

J. T. MA – P. S. DEROW – A. R. MEADOWS

RC 38 (AMYZON) RECONSIDERED

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 109 (1995) 71–80

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

RC 38 (AMYZON) RECONSIDERED

I. The Authorship of RC 38

The Karian site of Amyzon has produced a wealth of Hellenistic inscriptions.¹ Among these figures a letter to the Amyzonians, now in the British Museum and first published by F. H. Marshall (*GIBM* 1035). Marshall also drew attention to the fragment copied by W. R. Hamilton at Amyzon and published by Leake (*Journal of a tour in Asia Minor* [London, 1824] 238 and footnote; also *CIG* 2899; *Amyzon* no. 11) and (mistakenly) believed that it might be part of the same document. It must be observed that Marshall reproduced the text of *CIG* 2899 for a line of this fragment: τὸ μηθενὲ ἐνοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς· ἔρρωσθε, in fact a mistake for Leake's version, καὶ μηθενὲ ἐνοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς· ἔρρωσθε. A. Wilhelm gave a new edition of the text with a commentary on the historical context, the take-over of Karia by Antiochos III in 203 B.C. ("Ein Brief Antiochos' III", *AAW*, 1920, 40-57 [*Akademie-schriften* II, 39-56]). Wilhelm's text, with its very full restorations, runs as follows:

- [Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Ἀμυζονέων τῷ δῆ]μῳ χαίρειν. Ἡμεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μὲν πάντα [διατελοῦμεν εὐεργετοῦντες ὅσοι α]ὐτοὺς πιστεύσαντες ἡμῖν ἐνεχείρισαν, τὴν πᾶσαν αὐ- [τῶν πρόνοιαν ποιούμενοι πρὸς τ]ὸ μένοντα ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἐν τῇ πάσῃ ἐνα{ν}-
- 4 [ναστρέφεσθαι εἰρήνη· ἐπειδὴ] δὲ πρόκειται ἡμῖν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν φροντίζειν [τὰ δίκαια συντηρήσομεν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν τὰ τε ἄλλα ἃ καὶ ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίου [συμμαχίᾳ ὑμῖν ὑπῆρχεν· καλῶς οὖν] ποιήσετε ὄντες εὐθυμοὶ καὶ γινόμενοι πρὸς τῷ [ἐπιμελεῖσθαι μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας] τῶν ἰδίων· διαφυλάσσουσι γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τ(ὸ)ς
- 8 [θεοὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς πίστιν, εἰκὸς π]αρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντα συγκυκατασκευ- [αθήσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς ἐπιτροπῆν? κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκοντα· γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ [τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων στρατηγοῖς? ὅ]πως ἀντιλαμβάνονται τε ὑμῶν [προθύμως καὶ μηθενὲ ἐπιτρέπωσιν ἐ]νοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς. *vac.* Ἐρρωσθε· θρ' Δα(ι)κίου ιε'.

3. Marshall in *GIBM* read δομενον τὰς ἐπὶ κτλ; the present reading is by Wilhelm and accepted by Welles and Robert. The stone only shows traces of an apex.

6. [συμμαχίαι] restored by Wilhelm. Present reading at the end of the line is a "lecture de G. Hirschfeld, préférée à celle de Marshall τ(ὸ)ς; vérifiée par Welles" (*Amyzon* p.133 n.7). The correct reading is visible on Welles' photograph, and, indeed, on the stone (though it is easy to understand how Marshall came to his reading, since there are traces above the iota which make it look like an upsilon); from a methodological point of view, it is interesting to note how *GIBM* misleadingly reproduces Marshall's reading in the authoritative form of the fac-simile).

7. The stone has ΤΥΟC.

7-8. τὴν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς πίστιν Wilhelm: Welles, in *RC*, noted that "the stock reference to the gods has here an unusual form"; indeed, it probably is not justified here (see below).

9. The spelling was corrected to ἀνήκοντα by Welles and Wilhelm, but the Roberts observed that this is rather "un vulgarisme dans la rédaction", a well attested phenomenon (*Amyzon* p.135 and n. 22).

¹ The dossier is entirely republished in J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie. Tome I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions* (Paris, 1983), hereafter referred to as *Amyzon*.

C.B. Welles (*RC* 38) expressed admiration, but also misgivings about Wilhelm’s “brilliant and conservative” restorations. Among other changes, he felt that a mention of the Amyzonian *boule* should be inserted into the first line: [Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Ἀμυζονέων τῆι βούλῃ καὶ τῷ δῆ]μωι χαίρειν (see next section); he also was far more cautious than Wilhelm in filling in the gaps. Nonetheless, there is one set of lines which Welles substantially took over from Wilhelm, lines 7-9, published in *RC* as follows:

[ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ...] τῶν ἰδίων· διαφυλάσσει γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τ(οὺ)ς
 8 [θεοὺς εὐεβειαν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς πίστιν, εἰκὸς παρ’ ἐκείνων καὶ παρ’ ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ-
 [αθήσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς ... κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκο(ν)τα· γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ.
 κτλ.

