

SHEILA L. AGER

A ROYAL ARBITRATION BETWEEN KLAZOMENAI AND TEOS?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 85 (1991) 87–97

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A ROYAL ARBITRATION BETWEEN KLAZOMENAI AND TEOS?

In 1978 G. Pugliese Carratelli published a document which had been inscribed on a marble stele discovered in 1935 in the Asklepiaion on Kos.¹ The inscription, which covers both sides of the stone, gives the details of a boundary arbitration carried out on the mainland of Asia Minor by a group of Koan judges. Its date, insofar as stylistic dating can be trusted, appears to be the end of the 4th century B.C. Here are the opening lines of Pugliese Carratelli's edition of the inscription on the front of the stone:

- A [- - - - - Καρν]έωι ἐνδεκάτ[αι - - - - -]
 [τάδε διεδίκασαν οἱ δικαστ]αὶ οἱ τῶγ Κώϊων [- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]τος, Θεόφαντος ΛΑ[- - - - -]
 [- - - - -]ιφάνης Κατύρου, Ξενο[- - - - -]
 5 [- - κατὰ τοὺς νόμους] τῶμ πόλεων καὶ κατὰ τὸ διά[γραμμα]
 [τὸ Ἐντιγόνου - - -]ικου Θρακυκλεῦς Τηίου καὶ Δημ[- - -]
 [- - - - -] μὲ[ν] Ἄρτέμωνος Κλεισίππου, Μεγαθ[ύμου]
 [- - - - -] Κλα]ζομενίων δὲ Πυθέου τοῦ Ἡροκράτους [- - -]
 [- - - - -] . . . ΣΥ . οντος ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας τῆς ἀμ[φικ]-
 10 [βητουμένης - -] . . . Κλαζομενίαν εἰ[ῆ]ναι, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἀριετ[ε]-
 [ρῶι - - - -] τῶν ὄρων τῆς Κολωφονίας ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου τοῦ
 κτλ.

The judges' names are largely lost: one Theopantos apparently loaned his services, as did the son of Satyros (A, ll. 4-5). Although the state of the inscription makes it impossible to determine the exact number of judges who performed this service, they were evidently few enough to be listed by name in the space of two or three lines. We may conclude that the Koan arbitral commission was a small one, which no doubt visited the disputed territory in person in order to draw up its final judgement. Evidence from other cases of arbitration suggests that the presence of a small number of judges usually indicates an interest in obtaining a certain degree of expertise, whereas large arbitral courts, numbering in the hundreds and drawn from the citizen body at large, appealed to the principle of democratic fairness.²

¹La Parola del Passato 33 (1978) pp. 153-56; SEG XXVIII #697.

²For examples of the small tribunals which suggest a certain degree of elitism, see SIG³ #472 (3 judges), # 546B (3), #599 (5), IG IV^{2.1} #75 (6); for the large democratic courts, see SIG³ #683 (600 judges), #953

The editor's restorations are in keeping with some of the standard formulae of records of international arbitration and decrees honouring foreign judges. Pugliese Carratelli believed that the arbitration was undertaken and the final decision given in accordance with the laws of the cities involved ([κατὰ τοὺς νόμους] τῶν πόλεων). This restoration is certainly possible, but a reference to the laws of the individual cities would be unusual in the context of a boundary arbitration. Such a phrase is more to be expected in cases involving foreign judges, where individuals from another state would arrive in a city and carry out hearings in accordance with that city's laws.³ In cases of international arbitration between states, strict adherence to the individual laws of particular cities would be likely to hinder the judicial process. While references to the internal νόμοι of a city or cities do occasionally appear in documents concerning international arbitration, it is generally the case that judgements are said to be given in accord with a general idea of natural "justice" or in accord with the terms of a specific agreement between the disputants.⁴ In addition, logic suggests that an appeal to the laws of the individual cities involved would not be very likely to settle a boundary

(204), IG IV².1 #71 (151), XI #1065 (301). For an impartial survey of disputed territory by the arbitrators, see IG IV².1 #75, IX.1 #689, IX.2 add #205 II, Fouilles de Delphes III.1 #362.

