

LABRAUNDA AND THE PTOLEMIES:  
A REINTERPRETATION OF THREE DOCUMENTS FROM THE  
SANCTUARY OF ZEUS (*I.LABRAUNDA* 51, 45 AND 44).\*

*for Pontus Hellström*

Among the most cited documents in the second volume of Jonas Crampa's *Greek Inscriptions of Labraunda* is n° 43, a decree of the Chrysaoric League in honour of a Ptolemaic *oikonomos*, Apollonios,<sup>1</sup> dated to the 16th day of Daisios, year 19 of Ptolemy Philadelphos (267/266 BC).<sup>2</sup> Not only is this the earliest document to mention this much-discussed but little understood Karian league,<sup>3</sup> it is also the earliest known Ptolemaic document from Labraunda, together with the largely illegible n° 44, which Crampa considered to be a second Chrysaoric decree of approximately the same date. Apart from these two inscriptions, and a reference to Ptolemaic predecessors in one of the early letters of the Seleukid *strategos* Olympichos soon after the liberation of Mylasa by Seleukos II (246 BC),<sup>4</sup> we have very little direct information about the years of Ptolemaic domination over the sanctuary and the neighbouring city of Mylasa.<sup>5</sup> Evidence from the wider region strongly suggests that both came under Ptolemaic control in the early 270s. An inscription from the territory of the future Stratonikeia, dated to Panemos, ninth year of Philadelphos (April/May 277 BC) shows Ptolemaic presence in the Marsyas valley immediately to Mylasa's east.<sup>6</sup> A decree from Amyzon for the Ptolemaic *strategos* Margos is dated to Hyperberetaios of the same year (July/August 277). At Iasos, Ptolemaic presence is attested already under Ptolemy I, and an anonymous Ptolemaic 'Funktionärsbrief' from Euromos may also date to the 270s or 260s.<sup>7</sup>

---

\* My thanks go to J. Blid, W. Blümel, N. Carless Unwin, Ch. Crowther, R. Fabiani, P. Hamon, P. R. Parker, and especially to Pontus Hellström, for information, comments, suggestions, and discussion of these unpromising texts and their archaeological context. Only I am responsible for the version here presented, which may well not represent the last word said.

<sup>1</sup> Ἀπολλώνιος Διοδότ[ου?] (l. 4). Crampa's tentative suggestion (ad loc., p. 52), that this Apollonios was the same man who became *dioiketes* of Ptolemy Philadelphos (from c. 263 to 245 BC), although rejected by Bagnall (*Administration*, 92, n. 49: 'useless speculation') is certainly not impossible (cf. J. Pouilloux, review of *Labraunda* III.2, *AC* 42, 1973, 544–551, at 547, and Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen I, 57, n. 79). Whether the *dioiketes* was from Karia, as has been widely assumed (see the references in Rigsby, below, at p. 133), does not affect this point. Sceptical about his alleged Karian background are especially L. Criscuolo, *Studia Hellenistica* 34 (1998) 61–72 (who argues that he was from Aspendos), and K.J. Rigsby, *BASP*, 48 (2011), 131–136 (from Cyprus).

<sup>2</sup> April/May 267 (Grzybek, *Calendrier* p. 184). Crampa dated it as 'June 267'.

<sup>3</sup> On the Chrysaoreis see below, nn. 84, 90 and 94–96.

<sup>4</sup> *I.Labraunda* 3, ll. 4–6. For the date see Bencivenni, *Progetti*, 258–280, and the schedule on p. 281; for the city's liberation by Seleukos II see *I.Labraunda* 3, 7–8: κα[θ'] ὃν κ[α]ρ[ὸ]ν ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος| [ἐ]λευ[θ]ε[ρ]ω[σ]αί ὑμῶν τὴν πόλιν, and the new *I.Labraunda* 134, l. 13–14: ἐν ἡ| ἡμέραι ὁ δῆμος ἐκομίσαστο τήν| [τε ἐλευθερία]ν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν (Isager-Karlsson, 'New Inscription'; *SEG* 2008, 2020).

