

DOV GERA

PHILONIDES THE EPICUREAN AT COURT: EARLY CONNECTIONS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 125 (1999) 77–83

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

PHILONIDES THE EPICUREAN AT COURT: EARLY CONNECTIONS*

P. Herc. 1044 was first published at the turn of this century by W. Crönert, and has since been republished with extensive new readings and commentary.¹ Although very fragmentary, it is a major source for the life of the mathematician and Epicurean philosopher Philonides. Information gleaned from this papyrus and from three inscriptions which relate to the Epicurean and to members of his family has helped to establish his descent and background. Philonides was the eldest son of a respected citizen of Laodiceia-on-Sea in Syria, who was affiliated to the Seleucid court. Both father and son shared the same name and the son had a brother named Dicaearchus.²

Significant improvements in reading and restoration of the papyrus can still be made, e.g. recently Habicht has supplemented the name of Menochares, the *epistolagraphos* of Demetrius I in lines 2–3 of fr. 10.³ Of special interest to us is the approximate date in which the Epicurean, following in his father's footsteps, joined the Seleucid court. The papyrus specifically names Antiochus IV Epiphanes (fr. 30) and his nephew Demetrius I Soter (frs. 10, 27), and it is clear that Philonides was a contemporary of both kings.⁴ The epigraphic material is in general agreement with this. Dicaearchus, Philonides' brother, was honored by the Delphians for his help to Delphian theoroi who sought an interview with a 'King Antiochus' in Syria. The Delphian decree probably dates to 168/7,⁵ and if this is so, 'King Antiochus' must be Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁶ Dicaearchus and his brother Philonides, sons of Philonides, appear in a list of theorodokoi from Delphi. Various parts of this list have been inscribed at different times, but the names of the two brothers would have been inserted only after it was decided to confer upon Dicaearchus the honor of theorodokos, and therefore not earlier than 168.⁷ A third inscription comes from Athens and honors a man named Philonides for his benefactions [τοῖς ἀποστελλομένοις π]αρὰ τοῦ δῆμου πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς πρεσβευταῖς], and confers upon him and his two sons Philonides and Dicaearchus various signs of distinction. Philonides the son must be our Epicurean philosopher.⁸ Since

* Earlier drafts of this paper were read by Dirk Obbink, John Ma and Christian Habicht. I am grateful to all three scholars for their contribution towards its improvement, and would like to express my special gratitude to Dr. Obbink who has encouraged me from the start. However, the sole responsibility for the views expressed here rests with me.

The following abbreviations will be used here: Crönert 1900 = W. Crönert, Der Epikureer Philonides, *SB. Berl. Akad.*, 1900 (2), 942–59; Crönert 1907 = W. Crönert, Die Epikureer in Syrien, *JÖAI* 10 (1907), 145–52; Gallo = I. Gallo, Vita di Filone epicureo (*PHerc.* 1044), in id., *Frammenti biografici da papiri*, II, Rome 1980, 21–166; Habicht = Chr. Habicht, Zur Vita des Epikureers Philonides (*PHerc.* 1044), *ZPE* 74 (1988), 211–14; Philippson = R. Philippson, Philonides (no. 5), *RE* XX/1 (1941), 63–73.

¹ Crönert 1900; Gallo.

² See U. Köhler, Ein Nachtrag zum Lebenslauf des Epikureers Philonides, *SB. Berl. Akad.*, 1900 (2), 999–1001, who was first to assemble the epigraphic evidence on Philonides; Philippson 64. It should be noted that the latter's discussion is marred by the tendency to offer new readings of *P. Herc.* 1044 which do not rely on autopsy or the aid of photographs, and also ignore those offered by Crönert. Cf. Gallo 31–32. For examples of this, see below nn. 21, 27.

³ Habicht 214.

⁴ See Gallo 35–36 where he also claims that Antiochus IV is mentioned in fr. 9. However, in his discussion of this fragment on p. 117, Gallo apparently rejects such an identification. See below n. 27.

⁵ OGIS 241. The date of the inscription is based on the name of the archon, rendered by Cyriac of Ancona as ΕΛΕΩΝ. This is thought to refer to the archon Κλέων(ος) of 168/7 rather than (Ξέν)ων of 189/8. Some doubts as to the true date must remain. Cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, II, Oxford 1972, 601–2 n. 320.

