



<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

Francis Piejko

## Letter of Eumenes II to Tralles Concerning Inviolability and Tax Exemption for a Temple. After 188 B. C.

aus / from

**Chiron**

Ausgabe / Issue **18 • 1988**

Seite / Page **55–70**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1182/5549> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1988-18-p55-70-v5549.2

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](mailto:info@dainst.de) / Web: [dainst.org](http://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](mailto: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](mailto:info@dainst.de)).

FRANCIS PIEJKO

Letter of Eumenes II to Tralles Concerning Inviolability and Tax Exemption for a Temple. After 188 B.C.

Copied from an architectural block near Aydın in 1885 by M. PAPPAKONSTANTINOY. Ed. M. PAPPAKONSTANTINOY, *Ἀμάθεια*, Oct. 18–30 (1885) no. 860 (A. E. CONTOLEON, BCH 10 [1886] 515–516, no. 3). J. R. S. STERRETT, *An Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor*, Pap. Amer. School at Athens 2 (1888) 327–328, no. 382. Facsim. (C. B. WELLES, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* [1934] no. 41).

Cf. B. HAUSOULLIER, *Milet et Didymeion* (1902) 90, n. 3; 106, n. 3. M. HOLLEAUX, *REA* 5 (1903) 208–209; 18 (1916) 247 (now in *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* III [1942] 120–121). A. J. REINACH, *Rev. Arch.* 12 (1908) 385, n. 1. A. REHM, *Das Delphinion in Milet*, *Milet I*, 3 (1914) 198; 322. E. MEYER, *Die Grenzen der hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien* (1925) 127. A. H. M. JONES, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (1940) 312, n. 26. M. ROSTOVITZ, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World I* (1967) 466; 1440, n. 282. H. BENTSON, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit II* (1964) 119, n. 1, 137–138. D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor II* (1950) 922, n. 29. H. SCHMITT, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit* (1964) 245; 281. A. MASTROCINQUE, *La Caria e la Ionia meridionale in epoca ellenistica* (323–188 a. C.) (1979) 156–157. F. PIEJKO, *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 260.

[Βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης Τραλλιανῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· Ἀριστέα[ς καὶ ...]

[..... οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβεύται ἀπέδωκάν μοι τὸ ψήφισμα] α ἔγγράφετε ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱε-

[ροῦ καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγησαν ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι γεγραμμέ- νοῖς [ἀξιούν-]

[τες κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ ἔμπροσθεν βασιλευκότος Ἀντιόχου περιορισμοὺς [εἶναι]

5 [ἄσυλον τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐκ γῆς γεν[ο]μένων δεκάτην ἀ[φ]ρεῖναι]

[τῷ θεῷ. Βουλόμενος οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ] δι' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖν πάντ[α τὰ δι-]

[καὶα συνεχώρησα ὑμῖν ἄσυλον ὑπάρχειν τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Ἀ[πολλωνίαι] σὺν τοῖς [προσκό-]

[ρουσι καὶ ἀφήμι ὑμῖν τὴν προσοφειλομένην εἰς τὸ] βασιλικὸν δεκάτην  
τῶ[ν ἀπὸ]

[τῆς ἱερᾶς γῆς γενομένων προσόδων. Γέγραφα δὲ καὶ Θε]μιστοκλεῖ τῷ  
στρατηγ[ῶι ὃ-]

10 [πως μηδεὶς ἐνοχλῇ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἵνα αὐτὸς φροντίζῃ τῶν προγεγραμμένων  
κα[θάπερ ἡ-]

ξιούτε ---

*Supplevi.* L. 1. Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Σελευκῶν; Ἀριστέα[ς Παισανίου, STERRETT. βασιλεὺς ... Τραλλιανῶν (?), HAUSSOULLIER. Σελευκῶν; Ἀριστέα[ς .....], WELLES. L. 2. ΥΠΕ[ρ, facsim.; ὑπέ[ρ, STERRETT. πρεσβευταὶ τὸ τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν καὶ ὃ τι ἄλλο ἐγγράφετε ὑπέ[ρ κτλ., PAPPAKONSTANTINOU, STERRETT, HAUSSOULLIER. πρεσβευταὶ ἐνέτυχον ἡμῖν καὶ ἀπέδωκαν τὸ ψήφισμα] ὃ ἐγγράφετε ὑπέ[ρ, HOLLEAUX. οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὸ ψήφισμα] ὃ ἐγγράφετε ὑμεῖς, WELLES. L. 3. [ἀξιούν]τες, WELLES. συγγράμ[ματι, CONTOLEON, STERRETT. ψηφίσ]ματι, HOLLEAUX. διελέχθησαν μετὰ σπουδῆς ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσ]ματι γεγραμμένοις [ἀπολογισάμενοι ...., HAUSSOULLIER. L. 4. [... .. ὑπὸ βασιλέως Ἀντίο]χου περιορισμοὺς, HAUSSOULLIER. -- κατὰ τοὺς ἐπὶ Ἀντίο]χου, WELLES. L. 5. σπειρομένων, JONES. ἀ[φεῖναι?], WELLES. L. 6-7. Ἀ[πολλωνί]αι, STERRETT. [- 10 - καὶ ἡμεῖς βουλόμενοι διὰ τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ] δι' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖν πάντ[α τὰ συμ]φέροντα ὑμῖν -- 29 ---- ἐν Ἀ[πολλωνί]αι σὺν τοῖς [...], WELLES. L. 8. [--- 10 -- ἀφήκαμεν? ὑμῖν τὴν ἀποτελουμένην εἰς τὸ] βασιλικὸν δεκάτην τῶ[ν ...], WELLES. τῶ[ν σπειρομένων, JONES. L. 9. [-- 26 --- γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ through ὅπως, WELLES. L. 10. [πως -- 23 -- φροντίζῃ τῶν προγεγραμμένων κατὰ ....], WELLES.

On account of the name Ἀντίο]χου in line 4 it has been practically a unanimous assumption of scholarship that this is a Seleucid document and many specialists (e.g. HAUSSOULLIER, HOLLEAUX, WELLES, SCHMITT) take the author to be Antiochus III. For this reason many thought that the city was addressed under its name Seleucia, as it was known under Antiochus III (S. on the Maeander). I already had an opportunity to note briefly in *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 260, that this view is untenable. In my considered opinion the inscription belongs to a series of epigraphical documents, where the Attalid administration is confronting the problems of regulating the affairs of the formerly Seleucid cities and territories. After the settlement of Apamea Eumenes II and his brother Attalus, acting on the king's behalf, were obliged to make pronouncements on the status of arrangements validated, or introduced, by the now defunct Seleucid regime. This they did either on their own initiative, or more frequently in responses to individual petitions.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the Royal Correspondence here belong some misinterpreted letters, such as the nos. 47 B; 64; and probably 69. As ROBERT remarked several times, I am also convinced that no. 68 is Roman. Still «Attalus III» in W. ORTH, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (1977) 34, n. 11.

