

Peter THONEMANN*

A Hellenistic *isopoliteia* decree from Laodikeia on the Lykos

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.

Keywords: *Isopoliteia*; Laodikeia on the Lykos; Stratonikeia; Tralleis; Decree-formulae; Magistrates; Hellenistic period.

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 ([ἔ]δοξε τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳι - -). 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.

* Dr. Peter Thonemann, University of Oxford, Wadham College, Faculty of Classics, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PN (peter.thonemann@wadh.ox.ac.uk).

I am grateful to Gary Reger and Riet van Bremen for their helpful remarks. Francesco Guizzi kindly provided the photograph printed here as Figure 1.

¹ F. Guizzi, in Ritti *et al.* 2008: 42–47, no. 3.

πολιτείαν? καὶ | μετέχ]ειν αὐτο[ὺς πάντων ὧν καὶ οἱ ?Στρα|τον]ικεῖς μετέχο[υσι· G.; εἶν[αι Λαοδικεῖς πολίτας καὶ | μετέχ]ειν αὐτο[ὺς πάντων ὧν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ?Στρα|τον]ικεῖς μετέχο[υσι· H. *Lines 25–28*. [καλέσαι καὶ | εἰ]ς προεδρίαν τὸν [αφικουμένον? πρεσβευτήν? ἐν | τ]οῖς μουσικοῖς ἀγῶσ[ιν συντελουμ]μένοις G.; [καλεῖν (*vel sim.*) δὲ αὐτοὺς | εἰ]ς προεδρίαν τὸν [*e.g.* ἀγωνοθέτην οἰεροκήρυκα ἐμ̄ πᾶσι | τ]οῖς μουσικοῖς ἀγῶσ[ι τοῖς συντελουμ]μένοις H.; καλεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς | καὶ εἰ]ς Th(onemann). *Line 28*. [εἶναι δὲ] G.; [ὑπαρχεῖν δὲ] H. *Lines 29–32*. *rest. G. Lines 32–33*. ἀφ[ικ]νου[μένων]- - - G.; ἀφ[ικ]νου[μένων] πάγτω[ν] . . . [- -] Th.

“Resolved by the *boulē* and the *dēmos*, [- - son of N]aukrates made the motion: s[ince the Laodikeians, being well-disposed] both collectively towards the *dēm[os]* and individually towards ea[ch] of our citizens, have decreed *isopo[liteia]* and freedom from taxatio[n] and *prohedria* (for us), [and crown] our *dēmos* with a gold [crown] for the sake of its [virtue] and the goodwill [which it continues to hold towards] the *dēmos* 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 *dēmos* and [have made a speech concerning] the goodwill which they hold towards our *dēmos*, and have cal[led] (on us) to hold the sam[e] disposition concerning the things about which [they have *e.g.* written to the c]ity, having shown all possible [sobriety during their st]ay in the city, [- - -]. [And so the *dēmos*,] 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 hel]d by the *dēmos*; [and let them also have] right of access to the *boul[ē]* first after the] sacred business; and the *boulē* and the *stratēgoi* 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 τῶι δήμῳ), without a dating formula, proposed by a single individual (lines 1–2) whose name is lost. His patronym, [N]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 Ναυκρατίς 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 [ἔ]ψηφίσαντο in line 5. His suggestion [εὐνοὶ καὶ φίλοι ὄντες] gives the correct sense, but I should prefer to restore the participle διακείμενοι, “be disposed”, with an adverb (*e.g.* εὐνόως), since this seems to be the normal idiom in clauses with πρὸς + accusative: cf. *e.g.* *I.Ilion* 73 (decree of Ilion honouring Nikandros of Poimanenon, 80 BC), line 4, εὐνόως διακείμενοι πρὸς τὸν δήμον ἡμῶν; *OGIS* 335 (decree of Pitane honouring judges from Pergamon, *c.* 150 BC), lines 2–3, εὐνόω[ς] διακείμενοι πρὸς τὴν [πόλιν ἡ]μῶν. By contrast, we would expect a phrase like εὐνοὶ καὶ φίλοι 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, συγγενεῖς ὄν[τες καὶ φίλοι κα]ὶ εὐνοὶ τῶι δ[ά]μῳ; *I.Kaunos* 19 (decree of Kaunos responding to decree of Smyrna, second century BC), lines 64–65, φίλοι καὶ εὐνοὶ ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ δήμου.