⁶ Köhler (above, n. 2), 1000; O. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria*, Copenhagen 1966, 61.

⁷ A. Plassart, Inscriptions de Delphes: La liste des théorodoques, *BCH* 45 (1921), 24, col. IV ll. 78–80. For the nature of the list see Plassart's discussion on pp. 39–41. Cf. G. Daux, Listes delphiques de théarodoques, *REG* 62 (1949), 21–27; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1950, no. 127.

⁸ *IG* II² 1236, with [ἀποστελλομένοις] suggested by L. Robert, Décret d'Athènes pour un officier d'Antiochos Épiphane, *Hellenica* 11–12 (1960), 109 n. 3.

the Athenians conferred honors upon the sons on account of their father's services, these sons must have been quite young at the time. Consequently this inscription seems to be of an earlier date. The reference to the 'kings' probably predates the time Antiochus IV became king in 175, and alludes to Antiochus III (223–187) and one or two of his older sons, the co-regent Antiochus (209–193) and/or Seleucus. The latter became co-regent in 189, and after two years time, succeeded his father on the throne as Seleucus IV (187–175).⁹

The evidence so far discussed is consistent with the assumption that Philonides began his career at the Seleucid court at the time of Antiochus IV, although the Athenian inscription allows the possibility of an earlier start. Of more significance is the fact that *P. Herc.* 1044 twice mentions the name Heliodorus, first as a recipient of a letter concerning Philonides and his brother Dicaearchus (fr. 21), and then as being involved in the mobilization of mercenaries (fr. 28). Since the chief minister of Seleucus IV was named Heliodorus,¹⁰ it is only natural to identify the Heliodorus of the papyrus with Heliodorus the minister. Crönert who in his original publication of the papyrus confessed his bewilderment about the identity of Heliodorus, later accepted a suggestion of Wilamowitz, and identified the Heliodorus in *P. Herc.* 1044 with the chief minister of the Seleucid king.¹¹ We further know that the Seleucid courtier, Heliodorus, is reputed to have murdered Seleucus IV because he wished to appropriate the kingdom for himself by force. The plan was foiled by Eumenes of Pergamum and his brother Attalus who drove Heliodorus out of office and handed over the government to Antiochus IV, the brother of the dead king.¹² After the coronation of Antiochus IV in 175, nothing is heard of Heliodorus. The fact that Antiochus IV became king as a result of a power struggle with Heliodorus, seems to exclude the possibility that the former minister would have wanted, or was allowed, to return to the Seleucid court. Hence, the mention of Heliodorus in the papyrus favors dating the beginning of Philonides' involvement in the Seleucid court to an earlier date, in the reign of Seleucus IV. Nonetheless, Crönert insisted that no proof existed of such a connection between the Epicurean and Seleucus IV. He suggested that Heliodorus was expelled in 175, but was later pardoned for his crimes and allowed to return to the Seleucid kingdom. To buttress this claim Crönert further suggested that an episode concerning Antiochus IV which Athenaeus quotes from a writer named Heliodorus, was penned by Seleucus' former minister, who became a writer upon his return from exile.¹³ However, Heliodorus the author should not be confused with the minister.¹⁴ Thus the possibility exists, that Philonides was already active in the Seleucid court during the reign of Seleucus IV.¹⁵ Yet Crönert's opposition to an earlier connection of Philonides with the Seleucid court has been strongly supported by Gallo.¹⁶ The fact that both editors of *P. Herc.* 1044 adhered to a view which denies any ties of Philonides with the Seleucid court before 175, has obfuscated arguments to the contrary which have been raised so far. A fresh look at the papyrus may help solve the chronological problem.

⁹ The letter forms of the inscription support this date. Köhler (above, n. 2), 999, dates the inscription to *ca.* 200–170 B.C.E. Similarly, S. V. Tracy, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, Berkeley 1990, 95, who dates it to 185 B.C.E. or later. Cf. Chr. Habicht, *Athen und die Seleukiden*, *Chiron* 19 (1989), 18 (*Athen in hellenistischer Zeit*, München 1994, 175). Thus, Gallo 39, who identifies the 'kings' as Antiochus IV and Demetrius, ignores both content and form.

¹⁰ For Heliodorus' connections with the king, see *IG XI/4* 1112–1113 and 1114 (*OGIS* 247); 2 Macc. 3.7 and 37–38.

