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Abstract: The author re-edits a recently published decree of isopoliteia from Laodikeia on the Lykos in south-west Phrygia, dated on the basis of letter-forms to the third or early second century BC. The decree (passed by a city whose identity is uncertain, “city x”) confers citizenship and various other privileges on the people of Laodikeia, in response to a Laodikeian embassy reporting an earlier grant of isopoliteia from the Laodikeians to “city x”. The author proposes various new restorations to the text of the decree, and argues that the city responsible for passing the extant decree is not (as the first editor had suggested) Stratonikeia in Karia, but the city of Seleukeia–Tralleis in the Maeander valley.
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In 2008, Francesco Guizzi published a new Hellenistic decree discovered at the site of Laodikeia on the Lykos in south-west Phrygia (here, Fig. 1).1 The decree is inscribed on a block of white marble (H. 0.655, W. 0.35, Th. 0.18), broken below, but otherwise apparently complete. The front (inscribed) face of the stone has been significantly damaged as a result of secondary reuse of the stone. The entire left-hand edge of the front face of the stone has been carefully bevelled, causing the loss of the first 1–2 letters of each line. The top of the front face has been similarly bevelled, but there is no reason to think that any text has been lost: the first extant line of the inscription appears to carry the opening words of the decree (ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ - -). Two deep dowel-holes have been cut into the front face of the stone close to the left-hand edge. The upper dowel-hole was neatly cut, causing the loss of only a very few letters towards the beginning of lines 10–11 (c. 3–4 letters in each line). The lower dowel-hole has caused more damage: a large, roughly triangular part of the surface of the stone has sheared off at the left-hand edge of lines 16–26, causing the loss of c. 8–9 letters at the start of lines 21–24, and rather fewer letters at the start of lines 16–20 and 24–26. The greater part of the right-hand side of the front face of the stone has been rough-picked with a point chisel, causing the loss of the entire second half of lines 1–29 (c. 15–18 letters missing from each line). This systematic defacement does not extend all the way to the bottom of the stone, and lines 30–32 are preserved to almost the full breadth of the stone (2–4 letters missing at the right-hand edge). Line 32 is the last substantially preserved line of the text, but the inscription clearly continued for several further lines; the upper parts of a few letters at the start of line 33 are visible on Guizzi’s published photograph (reprinted here, Fig. 1).

Given the loss of so much of the original text (around half of each line), restoration of the decree is far from straightforward. Several convincing amendments to Guizzi’s editio princeps were made by Patrice Hamon in the Bulletin épigraphique (BE 2010, 544), and I have incorporated a few further suggestions of my own in the text below.

1 F. Guizzi, in Ritti et al. 2008: 42–47, no. 3.
A Hellenistic *isopoliteia* decree from Laodikeia on the Lykos


Date: “Fine II–inizio I a.C.” (Guizzi); “le III° e il curso del II° s. a.C.” (Hamon). Fig. 1 (photo: Francesco Guizzi, courtesy of the Director of the Denizli–Hierapolis Arkeoloji Müzesi).

Line 4: τῶι ισαράστου ἦται ἐπί τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶι δήμωι - - c.6–8 - -

[N]αικράτου ἐπέτει - ἐξερήμησις τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ δήμου.

[v]ή τε πρὸς τὸν δήμου καὶ ἱδίᾳ πρὸς ἱκανούς -

[t]όν τῶν πολιτῶν [εὐνόμως διακέιμενοι]

5 ἐφισάσαντο ἰσοπολιτείαν καὶ ἀτέλειαν -

[a]ν καὶ προεδρίαν, στεφάνια δὲ καὶ τὸν

[δ]ήμον ἡμῶν χρυσῷ[ι] στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς;

[ε]νεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας [Ἡς ἔχουσιν διατελεῖ πρός]

[t]ὸν δήμον τοῦ Λαοῦ[ικο]ῶν - - c.10–12 - -

[.]Ω. [πρέ]σβεις ἀπεστάλκασιν - - c.9–11 - -

[.]Ο. [πρέ]σβεις [Ἀρέας] [παρε]οἰόμενοι - - c.15–18 - -

[Σ]ατόρου, ὦτιν τὸ [το ψήφισμα ἀπέδεικτο] -

[k]αν τοῦ δήμου καὶ [διελέγασαν περὶ]