The Roberts printed Wilhelm’s text as *Amyzon* no. 9, and proposed various changes in matters of detail (pp.133-136); they, too, accepted Wilhelm’s restoration for lines 7-9, which they translated (starting with διαφυλάσσει) “for if you preserve your trust and good faith towards the gods and towards us, it is likely that from them and from us, all things pertaining to solicitude and care will be provided to you” (p.135).²

Welles sensed something odd about this sentence, and he commented (p.168): “The stock reference to the gods has here an unusual form. Like the gods, Antiochos may be expected to reward faithful service”. It is indeed odd to read Antiochos’ speaking of benefactions, not only from him, but also from the gods. What right does he have to make promises on the behalf of the gods as well as on his own? Why should Antiochos associate good faith towards the gods with trust in himself, or compare the rewards from the gods to rewards from himself? Other instances in royal correspondence of kings speaking about gods strike a different (and less hubristic) note: kings wish to honour gods, or mention their kinship with them, or manifest their piety towards them, or hope for their favour.³ A city might mention divine help for a king, as Ilion did in the context of honours for (quite probably) Antiochos I (*OGIS* 219, lines 10-11: τὸ δαίμόνιον); even this does not provide a parallel for the way which Wilhelm’s restoration makes Antiochos III speak about the gods, a casual mention that both he and the gods reward trust in them, as if both king and gods were intimately linked as recipients of human trust and as givers of rewards.

The lack of suitable parallels suggests the solution might lie elsewhere. There is nothing within the document which imposes a reference to the gods; nor is the letter necessarily by a king. In fact, a suitable category is that of letters written by a royal official, in which he refers to his royal master as well as himself, in a polar expression (“him/me”). Olympichos

² “Car si vous conservez votre confiance et votre bonne foi envers les dieux et envers nous, il est à penser que vous serez assurés par eux et par nous tout ce qui concerne sollicitude et considération”.

³ Honours: *RC* 9.7 (the wish of Seleukos I and Antiochos I to increase the honours of the gods); *RC* 31.23-24 (Antiochos III offers to help with honours to Artemis Leukophryene); *RC* 49 (Eumenes II asks for acknowledgement of honours for Athene Nikephoros); *RC* 70 (Baitokaike). Kinship: *RC* 22.5 (Seleukos II and Apollo of Didyma); *TAM* II.266 (Antiochos III and Xanthos). Piety: *RC* 27.6 (Ptolemy III acknowledges *asylia* of Koan Asklepieion for the sake of the god and of the city); general piety for τὸ θεῖον in *RC* 36.6-7 (Antiochos III praising Laodike), *RC* 44. 27 (Antiochos III), 62. 5 (Attalos II). Hoping for divine favour: *RC* 35.15 (Athamanian kings hope for favour of Dionysos in return for acknowledging *asylia*); *RC* 61.20 (Attalos II reflects that if defeated, he may yet fight back, with Roman help and divine favour); *RC* 63.3 (Orophernes promises benefactions to the Prieniens, εὖν [τ]ῆι τῶν θεῶν εὖνο[ί]α[ι]).

ended a letter to the Mylasans by writing: [καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν] πειράσομαι συνκατασκευάζειν ὑμῖν [διὰ τε τοῦ βασιλέως κ]αὶ δι' ἑμαυτοῦ ὅσα πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήκει], “I will try [in the future as well] to provide you [through the king] and through myself with all that pertains to honour and repute.” The decisive phrase, [διὰ τε τοῦ βασιλέως], is of course a restoration by L. Robert; it nonetheless is a very likely one.⁴ Another important parallel comes from Kildara, in Western Karia: Tlepolemos, a Ptolemaic high-official, writes to the Kildareis: [τά τε παρ' ἐκείνων ὑμῖν ὑπάρξει φιλόανθρωπα· ἡμεῖς δὲ ...] ροὶ ἐκόμεθα πρὸς τὸ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ὑμῶν ...] (W. Blümel, *EA* 20 [1992] 129, D 15-16). Ἐκεῖνοι in this document refers to Ptolemy III, Berenike (the wife of Antiochos II) and Berenike's son, Antiochos, the baby king at Antioch. Here, the second part of the polar expression is restored, but the restoration is guaranteed by the presence of the first part of a polar expression (παρ' ἐκείνων), followed by a sentence constructed with a first-person plural verb (ἐκόμεθα).