¹¹ Crönert 1900, 956; Crönert 1907, 148. Philippson 66 and 73, accepts the identification of Heliodorus in fr. 28 with Seleucus' minister but distinguishes him, without giving any reason, from the Heliodorus mentioned in fr. 21.

¹² Appian, *Syr.* 45: . . . ὁ μὲν Σέλευκος ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς Ἡλιοδόρου τινὸς τῶν περὶ τὴν αὐλὴν ἀποθνήσκει, τὸν δ' Ἡλιόδωρον Εύμενης καὶ Ἀτταλος ἐξ τὴν ἀρχὴν βιαζόμενον ἐκβάλλουσι, καὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον ἐξ αὐτὴν κατάγουσιν . . . For these events, see below.

¹³ Crönert 1907, 148–49. Heliodorus on Antiochus: Athenaeus 2.45c = Heliodorus, *FGH* 373 F 8.

¹⁴ F. Jacoby, *Heliodorus* (no. 11), *RE VIII/1* (1912), 16, and more decisively in his notes on *FGH* 373 F 8.

¹⁵ See W. Otto, *Heliodorus* (no. 6), *RE VIII/1* (1912), 13; Philippson 66.

¹⁶ Gallo 153–54.

II

P. Herc. 1044 frs. 28–29 (Gallo):¹⁷

28 --- --- --- --- ---

5] ἰατρικῶ[ν
--- --- --- --- ---
18]ατ[]αρι
--- --- --- --- ---
20 ε[]εκ[
[]ε[.]ω[]αι[
[]των ισπ[
νε[]ασ[]τε[.]ος φιλο-
[]τορα[
25 αγύτοῦ Ἡλιόδωρον ἀποξε-
[νο]λογήσαντα καὶ συναπά[[ραντα

29 []εχω π['Αν]-

τιφάνη[ς βασι]λέα Φιλωγί-
25 δου γράψαντος ἐν οῖς πα-
ρεθέμεθα πρότερον ὑπὸ ||

28 l. 24f. τὸν συνέκδη]μον | αὐτοῦ κτλ. Crönert 1907, 148 n. 21. τὸν διοικήτην] | αὐτοῦ κτλ. Philippson 66.

In fr. 29 the word [βασι]λέα is flanked by the names of Antiphanes and Philonides. The king is not mentioned by name, presumably because he was already named earlier in this section of the papyrus (either in fr. 29 or in the preceding one). Turning to fr. 28, we see that the name Heliodorus is mentioned in connection with another person. That other person was assumed to be Philonides.¹⁸ However we can easily restore Seleucus IV's epithet in ll. 23–24, Φιλο|[πά]τορα.¹⁹ Thus the person connected with Heliodorus in fr. 28 is Seleucus IV. The author similarly refers to Antiochus IV by his epithet, Epiphanes (fr. 30). Since the king, Seleucus IV Philopator, is mentioned in conjunction with Heliodorus, the latter can be none other than the chief minister. We know that Heliodorus was ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων of Seleucus IV, and that his rank in court was that of ὁ σύντροφος τοῦ βασιλέως.²⁰ The first is too long for the lacuna in fr. 28, 24, but the restoration τὸν σύντροφον fits.²¹ I therefore propose the following reconstruction for lines 23–26 of fr. 28.

νε[]ασ[]τε[.]ος Φιλο-
[πά]τορα [τὸν σύντροφον]
25 αγύτοῦ Ἡλιόδωρον ἀποξε-
[νο]λογήσαντα καὶ συναπά[[ραντα

¹⁷ For this and the following fragments I supply a rudimentary *apparatus criticus* only, in as much as such readings are pertinent to my discussion and restoration. For the full *apparatus*, see Gallo.

¹⁸ Crönert 1907, 148. See however below n. 21 for Philippson's view.

¹⁹ In fr. 28, 24 Gallo allows a space of only one letter at the beginning of the line, but somewhat surprisingly, does not restore the single letter. For Seleucus IV's epithet, see F. Stähelin, Seleukos (no. 6), *RE* II A/1 (1921), 1245.

²⁰ *IG XI/4* 1112–1114. 2 Macc. 3.7, mentions only his post as chief minister.

