The Decree of Ilion in Honor of a King Antiochus

Christopher P. Jones

ONE OF THE MOST FAMOUS Hellenistic inscriptions was transported from the Troad to England by Edward Wortley Montagu and his lady in 1718, and is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge.[1] It contains the larger part of a decree of the city of Ilion in honor of a "King Antiochus, son of King Seleucus," but does not make unambiguously clear which Antiochus is meant. The choice must lie between the first and third of the name, since the second was not the son of a Seleucus, and the Seleucids no longer ruled west of the Taurus after 190.

Though opinion has generally favored Antiochus I, in the present century several arguments have been advanced in favor of his great-grandson, Antiochus the Great. This study argues for Antiochus I, but approaches the question by a somewhat neglected route. In the first part, I attempt to interpret as precisely as possible the section of the text that says most about past and prevailing circumstances, for this purpose making

[1] *CIG* 3595; *OGIS* 219; P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Ilion* (Bonn 1975) no. 32. On the transportation of the stone by the Montagus and on the text of lines 31f, L. Robert, in *Essays in honor of Bradford Welles* (Toronto 1966) 175-211 (=*OMS* VII 599–635). I have used the following special abbreviations: *Inschr. Iasos*=W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos* (Bonn 1985); DROYSEN=J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus*[2] (Gotha 1877–78), 3rd edition, ed. E. Bayer (Basel 1952–53); HERRMANN=P. Herrmann, "Antiochos der Grosse und Teos," *Anadolu* 9 (1965) 29–160; HOLLEAUX=L. Robert, ed., M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* I–VI (Paris 1938–68); ORTH= W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit* (Munich 1977); OTTO=W. Otto, *Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (=*Abh.Münch* 34.1 [1928]); PIEJKO=F. Piejko, "Antiochus III and Ilion," *ArchPF* 37 (1991) 9–50; *Amyzon*=J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie* I (Paris 1983); SCHMITT=H. H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1964); WELLES=C. Bradford Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven 1934); WILL=É. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*[2] I–II (Nancy 1979–82).

especial use of the language of Polybius; next, I take up a recent proposal that the text can be dated to 197 or 196, and argue that this date is excluded by the way in which members of the Seleucid house are mentioned; thirdly, I deal more briefly with an earlier date in the reign of Antiochus III, about 213; finally, I attempt to show that a date between about 278 and 274 fits all the evidence. I shall refrain from palaeographical arguments since they have been used on both sides of the case, noting only that such arguments turn on layout and not merely on letter-forms, and that the "airiness" of the present text seems to me to recommend a date in the first half of the third century.[2]

I

I begin with the most informative part of the inscription, the so-called "considerations" and what immediately follows them, giving a text, translation, and commentary on certain words and phrases.

ἐπειδὴ Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Βασιλέως
Σελεύκου, ἐν ἀρχῆι τε παραλαβὼν τὴμ βασιλείαν καὶ προστὰς ἐν-
δόξου καὶ καλῆς αἱρέσεως ἐζήτησε τὰς μὲν πόλεις τὰς κατὰ τὴν Σε-
λευκίδα, περιεχομένας ὑπὸ καιρῶν δυσχερῶν διὰ τοὺς ἀποστάντας
τῶμ πραγμάτων, εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν εὐδαιμονίαν καται-
στῆσαι,
τοὺς δ' ἐπιθεμένους τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπεξελθών, καθάπερ ἦν
δίκαιον, ἀνα-
κτήσασθαι τὴμ πατρώιαν ἀρχήν· διὸ καὶ χρησάμενος ἐπιβολῆι
καλῆι καὶ δικαίαι
καὶ λαβὼν οὐ μόνον τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις εἰς τὸ διαγωνίσ-
ασθαι περὶ
τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶι προθύμους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον εὔνουν
καὶ συν-
εργόν, τάς τε πόλεις εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ τὴμ βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν
ἀρχαίαν διάθεσιν
κατέστησεν· νῦν τε παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους τοὺς ἐπιτάδε
τοῦ Ταύρου
μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἅμα καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν τὴν
εἰρήνην κατεσκεύ-

[2] See the photograph in Robert, *Essays ... Welles* (*supra* n.1) 211=635. On the importance of "overall style" in dating, *Bull. épigr.* 1964, 18, with citation of W. K. Pritchett.

ασεν καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴμ βασιλείαν εἰς μείζω καὶ λαμπροτέραν διάθεσιν
ἀγήγοχε, μάλιστα μὲν διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀρετήν, εἶτα καὶ διὰ τὴν τῶμ φίλων καὶ τῶν
δυνάμεων εὔνοιαν· ὅπως οὖν ὁ δῆμος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρότερόν τε, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν
παρέλαβεν τὴμ βασιλείαν, εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς
διετέλει ποιούμενος, καὶ νῦν εὔνους ὢν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν αἵρεσιν ἔχων
φανερὸς ἦι τῶι βασιλεῖ, τύχηι τῆι ἀγαθῆι, δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι
δήμωι, τὴμ μὲν ἱέρειαν καὶ τοὺς ἱερονόμους καὶ τοὺς πρυτάνεις εὔξασ-
θαι τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Ἰλιάδι μετὰ τῶμ πρεσβευτῶν τήν τε παρουσίαν γεγο-
νέναι (ἐπ' ἀγαθῶι) τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσης καὶ τῶμ φίλων
καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων, καὶ γίνεσθαι τά τε ἄλλα ἀγαθὰ τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ τῆι βασι-
λίσσηι πάντα, καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴμ βασιλείαν αὐτοῖς διαμένειν λαμβάνου-
σαν ἐπίδοσιν καθάπερ αὐτοὶ προαιροῦνται.

"Whereas in the beginning King Antiochus, son of King Seleucus, having succeeded to the kingdom and conducting a noble and honorable policy, sought to restore the cities throughout the Seleucis, which were beset by difficult circumstances because of those rebelling against the state, to peace and their former prosperity, and (sought), by punishing as was right those who attacked the state, to recover his ancestral rule; for which reason, both pursuing a laudable and just ambition and having not only his Friends and the forces as his supporters in contending for the state, but (having) also the divine as his well-disposed helper, he restored the cities to peace and the kingdom to its previous condition;

"and (whereas) now, having arrived in the region on this side of the Taurus, with all energy and love of glory he has simultaneously achieved peace for the cities and brought the state and the kingdom to a greater and more brilliant condition, above all by his own valor and also by the goodwill of the Friends and the forces;

"in order therefore that the people, since it also formerly, at the time when he succeeded to the kingdom, continuously made prayers and sacrifices on his behalf to all the gods,

may now too make clear to the king that it is well-disposed and has the same attitude (as before);

"with good fortune, be it decreed by the council and the people that the priestess, the *hieronomoi* and the *prytaneis* pray to Athena of Ilion together with the envoys that the arrival of the king and his sister the queen, the Friends, and the forces should have been for the best, and that all other good things should come about for the king and the queen, and that the state and their kingdom should last, increasing as they themselves desire."