Neither of these parallels offers a compelling match with the text from Amyzon. What the parallels do suggest is a situation which fits the letter to the Amyzonians very well. The author of the letter must be a high-ranking Seleukid official—most probably Zeuxis, the vice-roy for trans-Tauric Asia Minor, who figures prominently in the Amyzonian evidence (*Amyzon* nos. 14, 15, 19). Zeuxis was clearly in the area at the time, more precisely at Alinda, in 202 (*Amyzon* no. 14); his own presence at Amyzon is proved by the dedication he made at the Artemision of Amyzon (*Amyzon* no. 1).⁵ Here, Zeuxis promises benefactions παρ' ἐκείνων, “from them”, i.e. “the kings”, Antiochos III and Antiochos the son; the plural form is well attested at Amyzon (*Amyzon* nos. 12.1, 14.6, 15.10, 19.9). That Zeuxis should write in the first person plural to the Amyzonians is confirmed by his letter to the citizens of Herakleia under Latmos, where Zeuxis writes “we” consistently.⁶ In the letter to the Herakleians, Zeuxis also writes “as we had recovered the city for the king”, ἀνακεκομισμένων ἡμῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὴν πόλιν (II.8-9): this offers a parallel for the Amyzonians' surrender to Zeuxis (*RC* 38.2): [ὅσοι α]ὐτοὺς πιπτεύσαντες ἡμῖν ἐνεχείρισαν.

If Zeuxis is the author of the letter to the Amyzonians, referring to the kings Antiochos III and Antiochos the son, various possibilities spring to mind for lines 7-8, for instance:

διαφυλάσσουσι γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τ(οὺ)ς
8 [βασιλεῖς πίπτειν ? ... παρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντα συνκατασκευ-
[...]

If the Amyzonians preserve their trust (or perhaps goodwill, εὐνοίαν) towards the kings, then they will receive benefactions “from them” (the kings) and “from us” (Zeuxis). One is tempted to think of τὴν εἰς τ(οὺ)ς [βασιλεῖς καὶ τὰ πράγματα εὐνοίαν]: the formula is paralleled in the letter to Herakleia (IV.12: διαφυλάσσ[οντες τὴν εἰς] τὰ πράγματα

⁴ J. Crampa, *Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches III:1. The Greek inscriptions. Part I: 1-12 (Period of Olympichus)*, (Lund, 1969) [hereafter *Labraunda* I] no. 4, lines 14-16. The restoration was proposed in *Bull.* 65, 368 and restated forcefully in *Amyzon* p.149 n. 17 (“Habicht, *Gnomon* 1972, déclarait notre restitution évidente”).

⁵ In contrast, there is no direct evidence for Antiochos III being at Amyzon or indeed in Karia.

⁶ M. Wörle, *Chiron* 18 (1988) 423-425, II.8-9. III.11, IV 2, 6, 10; cf also the letter of Zeuxis to a subordinate, *SEG* 37.1010, line 9.

εὐνοϊαν), and in a letter of Antiochos III (*RC* 44.2: τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰ πράγματα αἰρέσεως), but this might be excluded on grounds of length (see next section).

II. A Text of *RC* 38

Zeuxis, then is the author of this letter to the Amyzonians. The next question that poses itself is that of how he addressed them. There are two choices. Either he wrote simply to the Demos (so Wilhelm and J. and L. Robert), or he wrote to the Boule and Demos (so Welles). Against Welles' view that the letter ought not to have been addressed only to the Demos "without the council or the officials" (*RC* p.167) the observations of the Roberts seem telling: there is no mention of the Boule in inscriptions of Amyzon of this period, and another royal letter is addressed to the Demos alone (*Amyzon*, pp.133-134). On the other side, one might argue that Zeuxis' usage and not that of Amyzon should determine the solution. Not long after this he wrote to the Boule and Demos of Herakleia (*SEG* 37.859 B.4). But the collocation of Boule and Demos was established at Herakleia throughout the period (*SEG* 37.857 and, probably, 2.536 [cf. 37.858]). It seems far more likely that Zeuxis took care to accommodate his own usage to that of his addressees. A further point is at issue. The attribution by restoration of Boule-and-Demos to the Amyzonians involves an assertion about the level and nature of the political development of that people, about the extent to which their political institutions had taken on typical Hellenic forms. This was indeed a time of such development in the inland towns of Karia. At Euromos in the late fourth/early third century B.C. we have Ἔδοξε[ν] Ε[ὐ]ρωμεῦσιν and in the second (?) Ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Εὐρωμέων; for the late third δέ[δοχθαι τῷ δήμῳ ...] appears likely (R. M. Errington, *EA* 21 [1993], nos. 2, 7, 4 respectively). At Kildara in the later fourth century we find Ἔδοξε Κιλδαραεῦσιν, ἐκκλησίης γενομένης (L. Robert, *Hellenica* 8 [1950], 14 no. 11); in the mid-third the Ptolemaic official Tlepolemos writes to Κιλλαρέων τῷ δήμῳ (W. Blümel, *EA* 20 [1992], 127-132). At Amyzon itself from the late fourth and third century we have Ἔδοξε Ἀμυζονεῦσιν· ἐκκλησίης κυρίας γενομένης (*Amyzon* no. 2, cf. 4-6) and ἐκκλησίης κυρίας γενομένης ... δέδοχθαι τῷ δήμῳ (*Amyzon* no. 3, which should probably be placed later than nos. 4-6 on the grounds of formula; and cf. no. 36 [late third ?]). The standard formula with Boule and Demos appears first in *Amyzon* no. 22 ("Mais le temps a passé; maintenant les Romains ont remplacé Antiochos III", *Amyzon*, 202; so also nos. 24, 39, and cf. no. 35; this formula should perhaps be restored in no. 23, line 31: cf. p.134 n. 9). Nor are these the only styles from the area: for the Hyllarimeis in the early third century we find Ἔδοξεν Ὑλλαριμέ[ων τῆι] πόλει (P. Roos, *MDAI* (I), 25 [1975] 339). There is work to be done. Even more clearly there is need for considerable care in these matters. We incline strongly to believe, in view of the evidence available (not least from Amyzon itself), (a) that it would be wrong to insert a Boule into the political institutions of Amyzon at the time of Zeuxis' letter and (b) that it would be right to consider that Zeuxis and others like him were very sensitive in the way they dealt with those who were, or who were coming, under their influence.