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 (χρυσῶ[ι στεφάνωι - - - ἀρετῆς | ἔ]νεκεν), I suspect that there is no need to do so. The sense is perfectly satisfactory without a lacuna, and the restoration χρυσῶ[ι στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς | ἔ]νεκεν 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 σ[ε]φανοῦσθαι 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 either a participle in the nominative plural or a verb in the indicative mood. Hamon restores the former (σ[ε]φανώσαντες δὲ τὸν | δ]ῆμον), but the particle δέ is out of place, since δέ cannot co-ordinate a main verb (ἔψηφίσαντο) and a dependent participle (σ[ε]φανώσαντες).² I would hence prefer to restore here a

² Cf. Thonemann 2007: 153 n.6.

second main verb in the indicative, στ[εφανουσι δὲ καὶ τὸν | δ]ῆμον. The shift from aorist (ἐψηφίσαντο) to present tense (στεφανουσι) 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, [ψ]ήφισμά τε καὶ πρεσβευτὴν ἀποστεύλαντες . . . [ἐπαιν]οῦσ[ι μ]ὲν τὸν δῆμον . . . καὶ στεφανουσίγ χρυσέωι στεφάνωι; *I.Kaunos* 19 (decree of Kaunos responding to decree of Smyrna, second century BC), lines 65–72, ἀπέσταλκαν πρεσβευτὴν καὶ ψήφισμα . . . ἐφ’ οἷς καὶ ἐπαινοῦσιν τὸν δῆμον ἡμῶν καὶ στεφανοῦσιν 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[ικέων] in line 9, but the precise restoration here is uncertain: we could perhaps have a clause such as [καὶ περὶ τούτ]ω[ν πρέ]σβεις ἀπεστ[ύ]λκασιν], as in *ICret I xix 3 A* (Chaniotis 1996: 73a, decree of Malla honouring foreign judges from Knossos and Lyttos, late second century BC), καὶ περὶ το[ύ]των ἀπέστηλαν ἄμειν δικαστά[ς]. In line 10, where Guizzi reads ἀπειστ[- -], Hamon plausibly assumes that we have a part of the verb ἀποστέλλειν. His own restoration, ἀπέστ[ε]ιλαν], gives perfectly good sense, but Guizzi’s photograph (here, Fig. 1) seems to show a triangular letter after the letters *sigma* and *tau* at the end of the preserved part of the line, whence my restoration ἀπεστ[ύ]λκασιν]. 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, [τ]ῆς εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχου[σιν - c.5–8 - πρὸς τὸν | δ]ῆμον ἡμῶν. Given the change of subject here (the ambassadors are the subject of [διελέγησαν] in line 13, while the Laodikeians are the subject of ἔχου[σιν] in line 14), we probably need a pronoun or proper noun indicating the subject of the verb ἔχουσιν: hence I suggest restoring either ἧς ἔχου[σιν αὐτοὶ πρὸς τὸν | δ]ῆμον (fifteen letters) or, for preference, ἧς ἔχου[σι Λαοδικεῖς πρὸς τὸν | δ]ῆμον (eighteen letters).

Lines 15–17: As Guizzi already saw, these lines must feature a clause indicating that the Laodikeian ambassadors “called on” (παρε[κάλ]εσαν], line 15) the other community to show or maintain “the same disposition” ([τὴν αὐ]τ[ὴ]ν αἴρεσιν, 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 early second century BC), lines 21–22, παρακαλέσοντ[ας] καὶ Θεῖους τὴν αὐτὴν αἴρεσιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέρα[ν] πόλιν; *I.Mylasa* 634 (decree of Teos for a judge from Mylasa, late second or first century BC), lines 22–24, [παρακ]αλέσει Μυλασ[εῖς . . . ἀπο]δέ[ξασθαι τὰς τιμὰς] καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν αἴρεσιν ἔχειν πρ[ὸς ἡμ]ᾶς; *I.Priene*² 108 (decree of Iasos honouring judges from Priene, 190s BC), line 32, παρακαλέσουσιν αὐτοὺς τὴν αὐτὴν αἴρεσιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον; similarly *I.Priene*² 109, lines 29–30; *I.Priene*² 112, line 26. Hamon tentatively restored [?]ῆμ[ας] in line 15 in order to provide an object for the verb παρακαλεῖν; this is possible, but not necessary, since the object of παρακαλεῖν 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, παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ (sc. ὑμᾶς) εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν αἴρεσιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.

