIGEOTTE's lower limit of 120–115 can be based on anything other than guesswork, and as such it is essentially arbitrary.

⁵ I respond to MIGEOTTE's criticisms of my over-exact date for I. Iasos 4 in section 2 of the text below.

I have defended the principle of offering earliest dates based on a relative chronology. I turn next to MIGEOTTE's criticism of the possibility of establishing such a relative chronology on the basis of the available evidence. MIGEOTTE believes that I relied in my discussion «too blindly» on the order in which the theatre lists were inscribed and tried too hard to fill all the likely gaps between individual lists and groups of lists. He suggests, in addition, that a number of the corrections and restorations that I proposed were gratuitous. By the first criticism, MIGEOTTE evidently means to question whether it is possible to make reliable judgments of temporal sequence from the surviving arrangement of the texts when it is clear that these were not inscribed systematically or sequentially. Since I recognised this difficulty in my own discussion, as MIGEOTTE acknowledges,⁶ I take it that his objections relate principally to specific instances in which I attempted to establish the order in which texts were inscribed from their arrangement. I deal with these specific cases, together with the particular restorations and corrections that MIGEOTTE seems unable to accept, below. MIGEOTTE's second general criticism of my paper, that I tried too hard to fill lacunae in the lists, can only be justified in particular instances, which, again, I try to deal with below, rather than in principle, since my discussion consistently marks and emphasises the existence of such lacunae.

2. MIGEOTTE criticises my proposed date for the stephanephorate of Kydias Hierokleous of 196/5 as too precise. This is, no doubt, formally correct.⁷ In my discussion, I argued that Laodike's letter to Iasos should belong in 196 or 195; 194, which MIGEOTTE allows, seems to me too late for the historical context of the letter. On this basis, I considered three possible absolute dates to which the stephanephoros year of Kydias could be attributed: 197/6, or 196/5, or 195/4. I chose 196/5 as the likeliest of these possibilities, but did not positively exclude the alternatives. This is marked clearly by a paragraph in the text of my discussion, and the qualification is recalled in the introduction to the first section of my chronological list, although it is not present in the list itself.

I assumed in my discussion that the lists I.Iasos 160–162 belonged to consecutive stephanephoros years. MIGEOTTE is correct to notice that this assumption is not explicitly supported by cross-references in the texts of the lists themselves and can only be based on the close sequence, albeit with a change of letter cutter in I.Iasos 161, in which they were inscribed on the Clandeboye pilaster.⁸ It remains possible, therefore, that the three lists were separated from one another by one or more years, although any such intervals are likely to have been short.

⁶ MIGEOTTE, loc. cit. (note 2) 283 n.47.

⁷ The absence of argument for this date which MIGEOTTE also criticises is, in part, supplied by Iasos I, to which I refer in a footnote, Iasos II, 145 n.8.

⁸ MIGEOTTE, loc. cit. (note 2) 269, 274.

MIGEOTTE stresses the uncertainty of the extent of the interval between I. Iasos 162 and the continuous sequence of texts dated from the stephanephorate of Menippos, I. Iasos 163–166.⁹ The same indeterminacy was also noticed in my paper, although I preferred to reduce the interval to a minimum. Two indirect arguments can be cited in support of this preference.

If the sequence of divine stephanephoros years dated from Menippos is placed as soon as possible after the stephanephorate of Kydias Hierokleious in I. Iasos 4 and 162, that is, beginning from 194/3, it matches a similar sequence of years in which Apollo was stephanephoros at neighbouring Miletos, in the difficult years immediately before and during the war between Antiochos III and Rome.¹⁰ This, of course, may be no more than a coincidence.

MIGEOTTE suggests that years in which no lists of contributors are recorded are likely to have been years in which the city itself was able to meet the full cost of performances at the Dionysia from its own resources.¹¹ If the interval between I. Iasos 162 and 163 is extended, as MIGEOTTE appears to envisage, these years would include the period of the war when Iasos itself came under severe pressure from a Seleucid garrison and Roman fleet. This does not seem altogether likely.

MIGEOTTE places the beginning of the sequence of stephanephorate years dated from Kleanax, which begins on the left and continues over on to the right lateral of the Clandeboye pilaster, between 185 and 180.¹² My own terminus post quem for I. Iasos 170 was 187/6. It now seems to me likely that this terminus should be lowered by at least two years, bringing it more closely into line with MIGEOTTE's. The new evidence that invites this adjustment is examined separately in section 3 below.