<sup>5</sup> *I.Labraunda* 29, a dedication of an exhedra by Demetrios, son of Python, may be of the early third century, but we know nothing about the dedicator. On the structure, see F. Tobin, *OA* 7 (2014) 54–57.

<sup>6</sup> *I.Stratonikeia* 1002. A fragment from the sanctuary of Zeus at Panamara of the same period is again dated by Philadelphos and also belongs in the 270s: R. van Bremen, 'Ptolemy at Panamara', *EA* 35 (2003) 9–14, with further references.

<sup>7</sup> *Amyzon* 3, with 4 and 5 probably equally of the 270s or 260s. For the dates see Meadows, 'Ptolemaic Annexation' 467. For Iasos, see below, n. 48; for Euromos, n. 110. For Kildara, see Kobes, 'Mylasa und Kildara in ptolemäischer Hand? Überlegungen zu zwei hellenistischen Inschriften aus Karien', *EA*

I hope to show in what follows that it is possible to add two further documents to this very small dossier of Ptolemaic documents of the (?) 270s and 260s BC. The two inscriptions that will be central to my discussion have never been considered in this light, since both were dated by Crampa to well after the removal of Ptolemaic power from the region, and their content has not been well understood. To my knowledge, there have been no attempts to improve on Crampa's readings.<sup>8</sup> The corrections suggested here throw a bit more light on the prehistory of the dispute between Mylasa and the sanctuary's priesthood, extensively documented in the so-called Olympichos dossier of the 240s and 220s, the subject of Crampa's first volume, *Labraunda III.1: The Period of Olympichos*.<sup>9</sup>

### *I. Labraunda 51 and 45*

The best preserved text, n° 45, is a letter from a royal official or a king, writing in the singular, to a body addressed in the plural. Crampa saw in it a letter from the *strategos* and local dynast Olympichos to the Chrysaoric league, and dated it to the 220s BC.<sup>10</sup> The second text, n° 51, of which only a few disjointed lines are legible, was dated by him on letter forms to the 'Republican period', a not very precise way of saying 'sometime in the late second, or first century BC'.<sup>11</sup> What links both inscriptions, despite the presumed chronological gap between them of at least a century, are the names of three individuals. They have different ethnics (Ἡρακλεώτης, Ἰασεύς [?- -]σεύς), but in each of the two documents they are mentioned together. Since both texts will be discussed in some detail, I give the text of both inscriptions here, in Crampa's version; for 45 I also give his translation (none was attempted for 51). The underlined sections in 45 are restored on the basis of 51, and *vice-versa*.

---

24 (1995), 1–6, with Ph. Gauthier, *BE* (1994) 528, and (1996) 397. For Miletos (Ptolemaic from 279/278 for two decades) see M.-Chr. Marcellesi, *Milet des Hécatomnides à la domination romaine. Pratiques monétaires et histoire de la cité du IVe au IIe siècle av. J.-C.* Miletische Forschungen, 3 (2004) 77–78 and 105. For Ptolemaic presence in Karia more generally see Bagnall, *Administration*, 89–102. Bagnall's warning (p. 94) that we should heed 'generalizing about the relations of a dynasty with a city on the basis of supposed control of its surroundings' is not an empty one: it was clearly possible for Labraunda to be Ptolemaic still in 267 BC and for a document issued by a community on the site of the future Stratonikeia to be dated by the joint rule of Antiochos I and II to 268 BC (*I.Stratonikeia* 1030). The Marsyas valley was the obvious route by which a Seleukid army would have reached the future Stratonikeia, coming from the east along the Maeander valley. It must have halted there. Mylasa did not become Seleukid until 259 BC or possibly even later, in 246 BC: see below, 00.

