



TYCHÉ

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 2, 1987

1987





**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 2

1987



Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Johann Diethart, Bernhard Palme, Brigitte Rom, Hans Taeuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgesendet werden. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490 und P. Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1987 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Guido Bastianini (Milano), La maledizione di Artemisia (UPZ I 1): un πρωτόκολλον.	1
Johannes Diethart (Wien) und Ewald Kislinger (Wien), „Hunnisches“ auf einem Wiener Papyrus (Tafel 1, 2).	5
Joachim Ebert (Halle/Saale), Der olympische Diskus des Asklepiades und das Marmor Parium (Tafel 3)	11
Vasilka Gerasimova-Tomova (Sofia), Zur Grenzbestimmung zwischen Mösien und Thrakien in der Umgebung von Nicopolis ad Istrum in der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jh. n. Chr. (Tafel 4—6).	17
Christian Habicht (Princeton), Zu neuen Inschriften aus Thessalien	23
Manfred Hainzmann (Graz), Die sogenannten Neubürger der ersten Generation in Noricum. Der Namenstypus Ti. Iulius Adgelei f. Buccio	29
Francisca J. A. Hoogendijk (Leiden) und Peter van Minnen (Leiden), Drei Kaiserbriefe Gordians III. an die Bürger von Antinoopolis. P. Vindob. G 25945 (Tafel 7).	41
Ewald Kislinger (Wien) und Johannes Diethart (Wien), „Hunnisches“ auf einem Wiener Papyrus (Tafel 1, 2).	5
Dieter Knibbe (Wien), Zeigt das Fragment IvE 13 das steuertechnische Inventar des <i>fiscus Asiaticus</i> ?	75
Leslie S. B. MacCoul (Washington, D. C.), P. Cair. Masp. II 67188 Verso 1—5. The <i>Gnostica</i> of Dioscorus of Aphrodito.	95
Leslie S. B. MacCoul (Washington, D. C.), Money and People in the Late Antique Hermopolite. BM and related texts	99
Olivier Masson (Paris), Noms grecs de femmes formés sur des participes (Type <i>Θάλλουσα</i>)	107
Peter van Minnen (Leiden) und Francisca J. A. Hoogendijk (Leiden), Drei Kaiserbriefe Gordians III. an die Bürger von Antinoopolis. P. Vindob. G 25945 (Tafel 7).	41
Bernhard Palme (Wien), Ein attischer Prospektorenvertrag? IG II ² 411 (Tafel 8)	113
Peter Panitschek (Graz), Die Agrargesetze des Jahres 59 und die Veteranen des Pompeius	141
George M. Parássoglou (Thessaloniki), Three Papyri from Upper Egypt (Tafel 9, 10).	155
Vincent J. Rosivach (Fairfield, USA), Some Fifth and Fourth Century Views on the Purpose of Ostracism	161
Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam), The Title πατήρ (τῆς) πόλεως and the Papyri	171
Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam) und Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam), Ende einer Bittschrift — Liste ausgehändigter Knidien (Tafel 11, 12)	175

Heikki Solin (Helsinki), Neues zu Munizipaldekreten (Tafel 13, 14)	183
Michael P. Speidel (Honolulu), The Rise of the Mercenaries in the Third Century	191
Karl Strobel (Heidelberg), Bemerkungen zur Laufbahn des Ti. Claudius Vitalis	203
Gerd Stumpf (München), Zwei Gerichtsurteile aus Athen. IG II ² 1641B und 1646 a	211
Klaus Tausend (Graz), Die Bedeutung des Importes aus Germanien für den römischen Markt	217
Gerhard Thür (München), Hypotheken-Urkunde eines Seedarlehens für eine Reise nach Muziris und Apographe für die Tetarte in Alexandria (zu P. Vindob. G 40.822) (Tafel 15, 16)	229
Frank Verkinderen (Leuven), The Honorary Decree for Malousios of Gargara and the κοινόν of Athena Ilias	247
Rolf Westman (Åbo), Vorschläge zur Inschrift des Diogenes von Oinoanda . .	271
Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam) und Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam), Ende einer Bittschrift — Liste ausgehändigter Knidien (Tafel 11, 12)	175
Literaturberichte und Buchbesprechungen	
Peter Siewert: Eine neue Bürgerrechtsverleihung der Triphylier aus Masi bei Olympia (Tafel 17)	275
Gerhard Dobesch: Autori vari, <i>Aspetti dell'opinione pubblica nel mondo antico</i> . A cura di Marta Sordi, Mailand 1978	277
Herbert Grassl: Gerhard Wirth, <i>Studien zur Alexandergeschichte</i> , Darmstadt 1985	278
Herbert Hunger: C. P. Thiede, <i>Il più antico manoscritto dei Vangeli? Il frammento di Marco di Qumran e gli inizi della tradizione scritta del Nuovo Testamento</i> , Roma 1987	278
Ekkehard Weber: Giuseppe Zecchini, <i>Aezio. L'ultima difesa dell'occidente romano</i> , Roma 1983	280
Indices: Johannes Diethart	283
Tafel 1 — 17	

FRANK VERKINDEREN

The Honorary Decree for Malousios of Gargara and the κοινόν of Athena Ilios*

In 1875, G. Hirschfeld published a text inscribed on a relatively well preserved marble stele found in a field belonging to M. F. Calvert near Hisarlik, the site of ancient Troy and Ilios¹. The inscription soon appeared in several publications² as the earliest and probably most important document from Hellenistic Ilios. A few years ago, a century after Hirschfeld's initial publication, the text was reedited by P. Frisch in *Inscripfen Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*³, as No. 1 of Vol. 3: *Die Inschriften von Ilios*, Bonn 1975⁴.

The inscription, which epigraphically seems to belong to the late fourth century B. C.⁵, in fact consists of six distinct texts, six closely related promulgations, all connected with the decisions of the συνέδριον of the κοινόν around the sanctuary of Athena Ilios, made in honour of Malousios of Gargara for his (financial) goodwill towards the association⁶. We give the text as edited by P. Frisch:

Decree I [γνώμη τῶν συνέδρων]· ἐπειδὴ Μαλούσιος Βακχί[ο]υ (C)
[Γαργαρεὺς ἀνὴρ ἀγ]αθὸς ὦν διατελεῖ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἄθ-
[ηνᾶς τῆς Ἰλιάδος] καὶ περὶ τὰς πόλεις, καὶ πρότερόν τε πολλὰ χρήσι-

* I would like to thank Prof. Dr. L. Mooren and E. Lanciers who read an earlier draft of this paper and B. Palme who refereed on behalf of the redaction. They made many valuable and stimulating remarks. The responsibility of course remains mine. Thanks also to R. Riall who made many improvements to my English.

¹ *Archäologische Zeitung* 32 (1875) 151—155.

² The readings of G. Hirschfeld were incorporated in the work of J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus. II. Geschichte der Diadochen*, Gotha 1878², 382 and that of W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*¹, Leipzig 1883, 125 (= *Syll.*² 169, Leipzig 1898). H. Schliemann, *Ilios. Ville et Pays des Troyens*, Paris 1885, 821—823 published a text copied by S. A. Kumanudes on a squeeze of M. F. Calvert; upon these readings were based the editions of *Syll.*³ 330, Leipzig 1915 and C. Michel, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques*, Bruxelles 1900, No. 522.

³ All inscriptions edited in the series "*Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*" will be referred to by the name of the city (if necessary specified by the volume of the publication) and the number of the document (e. g. *Ilios*, No. 1; *Erythrai* I, No. 28). The inscriptions from Priene are cited from the edition of F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inscripfen von Priene*, Berlin 1906.

⁴ The text given by L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques. Recueil des documents et analyses critiques*, Québec, Paris 1984, No. 79, is incomplete and seems confined to a compilation of the previous editions without reference to the stone or to a squeeze.

⁵ Cf. *Ilios*, Nos. 24 and 66 (both ca. 300); *Erythrai* I, No. 21 (334—332); No. 22 (end of the IVth C.); No. 28 (ca. 280); *Lampsakos*, No. 1 (ca. 300). Yet, Kumanudes, mentioned and followed by Schliemann, *op. cit.*, (n. 2) 821, assigned the inscription to the time of Antigonos Doston, on the basis of the letter style.

⁶ Since we do not know whether this koinon was a federal state, a symmarchy, an amphictyony or an assembly of yet another character, we will use the terminology of J. A. O. Larsen, *Greek federal states. Their institutions and history*, Oxford 1968, XIV—XV, who prefers to name 'league' all associations with a looser (and we would add undefinable) structure and character than the real federal states, the Confederacies.

- [μος ἐγένετο τῶι] συνεδρίωι καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν, εἰς τε τὰ κατασκευάσμα-
 5 [τα τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς πανηγύρεως καὶ εἰς τὰς πρεσβείας τὰς ἀποστελ-
 [λομένας καὶ ὑπὲρ] τῶν ἄλλων τῶν συμφερόντων τῆι πανηγύρει χρήματ[α]
 [ἔδωκεν ἄτοκα, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην προθυμίαν ἐμ πᾶσιν τοῖς καιροῖς παρεχόμε-
 [νος μετὰ] πολλῆς εὐνοίας, καὶ νῦν εἰς τε τὴν πρεσβείαν τὴν ὕστερον ἀποσ-
 [τελλομέ]νην πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ἔδωκεν χρυσοῦς τριακοσίους ἀτόκους καὶ εἰς
 10 [τὴν τ]οῦ θεάτρου κατασκευὴν χρήματα κομίσας εἰς Ἴλιον ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἐπ[ι]-
 [στ]άταις, ὅσων ἐδέοντο, χρυσοῦς χιλίους τετρακοσίους πεντήκοντα
 ἀτόκους· ἐπειδὴ Μαλούσιος διατελεῖ πράττων καὶ λέγων ἀπροφα-
 σίστως ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς καιροῖς τὰ συμφέροντα τῆι θεῶι καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν,
 ἀγαθῆι τύχηι, δεδόχθαι τοῖς συνέδροις, ἐπαινέσαι Μαλούσιον
 15 [Β]ακχίου Γαργαρέα καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῶι γυμνικῶι ἀγῶνι
 χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἀπὸ δραχμῶν χιλίων ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν τῆς περ[ὶ]
 τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὴν πανηγυριν καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πόλεων, δεδόσθαι δὲ
 αὐτῶι μὲν τὴν ἀτέλειαν καθάπερ δέδοται, δεδόσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ-
 γόνοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀτέλειαν, ὅ τι ἂν πωλῶσιν ἢ ἀγοράσωσιν. τὸ δὲ ψή-
 20 φισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαντας εἰς στήλην θεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς
 Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐπιμεληθῆναι δὲ τοὺς Γαργαρεῖς, ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν ἅπα[ντες]
 ὅτι ἐπίσταται τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πόλεων τοῖς οὖσιν ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν εἰς
 αὐτοὺς χάριν ἀποδιδόναι.

