



<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

Andrew Meadows

Four Rhodian Decrees. Rhodes, Iasos and Philip V

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **26 • 1996**

Seite / Page **251–266**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1023/5390> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1996-26-p251-266-v5390.8

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).

ANDREW MEADOWS

Four Rhodian Decrees. Rhodes, Iasos and Philip V

I. The Stele

On a summer's day in 1765, the British traveller RICHARD CHANDLER was touring the site of ancient Iasos: «By the isthmus is the vaulted substructure of a considerable edifice; and on a jamb of the doorway are decrees engraved in a fair character, but damaged and black with smoke; the entrance, which is lessened by a pile of stones, serving as a chimney to a few Greeks who inhabit the ruin.»¹

The stone was seen again in situ by at least four more western travellers in the following 75 years, though none were able to read more than the first 12 or 13 lines.² In the course of his *Voyage archéologique* of 1843–4, PH. LE BAS performed the invaluable service of transcribing and squeezing the stone to reveal the remains of the first 69 lines of inscribed text.³ It was not until 1872 however, that the stele yielded the last of its secrets when it was unearthed and transported to England where it was presented to the British Museum. The partial burial of the stone had preserved a lower portion of the inscription both from destruction and the eyes of earlier travellers. Thus in his *Manual of Greek historical inscriptions*, Oxford 1882, E. L. HICKS was able to publish the remains of the last 23 lines from the bottom of the stele. Four years later full publication followed as *Greek inscriptions in the British Museum* iii. 1, Oxford 1886, no. 441.⁴ In the intervening thirty years between LE BAS' examination of the stele and its arrival at the British Museum, a considerable portion of the stone's surface had flaked away, leaving

¹ R. CHANDLER, *Travels in Asia Minor, and Greece, or an account of a tour made at the expense of the Society of Dilettanti*³, London 1817, 1. 209.

² By TURNER and W. SHERARD, whose transcriptions formed the basis of A. BOECKH's text in *CIG* 2.2679 (see BOECKH *ad loc.*), and in 1817 by W. J. BANKES whose transcription seems not to have survived (I owe this information to CHARLES CROWTHER). Subsequently it was seen by the Frenchman CH. TEXIER who, in the summer of 1835, again transcribed only the first 12 lines: CH. TEXIER, *Description de l'Asie Mineure faite par ordre du gouvernement Français de 1833 à 1837*, Paris 1838–49, 3.140.

³ PH. LE BAS and W. H. WADDINGTON, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*, Paris 1847–70, 3. no. 251 (henceforth «LBW»).

⁴ Whence it found its way into *SGDI* 3 3750, edited (but largely unchanged from the text of HICKS) by H. VAN GELDER, and CH. MICHEL, *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1900, no. 431.

traces of only the first 44 of the lines seen by LE BAS and published by WADDINGTON.

Subsequent to the publication by HICKS, improvements were made to the text with the benefit of a squeeze from the British Museum, by M. HOLLEAUX, who had prior to this done much to elucidate the diplomacy that lies behind the inscription.⁵ These two studies were combined by L. ROBERT in *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* 4, Paris 1952, 146–62 (henceforth <Trois décrets>). A text collated from these earlier printed versions is presented by W. BLÜMEL as I. Iasos 150. In November 1994 I was able to examine the stone and a new squeeze.⁶ The stone has deteriorated further since it was seen by HICKS, and indeed seems to have done already by the time that HOLLEAUX' squeeze was taken (see below on l. 76). Consequently, in the text that follows I print as present on the stone all letters about which HICKS showed no doubt, even though some are no longer visible. Restorations printed are based on the text offered by HOLLEAUX, in part derived from HICKS. Divergences are explained in the notes. For portions preserved only in LBW (which HOLLEAUX did not print after line 44, and did not acknowledge before that), I follow the practice of HICKS, printing them within round brackets.⁷

- (A) Ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Δημέου τοῦ Στησιόχου,
 γραμματέως δὲ Μένητος τοῦ Πόδωνος· Γηφοριῶνος·
 ψηφίσματα παρὰ Ῥοδίων.
- 4 [Ὶ]δοξεν τῷ δάμῳ· περὶ ὧν Ἰασεῖς συνγενε[ις] καὶ φίλο[ι]
 [ῡ]πάρχοντες τοῦ δάμου ἀποστεί[λαν]τες ψάφισμα καὶ
 [πρ]εσβευτὰς ἐμφανίζοντι τ[ὰ] γεγονότα· ἀδικήματα ἔ[ν]
 [τᾶι] χώραι αὐτῶν ὑπὸ Ποδίου καὶ [παρακαλοῦν]τι τὸν δᾶμον
- 8 [καθ]άπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρότερο[ν] χρόνοις δια[τετέ]λεκεν· εὖε[ρ]-
 [γε]τῶν τὰν πόλιν τὰν Ἰασέων καὶ νῦ[ν] π[ρ]όνοιαν [ποιεῖ]σθ[αι]
 [ὅπ]ως ἂ τε πόλις αὐτῶν ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος [διαμέ]νη[ι]
 [καὶ] περὶ τῶν γεγονότων ἀδικημάτων ἐπιμ[έ]λει· [τις πο]ιη-
- 12 [θῆ]ι· καθότι κα δόξει τῷ δάμῳ, καὶ τ[οι] π[α]ραγενό[μενοι] παρ' α[ὐ]-
 [τῶ]ν Πολέμαρχος καὶ Γλαῦκος ἐπ[ελθ]όντες ἐπὶ [τὰν] β[ο]υλά[ν]
 [καὶ] τὰν ἐκκλησίαν διελέγεν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τ[ῷ] ψ[α]φισ-
 [ματι] γεγραμμένοις μετὰ πάσας σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμ[ί]-
- 16 [ας], ἀπ[ο]κρίνασθαι αὐτοῖς *vac.* ὅτι ὁ δᾶμος εἰδ[ὼς] [Ἰ]α[σ]εῖς

⁵ M. HOLLEAUX, *Curae epigraphicae*, REA 5, 1903, 223–8; id., *Trois décrets de Rhodes*, REG 12, 1899, 20–37.