In both the "considerations" (lines 2–16) and the "hortative formula" (lines 16–19), there is a contrast betwen a previous time, when the king established order in "Seleucis" after ascending the throne, and a more recent one, in which he has crossed to "this side of the Taurus" and brought peace there; in the first period the city prayed continuously on his behalf, and now that he is in the region it is anxious to make clear its undeviating policy of goodwill. The implication is surely that these two periods were successive, and that the date is some time near the beginning of the reign.[3] The aorists ἐζήτησε (4) and κατέστησεν (12) need not of course imply a remote past, any more than does κατεσκεύασεν (13) following νῦν (12) and balanced by ἀγήγοχε (15). All three aorists might be translated in English by perfects, the difference between the two tenses in such a context being only that the aorist stresses the completion of an act or state, the perfect the continuation of its effects into the present.[4]

3, ἐν ἀρχῆι παραλαβὼν τὴμ βασιλείαν. The text uses the noun βασιλεία both alone (1, 12, 17) and also in conjunction with τὰ πράγματα (14, 24). Though the two words are close in meaning, the first signifies either the royal position, 'rule', or the kingdom as a territorial entity, 'realm', while the second is the usual Hellenistic expression for the 'state', and may be applied to non-monarchic systems such as that of republican Rome. Thus Polybius can talk of the pretender Achaeos trying to "seize the power within the kingdom" (5.17.4: κρατῆσαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν πραγμάτων). Similarly Ptolemy Physcon leaves "the kingdom that belongs to me" to the Romans (τὴν καθήκουσάν μοι βασιλείαν) and at the same time entrusts them with "maintaining the state" (παρακατατίθεμαι τὰ

[3] Thus *e.g.* C. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte* (Munich 1956) 84: "in die ersten Regierungsjahre des Königs"; M. Wörrle, "Antiochos I., Achaios der Ältere und die Galater. Eine neue Inschrift in Denizli," *Chiron* 5 (1975) 70 n.48: "schon zu Beginn seiner Regierung"; Orth 68: "Dass OGIS 219 ein Zeugnis des Regierungsanfangs darstellt, liess sich niemals bezweifeln."

[4] R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* I (Hanover 1898) 167f.

πράγματα συντηρεῖν), by which he apparently intends that they maintain the existing constitution.[5]

4, προστὰς ἐνδόξου καὶ καλῆς αἱρέσεως. Among the many meanings of προίσταμαι is "conduct," "pursue":[6] thus Dem. 30.18, προστάντες τοῦ πράγματος τὰ γνωσθέν' ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀποστερῆσαί με ζητοῦσιν ("in their conduct of the matter.... ").

4f, τὰς πόλεις τὰς κατὰ τὴν Σελευκίδα. The term "Seleucis" designates the part of northern Syria containing (but not confined to) the four cities of Antioch, Seleucea Pieria, Laodicea, and Apamea, and recurs in this sense in a famous decree of Smyrna relative to Seleucus II, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος ὑπερέβαλεν εἰς τὴν Σελευκίδα.[7]

5f, διὰ τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῶμ πραγμάτων. In its sense of "state" (line 3), the expression τὰ πράγματα is often used to designate a kingdom as an entity whose interests and unity may be threatened by external or internal enemies.[8]

6, εἰς εἰρήνην ... καταστῆσαι. The king has established "peace" both in the Seleucis (6, 11) and in the regions beyond the Taurus (13). The word may have slightly different meanings in reference to the two areas, denoting internal peace or concord in the first, external peace, perhaps assured by treaty, in the second. It should not be pressed too far, however, since kings tended to use it meaning little more than that they had pacified a region or brought it under their rule: thus several inscriptions of Antiochus III talk of his establishing "peace" while on military campaign, and that is also implied here by the word δυνάμεις (below, on 9).[9]

7–8, τοὺς δ' ἐπιθεμένους τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπεξελθών, καθάπερ ἦν δίκαιον, ἀνακτήσασθαι τὴμ πατρώιαν ἀρχήν. The syntax clearly shows that this clause is separate from, and complementary to, the preceding, τὰς μὲν πόλεις ... καταστῆσαι, though both are governed by the verb ἐζήτησε (4); the clause beginning διὸ (8–12) summarizes both the previous ones. The first of these concerned those defecting (ἀποστάντας) from the state, whereas the second uses the same noun governed by a verb with a different prefix, those "attacking" (ἐπιθεμένους) the state. Polybius uses very similar language of

[5] *SEG* IX 7, lines 14, 17; for this interpretation, E. BICKERMANN, *Gnomon* 8 (1932) 429f; *cf. id., Institutions des Séleucides* (Paris 1938: hereafter 'Bickermann, *Institutions*') 4.

[6] Stephanus (Hase), *TGL s.v.* προίστημι 1730A.

[7] *OGIS* 229, lines 1f (T. Ihnken, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Sipylos* [Bonn 1978] no. 1; G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna* II [Bonn 1987] no. 573); *cf.* Strabo 16.2.4, C749; E. Honigmann, "Seleukis (2)," *RE* II.A.1 (1921) 1206–07; Otto 37f.

[8] Bickermann, *Institutions* 4, and below on lines 7f.

[9] *Amyzon* 134.