Decree II

- γνώμη τῶν συνέδρων· ἐπειδὴ Μαλούσι[ος] (B)
 ἀποστελλόντων τῶν συνέδρων πρέσβεις πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ὑ[πὲρ]
 25 τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ αὐτονομίας τῶν πόλεων τῶν κοινουουσ[ῶν τοῦ]
 ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς πανηγύρεως ἔδωκεν ἄτοκα χρήματα τοῖς ἀποστε[λλο]-
 μένοις ἀγγέλοις, ὅσα ἐκέλευον οἱ σύνοδροι, παρεσκευάσεν δὲ καὶ τὰ π[ρὸς]
 σκηνην ἄτοκα χρήματα, καὶ τᾶλλα δὲ προθύμως ὑπηρετεῖ[ν] εἰς ὅ τι ἂν πα-
 ρακαλῆι τὸ συνέδριον, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι, δεδόχθαι τοῖς συνέδροις, ἐπα[ι]-
 30 νέσαι τε Μαλούσιον Βακχίου Γαργαρέα, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ἐστιν περ[ὶ τὸ]
 ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ τὴν πανηγυριν καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πόλεων, καὶ στ[ε]-
 φανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἀπὸ δραχμῶν χιλίων ἐν τῶι γυ-
 μνικῶι ἀγῶνι, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε εἰς στήλην τὴν ὑπὲρ[ρ]
 τῶν συνεδρ[ε]ῶν τῶν Μαλουσίου μέλλουσαν ἀνατεθήσεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἱερό[ν],
 35 ἐπιμεληθῆναι δὲ τοὺς Γαργαρεῖς, ὅπως ἂν εἰδῶσιν ἅπαντες ὅτι[ι]
 ἐπίσταται τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πόλεων τοῖς οὖσιν ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν εἰς αὐ-
 τοὺς χάριν ἀποδιδόναι.

Decree III

- γνώμη τῶν συνέδρων· ἐπειδὴ Μαλούσιος κε-
 λεύει ἐπαγγεῖλαι αὐτῶι ἥδη τὸ συνέδριον, πόσων δεῖται παρ' αὐτοῦ χρημά-
 των εἰς τε τὸ θέατρον καὶ εἰς τᾶλλα κατασκευάσματα καὶ εἰς τ[ᾶ]
 40 ἱερά καὶ εἰς τὴν πρεσβείαν, καὶ φησι θέλειν παρόντων τῶν συ[ν]-
 ἔδρων ἥδη δοῦναι πάντα, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι, δεδό[χθαι] τοῖς συ[ν]-
 ἔδροις, ἐπαγγεῖλαι Μαλουσίωι δοῦναι τοῖς ἀγωνοθέταις χρ[υ]σοῦς]
 τρισχιλίους καὶ πεντακοσίους σὺν τοῖς πέρυσι ὀφειλο[μέ]νοις ἀ[τό]κοις],
 τοὺς δὲ ἀγωνοθέτας, οἷς μὲν ἂν αὐτοὶ χρήσων[ται], τ[ᾶ] δὲ ἄ[λλα] χρή-

45 ματα θεῖναι [εἰς τὸ ἱερ[όν]. ἂν δέ τι περιγένηται ἐ[κ]δοθέντ[ων τῶν]
ἔργων, ἀποδοῦναι Μ[αλο]υσίωι.

Decree IV γνῶμη τῶν συνέδρων· [ἐπειδὴ Μα]- (A)
λούσιος [Βακ]χίου Γαργαρεὺς ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὢν διατελ[εῖ περὶ τὸ]
ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀθ[ην]ᾶς τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ τὸ συνέδριον, δεδόχθαι
τοῖς συνέδροις, στεφανῶσαι Μαλούσιον χρυσῶι στ[εφάνωι ἀπό]
50 χρυσῶ[ν] τρι[άκοντα]· καλεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς προεδρί[αν Παναθηναί]-
οις ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ὀνομασ[τεῖ· δια]μεῖναι δὲ [τὴν προεδρίαν]
καὶ αὐτῶι καὶ ἐγγόνοις. τὸ δὲ ψήφ[ισμα τόδε] ἀναγράψαντα[ς τοὺς ἀγωνο]-
θέτας εἰς στήλην θεῖναι εἰς τὸ [ἱ]ερὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς.

Decree V [γνῶμη τῶν συν]-
ἔδρων· ἐπειδὴ Μαλούσιος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὢν διατ[ελεῖ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν]
55 τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Ἰλιάδος] καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν πόλεω[ν καὶ τὴν πανήγυριν],
ἀγαθῆι τύχηι, δεδόχθαι τοῖς συνέδροις, αἷς τιμαῖς [τετίμηται Μαλού]-
σιος ὑπὸ τοῦ συνε[δρ]ίου, ἀναγράψαι ἐκά[στη]ν [τῶν πόλεων τῶν κοινωνου]-
σῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ κ[αὶ τῆ]ς πανηγύρεως, καὶ θεῖν[αι τὴν στήλην ὅπου ἐκάσ]-
τηι νόμος ἐστ[ίν].

Decree VI Σίμαλος Λαμψακη[ὸς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Μαλούσιος]
60 ὁ Γαργαρεὺς ἐ[πιμ]εμέληται προθύ[μωσ]
τὰ ἀναλώμ[ατα]
πόλεσιν []
ὅτι προθυ[μ]
στεφα[ν] στε]-
φαν[]]

Since the text reveals intense building activity on the part of the κοινόν, one may suppose the association has recently been founded, revived, or, at least, substantially enlarged. The text's date, therefore, being the earliest one to mention the κοινόν, is of prime importance in establishing the koinon's history. An examination of the decrees is additionally of interest for its evidence concerning the position of the cities in Asia Minor during the last decades of the fourth century B. C.⁷

1. Epigraphical analysis

The sequence of the six promulgations on the στήλη is generally regarded as the chronological order in which the decrees were issued. Such an assumption seemed secured by the fact that this order of inscription also provides a precise dating of the document. According to decree I, envoys were sent to Antigonos (ll. 8—9) while the ambassadors of the 'second' decree were dispatched to a king (l. 24)⁸. Taking the identity of Antigonos and

⁷ This inscription has (too?) often been used as a fixed point of reference to situate other, similar documents and events. Cf. e. g. L. Robert, RPh 10 (1936) 160—161.

⁸ It may be noted that the text produced by Schliemann, *op. cit.*, (n. 2) 821—823 from the squeeze made by Calvert and used by Kumanudes, leaves a little gap after βασιλέα on line 24 large enough to accommodate the name of a king. But Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, (n. 1) 152, reads a damaged Y after βασιλέα, leaving no place on the stone for a name. The version of Hirschfeld has since prevailed even though the line as he reads it is rather short.

that king for granted, and reckoning that the former assumed the royal title in 306 B. C., many scholars concluded that the first decree was to be dated (shortly) before 306 B. C., the second some time after that date⁹.

But Frisch advanced in 1975¹⁰ that the sequence of the decrees does not correspond to the order in which they were issued. On the contrary, according to his conjecture we should consider decree I to be the most recent, while decree VI ought to be seen as the first and oldest. His argumentation, however, is confined to a reference to similar non-chronological sequences and to a rather vague analysis of the publication decisions. Moreover, he maintains the traditional identification of Antigonos as the king, even though his revision makes this improbable¹¹.

We would argue that his basic idea was right. It seems useful, therefore, to reexamine the question critically, certainly when we bear in mind the importance of the text and its precise dating.

Let us first examine the introductory term of each decree. I—IV all start with the formular expression γνώμη τῶν συνέδρων¹², whereas decree VI begins with the words Σίμαλος Λαμψακη[ῶς εἶπεν]. The latter formula is not attested for the inscriptions of Ilion¹³, but usually represents the very first stage in the growth of a decree or amendment.

⁹ E. g. L. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Centre des recherches d'histoire et de philologie. I. Hautes Etudes Numismatiques I), Genève, Paris 1966, 20—21; Migeotte, *op. cit.*, (n. 4) 265; Laura Boffo, *Ire ellenistici e centri religiosi dell' Asia Minore* (Pubbl. della Fac. di Lettere e Filosofia dell' Univ. di Pavia 37), Firenze 1985, 116.

This date has been questioned by P. R. Franke, *MDAI(A)* 76 (1961) 198, n. 1, who, according to H. Koehler (Gnomon 36 [1963] 82) "gedenkt, wie er mir mitteilt, in anderem Zusammenhang auf diese Inschrift einzugehen". Unfortunately, as far as I know, this has not yet been the case. Several scholars have disagreed on the foundation date of the κοινόν, for certain literary sources appear to point to the time of Alexander the Great as the period during which the association was formed. They therefore considered the above date a mere *terminus ante quem*. H. Pistorius, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Lesbos im vierten Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Jenaer Historische Arbeiten 5), Bonn 1913, 124; T. Lenschau, *Klio* 33 (1940) 221—222; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor ...*, Princeton 1950, 66 and 869—871; A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford 1971², 40.

¹⁰ *Ilion*, 6. R. Laqueur, *Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen*, Leipzig, Berlin 1927, 88—92, seems to have been the first to have seen that the presumed chronological sequence raises some problems. He argued that the first decree was a second version of II, but he did not reverse the chronological order of the whole series. Laqueur has frequently been criticised for his analysis, e. g. Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 9) 20, n. 6.

¹¹ See L. Robert, *Bull. Epigr.*, 1976, n. 66; Migeotte, *op. cit.*, (n. 4) 265, n. 20.

¹² See *Il.* 1; 23; 37; 46; 52. There seems to be no doubt as to the correctness of the suppletion of the phrase on l. 1 and 52. Cf. G. Ries, *Prolog und Epilog in Gesetzen des Altertums* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 76), München 1983, 89 (Antragsreden, 4. Jh. v. Chr.).

¹³ The restoration of the missing part of line 59 has, to my knowledge, been unquestioned since the first edition by Hirschfeld in 1875, even though our restored formula is the only occurrence of the word in the preserved inscriptions from Ilion. Though the quantity of the preserved documents and their fragmentary state can be the cause, it seems that the Ilion decrees did not usually mention the proposer, nor did they contain lengthy introduction-phrases. The Ilians seem to have preferred to inscribe only the decision, without further details. A similar situation may have existed in several cities of the region, at least in an early period. E. g. *Parion*, Nos. 1 and 2; the answers of Priene (to No. 1) and Eresos (to No. 2) however, do mention the proposer. Cf. *Lampsakos*, No. 1 (ca. 300); but *Erythrai* I, No. 1. The Lampsacene origin of the proposer therefore does not seem to account for the occurrence here. Or should one reckon that the proposal, being older than the other decrees, did not yet have the standardized formula of the ensuing decrees of the κοινόν?

This does not mean, however, that the texts were all inscribed in reversed order, for one cannot rule out the possibility that the proposal was added as a kind of postscript¹⁴.

A second element, found in most, if not all, honorific decrees is the argumentation of the honour, introduced by one or more *ἔνεκα* or *ἐπειδή*-phrases. In the mind of the promulgating authorities, the honours eventually granted were closely related to the reasons for this honour as argued in the motivation-formula. This should obtain as well in the privileges accorded by the syndedrians as introduced by the expression *ἀγαθῆι τύχηι, δεδόχθαι τοῖς συνέδροις*. The investigation of the six *ἐπειδή*-formulas and the ensuing *δεδόχθαι*-phrases may possibly clarify some aspects of the complex reality requiring the promulgation of several decrees. Since we are discussing whether or not the sequence of the decrees can be reversed, it seems appropriate to examine these two aspects starting with the proposal of Simalos of Lampsakos.

Despite the fragmentary nature of the sixth decree, we can read in the *ἐπειδή*-formula that Malousios should be honoured for his 'goodwill' (*προθύμῳς*), and maybe for some financial support of the expenses (*τὰ ἀναλώματα*) of the association.

Decree V is less explicit in giving the motivation of the honour for the Gargarean; it mentions only that he continually showed himself an *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός* (l. 54) to the temple (of Athena Ilias), as well as to the *κοινόν* and its festival.

In Decree IV we find a similar *ἐπειδή*-phrase, but with the difference that the *κοινόν* and the *πανήγυρις* have been replaced as objects of Malousios' goodwill by the *συνέδριον*¹⁵.

If we take into consideration the decisions taken by the members of the *συνέδριον*, some light may be shed on the causes for this lack of change in motivation.