⁶ I am indebted to my colleagues in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum for allowing me to inspect the stone and for speedy provision of a squeeze and photograph.

⁷ Round brackets are nowhere used (or required) in the text according to the Leiden convention.

[εὖνους] ὑπάρχοντας τᾷ πόλει πρότερόν τε [ἐτύγχανε τάν]
[πᾶσαν] ἐπιμέλειαν ποιούμενος π[ερὶ τ]ῶν [συμφερόντων αὐτοῖς]
[καὶ νῦν προαιρ]ούμενος σμγκατασκευάζ[ειν πάντα τὰ ποτ' ἀσφα]-

- 20 [λαιαν και σω]τηριαν τās πόλιος αὐτ[οῖς] ποιησείται τὰν πᾶ[-
σαν πρόνοια]ν ὅπως ὑπέρ τε τῶν γ[εγεννημέν]ων [ἀδικημάτων ὑπό]
[Ποδίου]ν τ[ἃ] δίκαια γένεται καὶ [Ῥόλυμπιχος μὴ ἐπιτρέπη τοῖς]
[ὑφ' αὐτό]ν τεταγμένοι μηθὲν [ἀδίκημα ποιεῖσθαι ἐν ταῖ]
- (B) 24 [χώροι τ]ᾱί Ἰασέων, καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ὥς [μάλιστα διατηρῶν]
[τὰν ὑπάρχου]σαν αὐτῷ ποτὶ Ἰασεῖς [συγγένειαν καὶ φιλίαν]
[οὐθενὸς ἀποστ]ασεῖται τῷ[ν] Ἰασεῦσι σ[υμφερόντων] τοὺς δὲ παρα[-
γενομένους πα]ρὰ Ἰασέων καλέσαι ἐπὶ [τὸ πρυτανεῖον].
- 28 [Ὶδοξεν τᾱί βουλᾱι] καὶ τῷ δάμωι· ὅπως Ἰασ[εῖς] συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι
[ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ] δάμου εἰδήσωντι τὰ [ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς φιλάνθρωπα]
[παρὰ τοῦ δάμου τοῦ] Ῥοδίων δεδόχθα[ι τᾱί βουλᾱι καὶ τῷ δάμωι]
[ἐλέσθαι πρεσβευ]τάς ἤδη δι[ύο], τοῖ δὲ ἄ[φικόμενοι ποτὶ Ἰασεῖς]
- 32 [καὶ τὰν συγγένειαν τὰν ὑπ[ά]ρχουσαν αὐτοῖς] κα[ι] τῷ π[λή]θει τῷ [Ὶοδί]-
[ων ἀνανεωσάμενοι] καὶ ἐπιδείξαν[τες] τὰ ἐψαφι[ομέ]ν[υ]α ὑπὸ το[ῦ]
[δάμου τοῦ Ὶοδίω]ν ὑπὲρ τ[ῶ]ν γεγεννη[μέν]ων ἀδικημάτων ἐν [τᾱί χώ]-
[ροι αὐτῶν ὑπὸ Π]οδίου δηλο(ύ)ντων αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ δᾶμος καὶ εἰς [τὸ λοιπὸν]
- 36 [διατηρῶν τὰν ὑπάρχ]ουσα[ν] αὐτῷ ποτὶ Ἰασεῖς [συν]γένειαν κα(ι φιλ)[ίαν]
[οὐθενὸς ἀποστασεῖ]ται τῶν Ἰασεῦσι συμφερό[ντω]ν. Αἵρεθ(εν)
[Τιμασίθεος Διονυσί]ου, Ἐπικράτης Τιμασι[τρ]άτου.
- (C) [Ὶδοξεν τᾱί βουλᾱι καὶ τῷ δ]άμωι. ἐπειδὴ Ἰασέων [σ]υ[ν]γενῶν κ(αι φίλ)[ων]
40 [ὑπαρχόντων τοῦ δάμου καὶ ἂ](π)οστειλ[άντ](ω)ν ψάφισμα καὶ πρεσβε[ί](αν)
[π](ο)[τί]
- [τὰν πόλιν τὰν ἐμφανιοῦσαν] τὰ γε(γ)ε[νη](μένα) ἀδικήματα εἰς α(ὐτούς) [ὑπό]
[Ποδίου τοῦ - - (c. 13) - - ὑ]πὸ Ῥόλυμπ(ιχον κ)αὶ παρακ[αλεσάν](τε(ω)ν τὸ)[ν δᾶ]-
[μον πρόνοϊαν ποιήσασθαι τ]ᾶς πό(λιος αὐτῶ)ν καὶ ἀποστε(ῖλαι πρε(ε)σ)[βευ]-
- 44 [τάς ποτὶ βασιλέα Φίλιππον τοὺς] ἀπολ[ο](γι)σομένους περὶ [τ]ῶν [ἀδικημάτων]
[καὶ ἀξιῶσοντας τὸν βασιλέα διατηρεῖν] (αὐτοῖς τὰν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν) [καὶ]
[αὐτόνομον - - - - - πρ](οα)[ί](ρεσι(ν) καὶ) [.](τ)[. - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](Ἰασέων τοῦ λ)[- - - - -]
48 [- - - - - - - - - - πα](ρακαλέσ)[- - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](γ)[. . .](κ)[.](ι)[- - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](ρακαια)[. . . .](ονον)[- - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - - τ](ᾶ ἀξιούμενα καὶ)[- - - - -]
52 [- - - - - - - - - -](ος εὐχαριστούντω)[ν - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](τῶν γεγε)[νημένων - - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](ων)[. . .](κα)[- - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](ιαγονν)[. . .](συν)[- - - - -]
56 [- - - - - - - - - -](εγον)[. . .](μα)[- - - - -]
[- - - - - - - - - -](ελ)[. . . .](ας)[- - - - -]