³For the use of the phrase κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τῶν πόλεων/τῆς πόλεως or related phrases in inscriptions honouring foreign judges see the following examples: IG V.1 #1336, XII.2 #658, XII.3 #172; J. and L. Robert "Bulletin épigraphique" REG 1984 #268; W. Blümel, Die Inschriften von Iasos, Bonn 1985, #80 (ll. 10-12: τὰς μὲν ἐδίκασαν | [τῶν δ]ικῶν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως, τὰς δ[ὲ] | διέλυσ]σαν ἴσως καὶ συμφερόντως), #82, #607, #609; G. Petzl, Die Inschriften von Smyrna II.1, Bonn 1987, #579-#581, #583, #585; O. Kern, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, Berlin 1900, #15 (ll. 19-20: τὰς τε δίκας ἐδίκασαν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαί[ως καὶ | ἀκολού]θως τοῖς νόμοις); P. Frisch, Die Inschriften von Lampsakos, Bonn 1978, #33, #34; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, Die Inschriften von Priene, Berlin 1906, #59; R. Merkelbach, Die Inschriften von Assos, Bonn 1976, #8.

⁴So for example Fouilles de Delphes III.4.4 #354 ll. 40-41: [κα]τὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν; M. Segre, "Tituli Calymnii", Annuario 22/23 (1944/45) #79A ll. 11-14: [κατὰ τὸ | παρὰ βασιλέως Δαματρίου ποτίταγμα] τὸ Καλυμνίων [τε κ]α[ὶ] Κώϊων δάμοις ἀποσταλὲν καὶ τοὺς κοινούς λόγους τοὺς γεν[ομένους] ἐκάτέροις]; P. Herrmann, MDAI (I) 29 (1979) p. 253, B l. 30: κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας. Cf. also SIG³ #683 (a Milesian arbitration between Sparta and Messene) ll. 46-47: καθότι Λα[κεδαίμονι]οι καὶ Μεσσηνιοὶ συνωμολογήσαντο. For a similar example from a literary source, cf. Thucydides' citation of the arbitration clause in the 30 Years' Peace treaty between Athens and Sparta: τὰ δὲ διάφορα δίκη <δια>λύεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ξυνθήκην (1,78,4; L. Piccirilli, Gli arbitrati interstatali greci, Florence 1973, #21).

SIG³ #674, the record of a Roman arbitration of about 140 B.C. between the small states of Melitaia and Narthakion, states that a boundary arbitration had been carried out between these same states in the past in accordance with the laws of the Thessalians, the koinon to which both Melitaia and Narthakion belonged (l. 50: κατὰ νόμους τοὺς Θεσσαλῶν). This is not a reference to civic laws. Similarly, an arbitration between Skarphai and Thronion over the right of hieromnemonie representation to the Delphic Amphiktionie abided by the law of the umbrella organization which included both states, the Amphiktionie itself (Fouilles de Delphes III.4.1 #38 ll. 11-12: κατὰ τὸ[ν | ἀ]μφικτιονικὸν νόμον). Cf. also SIG³ #665 (an arbitration between Sparta and Megalopolis carried out by the Achaian League) ll. 14-15: ἀκόλουθ[ον τῶι ὄρ]κῳ ὃν [ὠ]μ[όσα]μεν καὶ τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς τῶν Ἀχαιῶ[ν].

dispute between them.⁵ Given that the Koan judges here settled what was beyond doubt a disagreement over borders, we might expect rather some such phrase as [κατὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν] τῶμ πόλεων.

Pugliese Carratelli also suggested that it was possible that a royal edict was the catalyst for the arbitration, restoring καὶ κατὰ τὸ διά[γραμμα | τὸ Ἀντιγόνου] or perhaps [τὸ βασιλέως Ἀντιγόνου]. The phrase τὸ διά[γραμμα | τὸ Ἀντιγόνου] is clearly largely restored, but there is some justification for its appearance in decrees describing the regulation of disputes between or within cities.⁶ Not only was the διάγραμμα a common means of royal settlement of affairs among the city-states, but there is also ample evidence for Antigonos I in particular issuing such edicts and being involved in a variety of regulatory matters relating to the cities within his realm.⁷ If a monarch was involved here, he may indeed have been Antigonos Monophthalmos as suggested by the original editor.