Since among the Seleucids in Asia Minor Antiochus III is by far the one best known and since he was the immediate predecessor of Eumenes II and later Attalids, to whom those cities and territories were transferred on a permanent basis, it is natural that his dispositions created the most common occasion for invocation as legal precedents. It is true that such a change in the royal rule might have also brought about considerable shifts in the political and economic conditions, but the general tendency was nevertheless to uphold the *status quo*, with some necessary modifications. Thus some consideration of the arrangements existing under previous regime presented a well-nigh unavoidable point of departure. Consequently a reference to the former conditions, even by new subjects, usually did not raise, or imply, any questions of loyalty. This was eminent-ly so in cases of ἀσυλία and ἀτέλεια for temples and with taxation in general.<sup>2</sup> Of course in cases where the older conditions had been advantageous, or tolerable, the new subjects and dependent «free» allies were anxious to maintain the familiar position, and the successor rulers, so far as they thought it practicable, recognized the prudence of accommodation in the same spirit. Here we have before our eyes just one instance of this policy of Eumenes II. At the same time, but with this fundamental adjustment, the inscription does retain some of its already claimed value as an indirect evidence for Antiochus III in Tralles.<sup>3</sup>

L. 1. We know from the express statement of Polybius 21.46.10, that Tralles (which had resisted the Romans even after the battle of Magnesia) was one of the cities assigned to Eumenes in the treaty of Apamea.<sup>4</sup> It was no doubt on that transition that it reverted to its old name, abandoning the Seleucid dynastic style. The new master was well received and accorded public honors.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> That such «titles» (genuine or spurious) could be still valid, or at least offer good grounds for pleading, even centuries after conferment, is best proved by the fact that not only grants from Hellenistic rulers, but even those by Persian kings were carefully preserved and invoked, and damaged inscriptions recopied as late as the Roman Empire. It is by means of such copies that Syll.<sup>3</sup>, 22; Welles 9 and 70 have come down to us. Cf. Tac., Ann. 3.60–63; 4.14; Suet., Claud. 25.3.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. SCHMITT, 245; 281. One also cites in this connection a fragmentary inscription from Seleucia-Tralles, first published by ΠΑΠΑΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥ, and quoted by A. REHM, *Milet I*, 3 (1914) 321. It is a decree in honor of Leonides, who had obtained from the king (most likely Antiochos III) favorable replies: ὑπογράψαι δὲ ὑπὸ τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ τ[ῆς] παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολᾶς, ἐν αἷς γράφει πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἐπιχωρῶν [τὰ ὑπὸ Λεωνίδου ἄξιωθέντα, or κομιζόμενα φιλόανδρῳπα (ΠΙΕΚΟ)] καὶ τὴν παρὰ Λεωνίδου. However, seeing that the inscription was to be deposited in the temple of Zeus, those royal benefits probably concerned the whole city, rather than one temple.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also Livy 37.45.1; 38.39.16; I Macc. 8.8 (which I emend): καὶ χώραν τὴν Ἰωνικὴν καὶ Μυσίαν καὶ Λυδίαν ἀπὸ τῶν καλλίστων χωρῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὰς παρ' αὐτοῦ (scil. τοῦ Ἀντιόχου) ἔδωκαν πάσας Εὐμένει τῷ βασιλεῖ.

<sup>5</sup> The local Zeus Larasios is said to have received an additional epithet in honor of Eumenes. Cf. L. ROBERT, *Rev. de Phil.* 8 (1934), 280 l. 29 (OMS II 1179; 1186–90): ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ]

As suggested by previous editors the first envoy may well be Aristeeas the son of Pausanias, who in 212/11 B.C. was on the embassy from Seleucia-Tralles negotiating the treaty of isopolity with Miletus.<sup>6</sup> Here we have probably a two-member embassy, identified only by their first names, or at most one composed of three short names (the common number in deputations to kings), but in the latter case without the *καὶ* connections.

L. 2. WELLES had no warrant for «correcting» PAPPAKONSTANTINOU's and STERRETT's *ὕπερ* to *ὕμεῖς*. His only reason was that he could not find enough room for the object of the preposition, which should have been phrased – he thought – somewhat like *ὕπερ τῆς ἀτελείας ὑμῶν*. For the object of embassies and written requests *ὕπερ* is very well attested, perhaps even better than *περί*.<sup>7</sup>

L. 4. It was an ill-considered assumption of previous editors and commentators, shared by WELLES, that the mention of Antiochus in this line establishes the letter to be Seleucid and suggests Antiochus III as author.<sup>8</sup> As already set forth, in consideration of legal precedents there is no interdiction, or reluctance, against mentioning (if need be) a displaced foreign ruler by name, or even by title.<sup>9</sup> I think Tralles must have obtained from Antiochus III a grant, or rather a

---

Διὸς τοῦ Λαρασίου Εὐμένου. A sumptuous palace for the Attalid kings was also constructed in Tralles, OMS II, 1188–89, n. 1.

<sup>6</sup> REHM, Milet I, 3, no. 143,6 and the commentary.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. WELLES, index; J. CRAMPA, Labraunda III, 2 (1972) no. 42,4.

<sup>8</sup> WELLES 173: «The mention of an Antiochus in l. 4 stamps the writer as a Seleucid, for kings do not ordinarily mention members of another dynasty». «The letter may be reasonably assigned to him» (i. e. to Antiochos III). But on the basis of script characters REHM, op. cit., 123, n. 1 writes «Sterrett, dessen Wiedergabe der Typen allerdinges nicht besonders genau zu sein scheint, gibt Λ Μ ΤΤ : handelte es sich nicht um einen Seleukiden, so könnte man hier-nach an noch spätere Zeit denken». The facsimile is probably more accurate than allowed, but we may be now reasonably assured that the letter is not Seleucid, which is not to say that the short time distance would not fit the types of Antiochus III equally well.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. e.g. SEG I, 366,6–7 (Ptolemaic): ἐν τῇ Ἀναϊτίδι χώραι τῇ τασσομένην τότε ὑπ' Ἀντίοχον (II) τὸν βασιλέα. Labraunda III, 1, no. 3,3–6 (Seleucid): ἀπέδειξαν ἡμῖν οἱ πρεσβευταὶ καὶ χρηματισμοὺς ἄλλους τε καὶ τὰ παρὰ Σώφρονος γραφέντα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου. Ibid., no. 5,33–36 (Philip V): καὶ Σέλευκον δὲ ἀφιέντα τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν ἀποδοῦναι ὑμῖν τὰ τε λοιπὰ χωρία τὰ προσόντα τῇ πόλει κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἶχετε. WELLES 38,4–6 (Antiochos III. Cf. Gnomon 57 [1985], 610): ὁμοίως δὲ πρόκειται ἡμῖν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν φροντίζειν [καὶ συντηρεῖν τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν, τὰ τε ἄλλα ἃ καὶ ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίου [συμμαχίᾳ] ἦν εἰθισμένα] (cf. below n. 22). P. HERRMANN, Anadolu 9 (1965), p. 34, lines 19–20 (Antiochos III): κ[αὶ] τῶν ἄλλων ὧν ἐφέρομεν συντάξωμεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀττάλῳ ὑπεδέξατο ἀπολυθῆναι ἡμᾶς. I think the second letter in WELLES 47,3–5 should be restored: καὶ ὑπάρχειν τῷ θεῷ ἀτέλειαν καὶ προβάτων [καὶ τῶν ἄλλων καθάπερ αὐτοῖς πρότερον Ἀντίοχος ἔδωκεν. Cf. «the kings» in the letter of Eumenes II to Athymbra, WELLES 64 (Gnomon 52 [1980], 260) and WELLES 261 (under Eumenes II): Ἀντιόχῳ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου [φιλάνθρωπα (PIEJKO). WELLES 69 (Eumenes II?; I modify): Ἐγὼ δὲ [θέλων φυλάσσειν τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ βασιλέων συγχωρηθέντα, αἰῶξεν τε καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν τίμια, ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς ὡς ἤξιον] τὴν [ἀτέλειαν] ---. The inscriptions of Labraunda give us several good examples of successor kings honoring the decisions of former