[t]ῆς εὐνοίας ἢς ἔχουσιν ?Λαοδίκεις πρὸς τὸν

10 ἡμῶν καὶ παρεκάλλασαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐν 

[χεῖν] αἴρεσιν ἕπερ ὄν [εὐνόμως διακέιμενοι]

[πόλην τῆς] ἐνδεχομένης [εἰς εὐπαθείᾳ τῆς τοῦ]

[ἐπι]κήμην ποιούμενον [οί - - c.13–16 - -]

[. . . c.5 . . .] νου βουλώμενον [οίν ὁ δήμος vel sim.] - - c.6–9 - -

20 [. . . c.6 . . .] οὺν αὐτῶν [οί - - c.15–18 - -]

[τ]ινα δὲ καὶ διαμενέν ἐς [τὸν ἀεί χρόνον εὐνόμως διακέιμενοι]

[καὶ] ἕκαστας ἀμφιτετερίας [ταῖς πόλεσι χρυσῷ]

[ἀν]αγισθήν - δεδομένη - εν [αυτὴν Λαοδίκεις πόλεσι]

[καὶ] μετέχειν αὐτοῦς πάντων ὁν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι

25 [. . . c.4–5 . . .] ἰκανοί μετέχοντες [εἰς] καλείν δὲ αὐτούς]

[καὶ] εἰς προεδρίαν τὸν [ - - c. 9–12 - - ἐμ πᾶσι]

[μ]ὲνοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου [ὑπαρχεῖν δὲ αὐτοῖς]

[καὶ] ἐφοδοῦν ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν πρῶτους μετὰ

30 [τὰ] ἱερὰ τὴν δὲ βουλὴν καὶ τοὺς στρατη[γ] 

[γ]νοὺς καὶ τάλαμα ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι [καὶ]

[δ]ιεκένων τῶν εἰς [τήμι βόλιν αὐτοῦς][μεν]

[ον] πάντω[ι] . . . [ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - ]

---


“Resolved by the boule and the dêmos, [- - son of N]aukrates made the motion: s[ince the Laodikei-
ans, being well-disposed] both collectively towards the dêmos and individually towards each of our
citizens, have decreed isopo[leteia and freedom from taxatio]n and prohedria (for us), [and crown] our
dêmos with a gold [crown] for the sake of its [virtue] and the goodwill [which it continues to hold to-
wards] the dêmos of Laod[ikeia, - -], they have sent as ambassadors [x son of y], Athenaios [son of x, and x] son of [S]atyros, who have [delivered the decree] to the dêmos and [have made a speech con-
cerning] the goodwill which they hold towards our dêmos, and have cal[led (on us) to hold the sam]
le disposition concerning the things about which [they have e.g. written to the city, having shown all
possible [sobriety during their stay in the city, - - -]. [And so the dêmos], wishing to [- - -] their [- - -],
[in order that e.g. friendship might be preserved for [all time] for both [cities, with good fortune],
be it resolved: let the [Laodikeians be citizens and let] them share in [all the things that the other - -]
keis share in, [and let the (official) invite them to] a front seat [at all] the musical contests [that are
held] by the dêmos, [and let them also have] right of access to the boule[ê first after the] sacred busi-
ness; and the boule and the stratêgoi and the other officials are to take care of all those [Laod]ikeians
who arrive at the city . . .”