²¹ For the earlier readings of fr. 28, 24–25, see the *apparatus criticus*. Philippson's restoration, while not in keeping with Crönert's reading, demonstrates a correct grasp of the historical situation.

Translation: (Seleucus) Philopator (heard) that his ‘foster-brother’ Heliodorus had finished mobilizing the mercenaries and was marching away with them.

P. Herc. 1044 fr. 28, refers to Seleucus IV Philopator and his minister Heliodorus in connection with the mobilization of mercenaries. The author of the papyrus says concerning this unknown chapter of Seleucid history: Φιλωνίδου γράψαντος ἐν οἷς παρεθέμεθα πρότερον (“We have quoted earlier in our writings what Philonides has written”). The Epicurean seems to function here less as a philosopher and more as a court historian. His association with Seleucus IV and Heliodorus dates the beginning of his life at court to the time of Seleucus IV Philopator, and not the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

III

P. Herc. 1044 fr. 6b (Gallo):

6 β	[]σθῆναι
	[]κενού[...
	[]ἀ]λλα ρ[...
	[]αρε[.]ιενογ
5	[]ε περιπλέκη
	[]στάντα κα[ὶ τ]ὰς
	[]γ π[ω]ς ἐκτιθέ[ναι]
	[]μνημο[σύνας]. vac.
	[”Εστιν δὴ] φανερὸν ὅτ[ι ε]-
10	[πεὶ φιλοπ]άτωρ ἦν ε[ύσε]-
	[βέσταθ' ὁ Φι]λωνίδ[ης]
-- -- -- -- --	

L. 8 [ναι μνημοσύνας Crönert 1900. L. 10 [φιλοπ]άτωρ is based on the observation of traces of a *pi* by Crönert 1900. L. 10 εν read by Crönert 1900.

According to Gallo, this fragment features two distinct concepts which are not easily associated. One is connected with the presentation of records, while the other tells of Philonides’ affectionate feelings towards his father. The interpretation of the second part of the fragment rests on another section of the papyrus where Philonides’ love for his father is mentioned.²² However, we have seen that *philopator* refers to Seleucus IV in fr. 28, and it is most likely that here too the reference is to the Seleucid king.²³ Furthermore, once we assume that the second part of fr. 6b deals with Seleucus IV and Philonides, and with the king’s favorable attitude towards the philosopher,²⁴ the connection with the first part of the fragment becomes clear. What we are told in fact is that the presentation of the μνημοσύναι demonstrates the king’s good-will towards Philonides. It would seem that the author of these records was Philonides himself. We have already seen that Philonides wrote about an affair which involved the king, his chief minister Heliodorus, and the conscription of mercenary soldiers. This incident sheds light on Philonides’ initial duties at the Seleucid court, which also included tutoring young members of the royal family (fr. 32).

In accordance with this interpretation I offer the following tentative reconstruction of fr. 6b, 10–11:

²² Fr. 3. See Gallo 105–6; Philippson 68.

²³ I would also suggest restoring Φιλο[πάτωρ] in fr. 8, 4 instead of Gallo’s φιλοπ[ατ].

²⁴ As deduced from Crönert’s reading of EY at the end of l. 10.

10 [”Εστιν δὴ] φανερὸν ὅτ[ι ἐ]-
 [πεὶ ὁ Φιλοπάτωρ ἦν ε[ν]-
 [νούστατος Φι]λωνίδ[ει]
 --- - - - -

Translation: . . . to read the memoranda publicily. It is clear that since (Seleucus) Philopator was most friendly towards Philonides . . .

IV

P. Herc. 1044 fr. 9 (Gallo):

9 --- - - - -
 []Δημ[
 [o]ν ἀπο[δ
 'Ρωμα[ί]ο[ν]ς, Ἀντιόχου [Σε]-
 λεύκου δ[. . .]θ]έλον-
 5 τος αὐτὴν ἀνάστ[α]τον
 ποιεῖν, ὑπουργ[ί]ας ἔξαισι-
 ου κα[ὶ . . .]κμ[. . .]ολη-
 --- - - - -

