A shared disquiet over the state of the text of the S.C. de Tabenis\(^1\) prompted a visit to Denizli for inspection of the stone; we were perturbed that no treatment indicated the relationship of the inscribed area to the total width of the block, that, although the squeeze in MAMA VI pl.28 appeared to show an uninscribed surface at the end of line 11, all restorations assumed the possibility of a lost word here, and above all at the failure of attempts to restore lines 7–11 to pinpoint the grammatical difficulties involved.

The stone was located in the playground of the Elementary School at Denizli, just outside a fenced-off area labelled as the Depot of the Denizli Museum. The bottom line was sunk in the gravel and the whole stone was blackened by use as a windshield for bonfires; but it is clear that it is a substantially complete building block (width \(0.58 \times 0.40 \times 1.05\))


---

**Rome and Tabae**

*Michael Crawford and Joyce Reynolds*
from the left of the central portion of the inscribed area; it was also possible to observe that there are uninscribed spaces not only at the end of line 11, but also (of varying length) at the ends of lines 12–16. It follows that the mason responsible for inscribing the S.C. de Tabenis was reluctant to break words between lines, and this must be borne in mind in restoring the ends of lines 2–10; in fact the only place where a break seems unavoidable is at the end of line 5, where it is a very easy and unoffensive one to make. It also follows that the total line-length is somewhat shorter than has been supposed. Notably there is in general less room for supplements at the ends of the lines and often a little more at the beginning than has usually been supposed.

We print first a text in the form which our inspection of the stone seems to require. The supplements are those printed by the latest editor (R. K. Sherk, see n.1) unless otherwise noted.

...\[\ldots\]

\[\text{[δυνάμειν] τε ἐπιώδροτα} \text{[περὶ τῆς Ἀκίας]}\]
\[\text{[καὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀντιπετάχθησα, ἀρέσκεις τῇ} \text{[}]\]
\[\text{[συν]κλήτῳ καὶ τῶν δήμων} \text{[πάντα] α[υτοῖς]}\]

5 \[\text{[όπως] ἄριστα εἶναι ἐσεῖθαί τε, τῇ[ν τε εὐνύ]-}\]
\[\text{[κλήτων καὶ τῶν δήμων τὸν 'Ρωμιό[ϊῶν αὐτῶν (?)]}\]
\[\text{[διὰ] μνήμης ἔχειν ἔχειν τε νάκ. δεῖσα [τε τῆς]}\]
\[\text{[τού]των ἄρειθῆς καὶ καταληγῆς ἐπεκεν}]
\[\text{[μετά]κε συνβουλίου γνώμης Αὐεύκιος Κρ[ρήνης]}\]

10 \[\text{[Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχόρθησεν νάκ. ὅπω[ς]}\]
\[\text{[άριστος τοῖς νόμοις αἵρεσεῖν τε ὅσω νάκ.]}\]
\[\text{[όπως] τε χωρίων Θυησέων, δ ἐστιν ἐντός τῶν ν.]}\]
\[\text{[ἀρίστων, ἐὰν βούλωνται, ἀνυψώσων νάκ.]}\]
\[\text{[τὴν] μεγαλήττον τὸν τε δήμων τὸν 'Ρωμαίων νακατ}]

15 \[\text{[διαλέο]βάνειν πάντα αὐτοῖς καλῶς καὶ νακατ.}]
\[\text{[.ο.ο.ο.] ὅς καὶ ἄξιος αὐτῶν δεδόθαι τε νάκ.]}\]

Line 1. Perhaps [τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν B]ἐξ[κλεὼς Μιθριδάτου]; we calculate that the surviving letters are too far to the right to permit Doublet's ... τοῖς τε B]ἐξ[κλεὼς Μιθριδάτου ἡγεμόσιν] based on the S.C. de Stratonicensibus (Sherk 18), lines 82–84.

Line 3. [τ]ῆς clear on the squeeze, H no longer clear on the stone.

Line 4. The isolated A, tacitly doubted by Robert, is visible on the stone, but there is hardly room for the previously accepted [τῶι Ἄρμ.]α[ἀν πάντα αὐ]...
The text as printed is mostly a straightforward consequence of the shape of the inscribed area and of the line-length demanded by the width of the block. In lines 4-5 the probable sigma before ἄριστα suggests σποες, and the attribution to Senate and People of the simple wish that all should be arranged for the best for Tabai is hard to avoid; quite apart from considerations of space, [τῶν Ῥωμά]α[ίων] is quite superfluous in a document produced in Rome and should not be restored in line 4. In line 6 ταῦτα, referring to the rôle of Tabai in the war against Mithridates, would also be possible; the overall shape of lines 5-8 reflects the emergence of Senate and People as the subject of ἔχειν ἔχειν τε, parallel to πάντα as the subject of εἶναι ἐκείνα τε in the previous clause. Κορνήλιος can only be fitted in at the end of line 9 on the assumption of extreme crowding, which is, however, apparent in the preserved part of the line; it would be theoretically possible to allow longer restorations at the ends of lines 2-8 than we

* Compare Sherk 26 c line 3; 28 B line 6.
have printed, on the assumption of similar crowding; but there is no trace of this in the lines in question and no need to make the assumption. The numbers of letters restored at the beginnings of lines 12-16 follow from the shape of the stone at this point.