Lines 1–4: We appear to have the very beginning of the decree (line 1, [ἔ]δοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ[ τοὶ δήμοι]),
without a dating formula, proposed by a single individual (lines 1–2) whose name is lost. His
patronym, [Ν]αυκράτου, is a relatively common Greek name, attested in western Asia Minor in several
cities of Ionia (Ephesos, Erythrai, Priene, Smyrna, Teos), at Iasos and Labraunda in Karia (the feminine
Nauckratis at Kaunos), and at Xanthos in Lykia (LGPN VA and VB, s.v.). In line 4, Hamon correctly
saw that we need a participial phrase of some kind, dependent on the verb ἐψηφίσαντο in line 5. His
suggestion [eὐνοι καὶ φιλοὶ ὄντες] gives the correct sense, but I should prefer to restore the participle
diakēmēνου, “be disposed”, with an adverb (e.g. εὐνόω, since this seems to be the normal idiom in
clauses with πρὸς + accusative: cf. e.g. I. Ilion 73 (decree of Ilium honouring Nikandros of Poimanen,
80 BC), line 4, εὐνόος διακηκέμενος πρὸς τοῦ δήμου ἢμῶν; OGIS 313 (decree of Pitane honouring judges
from Pergamon, c. 150 BC), lines 2–3, εὐνόω[ς] διακηκέμενος πρὸς τὴν [πόλιν ἢμον. By contrast, we
would expect a phrase like ἐυνοῦ καὶ φιλοῦ ὄντες to be followed by a dative or genitive: cf. e.g. I.Knidos
218 (decree of Knidos honouring judges from Magnesia, 221/0 BC), lines 11–12, συγγενές ὃν[τες καὶ
φιλοὶ καὶ] εὐνοῦ τοῦ δῆμου; I.Kaunos 19 (decree of Kaunos responding to decree of Smyrna, second
century BC), lines 64–66, φιλοὶ καὶ εὔνοι ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ δῆμου.

Lines 5–9: Hamon’s restorations in these lines clearly give the correct sense and a plausible syntax. In
line 7, where Hamon posits a short lacuna (χρηστή[ι] στεφάνωι - - - ἀφίησθαι | ἧγεσθαι), I suspect that there
is no need to do so. The sense is perfectly satisfactory without a lacuna, and the restoration χρηστή[ι]
stefānōi ἀφίησθαι | ἧγεσθαι is not obviously too short (fifteen letters, including two iotas): compare line 5
(fifteen letters, including three iotas), and lines 12–13 (fourteen letters in each case). In line 6, Guizzi’s
restoration of the infinitive στεφανώσανται does not give satisfactory syntax (since we are still concerned
with honours voted by the Laodikeians for the community that passed the decree); we need ei-
ther a participle in the nominative plural or a verb in the indicative mood. Hamon restores the former
(στεφανώσαντες δὲ τὸν | δῆμον), but the particle δὲ is out of place, since δὲ cannot co-ordinate a main
verb (ἐνησίσθαι) and a dependent participle (στεφανώσαντες).2 I would hence prefer to restore here a

second main verb in the indicative, στεφάνωι δὲ καὶ τὸν | δῆμον. The shift from aorist (ἐψηφίσαντο) to present tense (στεφανόσι) is not problematic: it is quite normal for a decree summarising the content of another decree to cite its contents in the present tense: cf. e.g. I.Priene 2 112 (decree of Magnesia and replying decree from Priene, late third century BC), lines 33–6, and I.Priene 2 108 (decree of Iasos honouring judges from Priene, late second century BC), lines 21–22, similarly I.Kaunos 19 (decree of Kaunos responding to decree of Smyrna, second century BC), lines 65–72, ἀποστέλλειν πρεσβευτὴν καὶ ψήφισμα . . . ἐφ’ οἷς καὶ ἐπαινοῦσιν τὸν δῆμον ἡμῶν καὶ στεφανόσιν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ.

Lines 9–12: These lines turn to the despatch of ambassadors from Laodikeia. Most probably the clause describing the despatch begins immediately after the word Λαοδ[ικό̣]ν in line 9, but the precise restoration here is uncertain: we could perhaps have a clause such as καὶ περὶ τοῦ[το]ν [πρέ]σβευτῆ [ἀποστέλλαντες . . . ἐπαινο[σι]ν μὲν τὸν δῆμον ... καὶ στεφανόσιν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ; I.Kaunos 19 (decree of Kaunos responding to decree of Smyrna, second century BC), lines 65–72, ἀπόσταλαν πρεσβευτῆν καὶ ψήφισμα . . . ἐφ’ οἷς καὶ ἐπαινοῦσιν τὸν δῆμον ἡμῶν καὶ στεφανόσιν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ.

Lines 10–12 carried the names of the three Laodikeian ambassadors, x son of y, Athenaios son of x, and x son of Satyros: Athenaios and Satyros are both banal Greek names with no particular local colouring.