- [- - - - -](ον)[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -](λιπ)[- - - - -]
 60 [- - - - -](ραν αὐτω)[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -](καιδ)[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -](να)[.](σ)[.](αιεν πε)[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -](και τὰ λοιπὰ)[- - - - -]
 64 [- - - - -](αι)[- - - - -]
 ↑ [- - - - -](οοριο)[- - - - -]
 (D?) [- - - - -](ντα)[- - - - -]
 ↓ [- - - - -](ι)[- - - - -]
 68 [- - - - -](ι)[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -](ια)[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]
 72 [- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]
 [. c. 10]οντ[. c. 8 . . .]αν[. c. 30]
 [. τ]ῶι [δ]άμ[ωι, ἐπιδε]ί[ξ]α[ν]τες τὰ ἐπεσ[ταλμένα ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ποτὶ]
 76 [τὰ]ν πόλιν, [π]αρακαλ[ούντων] αὐτοὶ καὶ τὸν ὑπαρχο[ν καὶ Ὀλύμπιχον μὴ ἐπι]-
 [τρ]έπειν τοῖς ὑφ' αὐτὸν τεταγμένοις μηθὲν ἀδίκημα [ποιεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ χώ]-
 [ραι] τῇ Ἰασέων ἀλλὰ ποτιφέρεσθαι αὐτοῖς φιλανθρώπως, καὶ ἐ[πὶ τῶν γε]-
 [γ]ενημένων ἀδικημάτων πρόνοιάν τινα ποιήσασθαι ὅπω[ς γένη]-
 80 [τ]αι τὰ δίκαια ἀκολούθως τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπισταλεῖσιν, εἰδό]-
 [τ]α ὅτι τούτων ἐπιμεληθεῖς ὁμολογούμενα φανεῖται πράσσων [τᾷ]
 [τ]ε τοῦ βασιλέως αἰρέσει καὶ τοῖς ἐπιστελλομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φι[λαν]-
 [θ]ρώποις ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν· vac. ἐμφανιζόντων δὲ αὐτῶι τοὶ πρεσβευ[ταί]
 84 [ὅ]τι ὁ δᾶμος εἰδὼς Ἰασεῖς εὐνους ὑπάρχοντας τῇ πόλει καὶ προα[ιρ]οῦ]-
 μενος αὐτοῖς συγκατασκευάζειν πάντα τὰ ποτ' ἀσφάλειαν [καὶ]
 σωτηρίαν, πρότερόν τε ἐτύγγανε δεδωκὼς ποτίταγμα τοί[ς]
 ἄρχουσι τοῖς ἀποστελλομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τὰς Ἰασ[έων]
 88 χώρας καθάπερ καὶ τὰς τοῦ δάμου, καὶ νῦν μναμονέων τὰς ὑπ[αρ]-
 χούσας ποτ' αὐτοῖς οἰκειότατος οὐθενὸς ἀποσ[τα]σεῖται τῶν συ[μφε]-
 ρόντων Ἰασεῦσι· εἰ δέ κα, τοῦ δάμου πᾶσαν σπουδάν ποιουμένου [περὶ]
 τούτων, μηδεμίαν ἐπιστροφὰν Ὀλύμπιχος ποιῆται ἀλλὰ περ[ιο]-
 92 ρῇ τὰ γινόμενα ἀδικήματα, δηλούντω(ν) αὐτῶι τοὶ πρεσβευταὶ ὅτι
 τὰμ μὲν φιλίαν καὶ τὰν εὖνοιαν τὰν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι ποτὶ βασιλ[έ]α]
 Φίλιππον διαφυλάξει ὁ δᾶμος, πράξει δὲ ἅ πέπεισται συμφέροντα
 εἶμιν ποτὶ τὰν Ἰασέων ἀσφάλειαν. Αἰρέθεν· vac. Τιμασίθεος
 96 Διονυσίου, Ἐπικράτης Τιμασιστράτου.

Notes

1–2 On the families of the two officials, Demeas Stesiochou and Menes Podonos, cf. A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum, Caria, Cos, Rhodes etc., London 1897, Iasos no. 10 for the magistrate ΣΤΗΣΙΟΧΟΣ and LBW 294 (I. Iasos 193) ll. 6–7 for Μηνότιμος | Πόδωνος.

16 *vacat* c. 2 cm, approximately 1–1.5 letters.

22 [Ολύμπιχος μὴ ἐπιτρέπει τοῖς] Comparison with the restored lines 23 and 25 suggests a gap of approximately 22–4 letters long. The content of these lines is very similar to that at ll. 76–80, the order being reversed here: first justice, then provision for the future. The language must also be similar (cf. καὶ ἐ[πὶ τῶν γε|γ]ενημένων ἀδικημάτων πρόνοιάν τινα ποιήσασθαι ὅπως γένη[τ]αι τὰ δίκαια [78–80] and ὑπὲρ τε τῶν γε[γεννημένων]ων [ἀδικημάτων ὑπὸ | Ποδύλου τ]ὰ δίκαια γένηται [21–2]), the likelihood being that τοῖς [ὑφ' αὐτό]ν τεταγμένοις μὴτὲν [ἀδικημα ποιέσθαι ἐν ταῖ | χώραι τ]ᾶν Ἰασέων (22–4) is preceded by something similar to τὸν ὑπαρχόν καὶ Ὀλύμπιχον μὴ ἐπ[ι τ]ρέπειν τοῖς ὑφ' αὐτόν τεταγμένοις μὴτὲν ἀδικημα [ποιέσθαι ἐν ταῖ χώ|ραι] τᾶν Ἰασέων (76–8). The verb then seems reasonably secure (subjunctive after ὅπως), but there remains room for only one subject. HOLLEAUX remarked on an apparent discontinuity in the run of diplomacy as it stands on the stone: «D'après ce qu'on a vu dans les décrets A et B, c'est à Podilos, semble-t-il, que Timasitheos et Épikratès devraient porter les plaintes et les sommations des Rhodiens: or, nous observons avec surprise qu'il n'en est point ainsi. Le nom de Podilos ne figure pas dans toute la partie conservée du décret C.» Put another way, the curiosity is that Olympichos is not mentioned at all in decrees A or B given that he is Podilos' commander. In line 22 Olympichos' name therefore makes an attractive restoration.

27–8 The break between decrees is marked by widening of the gap between lines by c. 0.6–0.7 cm.

38–9 The break between decrees is marked by widening of the gap between lines by c. 0.6 cm.