But the major problem is posed by lines 7-12; some preliminary remarks on the grammatical structure of the whole inscription seem necessary. The infinitive ἀντιτετάχθαι doubtless depends on a preposition, possibly διὰ (το), or on something like ἐπεὶ ὁ δήμος ὁ Ταβηνων προεύετο; [ἀρέσκειν], if correctly restored, then depends on a phrase such as περὶ τούτων τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως ἔδοξεν and itself governs (a) two pairs of infinitives in lines 5 and 7, and (b) τὴν συνάλητον . . . διαλανβάνειν ταῦτα . . . δεδόθαι τε [ἐ.g. καὶ συνκεχωρήθαι]. ταῦτα here clearly picks up ὅκα. What Sulla granted is then specified in the two clauses with ὅπως and the subjunctive; given τούτων referring to the Tabenes in line 8, there seems no violence involved in making them the subject of ὅκαν and ὅχυμᾶωσεν.

Stripped of its verbiage, the surviving portion of the S.C. de Tabenis seems to us to record that Senate and People accept the correctness of Sulla's grant to Tabae of the right to fortify Thyessus and ἀρίστοις τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσειν τε (εἶναι); and this we take to be optimis legibus condicionibusque (esse). Despite the plurals used, we suggest as a parallel the phrase τῶι ἀρίστωι νόμωι ἀρίστωι τε δικαίωι (εἶναι) in the letter of Octavian about Seleucus (Sherk 58), lines 21-22, translating optima lege optimo iure esse; compare also Sherk 28 b line 8. The plural does in fact occur in Latin, at the beginning of the treaty with

9 Buckler and Calder: δο[α τε ψηφιοθέναι] in line 7;
[Σύλλας]αυτοκράτωρ ευνεχόρησεν νῦν ὅπως[e ἑπ'] [η (sic) αὐτοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσειν τε ὅκαν [κύρια] in lines 10-11.
Robert: δο[α τε φιλάνθρωπα ?] in line 7;
[Σύλλας]αυτοκράτωρ ευνεχόρησεν νῦν ὅπως[e ταύτα]
[ἑπ'] αὐτοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσειν τε ὅκαν [κύρια] in lines 10-11.
Bean: [Σύλλας]αυτοκράτωρ ευνεχόρησεν νῦν ὅπως[e κύριοι]
[ἐφ'] αὐτοῖς (?) τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσειν τε ὅκαν [χρήσθαι] in lines 10-11.
Klaffenbach: δο[α τε ἐπαθλα τῆς] in line 7;
[Σύλλας]αυτοκράτωρ ευνεχόρησεν νῦν ὅπως[e ὑφ']
[ἑαυτοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσειν τε ὅκαν [πάνται]
or [Σύλλας]αυτοκράτωρ ευνεχόρησεν νῦν ὅπως[e αὐθαίρετοι]
[ἑαυτοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσειν τε ὅκαν [πάνται] in lines 10-11.
Sherk: δο[ας τε κόμας τῆς] in line 7;
[Σύλλας]αυτοκράτωρ ευνεχόρησεν νῦν ὅπως[e αὐθαίρετοι]

4 Seen by Wilamowitz and Klaffenbach.
Antiochus, *amicitia* . . . *his legibus et condicionibus esto* (Livy 38.38.2); for *αἰρετέεις* with the meaning of *condiciones* see Dionysius of Halicarnassus 3.10.1 (misleadingly glossed in LSJ); 6.56.5; Cassius Dio 71.17 (72). Also relevant, although again using nouns in the singular, is Cicero’s advice to a Senator (*De legibus* 3.41), to know of all Rome’s allies *qua quisque sit lege, condicione, foedere*. The inscription makes it clear in general, in rhetorical terms, that Tabae stands in the most favourably placed category of friends of Rome.

As a whole the text may be translated thus:

[It was agreed that on account of the Tabenes] having most gallantly resisted [the leaders and forces of King Mithridates for the sake of Asia and] of Greece it was the wish of the Senate and People that everything now and in the future should be for the best for them and that the Senate and People of Rome should now and in the future keep the Tabenes in mind; it was also agreed that the Senate and People of Rome accepted that what L. Cornelius Sulla Imperator granted with the approval of his *consilium* as a reward for the bravery and respect⁶ (for us) of the Tabenes was rightly and [properly] and deservedly given [and granted] them, namely that they should enjoy the best laws and conditions (*i.e.* in their relationship with Rome) and that they should if they wish fortify the place Thyessus which is within their territory.
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OGIS II 442: Senatus Consultum de Tabenis

(photographed at Denizli, Turkey, by M. Crawford)