Lines 12–15: These lines (neatly restored by Hamon) describe the delivery of the decree and the speech of the ambassadors concerning the goodwill of the Laodikeians towards the community. In line 14, there is an awkward short lacuna between the verb and the prepositional phrase, τὴν ἡμῶν ἡμὲν ἑτέροις ἦς ἔχουσιν: hence I suggest restoring either ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ πρὸς τὸν | δῆμον (fifteen letters) or, for preference, ἔχουσι νι Λαοδικεῖς πρὸς τὸν | δῆμον (eighteen letters).

Lines 15–17: As Guizzi already saw, these lines must feature a clause indicating that the Laodikeian ambassadors “called on” (παρεκάλεσαν, line 15) the other community to show or maintain “the same disposition” (τὴν αὐ[τήν]ν ἄφρεσιν, lines 15–16) towards the Laodikeians. We clearly need to restore (either in line 15 or line 16) a verb in the infinitive meaning “show, hold, maintain”, and in this context the simple verb ἔχειν seems to have been standard: cf. e.g. SEG 29, 1149 (decree of Temnos granting isopoliteia to Teos, late third or first century BC), lines 21–22, παρακαλέσαντες καὶ Τησίου τὴν αὐτὴν ἄφρεσιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν πόλιν; I.Mylasa 634 (decree of Teos for a judge from Mylasa, late second or first century BC), lines 22–24, [παρε][κά][λεσαν Μύλασαςείς . . . ἀποδέ[ξαιθαί τοὺς τιμάς] καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἄφρεσιν ἔχειν πρὸς ἡμᾶς; I.Priene 2 108 (decree of Iasos honouring judges from Priene, 190s BC), line 32, παρακαλέσαντες αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἄφρεσιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν δήμον; similarly I.Priene 3 109, lines 29–30; I.Priene 2 112, line 26. Hamon tentatively restored [ἡμᾶς in line 15 in order to provide an object for the verb παρακαλέων; this is possible, but not necessary, since the object of παρακαλέων can be omitted in such cases when it is clear from the context who is being called upon: cf. e.g. Milet I 3, 139A (letter of Ptolemy II to Miletos, c. 262 BC), lines 12–13, παρακαλόμειν δὲ καὶ (sc. ἡμᾶς) εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον τὴν αὐτὴν ἄφρεσιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.

In line 16, after the word ἄφρεσιν, the stone clearly carries the words ὑπὲρ ὕπν. This can only be a relative clause indicating the sphere of reference of the ἄφρεσις, i.e. “the same disposition concerning the things which (sc. have been voted by the Laodikeians)”. The closest parallel I can find comes in a decree of a Dorian city (probably Kos) responding to the Magnesian request for asylia in 208 BC, I.Magnesia 57, lines 21–5, ὁ δάμος ἐν τῇ πρότερον χρ[όνιον τῶν πάσαν σπουδάν [καὶ προθ]υμ[ίαν
ẹ̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣̣́"
This inscription is a Hellenistic decree of a familiar type. The inhabitants of Laodikeia on the Lykos have passed a decree granting *isopoliteia* and other honours to a neighbouring community, “city x” (lines 5–9), and have sent ambassadors to city x to deliver the decree (lines 9–13), to assure the citizens of city x of their goodwill (lines 13–15), and to call on them to reciprocate (lines 15–17). The inhabitants of city x, acknowledging the impeccable behaviour of the Laodikeian ambassadors (lines 17–18), and wishing to respond appropriately (lines 19–22), pass a decree of their own in response, granting the Laodikeians citizenship, *prohedria* at their musical contests, and privileged access to their own civic authorities (lines 23–33).\(^\text{7}\)

The chief problem of this text is, of course, the identity of “city x”. The ethnic of this city is partially preserved at the start of line 25. Both Guizzi and Hamon tentatively restore [Στρατονικεῖς] in lines 24–25, and attribute the decree to the city of Stratonikeia in Karia. However, there are various problems with this proposal, as Hamon acknowledged: “L’identification de Stratonicee est une possibilité, mais doit rester conjecturale: le nom Ναυάρχης, patronyme du proposant, n’y est pas attesté; G(guizzi) souligne à juste titre l’importance des stratèges, qui sont mal connus à Stratonicee” (BE 2010, 554). In my view, Hamon is quite correct to question the attribution.