MIGEOTTE is correct to emphasise the absence of any direct connection between the theatre lists inscribed on the Clandeboye pilaster and the group of texts, now lost, recorded by LE BAS on the walls of the theatre. WADDINGTON assumed an immediate connection, and my own discussion followed a similar, but more heavily qualified pattern. In support of my sequence I pointed to a number of prosopographical links between the different groups of documents. These, of course, are by no means conclusive. I supported them, however, with a further series of positional arguments and two important corrections to readings in I. Iasos 185 and 203. The second of these corrections – my supplement ἀγωνοθέτου δὲ [Ἀρεταίου τοῦ Ἀλιχίνου | φ]ύσει δὲ Φανίου in lines 2–3 of I. Iasos 203 – has been accepted by

⁹ MIGEOTTE, *ibid.* 269.

¹⁰ On the new dating established by M. WÖRRLE, *Chiron* 18, 1988, 228–32, for the Milesian stephanephoros list Delphinion 124, the same sequence of years (194/3 to 190/89) was also occupied by divine stephanephoroi at Miletos; cf. R. M. ERRINGTON, *Chiron* 19, 1989, 287.

¹¹ MIGEOTTE, *loc. cit.* (note 2) 272.

¹² MIGEOTTE, *ibid.* 278.

MIGEOTTE.¹³ The first – my correction of WADDINGTON’s ἀγωνοθέτ[ης Οὐ]λιάδης Πινδάρου in I.Iasos 185 to [Ἀσ]τιάδης Πινδάρου, to match the agonothetes Astiades the son of Pindaros of I.Iasos 201 – is ignored by MIGEOTTE. I assume that he includes it among the other restorations, referred to in his note 46, that he regards as «gratuitous». I do not see how this correction can be dismissed in such a way. Astiades Pindarou is now a securely documented individual at Iasos who is also attested as stephanephoros in I.Iasos 202 and 203; as I emphasised in my original article, the name Ἀστιάδης was not attested at Iasos when WADDINGTON edited LE BAS’ copies, whereas Οὐλιάδης was, and WADDINGTON’s supplement was therefore a natural one. It is equally natural to correct it now that new information has become available. The slight change in reading required is also unproblematic, since there are several other cases, most of which MIGEOTTE appears to accept without hesitation, where LB-W’s readings appear to be at fault in minor details.¹⁴

I have restated this argument in detail because the consequence that follows from it is an important one. Astiades’ role as agonothetes-contributor in I.Iasos 185 ties that list and the immediately following sequence of lists I.Iasos 186–194 to a preceding sequence of lists (I.Iasos 213,¹⁵ 198–200, 167, 201), since Astiades also appears as agonothetes-in-office in I.Iasos 201,¹⁶ to make a list of 16 consecutive stephanephoros years. In MIGEOTTE’s tabulation, in contrast, I.Iasos 198–200, 167 and 201 (nos. 35–39) are placed after I.Iasos 185–194 (nos. 22–31). The reversal and interruption of the actual sequence of these lists, whatever the principles on which MIGEOTTE’s table is based, runs the risk of creating a misleading impression of their relative chronology.

A similar reversal of chronological sequence occurs in the position occupied by the lists I.Iasos 202, 203 and 217 in MIGEOTTE’s table (nos. 40–42). These lists, the last of which is dated to the stephanephorate of Menes the son of Tyrtaios, antedate the decree of the Dionysian technitai (dated to the third year after Menes), which, in turn, antedates the whole of the 16-year sequence of stephanephoroi from I.Iasos 213, 198–200, 167, 201 to 185–194, as MIGEOTTE himself apparently

¹³ MIGEOTTE, *ibid.* 283 n.46; MIGEOTTE, *ibid.* 283 n.48, evidently does not approve my suggested restoration ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπόλλωνος [τοῦ δευτέρου μετὰ Ἀστιάδην] at the end of l.1. in I.Iasos 203; since my restoration for the end of l.2 gives a secure length for the lacuna at the end of l.1, I prefer to regard my restoration as justified speculation.