confirmation, of an asyilia and a tax immunity from the *decuma* on the sacred land of the god of Apollonia.<sup>10</sup> It was exactly the mission of the embassy to obtain the confirmation of this pre-existent status, which proved successful, because, as in several other cases, Eumenes was disposed (at least for the time being) to leave his predecessor's arrangements in force, as the Romans proceeded later with many Attalid institutions, when the province of Asia was organized.

This argument may be fortified by the following additional considerations. Let us suppose for a moment that the letter is Seleucid. In that case (as in any other) Antiochus of I. 4 is excluded as author and must be the reigning king's predecessor. The first Seleucid who was preceded by a king Antiochus was Antiochus II Theos, but the letter forms are quite late for him, i.e. in the direction in which palaeographic criteria have greater evidential weight than in the opposite one. Since the same may well hold true even for Seleucus II, and in the total absence of any documents from the short reign of Seleucus III, who never was able to assert himself beyond the Taurus, Antiochus III remains the only Seleucid candidate to consider. He would then have to pronounce *late* on earlier normative arrangements of Antiochus I Soter, or Antiochus II Theos, the procedure for which it would not be easy to cite any concrete parallels, contrary to what is often enough stated in modern historical works, that every new king had to confirm his *predecessor's* regulations, if they were to continue in validity.

However, since it is generally believed that Soter was the founder of Seleucia on the Maeander in Tralles,<sup>11</sup> one might well speculate that he could have had an occasion to determine the boundaries of the *asylum* and of the sacred lands in question, especially because he was the first Seleucid who took effective control of Tralles. In itself the phrase κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ τότε βασιλεύοντος Σωτῆρος Ἀντιόχου περιορισμοὺς would fit both the conjectured sense and the space very well. But on the same proposition τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀντιόχου is perhaps also not unthinkable, although by one to three letters too short and somewhat redundant. More important is the fact that there are from this period no extant royal letters in which a ruler refers to his more distant ancestors by name. All we know is that since Seleucus II the ordinary form for that purpose, from grandparents' generation (πρὸ τῶν γονέων) back, was πρόγονοι (WELLES 22: τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ πατρός), and that Antiochus III favored it exceedingly, as no other Seleucid before or after him. Consequently, it must be on this evidence conceded that the case for Antiochus III bears no comparison to

---

foreign rulers. In OGI 335, 131–143 (L. ROBERT, OMS III, 1572, improved the text in I. 141/2) when Eumenes I succeeded Seleucus II in Pitane he confirmed the possession of land sold to that city by Antiochus I. On the historical circumstances E. V. HANSEN, *The Attalids of Pergamon*<sup>2</sup> (1971) 24, n. 63.

<sup>10</sup> M. ROSTOVITZ, SEHWW I, 466; 1440, n. 282.

<sup>11</sup> So e.g. V. TSCHERIKOWER, *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Großen bis auf die Römerzeit* (1927) 28.

that for Eumenes II, who was forced by well-known historical circumstances to make this sort of pronouncements, for which we can cite other parallels from his own reign.<sup>12</sup>

For the language of general references to former kings, of the same or other royal houses, a number of examples may be adduced. The kings of old may be designated vaguely οἱ πρότερον βασιλεύσαντες, as Antiochus III does in his letter to Erythrae, the city he must have seized ca. 197 B.C.<sup>13</sup> Ptolemy II in WELLES 14 identifies Antigonos (and possibly Demetrius) as τινὲς τῶν βασιλέων. The Canopus decree for Ptolemy III (OGI 56,15) refers to famines that had occurred ἐπὶ τινῶν τῶν πρότερον βασιλευκότην, which may possibly go back even to pre-Ptolemaic rulers, but does certainly include earlier Ptolemies.

Just as Antiochus briefly reviews the situation in Erythrae (presumably reflecting the points made in the city's pleading) as it obtained under Alexander, Antigonos, his own ancestors, and probably under other rulers as well, thus Eumenes follows the same routine in his response to the Athymbrians, WELLES 64,6-8 (I revise): ἀξιούντες ἐμὲ παραπλήσιον τι συγ[χωρ]εῖν καθότι [συνεχωρήθη καὶ πρότερον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν βασιλέων τῷ ἱερῷ [τῶν παρ'] ὑμῖν Πλούτωνός τε καὶ Κόρης]. In the fragment on p. 261 his immediate predecessor Antiochus the Great is mentioned by name and epithet, but (as we may infer from the position of δέ and the possibilities of restoration) probably not by his royal title. The genitive indicates clearly that this is not Antiochus' own letter and the position before the writing of Eumenes marks it as some sort of a covering message. N.B. the remains of the datation. Therefore it is also quite possible to advocate for our rescript κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ προβασιλευκότης μεγάλου (or μεγάλου προσαγορευθέντος) Ἀντιόχου<sup>14</sup> περιορισμούς, which in either case may have been borrowed from the city representations. But, however that may be, it would not materially alter anything in the proposed attribution.

<sup>12</sup> See above n. 1. Another good example is M. SEGRE, *Clara Rhodos* 9 (1938) 190, on the financial status of Cardaces, the military settlers left by Antiochus III near Telmessus. Immediately under the letter of Eumenes II there was engraved an old decree, of which only two lines is all left. I restore: Βασιλεύοντος Ἀντιόχου, ἔτους ιθρ', μηνὸς Ὑπερβερεταίου... Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· ἔδοξε Τελλεμεσσην τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖς παροίκοις].

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Gnomon 52 (1980) 258.