Though it may result from the poor state of preservation of VI, we find no reference to a resolution concerning the grant of honours and the engraving of the text on a *στήλη*. This is in a sense very normal in that decree VI is only a proposal. Consequently, it would appear that decree IV or V possibly offers us the official decision taken by the *σύνεδροι* in response to the proposition of Simalos. Furthermore, in decree V, the erection of a *στήλη* is mentioned, on which is to be inscribed *αἷς τιμαῖς [τετίμηται Μαλού]σιος* (ll. 56—57) without specification which honours were meant. Decree IV, however, does mention the bestowal of several privileges (ll. 49—52), the most important being the grant of a gold crown worth thirty gold(staters) (l. 49) and the proclamation to the *προεδρίαν* (l. 50).

These facts, taken together, suggest the following hypothetical interpretation. Decree V gives the official answer to the proposition of the Lampsacenan, and proposes to confer unspecified honour upon Malousios and to publish this decree. Decree IV is the officially published version of V as announced repeating the same vague¹⁶ *ἐπειδή*-phrase, but

¹⁴ The remark of Migeotte, *op. cit.*, (n. 4) 265, n. 18, "que la dernière proposition introduit plutôt un amendement au décret précédent", is possible, but can not be proved. Moreover, taking into account the absence of *εἰπεν*-formulas in other inscriptions of Ilion, one would rather expect a mention of the person who was at the basis of the whole "dossier", than of someone who made a mere amendment to the last decree.

¹⁵ Ll. 47—48. The congress of the *σύνεδροι* presumably was the main political event of the League's Panathenaia, held in the first month of the year. See *Ilion*, No. 3, ll. 1—3; cf. E. Preuner, *Die Panegyris der Athena Ilias*, *Hermes* 61 (1926) 113—133.

¹⁶ Though there need not be a special reason, it is possible that the argumentation of the official decree, IV or/and V, only mentions *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ὢν* (l. 47; 54), instead of the *προθύμῳς* and *ἀναλώματα* (ll. 60—61) of decree VI, because the *συνέδριον* (at this early stage of its existence) preferred to conceal from the public its dependence on a private person to cover part of its expenses.

specifying the honours — one of them being precisely the grant of a crown, as proposed by Simalos in Decree VI. This conjecture explains why the motivation-formulas of VI, V and IV show no noticeable evolution, belonging as they did to the same period, during which the reasons for the honour did not change¹⁷.

Unlike VI, V and IV, decree III has a new ἐπειδή-phrase, and thus possibly a reason for a new decree. We read that Malousios proposed that the συνέδριον draw upon his resources to cover expenses for the theatre and the sanctuary, and for the money needed for the other 'arrangements', and the embassy (ll. 37—41). In this decree, however, we find no real decision. The text says only that the σύεδροι ordered Malousios to hand over the money promised to the ἀγωνοθέται (ll. 41—46). If we respect the order of inscription, decree III seems to stand apart and to have no connection with the other documents.

If we take a look at decree II in the light of the proposed revision, we see that it probably makes explicit reference to III: (Malousios) ἔδωκεν ἄτοκα χρήματα ... ὅσα ἐκέλευον οἱ σύεδροι (ll. 26—27). It even specifies why Malousios was honoured: he gave money for the embassy and for the theatre and served the συνέδριον whenever it called upon him (ll. 26—29). From all this it seems likely that decree III and II belong together in the same period and that II is the official decision to honour Malousios for the facts related in III (and recapitulated in the ἐπειδή-phrase of II).

The examination of decree I shows that the initial section of the motivation-formula of I has a similar contents as in II. But the real reason for the promulgation of this new¹⁸ decree can be found in the second part of that ἐπειδή-phrase, introduced by καὶ νῦν (l. 8). This picture is more or less confirmed by the analysis of the decisions of the σύεδροι. The honours accorded to Malousios in I are identical with those in II, but we hear of one more: the grant of ἀτέλεια, for himself as well as for his descendants (ll. 17—19). It is rather obvious that the man from Gargara receives this supplementary exemption of taxes on top of the other privileges already conferred upon him in reward for his latest (καὶ νῦν) benefactions to the association.

We find a much similar situation when we take a look at the value of the gold crown accorded to the Gargarean. In decrees I and II (ll. 16 and 32) we hear of a golden crown worth 1000 drachms; decree IV mentions a golden crown of 30 gold (staters) (ll. 49—50). Although the value and the material of the crown cannot help us to date the inscription¹⁹, the fact that 30 gold (staters) correspond with only 600 (silver) drachms (certainly since ca.

¹⁷ The diverging publication decisions of decree V and IV can not be explained decisively. One might speculate on the σύεδροι having changed their mind in the lapse of time between V and IV (so Frisch, *op. cit.*, n. 10), on an augmentation of the honour from IV to V, or one might try to reconcile IV and V (IV being only one transcript of the text as decided in V). None of these speculations can be corroborated to the point as to be used as an argument in the discussion.

¹⁸ The word 'new' can be understood in two ways. In the light of the suggested inversion of sequence, it means that it is newer, i. e. more recent, than II—VI. In the normally accepted order of inscription, it has to be interpreted as new in comparison with the preceding facts and maybe even previous (but not attested) decrees.

¹⁹ The value fits very well in a series of 'crown values' of the fourth and third centuries B. C.; such a vague indication can hardly be taken into consideration. For parallels of the value, see W. Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik I*, Leipzig 1907, 509—510. Cf. A. S. Henry, *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees*, Hildesheim, New York 1983, 22—38: "Gold Crowns". This scholar states (22) that in Athens the conferring of gold crowns only became common from about the middle of the fourth century B. C.

350—340 B. C., when the parity between gold and silver was fixed at 1:10²⁰) gives us once again some indication of the logically expected order of the decrees.

Moreover, since the inscription was discovered (according to Hirschfeld²¹) “unmittelbar südlich von der ... Cisterne im Athenatempel ...”, it is more in keeping with the decision taken in decree I (ll. 20—21) to put up the στήλη in the sanctuary of Athena than with the decision in decree V (ll. 58—59) to place the stone wherever it was the local custom. Even though this argument cannot be of great importance²², it still shows that a backward reading of the text gives as good a meaning to the facts as the extant sequence does.

The hypothesis that decree I was not the first of six decrees, but rather the last of a group of three decisions to honour Malousios, can, unfortunately, hardly be more than a deduction based upon what we believe to be a fuller understanding of the text. Some problems, of course, remain. We have already mentioned the difficulty concerning the publication decision in decrees IV and V. It might for example, be objected also that the decrees following the first used an increasingly vaguer phrasing because the facts already known did not require further explication or repetition²³.

Another problem is the fact that we read in decree IV that the Gargarean is granted προεδρίαν (l. 50) at the Panathenaia; this privilege does not explicitly recur in any of the other decrees. This need not, however, be a major difficulty, since the grant of προεδρία can, in our reversed order, have been implicated in another privilege to be found in decrees II and I, the crowning of Malousios at the ἀγών (ll. 32—33 and l. 15). This public crowning ceremony makes the clause “to call him to the προεδρία during the contest” (ll. 50—51) unnecessary — the προεδρία is superseded by the public crowning²⁴.

The most obvious objection, however, is the sequence on the inscription. Although there are some parallels for a reversal as conjectured here, I have not encountered a single one that follows an achronological sequence to the same extent as the inscription under discussion here.

In Asia Minor, one can cite for instance the following two parallels, one from Priene and one from Ilion itself. The inscription from Priene probably has to be dated ca. 300 B. C. It gives us two decrees, from which the first obviously recapitulates, augments and reinforces the second, which seems at some time to have been disregarded²⁵. The inscription from Ilion is to be dated ca. 274 B. C. and gives four separate texts, of which the first, a message from Meleagros to Ilion, refers to three letters of Antiochos I given as a

²⁰ Cf. A. R. Bellinger, *Essays on the coinage of Alexander the Great*, (Numismatic Studies 11), New York 1963, 31. Cf. F. Hulstsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, Berlin 1882, 240—246; K. Regling, RE III A, 2 (1929) 2172, s. v. *Stater*.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, (n. 1) 154.

²² Cf. *supra* n. 17.

²³ The strength of the objection is mainly based upon the inversion of decrees V and IV, which indeed remains difficult; cf. *supra* n. 17. But even if one maintains the extant order of inscription, one need not reject the inversion as a whole, with the conjecture of three periods of decision, inscribed in reverse order. Schematically, one could propose VI—(A)V, IV—(B)III, II—(C)I as well as VI—(A)IV, V—(B)III, II—(C)I.

²⁴ It might even be so that decree I, in contrast with II, mentions the words to be spoken during the public crowning ceremony: ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν (ll. 16—17). This phrase would certainly supersede the καλεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς προεδρίαν Παναθηναί]οις ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ὀνομασ[τεῖ of decree IV (ll. 50—51).

²⁵ *Priene*, No. 12.

postscript²⁶. The three letters, however, seem to follow chronological order. Neither inscription, then, can be invoked as a good parallel.

We have to turn to the Athenian decrees to find better parallels. The honorary decree for the Mytilenaeans, dated to 369/68—368/67, for instance has a much more complex structure, but appears to have a reversed order²⁷. A decree of 343/42 could be ordered chronologically as follows: IIb, IIa, IIc, I, III (or: IIb, IIc, IIa, I, III)²⁸. For the honorary decrees for Herakleides of Salamis, issued between 330/29—325/24, P. J. Rhodes gives the following sequence: III, IV, II, V, I²⁹.

These parallels, among others, show that disregard of the chronological order is not unparalleled, even though the complete reversal of as many as six decrees seems quite unique. With regard to the rationale for the (re-)inscription of the whole dossier, be it in reversed order, we are inclined to agree with Susan Sherwin-White that such a selection of public documents was picked out by the community (or responsible authority) to create and propagate a particular theme and message³⁰. In this context, the publication of Malousios' dossier may be considered an ultimate honour. If we also accept the importance accorded by Sherwin-White to epigraphic dossiers and take into account the contents of this particular example, we might conjecture that Malousios was not so much honoured as a private person but rather as contributor to the genesis of the κοινόν. Our inscription might, therefore, be seen as a programmatic act of the association.

All in all, the above analysis of the inscription with its parallels enables us to affirm that Frisch may have been right in reversing the sequence of the decrees. In our opinion, a retrograde reading of the six decrees for the Gargarean gives a fuller understanding of the texts and their growth. Nevertheless, the main objection to this hypothesis remains, namely, the identification of Antigonos with the king and, hence, the inscription's date.

Decree I mentions two distinct embassies. Malousios provides money for 1: the ambassadors that are sent (ll. 5—6) ... and 2: "now (money) for the embassy sent later to Antigonos" (ll. 8—9). In the reversed reading, the first embassy recapitulates the one mentioned in decree II, *i. e.* the one to the king. The second embassy (νῦν ὕστερον, l. 8), on the other hand, is sent to Antigonos³¹. Such a reading makes the identification of Antigonos with "the king" not only unnecessary but impossible. The matter must remain undecided, however, until another plausible identification for the king of l. 24 is found.

²⁶ *Ilion*, No. 33. An Athenian inscription concerning the Methonaeans, dated between 430/29 and 424/23, shows much the same arrangement: IG I³ 61.

²⁷ IG II² 107 = *Syll.*³ 164, p. 223. The first of the three parts is explicitly dated to 367 (ll. 4—5). The second element, a proposal of Autolykos, refers to a decision taken earlier (l. 31), probably in the third part (dated to 369/68) in which Kallistratos makes a proposal (ll. 34—35). The proposal of Autolykos seems to have been incorporated in decree I afterwards; cf. ll. 32—34 with 25—26.