On the basis of these considerations and what has already been said about lines 7-8, the text can begin to take shape. The size of the missing left-hand portion is fairly well fixed by line 1: not exactly, of course, because the letters are not all of a size (iotas in particular occupy but little space). Apart, however, from lines 1 and 11 and part of line 8, it seems wisest to refrain from restoration.⁷ Brief arguments will be advanced below in support of this position, but the most important general point, clear from previous treatments, is that there is little that can be restored in this text that would not entail assumptions or decisions about matters of real substance.

1	[Zeύξις Ἀμυζονέων τῶι δῆ]μοι χαίρειν. Ἡμεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μὲν πάντα
2	[c. 18 α]ὐτοὺς πιτεύσαντες ἡμῖν ἐνεχείριαν, τὴν πᾶσαν αὐ-
3	[τῶν c.14 τ]ὸ μένοντα ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἐν τῇ πάσῃ ἐναν-
4	[c.17] δὲ πρόκειται ἡμῖν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν φροντίζειν
5	[c.11 ὑπάρχο]ντα ὑμῖν τά τε ἄλλα ἃ καὶ ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίου
6	[c.15] ποήσετε ὄντες εὐθυμοὶ καὶ γινόμενοι πρὸς τῶι
7	[c.16] τῶν ἰδίων· διαφυλάσσοι γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τ(οὺ)ς
8	[βασιλεῖς πίτιν, . . . π]αρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ-
9	[c.17 κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκοτα· γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ
10	[c.18 ὅ]πως ἀντιλαμβάνονται τε ὑμῶν
11	[καὶ μηθενὶ ἐπιτρέπων ἐ]νοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς. vac. Ἔρωσθε· θρ' Δα(ι)τίου ιε'

2. Wilhelm's restorations (based on a longer line) must succeed in giving the sense. It would not be surprising to find Ἐλληνας at the start of the line (see *Amyzon* p.13), but it seems as wrong to restore it as not to restore it.

3. Again, Wilhelm has surely apprehended the sense. Some shorter variation on his αὐ- | [τῶν πρόνοιαν ποιούμενοι] would seem to be indicated.

4. No satisfactory solution presents itself. Ἐνα{ν}|[ναστρέφεσθαι] (Wilhelm, Welles) is weakened by the rarity of the word, and by the necessity of assuming that the stonemason has here either abandoned his usual manner of word-division or (the alternative of Wilhelm and Welles) inscribed a *nu* in error at the end of line 3. Ἐναν[τιωθήσεται] (Piejko) is difficult to countenance. That ἐν τῇ πάσῃ (3) is completed by εἰρήνη is attractive but must remain uncertain. The lacuna must have closed with an adverb, adverbial phrase or conjunction of no great length, to precede δέ.

5. ὑπάρχο]ντα, likely preceded by τά, seems necessary. A good deal hangs on the verb that came before: did it involve granting something or reinstating something, and what would the verb imply about the time-scale? See below.