<sup>14</sup> Even immediately after his defeat the title μέγας was not completely renounced by the third Antiochus himself, nor by his subjects, but was used by independent friends and foes alike. Cf. J. et L. ROBERT, *Fouilles d'Amizon en Carie* I (1983) no. 23,15 (Gnomon 57 [1985] 617); F. DURRBACH, *Choix d'inscriptions de Délos* (1922), no. 87. Our inscription may also be dated after Antiochos' death. For προβασιλευκός cf. Diod. 31.19.5: Ἀριαράθης δὲ ὁ τοῦ προβασιλευκότης υἱός. 31.27 a: Ἀντιόχου δὲ τοῦ προβασιλευκότης φίλος. 31.32 a: Ἀντιόχῳ τῷ πρότερον βασιλευκότη. 32.16: Μασσανάσσης ὁ Λιβύων βασιλευκός. 33.20: Γαλαίστης τις υἱὸς δὲ Ἀμυνάνδρου τοῦ βασιλευκότης Ἀθαμάνων. App., Syr. 1.1: Σελεύκου τοῦ μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον Ἀσίας τῆς περὶ Εὐφράτην βασιλευκότης. *Peripl. Mar. Erythr.*, 47 (K. MÜLLER, *Geogr. Gr. Min.* I, 293); ἐπίσημα τῶν μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον βασιλευκότην Ἀπολλοδότου καὶ Μενάνδρου.

I believe WELLES is again off the mark in his conjectures on the significance of the περιουρισμούς. True, the term may apply to any tracing of boundaries,<sup>15</sup> but in this case it is *not a land survey*, because that is done at the division of larger estates, transfer of ownership titles, boundary disputes, etc. This then should be *a determination of the boundaries of the asylum*. Such limits were usually marked by stones and/or natural landmarks. Many of such inscribed stones (ὄροι ἀσύλου) have come down to us, often naming the deity and including other details.<sup>16</sup> As a rule in Hellenistic monarchies the delimitation, extension, or diminishing of such boundaries was a royal prerogative.<sup>17</sup>

Cf. e.g. for Antiochus and son, J. et L. ROBERT, Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I (1983), no. 12 (Gnomon 57 [1985] 613): [Ο]ἱ βασιλεῖς [ἀ]πέδωκαν τὸ [ιε]ρὸν ἄσυλον, ὥς ἡ στήλη περιορίζει. Eumenes II, RC 64,8–14 (I revise): βουλόμενος [οὔ]ν ἐπαύξειν τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμὰς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀποδειχθέντων μοι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν θεωρῶν ἀπὸ παλαιῶν χρόνων ὑπάρχουσας τὴν ἱεσσίαν καὶ ἀτέλειαν, συνεχώρησα ὥς οἱ περιεστηλωμένοι ὄροι ὑπὸ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν βασιλέων συνεχώρησα(ν) καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα φιλάνθρωπα καὶ τείμια, ὅσα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς συνεχώρησαν, ἐπιτρέπω. An unknown Antiochus donates the village of Baetocaecae to the local god, WELLES 70,7: ἐντό[ς] ὀρίων α[ὐ]τῆς τῆς περὶ Ἀπαμίαν σατραπείας.<sup>18</sup> Ibid., line 8: κατὰ τοὺς προϋπάρχοντας περιορισμοὺς, but this particular example is somewhat ambiguous because the village had been previously held in a secular usufruct. Syll.<sup>3</sup> 550: τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος το[ῦ] Πυθαίου τὸ ἐν ταῖ Καλχαιδονίαι ἄσυλον – εἴ[μ]εν, ὧι ταῖ σταλαὶ ὀρίζοντι. 629,17: (ἀποδέχεσθαι δὲ) τὸ τέμενος τᾶς Ἀθανᾶς τᾶς Νικαφόρου τὸ ποτὶ Περγάμῳ ἄσυλον καθὼς κα ὀρίξο. 630,23–24: ἀναδεῖχθαι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Νικηφόρου τὸ πρὸς Περγάμῳ ἄσυλον εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον, καθ' ᾧ ἀφορίσῃ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης, καὶ μηθένα ἄγειν ἐκ τοῦ περιωρισμένου

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the three examples of large tracts of land alienated from the royal domain. WELLES 13,15: τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ποιήσαντες καὶ στηλώσαντες. WELLES 18: εὐθέως δὲ καὶ περιορίσαι καὶ στηλῶσαι τὴν χώραν καὶ προσαναγράψαι τὸν περιορισμὸν εἰς τὰς στήλας. Labraunda III,1, no. 8,19 (Olympichus donates land he had purchased from queen Laodice to Zeus Oso-go): κατὰ τὰς προϋπαρχούσας ὁμοურείας.

<sup>16</sup> See on this J. et L. ROBERT, Hellenica VI (1948) 34–37; Bull. Ep. 1968, 446.

<sup>17</sup> Somewhat more complicated was the matter of the so-called «international» *asylae* for famous religious centers, but with those we are not concerned here. However some of the underlying principles were not much different. Cf. WELLES 27, 10–13, where Ptolemy III recognizes the inviolability of the Asclepieum in Cos: παραδώσομεν ἄσυλον ἡγεῖσθαι τὸ ἱερὸν ὡς τοὺς ὄρους τεθεῖκατε. Among other prerequisites the limits of the asylum had to be recognized by «kings, dynasts, nations, and cities».

<sup>18</sup> I resolve for ΕΝΤΟΥΡΓΩΝΑ, or ΕΝΤΟΥΡΙΩΝΑ (haplography?), updating Berytus 30 (1982) 99, n. 7 (the unusual number of misprints stems from the external conditions in Beirut, which created difficulties with skilled staff and forced the editors to forego proofreading by contributors). Cf. I Macc. 10.89: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἀκκαρῶν καὶ πάντα τὰ ὅρια αὐτῆς εἰς κληροδοσίαν. N.T. Mark 5.17: ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν; Acts 13.5: idem; OGI 442,12–13: χωρίον Θυησσόν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐντὸς ὀρίων αὐτῶν.

τόπου. 635,5: εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἄσυλον τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πτωῖου τὸ ἐν Ἀκραϊρίοις, ὡς ἂν αἱ στήλαι ὀρίζωσι. M. TH. LINGER, C. Ord. Ptol.<sup>2</sup> (1980) 64,8–9: προσ(τε)τάχαμεν ἐπιχωρῆσαι καὶ τοῦτῳ τῷ ἱερῷ ἐγγὺς αὐτοῦ περιβόλῳ τὴν ἄσυλίαν.