²⁸ IG II² 223 = *Syll.*³ 227.

²⁹ *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford 1972, 66—67 concerning IG II² 360 = *Syll.*³ 304. A similar complexity also in an inscription from Orchomenos, IG VII 3172. Migeotte, *op. cit.*, (n. 4) No. 13, 53—69 gives the sequence VI-VII-VIII-I-II-III-, IV-V.

³⁰ Susan M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Archives: The Edict of Alexander to Priene, a Reappraisal*, JHS 105 (1985) 69—89; 74.

³¹ The πρεσβεία announced in decree III, l. 40, and sent out according to decree II, ll. 24—27, is recalled in decree I, ll. 5—6, whereas line 8 announces a further embassy. Frisch, *op. cit.*, (n. 10) 9—12, understands the inscription in the same way, but he seems to consider it necessary that the "weitere Gesandtschaft" of line 8 was sent to the same person as the first one, even though the decrees distinctly mention the king (l. 24) and Antigonos (l.

2. Historical analysis

2. 1. Historical setting

Since the question of the identity of the king cannot be solved solely from the inscription, our decrees need tentatively to be situated in their proper historical setting. Following the mention of Antigonos, we can take his death in 301 B. C. as a *terminus ante quem* for the inscription³². A highly probable *terminus post quem* is the liberation from Persian domination in 336 B. C.³³.

During the troublesome decades before the end of the Achaemenid empire, Ilion belonged to the dominion of the Rhodian condottieri Mentor and Memnon, interrupted temporarily by the tyranny of Charidemos³⁴. The subsequent period was inaugurated by Philip II in 336 B. C. and continues under Alexander the Great to 334 B. C. During this period Parmenion occupied and defended parts of the Troad (including at least at some time Ilion) as a Macedonian bridgehead in Persian territory³⁵.

In 334, Alexander himself crossed the Hellespont. Upon his arrival in the Troad, Alexander brought offerings to the temple of Athena Ilias³⁶ and was met on his way to the city by a delegation of the local population offering him a golden crown³⁷. Alexander subsequently honoured the tomb of Achilles (and other heroes?)³⁸.

In the 13th book of his Geography Strabo reviews the history of Ilion. He clearly shows the importance of Alexander's interference during his stay in 334 and by means of a letter ca. 330 B. C.

26. Τὴν δὲ τῶν Ἰλίων πόλιν τῶν νῦν τέως μὲν κόμην εἶναι φασι, τὸ ἱερὸν ἔχουσαν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς μικρὸν καὶ εὐτελές, Ἀλέξανδρον δὲ ἀναβάντα μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Γρανίκῳ νίκην, ἀναθήμασί τε κοσμηῆσαι τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ προσαγορεῦσαι πόλιν καὶ οἰκοδομίαις ἀναλαβεῖν προστάξει τοῖς ἐπιμεληταῖς ἐλευθέραν τε κρῖναι καὶ ἄφορον, ὕστερον δὲ μετὰ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῶν Περσῶν ἐπιστολὴν καταπέμψαι

8), and though he finds himself confronted with a contradiction between his revision of the sequence and the king's traditional identification. Laqueur, *op. cit.*, (n. 10) 91, also encountered this last problem. Both scholars asserted that in the early Hellenistic period the address of kings was not as rigid as it became later. But the parallels invoked (*OGIS* 8, republished with commentary by A. J. Heisserer, *Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence*, Norman 1980, 27—78; *OGIS* 335; *Syll.*³ 349), fail to convince; cf. Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 10) 21.

³² The fact that the mention of Antigonos is introduced by καὶ νῦν (l. 8) makes it possible to state that the decree can hardly have been issued long time after his death.

It seems unnecessary to dwell on the identification with Antigonos Dason. Cf. L. Robert, *Etudes de numismatique grecque*, Paris 1951, 7, n. 4. Cf. supra n. 5.

³³ Though one may suggest that the king of l. 24 is the Persian king, it is unlikely. Antigonos cannot have been in Asia Minor before the arrival of Parmenion in 336 B. C.

³⁴ For this period, see J. Hofstetter, *Die Griechen in Persien. Prosopographie der Griechen im Persischen Reich vor Alexander*, Berlin 1978, 125—126 (s. v. Memnon I, with bibliography) and 129—131 (s. v. Mentor, id.). The early years of this period are also treated in a more general way by M. N. Weiskopf, *Achaemenid Systems of Governing in Anatolia*, Diss. Univ. of California, Berkeley 1982, 470—487.

³⁵ Cf. E. Badian, in *Studies V. Ehrenberg*, Oxford 1966, 40—41.

³⁶ Arr. I 11, 7; Plut., *Alex.* 15, 7; Diod. XVII 18, 2.

³⁷ Arr. I 12, 1; cf. infra.

³⁸ Arr. I 12, 1; (Diod. XVII 17, 3); Plut., *Alex.* 15, 8—9; Justin XI 5, 12; they locate the tomb at Ilion. Strabo XIII 1, 32 (C. 596), however, locates the tomb(s) near Sigeion. Cf. A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander. 1. Books I—III*, Oxford 1980, 103.

φιλόανθρωπον, ὑπισχνούμενον πόλιν τε ποιῆσαι μεγάλην καὶ ἱερὸν ἐπισημότατον, καὶ ἀγῶνα ἀποδείξειν ἱερὸν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευταίην Λυσίμαχος μάλιστα τῆς πόλεως ἐπεμελήθη καὶ νεῶν κατεσκεύασε καὶ τείχος περιεβάλετο ὅσον τετταράκοντα σταδίων, συνώκισέ τε εἰς αὐτὴν τὰς κύκλῳ πόλεις ἀρχαίας ἤδη κεκακωμένας, ...

“It is said that the city of the present Ilians was for a time a mere village, having its temple of Athena, a small and cheap temple, but that when Alexander went up there after his victory at the Granicus River he adorned the temple with votive offerings, gave the village the title of city, and ordered those in charge to improve it with buildings, and that he adjudged it free and exempt from tribute; and that later, after the overthrow of the Persians, he sent down a kindly letter to the place, promising to make a great city of it, and to build a magnificent sanctuary, and to proclaim sacred games. But after his death Lysimachus devoted special attention to the city, and built a temple there and surrounded the city with a wall about forty stadia in circuit, and also incorporated into it the surrounding cities, which were now old and in bad plight”³⁹.

The so-called ὑπομνήματα of Alexander mention yet another instance when Alexander was preoccupied with the sort of the city: he intended to construct a temple to the goddess of Iliion „never to be surpassed by any other sanctuary”⁴⁰.

For the decades following the death of Alexander, we are dependent to a still greater extent upon the account of Strabo: μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευταίην Λυσίμαχος μάλιστα τῆς πόλεως ἐπεμελήθη ... Although Strabo’s report (at least the passage on Lysimachos’ concern with the city) has been subject to several critical studies⁴¹ that would impugn the text’s value here, it may still be significant that nothing is said about Antigonos in direct connection with the city of Iliion.

Having served Alexander as στρατηγὸς τῶν συμμάχων and later as satrap of Great-Phrygia, Antigonos lost, and later gradually recovered, his imperium in Asia Minor, including the Troad, after the death of the king⁴². In 315 B. C., Antigonos defied his opponents in proclaiming the liberty of all Greek cities and favouring or protecting the

³⁹ Strabo XIII 1, 26 (C 593); text and translation are reproduced from *The Geography of Strabo VI (Book XIII—XIV)*, ed. trad. H. L. Jones (Loeb), London, Cambridge (Mass.), 1960 (= 1929). According to Arr. I 17, 3; Diod. XVII 21, 7; Plut., *Alex.* 17, 1, Alexander did not return to Iliion after the battle at the Granikos but went straight to Sardes. It is hard to evaluate the testimony of Strabo against the others on the basis of the available sources. One should bear in mind, however, that the geographer speaks of Iliion in a different context than the historians of Alexander.

⁴⁰ Diod. XVIII 4, 5. The historical crux posed by this ‘testament’ cannot be conclusively solved, though its authenticity is generally accepted since the articles of F. Schachermeyr, *JÖAI* 41 (1954) 118—140; E. Badian, *HSCPh* 72 (1967) 183—204, esp. 202—204; A. B. Bosworth, *CQ* 65 (1971) 112—136, esp. 130—134.

⁴¹ Many scholars have noted that some facts in the report of Strabo cannot apply to Iliion (e. g. the wall of forty stades) but correspond very well with what we know about Alexandria Troas. On this basis alterations have been proposed and rejected. Cf. A. R. Bellinger, *Museum Notes* 7 (1956) 43—49. Cf. Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 2) 7, n. 4; R. Merkelbach, *ZPE* 23 (1976) 242—243. One should also bear in mind that in this passage Strabo probably drew upon the work of Demetrios of Skepsis (in the Troad), an author who may well have been biased against Iliion; cf. E. Schwartz, *RE* IV (1901) 2809 (s. v. *Demetrios*, 78).

⁴² See e. g. C. Wehrli, *Antigone et Demetrios*, Genève 1968, 29—43; P. Briant, *Antigone le Borgne. Les débuts de sa carrière et les problèmes de l’assemblée Macédonienne* (Centre des recherches d’histoire ancienne 10), Paris 1973; O. Müller, *Antigonos Monophthalmos und “Das Jahr der Könige”* (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 11), Bonn 1973, 17—32; R. Engel, *Untersuchungen zum Machtaufstieg des Antigonos I. Monophthalmos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der frühen Diadochenzeit*, Kallmünz, s. d. (1976).

league of the Nesiotai⁴³. The freedom and autonomy of all Greek cities was reaffirmed by all opposing parties in the general peace treaty of 311. It is to this declaration of peace that the embassy of decree II for freedom and autonomy is usually thought to refer⁴⁴.

In 306 B. C., Antigonos assumed the royal title and shared it with his son Demetrios⁴⁵. Even though no direct intervention of Antigonos at Ilion is known apart from our inscription⁴⁶, it is clear that the more general policy of Antigonos will have had certain repercussions on the city.

This brief outline of the city's history from 336 to 301 B. C.⁴⁷, shows that our inscription may but certainly need not be situated in the reign of Antigonos. It seems that another period could be invoked as the background for the growth of our series of documents: namely, the early years of the reign of Alexander the Great.

2. 2. Conformity between the inscription and Alexander's proceedings after the Granikos

First, we should like to draw attention to some elements of our decrees that seem to correspond more or less with other evidence.

There appears to be agreement between our inscription and four points in the text of Strabo concerning Alexander's actions after his victory at the Granikos.

In decree II of our inscription, we hear that the σύνεδροι dispatched an embassy to the

⁴³ Cf. R. H. Simpson, *Historia* 8 (1959) 395—398; Wehrli, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) 113—118 (who defends the idea that the League was founded in 314); Müller, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) 37—39; E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323—330 av. J.-C.)*. I: *De la mort d'Alexandre aux avènements d'Antiochos et de Philippe V* (Annales de l'Est, Mémoire No. 30), Nancy 1979, 56—58; K. Buraselis, *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis. Forschungen zur Politik Kassandros' und der drei ersten Antigoniden (...) im Ägäischen Meer und in Westkleinasien* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, H. 73), München 1982, 60—86; J. Seibert, *Das Zeitalter der Diadochen* (Erträge der Forschung 185), Darmstadt 1983, 117—120.

⁴⁴ Among the scholars who would date our inscription to ca. 306 B. C., one can also mention Will, *op. cit.*, (n. 43) 64—65, who holds that the proclaimed peace was not always respected in Antigonos' pragmatic policy towards the Greek cities. This discrepancy between theory and practice could have been the reason for the city's sending an embassy to the king.