Hannibal attacking Rome, ἡλίκοις Ἀννίβας ἐτόλμησε πράγμασιν ἐπιθέσθαι (2.24.1); so also Ptolemy Physcon enjoined the Romans "to bring aid according to our friendship ... and to justice if any persons attack either the cities or the territory" (ἐάν τινες ἐπίωσιν ἢ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἢ τῆι χώραι, βοηθεῖν κατὰ τὴν φιλίαν ... καὶ τὸ δίκαιον: *SEG* IX 7, lines 19–23). In the decree of Ilion, then, it seems at first sight clear that two different groups of enemies are meant, though they may have concerted their actions, internal ones mentioned in lines 4ff and external ones in lines 7f. Droysen, seeing Ptolemy II behind the reference to unnamed "attackers," postulated a "War of the Syrian Succession."[10] Though contradicted by Dittenberger, Droysen's interpretation suits both ἐπιθέσθαι and ἐπεξελθεῖν, which in Attic Greek means to "pursue" or "punish," often in a juristic sense. Thus Thucydides makes Cleon say that delaying a decision on the Mitylenеans is to their advantage as the guilty party, "since the victim pursues the agent with his anger weakened" (3.38.1: ὁ γάρ παθὼν τῷ δράσαντι ἀμβλυτέρᾳ τῇ ὀργῇ ἐπεξέρχεται); so also the Athenians addressing the Melians forbear to use the plea that "we are seeking redress for an injury" (5.89: ἀδικούμενοι ἐπεξερχόμεθα).[11] In the decree of Ilion this juristic overtone is also heard in καθάπερ ἦν δίκαιον and below in ἐπιβολῆι καλῆι καὶ δικαίηι.

8, χρησάμενος ἐπιβολῆι καλῆι καὶ δικαιῆι. *Cf.* Polybius on the Cretans (6.47.5), οὔτε κατ' ἰδίαν ἤθη δολιώτερα Κρηταιέων εὕροι τις ἂν οὔτε κατὰ κοινὸν ἐπιβολὰς ἀδικωτέρας ("a public policy more unjust," tr. Paton). In the philosophical inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda, of the second century, Adolf Wilhelm restored [ταῖς] ἀρίσταις ἐπι[βολαῖς εἴ] τις σὺ χρώ[μενος].[12]

10, λαβὼν οὐ μόνον τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὰς δυνάμεις εἰς τὸ διαγωνίσασθαι περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων προθύμους. "The Friends" is a technical term of the Seleucid Empire, as of other Hellenistic states, connoting a group of courtiers and advisors close to the ruler (Bickermann, *Institutions* 40ff). The term δυνάμεις is usually, perhaps always, applied to troops levied for the purpose of war, and is often combined with mention of the Friends.[13] The verb διαγωνίσασθαι in Polybius, as also in other writers, suggests a struggle in an honorable cause, and here reinforces the idea of justification: thus 6.49.4, (the Spartans) ἐπιπορευομένους τοὺς Πέρσας ἐνίκων δια-

[10] Droysen III.1[2] 256=III[3] 165, followed among others by Otto 17 n.3.

[11] It makes no difference that the verb here takes the accusative and not the dative: *cf.* Claudius to the Alexandrians, *CPJ* 153 line 99 (E. M. Smallwood, *Documents of Gaius, Claudius and Nero* [Cambridge 1967] no. 370).

[12] A. Wilhelm, in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (Manchester 1927) 416f.

[13] M. Holleaux, "Sur une inscription de Siphnos," *BCH* 29 (1905) 326; Herrmann 53.

γωνισάμενοι περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας, 9.35.2, (the Macedonians) οὐ παύονται διαγωνιζόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀσφαλείας.

12, τοὺς τόπους τοὺς ἐπιτάδε τοῦ Ταύρου. τόποι is a vague expression, which Polybius uses similarly to describe the entirety of a region, εἰς τοὺς κατ' Ἰβηρίαν τόπους (2.1.5), πρὸς τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τόπους (10.1.2). In the Seleucid Empire at its fullest extent, "beyond the Taurus" was the official term for the northwest portion; its ambiguity led to a famous *contretemps* over the terms of the Treaty of Apamea.[14] With the contrast here compare a decree of Teos for Antiochus III, πρότερόν τε ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ Ταύρου ... καὶ παραγενόμενος εἰς τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τόπους (Herrmann 34 lines 8ff, *cf.* 54).

20–22, εὔξασθαι τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι Ἰλιάδι μετὰ τῶμ πρεσβευτῶν τήν τε παρουσίαν γεγονέναι (ἐπ' ἀγαθῶι) τοῦ βασιλέως, κτλ. Chishull, followed by Stephanus (Hase), *TGL* (*s.v.* εὔχομαι, 2523B), took εὔξασθαι to mean "give thanks," and elsewhere the verb is rarely if ever followed by a perfect infinitive. But just as Aeschines can say μετρίως ἐλπίζω μοι προειρῆσθαι (1.3), so the present sentence can be brought into order by assuming the lapse of some expression signifying "with good fortune," and Boeckh's ἐπ' ἀγαθῶι has been universally accepted. The mason would have made a more venial error by omitting εὖ before γεγονέναι; even if that would entail making εὖ γεγονέναι intervene between τὴν παρουσίαν and its dependent genitives, such hyperbaton is extremely frequent in Polybius.[15] For this sense of εὖ compare Polyb. 8.15.7, πολλὰ δ' εὖ γενομένων ὑπισχνεῖτο δώσειν ("für den Fall des Gelingens," Mauersberger); it is particularly at home in the language of prayer, *e.g.* Aesch. *Supp.* 454, γένοιτο δ' εὖ παρὰ γνώμην ἐμήν; Eur. *Alc.* 627, εὖ σοι γένοιτο.

The phrase τὴν παρουσίαν γεγονέναι (ἐπ' ἀγαθῶι) τοῦ βασιλέως has evoked a variety of translations, "that his presence has been for the good of the King,"[16] "that his presence (this side of Taurus) should be to the advantage of the King,"[17] "that his visit shall be for the good of the king,"[18] "shall pray ... for the propitious advent of the King" (Pieijko 11: the last two translations are excluded by the tense of γεγονέναι). παρουσία in Polybius always means "arrival,"

[14] A. H. MacDonald, "The Treaty of Apamea (188 B.C.)," *JRS* 57 (1967) 1–8.

[15] J.-A. Foucault, *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe* (Paris 1972) 255.

[16] R. S. Bagnall and P. Derow, *Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period* (Chico 1981) no. 16.

[17] M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest* (Cambridge 1981) no. 139.