41 τὰ γε(γε)[νη](μένα) ἀδικήματα: there is room on the stone between ταγε seen by HICKS (and still barely visible) and the beginning of ἀδικήματα for six letters at most. – [ὑπὸ]: for the reading see HOLLEAUX 155 n. 1; (AG) LBW, BLÜMEL.

42 [Ποδύλου τοῦ . . .] If HOLLEAUX was correct to insert ὑπὸ at the end of 41, then line 42 must begin with the name of the author of the ἀδικήματα, viz. Podilos. The gap between his name and the following ὑπὸ must contain the participle describing Podilos' appointment. Καταλειφθέντος, for example, would fit the gap fairly well, but given our ignorance about the precise nature of Podilos' position, it seems best not to restore.

43 πρ(ε)σ[βε]ν- LE BAS read ΠΡΟΣ which was taken by WADDINGTON and HICKS to be πρὸς. HOLLEAUX (153) pointed out that the form we should expect is ποτί, and emended his text accordingly. The alteration is unsatisfactory however, and BLÜMEL is surely correct to point to the case in line 44 where LE BAS confused the two letters *omicron* and *epsilon* (see WADDINGTON at LBW iii. 2 p. 86; cf. line 2 where LE BAS and WADDINGTON both read Μέ[λ]ανος for Πόδωνος), and to suggest that the reading should be πρὸς[βε]ντάς. After the ταν of ἀποστε(ῖ)λαι there is room for c. 11–12 letters.

44 The gap at the beginning of the line corresponds to 25 letters in the securely restored line 39. Any restoration of the text depends entirely upon preconception of the target of the embassy being requested. For HOLLEAUX this was Olympichos. For full arguments that this should in fact be Philip V, see below part II. – [ἀδικημάτων] BLÜMEL's rejection of HOLLEAUX' restoration is based on a mistranslation of ἀπολογίζομαι περὶ which means to recount, not «verteidigen». Cf. LSJ s.v. III; C.B. WELLES, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, New Haven 1934, 317.

45 [καὶ ἀξιῶσοντας τὸν βασιλέα διατηρεῖν] scripsi. There is room for approximately 32 letters.

46 [πρ](οα)[ι](ρεσι(ν) και)[.](τ)[.], OA.PEΣΙΚΑΙ.T. lap. (Waddington ad LBW 3. .2 p.86). Reference may well be to the policy of Philip's predecessor, Dison. There is space for approximately 21 letters after [αὐτόνομον].

50 Hicks restores [ἐλευθε]ρα[ν] και α[ῦ]τόνομ[ον]. On LE BAS' transcription however there is no room for the *nu* at the end of the first word and in the third the gap to which Hicks assigns *upsilon* and *tau* shows room for four letters. The restoration is probably best rejected.

70–73 The last line of the first section of the stone with any traces visible to Hicks was (as it is now) line 44. LE BAS saw traces of a further 25 lines (45–69). Hicks then allowed a further two completely lost lines (70–71) before the beginning of the first line of the second section (his line 72). Measurement of the stone as it is now restored in the British Museum⁸ produces a distance from the top of the letters of line 44 to the top of the letters of Hicks' line 72 of 55.5 cm. The average distance from the top of the letters of one line to the top of the next over the whole stone (omitting the two occasions where this is exaggerated by gaps between decrees [see above on ll.27–8 and 38–9]) is 1.84 cm. The average (by the same means) for the section prior to the break (ll.1–44) is 1.88 cm; for the section after (Hicks' ll.72–94) is 1.78 cm. On these figures, the gap of 55.5 cm could have held 30.16, 29.52 or 31.17 lines. The high figure for the first section is caused in large part by initial wide spacing of the prescript and first decree (average 1.93 cm). By the last five lines (39–44) the average is down to 1.7 cm. It is perhaps safest, then, to take the middle of the three figures (30.16) as the best guide to the number of lines from the top of 44 to the top of Hicks' 72. One of these is line 44 itself, 25 more are LE BAS' ll.45–69, and thus the number of completely lost lines will have to be increased from two to four. I renumber accordingly. All line references henceforth are according to this new numeration.

75 τ[ω]ι HOLLEAUX; γ[ω]ι Hicks; τ[ω]ι BLÜMEL. Only the apex at the right end of the horizontal is now visible.

76 Stone and squeeze now reveal only αὐτο[. . .]ον ὑπαρχο[There is room between the first *omicron* and the second for between three and five letters, depending on their widths (three broad letters plus up to two *iotas*). Traces of the upper part of a vertical are visible after the first *omicron*, though no apex can be detected. There may be traces of a diagonal extending down from the top of this to the right, but this could equally be the result of damage to the stone. Thus, while Hicks' reading αὐτοὶ και τὸν ὑπαρχο[ντα fits the gap it does not fit the traces now visible; on the other hand, HOLLEAUX' αὐτὸν και τὸν ὑπαρχο[fits better the traces but cannot be squeezed into the gap on the stone – as he himself seems to have realised (p. 153). His alternative, αὐτὸν τὸν κτλ. however does not seem long enough. Given that Hicks probably saw more on the stone than HOLLEAUX could (cf. HOLLEAUX p. 153: «la pierre a dû souffrir quelque dommage depuis la revision de Hicks»), and that the former showed little doubt about his readings, it is probably best to accept them and restore around them. By restoring [π]αρακαλ[οῦντων] as an imperative the subject of which will be the Rhodian ambassadors (the construction will be parallel to that at ll.83 and 92), the two preceding clauses will have been parenthetical. The end of 74 and the beginning of 75 is perhaps to be restored [καθ[ο]τι | δεδ[ο]χθ[αι] τ[ω]ι [δ]άμ[ω]ι vel sim. The gap at the end of the line contains room for approximately 17–8 letters.

83 vacat c. 1.3 cm, approximately 1 letter.

92 δηλούντω(ν) Hicks; δηλούντοι lap.

95 vacat c. 4 cm, approximately 3–4 letters.

⁸ The stele has a transverse break running through the gap between the upper and lower portions of text. There do not seem to be any pieces of the stele missing however, and restoration appears to have been accurate. If an error has occurred, then the length of the stele must be increased rather than reduced.