⁴⁵ Cf. Müller, *op. cit.*, (n. 42). For the possible purport of the act and title, see also H. Hauben, *AncSoc* 5 (1974) 105—117, but R. M. Errington, *JHS* 95 (1975) 250—251.

⁴⁶ A further witness (though obscure) to the interference of Antigonos in the affairs of Ilion may be attested. In connection with the famous 'Maidens of Lokris' sent as an expiatory sacrifice to Athena Ilias, Aelian (Fr. 47) writes that a king Antigonos was asked to arbitrate between the two cities of Ilion and Lokris. G. L. Huxley, in *Studies V. Ehrenberg*, Oxford 1966, 151—152, and lately P. Vidal-Naquet, *Le Chasseur Noir. Formes de pensée et formes de société dans le monde grec*, Paris 1981, 259—260, identify Antigonos as Monophthalmos, thereby rejecting Gonatas and Doson. This identification nevertheless remains uncertain for three reasons: 1) the text of Aelian presents a lacuna at this place; 2) the testimony of Aelian does not accord at all with the information from the "Mädcheninschrift" found at Vitrinitsa; 3) the identification of Antigonos as Monophthalmos is based mainly on the 'testimony' of our inscription that king Antigonos did interfere with the city of Ilion and its sanctuary.

⁴⁷ For the history of Ilion in the century following the reigns of Antigonos and Lysimachos, see W. Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit. Untersuchungen zu den politischen Beziehungen zwischen den ersten Seleukidenherrschern (...) und den Städten des westlichen Kleinasien* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 71), München 1977, 12—15 (general) and 43—71.

king charged with discussing the matter of the freedom and autonomy of the city⁴⁸. Since it is likely that in the early hellenistic context⁴⁹ the idea of αὐτονομία — despite its formal character — covered a meaning at least incorporating the exemption from tribute⁵⁰, the relation of the provisions of decree II with Strabo's text become clearer.

Corresponding with the 'order' to erect buildings in the Strabo text, our inscription mentions an intense building activity⁵¹.

Strabo mentions also that the village (?) was proclaimed a city⁵². It is significant that this grant is closely linked to the promulgation of freedom and autonomy since, together with territorial integrity⁵³, these three privileges are constituent elements of the city status. The emergence, or better the existence of Ilion as a city can be found throughout our decrees⁵⁴. C. Habicht adduced another Ilian inscription, belonging to the Roman period, in

⁴⁸ Ll. 24—25. From the text it cannot be concluded whether the embassy is meant as a request for freedom (not yet obtained) or as an inquiry into certain (practical) aspects of freedom already gained. The declarations of freedom for the Greeks of Asia Minor have been treated recently by R. Seager, C. Tuplin, *JHS* 100 (1980) 141—154. Cf. P. Karavites, *RIDA* 29 (1982) 145—162 and 31 (1984) 167—191. For the application of the idea by Alexander the Great, see the *status quaestionis* in J. Seibert, *Alexander der Große* (Erträge der Forschung 10), Darmstadt 1972, 85—92. Regarding the policy of liberation of Antigonos, see A. Heuss, *Antigonos Monophthalmos und die griechischen Städte*, *Hermes* 73 (1938) 133—194; cf. R. Seager, *CQ* 31 (1981) 107. See also n. 63.

⁴⁹ We have to take into account the possibility of a terminological discrepancy between our inscription and the testimony of Strabo or his source.

⁵⁰ Cf. V. Ehrenberg, *Der Staat der Griechen*, Zürich, Stuttgart 1965², 114. Cf. A. Mastrocinque, *L'ELEUTHERIA e le città ellenistiche*, *Atti dell' Istituto Veneto* 135 (1976—1977), 1—23. It is very likely that under Alexander (as well as under Antigonos) autonomy did not always include complete freedom to rule a city according to its proper laws. See, for instance, a decree of Alexander concerning freedom and autonomy for Priene (Heisserer, *op. cit.* [n. 31] 146). Alexander granted exemption of σύνταξις (l. 14) — in contrast with some of the neighbouring territory —, but the Prieneans nevertheless had to put up with a certain interference in their courts (ll. 18—20). For Antigonos' liberation promises, see the decree of Skepsis, *infra* n. 87. Concerning the imposition of taxes on the cities of Asia Minor, see also G. Wirth, *Chiron* 2 (1972) 91—98 and C. Corsaro, *ASNP* 10, 4 (1980) 1165; 1173—1184. With regard to the precise meaning of ἐλευθερία and αὐτονομία, K. Raaflaub, *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit. Zur historischen Semantik und Gesellschaftsgeschichte eines politischen Grundbegriffs der Griechen* (Vestigia 37), München 1985, 189—207, states that both ideas cover a same meaning, each with its own connotation of respectively external and internal independence. These semantic fields were liable to many different practical applications. Unfortunately, his treatment does not include the fourth century and the Hellenistic period and so does not give an idea of the 'formalisation' of these notions. The fourth century slogan ἐλευθερία καὶ αὐτονομία then appears to be a propaganda formula for the *nec plus ultra* of liberation. One could then ask whether Strabo's ἐλευθέραν τε καὶ ἄφορον was not a similar *nec plus ultra* of independence in the Roman Empire (or in the second century B. C. Hellenistic context of Demetrios of Skepsis).

⁵¹ *Passim*. Strabo XIII 1, 26 (C. 593) speaks of οἰκοδομία, nothing specific such as ἱερά or θέατρα, seemingly indicating only private construction. This is unlikely, however, in light of the reference to the supervision of 'those in charge'. Unfortunately, no archaeological confirmation of this building activity can be found. The remains of this period (Phase VIII) were dug away almost completely during the Roman period, with the exception of some buildings situated on the outskirts of the city. Cf. W. Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion 1870—1894*, Athen 1902, I, 206 with fig. 32; II, Tafel VI.

⁵² Strabo XIII 1, 26 (C. 593): προσαγορευσαὶ πόλιν.

⁵³ Cf. Mastrocinque, *op. cit.*, (n. 50) 11—12. In the light of this, the city's statutory promotion can more or less be corroborated by the conjecture of Jones, *op. cit.*, (n. 9) 40; 384, n. 22, that Alexander increased the territory of Ilion by adding Gergithia to it. This suggestion is uncertain, however: *OGIS* 221 is late and only alludes to the idea that Gergithia was part of the Ilian territory. Nevertheless, the conjecture does more or less agree with the fact that Alexander increased the territory of several other cities, for instance, Priene, Nesos, Mytilene etc.

⁵⁴ It cannot, however, be ruled out that a mere κώμη, certainly one with Ilion's history, may speak of itself as a city in its own decrees.

which we hear of a φυλή called Alexandris. He suggests that this φυλή ‘dürfte im Zusammenhang mit dem Entstehen einer städtischen Organisation geschaffen worden sein’⁵⁵. Besides the epigraphical evidence, Ilios’s status as a city is confirmed also in the numismatic data. In his still valuable discussion of “Die Münzen von Ilios”, H. von Fritze linked the first autonomous coinage of Ilios with Strabo’s testimony of the statutory promotion of Ilios in 334 from a κώμη to a πόλις⁵⁶. Von Fritze also pointed out that the obverse of some of the oldest, (extant) coins of Ilios carries a vase and (sometimes) a laurel wreath, two symbols reminiscent of the ἀγῶνα ... ἱερὸν accorded to the city by Alexander in a letter ca. 330⁵⁷. It is needless to comment upon the importance of the coinage as a mark of Ilios’s emergence as a city⁵⁸.

Yet, Ilios was not the only city to benefit from Alexander’s interference. Lampsakos began striking Alexander coins in the same period⁵⁹. A few years later Abydos began issuing coins with a similar obverse to concurrent issues from the Lampsakos mint⁶⁰. The existence of temporal and iconographic similarities between the coins of some cities in the Troad could point to a certain cohesion of the district. The numismatic material, however, does not provide decisive proof of the existence of a League at this early stage since an institutional coin issue does not appear before 188 B. C.⁶¹. One coin is extant that could prove, however, the existence of a League. It has been proposed to complete the legend ΙΑ on a tridrachm of Lampsakos, dated ca. 330 B. C., to ΙΑ(ΙΕΩΝ)⁶². If this tridrachm is genuine, it would not only substantiate the existence of the koinon in the early years of Alexander’s reign, but it could also shed some light on the role played by the city of Lampsakos in the League.

The fourth aspect of Alexander’s activity at Ilios in 334 as recorded by Strabo, the adornment of the temple, cannot be confirmed, either by reference to it in our inscription or by archaeological evidence⁶³. Some parallels, however, can be noted. Alexander did

⁵⁵ *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte* (Zetemata 14), München 1970², 21. Frisch (*Ilios*, No. 122, p. 220), however, warns against hasty conclusions. The existence of another phyle named Panthois (*Ilios*, No. 123) after Trojan Panthoos, draws attention to the possibility that the Alexandris-phyle was named after Alexander-Paris.

⁵⁶ In *Troja und Ilios*. I. (n. 51) 502; cf. A. Brückner, also in *Troja und Ilios*, I, 577. A. R. Bellinger, *The Earliest Coins of Ilios*, *Museum Notes* 7 (1957) 43–49, although accepting the emergence of Ilios as a city by the will of Alexander (45), argues that the earliest autonomous coinage of the city should be dated to the reign of Lysimachos.

⁵⁷ See Strabo XIII 1, 26 (C. 593), and von Fritze, *op. cit.*, (n. 56) 502. Cf. A. R. Bellinger, *Troy. Supplementary Monograph II. The Coins*, Princeton 1961, 15.

⁵⁸ Cf. Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 9) 87 (with n. 3–4).

⁵⁹ See Margaret Thompson, A. R. Bellinger, *A Hoard of Alexander Drachms*, *YCIS* 14 (1955) 9.

⁶⁰ Cf. Thompson, Bellinger, *op. cit.*, (n. 59) 14; 17.

⁶¹ See Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 9) 37 (et passim): in that year, we find at Ilios tetradrachms and drachms with the legend ΑΘΗΝΑΙ ΙΑΙΑΔΟΣ instead of the previously usual ΙΑΙ(ΕΩΝ).

⁶² So Frisch, *op. cit.*, (n. 10) XV, hereby altering the completion of the editors ΙΑ(ΙΟΥ). Unfortunately, the coin is a unicum and for all I know published only in the *Verkaufskatalog Bank Leu Zürich-Münzen und Medaillen Basel, Griechische Münzen. Aus der Sammlung eines Kunstfreundes*, Auktion 28. 5. 1974, Nr. 248 (358–359). Although perfect iconographical parallels can be found as well for the reverse as for the obverse, the inscription remains “rätselhaft” (*Verkaufskatalog*, 358). Reservations must therefore be harboured in using the single coin as evidence, not only because the inscription is unique for the Lampsacene mint, but also because the normal legend used at Ilios itself was the above mentioned ΙΑΙ instead of ΙΑ.

⁶³ It has already been mentioned above (n. 51) that most of the Hellenistic city was dug away in Roman times, but fortunately part of the temple of Athena Ilios has survived. It is, however, very difficult to date the construction of the temple on purely archaeological grounds. Cf. F. Goethert, H. Schleif, *Der Athenatempel von*

dedicate (and presumably also adorned) the temple of Athena Polias at Priene and the Letoon at Xanthos, both probably ca. 334/333. By doing so he acted in a capacity that enabled the inhabitants of at least these cities to call him βασιλεύς⁶⁴. Alexander's adornment of the temple of Athena at Iliion certainly cannot be ruled out as a possibility. It fits well in a series of dedications. Alexander seems to have made a point of dedicating the most important (= the federal?) sanctuaries of Asia Minor.

These three or four correspondences between the literary source(s) and the inscription suggests a possible background against which the document may be read. The clarification of some elements remains.