<sup>8</sup> Only F. Piejko, 'Labraunda' has offered numerous, though rather bold, restorations (*SEG* 40, 969–989) often dismissed by those who have noted them ('avec la virtuosité et l'horreur du vide qu'on lui connaît', Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1991, 529). He offers nothing, however, on 45 and 51. P. Roesch (*RA* 2, 1974, 364–365), merely notes that some of Crampa's restorations are 'à reprendre'; J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1973, 410, offer nothing on 45 and 51 and pass over 44 as 'début d'un décret' (*ibidem*, 409). J. Pouilloux, in a detailed review, (above, n. 1) is despondent: 'Il n'y a guère à tirer' (on 44); 'La mutilation . . . est telle que l'on n'en devrait rien dire' (on 51). His few suggestions for our inscriptions will be noted below in my commentary.

<sup>9</sup> To the dossier should now be added three recently published inscriptions: Isager and Karlsson, 'New Inscription' (= *I.Labraunda* 134), Carless Unwin and Henry, 'New Olympichos' (= *I.Labraunda* 137) and van Bremen, 'Olympichos', *ibidem*, 1–26.

<sup>10</sup> In the Preface to *I. Labraunda* vol. II, he wrote: '45 seems to me now to be most likely a letter by Olympichos, and, anyhow, it belongs to the group covered by Part I'. Cf. in the same vol. 188–189. The reasons for dating the letter to the time of Philip V rather than that of Seleukos II are convoluted, and are explained on p. 59. See also below, 00.

<sup>11</sup> *I. Labraunda* 2, p. 75; cf. *ibid.*, p. 189.

I.Labraunda 45 (Crampa's version)

-----  
1 [- - c.8 - - ἐκά]στω[ι? δ]ιετέ[λ]ε[σαν -c.4 - -]  
[- c.2 - προφ]ερόμενοι? τὰς γεγεννημ[ένας]  
[ύμειν] εἰς τὰ κοινὰ δαπάνας μηδ[έπο]-  
4 [τε] ἀποκαταστήσαι τοῖς προκεχρ[ηκό]-  
[σιν] ἄλλ' αὐτοὺς εἰσπράσσεσθαι δι[ὰ τὸ]  
[τ]ὸν ἱερῆ καὶ τὸν νεωκ[ό]ρον μὴ οἴεσθ[αι]  
[δε]ῖν εἶναι ὑμῖν ἰσοτελεῖς, καὶ διὰ τὰ[ύτα]  
8 [μ]ηδ' ὑ[μᾶ]ς ὑπομένειν καταδιαιρεῖσθ[αι]  
[τ]ὸ δ[α]πάνημα· ἐπέδειξαν δέ μοι κα[ὶ]  
[ἄλλ]ο τι ἀντίγραφον, ἧς Μένανδρ[ός]  
[τε Κ]λεισθένους Ἡρακλεώτης καὶ Ἑ[στι]-  
12 [αῖος] Διοδώρου Ἰασε[ύς κ]αὶ Πολίτη[ς]  
[Μενοίτου Μυ]λα[σεύς γ' ὑ]ποταγεῖ[σης]  
[πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον συγγραφῆς α]ὐτο[ῖς ἐδά]-  
[νεισαν ἐπὶ ταῖς προσόδοις τοῦ Διὸς]  
16 [τοῦ Λαβραύνδου —]

Crampa's translation:

- -they continually alleged against everybody that [they] had [never] paid back to the lenders the money which had been produced [to you] for the common expences (sic) but that they were charged [because] the priest and the neocorus did not think themselves [to have to] bear burdens equal to you; and that on this account you did not accept either to distribute the expenses among yourselves. They also showed me [as well] a copy [of the contract which had been appended to Apollonius, when] Menander, son of Cleisthenes, from Heraclea, [Hestiaeus] son of Diodorus, from Iasus, and Polites, [son of Menoitias, from Mylasa, had lent them money on the security of the revenues of Zeus Labraundos].