II. The Diplomacy

At some point between c. 220 and c. 214 BC the city of Iasos, having suffered wrongs (*ἄδικήματα*) at the hands of Podilos, the officer of the local dynast Olympichos of Alinda, sent ambassadors to Rhodes to ask for help.⁹ Their requests and the Rhodian responses are recorded in a series of Rhodian decrees set up on a single stele at Iasos. The interrelationship of these decrees was first demonstrated by M. HOLLEAUX (*Trois décrets*). In his view, as the title of his article suggests, the stele contains three decrees, «connected to each other by a direct and close link; they form . . . a clearly coherent ensemble: the Rhodians promise the Iasians that they will act on their behalf (decree A); the Rhodians decide to act on behalf of the Iasians (decree C); the Rhodians announce to the Iasians that they have just taken the decision to act (decree B)» (*Trois décrets*, 154). Of the historical circumstances, HOLLEAUX was certain: «the operations of Olympichos in Caria were contemporary with those being conducted by Philip in Thrace and on the shores of the Propontis; unable to reach the area of Asia Minor he coveted and which his accomodation with Antiochus III granted him, the king, from 202 BC, set up Olympichos as his representative, and gave him the task of establishing Macedonian domination.» (*ibid.* 161–162).

More evidence is now available than was to HOLLEAUX, notably for the date of the documents and the nature of Philip's rule in Caria. It is now clear that the events contained in the decrees come from the earlier part of Philip's reign, when his policy towards Caria was less hostile. In this respect the texts of letters found at Labraunda from Philip to the city of Mylasa have played a crucial rôle.¹⁰ Furthermore, as we have seen above, the disposition of the texts on the stone was not quite as HICKS and HOLLEAUX saw it. A thorough re-examination of HOLLEAUX' reconstruction is thus desirable. The details of the case are as follows:

A. (1–27) Decree 1. The Iasian ambassadors having arrived at Rhodes relate the story of the wrongs they have suffered at the hands of Podilos to the Rhodian *boule* and *ekklesia*. The *damos* of the Rhodians resolves that the wrongs shall be put right and that steps shall be taken to ensure that the Iasians' rights are not infringed again. The Iasian ambassadors are invited to the *prytaneion*.

⁹ Philip V came to the throne in summer/autumn 221 (on the date of Doson's death see now N. G. L. HAMMOND and F. W. WALBANK, *A History of Macedonia III*, Oxford 1988, 362 n. 9). Realistically then the terminus post quem is probably early 220. The terminus ante is provided by the election of Timasitheos Dionysiou as ambassador (Il. 38, 95–6). He is known to have died at Alexandria in May 213: B. F. COOK, *Inscribed Hadra Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York 1966, p. 24 no. 9 (cf. OGIS 36 n. 2). The identity of this Timasitheos was disputed when it was fashionable to date this stone after 213: for the history of the debate, J. CRAMPA, *Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches III. 1–2 The Greek Inscriptions*, Stockholm 1969–72, 1. 95–6 n. 43.

¹⁰ Note especially Labraunda nos. 4–7 with commentary ad loc (pp. 93–96; cf. *Bulletin épigr.* 1970, 559).

B. (28–38) Decree 2. The Rhodian *damos* resolves that, in order that the Iasians know that the Rhodians have their interests at heart, two ambassadors will be chosen to go to Iasos with copies of the Rhodians' decrees concerning the injustices committed by Podilos, and tell the Iasians that the Rhodian *damos* will continue in the future to protect their interests. The two ambassadors are chosen: Timasitheos Dionysiou and Epikrates Timasistratou.

C. (39–44) Decree 3. Since the Iasians have sent ambassadors who have told of the wrongs committed by Podilos, Olympichos' officer, and since they have requested the Rhodians to send ambassadors to [someone] to give an account of the wrongs committed. . . . There follow 30 lines where the text has become too mutilated for comprehension. The text emerges again in the middle of instructions to ambassadors to Olympichos:

D. (75–96) The ambassadors are to request that Olympichos and his *hyparchos* leave Iasos alone, producing at the same time letters from king Philip. Olympichos is requested instead to direct his attention to redress for the Iasians, so that justice may be done in accordance with the letters of Philip, Olympichos thereby showing himself as acting in accordance with Philip's policy. The ambassadors are further to make it clear that the Rhodians value Iasos' friendship and, being anxious to protect the Iasians, previously despatched orders to their commanders to protect Iasian land as if it were Rhodian, and now too will do all necessary on Iasos' behalf. If Olympichos persists in his hostility, the ambassadors are to make it clear that, while the Rhodians will maintain their goodwill towards Philip, they will also do all necessary to protect the Iasians. The ambassadors chosen are again Timasitheos Dionysiou and Epikrates Timasistratou.

The damaged section between C and D has received little attention, and the traces recorded only by LBW offer little hope of safe restoration. Nonetheless, these lines cannot be ignored: a section longer than decree A and twice as long as B has been lost. What might it have contained? The first line or two must have contained the completion of the sense of C 42 ff: the genitive absolute clause containing the details of the Iasian request (still perhaps continuing in l. 46) will have closed, and the clause dependent on ἐπειδὴ (l. 39) will probably have followed, perhaps stating the reason for Rhodes' decision to act on the Iasians' behalf (friendship, benevolence vel sim.). There will have followed the resolution (οὔτι ὁ δᾶμος or δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλᾷ καὶ τῷ δάμῳ), undoubtedly to fulfil the specific request of the Iasian ambassadors just mentioned. [τ]ὰ ἀξιούμενα in l. 51 may be from this point. Some elaboration on the nature and mission of this embassy may have followed, and finally will have come the appointment of the ambassadors.

It has been the assumption of all scholars treating this stone in its entirety that the section of text preserved in D is the termination of the decree that begins with C, and that consequently the embassy being requested and provided in ll. 39–44 is to be sent to Olympichos. Yet this would require the entire section lost after c. l. 52 (some twenty-two lines) to have been taken up with the instruc-

tions to the ambassadors, still running when the text resumes (the entire set of instructions thus running to some forty-three lines). This seems inordinately long. How safe is this assumption?