It was common practice for the kings to intervene in inter-city affairs. In some cases the cities would have turned to the monarch voluntarily to settle disputes, as Priene and Samos referred their border disagreement to Lysimachos around 283.⁸ In others, a king would take the first move and force his own view on the communities.⁹ Regardless of whether the city-states or the king made the first move, it was also a common practice for the king to be involved only in a general way and to delegate the minute details of an arbitration to some neutral third city. It is true that Lysimachos apparently arbitrated the Samos-Priene dispute himself, but Antigonos, when he set down his regulations for the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos, made provisions for the state of Mytilene to resolve potential problems with the

⁵Already established civic laws might be more easily incorporated into the settlement of individual suits and disputes between the citizens of different states. Cf. SIG³ #344 (Welles, Royal Correspondence, 1934, #3/4) ll. 25-26: αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτοὺς διαλυθῆναι ἢ διακριθῆναι κ[ατὰ τοὺς ἑκατέρων | νόμους καὶ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν διάγραμμα.

⁶Cf. OGIS #7 (ll. 1-2): τὸ δικαστήριον παργενόμε[νον] ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ κατὰ τὸ διάγραμμα τὸ Ἀντιγόνου (the inscription refers to the despatch of foreign judges from Magnesia to settle international disputes within Kymai); B. Helly Gonnoi II, Amsterdam 1973, #93 A (l. 10): κ[α]θάρ[ε]ρ ἐν τῷ διαγράμματι γέγρα[πται] (regulations of Philip V in an arbitration between Gonnoi and Herakleion); Inschriften von Iasos #82 (a decree of Kalymnos from the end of the fourth century, honouring foreign judges from Iasos) ll. 44-45: ἔκριναν διὰ ψήφου κατὰ τε τὸ διάγραμ[μα τοῦ] βασιλέως καὶ τοὺς νόμους. Antigonos' letter to Teos about the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos also refers to the διάγραμμα of the king, and IC III.IV #9 (ll. 107f.) may refer to a διάγραμμα of Ptolemy Philometor relating to the affairs of Itanos. See Welles, RC appendix s.v. "Διάγραμμα" (p. 324).

⁷Cf. OGIS #7; Welles #2 (Antigonos' letter to Eresos); SIG³ #344 (the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos); Inschriften von Priene #37 (SIG³ #599), an arbitration between Priene and Samos which makes a reference to the involvement at some stage in the past of an Antigonos, perhaps Monophthalmos.

⁸OGIS #13.

⁹On Antigonos forcing synoikism on the city-states within his sphere, see, in addition to the Teos-Lebedos affair, Strabo 13.1.52: εἶτ' εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν συνεπόλιε τοὺς Κηψίους Ἀντίγονος, εἶτ' ἀπέλυε Λυσιμάχος καὶ ἐπανῆλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν. R.A. Billows (Antigonos the One-Eyed and the Creation of the Hellenistic State, University of California 1990, pp. 213-15, 232) argues in favour of a less intrusive role for Antigonos vis-à-vis the affairs of the city-states.

accord. The Koans were also involved in helping to smooth the transition of Teos and Lebedos into one state.¹⁰

The first several lines of the inscription cited above establish the fact then of a boundary dispute, the presence of judges from Kos and the possible involvement of a king. They also give a list of names of individuals; one of them is a Teian, and another is from Klazomenai. The remainder of the inscription, a total of roughly 30 more lines on both the front and back of the stele, contains the final decision of the Koan judges on the specific boundaries of the disputed territory. Boundary settlements far outnumber other examples of the phenomenon of international arbitration as it existed in ancient Greece, and this delimitation is fairly typical, describing various landmarks in order to establish the new line of the frontier adjudicated by the Koans. Hills, rivers and man-made monuments are all mentioned in the process of determining the future boundary between the states.¹¹

It is in part the boundary delimitation which gives us a clue to identifying the states involved in this arbitration. There is no question of the identity of the judges, and the identity of one disputant seems clear from line 10: Κλαζομενίαν ε[ἶ]ναί.¹² But with whom did Klazomenai dispute this territory? Pugliese Carratelli thought it might be Kolophon. This suggestion derived from the appearance of a reference to "the borders of Kolophon" in the course of the Koan frontier delineation.¹³ Another look at the inscription, however, suggests a more plausible candidate for Klazomenai's rival.