I.Labraunda 51 (Crampa's version)

[- - c.7- - ]ον[- - c.6 - -]! ὅτε ἰ- - - - c.20 - - - - εἰς ἔριν ε[ - c.3 - ]  
[- - - - -c.37- - - - -] δεδίηι τη[- - c.4 - -]  
[- - - - c.12 - - - - τ]ῶι ἱερῶι τὸ [ἀντίγραφον, ἧς Μέναν]δρος Κλ[ε]ισθέ-  
4 [νου]ς Ἡρακ[λεώτ]ης, Ἑστιαῖος [Διοδ]ώρου Ἰασε[ύς, Πολίτης [Μεν]οί<τ>ο[υ?]  
[c.2 - λα]σεύς γε [ύ]ποταγεῖ[σης πρὸς Ἀ]πολλώνιο[ν συγγραφ]ῆς  
[αὐτοῖς ἐδάνεισαν ἐπὶ ταῖς προσό]δοις τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λαβραύν-  
[δου [- - - - -c.28- - - - -] οὺς μάλιστα μὲν δια  
8 [- - - - -c.35- - - - -] κ[αὶ] τοῖς δικαιο-  
[- - - - -c.32 - - - - -] τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λ[α]β[ρ]αύνδου ἐκοι-  
[- - - - -c.35 - - - - -]ς μὲν τὸν  
[- - - - -c.38- - - - -] εἰς τὰ  
12 [- - - - -c.38- - - - -] οσα τ[ι]-

Despite its 'Republican' date, the occurrence of the name Ἀπολλώνιος in l. 5 of n° 51 suggested to Crampa that this might be the same man as the Ἀπολλώνιος Διοδότ[ου?],

*oikonomos* of Ptolemy II, who is honoured in the Chrysaoric decree *I.Labraunda* 43 (above, n. 1). Since that decree is securely dated to 267 BC, Crampa decided that n° 51 must refer back to a contract concluded in the 260s and sanctioned by the Ptolemaic *oikonomos*. By extension, n° 45 also ought to refer back to the same, earlier, document, because of the occurrence of the same three men. As can be seen, this assumption has guided his restoration of both documents.<sup>12</sup>

Crampa's interpretation of these inscriptions and their relation to one another is speculative and not without problems, and some of his readings and restorations are open to doubt. In particular, the word for 'contract', *συγγραφή*, which for him constitutes the main point of reference in both documents, is entirely restored in n° 45, ll. 13–14: [ὑ]ποταγεί[σης πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον συγγραφῆς], and as good as entirely restored in 51, l. 5: [ὑ]ποταγεί[σης πρὸς Ἀ]πολλώνιο[ν συγγραφ]ῆς. The underlined sections in 45 are 'taken from' 51, but it is clear that there is no secure basis for the borrowing, and neither do the strange construction and translation convince: 'the contract which had been appended to Apollonios'.<sup>13</sup> In addition, his attribution of 45 to the Olympichos dossier is questionable, first, because neither the size nor the character of the letters match those of the now quite numerous documents in that dossier, and secondly, because the block on which n° 45 is inscribed, does not belong to any of the three buildings on whose antae the individual components of the dossier were inscribed, namely the temple of Zeus and the *andrones* A and B (fig. 1).<sup>14</sup>