We must begin with a minor problem which HOLLEAUX himself noticed: «Que si, contrairement à l'ordre chronologique, le décret B se trouve inscrit le second et non le troisième sur le marbre, on en a vu plus haut le très simple motif: les ambassadeurs de Rhodes, délégués à Iasos en vertu de ce décret, l'ont communiqué aux Iasiens avant le décret C.» (Trois décrets 154). One feels nonetheless a sense of redundancy in decree B, that is not dissipated by consideration of the choice of ambassadors at the end of decree B and at the end of D. If, as would be the case on HOLLEAUX' reconstruction, the ambassadors for the mission to Olympichos provided for in D had already been chosen, why go to the trouble of explicitly choosing again in B? In fact the whole procedure at Rhodes takes on an unwieldiness close to clumsiness. If the same ambassadors are to inform the Iasians of the Rhodians' decisions on their way to meet Olympichos, why not write this into the first decree (C), rather than go to the trouble of passing another decree and choosing the same ambassadors over again? More sense would be made of this situation if the purpose and position of decree B was in some way necessitated by the decree that followed it on the stele, and if the mission of the ambassadors recorded in D was not contemporaneous with that in B.

Could there have been an interval between the sending of missions B and D from Rhodes, and if so what occurred during it? A closer examination of D may hold the answer. The ambassadors on the mission to Olympichos are in possession of letters sent to the Rhodians by king Philip: τὰ ἐπεσ[ταλμένα ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ποτὶ | τὰν πόλιν (75–6); τοῖς ἐπιστελλομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φι[λαν]θ[ρώποις ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν (82–3). Moreover the contents of these letters seem to be of specific relevance to the question of rectifying the ἀδικήματα caused by Podilos: ὅπως γένη[τ]αι τὰ δίκαια ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπισταλῆσ[ιν (79–80). What had caused Philip to send such letters? For HOLLEAUX the letters are connected with the previous occasion on which the Rhodians had turned out in support of Iasos (ll. 7–9). Indeed they form for him the proof that the previous occasion took the form of an earlier (perhaps armed) intervention against Olympichos, in which Philip's help was sought to restrain Olympichos. In none of the decrees however is it stated who the enemy was on the previous occasion of Rhodian intervention, and the reconstruction proposed by HOLLEAUX once again produces an odd sequence of events: Olympichos wrongs the Iasians in some respect,¹¹ the

¹¹ The precise nature of the ἀδικήματα in question is, alas, unclear. CRAMPA (above n. 9) l. 94, however, surely misses the point completely when he writes «To me it is evident . . . that Olympichus' troops had not invaded Iasian territory – indeed, that their right to stay there was not questioned. Nowhere in the decrees is there the slightest hint of a wish or a demand that the troops be withdrawn.» There is in fact no mention whatsoever of troops

Rhodians turn out in force (perhaps with ships in the Iasian Gulf)¹² and obtain letters from Philip in support of Iasos' position; Olympichos backs down; within the space of four years or less on HOLLEAUX' chronology, Olympichos commits an identical transgression; the Iasians turn again to the Rhodians who hunt down the old letters from Philip in their files, hand them to ambassadors and despatch the latter to Olympichos in the expectation that he will back down again. Such a recourse to previously ineffective and out of date documents makes for a pitifully weak riposte. The natural response of such threatened parties would surely be to strengthen their reply a second time to make it decisive. Furthermore, we are left with no explanation for how these instructions from Philip came to be in Rhodian possession, nor for why, given the existence of such instructions prior to the incursions of Podilos, the Iasians needed to turn to a fourth party. Surely the Iasians would have had copies of such letters themselves – the matter ought to have been resolvable between the city, the king and his *strategos*.

Some modification to HOLLEAUX' reconstruction is, I think, necessary. We may begin with the question of the letters. Since they seem to pertain to the recent transgression of Podilos in some meaningful way, it is not an unreasonable assumption that they were recent letters, written by Philip with full knowledge of Podilos' transgression. Since they were written to the Rhodians, the Rhodians will have requested them. If we turn back to the beginning of decree C, we may perhaps see the circumstances behind this. The Iasian ambassadors had requested that the Rhodians send ambassadors to someone (ll. 42–4). HOLLEAUX was certain about the restoration required in line 44: «il n' est pas douteux que le mot gouverné par le préposition ne fût le nom propre Ὀλύμπιχον (cf. l. 89).» This opinion rests, of course, on the assumption that C and D are from the same decree. If we are prepared to accept the possibility that they were in fact the beginning and end respectively of two separate decrees, then another restoration is possible: *ποτι βασιλέα Φίλιππον*.¹³ Thus we may restore:

παρακ[αλεσάν](τ(ω)ν τὸ)[ν δᾶ]-
[μον πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι τ]ᾶς πό[λιος αὐτῶ]ν καὶ ἀποστε[ῖλαι πρ(ε)σ][βευ]-
44 [τὰς ποτι βασιλέα Φίλιππον τοῦς] ἀπολ[ο](γισουμένους) περὶ [τ]ῶν [ἀδικημάτων]

The sequence of diplomacy will have been the following. The Iasians asked the Rhodians to send an embassy to Philip, giving full account of Podilos' transgressions and asking for Philip's aid in seeking redress. The Rhodians resolved to

or a garrison stationed in Iasian territory in any of the decrees. The most natural inference is rather that Olympichos and Podilos have been committing illegal acts in the territory of a city recognised as free and autonomous by Macedon and Rhodes.

¹² HOLLEAUX, *Trois décrets* 159: «peut-être l' envoi d' une escadre rhodienne dans le golfe d' Iasos».