First, there is the testimony of Strabo regarding the written promise of a ἀγῶνα (...) ἱερὸν by Alexander⁶⁵, whose existence is substantiated both by our inscription and by some of the numismatic material. But Alexander's letter was sent ca. 330, while the inscription and the coins seem to correspond more or less with the situation ca. 334. This discrepancy, however, can be easily resolved if only one understands the pledge of the Macedonian king ca. 330, after the defeat of the Achaemenid empire, as a grant *post factum*, or better yet, as the official recognition as a "holy contest" of an already existing ἀγών⁶⁶. The reason for this pledge may have been gratitude towards the cities in whose name he initially fought the

Iliion, (Denkmäler antiker Architektur 10), Berlin 1962, XI—XII; 34—42. But the metopes of the temple seem to find their best stylistic setting in the early years of the Hellenistic period; cf. R. A. Tomlinson, *JHS* 83 (1963) 219—220; H. Kaehler, *Gnomon* 36 (1964) 87; H. Jucker, *AA* (1969) 248—256.

⁶⁴ The dedication on one of the antae of the temple of Athena Polias states: βασιλεύς Ἀλέξανδρος | ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν | Ἀθηναίῃ Πολιάδι (*Priene*, No. 156; cf. M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* II, Oxford 1948, No. 184, 241—242; Heisserer, *op. cit.*, [n. 31] 143—145). In the Letoon at Xanthos is the inscription Ἀλέξανδρος βασιλεύς ἀνέθηκε] (C. Le Roy, *Alexandre à Xanthos*, Actes du colloque sur la Lycie antique [Bibl. de l'Inst. français 27] 1980, 56). One might contend that the title βασιλεύς was not assumed by Alexander the Great before 330/329. Thus A. Aymard, *L'usage du titre royal dans la Grèce classique et hellénistique*, RD 27 (1949) 579—590 (esp. 585—587); Badian, *op. cit.*, (n. 35) 47, n. 41; Briant, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) 38, n. 6; P. Goukowsky, *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336—270 av. J.-C.) I. Les origines politiques*, Nancy 1978, 182. These assumptions, however, cannot have any bearing on the dating of our text. One should distinguish between texts emanating from the king or his court and documents issued by a third party; cf. L. Mooren, *The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy*, in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 24—26 May 1982, edd. E. Van 't Dack e. a. (*Studia Hellenistica* 27), Louvain 1983, 214 (n. 34; with recent bibliography). Moreover, I am inclined to think that there might also be a difference in Alexander's use of titulature in a Greek or an "Asian" setting. Cf. Goukowsky, *op. cit.*, II. *Alexandre et Dionysos*, Nancy 1981, 116. For these reasons I believe the two dedications to be connected with Alexander's stay in 334 B. C., even if the text may not have been engraved on his order or in his presence. See J. C. Carter, *The Sculpture of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene* (Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London 42), London 1983, 30, for an evaluation of the political implications of the title for the situation in 334 B. C.

⁶⁵ Strabo XIII 1, 26 (C. 593).

⁶⁶ Something similar can be perceived in Priene where Alexander had his dedication (cf. supra n. 64) inscribed on a temple that was probably already built; cf. Hiller von Gærtringen, *op. cit.*, (n. 3) 129. The Letoon of Xanthos also was standing when Alexander had it dedicated. Cf. Plut., *Alex.* 17, 4—6; cf. C. Le Roy, REG 90 (1977) XX—XXII. An offering *in absentia*, in a similar context as at Iliion, was also made in the temple of Athena at Lindos: βασιλεύς Ἀλέξαν[δ]ρος, μάχαι κρατήσας Δάρειον καὶ κύριος γε[ν]όμενος τῆς Ἀσίας ἔθυσε τ[ῶ]ι Ἀθ[η]ναί τ[ῶ]ι [Δι]ῶνδ[ει]α; cf. *Timachidas of Lindos. The Chronicle of the Temple of Athena at Lindus in Rhodes*, ed. comm. C. Blinkenberg, Chicago 1980 (= Blinkenberg, Bonn 1915), 32—33: c, xxxviii. Strabo XIV 1, 22 (C. 640—641) also mentions a pledge of Alexander regarding the temple of Artemis at Ephesus: Ἀλέξανδρον δὲ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ὑποσχέσθαι τὰ γεγονότα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἀναλώματα, ἐφ' ᾧ τε τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν αὐτὸν ἔχειν.

Persian empire, for ca. 330, after his victory over the Persians, Alexander did send the troops of the σύμμαχοι home⁶⁷.

A further complication in need of clarification is Arrian's report of Alexander's approach to Ilios. Arrian claims, "When Alexander went up to Ilios, Menoitios, the helmsman, crowned him with a gold crown, and next Chares, the Athenian coming from Sigeion, and also some others, Greeks as well as natives"⁶⁸. This event may reflect (though there is no indication whatsoever it should be) the decision taken in the second of our six decrees: *πρέσβεις πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ὑ[πὲρ] | τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ αὐτονομίης τῶν πόλεων* (II. 24—25). Arrian does explicitly state *ἀνιόντα δ' αὐτὸν ἐς Ἴλιον*, and it seems that the crowning by Menoitios was connected with the 'coming' of Chares and the others. It does not seem impossible therefore that Menoitios⁶⁹ came to meet Alexander as the head (?)⁷⁰ of an Ilian embassy to demand that the freedom and autonomy promulgated for the Greek cities be applied to Ilios or the κοινόν. Our text, however, is equivocal with regard to the number, the identity and the purpose of the embassies, and therefore does not permit too close a comparison with our decrees.

A last item in the decrees that could possibly assign them to the reign of Alexander is more controversial, for it could also be the main objection to a date in 334 B. C. On II. 8—9 we read: *πρεσβείαν τὴν ὕστερον ἀποσ[τελλομέ]νην πρὸς Ἀντίγονον*.

2. 3. Antigonos' position

Any dating suggestions for the text must deal with the problem of Antigonos' presence in Ilios. Could he have been mentioned in an inscription of 334 B. C.? And if so, for what reason?

a. Commander of the Allies

We already observed above that Antigonos was Alexander's στρατηγὸς τῶν συμμάχων in 334 and that he was thereafter appointed satrap of Great-Phrygia. Apart from the title itself, we have little information regarding the duties of this στρατηγία τῶν συμμάχων. Most scholars have seen it as a military command with a certain political aspect vis-à-vis the relationship with the Allies⁷¹. Briant, however, calls the office a 'commande-

⁶⁷ See Arr. III 19, 5—6; Diod. XVII 74, 3; Curt. VI 2, 17; Plut., *Alex.* 42, 5; *Marmor Parium* B, par. 5. The phrasing itself of the pledge makes us think of it as an official message (sent along with the dismissed troops [?]).

⁶⁸ Arr. I 12, 1. There is a lacuna in the text of Arrian after these lines. Moreover, it has often been stated that Arrian mixed his sources in an attempt to compare them or to draw upon several together. This could explain why Arrian first reports the offerings in the temple (I 11, 7) and only later *ἀνιόντα δ' αὐτὸν ἐς Ἴλιον* (I 12, 1). Cf. Bosworth, *op. cit.*, (n. 38) 102—103.

⁶⁹ Cf. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage. II. Prosopographie*, München 1926, No. 511. The assumption of Bosworth, *op. cit.*, (n. 38) 102—103 (ad. I 12, 1) that Menoitios was the 'regular helmsman' of Alexander cannot be confirmed by other evidence. H. V. Instinsky, *Alexander der Grosse am Hellespont*, Godesberg 1949, 71, n. 1, conjectures that κυβερνήτης is corrupt and conceals an indication of origin.

⁷⁰ So A. Weise, *Wörterbuch zu Arrians Anabasis, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Eigennamen und Sach-Erklärung*, Leipzig 1854 (= Hildesheim, New York 1971) 133, s. v. Menoitios. But it can hardly be substantiated that Menoitios was really an Ilian, whereas the meaning of 'helmsman' as the head of the state is only attested in metaphoric usages. See, however, Hekataios, *FGHist* I, F266.

⁷¹ Cf. Berve, *op. cit.*, (n. 69) I, 143 and II, No. 86 (43); Wehrli, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) 30; Bosworth, *op. cit.*, (n. 38) 174 (ad I 29, 3).

ment théorique' consisting of a variety of tasks of confidence but lacking important military power⁷².

What we know about Alexander's other officers raises one of the major problems concerning the commands of Antigonos.

During Alexander's stay in Sardes, Kalas, former officer of Philippos and Parmenion in the Troad and then satrap in Daskyleion, and Alexander Lynkestes were sent to Memnon's district with the allied troops, the Argives, who were to remain at Sardes, excepted⁷³.

A few days later, when the Macedonian king stopped at Ephesos, another of the noblest Macedonians, Alkimachos, was dispatched to the Aeolian and Ionian cities to establish democracies, to restore the ancestral laws and to exempt them from tribute⁷⁴.

In other words, Kalas led the troops that were supposedly Antigonos', the Allies, and Alkimachos obtained an office that would seem to be Antigonos', namely, the liberation of the Hellenic cities and the confirmation of their allignment as new Allies. This evidence has led Bosworth, though accepting the traditional interpretation of the στρατηγία τῶν συμμάχων, to suggest that in the summer of 334 Antigonos had not yet been appointed⁷⁵, which is all the more possible since Alkimachos is not attested after the summer of 334⁷⁶.

It should be remembered, however, that the hierarchic structure and the prosopography of Alexander's army is not sufficiently known to conclude merely on the basis of titlature (if any) whether an officer was superior or subordinate to another. Furthermore, there seems to have been a flexible system for the distribution of tasks alien to the ordinary duties of the expeditionary army such as logistic, diplomatic or administrative missions. This makes it even harder to get a clear view of these special offices and their executives. Notwithstanding these uncertainties, it appears from what we know about Alexander's army in 334, that Antigonos probably had a real military στρατηγία from the very start of the campaign⁷⁷.

⁷² Briant, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) III: "Le stratège des Alliés", 27—41, esp. 35—39.

⁷³ Arr. I 17, 8.

⁷⁴ Arr. I 18, 1—2. Concerning the 'restoration of democracies', J. A. O. Larsen, (*Demokratia*, CPh 68 [1973] 45—46) remarks that the word democracy had a much more general sense than we usually accept, almost synonymous with 'republican constitution'. For a better understanding of the real scope of this grant, a study of the internal political, cultural and socio-economic constituents of the cities of Asia Minor, as J. M. Balcer did for the fifth century, *Arktouros. Studies pres. to B. M. W. Knox ...*, Berlin, New York 1979, 261—268, would be welcome.

⁷⁵ Bosworth, *op. cit.*, (n. 38) 131.

⁷⁶ Cf. Berve, *op. cit.*, (n. 69) No. 47 (23). The only other mention of the name Alkimachos is in the so-called 'Second Letter of Alexander to the Chians' (l. 10). It is not certain, however, whether he is a native Chian or someone else (our Alkimachos?). Even less certain is to what period the inscription belongs, 334 or 332. Cf. W. G. Forrest, *Klio* 51 (1969) 202; Heisserer, *op. cit.*, (n. 31) 101.