6. συμμαχία has regularly been restored at the beginning of the line, and a reference to the status of Amyzon within Ptolemy's dominion accordingly envisaged. This is, perhaps, not possible. Such was at least the Seleucid way of referring to the Seleucid dominion: cf. *RC* 11.21-22, πρὸς ἣν ἄμ βούληται πόλιν τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρα[ι] | τε καὶ συμμαχίαι (and see *RC* pp. 66-67 and E. Bickerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* [Paris 1938] 144); *RC* 12. 9 (τῶμ πόλεων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέροι συμμαχίαι), 22-23 (πρὸς ἣν ἄμ βούληται[ι] | πόλιν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέροι συμμαχίαι). However, we do not know if this is how Zeuxis would have referred to the dominion of another king, or indeed whether he would have done so at all. It seems more likely that the reference here is to a document. Were the document a συμμαχία, or a συνθήκη, a construction involving πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον would be expected, or perhaps something analogous to what occurs in the treaty between Eupolemos and Theangela: εἶναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς Εὐπολέμοι καὶ τὰς Πευκέσται γεγεννημένας (L. Robert, *Collection Froehner* I [Paris, 1936] no. 52 [*Staatsverträge* 429], lines 13-14: see below, note 18). This last might be taken to indicate that a particular text is at issue in Zeuxis' letter too. For the document to which Zeuxis refers as being of or from Ptolemy, we would suggest ἐντολή (cf. *RC* 30, line 11, with p.331) or ἐπιτολή, with a strong preference for the former on grounds of sense and length (see below, n. 17). All this

⁷ The text was subjected to comprehensive restoration by F. Piejko, *Gnomon* 57 [1985] 610-612; cf. *SEG* 38.1049, 41.906 for reference to other and varying restorations by the same scholar.

assumes that the Ptolemy here is in fact a king (cf. n. 16 below). The lacuna must have ended with something like Wilhelm's καλῶς οὖν, or διὸ καὶ εὖ (Zeuxis to Herakleia: *SEG* 37.859, D9). This leaves little room for the verb expected after the relative pronoun ἃ in the previous line. Ὑπήρχεν has been the favoured restoration but seems too long. The same consideration militates against γράφεται, *vel. sim.*, which might be expected after ἐντολή or ἐπιτολή. ἦν (or ἔστι) could be considered, which would avoid the infelicity of τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν... ἃ καὶ ... ὑπήρχεν.

7. The sense of Wilhelm's restoration seems necessary and could be achieved by [ἐπιμελεῖσθαι ἀδεῶς], but the restoration does not impose itself.

8-9. The first word of line 8 must be βασιλεῖς (see section I above). For the next word, the sentiment the Amyzonians are invited to maintain towards the kings, πίπτειν seems preferable (cf. *Amyzon* pp.134-135), although εὖνοιον is perhaps possible. After that there are essentially two choices. One involves Wilhelm's construction with εἰκός: [εἰκός π]αρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ[αθήσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς ... κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκοτα. The other does without the nicety: [καὶ (?) π]αρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ[αθήσεται τὰ πρὸς ... κ]αὶ κτλ. There is no obvious way of deciding, unless the latter be judged marginally preferable on grounds of length. The missing abstract could be τιμὴν or δόξαν or something else again.

10. The question is about the recipients of Zeuxis' letters, which entails a further question about lines of communication and command. Anything involving τοῖς ἐπὶ ... τεταγμένοις is clearly too long for the space (such as τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τεταγμένοις, for which cf. *RC* 31.26, and see E. Bickerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* [Paris, 1938] 145), and it seems in any case at least as likely that Zeuxis would write to named individuals. There are candidates, most notably Chionis, τεταγμένος ἐπ' Ἀλίνδων and honoured by the Amyzonians for his help in their dealings with Zeuxis (*Amyzon* no. 14). Along with him there is Nikomedes, named with Chionis in the Amyzonian decree for Menestratos (*Amyzon* no. 15.11: Menestratos has written often πρὸς Νικομήδην καὶ Χίονιν τὸν ἐπ' Ἀλίνδων τεταγμένον), and himself honoured by the Amyzonians (*Amyzon* no. 15). That line 10 began with πρὸς and contained the name Chionis seems very likely, that it contained also the name Nikomedes entirely possible. One might accordingly (and on the strength of *Amyzon* 15) suggest [πρὸς Νικομήδην καὶ Χίονιν ...] (22 letters, of which four are *iotas*), but this must remain uncertain.

11. Here alone the full restoration pretty well imposes itself.

III. The Capture of Amyzon

By 15 Daisios, Year 109 SE (c. 24th May 203) Antiochos III had made the city of Amyzon subject to his authority. So much is clear from the letter of Zeuxis to the city. At whose expense, however, was this acquisition made? The first editor, F.H. Marshall, without fully comprehending the content of the letter, regarded Amyzon as being still in Ptolemaic hands at the time of its writing.⁸ In 1920 A. Wilhelm showed that Amyzon was a Seleucid possession at the time of the letter and took the stone as evidence of an early move by Antiochos III against the possessions of the young Ptolemy Epiphanes in Asia Minor. In this he was followed by Welles and the Roberts in their editions of the text.⁹

Crucial to this question are lines 5 - 6, but before we turn to consideration of their interpretation, some historical background, ancient and modern, is required. In 1969 J. Crampa published a series of documents from the sanctuary at Labraunda which proved beyond

⁸ "We can see that its tenor is a promise of assistance and protection, and the mention of the name of Ptolemy, of whose possessions Karia formed a portion, leads us to suppose that we have here a promise of support on the part of ... Antiochos III in the case of a revolt" (Marshall *ad GIBM* 1035 [p.174]). That there had been a previous period of Ptolemaic control is, of course, beyond doubt: see *Amyzon* pp.118-132.