It seems probable that it was not Kolophon but rather Teos who was involved in a land struggle with Klazomenai. To begin with, the general geographic distribution of the various communities argues in favour of Teos. It is much closer to Klazomenai than are either the old or new settlements of Kolophon.¹⁴ Teos, in fact, lies almost directly between Klazomenai, to the north, and Kolophon, to the southeast, beyond Lebedos. The following is what Strabo has to say about the various sites on the peninsula of Erythrai:

¹⁰Antigonos Monophthalmos was not the only Hellenistic monarch to delegate the work of arbitration to others. The publication of a *διάγραμμα*, or edict outlining general rules and procedure, followed by the delegation of the detailed task to another party was the route followed by Philip V in settling the dispute between Gonnoi and Herakleion (Helly, Gonnoi II #93). The Romans later also adopted the approach of making a general ruling and assigning the actual task of arbitration to another Greek city; cf. SIG³ #679, #683; Pausanias 7.11,4.

¹¹For good examples of border delimitations see SIG³ #826; IG IV².1 #71; Inschriften von Priene #37; and the monument discussed by P. Cabanes and J. Andréou, BCH 109 (1985) pp. 499-544.

¹²Cf. IG IV².1 #71 (the arbitration of Megara between Corinth and Epidauros) l. 7: Ἐπιδαυρίων εἶμεν τὰν χώραν.

¹³See l. 11: τῶν ὄρων τῆς Κολωφονίας, and Pugliese Carratelli p. 154 "la decisione di giudici inviati da Cos su invito di Clazomene e di un' altra città a quella limitrofa (Colofone?), tra le quali era sorta contesa circa il possesso di alcune terre." The suggestion that Kolophon was the other disputant was tentatively accepted by the editors of SEG XXVIII #697.

¹⁴On "old" and "new" Kolophon (Notion), see Bürchner RE I.XI, 1, col. 1114; C. Wehrli, Antigone et Démétrios, Geneva 1969, pp. 89f.

[After Ephesus, then] one comes to the mountain Gallesius, and to Colophon, On a straight voyage it is 70 stadia from Ephesus, but if one includes the sinuosities of the gulfs it is 120. After Colophon one comes to the mountain Coracius and to an isle sacred to Artemis, ... Then comes Lebedus, which is 120 stadia distant from Colophon.... Teos, also, is 120 stadia distant from Lebedus; and in the intervening distance there is an island Aspis, by some called Arconnesus. And Myonnesus [between Teos and Lebedos] is settled on a height that forms a peninsula. Teos is also situated on a peninsula; and it has a harbourAnd there is another harbour to the north, 30 stadia distant from the city, called Gerrhaeidae. Then one comes to Chalcideis, and to the isthmus of the Chersonesus, belonging to the Tëians and Erythraeans. Now the latter people live this side of the isthmus, but the Tëians and the Clazomenians live in the isthmus itself; for the southern side of the isthmus, I mean the Chalcideis, is occupied by Tëians, but the northern by Clazomenians, where their territory joins the Erythraean. At the beginning of the isthmus lies the place called Hypocretnus, which lies between the Erythraean territory this side the isthmus and that of the Clazomenians on the other side. Above the Chalcideis is situated a sacred precinct consecrated to Alexander son of Philip; and games, called the Alexandria, are proclaimed by the general assembly of the Ionians and are celebrated there. The passage across the isthmus from the sacred precinct of Alexander and from the Chalcideis to Hypocretnus is 50 stadia, but the voyage round by sea is more than 1000. Somewhere about the middle of the circuit is Erythrae.... Before coming to Erythrae, one comes first to a small town Erae belonging to the Tëians; and then to Corycus, a high mountain, and to a harbour at the foot of it, Casystes, and to another harbour called Erythras, and to several others in order thereafter....

[14.1, 27-32 (C642-644); H.L. Jones (Loeb) translation]

Some evidence supporting the case for Teos thus arises from general considerations of geography.¹⁵ But further evidence is to be obtained from the inscription itself. To continue the emphasis on geography for the moment, one of the distinguishing landmarks in the boundary description is described as being "in the direction of Erythrai".¹⁶ As we have seen, both Klazomenai and Teos lie between Kolophon to the east and Erythrai to the west. Klazomenai and Teos are therefore likely to have had a joint boundary which could have

¹⁵For discussions of the territory of Teos and the general region, see W. Ruge RE II.V A, 1 cols. 565f and J. and L. Robert, *Journal des Savants* 1976 pp. 167 f.

¹⁶Pugliese Carratelli B, l. 10: [τ]ῆν ἐπ' Ἐρυθρα[αί - -].

been described in this way. It is improbable, on the other hand, that Klazomenai and Kolophon would share such a landmark.