L.5. The god's name is deduced from the toponym in l.7. There were great many local cults of Apollo in Asia Minor, some of them still imperfectly assimilated from the indigenous substratum to the dominant Greek culture. From an early date Zeus and Apollo were chief deities of Tralles and continued in that role under the Empire.<sup>19</sup>

Τὰ (e.g. ἐκ τῆς γῆς,<sup>20</sup> etc.) γενόμενα (or simply γενήματα), crops, profits, produce, was the universal basis of taxation (πρόσοδος, τέλος, φόρος) and the term applied most commonly to land taxes. In Hellenistic and Roman taxation a tith<sup>21</sup> for grains (γενήματα, καρποί) was the usual norm, which may be different for fruit trees, the most important of which were olives, grapevines, and figs. The term γενήματα may sometime include generically fruit trees, animal increase, and other revenues as well. Cf. Demosth. 18.145: οὔτε γὰρ ἐξήγετο τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς γιγνομένων οὐδέν, οὐτ' εἰσήγετο. Arist., Oecon. II,4: αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων (τῶν προσόδων) πρώτη μὲν καὶ κρατίστη ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐκφόριον, οἱ δὲ δεκάτην προσαγορεύουσιν), δευτέρα δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων γινομένη ---, τετάρτη δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ γῆν --- τελῶν γινομένη. W.H. BUCKLER – D.M. ROBINSON, Sardis VII,1 (1932) no.1, Col. I,12–13: τῶν ἀγγείων τῶν οἰνηρῶν καὶ τοῦ φόρου τοῦ ἀργυρικοῦ καὶ τοῦ λητουργικοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν γενομένων ἐκ τῶν κωμῶν. Ibid., no.2,16–19 (I restore in parts): διδόναι τρεῖς ἀναφορὰς ἀπὸ] πασῶν τῶν γινομένων προσόδων πα[ρ' αὐτοῖς κατ'] ἐνιαυτὸν ἀργυρίου μνᾶς εἴκοσι καὶ ἄλλως μὴ παρενοχλεῖσθαι. I Macc. 11.34 (concessions of Demetrius I to Jews): ἀντὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν, ὧν ἐλάμβανεν ὁ βασιλεὺς παρ' αὐτῶν τὸ πρότερον κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν γενημάτων τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀκροδρύων καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ἀνήκοντα ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν τῶν δεκατῶν καὶ τῶν τελῶν. Sept. Deut. 26.12: Ἐὰν δὲ συντελέσης ἀποδεκατῶσαι πᾶν τὸ ἐπιδέκατον τῶν γενημάτων τῆς γῆς σου. Jos., A. J. 12.151: καὶ ἀτελεῖς τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς καρπῶν ἀνήσεις.

L.6. The god himself is the legal person and the proprietor, the anthropomorphic fiction of which we have numerous parallels from Oriental, Greek, Roman, and even Christian, religions. WELLES 275, may be exaggerating in his assertion that concessions (*asylia*) to a god, rather than to a temple, is a sure sign of an Asiatic, non-Hellenic character of the establishment. In fact the idea of god as

<sup>19</sup> L. ROBERT, *Études anatoliennes* (1938) 420; 429; 560.

<sup>20</sup> The article for γῆ in agricultural sense, when accompanied by adjective, or proper name, may be omitted. Cf. WELLES, index; M. ROSTOWZEW, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (1910), index. Sometimes it is omitted absolutely, e.g. Arist., Oecon. II,4; 6.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. M. ROSTOWZEW, *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1902), index s.v. *decuma*. Kolonat, s.vv. γενήματα, δεκάτη. SEHWW III, s.v. δεκάτη.

beneficiary of something material or ideal, or as proprietor of real estates, dependent personnel, cattle, etc., is nearly as universal as is the phenomenon of religion itself.

«For the sake of the god as well as on your own account» is a typical expression in granting (sometimes requesting) favors, where a god is the ostensible beneficiary. Syll.<sup>3</sup> 552, Philip replies to the people of Abae, who had requested ὅπως ὑπάρχει ὑμῖν τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρας ἡ ἀτέλεια καθὰ καὶ πρότερον. καὶ διὰ τὸν θεὸν καὶ ὑμῖν βουλόμενος χαρίζεσθαι γέγραφα τῷ Ἡρακλείδῃ μὴ ἐνοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς. R. K. SHERK, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (1969), no. 38, 22: πειρασόμεθα αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ [παρ]αίτιοι τοῖς Δελφοῖς γενέσθαι διὰ τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ δι' ὑμᾶς. SHERK 44, 3–6: συγχωρῶ ὑμῖν ἔνεκεν τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ [τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐπιτηδεύματος, οὗ προεστήκατε, ὑμᾶς παντάπασιν ἀλειτουργήτους εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπιστάθμευτους καὶ ἀτελεῖς. WELLES 13, 10: καὶ διὰ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐνοίαν. WELLES 27, 5–8 (Ptolemy III to Cos): ἡμεῖς δὲ [καὶ] διὰ τὸν θεὸν καὶ διὰ [τὴν πόλιν προσδεδέγ]μεθα καθάπερ ὤεσθε δεῖν. WELLES 49, 6–7 (Eumenes II to a Carian city): πρῶτομ μὲν διὰ τὴν θεὸν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τε φιλοφρόνως διακούσαντες καὶ ἀποδεξάμενοι τὰ τε Νικηφόρια καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν ---. R. HERZOG – G. KLAFENBACH, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* (1952) no. 2, 13–16: τὴν τε θυσίαν καὶ τὴν [παν]ήγυριν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀσυλίαν δε]χόμεθα μάλιστα μὲν διὰ τὸν θεόν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ δι' ὑμᾶς. Although expressed differently Labraunda III, 1, no. 8, 16–20 still reflects the same idea of the god and the city as joint beneficiaries: βουλόμενοι ὑμῖν τε χαρίζεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐξεῖν τὰς ὑπαρχούσας ἡμῖν γέας πάσας κατὰ τὰς προὔπαρχούσας ὁμοιρίας --- ἀνατίθῃμι Διὶ Ὅσογῳ.

L. 6/7. For τὰ δίκαια in recognition of just claims and rights cf. e.g. WELLES 15, 24–26: θεωροῦ(ν)τες τούτους τε κρί[ναν]τας δικαίως καὶ αὐτοὶ βουλόμενοι μὴ λείπεσθαι ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις ---. WELLES 23, 14–15: κρίνοντες οὖν δίκαιον εἶναι μὴ ὀλιγορεῖν τῶν οὕτως ἐπιστατούντων. WELLES 35 II (I restore): [--- ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ποιεῖν πάν]τα τὰ δίκαια καὶ καλῶς ἔχοντα, καλὰ καὶ ἔνδοξα προεσηφισαμένων τῶν πόλ[εων, ἀπεδεξάμεθα, καθάπερ περιέχει τὰ ὅρια τὰ περιφορισμένα τοῖς παλ[αίων βασιλέων ὅροις. ---. SHERK 55, 10–13: πρεσβευταὶ ὑμέτεροι --- ἐμοὶ προσήλθον ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἱερῶν νόμων ἀσυλίας τε --- ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ δικαίων. Labraunda III, 1, no. 5, 45–46: ἐγεγραφεῖκε μοι ἀποκαθισ[τά]ναι (ΠΙΕJΚΟ) ὑμῖν, ὥς καὶ δίκαιον ἀξιούσιν. Fouilles d'Amyzon I, no. 13, 2–4 (Gnomon 57 [1985] 613): ἐπιχωροῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὴν προὔπαρχουσαν διάταξιν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν, καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον εἰσθισ[μέν]οι ἦτε χρῆσθαι, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑμῖν κεκυρωμένων δικαίων.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> I now wonder whether for WELLES 38, 4–6 one should not rather consider: ὁμοίως δὲ πρόκειται ἡμῖν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν φροντίζειν [καὶ συντηρεῖν τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν, τὰ τε