In line 16, after the word αἴρεσιν, the stone clearly carries the words ὑπὲρ ὧν. This can only be a relative clause indicating the sphere of reference of the αἴρεσις, 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 δᾶμος ἔν τε τῶι πρότερον χρ[ό]νοι τὰν πᾶσαν σπουδὰν [καὶ προθυ]μίαν

ἐ]ποιεῖτο ὑπερ ὧν ἐπέστει[λαν Μάγνητες κ]αὶ νῦν τὰν αὐτὰν αἴρεσι[ν ἔχων κτλ.], “the *demos* has in former times shown all eagerness and enthusiasm concerning the things about which the Magnesians have written, and now, holding the same disposition, etc”. I would therefore propose restoring ὑπερ ὧν [ἐπέστειλαν] or [ἐπεστάλκασιν] in line 16; Gary Reger suggests [ἀπηγγέλκασιν], which is equally possible. The letters [. .]λει at the start of line 17 can only be the end of the dative [τῆι | πό]λει, and this is most easily understood as an indirect object of the verb ἐπιστέλλειν/ἀπαγγέλλειν. I therefore propose to restore the entire clause παρε[κάλεσαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἔ]χειν αἴρεσιν ὑπερ ὧν [e.g. ἐπεστάλκασιν τῆι | πό]λει, “they have called (on us) to hold the same disposition concerning the things about which they have (e.g.) written to the city”. In lines 15–16, one could equally well restore [ἔ]χειν τὴν αὐ[τῆ]ν αἴρεσιν, but the word-order proposed here is more elegant and is well-paralleled elsewhere: cf. e.g. *Milet* I 3, 139A (cited above), τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν αἴρεσιν; *IG* XII 5, 824 (Tenos, honorific decree for Apollonios of Miletos, second century BC), lines 24–5, παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχειν προαίρεσιν.

Lines 17–19: In line 17, Guizzi read τῶν ἐνδεχομ[- - -], but the letter which he read doubtfully as an *omega* is not clear on the photograph (here, Fig. 1), and I should prefer to read here τὴν ἐνδεχομ[ένην]. The verb ἐνδέχεσθαι is frequently used (usually in its participial form) in Hellenistic epigraphy to signify “as much/great as possible”: cf. e.g. *I.Erythrai* 28 (decree of Erythrai for Polykritos, c. 270 BC), lines 5–7, ὁ δῆμος . . . τῶν πληρωμάτων τὴν [ἐ]νδεχομένην ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποίησατο; Sherck, *RDGE* 35 (letter of the Scipiones to Herakleia under Latmos, 189 BC), lines 8–9, πειρασόμεθα . . . πρόνοιαμ ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐνδεχομένην; *SEG* 53, 1373 (decree of the *koinion* of Athena Ilias for Antikles of Lampsakos, early second century BC), lines 16–17, κεχορηγηκότος εἰς τὴν γυμνασια[ρ]χίαν ὡς ἐνδ[έχ]ε[τ]αι φιλοτιμότητα. This whole clause should concern the good behaviour of the Laodikeian ambassadors during their embassy (line 18, [ἐπιδ]ημίαν ποιούμεν[οι]), and hence I would restore here τὴν ἐνδεχομ[ένην] e.g. εὐταξίαν περὶ τὴν | ἐπιδ]ημίαν ποιούμεν[οι]; for the general shape of the phrase, compare *I.Kaunos* 18 (decree of Smyrna for a *grammateus* from Kaunos, second century BC), lines 55–57, ἐμφανίσαι τε περὶ τοῦ γραμματέως . . . ἦν ἐποίησατο εὐκοσμίαν περὶ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν; *SEG* 49, 621 (decree of Athens for judges from Larissa, 109/8 BC), lines 35–39, ἐπ[αινε]σαι δὲ καὶ τοῦς παραγεγονότας παρ’ αὐτοῦ δικασ[τὰς] . . . ἐπὶ τε [τῆι ἀναστροφῆι ἢ πε]ποιήνται κατὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν. The phrase that follows in the latter half of line 18 and the beginning of line 19 cannot be restored with confidence: it may belong either to the preceding or following clause.