⁷⁷ The Allies are attested at the start of the Asiatic expedition, see Diod. XVII 17, 3—4. The whole infantry is said to have been under the general command of Parmenion. Erygios is alleged to have commanded 600 allied cavalrymen, while Kalas led 1800 mounted Thessalians. Diodoros was probably mistaken concerning Erygios, for he was appointed only in early 333 (the same time Antigonos was relieved!) to replace Philippos as commander of the allied cavalrymen. See Arr. I 14, 3 and III 6, 6; cf. Berve, *op. cit.*, (n. 69) No. 302 (151) and Bosworth, *op. cit.*, (n. 38) 118—119; 283. It is suggestive that there is a place left possibly for a general commander of the Allies and certainly for an officer of the allied infantry. Balakros, the successor of Antigonos (Arr. I 29, 3), is said to have commanded the allied infantry (Arr. III 5, 6). Besides, no one before Antigonos is mentioned as 'Commander of the Allies', though the replacements of Antigonos by Balakros in 334/33 and of Balakros by Kalanos in 332/31 are duly reported by Arrian.

Moreover, the Prieneans issued a honorary inscription for Antigonos probably in August 334 B. C. very shortly after the city's liberation⁷⁸. The motivation of the honour proclaims simply, Ἀντιγόνῳ Φιλίππου Μακεδόνι | [εὐ]εργέτη γενομένῳ καὶ προθύμῳ ἔοντι | [εἰς τὴν πόλιν τὴν Πριηνέων (ll. 5—7). The decree on the other hand, emphasizes in its 'introductory' lines the freedom and autonomy of the city. It can be reasonably assumed therefore, that the beneficence of Antigonos had something, if not everything, to do with this new freedom. When we also bear in mind the above cited dedication of king Alexander on the anta of the temple of Athena Polias, we can infer probably that Antigonos did work at Priene at Alexander's side, or in his name⁷⁹, precisely in the role in which we would expect Alkimachos. What is more, we find Antigonos in, among others, inscriptions from Skepsis, Kyme, Kolophon, whereas Alkimachos is rarely mentioned. I am inclined, therefore, to accept both Antigonos' military authority as well as the 'political' aspects of this στρατηγία τῶν συμμάχων of 334 B. C.

In examining further the usual interpretation of the στρατηγία, we will take a closer look at the inscriptions attesting Antigonos.

b. Epigraphical attestations

We already cited the inscription from Priene issued in honour of Antigonos in connection with the grant of freedom to the city. Interesting is also the fact that the altar of Poseidon Helikonios on the peninsula of Mykale, near Priene, was used again in this same period as the center of the new Ionian κοινόν⁸⁰. The renewed association built a βουλευτήριον for the Πανιώνιον according to a plan found in the theatre at Priene⁸¹. It also organized (sacred) games, the Alexandria, to celebrate Alexander's birthday⁸². The character of these festivities seems to indicate that they were organized first during the king's lifetime rather than after his death (though the latter possibility cannot be excluded)⁸³.

We observe, then, an almost complete parallel between the events at Ilios and at Priene. In decrees of both cities Antigonos and Alexander are mentioned, albeit indirectly, in connection with the cities' liberation and with the (re)appearance of a κοινόν and its related arrangements: the pledge of a (sacred) contest, the erection and/or dedication of a sanctuary and the construction of other federal accommodations. The parallel is even more

⁷⁸ *Priene*, No. 2. Cf. Tod, *op. cit.*, (n. 64) No. 186, 244—246; Briant, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) 35, n. 1. The establishment of the date is based upon the fact that the decree mentions an eponymous 'prytanis', whereas the eponymous dignitaries from 333 on were the στεφανηφόροι. See Hiller von Gaertringen, *op. cit.*, (n. 3) XII; 5; 13.

⁷⁹ Cf. Habicht, *op. cit.*, (n. 55) 23. Tod, *op. cit.*, (n. 64) 245—246 is rather cautious.

⁸⁰ Cf. G. Kleiner, P. Hommel, W. Müller-Wiener, *Panionion und Melie* (JDAI, Ergänzungsheft 23), Berlin 1967, 6—77, including an inscription that could be the oldest evidence for the new Panionion. The Ionian League is also attested in other inscriptions. See e. g. *Priene*, No. 139: Ἰώνων τῆ βουλῆ, probably to be dated ca. 334 B. C., some time after the battle at the Granikos; No. 4, 11, 35—36: προε]δ[ρ]ίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι καὶ ἐμ πρυτα[νεύει] καὶ ἐμ Π[αν]ιονίῳ σίτησιγ dated at the earliest 333/31 according to Hiller von Gaertringen. Cf. Habicht, *op. cit.*, (n. 55) 17. G. Fogazza, *Per una storia della lega Ionica*, PP 28 (1973) 157—169, esp. 167, deals with the question of the restoration in a rather unsatisfactory way.

⁸¹ Cf. Müller-Wiener, *op. cit.*, (n. 80) 28—37. Carter, *op. cit.*, (n. 64) 27—29 emphasizes the possible importance of the use of the Attic foot as the unit of measure for the construction.

⁸² Strabo XIV 1, 31 (C. 644). Cf. *Erythrai* II, No. 504, l. 25.

⁸³ Cf. E. Kornemann, *Klio* 1 (1901) 57; J. Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* I, Leipzig, Berlin 1917², 345—346; Habicht, *op. cit.*, (n. 55) 17.

remarkable, if the theory recently rehabilitated by D. Van Berchem is accepted, that the *city* of Priene was refounded by Alexander the Great⁸⁴.

Others also have linked the events at Iliion and Priene. Alexander's activities may have inspired Augustus to rebuild the temple of Athena Ilias and dedicate it with a large bronze inscription set across the middle architrave of the east fronton⁸⁵. Augustus also made a 'rededication' of the sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene in a conspicuous inscription on the outer architrave of the templefront⁸⁶.

In contrast with the document from Priene, the honorary decree for Antigonos and his sons issued by the city of Skepsis does not mention Alexander and is almost certainly to be dated to ca. 310 B. C.⁸⁷.

The other inscriptions must fall between these poles. In the case of the inscription of Kyme⁸⁸ regarding the judges, it cannot be settled even approximately whether it belongs to the first period (thus paralleling Antigonos' intervention at Priene) or to the years during which the decree of Skepsis was issued.

The decree of Kolophon has not yet been dated with certainty. Its first editor, B. D. Meritt⁸⁹, dated the inscription "with great probability" to the first year of Alexander's Asian campaign, relying on ll. 6—7, παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεὺς | τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ Ἀντίγονος, and on the fact that Antigonos was Commander of the Allies in 334 B. C. It could of course be mere coincidence, but among the contributions for the extension of the city-walls which were appended to the inscription one finds payments of ἀργυρίου συμμαχικοῦ (ll. 151—153). Yet L. Robert⁹⁰ dates the inscription to the period 311—306, adducing as parallels the documents from Skepsis, Iliion and Kyme. Though it is not clear from the text that Antigonos operated at Kolophon in the capacity of Alexander's commander of the Allies⁹¹, there is no evidence to the contrary. The inscription from Skepsis, on which Alexander is not mentioned and on which the formula [π]όλει καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν seems to point to the period ca. 310, is the only one of the parallels adduced to be dated with a high measure of certainty. The honorary decrees for Malousios of Gargara surely provide a parallel, but they are no real help since it cannot be point of reference for the dating of other texts. But the text's mutually similar situations in a more or less coherent setting in contrast with the divergent information of the decree of Skepsis puts the burden of argumentation on the shoulders of those opting for 311—306 as the date for

⁸⁴ *Alexandre et la restauration de Priène*, MH 27 (1970) 198—205. The most recent research, however, is inclined to credit the Karian dynast Mausolos with the restoration of the city. Thus S. Hornblower, *Mausolos*, Oxford 1982, 323—332 and Carter, *op. cit.*, (n. 64) 27—29. But even if this conjecture is correct, Alexander finished what Mausolos began, and agreed with his intentions.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Iliion*, No. 84. Cf. Carter, *op. cit.*, (n. 64) 254—256.

⁸⁶ Cf. *Priene*, No. 157; No. 156 (see n. 64).

⁸⁷ *OGIS* 6: ἐπειδὴ Ἀντίγονος τῆι τε [π]όλει καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος γεγένηται, συνησθῆναι δὲ | τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ὅτι ἐλεύθε[ρ]οι καὶ αὐτόνομοι ὄντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ ... (ll. 10—16). Cf. L. Robert, *RPh* 10 (1936) 161. But the freedom and autonomy proclaimed by Antigonos (cf. *OGIS* 5) was of no enduring value. The city ceased to exist shortly afterwards and was incorporated into newly founded Antigoneia Troas. Cf. Strabo XIII 1, 52 (C. 607). See U. Koehler, *Sitzungsbericht Berlin* 1901, 1057—1068.

⁸⁸ *Kyme*, No. 1.

⁸⁹ *Inscriptions of Colophon*, *AJPh* 56 (1935) 359—372.

⁹⁰ Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 87) 160—161.

⁹¹ So Robert, *loc. cit.*

the Kolophon inscription. We therefore support Meritt's date and confirm our conjecture that the period ca. 334 provides a probable background for the inscriptions mentioning Antigonos and Alexander side by side.

Somewhat apart stands a letter of Antiochos I to the city of Erythrai mentioning ἐπί τε Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου αὐτό[ν]ομος ἦν καὶ ἀφορολόγητος ἢ πόλις ὑμῶν⁹². On the evidence of this inscription, dated some 50 years after Alexander and set in the context of a city demanding autonomy on the basis of earlier, sometimes alleged, grants⁹³, it is impossible to infer whether both Alexander and Antigonos accorded autonomy and exemption from tribute together, or the one some two decades after the other. It is nevertheless probable that the earlier grants of Alexander invoked by Erythrai really were granted. The existence of Alexandria-games at Erythrai can hardly be expected in a city that had not received certain benefits⁹⁴.

Here too, as in the case of our decree from Priene, another inscription from the same city should be considered: ἔδοξεν Ἰωσι καὶ Αἰολεῶσι⁹⁵. Assuming W. J. Hamilton read the stone correctly in 1842⁹⁶, the Ionic form Αἰολεῶσι seems to belong to the reign of Alexander, probably to the early years, ca. 334/33⁹⁷. This document, together with some coins from northern Asia Minor bearing the legend ΑΙΟΛΕ(ΩΝ) dated ca. 330—328⁹⁸, has been taken as proof of the existence of a κοινὸν τῶν Αἰολέων⁹⁹. This koinon of Aeolians would fit 'de façon indispensable, entre la confédération ionienne et la confédération des villes de Troade'¹⁰⁰.

The examination of these inscriptions (and of the literary sources) securely shows that (king) Antigonos Monophthalmos was not the only ruler to have granted freedom and autonomy to Greek cities in Asia Minor. On the contrary, it is clear that Alexander actually

⁹² *Erythrai I*, No. 31, ll. 22—23 (= C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondance in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, New Haven 1934, No. 15).

⁹³ For the possible importance of this context, see M. Ostwald, *Autonomia: its Genesis and Early History*, (American Classical Studies 11), Chico 1982, 2.

⁹⁴ Cf. supra n. 83.

⁹⁵ *Erythrai I*, No. 16, l. 6.

⁹⁶ W. J. Hamilton, *Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus and Armenia II*, London 1842, 212. He appears to be the only one to have seen this marble slab.

⁹⁷ Cf. H. Engelmann, R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai I* (Nr. 1—200) (Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 2), Bonn 1973, 83. It is noteworthy that the Ionic forms are still present in the honorary decree of the Prieneans for Antigonos, dated August 334 B. C. (cf. supra n. 78; cf. Tod, *op. cit.*, [n. 64] 245), while these forms tend to disappear shortly afterwards. The change from Ionic to Attic forms, therefore, seems to have taken place in the early years of Alexanders' reign along with the introduction of the Attic standard for minting and the general use of the Attic foot in architecture.

⁹⁸ Cf. Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 32) 92—100; *op. cit.*, (n. 9) 95—97. L. Lazzarini, *L'Inizio della monetazione di Assos e una nuova ipotesi su Aioleis (Troade)*, RIN 85 (1983) 3—15, rightly attributes the 'Eolian' coins to Assos, but his date of ca. 310 instead of ca. 330 B. C. is based upon the attribution of our inscription to the reign of Antigonos.