For συγχωρεῖν our nearest parallels are offered by the letter of Eumenes II to Athymbra, WELLES 64. Cf. also F. VON WOESS, *Das Asylwesen Ägyptens in der Ptolemäerzeit und die spätere Entwicklung* (1923) 247, ll. 18–19; ἐπιχωρήσαι ἄσυλον ὑπάρχειν τὸ διασαφούμενον ἱερόν.

L.7. Apparently influenced by STERRETT's transcription Ἀπόλλωνι αἱ L. ROBERT expressed strong doubts about the accuracy of the reading ἐν Ἀπολλωνίαι, but WELLES nevertheless retained it, and I trust for good reasons. It cannot be easily explained away even by the unsurmountable problem that the only known city of Apollonia on the Maeander was situated far away upstream from Tralles.<sup>23</sup> Certainly it was a good question whether our Apollonia is identical with that remote city. I would rather hazard a conjecture, that at the time in question the Apollonia of WELLES 41 should be a dependency of Tralles. In any case the sanctuary and the city that controlled it must have been important enough to receive this kind of attention from Antiochus III and Eumenes II, and quite possibly also from their predecessors. But had it not been for the coins we should know very little of that otherwise obscure city of Apollonia. Moreover the address Ἀπολλωνιατῶν would seem slightly too long, and considering the distance hardly any theory of a «travelling stone» can be advanced. Either it is a dependent village, or less likely, the name was not there at all.

But *audiatur et altera pars*: let us suppose that Ἀπόλλωνι αἱ is the correct reading. Attractive as it is on one side, it proves no less embarrassing on the other. In that case αἱ would be a relative pronoun, anaphoric to something mentioned above. Already WELLES thought that περιορισμοί had something to do with land surveying, which would of necessity imply that an authoritative survey left by a king Antiochus might have been questioned under a new sovereign, or fallen in abeyance under a completely new regime. Since normally there was little reason for rulers of the same dynasty to question their own ancestors' settlements of this nature, we must urge again the change of regime. Sacred γέαι, χῶραι, κῶμαι, κτήσεις, or πρόσοδοι come to mind, but *mutatis mutandis* the sense cannot be radically different, e.g.:

[..... οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ ἀπέδωκάν μοι τὸ ψηφισμ]α ὃ ἐγεγράφετε  
 ὑπὲρ τῆς [ε-]  
 [ρᾶς χώρας καὶ διελέγησαν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσ]ματι γεγραμμένοις  
 [ἀξιούσιν-]

ἄλλα ἃ καὶ ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίου [συμμαχίαι εἶχετε δίκαια. εὖ οὖν] κτλ. Cf. however Gnomon 57 (1985) 610. For ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ δίκαια see also Syll., index, s.v. δίκαιον.

<sup>23</sup> On Apollonia-Tripolis see L. et J. ROBERT, *La Carie II* (1954) 237–242; 256. L. ROBERT, *BCH* 107 (1983) 498–505. Cf. A. REHM, *Milet I*, 3, no. 74: new citizens of Miletus [Π]ασι-κράτης Παιωνίου Ἀπολλων[ι]άτης ἀπὸ Μαιάνδρου, γυνὴ τοῦτου Δημύ[λ]α Με[μ]εμάχου Τραλλιανή. If they had not first met in Miletus the relationship of Tralles to that Apollonia certainly raises questions, but unfortunately unanswerable.

[τες κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ ἔμπροσθεν βεβασιλευκότος Ἀντιόχου περιορισμοὺς  
[μένειν]  
5 [τὰς ἱεράς κώμας τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐκ γῆς γεν]ομένων δεκάτην  
ἀ[φείναι]  
[τῶι θεῷ. Βουλόμενος οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ] δι' ὑμᾶς ποιεῖν  
πάντ[ι]α τὰ δί-]  
[καὶα κρίνω πασῶν τῶν κωμῶν κτήσιν μένειν κυρίαν τῶι Ἀ]πόλλωνι, αἱ σὺν  
τοῖς [προσκού-]  
[ρουσι ἱεραὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἀφίημι ὑμῖν τὴν δεομένην εἰς τὸ] βασιλικὸν δεκάτην  
τῶ[ν κτλ.]

At first sight something in this tenor may seem no more, no less «plausible» than the reconstruction preferred and displayed above, yet I would hesitate to regard these two as equivalent. In this period one may point to many decisions on ἀσυλία and ἀτέλεια for temples, but the situation is much different with (challenging and) confirmation of their property titles. The one unequivocal example I can recall, and also concerned with taxation, comes from Apollonia Salbace under Antiochus III, who may have just effectively recovered that region of Caria. In that decree a citizen is honored for his success in pleading, not before the king, but with a royal revenue officer (ἐκλογιστής), who at the instance of a «superintendent of temples» (ὁ τεταγμένος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν) disputed the city's right to certain lands dedicated to gods, La Carie II, 166,13–32: διαμ[φι]σθη[τήσαντο]ς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν κωμῶν [Σ]αλειῶν τε ὀρειῶν καὶ Σαλειῶν τῶν πεδινῶν ἀφικόμενος παρεκάλει Δημήτριον μηθὲν τῶν προϋπαρχόντων τῶι δήμῳ κινεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτο[ῦ] πραγ[μα]τείας, ἀλλὰ ἔαν διαμένειν καθάπερ [ἔ]ως [τοῦ νῦν]. καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα πεμφθεῖσιν πρε[σ]βε[υ]ταῖς περὶ τῶν προδεδηλωμένων κωμῶν οὐ μ[ό]νον ἀκόλουθον τοῖς ἐψηφισμένοις προήκατο ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς Δημήτριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαντήσας διελέγη φιλοτιμότερον κτλ.