Lines 19–22: These lines seem to preserve the beginning of the hortatory formula, here introduced with the participle βουλόμενος (“wishing to [e.g. be receptive to/respond appropriately to the decree of the Laodikeians], *vel sim.*”). In lines 21–22, we clearly have a purpose clause with ἵνα or ὅπως + subjunctive, expressing the intention that something may persist (διαμένηι, line 21) for both cities concerned ([ἀμ]φοτέραις [ταῖς πόλεσι], line 22). My proposed restoration here ([ἵνα δὲ καὶ] διαμένηι εἰς [τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον e.g. ἡ οἰκείότης ἀμ]φοτέραις [ταῖς πόλεσι]) is intended merely to give the likely shape of the clause: for clauses of this kind, compare e.g. *Milet* I 3, 148 (peace treaty between Miletos and Magnesia, early second century BC), lines 38–40, ἵνα δὲ ὦσιν ἀσφαλεῖς αἱ σ[υν]λύσει[ς] καὶ διαμένηι ἡ εἰρήνη καὶ φιλία εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον ἀμφοτέραι[ς τ]αῖς πόλεσιν.

Lines 22–33: These lines contain the answering decree of the other city, granting reciprocal *isopoliteia* and other honours to the Laodikeians. I have accepted all of Hamon’s restorations in these lines, with one or two minor alterations and additions: I have added [τύχηι | ἀγαθῆι] before [δε]δόχθαι in lines 22–23, moved [καὶ] from the end of line 23 to the beginning of line 24 (the single word [μετέχ]ειν is clearly too short for the lacuna at the start of line 24), inserted [καὶ] at the start of line 26 (there appears to be space for this in the lacuna at the start of the line), and added the single word πάντω[ν] in line 33 (visible at the very bottom of the stone on Guizzi’s photograph, reprinted here, p. 52 Fig. 1).

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).³

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 [Στρα|τον]ικεῖς 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 Ναυκράτης, patronyme du proposant, n’y est pas attesté; G(uizzi) 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 [- - -]ΙΚΕΙΣ. 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 [- - -]ικεῖς and [- - -]υκεῖς 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 [Στρα|τον]ικεῖς 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 ([Στ|ρατον]ικεῖς or [Στ|ρατον]ικεῖς).

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.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.⁵ The absence of a Stratonikeian demotic for the proposer of our decree (lines 1–2) is also notable.⁶ We do know of a μουσικὸς ἀγών 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 στεφάνων ποιησάσθωσαν οἱ ἀγωνοθέται 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 στρατηγοὶ κατὰ πόλιν, and one στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας; 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 Ἀπολλόδ[ο]τον Χρυσάορος Κω(ραιέα) πρυτάνε[ι]ς ἀνέγραψαν δ’ ἀνέ[φε]ρον ψήφισμα [κ]εκυρωμένον; 1038c, πρυ(τάνεων) γ[ν]ώμη; *I.Stratonikeia* 1040 (*I.Smyrna* 585, second or first century BC: not certainly a decree of Stratonikeia), π[ρυ]τάνεων 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 [ἔ]δοξε) Στρατονικέων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ). On Stratonikeian decree-formulae, 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 regularly, but not consistently, recorded in Stratonikeian decrees of the later Hellenistic period: cf. e.g. *I.Stratonikeia* 1038a ([οἱ] περὶ Ἀπολλόδ[ο]τον Χρυσάορος Κω(ραιέα) πρυτάνε[ι]ς), but contrast *I.Stratonikeia* 512, line 1 (eponymous *stephanēphoros*); *I.Stratonikeia* 1039, line 40 (ambassador to Assos): cf. van Bremen 2000.