⁹ Wilhelm, *AAW* 1920, 51 (= *Akademischeschriften* II 50); *RC* p.167, *Amyzon* p.133.

doubt that Olympichos, a local dynast whose seat was almost certainly at Alinda, was the local *strategos* first of Seleucus II and subsequently, after Antigonos Doson's Karian campaign of c. 227, both Doson and his successor Philip V.¹⁰ From these documents and two other *stelai* from Iasos it seems clear that Olympichos' sphere of influence stretched south and west from Alinda as far as Euromos, Pedasa, Labraunda, Mylasa and Iasos (the last two being free cities, through intervention of Olympichos' superiors).¹¹ But what of Amyzon itself? Topography alone suggests a strong link between Alinda and the sanctuary of Artemis.¹² Two inscriptions from the reign of Antiochos III confirm this link. The first, *Amyzon* no. 14 (Oct./Nov. 202), is a decree of Amyzon honouring Chionis, the Seleucid governor at Alinda, for his rôle in the reception of Amyzonian ambassadors to Zeuxis. The second, from the following year, *Amyzon* no. 15 (Nov./Dec. 201), honours Menestratos, *epistates* of the Artemision at Amyzon, for his rôle as intermediary between Amyzon and Zeuxis, notably in the recovery of Amyzonian παρασκευή being held at Alinda, apparently as a result of local military activity. "C' est naturel, on peut même être assuré que le roi [Antiochos] se saisit d' Alinda avant de s' en prendre à Amyzon" (*Amyzon* p.147). Once the latter had taken place, the people of Amyzon looked naturally to the governor of Alinda for restitution of property and other administrative matters. Given the proximity of these two cities to one another, and the known extent of Olympichos' territorial claims to the south and west, it seems inconceivable that the dynast of Alinda did not exercise control over Amyzon; or, if he did not, that the freedom of the sanctuary was not due to his master Philip, as was the case at Labraunda and Iasos.

Two possibilities thus present themselves. Either Amyzon had fallen back into Ptolemaic hands during a period between the fall of Olympichos and the collapse of Antigonid control in Karia, and the arrival of Zeuxis in 203; or, Amyzon was not Ptolemaic at the time of Seleucid takeover and the interpretation of lines 5 - 6 of our text must be revised accordingly.

Two imponderables hamper the first suggestion. First, we do not know the date of Olympichos' death or overthrow. It is not impossible that he was still in place in c. 203, but, while the possibility that he was somehow involved in the events of this year has been canvassed, this can only be speculation (*Labraunda* I p.96 n.44). Second, no literary or documentary sources give any hint whatsoever of Ptolemaic military activity in Karia between

¹⁰ Note especially *Labraunda* I nos. 1-3, 8-9 (reign of Seleucus II), 4-7 (reign of Philip V). On the career of Olympichos, *Labraunda* I commentary *passim* and pp.86-96 for synopsis. Crampa's conclusion that he was an independent dynast under Philip has met with little acceptance: cf. Ch. Habicht's review of Crampa, *Gnomon* 44 (1972) 162-170, 166-167, *Amyzon* pp.147-150, S. Le Bohec, *Antigone Dôsôn roi de Macédoine* (Nancy, 1993) 343-347. For Olympichos' seat at Alinda, see A. Laumonier, *BCH* 58 (1934) 291-380, no. 1, and *Amyzon* p.147.

¹¹ Iasos: cf. *GIBM* 441 ~ *I.Iasos* 150, decrees of Rhodes recording a diplomatic mission from the island pressing Olympichos to observe the freedom granted to the city by Philip V, and G. Cousin and Ch. Diehl, *BCH* 13 (1889) 23-40, no.1 (*I.Iasos* 35), a proxeny decree probably for Olympichos, probably from Iasos. For the inference of Euromos and Pedasa, *Amyzon*, p.150.

¹² *Amyzon* pp.17, 50, 137. On the route from Alinda to Amyzon, cf. L. Robert, *CRAI* 1953 6-7 (*OMS* III.1528-9) and G.E. Bean, *Turkey Beyond the Maeander*² (London 1989), 168-170.