[18] S. M. Burstein, *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsos to the Death of Cleopatra VII* (Cambridge 1985) no. 15.

though there is sometimes the sense of "presence after a recent arrival."[19] As in English, the word "arrival" is relative to the situation of the speaker, and can denote arrival in a region, not just a place. Thus while Hannibal is still crossing the Pyrenees, the Celtic Boii desert the Romans, πιστεύοντες ἐκ τῶν διαπεμπομένων τῇ παρουσίᾳ τῶν Καρχηδονίων (3.40.7: "the near arrival," tr. Paton); while Antiochus III is still in Asia, the senate warns Philip V to enter into alliance with Rome ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ ... ἀποκαραδοκεῖν τὴν Ἀντιόχου παρουσίαν (18.48.4: "looking forward to the arrival of Antiochus," tr. Paton). That the same sense is meant here is reinforced by παραγενόμενος in 12, where the verb must have its usual sense of "come," "arrive." It follows that the Ilians are praying, not for a visit of the King and his retinue to the city, but that his arrival "on this side of the Taurus" should prove to have been as propitious as his earlier campaigns at the heart of the kingdom. That indeed was the interpretation of Boeckh, seconded by Dittenberger (on *OGIS* 219 n.15), "non Ilium regem advenisse, sed de transitu in terras cis Taurum sitas haec intellegenda."

21, τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσης. This phrase, recently cited as proof of a date under Antiochus III, is best considered separately (below).

24, λαμβάνουσαν ἐπίδοσιν καθάπερ αὐτοὶ προαιροῦνται. For ἐπίδοσιν λαμβάνειν, *cf.* Polyb. 1.20.2, the Romans hope to eject the Carthaginians from Sicily, τούτου δὲ γενομένου μεγάλην ἐπίδοσιν αὐτῶν λήψεσθαι τὰ πράγματα.[20] The word ἐπίδοσις signifies not so much "prosperity" as "growth," "increase," in a political sense ("[Macht-]Zuwachs, Aufschwung," Mauersberger). προαιρεῖσθαι, which LSJ translate "choose deliberately," must here have a weaker sense, "wish, desire," a sense also found in other Hellenistic texts: thus Laodice III writing to Iasos talks of "desiring for my part to act in conformity with his [Antiochus'] keenness and determination" (προαιρουμένη καὶ ἐγὼ ἀκόλουθα πράσειν τῇ σπουδῇ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκτενείαι).[21]

II

Of the various dates for the inscription, the latest is also the latest to be proposed, 197 or 196.[22] This would place it in the context of Antiochus III's great invasion of Asia Minor that was

[19] Foucault (*supra* n.15) 369, with ten examples of "arrivée," two of "présence."

[20] For epigraphical examples, Holleaux II 114.

[21] *Inscr. Iasos* no. 4, lines 11f, *cf.* 29f.

[22] Piejko. The author first made this view known in *Gnomon* 52 (1980) 258.

to lead to his clash with Rome, his defeat at Magnesia, and the Treaty of Apamea by which the Seleucids lost forever their realm beyond the Taurus. He began operations in the spring of 197 by sending a land army under two of his sons, while he sailed with a fleet of 200 ships along the southern coast. Already by the summer he had recovered many of the realm's ancient domains as far as the Hellespont, meeting resistance from only a few cities, Coracesion in Cilicia, Smyrna in Ionia, Lampsacus in the Troad. After wintering in Ephesus, Antiochus crossed to the Thracian Chersonese in 196, intending to establish his second son Seleucus (the future Seleucus IV) at Lysimachea, which was now rebuilt after its destruction by marauding Celts. While negotiating in this same city with Rome, however, Antiochus was called back to Syria by news, later to prove false, that the boy-king of Egypt Ptolemy V was dead. Taking with him his elder son Antiochus, and leaving Seleucus at the head of an army in Lysimachea, he returned to Syrian Antioch before the end of 196.[23]

On the new view, the reference to the king's "sister-queen" (τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλίσσης, 22: restored in 44) is "incontrovertible proof that [the inscription] cannot belong to Antiochus I" (Piejko 36). Antiochus I's only known wife, Stratonice, was not his sister, but the daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Phila, who in her turn was the daughter of the great Macedonian general Antipater.[24] Boeckh thought that Antiochus had married a half-sister after Stratonice's death, while Wilcken, realizing that this would put the inscription too late in his reign, proposed that the unnamed wife was a secondary, bigamous one.[25] What had come to be accepted as the correct solution was first proposed by Gustav Droysen, that the wife here is Stratonice, and in the Seleucid house as in the Ptolemaic 'sister' was a courtesy title of the queen.[26] The new

[23] In general Will II² 181–89; the most important ancient sources are Polyb. 18.39, 41a, 47.1f, 49–52; Liv. 33.19f, 38–41.

[24] Geyer, "Stratonike (8)," *RE* 4A (1931) 319f; W. Hoffmann, "Phila (3)," *RE* 19 (1938) 2087f.

[25] U. Wilcken, "Antiochos (21)," *RE* 1 (1894) 2452, followed by Dittenberger on *OGIS* 219 n.17.

[26] Droysen III.1² 267 n.=III³ 171 n.173. Note especially Holleaux III 180: "On doit donc désormais tenir pour démontré ce qu'on soupçonnait depuis longtemps,—à savoir, que chez les Séleucides aussi bien que chez les Lagides, le nom d'ἀδελφή donné aux reines n'était qu'un titre honorifique."

view follows Droysen, with the limitation that "a careful examination of all the material on the title ἡ ἀδελφὴ Βασίσσα in the Seleucid royal house proves beyond possibility of any legitimate doubt that in the light of the presently available evidence no queen bore that title before Laodice III, the consort of Antiochus III" (Piejko 35).

It may be noted that the argument comes close to being circular, since it assumes what it is designed to prove, that the sister-queen of the decree of Ilion is not the consort of Antiochus I. Moreover, the word "title" must be used with caution. In the Lagid house the decisive moment was the marriage of Ptolemy II (285–246) with his sister Arsinoe. Beginning with Berenice II, who was in fact only the cousin of Ptolemy III Euergetes, the king's consort was regularly styled his "sister and wife," ἀδελφὴ καὶ γυνή: thus "King Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, Brother-and-Sister Gods, and Queen Berenice, his sister and wife, (consecrated) the sanctuary to Osiris" (*OGIS* 60: Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος Πτολεμαίου καὶ Ἀρσινόης, θεῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ Βασίλισσα Βερενίκη, ἡ ἀδελφὴ καὶ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, τὸ τέμενος Ὀσίρει).[27] By contrast, Laodice III never had 'sister' in her regular titulature: this is not so much a title as an appellation or mode of address, like the terms 'father' or 'brother' used by Seleucid monarchs in addressing members of the Friends.[28] Similarly in British etiquette the term "lady" does not signify a particular rank, but is "a less formal substitute for the specific designation of rank ... in speaking of a marchioness, countess, viscountess or baroness" (*OED s.v.* "Lady" 6a).