τῶι μουσικῶι τῶι συντελουμένῳ τῆι Ῥώμῃ; cf. lines 25–28 of the present text), but that is not in itself a strong reason for attributing the decree to Stratonikeia, since a μουσικὸς ἀγών of one kind or another is attested at many other cities of south-western Asia Minor in the Hellenistic period.⁷

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.⁸ Cities which shared *isopoliteia* in the third and second centuries BC were generally either close geographic neighbours (Miletos and Phygela, Seleukeia–Tralleis, Mylasa, Herakleia under Latmos, etc.) or cities bound by mythological or historical ties of kinship (Miletos and Kios, Pergamon and Tegea, etc.).⁹ 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 Tralleis (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 Tralleis.¹⁰ Seleukeia–Tralleis 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 [Σελε]υκεῖς, which fills the lacuna at the start of the line in highly satisfactory fashion.

What we know of the institutions of Hellenistic Seleukeia–Tralleis 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–Tralleis.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 dēμου* 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 Tral-
lian decrees of the second and first centuries BC.¹⁴ Furthermore, we know that Seleukeia–Tralleis cele-

⁷ E.g. Halikarnassos (*SEG* 29, 1072), Magnesia (*I.Magnesia* 15b, line 7), Mylasa (*I.Mylasa* 101, lines 61–62), Kaunos (*I.Kaunos* 19, lines 91–93), Priene (*I.Priene*² 34, lines 14–15).

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.

⁹ Gawantka 1975: 93–113.

¹⁰ Cohen 1995: 265–268, citing all the relevant evidence for the changes of name; cf. Thonemann 2003: 101–102, and (for bronze coins in the name of Seleukeia) Thonemann 2011: 40.

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).

¹² Woodward and Robert 1927/1928: 68–72.

¹³ *Milet* I 3, 143B, with *Milet* VI 1, pp.176–177 (*I.Tralleis* 20), lines 57–59, τὸμ βουλόμενον Μιλησίων πολιτεύεσθαι ἐν Σελευκε[ί]α ἀπογράφεσθαι πρὸς τε τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου; lines 62–63, ποιῆσθαι δ’ ἐπιμέλειαν τοὺς ἀεὶ χειροτονουμένους στρατηγοὺς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Μιλησίων καὶ προνοεῖν τῶν παραγινομένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

¹⁴ *I.Tralleis* 27 (from Sparta, Hellenistic period), στρατηγῶν γνῶμ[η], with list of (apparently) 11 names; also probably *I.Tralleis* 21 (*I.Magnesia* 85, second century BC), [στρατηγῶν γν]ῶμη, with list of c. 8 names; *I.Tralleis* 22 (*I.Mylasa* 631, late second or early first century BC), [στρατηγῶν] γνῶμη, with list of 9 or 10 names. The *isopo-*

brated μουσικοί ἀγῶνες 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 th]e *dēmos* in honour of King Eumenes Soter” (ἐν τοῖς μουσικοῖς ἀγῶσιν τοῖς [συντελουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου βασιλεῖ Εὐμένει Σωτήρι).¹⁵ It is worth noting that, although μουσικοί ἀγῶνες 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 τ]οῖς μουσικοῖς ἀγῶσ[ι τοῖς συντελου]μένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου) is otherwise only attested at Seleukeia–Tralleis.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ 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, ἐπειδὴ Μιλήσιοι φίλοι καὶ οἰκεῖοι ὑπάρχοντες διὰ προγόνων πρότερόν τε διετέλουν ἐμ παντὶ καιρῶι πρόνοιαν ποιούμενοι καὶ κοινῆι παντὸς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σελευκέων καὶ καθ’ ἰδίαν ἐκάστου τῶν ἀφικνουμένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν; compare our text, lines 2–4, ἐ[πειδὴ Λαοδικεῖς κοιν]ῆι τε πρὸς τὸν δήμ[ον καὶ ἰδία] πρὸς ἕκαστ[ὸν τῶμ πολιτῶν [εὐνόως διακεῖ]μενοι]). 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 αὐξήται τὰ προϋπάρχοντα φιλόφρονα καὶ οἰκεῖα ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀμφοτέραις; our text, lines 21–22, [ἵνα δὲ καὶ] διαμένῃ εἰς [τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον e.g. ἡ οἰκειότης ἀμ]φοτέραις [ταῖς πόλεσι]). 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, δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ πολιτείαν ἐφ’ ἴση καὶ ὁμοίαι καὶ μετέχειν αὐτοῦς ἀπάντων ὧν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πολῖται μετέχουσιν; our text, lines 23–25, εἶν[αι Λαοδικεῖς πολί]τας καὶ μετέχ[ειν αὐτοῦ]ς πάντων ὧν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Σελευκ[ηκεῖς μετέχ]ο[υσι]). Finally, in each text, the Milesians/Laodikeians are granted three further privileges, listed in the same order in both cases: *prohedria* at all Seleukeian ἀγῶνες (*Milet* I 3, 143B, lines 60–61; our text, lines 25–28); *ephodos* to the Seleukeian *boulē* (and *dēmos*) after sacred business (*Milet* I 3, 143B, lines 61–62; our text, lines 28–30); a guarantee that the Seleukeian *stratēgoi* (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 III^e ou le cours du II^e s. a.C.”. There is no way of saying for certain how far the goodwill, friendship,