First, the epigraphic basis of the identification of city x with Stratonikeia is distinctly fragile. At the start of line 25, Guizzi reads [- - ]IKEΣ. In fact, the first iota is not fully preserved: only the lower part of the vertical hasta is visible on Guizzi’s photograph (here, Fig. 1), and hence both [- - ]ΙΧες and [- - ]ΙΧες are possible readings. (If the relevant letter is indeed an iota, then its vertical hasta is surprisingly far to the left of the following kappa.) It is also worth noting that Guizzi’s line-division [Στρατονικεῖς] is rather unlikely to be correct. At the start of line 25, there is space for four or five letters before the vertical hasta: in order to restore the ethnic *Στρατονικεῖς*, we would have to assume that the stonemason chose to divide the word at a rather awkward place ([Στρ][ατονι][κε]ἷς or [Στρ][ατονι][κε]ἷς).

Institutional considerations also tend to point away from Stratonikeia. As Hamon remarked, the civic institutions of city x, as indicated by the new decree, do not fit well with what we know of the institutions of Hellenistic Stratonikeia. Although a college of four *stratēgoi* is attested at Stratonikeia in the Hellenistic period, they appear to have been strictly military officials, serving for a six-month period only; the *stratēgoi* are nowhere else found playing a role in civic decrees of Stratonikeia.\(^\text{4}\) The chief civic officials of Hellenistic Stratonikeia appear to have been the prytaneis, who were responsible for proposing almost all of the (very few) extant Hellenistic decrees of Stratonikeia.\(^\text{5}\) The absence of a Stratonikeian demotic for the proposer of our decree (lines 1–2) is also notable.\(^\text{5}\) We do know of a ἀγὼν at Stratonikeia at which crowns were bestowed (*I.Stratonikeia* 1039, decree for a judge from Assos, after 166 BC, lines 20–22: τὴν δὲ ἀναγγελίαν τῶν στρατονικεῖων θεωρίσασθαι οἱ ἀγωνισθηται ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι

3 On *isopoliteia* in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, see Gawantka 1975, with a useful checklist of attested cases (now in need of updating) at pp. 206–220. On the numerous Cretan cases, see Chaniotis 1996: 101–104.

4 *I.Stratonikeia* 10, line 31; 485; 1005–1006a; 1317–1319: three στρατηγοί κατὰ πόλιν, and one στρατηγός ἐπὶ τῆς γύρος; see Boulay 2014: 77, 90–91. Riet van Bremen is currently preparing a study of the *stratēgoi* of Hellenistic Stratonikeia, based on a new edition of *I.Stratonikeia* 1505.

5 *I.Stratonikeia* 512 (first century BC), πρυτάνεων γνώμη; *I.Stratonikeia* 1038a (first century BC?), [οἱ] περὶ Ἀπολλόδορος Κοινοῦ(ᾶς) πρυτάνεως, ἰσορροπίαν δὲ ἀνέγραψαν δ’ ἀνέγραφον ψήφισμα [κ]αικηρομένων; 1038c, πρυτάνεων γνώμη; *I.Stratonikeia* 1040 (I.Smyrna 585, second or first century BC: not certainly a decree of Stratonikeia), π[ρ][υτάνεων] γνώμη]; *I.Stratonikeia* 10 (39 BC) seems to have had an individual proposer (restored). SEG 58, 1225 (second century BC?) does not indicate the proposer at all (simply Στρατονικεῖων τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου). On Stratonikeian decree-formule, see Rhodes with Lewis 1997: 351–352; van Bremen 2004: 387 n.75 (emphasizing the absence of early decrees from Stratonikeia).