¹⁴ LE BAS’ copy, in fact, marks lambda and iota of [-]ΛΙΑΔΗΣ as less securely read than the following letters.

¹⁵ I assume, following WADDINGTON, that this list would supply the missing stephanephoros year of Kleanax Kleanaktos; this assumption is not secure, but seems justified by the relative position of the inscription, immediately above I.Iasos 152 and immediately to the left of 198–200. MIGEOTTE prefers agnosticism on this point.

¹⁶ For the pattern on which this connection is based, see Iasos II, 147, followed by MIGEOTTE, *loc. cit.* (note 2) 278 n.31.

acknowledges.¹⁷ In his table, however, they come after them, and, again, the result is distracting.

At this point, it may be helpful to summarise the results that follow from the corrected readings that I proposed in my original article. The lists I.Iasos 213, 198–200, 167, 201, 185–194 postdate I.Iasos 152, which, in turn, postdates directly the new lists I.Iasos 202, 203, 217 found in the Italian excavations. A further series of lists inscribed in gaps on the theatre walls around I.Iasos 152, from their positioning (for which see the plan reproduced as fig. 2 on p. 149 of my original article),¹⁸ should postdate I.Iasos 194 (I.Iasos 195–197).¹⁹ Together these lists cover a period of at least 28 years.

I return now to the relative chronological position of the lists inscribed «sur le bandeau du mur du théâtre». There are two possible locations for these lists in relation to the other surviving lists: either between the lists on the Clandeboye pilaster and I.Iasos 202 or between I.Iasos 152 and the lists inscribed around it. A prosopographical connection excludes a position after this last group of lists. The stephanephoros Leontiades the son of Herakleides, from whom the lists are dated, is separately attested as a contributor in I.Iasos 204, one of the lists on the right lateral of the Clandeboye pilaster, which should be at least 40 years earlier than the latest of the lists inscribed lower down on the theatre wall. The same prosopographical connection naturally favours, although it does not quite prove, a close relationship between I.Iasos 209, 178–181 and the lists on the Clandeboye pilaster. In my discussion I supplemented this connection with an argument based on the arrangement of a group of new lists found in the Italian excavations. Arguments of this kind, which MIGEOTTE prefers to avoid, can be applied successfully in certain circumstances. I draw encouragement for my own practice from the fact that positional arguments can be independently verified through prosopographical cross-references both in the case of the new block illustrated in my original fig. 2 and for the no longer extant lists arranged around I.Iasos 152 on the walls of the theatre. I take one example: I.Iasos 217, which from its position alongside and to the right of I.Iasos 202 appears to postdate the latter is, in fact, shown to do so by my restoration of I.Iasos 203, 2–3 (cited in the text above). On the same basis, 202 should be later than 184, 183, and 182 which are inscribed in that order above it on the same block. The final list on the block, I.Iasos 216, which was inscribed alongside and to the right of 184 and 183, appears, I suggested, to have been squeezed in there and should, accordingly, be the latest of the six lists. I do not feel that I have trusted too blindly in the arrangement of the lists in proposing this relative sequence and I do not see

¹⁷ MIGEOTTE, *ibid.* 283.

¹⁸ Iasos II, 149, fig. 2.

¹⁹ It is possible, as I noted at Iasos II, 150, that I.Iasos 214 should be added directly to this sequence.

what else MIGEOTTE himself would suggest, unless non liquet, which in this case seems to me unjustified.

The importance of this positional argument turns partly on the stephanephorate of the third list (I. Iasos 182), which is dated to the second year after Leontiades the son of Herakleides. A similarly designated year also appears in I. Iasos 179 (LB-W 275), although there the agonotheses appears to be different: Pos[eidip]pos An[-] rather than Pantainos Hestiaiou. In my paper I suggested that LB-W's reading was at fault in I. Iasos 179. MIGEOTTE rejects this suggestion and, following BLÜMEL in I. Iasos, prefers to believe in a second stephanephorate sequence for Leontiades. This is a possibility that I perhaps passed over too easily in my original discussion. Nevertheless, the misreading that I attributed to LE BAS and WADDINGTON is one that is consistent with mistakes that they can be shown to have made occasionally elsewhere and I continue to believe that it provides the right solution in this case.²⁰