The inscription also furnishes prosopographic clues of a sort. Although none of the persons mentioned in the course of the document can be identified with previously known individuals, we are fortunate in that the inscription has preserved their ethnic connections. It has already been pointed out that the list of names in lines 6 through 8 from the front of the stone refers to at least one Teian and one Klazomenian: [- -]ικου Θρακυκλεῦς Τηίου καὶ Δημ[- | -] με[ν] Ἀρτέμωνος Κλεισίππου, Μεγαθ[ύμου] - Κλα]ζομενίων δὲ Πυθέου τοῦ Ἡροκράτους. The inscription does not tell us why these individuals are mentioned at this point, but, given that this document reports an international arbitration over boundaries, the obvious conclusion is that this list represents the individual advocates from the two states involved in the dispute.¹⁷ The presence of Klazomenian representatives is to be expected, and the simplest reason for a Teian's name appearing is that he also was representing the interests of his own state.

If the appearance of one Teian at this point is not sufficiently persuasive, we need only look further on in the inscription. In the course of the boundary description (line 11 to the end of the inscription), the property of a Teian citizen is mentioned.¹⁸ If this were indeed a boundary arbitration between Klazomenai and Kolophon, it is not impossible that one of the landmarks along their border would be the private property of a Teian. But surely the simpler explanation is that it is an arbitration between Klazomenai and Teos, and the border drawn by the Koan judges would touch on land owned in some cases by Teians, in others by Klazomenians.¹⁹

What then of the reference to "the borders of Kolophon"? If the two states involved in this dispute are Klazomenai and Teos, some explanation must be found for the appearance in line 11 of τῶν ὄρων τῆς Κολωφονίας. We are clearly already into the boundary delineation here; the full line reads [- -] τῶν ὄρων τῆς Κολωφονίας ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου τοῦ [- -]. The most obvious explanation is that the borders of Kolophon simply served the function of an extreme eastern starting point for the demarcation of territory lying between its two western neighbours, Klazomenai and Teos. It might be possible to restore [ἀπὸ] before τῶν ὄρων to indicate this. The use of the borders of a third, uninvolved community as a landmark for territorial demarcation is not unprecedented, and it provides a reasonable explanation for the appearance of Kolophon here.²⁰ We could also conclude that the boundary demarcation

¹⁷For other examples of arbitration inscriptions which provide lists of the judges and/or the advocates of either side, see SIG³ #588, #599, #674, IG IX.2 add #205, L. Robert, RPh 3.13 (1939) pp. 97-122, #1.

¹⁸A, ll. 21-23: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ χαρα[κώματος - -] ΟΛΙ . - - Ἀναξίππου Cίμωνος Τηί[ου - -] ἀπὸ δὲ τῶμ πάγων κτλ.

¹⁹Cf. A, ll. 15-16, where a comparable reference is made to property owned by a Klazomenian: [- ω]ν τῶ[ν] Θε[οδώ]ρου τοῦ Ἀντιθένου Κλαζο[μενίου].

²⁰Cf. one of the most detailed boundary delineations turned up in recent years, the agreement between Ambrakia and Charadros published by Cabanes and Andréou in BCH 109; there the boundary is drawn with

specified that the land lying to the right of a line drawn from Kolophon westwards was to belong to Klazomenai, while territory on the lefthand side would be Teian.

The results of a survey of this arbitration inscription, then, provide us with the following facts or probabilities. At the end of the fourth century B.C. the coastal states of Teos and Klazomenai were involved in a territorial rivalry over the land between them. This was a time late in the reign of Antigonos Monophthalmos, a period when we find him active in settling the affairs of the small city-states within his realm. He may well have taken a hand in the dispute between Klazomenai and Teos, perhaps by direct intervention and the issuance of a specific *διάγραμμα* intended to lay down general rules and force the two states to submit their difficulties to the Koans to settle. On the other hand, the possible reference to a *διάγραμμα* may be connected to a non-specific regulation regarding affairs in either Klazomenai or Teos or both generally, a regulation containing a provision that any potential problems be settled by arbitration. In the latter case, Antigonos' role would be less direct. In any event, the final result was an arbitration by judges from Kos, an arbitration which apparently awarded the disputed territory to Klazomenai.