6 The demotic is regular, but not consistently, recorded in Stratonikeian decrees of the later Hellenistic period: cf. e.g. *I.Stratonikeia* 1038a ([οἱ] περὶ Ἀπολλόδορος Κοινοῦ(ᾶς) πρυτάνεως), but contrast *I.Stratonikeia* 512, line 1 (eponymous *stephanéphoros*); *I.Stratonikeia* 1039, line 40 (ambassador to Assos): cf. van Bremen 2000.
Finally, it would be something of a surprise (though not impossible) to find Laodikeia and Stratonikeia voting *isopoliteia* for one another at any period. The two cities (although both Seleukid foundations) are geographically far removed from one another, and belong to completely different political and ecological zones of south-western Asia Minor.7 Cities which shared *isopoliteia* in the third and second centuries BC were generally either close geographic neighbours (Miletos and Phygela, Seleukeia–Talleis, Mylasa, Herakleia under Latmos, etc.) or cities bound by mythological or historical ties of kinship (Miletos and Kios, Pergamon and Tegea, etc.).8 But exceptions are not difficult to find, and I would not wish to lay too much weight on this point.

In sum, there are several strong reasons to question the attribution of our decree to Stratonikeia, and we ought to wonder whether there is another city in the vicinity of Laodikeia whose ethnic could plausibly be restored in line 25, and whose civic institutions might make a better fit with those attested in our text. I propose to identify “city x” with the important city of Talleis (modern Aydın) in the middle Maeander valley, which carried the dynastic name Seleukeia from c. 260 BC (and perhaps earlier) down to the treaty of Apameia or shortly thereafter, when the city reverted to its original name of Talleis.10 Seleukeia–Talleis was a near neighbour of Laodikeia, some 100km to the west as the crow flies; both cities lay on the major Seleukid road (the “Southern Highway”) which ran from Ephesos eastwards along the Maeander valley, and on up the Lykos valley towards Apameia–Kelainai.11 In line 25 of our text, we can easily restore the ethnic Σελευκε̣[i]κε̣ς, which fills the lacuna at the start of the line in highly satisfactory fashion.

What we know of the institutions of Hellenistic Seleukeia–Talleis also provides strong support for this attribution. The *stratēgoi*, organised in a college of around 10–11 members, were the main civic officials of Seleukeia–Talleis.12 In a Seleukeian decree of 218/217 BC, conferring *isopoliteia* on the nearby city of Miletos, it is the *stratēgoi* and the *grammateus tou dēmou* who are responsible for registering those Milesians who wish to take up citizenship at Seleukeia, and later in the same text it is once again the *stratēgoi* who are to take care of Milesian visitors to Seleukeia (cf. lines 30–33 of our text: *boulē, stratēgoi, other officials*).13 This college of *stratēgoi* acted as collective proposers of several further Talleian decrees of the second and first centuries BC.14 Furthermore, we know that Seleukeia–Talleis cele-

---

8 There is little evidence for interaction between Laodikeia on the Lykos and south-west Karia at any period: see Corsten 1995 (a very meagre haul). van Bremen 2004 has decisively ruled out any connection between the “koinon of the Laodikeis” in south-west Karia and Laodikeia on the Lykos.
11 On this road, see Strabo 14.2.29; Magie 1950: II 789–793; Thonemann 2011: 174 n.115 (third-century Seleukid foundations strung along this road); Mitchell 1999: 17–21 (Roman Republican period).
14 *I.Talleis* 27 (from Sparta, Hellenistic period), στρατηγῶν γνώμη[η], with list of (apparently) 11 names; also probably *I.Talleis* 21 (*I.Magnesia* 85, second century BC), [στρατηγῶν] γνώμη, with list of c. 8 names; *I.Talleis* 22 (*I.Mylasa* 631, late second or early first century BC), [στρατηγῶν] γνώμη, with list of 9 or 10 names. The *isopo-
brated μοσικοί ἀγώνες during this period, at which crowns were bestowed: a decree of Tralleis honouring a judge from Phokaia (c. 182–159 BC) states that the crowns bestowed on the people of Phokaia, the judge himself, and the grammateus who accompanied him were to be announced “at the musical contests [held by the] δῆμος in honour of King Eumenes Soter” (ἐν τοῖς μοσικοῖς ἀγώσησι τοῖς [συντελουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου βασιλεί Εὐμένει Σωτῆρ]. It is worth noting that, although μοσικοί ἀγώνες were of course perfectly common throughout western Asia Minor in the Hellenistic period (n.5 above), the specific phrase attested in our decree (lines 27–28, [ἐν τοῖς μοσικοῖς ἀγώσησι τοῖς συντελουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου]) is otherwise only attested at Seleukeia–Tralleis.