A review of Crampa's edition of the two texts seemed desirable but also somewhat hopeless. As is well known, the photographs in the relevant volumes are too small to be of use.<sup>15</sup> Pontus Hellström has, however, once again come to the rescue and has produced digital scans from the original glass plate negatives. Although these are of course the same negatives from which the photos in the *Labraunda* volumes are printed, the format is larger and allows for magnification. I have also been able to consult a squeeze of n° 51 in Crampa's collection, kept in the University Library of Uppsala (none survives of 45).<sup>16</sup> The revisions offered here (with some additional suggestions for the almost illegible n° 44, in the Appendix) can only be tentative, given that autopsy of the stones is no longer an option because of the further damage to their inscribed surface since Crampa's time (see fig. 9b for a photograph taken of n° 45 in July 2017). Crampa saw letters on the stones that I cannot confirm from the photographs. In some cases I have found his suggested reading implausible or too speculative and have therefore removed them; in other cases I have tentatively left what he saw on the stone.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> 'Apollonius in l. 14 [of no. 45] is to be assumed to be identical with the oekonomus who was honoured by the Chrysaoreis in 43, *q.v.*, since he was the authority at the time to sanction an affair of this kind' (p. 60). He kept open the possibility that 51 was a late copy of a Ptolemaic document (p. 76): 'In ll. 3–7 [of no. 51] reference is made to the same contract from the sixties...which was adduced in 45, ll. 9ff....; this is considerably earlier than 51 to judge by the letter-forms. It does not seem possible to state whether or not that bond had yet been regulated, but had caused a dispute (ll. 1–2) or whether the contract was referred to as a precedent, and also we have at Labraunda to consider the possibility of a late copy.'

<sup>13</sup> See the discussion below.

<sup>14</sup> Temple of Zeus: *I.Labraunda* n°s 1, 3 and 137; Andron B: *I.Labraunda* n°s 5, 6 and 7; Andron A: *I.Labraunda* 4. For a description of the anta blocks and their location, see most recently Carless Unwin and Henry, 'New Olympichos'.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the comments of J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1(973) 403, 408; and those of P. Roesch, *RA* (1974) 364.

<sup>16</sup> The squeezes are a bequest of Crampa's widow, donated to the library in 2007 through the care of Pontus Hellström. The squeeze of 51 does not add anything to what the photograph allows us to read.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. e.g. the comments in *BE* 1973, 403, 408; and those of P. Roesch, *RA* (1974) 364.

No startlingly new versions are offered here; the corrections and suggestions are modest and many questions about these documents have to remain open. But there is, I believe, enough to propose a different overall interpretation of their date, meaning and context. Since, as will become clear, I think that 51 predates 45, rather than the other way round, it is with this text that I begin.

### 1. *Labraunda* 51

In Crampa's view, this is a document 'concerning some economic-juridic questions'.<sup>18</sup> I give below a revised version of the text itself, removing some of the more speculative restorations, then discuss the date.

Anta block (Inv. 13/B30) found, according to Crampa, 'in front of the East Anta of Maussollos' Stoa, of which it formed originally part'. The current excavators describe it as as having been found 'in front of the W. entrance to Propylon Y'; it now lies 5 m. straight W. of the SW corner of the same building (see the plan, fig. 2).<sup>19</sup> 'The front face is broken to the left and above in a wedge-like section; most of its surface is lost through breaking or is completely worn away; the left side is broken, though not much is lost; the right side is very badly worn in parts' (Crampa). The right edge is probably largely intact, with some letters lost only through wear. On the right face of the block is inscribed no. 76, a Νίκη-inscription of the imperial period. Photo fig. 3. Squeeze Uppsala University Library. H. 0.46 m, w. 0.68 m, d. 0.31 m; one small central dowel hole on the top 0.11 m. from the front; two clamp cuttings towards the back, l. and r.; on top there is anathyrosis 0.065 m (to the front) and 0.075–0.08 m (to the sides); on the back, 0.04 m (to top) and 0.08 m (l. side).<sup>20</sup> Above the preserved l. 1 there is space on the stone for two lines—no writing is any longer visible. There is space for c. 10 lines after l. 12. Letters 1.0 to 1.5 cm high, omicron 0.8 cm, interlinear space 1.9 to 2.6 cm (Crampa).<sup>21</sup> 'The letters are carved with a fine chisel, they have slightly thickened finials and vary somewhat in shape and considerably in spacing' (Crampa).