liteia-decree for Miletos of 218/217 BC (previous n.) was made on the motion of the *boulē* (line 46, βουλῆς γνώμη).

¹⁵ *I. Tralleis* 23, with the comments of Robert, *OMS* II 1178–1190. On the analogy of this text, Robert restores lines 13–15 of *I. Tralleis* 29 (third or second century BC) in similar fashion: [ποιή]σασθαι τὴν ἀναγγέλιαν τῆς εἰκόν[ος ἐν τοῖς μουσικοῖς ἀγῶσιν τοῖς συντελουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τῷ βασιλεῖ (not necessarily Eumenes II: Robert thinks that the text could equally well date to the Seleukid period).

¹⁶ Elsewhere the singular ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι τῷ μουσικῷ *vel sim.* seems to have been normal. Plural μουσικοὶ ἀγῶνες are also attested e.g. at Magnesia (*I. Magnesia* 89, lines 14–16, [ὅπως] . . . καλῆτ[αι εἰς π]ροεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν τοῖς μουσικοῖς οἷς τίθησιν [ἢ πόλ]ις), and at Magarsos–Antiocheia on the Pyramos (Sokolowski 1955: no. 81, lines 23–25, καλεῖσθαι [ὑ]πὸ τοῦ ἱεροκίρκου εἰς προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς μουσικοῖς ἀγῶσ[ι]).

¹⁷ *Milet* I 3, 143B, with *Milet* VI 1, pp.176–177 (*I. Tralleis* 20); for the date, see Wörle 1988: 432–437. On the “kinship” (συγγένεια) there invoked between Miletos and Seleukeia–Tralleis, see further Curty 1995: 136–138.

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

Abbreviated Literature

- Boulay 2014 Th. Boulay, *Arès dans la cité: Les poleis et la guerre dans l’Asie Mineure hellénistique*, Pisa and Rome 2014 (Studi Ellenistici XXVIII).
- van Bremen 2000 R. van Bremen, *The Demes and Phylai of Stratonikeia in Karia*, *Chiron* 30, 2000, 389–401.
- van Bremen 2004 R. van Bremen, *Laodikeia in Karia*, *Chiron* 34, 2004, 367–399.
- Chaniotis 1996 A. Chaniotis, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*, Stuttgart 1996.
- Cohen 1995 G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford 1995.
- Corsten 1995 T. Corsten, *Das Koinon der Laodikener in Panamara*, *EA* 25, 1995, 87–88.
- Curty 1995 O. Curty, *Les parentés légendaires entre cites grecques*, Geneva 1995.
- Gawantka 1975 W. Gawantka, *Isopolitie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*, Munich 1975.
- ICret* M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae* (4 vols.), Rome 1935–1950.
- I.Erythrai* H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* (2 vols.), Bonn 1972–1973 (IGSK 1–2).
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*.
- I.Ilion* P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion*, Bonn 1975 (IGSK 3).
- I.Kaunos* C. Marek, *Die Inschriften von Kaunos*, Munich 2006.
- I.Knidos* W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften from Knidos*, Bonn 1992 (IGSK 41).
- I.Magnesia* O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900.
- I.Mylasa* W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa* (2 vols.), Bonn 1987–1988 (IGSK 34–35).
- I.Priene²* W. Blümel and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Priene* (2 vols.), Bonn 2014 (IGSK 69)
- I.Smyrna* G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna* (2 vols. in 3), Bonn 1982–1990 (IGSK 23–24).
- I.Stratonikeia* M. Ç. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia/The Inscriptions of Stratonikeia* (3 vols. in 4), Bonn 1981–2010 (IGSK 21–22, 68).
- I.Tralleis* F. B. Poljakov, *Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa. I.*, Bonn 1989 (IGSK 36.1).
- LGPN* *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*.
- Milet* *Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahr 1899*.
- Magie 1950 D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ* (2 vols), Princeton 1950.
- Mitchell 1999 S. Mitchell, *The Administration of Roman Asia from 133 BC to AD 250*, in: *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*, ed. W. Eck, Munich 1999, 17–46.
- OGIS* W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae* (2 vols.), Leipzig 1903–1905.
- Rhodes with Lewis 1997 P. J. Rhodes, with D. M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford

