

Rome and Tabae

Michael Crawford and Joyce Reynolds

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 un-inscribed 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 × height 0.40 × depth 1.05), though damaged along the edges and at the corners, and shows what are certainly ancient surfaces on top, both sides and back (see PLATE 7; in so far as the underside could be examined it appeared to have a tooled surface). The inscription began on a block or blocks which stood above it and continued onto at least one other below it, but did not extend horizontally beyond its width. It was possible to establish that the τὼν of line 12 is almost at the edge of the block and that there are only some 5–6 cms. missing

¹ Published by G. Doubler, *BCH* 13 (1889) 503ff; revised text produced by P. Viereck, *Hermes* 25 (1890) 624ff; whence W. Dittenberger, *OGIS* II (1905) 442; F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton 1926) no.16, p.271; other restorations suggested by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, in *Mommsen und Wilamowitz: Briefwechsel 1872–1903* (Berlin 1935) 392ff; new publication by W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* VI (Manchester 1939) no.162, pp.59ff (notably substituting ὄπω for πόλις in line 10; an allusion in A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* [Oxford 1937] 391 n.51, unchanged in the 1971 edition, 390 n.51); whence J. Robert and L. Robert, *La Carie* II (Paris 1954) no.5, pp.97ff (cf. *BullEpig* 1955, 201); G. Klaffenbach, *Gnomon* 27 (1955) 234–35 (cf. *SEG* XIII [1956] 490); G. E. Bean, *AJA* 60 (1956) 196 (cf. *SEG* XV [1958] 656), all attempting to restore lines 10–11; F. G. Maier, *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften: I, Texte und Kommentare* (Heidelberg 1959) no.75, pp.245–47, following Klaffenbach; R. K. Sherk, *GRBS* 6 (1965) 295–300, on lines 10–11 (cf. *BullEpig* 1967, 555); R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) no.17 [hereafter, *SHERK*].

from the left of the central portion of the inscribed area; it was also possible to observe that there are un-inscribed 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. Sherck, see n.1) unless otherwise noted.

...]ΑϚ[...]

[δυνάμεσίν] τε ἐπ'ἀνδρότατα [περὶ τῆς Ἀσίας]
 [καὶ τ]ῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀντιτετάχθ[αι, ἀρέσκειν τῇι]
 [συν]κλήτῳ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ [πάντα] αὐτοῖς
 5 [ὅπῳ]ς ἄριστα εἶναι ἕσεσθαι τε, τῆ[ν τε σύν]-
 [κλή]τον καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ῥωμαίων αὐτοὺς (?)
 [διὰ] μνήμης ἔχειν ἕξειν τε νας. ὅσα [τε τῆς]
 [τού]των ἀρετῆς καὶ καταλογῆς ἔγ[εκεν]
 [μετ]ὰ συνβουλίου γνώμης Λεύκιος Κο[ρνήλιος]
 10 [Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νας. ὅπῳ[ς]
 [ἀρί]στοις τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσειν νας.
 [ὅπῳ]ς τε χωρίον Θυησσόν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐντὸς τῶν ν.
 [ὀρίω]ν αὐτῶν, ἐὰν βούλωνται, ὀχυρώσων νας.
 [τῆν σ]ύνκλητον τὸν τε δῆμον τὸν Ῥωμαίων vacat
 15 [διαλα]μβάνειν ταῦτα αὐτοῖς καλῶς καὶ vacat.
 [. . .σβ. . .]ῶς καὶ ἀξίως αὐτῶν δεδόςθαι τε νας.

LINE 1. Perhaps [τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Β]α[ς][ιλέως Μιθριδάτου]; we calculate that the surviving letters are too far to the right to permit Doublet's ... τοῖς τε Β]α[ς][ιλέως Μιθριδάτου ἡγεμόσιν] based on the *S.C. de Stratonicensibus* (Sherck 18), lines 82–84.

LINE 3. [τ]ῆς clear on the squeeze, Η no longer clear on the stone.

LINE 4. The isolated Α, tacitly doubted by Robert, is visible on the stone, but there is hardly room for the previously accepted [τῷ Ῥωμ]α[ίων πάντα αὐ]-.