L. 1 . . . ΔΗΜΙ . . . Crönert 1900. L. 2]ΩΝ ἀποδ[ημ Crönert 1900. L. 3/4 Σε|λεύκου Crönert 1900.

It has been plausibly suggested that this fragment tells of the wish of a Seleucid ruler to destroy Laodiceia-on-Sea, Philonides' native city. This plan to obliterate Laodiceia apparently did not materialize for we hear of an extra ordinary service (ὑπουργ[ί]ας ἔξαισι[ου]), performed no doubt by Philonides, to save his city. This episode in the city's history has been linked with what we know happened during the reign of Antiochus V Eupator, the son of Antiochus Epiphanes. At the time, a Roman embassy headed by Cn. Octavius came to Laodiceia with instructions to destroy the Seleucid navy there. The task was accomplished, but the sight of the burning ships prompted a certain native of the city by the name of Leptines to murder Cn. Octavius.²⁵ Consequently, it has been conjectured that either Antiochus V and his guardian Lysias, or else Demetrius I who escaped from Rome soon after the murder of Octavius and seized the seat of power, sought to punish the city of Laodiceia in order to appease the Roman senate. The Seleucid ruler was then convinced by Philonides to abort his plan.²⁶ There is however one detail in fr. 9 which stands in the way of any attempt to link it with the consequences of the assassination of the Roman legate. For in this section of the papyrus the urge to destroy the city (of Laodiceia) seems to be assigned to an Antiochus son of Seleucus, a name which does not fit either Antiochus Eupator or Demetrius Soter. It is, of course, possible to maintain that our author, or a later copyist, has made a mistake in the name of the Seleucid king.²⁷ However, such a

²⁵ Polyb. 31.2.11, 31.11.1; Cic. *Phil.* 9.4; Appian, *Syr.* 46; Zon. 9.25. Obsequens 15, dates the murder to 162.

²⁶ Our sources, apart from *P. Herc.* 1044, do not refer to the wish of either of these kings to destroy Laodiceia. This has been inferred from Leptines' request of Demetrius μηδὲ βουλεύεσθαι μηδὲν δυσχερές κατὰ τῶν Λαοδικέων (Polyb. 32.3.3). See Philippson 66; L. Moretti, *Epigraphica, RFIC* 93(1965), 285–86; G. Marasco, *L'uccisione del legato Gn. Ottavio e la politica romana in Siria, Prometheus* 12 (1986), 236. F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, III, Oxford 1979, 520, advises caution.

²⁷ Philippson 66 sought to overcome the problem by restoring fr. 9, 3–4 'Αντιόχου Σελεύκου <νί>δον θέλοντος κτλ. This is rightly rejected by Gallo 117. However, Gallo apparently shares Philippson's conviction that the fragment tells of

mistake seems unlikely in light of the knowledge displayed in the papyrus of matters relating to the Seleucid court.²⁸ What is more, Antiochus son of Seleucus can easily be identified with a son of Seleucus IV Philopator, who was murdered during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.²⁹ While the Greek sources which tell of his assassination do not mention that he became king, it has been established that this young son of Seleucus IV was put on the throne after the death of his father on September 3, 175 B.C.E. Coins issued at an intermediate period between the coins of Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV show the boy's portrait and the legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ. In other coins the boy-king appears alongside a grown up woman, presumably his mother, queen Laodice, who must have played a prominent role during her son's brief reign. No less important was Heliodorus, the man said to be responsible for Seleucus' assassination, who now wielded enormous powers, even though his official title, as chief minister, probably remained unaltered. The solo reign (if such it may be called) of this boy-king, Antiochus son of Seleucus, did not last long. His uncle Antiochus, who had been in Athens since 178, made his way to Syria as soon as he heard of his brother's death, and with the support of king Eumenes II he was able to install himself as king. He married Seleucus' widow and adopted her son, whom he recognized as his co-regent.³⁰ I therefore suggest that the report described in *P. Herc.* 1044, fr. 9, of a Seleucid ruler named Antiochus son of Seleucus who wishes to destroy a city, obviously Laodiceia, and is convinced not to follow through with his design because of Philonides' intercession, is to be assigned to the short period in 175 when Antiochus, the son of Seleucus IV Philopator, was sole king.³¹ Of the kings that reigned during Philonides' lifetime, his name alone fits the reading in the papyrus.