⁹⁹ Cf. Engelmann, Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, (n. 97) 75—76. See also H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht I*. (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 26), München 1937, 216, adducing as evidence the text of Diod. XX 107 concerning the strategy of Prepelaios in 302/01: στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰολίδος καὶ τῆς Ἰωνίας πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ Λυσιμάχου.

¹⁰⁰ Robert, *op. cit.*, (n. 32) 95.

accorded such privileges to several cities¹⁰¹. It is a good possibility that the young king did the same at Ilion. Such a display at the city of ancient Troy would fit very well with a more general policy of Alexander.

2. 4. Alexander's policy concerning Hellenized Asia Minor

Alexander made offerings and/or dedications in many sanctuaries that either were or became the hub of one or another association or League¹⁰². We find him making an offering in Ilion and either reviving or founding the *κοινόν* of Athena Ilias. He is attested in Priene where the Panionion was restored to its former condition. The king had his dedication inscribed on the Letoon in Xanthos, the federal sanctuary of the Lykians¹⁰³, and he made a distant dedication in the temple of Athena at Lindos, the most important sanctuary of the Rhodian federal state. If we add to these testimonies the Aeolian League, whose sanctuary or centre is unknown¹⁰⁴, we see that these associations cover the whole Hellenized coastal strip of Asia Minor, with the sole exception of Karia. The special position of the local Hekatomnid dynasty provided, however, a ready-made instrument for exercising and legitimising Macedonian power: Alexander restored Hekatomnid Ada to power, but he made himself the heir to this dynasty through adoption by 'queen' Ada¹⁰⁵. Moreover, the Karian inland had always been 'divided' in several local *κοινά*, so that no new structure had to be created¹⁰⁶.

Alexander doubtlessly had several motives in making such an extensive use of these associations as an instrument of power. In the context of the present discussion we may confine ourselves to a few of these possible reasons.

Our sources do not provide much evidence for the significance of the foundation, revival or protection of these *κοινά*. Looking at the texts of some of these *κοινά* one sees that they had, above all, a religious function. The associations also had some economic importance since they controlled a common market during the federal games and (sometimes) issued 'federal' coins.

Both the economic and religious functions may have been somewhat important to the 'founder(s)' of the League(s), but it appears the political functions of the *κοινά* may have been more important though camouflaged under religious and economic guises. To control, even passively, certain cities, it would prove much easier to manipulate one central organisation than several small, 'independent' cities. The Corinthian League was a good

¹⁰¹ Besides the cities already mentioned, the city of Nessos may also be noted. This Eolian island-state obtained its freedom and autonomy (along with an enlargement of its territory) from Alexander ca. 334/333, perhaps on the same occasion when another Eolian state, Mytilene, was given a larger territory (Curt. IV 8, 13); see *IG XII 2*, 645 (= *OGIS* 4) and 646, esp. ll. 38—39.

¹⁰² Cf. Lenschau, *op. cit.*, (n. 9) 220—224: 'Stammesverbänden mit sakralem Mittelpunkt'.

¹⁰³ Cf. Le Roy, *op. cit.*, (n. 64) 56.

¹⁰⁴ But Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, (n. 98), seems right in situating the epicenter of this league at Assos.

¹⁰⁵ Plut., *Alex.* 22, 7. Cf. L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie. I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*, Paris 1983, 6. On the position of the local dynasty see Hornblower, *op. cit.*, (n. 84).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Hornblower, *op. cit.*, (n. 84) 52—67; esp. 62.

example, both for Alexander and for Antigonos¹⁰⁷, of what could be realized by such a grouping of cities.

It should be remarked, however, that the religious aspect was actually no disguise for the possible political motives. Rather it formed an integral part of and instrument for political interference¹⁰⁸.

The inseparability of the political and the religious can be seen in the religious titlature of several cities of Asia Minor. The well known religious connotations of βασιλεύς were preserved during the Hellenistic period in several cities such as Ephesos, Miletos, possibly Priene, and some Karian cities¹⁰⁹. Thence, it does not seem impossible that the use by or the application to Alexander of this title was favoured by the king's possible position as head or protector of the religious κοινά¹¹⁰.

Another motive (related to the religious sphere and its titlature) for the revival or foundation of (a) League(s) may have been the prestige found in temple dedications, federal games or even ruler-cult proper¹¹¹. But it remains difficult to measure or even to estimate the importance of this motivation.

Besides the religious, economic, political reasons and motives of prestige, a ruler may also have aimed to gain certain military advantages from these associations.

This aspect of the relation between ruler and κοινόν, however, has little evidence for it and is difficult to evaluate. It probably was not an obligation imposed at all times and may not have been advertised, since a levy of troops or 'the generous sending of help' contradicts general freedom and autonomy¹¹². It is against a similar background of unadvertised needs and intentions that we should consider the task of Antigonos as Alexander's Commander of the Allies. His office may have existed by the grant of freedom and autonomy, making the cities true and unconditional supporters of Alexander's rule, while at the same time

¹⁰⁷ The (re)appearance of several κοινά in Asia Minor, may be explained by the fact that Alexander had learned a lesson from his troubles with the Corinthian League and wanted to keep these associations rather small in order to reduce the potential power concentrated in one League. Cf. W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 3th. ed. rev. by G. T. Griffith, London 1974, 70—71; cf. Buraselis, *op. cit.*, (n. 43) 85—86. The grouping of cities may also have facilitated the collection of the συντάξεις.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. G. Scholz, *Die militärischen und politischen Folgen der Schlacht am Granikos*, *Klio* 15 (1918) 201; S. F. R. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, New York 1984.

¹⁰⁹ Ephesos: see Hommel, *op. cit.*, (n. 80) 49, l. 22; l. 24. Miletos: see *Syll.*³ 1037, l. 5 (ca. 300 B. C.). Priene: cf. Strabo VIII 7, 2 (C. 384), according to some manuscript readings at least. Karia: see Hornblower, *op. cit.*, (n. 84) 59—62, with a discussion of the evidence for the cultic 'kingship' of the Hekatomnids.

¹¹⁰ Α βασιλεύς τῶν Ἴωνων is attested in later times. There is continuing discussion concerning the nature of the office (or title) and the period during which it may have existed. According to Fogazza, *op. cit.*, (n. 80) 159, n. 15 'il basileus ... fosse una carica sacerdotale, forse il più elevato in grado dei funzionari del Panionion'. Whatever its meaning, the use of the title in Asia Minor may help to explain why Alexander was already named 'king' in 334, even if this use of the word may have had no religious implications. Cf. *supra* n. 64.

¹¹¹ Cf. Habicht, *op. cit.*, (n. 55) 17—18; 21. Alexander followed his father's example and, from the beginning of his reign, sought adulation, even to the point of skirting deification. It is not clear when he actually claimed a ruler-cult. Cf. E. A. Fredricksmeier, *On the Background of the Ruler Cult, in Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of C. E. Edson*, Thessaloniki 1981, 145—156; but see E. Badian, *The Deification of Alexander the Great*, *ibidem*, 27—71. Regarding Antigonos, the federation of the Nesiotai too may to some extent have been meant to serve his prestige and cult; see Habicht, *op. cit.*, (n. 55) 58—61.

¹¹² This contradiction is clearly reflected in a remark of Diod. XIX 77, 3 concerning the Rhodian alliance with Antigonos in the year 313 and in the letter of Antigonos to Skepsis cited above. Cf. Bosworth, *op. cit.*, (n. 38) 130.

imposing certain political and military restraints on their freedom. Antigonos' rich experience (he was one of Alexander's senior officers and had served in all Philip II's campaigns) and his connections with the most important noble houses of Macedon¹¹³, may have made him a good candidate for an office that required a delicate blend of freedom and dependence, of political propaganda and military and juridical restraints. If the command of the Allies is to be understood in this way, one can understand why Antigonos need not always be with his troops and why he could be relieved from his office as soon as the situation in the Hellenic cities of Asia Minor was settled, to become satrap of Great-Phrygia in 333. This interpretation brings, to my opinion at least, a possible explanation for the testimonies of several inscriptions concerning Antigonos' interference with some cities of Asia Minor, and above all of the document from Ilion under discussion here. The fact that Antigonos may be attested as Alexander's cooperator and that his office finds a sufficient explanation in the specific situation of the district does of course not rule out that Antigonos proceeded in the same way during his own reign. It seems rather that he would have been influenced (to some extent at least) by the policy advocated by his former king.

It is now clear how significant it is that Antigonos had granted freedom and autonomy in several cases already in 334 B. C. while acting on behalf of Alexander, rather than later in his own right. It is thus possible that Alexander was a more 'genuine' champion of freedom for the Greek cities of Asia Minor than Antigonos, 'ce défenseur patenté de la liberté des cités ...'¹¹⁴. Our inscription (and maybe still others) cannot be credited to Antigonos¹¹⁵.

Conclusion

In light of these observations, it may be considered a good possibility that the decrees issued by the κοινόν of the Troad in honour of Malousios refer to an interference of Antigonos in cooperation with Alexander, rather than to Antigonos as dynast and king. The inscription should be dated, therefore, to 334 B. C., perhaps even to the late summer of that year. The text refers immediately to Antigonos (καὶ νῦν, l. 8) (possibly as commander of the Allies, an office he held until spring of 333) and more distantly to the king (l. 24), *i. e.* Alexander. The first embassy, the one to the king, may then be placed during Alexander's stay at Ilion in (May)/June of 334, and might be connected with the encounter with Menoitios. The appeal of the κοινόν to Antigonos appears to be some time later. Envoys may have been sent to Antigonos in reaction to the overall declamation of freedom and democracy by Alexander at Ephesos (end of July?) and/or to the preceding liberation of some parts of the Troad, the district of Memnon. As the first evidence of the association around Athena Ilias, our inscription would then be a testimony for its existence as early as 334 B. C. To conclude, then, that the κοινόν was founded necessarily by Alexander is a step we would not take, even though there are strong presumptions in that direction. There are no cogent reasons for the non-existence of the League under Persian 'domination'¹¹⁶. The κοινόν may simply have been accepted by the new Macedonian ruler since it could easily

¹¹³ Cf. Berve, *op. cit.*, (n. 69) 40—41, (No. 87).

¹¹⁴ Will, *op. cit.*, (n. 43) 65.

¹¹⁵ The freedomproclamation remaining to the credit of Antigonos were above all propagandistic initiatives and responses to similar claims of his antagonists. Cf. Mastrocinque, *op. cit.*, (n. 50) 15.

¹¹⁶ See for instance C. Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, München 1967, I, 641.

find a place in the policy of Alexander, seeing that 'à la fin du IV^e siècle, le système fédératif avait atteint un développement prometteur ...'¹¹⁷.

The conclusions here can hardly prove beyond doubt that the reading of our inscription should be reversed and that it should be dated to the first year of Alexander's Asiatic campaign, but what we aimed to establish is that the honorary decrees for Malousios of Gargara can be read in another sequence, against another background, while respecting the text and its historical setting. At any rate, our reading provides as full and as rich a meaning as the traditional one.

This tentative epigraphical and chronological resetting of one of the most important documents for the history of Ilium and the Troad, even of Hellenistic Asia Minor as a whole, is meant to reopen the discussion of the inscription. It seems that the usual interpretation has been taken for granted too long on too few grounds.

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Afdeling Oude Geschiedenis
Blijde Inkomststraat 21
B-3000 Leuven

Frank Verkinderen

¹¹⁷ Wehrli, *op. cit.*, (n. 42) 98.