The closest parallel for our decree is the grant of isopoliteia decreed by the city of Seleukeia for Miletos, precisely dated to 218/217 BC. This document (although somewhat more expansive in its wording) is suggestively close to our decree in both structure and content. Both texts begin with a general statement of the friendly attitude shown by Miletos/Laodikeia towards the Seleukeians, both collectively and as individuals (Milet I 3, 143B, lines 46–49, ἐπείδη Μιλήσιοι φίλοι καί οἰκεῖοι υπάρχοντες διὰ προγόνων πρότερον τε διετέλον ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ πρόνοιαν ποιούμενοι καὶ κοινῆ παντὸς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σέλευκεαν καὶ καθ᾿ ἐκκαθάριστον τῶν ἀτυχουμένων εἰς τῆς πόλεις αὐτῶν; compare our text, lines 2–4, ἐπείδη Λαοδικεῖς κοινῆ ντε τῷ τῶν δήμουν καὶ ὕδαι πρὸς ἐκαθαριστὸν τῶν πολιτῶν [ἐννόμους διακαμένους]). Both texts then move on to describe the arrival of an embassy from Miletos/Laodikeia (Milet I 3, 143B, lines 49–52: a certain Prytanis of Miletos; our text, lines 9–19, ambassadors from Laodikeia). In both texts, the Seleukeian decree proper is then announced with a hortatory clause expressing the intention of preserving the good relationship between the two communities (Milet I 3, 143B, lines 52–53: ὅπως οὖν ἐπὶ πλέον αὔξητα τὰ προηγούμενα φιλάνθρωπα καὶ οἰκεία ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀμφοτέρως; our text, lines 21–22, ἰνα δὲ καὶ διαμένη ἐμ [τὸν ἀλ ἰοίνον ε.]. ή οἰκείατης ἀμφοτέρως [ταῖς πόλεσιν]). The Milesians/Laodikeians are granted both citizenship and “a share in all the things which the other Seleukeians/citizens have a share in” (Milet I 3, 143B, lines 56–57, δεδοσθὶ δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ πολιτεῖαν ἐν ᾑ ἴση καὶ ὅμοια καὶ μετέχειν αὐτῶι ἀπάντων ὑπὸ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πολίται μετέχονσιν; our text, lines 23–25, εἰς αὐτοῖς Λαοδικείας πολίταις καὶ μετέχειν αὐτῶις πάντων ὑπὸ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Σελευκείας μετέχοντι). Finally, in each text, the Milesians/Laodikeians are granted three further privileges, listed in the same order in both cases: ἀγῶνες at all Seleukeian ἀγώνες (Milet I 3, 143B, lines 61–62; our text, lines 28–30; a guarantee that the Seleukeian strategoi (and other magistrates) will take care of all Milesian/Laodikeian visitors to their city (Milet I 3, 143B, lines 62–64; our text, lines 30–33).

The precise date of the decree cannot be established with certainty. Tralleis seems to have carried the name Seleukeia from c. 260 BC down to c. 190/188 BC, which provides us with a broad date-range for our decree; this fits well with Hamon’s proposed dating for the decree (on the basis of letter-forms), “le IIIe ou le cours du IIe s. a.C.”. There is no way of saying for certain how far the goodwill, friendship,
and reciprocal honours between Seleukeia–Tralleis and Laodikeia may have been influenced by the fact that both cities were Seleukid (re)foundations: many Seleukid colonies would of course have had shared cults, particularly of the Seleukid ancestral deity Apollo, and we have examples of Seleukid colonies recognising one another as “kinsmen”, perhaps in part as a result of their shared Seleukid origin.\(^{18}\)
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Özet

Lykos Laodikeia’sından bir Helenistik isopoliteia Karamaneni


Anahtar Sözcükle: Isopoliteia; Lykos Laodikeia’si; Stratonikeia; Tralleis; Kararname formülleri; Kent memurları; Helenistik Çağ.
Fig. 1. Hellenistic decree from Laodikeia (photo: F. Guizzi).