[- - - - -]ON[- - - - - ]TO.E. Λ[- - - - -] περὶ Νί[. c.2 ]  
 [- - - - -]ΛΑ[- - - - - ]δὲ διήιτησ[αν]  
 [- - - c. 8 - - ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι ΤΟΙ[- - - - - c.11 - - - Μέν]ανδρος Κλ[εισθέ]-  
 4 [νου]ς Ἡρακ[λεώτ]ης, Ἐστιαῖος Δ[ιοδ]ώρου Ἰασ[εύς], Πολίτης [Διο]δότ[ου]  
 [?- - - -]σεύς - - - - - Ο.Π.Λ[- - - - -] Ἄ[πολλωνιο[- - - - - ]ΙΣΙ  
 [- - - - -] - ? προσό]δοις τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λαβραύν-  
 [δου - - - - -] οὺς μάλιστα μὲν δια-  
 8 [- - - - -] αὐτοῖς δικαι-  
 [- - - - -] τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λ[α][β]ραύνδου ἐκοι-  
 [- - - - -] μὲν τὸν  
 [- - - - -] οἱ εἰς τὰ  
 12 [- - - - -] οσα τ[ι]-  
 [—]

1. middle: ὅτε ἰδ; end: [εἰ]ς ἔριβ ε[- - -] C.; περὶ νε[- - -] P.<sup>22</sup>; 2 end: δεδίηι τη C.; 3. τῶι ἱερῶι τὸ [ἀντίγραφον, ἧς Μενα]νδρος C.; 4, end: [Μεν]οῖ(τ)ο[υ(?)] C.; 5. [-λα]σευς γε

<sup>18</sup> *I.Labraunda* ad loc., p. 75.

<sup>19</sup> Hedlund, 'Antae' 58.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, and see the schedule on p. 61.

<sup>21</sup> Crampa's interlinear spaces are calculated from the base of one row of letters to the base of the row below.

<sup>22</sup> Pouilloux, *AC* 42 (1973) 548.

[ὁ]ποταγῆ[ς] πρὸς Ἀ[πολλώνιο]ν C.; end: ΗΣ C.; **6.** [αὐτοῖς ἐδάνεισαν ἐπὶ ταῖς προσό]δοις C.; **8.** end, κ]αὶ τοῖς C. ; **11.** εἰς τὰ C.

#### Notes on the text

**1.** C. restored - - εἰ]ς ἔριν, suggesting a dispute, but the broad Π with its distinctive hooked right hasta is clearly visible. A noun following περί starting with a *ny* is less easy to imagine than a personal name, as in the usage οἱ περί, followed by one or more names, for officials, magistrates, ambassadors etc.<sup>23</sup> There are indistinct traces of letters before περί.

**2.** Instead of C's δεδίη τη[- -] from δειδω, 'to fear' ('The freedom from fear in this matter may have been motivated by the fact that a copy was preserved in the shrine'), read δὲ διήιτησ[αν], from δαιτάω, 'arbitrate'; the upper left corner of the *sigma* is visible. The verb is rarely found in what are broadly called 'decrees for foreign judges', with only three attestations, from Kalymna, Priene and Ephesos, all of the early third century.<sup>24</sup>

— *I.Iasos* 82, l. 39–43, one of the decrees of Kalymna for Iasian judges, mid-third century BC: τὰς μὲν πλείσ<τας> διέλυσαν | [πείσ]αντες τοὺς ἀντιδίκους, ὅπως μὴ διὰ ψάφου τῶν πρα[γμά]των κρινομένων εἰς πλέω ταραχὰν ὁ δᾶμος | [καθισ]τάται: **τινὰς δὲ καὶ διαίτασαν συμφερόντως** | [έκα]τέροις τοῖς ἀντιδίκους...<sup>25</sup>

— *I.Priene*<sup>2</sup> 107, decree for foreign judges (286/85 BC),<sup>26</sup> l. 8–9: [τὰ]ς μὲν ἐδίκασαν τῶν δικῶν τῆι ψήφ[ω]ι κατὰ τοὺς νό[μου]ς, **τὰς δὲ [δ]ιήιτησαν ἴσω[ς] καὶ δικαίως.**

— clearer still as to its function in the procedure, in the well-known Ephesian law on debts of 297/296 BC, *I.Ephesos* 4, ll. 87–88: εἶναι αὐτοῖς κρίσιν περὶ τούτων ἐν τῷ ξενικῷ δικαστηρίῳ, **προδαιτᾶσθαι** δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν διαιτητῶν κατὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον.