To begin with the handful of documents in which Antiochus is called "brother" by his queen, and Laodice is called his "sister queen" either by himself or by a city:

(1) A decree of Sardis dated to 213 mentioning a letter "from the queen" is followed by the text of the letter. Appearing in the prescript as "Queen Laodice," she thanks the city for instituting various divine honors including "a sacrfice to Zeus Genethlios

[27] The easiest way to view the material is in Abschnitt 2, "Könige," of F. Preisigke's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin 1931) with Suppl. 1–2 (Amsterdam 1971–91).

[28] "Father": Jos. *AJ* 12.148, 13.127; "brother": *2 Macc.* 11, 22; in general, Bikermann, *Institutions* 43; C. Habicht, *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* I.3: *2. Makkabäerbuch* (Gütersloh 1976) 257 n.22; P. GAUTHIER, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes* II (Geneva 1989: hereafter 'Gauthier, *Sardes*') 41.

for the safety of our brother King Antiochus, ourselves, and our young children (παιδία)." As Gauthier has observed, the choice of Zeus Genethlios underlines the familial nature of the reference to "our brother" and the "young children."[29]

(2) Teos, recently wrested from Attalus by Antiochus, probably in 204 or 203, passes two separate decrees in honor of the royal pair. In the first the city votes "marble statues, as beautiful and as venerable as possible, of King Antiochus and his sister queen Laodice, in order that, having declared the city and its territory sacred and inviolable ... they may receive honors from all so far as is possible and ... be joint saviors of our city and jointly give blessings to us."[30] In the second, which is somewhat later, the city decrees cultic honors first to "King Antiochus the Great and his sister queen Laodice" together, then details the particular honors that each is to receive, and finally appoints ambassadors to both, all the time using these same appellations.[31]

(3) A fragmentary letter of Antiochus to Teos, presumably of about the same date, refers to "me and my sister...," the next words being lost (Herrmann 158 line 16).

(4) A letter of Antiochus to Heraclea by Latmos, not earlier than 196, refers to "... Laodice and my son Antiochus": Laodice's name may well have been proceded by "my (our) sister queen."[32]

(5) A long inscription of Iasos not earlier than 195 contains two documents, the first a letter of Laodice. She begins: "having heard several times from my brother what help he always gives to his friends and allies" and ends, "I will try to bring about whatever (benefits) I think of, desiring in every way to conform to my brother's wish." In the following decrees of the city, after the honors for the "Great King Antiochus," the section referring to the queen probably began "and that [his sister] queen

[29] Gauthier, *Sardes* II 47ff no. 2 (*SEG* XXXIX 1284B), especially 71ff.

[30] Herrmann 35, lines 45–52 and, on the date, 93–97. F. Piejko, "Antiochus III and Teos Reconsidered," *Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten* 55 (1991) 13–69, dates this to 197/196, partly on the basis of his redating of *OGIS* 219 (p.25).

[31] Herrmann 37, lines 11f, 30; 39, line 64; 40, lines 107f.

[32] M. Wörrle, "Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos, I: Antiochos III., Zeuxis und Herakleia," *Chiron* 18 (1988) 422 N I, line 1 (*SEG* XXXVII 859 A).

Laodice be praised" (ἐπῃνῆσθαι δὲ [καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ βα]σίλισσαν Λαοδίκην).[33]

(6) In 193 Antiochus decided to incorporate the cult of Laodice in the state-cult of the realm. His edict announcing the decision is known from three copies, one from Phrygia and two from Iran.[34] The king declares his intention to "increase still further the honor of our sister queen Laodice, [thinking] it important to do so because she lives with us lovingly and considerately"; copies of the edict are to be inscribed "so that both now and in the future our attitude toward our sister may be evident to all."

With these documents may be compared the more numerous ones in which the titles "brother" and "sister" are omitted (I take only those referring to Laodice, and have not aimed at completeness).

(7) A undated manumission of Susa is made "on behalf of [King] Antiochus and [Queen] Laodice."[35]

(8) The decree of Sardis preceding Laodice's letter to the city (no. 1 above) mentions the letter sent "by the Queen" and the honors voted by the city "to the King, the Queen, and their children (τέκνα)."[36]

(9) An agonothete of Syrian Antioch in 198/197 is honored for his good will towards "the Great King Antiochus, Antiochus his son, Queen Laodice, and the children (παιδία)."[37]

(10) The letter of Antiochus to Heraclea of 196 or later (no. 4 above) is followed by one from the viceroy Zeuxis to the city mentioning its decision to sacrifice to "the King and Queen (οἱ βασιλεῖς) and their children (τέκνα)."[38]

(11) A decree of Iasos, apparently separate from and later than

[33] *Inschr. Iasos* 4, lines 4ff, 28ff, 76f.

[34] Welles nos. 36f (Dodurga); L. Robert, *Hellenica* 7 (Paris 1949) 5–22 (Nehavend) and *OMS* V 469–84 (="Encore une inscription grecque de l'Iran," *CRAI* 1967, 281–96 [Kermanshah]).

[35] *SEG* VII 15, revised by Robert, *OMS* II 1216–20 (="Études d'épigraphie grecque," *RPhil* SÉR. 3 10 [1936] 137–41); Schmitt 11f.

[36] Gauthier, *Sardes* II 47 no. 2A (*SEG* XXXIX 1284A).

[37] C. H. Kraeling, "A New Greek Inscription from Antioch on the Orontes," *AJA* 68 (1964) 178f; *Bull. épigr.* 1965, 436; Wörrle (*supra* n.32) 450.

[38] Wörrle (*supra* n.32) 432 N II, line 10 (*SEG* XXXVII 859B).

the one honoring Antiochus and Laodice jointly (no. 5 above), is intended to show the attitude of the people towards "the Great King Antiochus, Queen Laodice, and their children (τέκνα)."[39]

(12) A decree of a tribe of Iasos of 195 or later expresses good wishes for "the Great King Antiochus and Queen Laodice."[40]

(13) An account of Delos inscribed in 192 but referring to the year 194 mentions statues of "King Antiochus and Queen Laodice."[41]

(14) All three copies of Antiochus' edict of 193 (no. 6 above) also include copies of the covering letters of the officials who published them in their regions. The letter of the satrap of Phrygia refers to the "edict written by the King concerning the appointment of Berenice ... as chief-priestess of the Queen in the satrapy": the letter of Menedemos in the two Iranian copies does not mention the queen.