¹³ In fact, the restoration of Olympichos' name seems too short by about five letters.

send the embassy as requested, or possibly appended the Iasians' request to a mission to Philip already resolved upon (decree C).¹⁴ In the meantime envoys were sent to Iasos to announce the decision of the Rhodian *damos* and to reassure the Iasians that something was being done (decree B). These ambassadors carried with them copies of decrees A, B and C and subsequently, when the full account of the affair was published on stone by the Iasians, B preceded C by way of clear explanation for it: the Rhodians resolved to send copies of decrees relevant to the case to Iasos so that the Iasians should know what was going on, in lieu of immediate intervention with Olympichos. Upon the return of the Rhodian embassy to Philip with the letters from the king, another embassy was voted for despatch to Olympichos with the letters (decree D). The ambassadors chosen were the two Iasos specialists again: Timasitheos and Epikrates. The physical disposition of these arrangements on the stone is not absolutely ascertainable, but the general lines can perhaps be followed. Decree C: ll. 39 – c. 54 the Iasian request for an embassy to Philip, and the Rhodian resolution to send it; c. 54 – c. 65 instructions to ambassadors to fulfill this request (or perhaps instructions to be sent to ambassadors already with Philip), followed by choice of ambassadors. Decree D:¹⁵ c. 66 – c. 70 preamble followed by announcement of return of the embassy and Philip's response; c. 71 ff the decision to send ambassadors to Olympichos followed by details of their mission (the latter ongoing when the text re-emerges at l. 75).

Reconstruction of earlier events becomes more a matter for speculation with the movement of the context of the letters of Philip to the more recent troubles. The previous threat to the Iasians which the Rhodians had met with instructions to their *archontes* (ll. 86–8) cannot be identified with certainty. The strong probability is that this threat came in the person of Olympichos who had been dynast and *strategos* at Alinda probably without break since the late 240s, first under Seleucus II, subsequently under Antigonos Doson following the latter's Carian campaign of 227, and hence Philip V.¹⁶ Certainty as to the allegiance of Olympichos at the time of the previous threat is impossible however. It is not clear from the

¹⁴ We know for example of Rhodian embassies to Philip in 218 and 217 attempting to mediate in the Social War (Polyb. 5. 24.11, 100.9–11).

¹⁵ The precise point of the break between the third and fourth decrees (C and D) cannot be ascertained: LE BAS did not mark the increased gaps between decrees A and B and B and C on his transcription, consequently it is impossible to tell whether any such increase was visible to him in the last lines he saw, or not.

¹⁶ Note especially Labraunda 1–3, 8–9 (reign of Seleucus II), 4–7 (reign of Philip V). On the career of Olympichos, CRAMPA (above n. 9) 1 commentary passim and 86–96 for synopsis. CRAMPA's conclusion that Olympichos was an independent dynast under Philip has met with little acceptance: cf. CH. HABICHT's review of CRAMPA, *Gnomon* 44, 1972, 162–70, 166–7; J. and L. ROBERT, *Fouilles d' Amyzon en Carie I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*, Paris 1983, 147–50; S. LE BOHEC, *Antigone Dôsôn roi de Macédoine*, Nancy 1993, 343–7.

documents as they survive whether the Iasians and Rhodians on the previous occasion had referred the matter to Olympichos' superior or not. Conceivably they had relied on a Rhodian show of strength, which turned out in the event of the second infringement to have been indecisive.¹⁷

III. *The Historical Background*

Fascinating as this inscription is for the details it provides of the relationship between Philip, Olympichos and a Greek city of Caria, another equally interesting aspect has received virtually none of the attention it deserves. The rôle of Rhodes in the affairs of Iasos is remarkable. Two basic questions require answers:

(i) Why did Iasos turn to Rhodes?

The stone, of course, provides one answer. The Iasian ambassadors [παρακαλοῦν]τι τὸν δᾶμον | [καθ]άπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις διατετέ[λεκεν] εὐ-ε[ρ]γε[τῶν] τὰν πόλιν τὰν Ἰασέων καὶ νῦν π[ρ]όνοιαν [ποιεῖ]σθ[αι] ... (7-9). Rhodes had been of help before. But this merely pushes the same question back in time. Why had they gone to Rhodes previously? Much play is made of the *συνγένεια καὶ φιλία* between the two states (1, 25, 28, 32, 36, 39), yet there were plenty of other Dorian states on whom Iasos could have made a similar if not better claim purely on such grounds, not least her mother city Argos.¹⁸ Obviously the answer lies in the substantial local military and economic power wielded by Rhodes. She had a military presence that could command respect, as we learn it did in the earlier episode (ll. 86-8). Moreover the economic might of the Rhodian merchant marine could command the respect and generosity of even the most land-locked dynasts. In c.227 Olympichos himself, though possessing perhaps only the harbour of Heracleia Latmos, felt the need to garner Rhodian favour with an earthquake relief donation (Polyb. 5. 90.1). Likewise, his master in Macedon had joined the rush of monarchs to make his friendship clear to the island.¹⁹

¹⁷ Given the date of our inscription early in the reign of Philip, it may be that the second infringement was part of an exploratory test by Olympichos of the level of the new monarch's commitment to the policies of Doson. The previous infringement would thus predate Philip's accession.

¹⁸ On the relationship between the two cities, Polyb. 16. 12.2. It was presumably through this Argive connection that the Iasians were claiming close ties with Rhodes, which was likewise believed to be an Argive colony. So O. CURTY, *Les parentés légendaires entre les cités grecques*, Geneva 1995, 157 n. 86. For a far more elaborate exercise in the establishment of Dorian credentials as a basis for aid shortly after this, see now the texts published by J. BOUSQUET, *La stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos*, REG 101, 1988, 12-53 (SEG 38.1476).

¹⁹ Polyb. 5. 89.6. For Philip's continuing friendly attitude towards Rhodes, cf. Lind. Chron. C 42, a dedication by Philip V to Athena at Lindos. See F. W. WALBANK, *Philip V of Macedon*, Cambridge 1940, 268.

Only four or five years before the second Iasian request, during the crisis at Byzantium (see below), πάντες ἐνεκάλουν οἱ πλοιζόμενοι τοῖς Ῥοδίοις διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τούτους προεστάναι τῶν κατὰ θάλατταν (Polyb. 4. 47.1). The Iasians clearly had a poor opinion of their own prospects of success in an embassy to Philip; everyone, however, listened to the Rhodians. Rhodes then was the natural choice from the point of view of both proximity of military support, and her position on the Aegean economic and political stage. A claim of *συνγένεια* provided strong buttressing.