The relative positions in which they were inscribed indicate that the lists I. Iasos 184 and 183 (both dated to the year of Hermias) were inscribed before 182 (the second year after Leontiades) and 202 (Astiades Pindarou), the latter of which, in turn, directly precedes the sequence dated from Menes (217). On this basis, even if Leontiades was stephanephoros twice, his year or years of office should have preceded those of the Astiades-Menes series (I. Iasos 202, 203, 217, 152). The stephanephorate of Hermias, in that case, will either have divided two separate sequences of years dated from Leontiades or, as I believe, separated Leontiades' stephanephorate from those recorded on the right lateral of the Clandeboye pilaster. The relative position of a number of other lists is somewhat less secure. I placed the stephanephorate of Iason and the following year together with a third unspecified year (I. Iasos 210–212) after the stephanephorate sequence dated from Leontiades on the basis of their position alongside and to the right of the lists dated from Leontiades. The assumption that the lists were inscribed in that order is consistent with the pattern followed by the other lists «sur le bandeau», although the poor preservation of I. Iasos 210–212 means that this is an assumption that cannot be directly verified.

There is also some indeterminacy in the location of the stephanephorates of Paionios and Drakon recorded, respectively, by I. Iasos 216 and 215. My assignments were based on arrangement and probability and their insecurity was marked in my discussion and lists.²¹

²⁰ (Ποσ[εἰδip]πος: O for A, Σ for N, Π for N of Πάνταινος; Ἄν[-]: A for E, N for Σ of Ἐο[πταίου]).

²¹ A further small uncertainty can also be marked. I. Iasos 199, according to LE BAS' copy, is dated to the third year after Kleanax (LB-W 284). As MIGEOTTE, loc. cit. (note 2) 284 n. 49, notes, this date was corrected to the second year after Kleanax by A. BRINCK, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad choregiam pertinentes*, Diss. Phil. Halenses 1886, 238 no. 138, because

Some of these minor uncertainties may eventually be resolved by the discovery or publication of new inscriptions. The evidence available now, however, is entirely sufficient to construct a relative chronology which can provide reliable earliest dates for the stephanephorate years of the theatre lists and through them for a range of other Iasian inscriptions. I take an example also discussed by MIGEOTTE. The decree of the Dionysian technitai I.Iasos 152 is dated to the third stephanephorate year after Menes the son of Tyrtaios. This year, as has been seen, can be assigned a secure place in the relative sequence of Iasian stephanephoros years three years after I.Iasos 217 and before the 16-year stephanephorate sequence beginning from I.Iasos 213. This relative position can be converted, in turn, on the basis of the chronological fix provided by I.Iasos 4, into an absolute terminus post quem of 156/5. This is not an exact date, but it is, I believe, a reliable limit. If, as MIGEOTTE does, one rejects the possibility of constructing a relative chronology on the basis of the theatre lists, the alternative can only be to rely on intuition and general dating formulae such as the one that MIGEOTTE himself provides for the stephanephorate of Menes: «il peut en tout cas être plus ancien que son classement ne le laisse croire et dater aussi bien du deuxième part du siècle que du troisième».²² This seems to me unsatisfactory.

3. MIGEOTTE refers twice in his paper to the uncertain status of Iasos after the Peace of Apameia, but misses a piece of evidence that may help to clarify its condition.²³ The new Iasian decrees for foreign judges published by G.PUGLIESE CARATELLI in DIOGS²⁴ provide lists of prytaneis, epistatai, and secretaries as well as stephanephoroi in their prescripts that can help to establish dating ranges for them. I shall return briefly to the question of their likely dating ranges at the end of this section, but immediately I should like to draw attention to the name of the epistates and prytanis Apollonios the son of Nysios the son of Apollonios in the Iasian decree for Klazomenian judges DIOGS 2.1 (SEG 41, 930). Apollonios has a homonym in the list of ambassadors in Delphinion 148, a peace treaty be-

the identity of the agonothetes-contributor in I.Iasos 199 and the agonothetes-in-office of 198, which is dated to the year after Kleanax, shows that they belonged to consecutive years. MIGEOTTE, *ibid.*, also argued that 199, in turn, should have been separated from 200 (dated to the fourth year after Kleanax) by one year, since the agonothetes of 199 is not named among the contributors of 200. This is not quite correct, however; no agonothetes is named among the contributors of 200, and no positive judgment can therefore be made on this basis about its relationship to 199. In Iasos II I preferred to mark this uncertainty with a question mark (retaining, in this case, WADDINGTON's reading); a possible explanation for the discrepancy might be a confusion between inclusive and exclusive counting in the numbering of this stephanephorate sequence.