This passage suggests that such a weighty matter like sacred land possession (if indeed in real jeopardy) should have been spelled out in the petition (decree) and restated in the body of the decision (letter) with some attending circumstances, whereas none but a very perfunctory allusion to the background of that hypothetical controversy is possible to postulate. The necessary omission of αὐτοὶ in line 2, although admissible, is infrequent (three examples in Welles s.v. διαλέγομαι). Moreover, although grammatically and stylistically not objectionable, the relative αἱ has to be rather uncomfortably distanced from its antecedents. Certainly there is no room for any characterization of the lands in question, not even for their names, unless the reference to the earlier decision by Antiochus should be sufficient, as tacitly assumed to be known to all concerned. But that is not the legal language, without any provisions for the future and for a proof that the specified rights were maintained without interruption. Or were those details specified in the decree to be engraved along (beneath) with the letter? Or was this all

deliberately glossed over because of some embarrassment? No matter from which angle we may try to penetrate the problem, we are confronted with a rather untypical aspect. And even for an elliptic statement some precision, e.g. πασῶν τῶν κωμῶν τούτων --- αἱ --- τὸ πρότερον, ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἕως τοῦ νῦν ἱερὰ ἦσαν, would not be amiss. Cf. SHERK 1A, 6: κυριεύον[τας τῆς τε ἱερ]ᾶς χώρας --- καθὼς πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἦν. SHERK 5,8: θεραπεύειν τὸ ἱερὸν καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον. SHERK 34,17-20: διὸ καὶ διὰ τε ταῦτα καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐνοίαν --- κρίνομεν εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἱερὰν, καθὼς καὶ νῦν ἐστίν καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ ἀφορολόγητον. Sardis VII,1, no.1, Col. I,10-13: φόρος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ --- ἐκ πασῶν τῶν κωμῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν κλήρων καὶ τῶν οἰκοπέδων (their names are listed). Yet, it should be noted, that in the first and third examples from SHERK the stereotyped pronouncement on the sacred lands forms only a part of a longer formula, where asyilia, liberty and autonomy are recited by a «liberator».

Since it was not a normal policy of any dynasty actually to confiscate inherited temple properties, we are compelled, even under the here discussed assumption, to consider again the moment of transition from the Seleucid to the Attalid rule. In theory (no doubt developed from some practices) conquest creates an exceptional situation in which the entire fundamental order of life, including the rights of property, sacred and profane, is suspended and may be restored only by the conqueror's grace. Since Tralles persevered much too long in loyalty to Antiochus it may have been treated with all severity as a conquered city. It is therefore probable that after the take-over a hastily drawn decree paid homage and professed loyalty to king Eumenes, and humbly pleaded for grace and for the confirmation of old rights (privileges) existing, obtained, guaranteed, or enlarged under the departed Antiochus. In that case it would be sufficient to express the object of the petition and its granting in very general terms, for which we have also some historical analogies.

Thus for instance (if we leave apart the unlimited generalities of propaganda and diplomacy) when Antiochus III conquered Amyzon in 203 B.C. in more than one document it is attested that he conceded to the citizens all the rights they had enjoyed under Ptolemies and before. In a dedicatory inscription sacred lands were on royal authority restored to the gods: Ζεῦσις Κυνάρχου Μακεδῶν τοὺς ἀγρούς, τῶν βασιλέων κελευόντων, ἀπέδωκεν Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι.<sup>24</sup> However that does not necessarily mean that they had been literally confiscated. In the decree for Corragus it is said that at the take-over the royal representative ἡξίωσεν τὸν βασιλέα ἀποδοθῆναι τοὺς τε νόμους καὶ τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τεμένη κτλ.<sup>25</sup> Again that does not necessarily imply that the sacred

<sup>24</sup> J. et L. ROBERT, Fouilles d'Amyzon I (1983), no. 1 (p. 93). Cf. Gnomon 57 (1985) 609. See above, p. 61 (Fouilles, no. 12) for the royal demarcation of the asylum.

<sup>25</sup> HOLLEAUX, Études II 74, ll. 9-11.

precincts, by which even extensive estates could be designated, had been confiscated. It was a moment of incorporation of an unknown city to Pergamum, but significantly enough, as in Amyzon, there is no question of any «demarcations», as needed in cases of land transfer (in Tralles a threat of partial expropriation?), border disputes, or encroachments, ad e.g. between cities, *Ist. Mitt.* 36 (1986) 96, ll. 31–32: καὶ στηλὰν τινὰς κινῖν τᾶν περὶωρισμένῃαν τὸ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνατεθὲν τέμενος. 34–35: φαντὶ τοὺς ἀφωρισμένους τῶπους ἐπενβεβάσθαι καὶ στάλας] τινὰς κεκινήσθαι.

But in Tralles the sanctuary of Apollo was not the only one of some importance, why then should it thus have been singled out at the take-over? There is no hint for suspecting any exceptional reasons. Therefore, if all this reasoning is correct, we are obliged to conclude that there are serious problems with the implications of STERRETT's reading (favored by ROBERT), even if in isolation it has much to command attention. All is much simpler and familiar if we think only of a routine request and a routine confirmation of an ἀσυλία and ἀτέλεια, necessitated by the subjection of the former Seleucid city to Pergamum.

For the language one may compare RC 39: τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὸ ἐν Ἰαμυζῶνι ἄσυλον εἶναι βουλόμεθα? (FP). L. MORETTI, *Iscr. stor. ellenist.* II, no. 74, 11–12: τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Ἰωνίας τὸ ἐν Κορωνεῖαι ἄσυλον εἶναι. A. REHM, *Didyma* II (1958), no. 424, 12 (WELLES 5, 3): τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Διδύμοις. The same phrase *ibid.*, lines 28 and 41–43. I Macc. 10.43: τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις. Cf. the pertinent quotations in the commentary to our line 4 on the περιορισμοί.

The substantive participle τὰ προσκύροντα, or συγκύροντα, «appurtenances», «belongings», is used for both sacred and profane properties. Cf. WELLES 70, 7–9: σὺν τοῖς συγκύρουσι καὶ καθήκουσι πᾶσι κατὰ τοὺς προϋπάρχοντας περιορισμοὺς καὶ σὺν τοῖς τοῦ ἐνεστώτος ἔτους γενήμασιν. More on this in WELLES, p. 364. OGI 732, 8: τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Λέοντος καὶ τὰλλα τὰ προσκύροντα τῷ ἱερῷ. Bull. Ep. 1938, 550: τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ περίβολον καὶ τὰ συγκύροντα πάντα. 1954, 22: τὸ τέμενος --- καὶ τὰ προσκύροντα. U. WILCKEN, *Chrest.*, no. 59: τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὰ προσκύροντα. See also OGI, index. s.v. συγκύρω.<sup>26</sup>

L. 8–9. In this context προσόδων would mean crops, income, proceeds, revenues. I Macc. 10.43: καὶ ὅσοι --- ὀφείλων βασιλικά καὶ πᾶν πρᾶγμα ἀπολελύσθωσαν. 15.8: καὶ πᾶν ὀφείλημα βασιλικόν. Sardis VII, 1, no. 2, 21–24 (I restore): ἀπολελύσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων καὶ τοὺς φόρους τοὺς ἐπιβάλλον]τας αὐτ[ο]ῖς [ἐκ τῶν γενήμάτων κατ' ὅλου μὴ τελεῖν εἰς τὸ] βασιλι-

<sup>26</sup> Some more in Sardis VII, 1, no 1, Col. I (villages). P. HERRMANN – K. Z. POLATKAN, *Das Testament des Epikrates* (Sb. Wien 265, 1, 1969) 10, line 41: τούτου του μνημείου καὶ τῶν προσκυρούντων πάντων. AD. WILHELM, *Griechische Inschriften rechtlichen Inhalts*, Pragm. Akad. Athen., 27 (1951), 61 collects references to προσκύροντα. Cf. P. M. FRASER, *Eranos* 49 (1951), 102–108.