December 220, the last dated evidence for Olympichos' command,¹³ and 203. If the assumption that Amyzon did become Ptolemaic at this period is to be maintained, then one of two reconstructions must be adopted. (1) There was an inland military offensive during the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, of which this text forms our sole evidence. The date of this would remain uncertain, but is unlikely to be during the period of the Social War in Greece, in the course of which Ptolemy sought to mediate as a neutral between Philip and the Aetolians (Plb. 5.100.9-10). (2) It was not Ptolemy who was directly responsible for the renewal of his relationship with Amyzon, but the Rhodians. Diplomatic inroads into the crumbling Antigonid province in the period between c. 220 and 203 would fit well with other Rhodian activities at the expense of Philip during this period.¹⁴ Moreover the issue of alliance with Ptolemy was certainly live in Rhodian propaganda shortly after this. A fragment of a decree from Samos makes it clear that during the period of the Rhodian-Macedonian War (c.201- 197) the island was taken from Ptolemy by Philip, only to be restored to Ptolemaic alliance by the Samians, most probably with Rhodian support.¹⁵ Firm evidence for Rhodian activity earlier than this and on the mainland against Antigonid interests is not available to support such a hypothesis, however.

Or must we revise our interpretation of lines 5 - 6? The first point to note is that there is nothing in these lines that strictly requires Ptolemy to have been the immediately preceding suzerain at Amyzon.¹⁶ Zeuxis seems to be abbreviating his own letter of arrangement with Amyzon by way of invoking the conditions of a previous arrangement with Ptolemy.¹⁷ The question which we must ask, but cannot answer, is, did Zeuxis do this because the Ptolemaic arrangement was the most recent, or because it was the most relevant, or perhaps because it was among the documents that the representatives of the city presented to Zeuxis at the time of petition? It may, for example, simply be that the arrangement that had obtained between Amyzon and, say, Olympichos, did not fit the style of administration that Zeuxis was

¹³ *Labraunda* I no. 7 (Audnaios, Year 3 of Philip V). Though *GIBM* 441 (*I.Iasos* 150), also from the period of Olympichos' service under Philip, may date as late as 214 B.C. See *Labraunda* I pp.95-96 with n.43.

¹⁴ A.R. Meadows hopes to argue this point at length elsewhere.

¹⁵ Ch. Habicht, *MDAI (A)* 72 (1957) 233-235, no. 64. For further discussion of the date and the suggestion of Rhodian aid, see G. Shipley, *A History of Samos* (Oxford, 1987) 192-194. Cf. Livy 33.20.10-13 on Rhodian concerns in 197: "Rhodii dempto metu a Philippo omiserunt consilium obviam eundi classe Antiocho; illam alteram curam non omiserunt tuendae libertatis civitatum sociarum Ptolomaei . . . causaque libertatis fuerunt Cauniis, Myndiis, Halicarnassensibus Samiisque."

¹⁶ Omitted here is the possibility that the Ptolemy referred to in line 5 is not a Lagid king at all. The lack of royal title proves nothing, since this a Seleucid document, but while individuals named Ptolemaios are known in the upper levels of both Ptolemaic and Seleucid command, none are known to have been active in Karia at this period. See, for example, M. Segre, *Clara Rhodos* 9 (1938) 181-208 for Ptolemaios Lysimachou at Telmessos at this time, and C.P. Jones and Ch. Habicht, *Phoenix* 43 (1989) 338-344 for Ptolemaios Thrasea, a Ptolemaic commander at the time of the fourth Syrian war, but Seleucid *strategos* of Coele Syria and Phoenice by c. 202 - 199 at the latest.

¹⁷ The nature of this Ptolemaic document is unfortunately unclear: see above on line 6. If ἐπιτολή is to be restored there, Ptolemy clearly wrote to the Amyzonians themselves at some point on the matter; if ἐντολή, then the document may have been a set of instructions concerning Amyzonian rights, addressed by the king to his local official, and set up on stone by the Amyzonians. For the latter, cf. *RC* 30, instructions from a Ptolemy to a local official concerning the treatment of Soloi.

imposing in Karia. We might even consider the possibility that on arriving at Amyzon and seeking precedent for any sort of arrangement, Zeuxis could find only a relevant Ptolemaic document on the archive wall.¹⁸ It should be borne in mind that we do not know whether *Amyzon* no. 9 stood alone, or was inscribed below or alongside another text, such as the Ptolemaic document referred to. Other Seleucid inscriptions are found in close proximity to Ptolemaic on the temple walls.¹⁹

If Olympichos' day had already passed, then Zeuxis' advance into the mountains of northern Karia perhaps brought direct control back to an area currently in a state of confusion. Conceivably, Zeuxis may have had to deal with some form of Karian uprising; the arrival of Seleucid troops will in any case inevitably have caused disaffection in some quarters.²⁰ Certainly his advance as far as Amyzon had not been without violence.²¹ Nonetheless, the gain would have been at the expense of the nominal Antigonid control in the Karian province that Philip would shortly prove himself ready to fight to defend. If the Roberts' dating of a text from Labraunda is correct, then these inroads in 204/3 may not have been confined to Amyzon. The inscription appears to contain instructions from Zeuxis to his soldiers telling them not to billet themselves ἐν Λαβραούνδοις μήτε ἐν τοῖ[ς ἱεροῖς] | [οἴκ]οις.²² Labraunda is on the mountain route, ancient and modern, from Alinda and the northern sections of the Latmos to Mylasa (Strabo 14.2.23 C659; on the route in modern times, see *Amyzon* pp.10-17). The sanctuary high on the mountain side overlooks the plain of Mylasa and the town itself, but half a day's march away. Zeuxis' concern for the holy buildings of Labraunda, particularly, one suspects, the capacious *andrones* which offered ready-built messes for his troops, displays a deliberate concern for the sensibilities of their