²² MIGEOTTE, *loc. cit.* (note 2) 286.

²³ MIGEOTTE, *ibid.* 227 with n.27, 285 with n.54.

²⁴ Now reproduced as SEG 41, 930-933.

tween Miletos and Herakleia recently redated by R. M. ERRINGTON to the second half of the 180s.²⁵ The treaty begins with a list of envoys sent by the various cities that, under Rhodian leadership, had joined in mediating the agreement (Delphinion 148, 3–21). The eighth name on the list was restored by REHM as [Μυλα|σ]ῆων («Mylasa») and its representatives were given as Apollonios the son of Nysios, Iason [the son of Dionysios(?)], and Hyssaldomos the son of Eirenaios. Apollonios is a common name, but the patronymic Nysios is not. The papponymic Apollonios is missing from Delphinion 148, but since the other envoys' names are also attested at Iasos,²⁶ it seems appropriate to identify the ambassador Apollonios with the epistates of DIOGS 2.1 (SEG 41, 930) and to correct REHM's restoration of his origin accordingly to [Ἰασ]ῆων («Iasos»).

If this restoration is correct, as it has every chance of being, since there are other grounds for placing the new Iasian decrees within the same dating range as Delphinion 148, it throws new, if limited, light on the status of Iasos after the Peace of Apameia. The participation of Iasos in the peace settlement between Miletos and Herakleia alongside other states which have usually been assumed to have been independent at this time suggests that the Iasians' own status was similar. Some caution needs to be observed in drawing this conclusion, however, since, as ERRINGTON has emphasised,²⁷ a simple opposition between free and dependent is almost certainly too schematic to fit the range of conditions that smaller states in Caria are likely to have experienced, in their relations especially with Rhodes, during this period. But the regular assumption, followed with reservations by MIGEOTTE,²⁸ that Iasos became part of the Peraea after Apameia certainly now appears to need modification.

The new Iasian proxy and citizenship decrees published by PUGLIESE CARRATELLI supply the name of a new stephanephoros, Basilides (DIOGS 4.2; SEG 41, 932), as well as providing additional attestations for the stephanephorate of Hierokles the son of Iason (DIOGS 2.1; SEG 41, 930), previously known from I. Iasos 25. In my original paper I was unable to assign a secure place to Hierokles' year in the sequence of Iasian stephanephorate years from the first half of the second century.²⁹ Three possible locations were considered there: either before the year of Nemertes the son of Theotimos (ca. 199/8); or between the year of Kydias the son of Hierokles (ca. 196/5) and that of Menippos; or between the fifth stephanephorate of Apollo counted from Menippos' year (no earlier than 190/89) and the

²⁵ ERRINGTON, loc. cit. (note 10) 279–88.

²⁶ As ERRINGTON, *ibid.* 283 n.26, pointed out. For the rare Carian name Hyssaldomos, which also appears at I. Iasos 215, 6, see L. ROBERT, BCH 108, 1984, 527 n.167; REHM's restoration of Iason's patronymic as Dionysios was based on the assumption that he was a Mylasian.

²⁷ ERRINGTON, *ibid.* 284 n.31.

²⁸ MIGEOTTE, loc. cit. (note 2) 277, with the references in his note 27.

²⁹ Iasos II, 145.

stephanophorate of Kleanax the son of Theokles. In a forthcoming paper on the use of foreign judges at Iasos in the early second century in BICS 40, 1995, I now argue that the third of these possibilities is the most likely and that the stephanophorates of both Hierokles and Basilides should be placed between the stephanophorate series on the front and left faces of the Clandeboye pilaster. The terminus post quem for the year of Kleanax the son of Theokles given in Iasos II should accordingly be lowered two years to 187/6.

To summarise: anyone interested in questions of public finance and liturgies will read MIGEOTTE's excellent discussion of the theatre lists from Iasos with considerable profit. Those interested in questions of chronology, in contrast, are likely to be misled by it and should instead consult my paper in BICS 37.

Wolfson College
GB-Oxford OX2 6UD