These two lists confirm that "sister queen" is not a fixed title of Laodice, but appears only in those texts, usually letters of the royal couple, which emphasize their mutual collaboration and devotion. When the city of Teos wishes to honor both of them as gods in gratitude for their benefactions, it refers to them as "King Antiochus and his sister queen Laodice," and the same may be true at Iasos. In those texts by contrast in which the queen is mentioned by herself, or in which the royal pair is mentioned without reference to their joint benefactions or mutual affection, the terms "brother" and "sister" are eschewed.[42]

The next step, then, is to apply this same distinction to the earlier texts mentioning Seleucid queens. Such texts are very sparse. The only one that mentions a "sister queen" is the same decree of Ilion, in which the emphasis is on the royal pair's

[39] *OGIS* 237, lines 12f, republished by Blümel as *Inschr. Iasos* 4, lines 61f, but C. Vollgraff Crowther has shown that this fragment is not part of the same decree: "Iasos in the Early Second Century B.C. A Note on *OGIS* 237," *BICS* 36 (1989) 136ff (*SEG* XXXIX 1110).

[40] *Inschr. Iasos* 5, lines 3f; *cf. Amyzon* 164.

[41] *I.Délos* 399 A 49; on this text, M.-F. Baslez and C. Vial, "La diplomatie de Délos dans le premier tiers du II[e] s.," *BCH* 111 (1987) 289, 291, 303.

[42] To some extent, the same 'emotional' use of 'sister' can be seen in texts emphasizing the affection of a Ptolemy and his sister queen, notably in the prescript of Chremonides' decree, *SIG*[3] 434/435 line 16, ἀκολούθως τεῖ τῶν προγόνων καὶ τεῖ τῆς ἀδελφῆς προαιρέσει: *cf.* H. Hauben in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (=*Studia Hellenistica* 27 [Louvain 1983] 116f; *cf.* also *OGIS* 84 (Paphos), 99 (uncertain origin).

collaboration, as in the two decrees of Teos (no. 2 above). Otherwise I have noticed only two comparable texts. One is the decree of Miletos in honor of Apama, the first wife of Seleucus Nicator.[43] This begins, "when Queen Apama previously showed much good will and zeal on behalf of the Milesians serving with King Seleucus": here the queen alone is the recipient of the city's honors, and her husband is mentioned only secondarily. The second is the letter written by Antiochus II in 243/242 to the satrap of the Hellespont about land recently sold to "Laodice": it is now generally agreed that this is indeed Antiochus' first wife, but that the bare title is used because he was in the process of divorcing her and marrying the Ptolemaic princess Berenice.[44] In short, the earlier texts conform to the practice established by considering those from the reign of Antiochus III. As Louis Robert observed in a similar context,[45] "La théorie perd toute base si on procède à l'examen des documents et des formules au point de vue diplomatique, comme on doit toujours le faire sous peine des plus graves confusions et des reconstructions les plus fallacieuses."

Another title, this time a true title rather than merely a form of address, enters into consideration. According to Appian, after Antiochus III had "attacked Media, Parthyene, and many tribes that had rebelled from him, had achieved many great deeds, and had been called 'Great' in consequence, he was made overconfident by all this and by the appellation (προσωνυμία), and ... proceeded to attack the Hellespontines, Aeolians, and Ionians as if they belonged to him as ruler of Asia" (*Syr.* 1.1, *cf.* Plut. *Flam.* 9.9). Holleaux observed that the city of Antioch in Persis, in its decree of 205 honoring Magnesia on the Maeander, omits the title "Great" when referring to Antiochus, who was just then returning from his 'Anabasis' in the Upper Satrapies; by contrast, all the inscriptions then known in which he is given the title in his lifetime either were or could be placed after that date. Holleaux inferred (III 162), "On ne peut raisonnablement penser que les Antiochéniens, sujets très respectueux des

[43] A. Rehm, *Die Inschriften von Didyma* (Berlin 1958) 480, on which see Holleaux III 99–110.

[44] *OGIS* 225 (part); Welles no. 18, lines 17, 19, with commentary p.92; Rehm (*supra* n.43) 492B. The decree of Delphi about the cult of Stratonice as the mother of Antiochus II does not refer to the current queen: *OGIS* 228 (*FdD* III.4.2 no. 153).

[45] L. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Geneva 1966) 91.

souverains Séleucides dont ils célébraient le culte, aient commis l'inexcusable faute de passer sous silence le qualificatif glorieux dont le roi Antiochos avait orné son nom. L'absence de l'épithète dans le décret implique qu'à l'époque où il fut rendu, elle ne faisait point encore partie de la titulature officielle."

Since Holleaux the examples have multiplied, and there have been several valuable discussions.[46] Just as with the title of "sister queen," it is instructive to observe the diplomatic nuances. "Antiochus the Great" ('Αντίοχος [ὁ] μέγας) is the standard form in authors such as Polybius, and is found in posthumous inscriptions listing the king among the gods of the Seleucid state cult.[47] The earlier of the two decrees of Teos dated to 204 or 203 (no. 2 above) omits the epithet, while the second calls the king βασιλεὺς 'Αντίοχος μέγας (Herrmann 37 line 11), perhaps because it is following the practice of the Seleucid state cult. Thereafter the usual order in texts from the king's lifetime is βασιλεὺς μέγας 'Αντίοχος and the title is omitted only in two types of context: in the protocol of royal letters and edicts, such as the edict of 193 proposing honors for Laodice, and in dating-formulas of the type, "in the reign of Antiochus and Antiochus the son" (the king's elder son and co-regent from 210 to 192), βασιλευόντων 'Αντιόχου καὶ 'Αντιόχου τοῦ υἱοῦ, though here too the adjective "Great" may be inserted after the first "Antiochus." Notably, Antiochus is sometimes called "the Great King" while his consort is merely "Queen Laodice."[48] Holleaux's observation about the omission of the title in the decree of Antioch in Persis can be applied, *mutatis mutandis,* to the decree of Ilion: "L'absence de l'épithète dans le décret implique qu'à l'époque où il fut rendu, elle ne faisait point partie de la titulature officielle."

[46] P. P. Spranger, "Der Grosse. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung des historischen Beinamens in der Antike," *Saeculum* 9 (1958) 29–32; Schmitt 92–95; Herrmann 147–57; *Amyzon* 163f.