The question remains, can we fit this minor incident into the general pattern of events in this region at the end of the fourth century? We have already referred to Antigonos' tendency to manipulate the affairs of the small city-states to suit his own interests of increased security and economic stability. The most famous example of this is of course the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos, initiated sometime between 306 and 302.²¹ This particular synoikism was to entail moving the people of Lebedos to Teos, a move which evidently was causing some stress both for the Teians and for the Lebedians.²² It was evidently never fully carried out, although it is impossible to say when exactly the plans collapsed or to what extent they had been implemented before their failure.²³

reference to the situation of a third community, Horraon. Similarly, Pergamene judges marked the northern limit of a mainland territory disputed by Mytilene and Pitane by referring to the borders of Atarneus (OGIS #335, l. 117).

²¹See notes 5, 6, 7 and 9 above. In 306 Antigonos adopted the royal title; in 302 he lost Teos. See Wehrli pp. 87f.

²²See Welles, *Royal Correspondence* p. 25: "The many difficulties and excuses for delay show that the measure was far from popular with either city."

²³That the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos was ultimately a failure seems clear from the fact that the two communities appear later as independent from one another. Teos was taken by Prepelaos for Lysimachos in the summer of 302; he took Kolophon at the same time, but failed to secure Klazomenai and Erythrai (Diodoros 20.107,5). This in itself does not prove that the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos was not carried out; nor is it necessarily the case that the union would have been hindered by the cities being removed from Antigonos' sphere. Nevertheless, it seems clear that the Lebedians did not in fact become Teians, as Antigonos' rulings called for, since sometime after 299 Lysimachos moved the Lebedians, who had obviously retained their ethnic, to the new site of Ephesos-Arsinoeia (Pausanias 1.9,8; 7.3,2). Whether he removed them from their old home at Lebedos, or from an as yet unintegrated position in Teos makes no difference; this was clearly the end of Antigonos' effort at synoikism of the two cities.

If we can date the arbitration between Klazomenai and Teos to a time late in Antigonos' reign, shortly before the war of 302/1, then perhaps we can connect it to the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos. The union of the two states was bound to place at least a temporary strain on their resources, and in particular it was to be the responsibility of Teos to provide land for the new immigrants.²⁴ Economic pressures such as the matter of potential food shortage aside, there was the simple issue of finding room for this new population. The synoikism regulations of Antigonos seem to envision such problems, though it may be questioned whether they also dealt with them in an effective way. Oblique references are made to the possibility that some of the population at any rate might abandon the old city of Teos and spread north and west into the peninsula, a move which would inevitably bring them in the direction of Erythrai and Klazomenai.²⁵

Such an attempt to expand could easily have involved the Teians in a quarrel with their northern neighbour Klazomenai. We may even speculate that there was an ongoing disagreement of long standing, a territorial rivalry, common enough among Greek states, which would have flared up under these new circumstances.²⁶ Both parties could then have turned to the individual who was in part responsible for this state of affairs, Antigonos. Antigonos could then have issued a *διάγραμμα* calling for an arbitration, or perhaps even referred the disputants to some unknown provision in the original *διάγραμμα* drawn up to regulate the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos.

The possible connection of the boundary dispute between Klazomenai and Teos to the attempted synoikism of Teos and Lebedos is perhaps strengthened by the appearance of the Koans as intermediaries in both issues. The Koans of course provided the judges to decide the dispute in the arbitration under discussion here, but they also played a role in the union of Teos and Lebedos. When the proposed synoikism was still under discussion, the issue of civic laws naturally came up. The new state formed by the union of the two older cities was to have a new set of laws, agreed upon by both sides, but an interim law code was necessary. The Teians were perfectly prepared to suggest that the regular Teian law code

²⁴See Welles' translation of the first letter of Antigonos to the Teians (#3): "We thought it best that a building lot [be given] to each of the [Lebedians] in your city equal to that which he leaves in Lebedus" (ll. 4-5); "[We thought] it right that a place be assigned the Lebedians where they may bury their [dead]" (ll. 17-18).

²⁵Welles # 3, l. 7: "If it is necessary to tear down the existing city"; ll. 69-72: "We think it best, if all of you remain [in the old city], that the Lebedians should be immune from the liturgies for three years. [If any of you] move into the peninsula that they also should be immune for the [same period, and that those whose] houses are not moved (torn down?) should assume the liturgies." Welles (p. 26) speculated that the question of territory may have been dealt with at greater length in the missing portion at the beginning of letter #3. Feldmann, *Analecta Epigraphica*, Strasbourg 1885, pp. 134-36, believed that the "peninsula" meant here was the small peninsula to the west of Teos, while Hicks (*Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1882, #149), citing Strabo C 644, argued that the greater Erythraian peninsula was meant.