κόν. LE BAS – WADDINGTON, no.385 (I restore): καὶ δίδομεν ὑμῖν [ἀ]τέλειαν· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ e.g. τετάρτου ἔτους δεῖ δι[ο]ρθοῦ[σ]θ[αι] δε[κ]άτην πάντων τῶν γενημά[των] καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν γε[νο]μένων παρ' ὑμῖν e.g. κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν προσόδων? ---. C. Ord. Ptol. 14,22: ὀφείλε[ι]ν χρήματα εἰς τὸ βα[σι]λικόν. 14,29: τὸ δὲ ὀφείλημα εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν. P.C.Zen. 59638,7-8: [εἰ γάρ] μὲν οὖν μὴ προσώφειλεν εἰς τὸ βασιλικ[ὸν] ἃ δεῖ αὐτὴν διορθώσασθαι. RC 54,5-7: ἀπολυθῆναι --- ἃς προσωφείλετε δραχμὰς ἑνακισχιλίας ἐπισκευ[ῆς] ἕνεκ[ε].<sup>27</sup> 13-15: ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ φόρου κα[ὶ] τε[λέ]σ[μα]τος [δραχ]μὰς τρισχιλίας καὶ ἄλλας δραχμὰς ἑνακισχιλίας, [ἃς] προσωφείλετε ἡμῖν.

LI.9-11. M. HOLLEAUX and after him REHM, WELLES, and others, admitted a possibility that Themistocles might be identical with the Seleucid general to whom Achaeus had once entrusted the defense of Didyma Teiche and the (military?) government of the surrounding region in Mysia, and who in 218 B.C. delivered them to Attalus.<sup>28</sup> Although the above named scholars assumed that on the same occasion Themistocles also defected to Attalus (which *may be implicit* in the text of Polybius, but *is not explicit*), they nevertheless speculated that, if he is the same person, he would somehow stand here again in the Seleucid service under Antiochus III. It appears that even on their attribution of authorship the double change of allegiance was not absolutely necessary. However, judging by the careers of many mercenary commanders (cf. e.g. the defections of Ptolemaic officers in Palestine to Antiochus III, and later in Cyprus to Antiochus IV) it would be natural to suppose the same for Themistocles. Since the name is not too common (although by no means exceptional for various places and historical periods) I think chances are very good that he is the same man, especially since his career appears now less complicated and therefore more credible. Since his defection the man may have remained continuously in the Attalid service.<sup>29</sup> In 218 a commandant of a not too large district, with a garrison stationed in a subordinate fort, might have been not yet over thirty years old, and now promoted to a more important post in Tralles and possibly again in charge of some area, or a «province». At an age of about sixty, or even somewhat older, he might still be well within the normal limits of active career expected for a senior military and administrative officer, apparently one of those entrusted with the organization of the newly acquired territories.

<sup>27</sup> Since there has been voiced a good deal of perplexity on the import of this phrase (WELLES 240) it may be opportune to note that through Latin translation this simply means «war reparations». So essentially already HOLLEAUX in 1917, *Études* II, 151: «en réparation des dommages qu'ils avaient causés». Cf. Pol. 1.73.3: ἐτοιμάζοντας πλείστας χορηγίας καὶ ἐπισκευάς, «accumulating stores and provisions from exactions and forced contributions».

<sup>28</sup> Pol. 5.77.8. Cf. BENGTON, 116.

<sup>29</sup> Curiously enough HILLER VON GAERTRINGEN, who had considered for line 7 Ἀπολλωνίδι (in Lydia!) thought that in such a case the identity would have to be abandoned. Cf. on this Milet I,3, 322, n.2.

As in numerous other grants of similar character the initiative would normally come from the side *cui prodest*, i.e. from the beneficiaries. We know that some petitioners would request specifically that the king writes to such-and-such officer with an appropriate order or notification to him, that they should be quit of further demands, (παρ)ενοχλεῖν. And in case of favorable decision kings write to petitioners and concerned royal officials (often with cross references) signifying consent, or executive order, to do «just as you (they) have asked». E.g. Syll. 552: γέγρα[φ]α τῷ Ἡρακλείδῃ μὴ ἐνοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς. OGI 59: καθάπερ ἤξιουν προστετάχαμεν Διογένει τῷ διοικητῇ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς. OGI 138: [Κ]αλῶς οὖν ποιήσης συντάξας καθάπερ ἄξιουσιν, μηδέν]α ἐνοχλεῖν αὐτοὺς ---. Jos., A.J. 12.263: ἀπολύομεν αὐτοὺς τῶν αἰτιῶν, καὶ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἱερὸν, καθάπερ ἤξιώκασι, προσαγορευθήτω Διὸς Ἑλληνίου. Welles 26,21-23: παραδεχόμεθα δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν καθότι ὁ δῆμος ἤξιωσεν. Labraunda III,1, no.4,13: γράφω δὲ [πρὸς βασιλέα] Φίλιππον περὶ ἀπάντων καθότι ἤξιουσ[τε]. Syll. 611,10-11 (SHERK 38): γράψαι πρὸς Μάαρκον Φόλουιον τὸν ἡμέτερον στρατηγόν, ἵνα φροντίσῃ ὅπως ---. 695,6: περὶ τῶν προγεγραμμένων φροντίσαι. Jos., A.J. 12.153: πρόνοιαν δὲ ποιοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἔθνους κατὰ τὸ δύναντον, ὅπως ὑπὸ μηδενὸς ἐνοχλῇται. A.J. 14.230: ὑμᾶς τε βοῦλομαι φροντίσαι, ἵνα μὴ τις αὐτοὺς διενοχλῇ. 232: ἵνα --- τούτοις μηδεὶς ἐνοχλῇ. 233: ὑμᾶς οὖν θέλω φροντίσαι καὶ προνοῆσαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα. With this we may compare Bull. Ep. 1970,626 (p.359): γενέσθω οὖν ὥσπερ ἄξιοι. Ibid. (p.360): [γε]νέσθω οὖν καθάπερ ἄξιοι. Thus it would seem that the common closing formula, καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν πειράσομαι ἀγαθοῦ τινος αἷτιος ὑμῖν γενέσθαι, is quite unlikely in this position. Be that as it may, the letter is virtually complete, only Ἐρρωσθε (not always engraved) and possibly a date, might have been added to conclude it.

1106 Erie St.

Utica, N. Y. 13502

USA