[47] Polyb. 4.2.7, *cf.* F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford 1957–79) I 450f; *OGIS* 245 lines 18, 40 (Seleucea Pieria), 246 line 7 (Teos); a problematic inscription from Nysa (Welles 261f; *Bull. épigr.* 1950, 28 *ad fin.*) is certainly posthumous.

[48] Without "Great": *SEG* XXXVI 973 (Euromos, 198/197); *Amyzon* no. 15B (Xanthos, 197/196); "Great" is also missing from the Delian inscription of 192 (no. 12 above), but that is explained by the place and time. "Great" included: *Amyzon* 146 no. 14, 151 no. 15. "Antiochus the Great and Queen Laodice": Kraeling (*supra* n.37) 178f (Syrian Antioch); *Inschr. Iasos* 4 lines 61f (*OGIS* 237 lines 12f) 5 lines 3f.

Another omission is also worth remarking. The text says clearly that the queen has crossed the Taurus with her husband, and expresses the wish that "all other good things should come about for the king and the queen, and that the state and their kingdom should last, increasing as they themselves desire" (23ff). The royal children are mentioned, if at all, only near the end, when ambassadors are instructed to convey the city's pleasure at the good health of "(the King) himself and his [sister queen, the children], the Friends and the forces" (44f). The comparatively abundant sources for Antiochus' invasion of 197 (Polybius, Livy, inscriptions) testify that he was accompanied by his two eldest sons, who commanded his fleet, but do not mention Laodice's presence; of the sons, Antiochus had been his co-regent since 210, while one of the objects of the campaign was to install the second, Seleucus, in Thrace.[49]

III

The first person to declare firmly for Antiochus III as the subject of the decree of Ilion was a Russian scholar, T. Sokoloff, though the same proposal was also made more tentatively at the same time by Richard Laqueur.[50] Sokoloff placed the decree in 213, just after Antiochus' defeat and capture of his cousin Achaeus, who after beginning the reign as his viceroy in Asia later declared independence. Sokoloff's proposal would certainly obviate some of the difficulties encountered by the date of 197, but has been universally rejected for other reasons. In 218, Ilion was sympathetic to Pergamum, since Polybius, describing Attalus' successful campaign of that year against Achaeus, mentions it as a city that had retained its fidelity (πίστις) to the king (Polyb. 5.78.6).[51] It is unclear how far back

[49] The letter of Antiochus to Heraclea of 196 (*SEG* XXXVII 859A; no. 4 above) mentions crowns that the city had sent to the king in honor of the queen and all his sons, and Wörrle (*supra* n.32: 454) suggests that the whole family was with Antiochus in Thrace or Asia. I am grateful to the reader for *GRBS* for pointing this out.

[50] T. Sokoloff, "Zur Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v.Chr. Der Antiochus der Inschriften von Ilion," *Klio* 4 (1904) 101–10; R. Laqueur, *Quaestiones epigraphicae et papyrologicae selectae* (diss.Strasbourg 1904) 80 n.1 (*non vidi*). For what follows, see especially Orth 68ff; R. E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom* (Oxford 1983) 36–58.

[51] *Cf.* Walbank (*supra* n.47) I 606f; Allen (*supra* n.50) 40, 57f.

this relationship went, and Ilion may well have been in the Seleucid camp at the beginning of Antiochus' reign, when Achaeus was still loyal. In 216, Antiochus crossed the Taurus for the first time in his reign intending to crush Achaeus, and did not return until he had captured him in Sardis after a long siege, probably in winter 214/213. It is hardly possible that Ilion had gone over to Antiochus after 218, since in order to fight Achaeus he was obliged to make an agreement of cooperation with his kingdom's hereditary enemy, Attalus.[52] In addition, there is no sign at all that Antiochus' inglorious campaign affected the cities of the Hellespont in any way. Whatever the Ilians' position in 223, therefore, it is hardly conceivable that in 213 they should imply that they were and always had been unwavering supporters of Antiochus.

IV

If Antiochus III is eliminated, Antiochus I remains the only possibility, but not merely by default. Enough is known about the early years of his reign, above all from the summary of Memnon of Heraclea given by Photius, to show that the decree fits comfortably within it.[53]

In late 282 Seleucus I crossed the Taurus to confront his old enemy Lysimachus, whom he defeated early in 281; after crossing to Lysimachea, he was assassinated by his erstwhile suppliant, Ptolemy Ceraunus, in August or September of the same year. Despite the troubles in Asia Minor that followed from his father's assassination, Antiochus remained in Syria, and instead sent an expeditionary force under a trusted general, Patrocles. When a subordinate of Patrocles had been besieged and killed by Zipoites of Bithynia, Antiochus in Memnon's words "determined to lead an army against the Bithynians."[54] Once in Asia, however, Antiochus was faced by an array of enemies. In Bithynia, Zipoites had been succeeded by his son, Nicomedes I,

[52] For the chronology of these events, see now Gauthier, *Sardes* II 15–19. On the κοινοπραγία of Antiochus and Attalus (Polyb. 5.107.4), Will II^2 49ff; H. Malay, "An Inscription from Apollonia Salbake in Caria," *EpigAnat* 10 (1987) 12f.

[53] For what follows see especially Otto 17–22; Will I^2 142ff.

[54] Memnon, *FGrHist* 434 F 1, 9 (3); on these events, C. Habicht, "Zipoites (1)," *RE* X.A (1972) 453f.

who entered into alliance with the 'Northern League' of maritime cities (Cios, Byzantium, Chalcedon, Heraclea, and Teos); this alliance was joined by Antigonus Gonatas, who as the son of Demetrius Poliorcetes had his own claim to the throne of Macedonia.[55] In addition, the confusion in Macedonia and Asia had drawn in the Celts, who invaded Greece in 279, and in the following year were brought over to Asia by Nicomedes as his allies; they had previously negotiated unsuccessfully with a Seleucid official called Antipater.[56] Probably in this same year of 278, Antiochus and Antigonus made peace, induced (it seems) to end their long hostility by the Celtic threat.[57] Antiochus remained in Asia with his capital at Sardis, no doubt devoting much of his energy to the Celts, and eventually, either in 275/274 or about 270, won a brilliant victory over them in the so-called "Elephant Battle." After his death, his status as a scourge of the Celts won him the title of "Savior" (Σωτήρ) in the Seleucid state cult, just as the Aetolians had founded the Soteria of Delphi in 278 to commemorate their own Celtic victory in 279.[58]

The analysis of lines 2–8 suggested that, even while still in Syria, the king was faced both with internal rebellion and external aggression. Numismatic evidence has been cited to show Antiochus beset by troubles in Syria, but is inconclusive.[59] Whether or not confronted by a "War of the Syrian Succession," however, his lingering in Syria during the campaign of

[55] On the reflection of this period in coins of the Northern League, H. Seyrig, in *Centennial Publication of the American Numismatic Society* (New York 1958) 617ff (=*Scripta Numismatica* [Paris 1986] 206ff). Getzel Cohen points to the name of an island "Antiochia" in the Propontis (Plin. *HN* 5.151; *Tab. Peut.* 11.1) as a possible trace of this campaign.