¹⁸ Civic cults of Apollo in Seleukid colonies: Robert 1969: 294–298 (Laodikeia on the Lykos and Nysa). Kinship between Seleukid colonies: Curty 1995: 207–208 (Antiocheia on the Pyramos and Antiocheia on the Kydnos).

- 1997.
- Ritti *et al.* 2008 T. Ritti, H. Baysal, E. Miranda and F. Guizzi, Museo Archaeologico di Denizli-Hierapolis. Catalogo delle iscrizioni greche et latine. Distretto di Denizli, Naples 2008.
- Robert 1969 L. Robert, Les inscriptions, in: J. des Gagniers et al., Laodicée du Lycos: Le Nymphée. Campagnes 1961–1963, Québec and Paris 1969, 247–389.
- Robert, *OMS* L. Robert, Opera Minora Selecta. Epigraphie et antiquités grecques (7 vols.), Amsterdam 1969–1990.
- SEG* Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.
- Sherk, *RDGE* R. K. Sherk, Roman Documents from the Greek East, Baltimore 1969.
- Sokolowski 1955 F. Sokolowski, Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure, Paris 1955.
- Thonemann 2003 P. Thonemann, Hellenistic Inscriptions from Lydia, EA 36, 2003, 95–108.
- Thonemann 2007 P. Thonemann, Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia (I.Magnesia 16.16), GRBS 47, 2007, 151–160.
- Thonemann 2011 P. Thonemann, The Maeander Valley: A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium, Cambridge 2011.
- Woodward and Robert 1927/1928 A. M. Woodward and L. Robert, Excavations at Sparta, 1924–1928, Part II: Four Hellenistic Decrees, ABSA 29, 1927/1928, 57–74.
- Wörle 1988 M. Wörle, Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos I: Antiochos III, Zeuxis und Herakleia, Chiron 18, 1988, 421–476.

Özet

Lykos Laodikeia'sından bir Helenistik *isopoliteia* Kararnamesi

Yazar makalesinde Güneybatı Phrygia'da yer alan Lykos kıyısındaki Laodikeia'da bulunmuş olup kısa bir süre önce yayımlanan, İ.Ö. 3. yüzyıl veya erken 2. yüzyıl tarihli *isopoliteia* kararnamesinin edisyonunu yeniden yapmaktadır. Hangi kent tarafından alındığı bilinmeyen (bu kent makalede “X kenti” olarak anılmaktadır) kararname, daha önce Laodikeialılar tarafından söz konusu X kentine tanınmış *isopolitea*'yı rapor eden Laodikeia elçi heyetine cevaben Laodikeia yurttaşlarına vatandaşlık hakkı ve başka imtiyazlar bahşetmektedir. Yazıtın çeşitli satırlarına yeni tamamlama önerileri getiren yazar, kararnameyi geçiren kentin, ilk editörlerinin düşündükleri gibi Karia'daki Stratonikeia değil; Maiandros Vadisi'nde yer alan Seleukeia–Tralleis olması gerektiğini tartışmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Isopoliteia*; Lykos Laodikeia'sı; Stratonikeia; Tralleis; Kararname formülleri; Kent memurları; Helenistik Çağ.



Fig. 1. Hellenistic decree from Laodikeia (photo: F. Guizzi).