¹⁸ An interesting parallel is perhaps provided by L. Robert, *Collection Froehner* I, (Paris, 1936) no.52 (*Staatsverträge* 429) the treaty between the Macedonian Eupolemos and the Karian community of the Theangeleis. Eupolemos too shortens his arrangements with the community by reference to an earlier agreement between a Macedonian general and the community: τῶν δὲ δούλων ὅσοι μὲν ἐν εἰρήνῃ παρεγένοντο | εἶναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς Εὐπολέμοι καὶ τὰς Πευκέσται γεγενημένας (12-14). Peukestas had probably made his agreement in c. 312 as a general of Antigonos Monophthalmos, Eupolemos probably 20-30 years later (after the intervening rule of Pleistarchos) either as an appointee of Lysimachos, or as an independent dynast. On the chronology of these figures, see R.A. Billows, *Class. Ant.* 8 (1989) 173-206.

¹⁹ Cf. *Amyzon* nos. 6,7, 14 and 17 (relationship described on *Amyzon* p.127).

²⁰ On the later upsurge of Karian unity brought about by the removal of Rhodian domination, see J. and L. Robert, *Amyzon* pp. 249-250 on *Amyzon* no. 51, a *stephanephoros* list commencing [Cτ]εφανηφόροι οἱ γεγονότες ἀφ' οὗ | [Κ]ἄρες ἠλευθερώθησαν (1-2). Could the removal of direct Antigonid control over northern Karia in the last decade of the third century have led to a similar movement?

²¹ Note the mention of τὸν περιεττηκότα π[όλεμον] in the Amyzonian decree for the Seleucid governor of Alinda in Oct. / Nov. 202 (*Amyzon* no. 14, line 13), and the thanks offered to the *epistates* of the Artemision in Nov. / Dec. 201 for his efforts at recovering property plundered from the Amyzonians (*Amyzon* no. 15, lines 12-14).

²² J. Crampa, *Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches III.2. The Greek inscriptions. Part II : 13-133*, no. 46 and pp.61-62 for date and context, following the comments of J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin* 1970, 553. Cf. *Amyzon* pp.139-140.

users, the people of Mylasa. It is more than likely that at the time of *Labraunda* 46, the former Hecatomnid capital had fallen under the influence of the Seleucids.²³

Against this background arguably must now be set all future discussion of the so-called Syro-Macedonian pact between Philip V and Antiochos III. The date of our letter may still provide a *terminus post quem* for the conclusion of such a contract,²⁴ but a different light is now thrown on Philip's motive for participation, and a starker contrast placed on what Antiochos was, for the time being, prepared territorially to forgo.

Certainty on any of the matters discussed in this section is impossible on the basis of the evidence currently available. Hopefully it is now clear, however, that in some respect, the accepted picture of what happened in Karia in the last decade of the third century must change. Either our picture of the indolent Ptolemy Philopator allowing his empire to slip away must be rejected in favour of an otherwise unattested resurgence of Ptolemaic activity in Karia late in his reign. Or our interpretation of *RC* 38 must be revised, and with it the view that Antiochos III was gaining Karian territory in 203 at the expense of Ptolemy.²⁵

All Souls College, Oxford
Wadham College, Oxford
Trinity College, Oxford

J. T. Ma
P. S. Derow
A. R. Meadows

²³ So *Amyzon* p.140. Cf. F. Piejko, *OAth* 18 (1990) 155 for the suggestion that *LBW* III. 385 (*I.Mylasa* 24), a grant of *ateleia* to the city by an unknown individual, may belong to the same year - the author would perhaps be Zeuxis, rather than Antiochos. The possibility may also be considered here that the text published by the Roberts as a letter of Zeuxis in the name of Antiochos to his troops concerning the treatment of the Kildareis may in fact also be from the same period (*Amyzon* p.186 [*SEG* 33. 867; *I.Mylasa* 962]).

²⁴ *Staatsverträge* no. 547. See for example F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* II (Oxford, 1967) 472.

²⁵ The first section was written by JTM; the second by PSD; the third by ARM. Nonetheless, each commented on the work of the others and contributed significantly to it, so that the whole is a collaborative effort for which all three are responsible. Thanks are owed to Ph. Gauthier, Ch. Habicht and P. Herrmann for comments at an early stage. ARM would like to thank the President and Fellows of Trinity College, Oxford, for a Lingen Grant that enabled him to visit Karia in 1994.