²⁶For perennial border disputes, submitted time and again to a variety of states and individuals for arbitration, see OGIS #13, SIG³ #599, #688 (Priene and Samos); SIG³ #674 (Melitaia and NARTHAKION); SIG³ #683, Tacitus, *Annales* 4.43 (Messene and Sparta); SIG³ #826-#827 (Delphi and her neighbours).

remain in effect, but the Lebedians, understandably enough, vetoed this, and both sides agreed to request a copy of the law code of Kos for temporary use.²⁷ The extent of Koan cooperation in the synoikism was not, however, limited to providing a law code. When troubles arose over the question of compensation to the Lebedians for their lost property and homes, it was the Koans who agreed to send assessors to calculate the value of the Lebedian property and the compensation due.²⁸

So the Koans may have seemed a natural choice for the Teians and the Klazomenians to turn to, perhaps because a commission simply happened to be in the neighbourhood in a capacity as assessors or legal experts providing the law code.²⁹ Alternatively, if they had already discharged these functions to everyone's satisfaction, then their good record will have been sufficient reason to summon them again to perform a new favour. A good reputation in matters of international arbitration and diplomacy always led to further requests.³⁰

The sequence of events, then, may have been as follows. Antigonos, as part of a program of consolidating the small city-states within his realm, exemplified by his earlier transfer of the Skepsian population to Antigoneia, later Alexandria Troas, decided to bring about the synoikism of Teos and Lebedos, close neighbours on the Erythraian peninsula.³¹ This synoikism would bring with it a variety of problems, some of which were to be dealt with by reference to the city of Mytilene, others through the good offices of Kos. One problem, perhaps foreseen and provided for at the time of Antigonos' original *διόγγραμμα* for the synoikism, perhaps not, was that of the limited Teian territory. Attempts to expand brought Teos into conflict with its northern neighbour Klazomenai, a conflict which, on consultation either with Antigonos personally or of his *διόγγραμμα*, was referred to a Koan judgement. The boundary dispute with Klazomenai is one more example of the kind of problems faced in getting this synoikism underway. The letters of Antigonos to Teos deal with a variety of other difficulties. The fact that the synoikism was probably never successful should be

²⁷Welles #3, ll. 55-61: "[Until this code of] laws should have been drawn up, your envoys (i.e. the Teians) thought it best [to use the laws] of your city, [but those from] Lebedus asked permission to send for and [to use] those from some other city. [Since] we thought it fairer to send for [laws] from another city [we directed] both parties to name the city whose laws they wished to use, and as both agreed to use the laws of Cos we decided that this should be done, [and we have requested the Coans] to give you the laws to copy."

²⁸See Welles #4.

²⁹When Hermione and Epidauros were involved in difficulties around the end of the third century, they turned to a commission of Milesian judges who already happened to be at Kleitor, more or less in the neighbourhood (W. Peek, *MDAI (A)* 59 [1934] pp. 47-52 and *ASAW* 60.2 [1969] pp. 26-27).

³⁰Within a couple of decades of the Teos-Lebedos synoikism and the Klazomenai-Teos arbitration we again find a royal request for Koan legal expertise, when the Ptolemaic nesiarch Bakchon asked the Koans to despatch a judicial commission to Naxos (OGIS #43). Cf. also the international arbitration carried out by the Koans for Telos, discussed by S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, Göttingen 1978, pp. 88-89.

³¹On Antigonos and the Greek cities at this time see E. Meyer, *Die Grenzen der hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien*, Zürich/Leipzig 1926, pp. 22f; Wehrli pp. 98f., 103f; Billows pp. 205f. On the new foundation of Antigoneia, see note 9 above and Wehrli pp. 86-87.

attributed not only to the war between Antigonos and the other successors, and the loss of this region to Lysimachos, but also to the problems presented by the regulation of the synoikism itself.

In conclusion, it should be reiterated that the connection of this boundary arbitration with the Teos-Lebedos union rests on the assumption that Pugliese Carratelli's admittedly tentative identification of one of the disputants as Kolophon is mistaken. The evidence certainly points in that direction, and further suggests that the arbitration should be placed in the context of Antigonos' manipulation of the city-states of this region, a phenomenon well known from other sources. With this new inscription we can add another small piece to the mosaic of evidence for the affairs of the Asia Minor states and their relationship with the new kingdoms in this period.

University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada

Sheila L.Ager