What event could have brought on a decision by the king, or rather by Heliodorus, the most powerful man in the kingdom, to have Laodiceia razed to the ground? The answer to that must be conjectural, for we possess no information on what happened in Laodiceia in 175, which may have given cause for such an extreme reaction. We know, however, that in that year, on September 3, king Seleucus IV died. His death, as we have seen, was unnatural, the result of a plot which Appian attributes to Heliodorus. The chief minister, whether implicated in the assassination or not, would have wanted to distance himself from such a charge, and the way to do so was by blaming others. I suggest that Seleucus IV was assassinated in Laodiceia-on-Sea, and that responsibility for the death of the king was assigned to its citizens. Such an hypothesis is consistent with the language of fr. 52a, which scholars have often connected with the events mentioned in fr. 9. Recently, Habicht has offered a new reading of fr. 52a, 8–10: . . . τη[. τ]ελευτ[. .] | αὐτοῦ τῆ[ς] Λαοδικείας | ἐπισταθθεύσης κ[αὶ]. Habicht's new reading, ἐπισταθθεύσης, for the text's επισταθηεύθεισης has the sense of "being billeted by troops". This is what happened to the city of Laodiceia after the death of the person mentioned in l. 8, whom Habicht thinks is the Roman ambassador Cn. Octavius.³² I wish to suggest, however, that the person whose death was followed by the stationing of troops in Laodiceia is not Octavius, but Seleucus IV.

To sum up, fr. 9 deals with the last years of Seleucus IV and then concentrates on events that followed that king's death. Fr. 9, 3 mentions the Romans, and this has been taken as supporting

Antiochus V. He further states that in the period under discussion there was no king by the name of Antiochus whose father was named Seleucus.

²⁸ In addition to the discussion above, see Habicht 214.

²⁹ Diod. 30.7.2; John Antioch. fr. 58, *FHG* IV. 558.

³⁰ See O. Mørkholm, The Accession of Antiochos IV of Syria, *Amer. Numism. Soc. Museum Notes* 11 (1964), 63–76; *Antiochus IV* (above, n. 6), 36, 38–50. Cf. G. Le Rider, L'enfant-roi Antiochos et la reine Laodice, *BCH* 110 (1986), 409–17. For a recent re-statement of the cuneiform evidence concerning the young king, see G. F. Del Monte, *Testi dalla Babilonia Ellenistica*, I, Pisa – Rome 1997, 239.

³¹ The king's young age does not invalidate our argument. The initiative for the 163 campaign against the Jews is assigned to Antiochus V, then aged 10, rather than to his chief minister. See 1 Macc. 6.28 ff.; 2 Macc. 13.1 ff.; Jos. *BJ* 1.41 ff.; *Ant.* 12.366 ff.

³² Habicht 211–14.

evidence for the link between this fragment and the events following the assassination of Octavius. However l. 1 of this fragment apparently mentions Demetrius, Δημ[ήτριον]. The subsequent reference to the Romans, preceded by what seems to be the beginning of the verb ἀποδημέω, suggests that the beginning of the fragment deals with Demetrius' passage to Rome during his father's lifetime.³³ The young prince was sent to Rome as a hostage by his father Seleucus IV, to replace Seleucus' brother, the future Antiochus IV Epiphanes. This exchange occurred, as we now know, not later than 178/7 B.C.E.³⁴ The papyrus then moves on to what happened in 175, and to the dire consequences for Laodiceia, which were averted at least partly by Philonides who was able to save his city from extinction.

My proposed restoration of this fragment is as follows:

9	---	---	---	---	---
	[Δημ[ήτριον]				
	[ο]ν ἀπο[δημεῖν εἰς]				
	'Ρωμα[ί]ο[ν]ς, Ἀντιόχου [Σε]-				
	λεύκου δ[. . . θ]έλον-				
5	τος αὐτὴν ἀνάστ[α]τον				
	ποιεῖν, ὑπονργ[ί]ας ἔξαισί-				
	ον κα[ὶ . . .]κιμ . . . [.]ολη-				
	---	---	---	---	---

Translation: (After?) Demetrius went abroad to the Romans, Antiochus son of Seleucus wishing to make it (Laodiceia-on-Sea) a ruin, an extraordinary service . . .

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Dov Gera

³³ Cf. Gallo 116–17 who raises this idea, only to discard it forthwith.

³⁴ See Appian, *Syr.* 45 and 47; Polyb. 31.2.2. For the date of the exchange, see *SEG XXXII* 131, first published by S. V. Tracy, Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora: Third to First Centuries B.C., *Hesperia* 51 (1982), 60–62.