[56] Crossing of the Celts: Paus. 10.23.14; Antipater: Liv. 38.16.5 (on this person, H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* II [Munich 1944] 98 n.2, 337f).

[57] Memnon, *FGrHist* 434 F 1, 10 (1), χρόνον συχνόν; Just. 25.1.1, *inter duos reges, Antigonum et Antiochum, statuta pace cum in Macedoniam Antigonus reverteretur.* For a conspectus of views on the date, Orth 71 with n.89.

[58] App. *Syr.* 65, 343, with the discussion of K. Brodersen, *Appians Abriss der Seleukidengeschichte* (Munich 1989) 193–96. On the Aetolians, G. Nachtergael, *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes* (Brussels 1977) esp. 176 on propaganda exploitation of such victories by Antiochus, the Aetolians, and (later) Attalus I.

[59] Will I^2 141, though retaining Newell's argument about the coinage of Apamea; on this see now A. Houghton, *Coins of the Seleucid Empire from the Collection of Arthur Houghton* (New York 1983) 29.

Patrocles suggests difficulties there, and it is certain that in the Aegean Ptolemy II had already taken both Samos and Miletos by about 280, clearly turning to advantage the disorder created by Seleucus' assassination.[60]

While there is no other evidence that Laodice accompanied her husband in 197, with Stratonice it is otherwise. An astrological diary from Babylon, many times discussed but only recently published in full, shows that in Year 36 of the Seleucid era (276/275) the governor of Babylonia and other courtiers appeared before Antiochus in Sardis, where he had presumably resided since crossing the Taurus. The following year the governor returned to Seleucea; in the year after that, Year 38 (274/273), which is the year of the diary, "the king left his..., his wife and a famous official in the land Sardis to strengthen the guard. He went to Transpotamia against the troops of Egypt which were encamped in Transpotamia, and the troops of Egypt withdrew before him."[61] The presence of Stratonice on this campaign can be seen as an extension of the long years she had spent with Antiochus in the Upper Satrapies when he was co-regent with his father, but in addition she was the full sister of Antigonus Gonatas, and the peace between Syria and Macedon was sealed by the marriage of her daughter, the younger Phila, to Antigonus.[62] Some have supposed that Arsinoe, the powerful wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus, had hopes of placing her son by Lysimachus, "Ptolemy the son," on the Macedonian throne,[63] and if that were correct, it might further be speculated that Antiochus hoped to outmaneuver his Egyptian rival by the

[60] Miletos: *SIG*^{3} 322 with n.6; Samos: *SEG* I 363, also mentioning Miletos, Myndos, and Halicarnassos; *cf.* R. S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (Leiden 1976) 80, 94, 97; in general, Will I^2 140f.

[61] A. J. Sachs and H. Hunger, *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia* I (=*DenkschrWien* 195 [Vienna 1988]) 345 lines 34 (years 36–37), 29 (year 38). On this text in general, Otto 3ff; P. Bernard, "Nouvelle contribution de l'épigraphie cunéiforme à l'histoire hellénistique," *BCH* 114 (1990) 532–39; on the reading in line 29, J. Renger, "Ein seleukidischer Ehrentitel in keilschriftlicher Überlieferung," *Orientalia* 54 (1985) 257ff.

[62] On this marriage, J. Seibert, *Historische Beiträge zu den dynastischen Verbindungen in hellenistischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967) 33f; on the younger Phila, see now the remarkable inscription of a Macedonian officer "in the service of Queen [Phil]a," M. B. Hatzopoulos, in ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑ (=Μελετήματα 10 [Athens 1990]) 135–55, esp. 144–48.

[63] For this theory, see the sceptical discussion of Hauben (*supra* n.42) 114–19.

dynastic claims of his own wife, giving Antigonus his stepdaughter instead of threatening him with a rival.

It has often been suspected that this peace is precisely that mentioned in the decree of Ilion.[64] That would help to explain the extravagant language of the decree, for being in the buffer zone between the two kingdoms the cities of the Troad would have had more to gain than most from the conclusion of peace between them. If that is right, the terminus post quem of the text will be 278, the most plausible date for the treaty, and a terminus ante of 274 or 273 is provided by Antiochus' return to Antioch.

Another danger may also have been in the citizens' thoughts. When the decree states that Antiochus "has proved the savior of the city" (σωτῆρα γεγονότα τοῦ δήμου, line 37), this perhaps need not mean that he had saved it on a specific occasion or from an external enemy; but it is tempting to suppose that, just as the Aetolians celebrated their defeat of the Gauls by naming the new Delphic festival the Soteria, so a similar success of Antiochus is meant here. That supposition receives support from the reference in line 27 to Victory as one of the gods to whom the city of Ilion resolves to pray. The success is not likely to be the Elephant Battle, but some encounter in 278 or not long after.

There remains an intractable problem that does not affect the date. Strabo (13.1.27, C594) alleges that "after crossing over from Europe the Celts went up to (Ilion) in search of a stronghold, but immediately left it because it had no walls." Just before that, however, the geographer credits Lysimachus with giving the city a wall forty stades long. The answer may be that he is referring to a later crossing, not the first one as generally assumed; on at least one later occasion, in 217/216, the Celts besieged the city, which must by then have rebuilt its walls.[65]

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
October, 1993

[64] Thus Droysen III.1² 257 n.2 (omitted in the third edition), followed by Dittenberger on *OGIS* 219 n.11; *cf.* Habicht (*supra* n.3) 84 n.3; Wörrle (*supra* n.3) 68.

[65] Polyb. 5.111.2, with Walbank (*supra* n.47) I 633. On this problem see now B. Schmidt-Dounas, "Zur Datierung der Metopen des Athena-Tempels von Ilion," *IstMitt* 41 (1991) 364–69. I am grateful to Glen Bowersock and Getzel Cohen for their comments.