It is worth remarking here upon the strong similarity between the situation recorded in our stele and the diplomacy surrounding the Roman siege of Iasos in 190 B.C. described by Livy (37.17.3–8). Iasos, in the hands of a Seleucid garrison, was being beset by the Roman praetor L. Aemilius Regillus. Some Iasian exiles present in the Roman camp were anxious that in the impending assault their city would be destroyed. Rather than approaching the praetor directly, however, *ii frequentes Rhodios orare instituerunt ne urbem et vicinam sibi et cognatam innoxiam perire sinerent*. Once again the claim of *συνγένεια* (*cognatio*) was wielded and the Rhodians successfully intervened with the praetor on the Iasians' behalf, with the result that the Roman force was withdrawn.

(ii) Why did Rhodes agree to help?

Here we move into much deeper water. Unlike their Iasian friends, the Rhodian *damos* could choose whether or not to enter the diplomatic fray. Potentially there was much to lose. An attempt to intervene in the manner she did – by playing off Philip against Olympichos – could be construed by either of the latter parties as a hostile act, an attempt to drive a wedge between the Macedonian king and his general. Furthermore, less than wholehearted support from Philip could have resulted in the need for a Rhodian military intervention in Caria, at the very least; at worst breakdown of relations with Philip could ensue (such seems to be the fear behind the concessive in ll. 93–5: τὰ μὲν φιλίαν καὶ τὰν εὐνοίαν τὰν ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτῷ ποτὶ βασιλέα | Φίλιππον διαφυλάξει ὁ δᾶμος, πρᾶξει δὲ ἃ πέπεισται συμφέροντα | εἶμιν ποτὶ τὰν Ἰασέων ἀσφάλειαν.) Much was at stake, what was to gain?

The answer lies tucked away, though nonetheless firmly present, at the end of the fourth decree. The Rhodian ambassadors will warn Olympichos of their people's intention ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τᾶς Ἰασ[έων] | χώρας καθάπερ καὶ τᾶς τοῦ δάμου (87–88). De iure, it was Philip's prerogative to grant and maintain (or withdraw) Iasian autonomy – on this point the entire diplomatic exchange recorded by the Podilos decrees is predicated. De facto, the Rhodians were the champions of Iasos. To them the Iasian *damos* turned, and through them, however ill-advisedly, Philip responded. Iasos as a result entered a diplomatic grey area. In a region dominated by one of the Hellenistic powers, freedom and autonomy were always privileges granted by that power: such indeed is one of the markers by which the geographi-

cal extent of, say, a monarch's power is measured. The Podilos decrees provide a snapshot of a Greek city perched on the boundary between two powers. These two powers were friendly towards each other, thus no conflict emerged for the time being. The relationship is further encapsulated in two more decrees that share a stone. In 1889 G. COUSIN and CH. DIEHL published a stele found at Bargylia (but probably transported there by caique from Iasos) which preserves first a grant of proxeny to an Olympichos son of Olympichos, and second a decree honouring the Rhodian people and dikasts sent by them. If this is the dynast Olympichos, and the two decrees are close to each other in date, then once again we find the Iasians looking two ways at once.²⁰ There has been a development, however. The Rhodians are no longer merely friends and relations, they have become [σ]ύμμαχοι τῆς πόλ[εως] (I. Iasos 76, 14). One more step has been taken down the road from Macedon to Rhodes.

In his account of an event probably almost contemporary with the Podilos crisis, Polybius passes interesting comment on the motivation of the Rhodian state in its foreign policy. In 220 BC the Byzantines introduced a crippling toll on those transporting goods through the Bosporus. Οἱ γὰρ Ῥόδιοι, συνεξεγερόντες ἅμα μὲν διὰ τὴν σφετέραν βλάβην, ἅμα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶν πέλας ἐλάττωσιν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον παραλαβόντες τοὺς συμμάχους ἐπρέσβευον πρὸς τοὺς Βυζαντίους (Polyb. 4. 47.3). The diplomatic flare-up that followed was to lead to war. A conscious aspect of Rhodian foreign policy in 220 was, according to Polybius' (probably Rhodian) sources, the maintenance of a protectorate over her smaller neighbours. This is not to deny that there may also have been an economic motivation behind such a policy, but there are inevitable political ramifications. The Rhodian provision of what amounted to economic aid to these smaller cities placed a reciprocal burden upon them. Perhaps not heavy, nor on a day to day basis intrusive, this would nonetheless be felt if the Rhodians ever needed to remind them.

So too at Iasos a plea for help to Rhodes would result in a closing of relations between the two states, leading ultimately to the movement of Iasos out of Philip V's *συμμαχία* and into that with Rhodes. The Rhodians were far from pas-

²⁰ G. COUSIN and CH. DIEHL, *Inscriptions de Iasos et de Bargylia*, BCH 13, 1889, 23–40 no. 1 (I. Iasos 35 and 76). The date of the first decree depends on the identity of Olympichos and (if it is the dynast) the length of his career. The second decree was cut in a different year, but how much later than the first cannot be precisely fixed: C. CROWTHER, *Iasos in the Second Century B.C. III: Foreign Judges from Priene*, BICS 40, 1995, forthcoming suggests that a context for the alliance between Rhodes and Iasos may be provided by the aftermath of the Iasians' dispute with Olympichos concerning Podilos. This being the case, «one of the new ally's first services may have been to send the judges whose mission is recorded in I. Iasos 76.» CRAMPA 1. 87 n. 7 tentatively suggests that the Glaukos who was sent as ambassador to Rhodes (GIBM 441 ~ I. Iasos 150 l. 13) is the same man as Glaukos Skylakos, *epistates* in I. Iasos 76, ll. 3 and 7.

sive in this movement.²¹ The new position of the Podilos decrees in the history of relations between Rhodes and Philip V must now provide the basis for future investigation of the history of Rhodian foreign-policy in the last quarter of the third century.²²

Department of Coins and Medals
British Museum
GB-London, WC 1B 3DG

²¹ Cf. J.T.MA, P.S.DEROW and A.R.MEADOWS, RC 38 (Amyzon) Reconsidered, ZPE 109, 1995, 78.

²² It is a pleasure here to thank the following for their comments on earlier draughts of this paper: RICHARD ASHTON, CHARLES CROWTHER, PETER DEROW, Professor CHRISTIAN HABICHT, JOHN MA and ELLEN RICE. Remaining errors are my own.