LINE 5. [ὄπω]ς rather than the previous [τοῖς] τ—traces on the stone, incompatible with T, suggest C. At the end τῆ[ν τε πρὸς τῆν κυν] seems to us overlong.

LINE 6. Ῥωμα[ίων ἀντῶν (?) πίςτιν] seems too long.

LINES 7–11. For the main proposals rejected here see n.3.

LINE 7. ὁα—the stone has broken along the left hasta of A (or, in theory, Λ).

LINE 8. ἔν[εκεν ἀντοῖς] seems too long.

LINE 9. Κο[ρνήλιος]—clear traces of O are visible on the stone, crowded up against K; crowding is apparent in this line from the latter part of Λεύκιος onwards (see above on the length of line 12).

LINE 10. [Σύλλ]αc clear on the squeeze, A no longer clear on the stone.

LINE 11. There is room for four letters at the beginning—[ἀρίς]τοῖς seems the obvious supplement, given that a word begun on the previous line is unlikely to have continued onto this line. [ἐπ' ἀν]τοῖς seems to yield no sense.

LINES 12–13. The earlier [ὁ]-[ρίω]ν is opposed to the mason's dislike of word-division; there is room for four letters at the beginning of line 13.

LINE 13. There is no room for [τῆν] at the end.

LINE 14. c[ύνκλητον] on both the squeeze and the stone; there is room for [τῆν] before it but no room for [δια]- at the end of the line.

LINE 15. [διαλα]νβάνειν—N is clear on the squeeze but no longer on the stone, and there is room for the five letters at the beginning. For the *vacat* at the end of the line see above.

LINE 16. [εὐπρεπ]ῶς *vel sim.* The small *vacat* surviving at the end of the line doubtless extended to the edge of the stone.

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 ὄπως, 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, [τῶι Ῥωμ]α[ίων] is quite superfluous in a document produced in Rome and should not be restored in line 4.² 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 ἔξειν τε, parallel to πάντα as the subject of εἶναι ἔσεσθαι 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

² 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;³ some preliminary remarks on the grammatical structure⁴ of the whole inscription seem necessary. The infinitive ἀντιτετάχθαι doubtless depends on a preposition, possibly διὰ (τὸ), or on something like ἐπεὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ταβηνῶν προείλετο; [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 σύνκλητον . . . διαλαμβάνειν ταῦτα . . . δεδόχθαι τε [e.g. καὶ συνκεχωρηῆσθαι]. ταῦτα here clearly picks up ὅσα. 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 ὤσιν and ὀχυρώσωσιν.

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 αἰρέσεσιν 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

³ Buckler and Calder: ὅσα τε ψηφισθῆναι in line 7;

[Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νν ὅπως ἐπ' ἔ]-

[ση (sic) αὐ]τοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσιν [κύρια] in lines 10–11.

Robert: ὅσα τε φιλόφρονα ?] in line 7;

[Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νν ὅπως ταῦτα

[ἐπ' αὐ]τοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσιν [κύρια] in lines 10–11.

Bean: [Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νν ὅπως κύριοι]

[ἐφ' αὐ]τοῖς (?) τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσιν [χρηῆσθαι] in lines 10–11.

Klaffenbach: ὅσα τε ἔπαθλα τῆς] in line 7;

[Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νν ὅπως ὕψ']

[ἔαυ]τοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσιν [πάσαις]

or [Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νν ὅπως αὐθαι]-

[ρέ]τοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσιν [πάσαις] in lines 10–11.

Sherk: ὅσα τε κώμας τῆς] in line 7;

[Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν νν ὅπως αὐτ]-

[αι αὐ]τοῖς τοῖς νόμοις αἰρέσεσιν τε ὤσιν [ὑπήκοοι] in lines 10–11.

⁴ Seen by Wilamowitz and Klaffenbach.

Antiochus, *amicitia . . . his legibus et condicionibus esto* (Livy 38.38.2); for *αἰρέσεις* 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 respect⁵ (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.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE and NEWNHAM COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

May, 1974

⁵ See Michael Crawford, "Καταλογία—Respectus," (forthcoming).



OGIS II 442: SENATUS CONSULTUM DE TABENIS
(photographed at Denizli, Turkey, by M. Crawford)