At Kalymna conciliation (διέλυσαν) and arbitration (διαίτασαν) judgements are distinguished, but at Priene διαιτᾶν appears to have taken the place of διαλύειν. The latter verb is far more frequently (indeed almost exclusively) found in a kind of double-act with δικάζειν/κρίνειν, reconciliation being by far the preferred option, before the often divisive process of pronouncing judgments kicked in (μάλιστα μὲν διαλύειν – see below, comment at l. **6**).<sup>27</sup> The noun, διαιτητής, 'arbitrator', well-

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen II', 228, with reference to the there published letter of Ptolemy II, in which the king writes that he has written to τοὺς περὶ Φιλοκλῆν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλην. See now also Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen VIII', 386. In a letter to Kildara of 246 BC the Ptolemaic official Tlepolemos refers to the ambassadors of the Kildareis as παραγενόμενοι πρὸς ἡμᾶς οἱ περὶ Ἰατροκλῆν καὶ Οὐλιάδην καὶ Πίνδαρον καὶ Ἰσχυρίαν πρεσβευταί (*SEG* 42, 994, l. 1–3). For examples at the local level see e.g. *I.Mylasa* 866, l. 9–10: τοὺς ταμί]ας τοὺς πε[ρ]ὶ Ἰατροκλῆν (Olymos, early 3rd century) or the early (281 BC) Ptolemaic inscription from Termessos, in the revised edition of A. Meadows and P. Thonemann, 'Ptolemaic Administration', 225, ll. 3–4: ἐπὶ δικάστων τ[ῶν] | [πε]ρὶ Μυρεσιν κτλ.

<sup>24</sup> So also Scafuro, 'Decrees for foreign judges' 366–368.

<sup>25</sup> See Crowther, 'Foreign Courts' and *idem*, 'Iasos III', for a discussion of the series. On the date, see Fabiani, *Decreti Onorari*, 263–4, and *ibidem*, n. 76, confirming that the king in l. 44 (ἔκριναν διὰ ψάφου κατὰ τε τὸ διάγραμ[μα τοῦ] βασιλέως καὶ τοὺς νόμους) is Ptolemy II.

<sup>26</sup> On the date see C. Crowther 'I.Priene 8 and the History of Priene in the Early Hellenistic Period', *Chiron* (1996), 234–238.

<sup>27</sup> See the many examples of διαλύειν (and derivatives) in Steinwenter, *Streitbeendigung*, 144–155, and his discussion of the two aspects of the arbitration/reconciliation process *ibidem*; the discussion of the

known from fourth-century Athens, occurs a number of times in the Ephesian document, e.g. in l. 17–19: τοὺς δὲ γενομένους ὑπὸ τῶν διαιτητῶν ἢ τῶν δικαστῶν μ[ε]ρι[σ]μ[ο]ῦς ἀνενεγκά[τ]ωσαν οἱ διαιτηταὶ καὶ οἱ δικασταί. The Ephesian διαιτηταί were selected from among the citizens; the judges were external to the city, their separation emphasizing the separateness of the two procedures.<sup>28</sup> When διαίταω was specifically among the tasks of the foreign *dikastai*, as at Kalymna and Priene, we should imagine the procedure to have taken place (in the words of Steinwenter) ‘zwischen dem πείθειν [reconciling] und κρίνειν’, and to have been ‘eine Entscheidung, wenn auch nicht nach dem strengen Recht...; m.a.W. die Richter entscheiden hier als Diaiteten nach billigem Ermessen.’<sup>29</sup>

The δέ preceding διήτησ[αν] in our text suggests an earlier μέν, hinting at the dialectic just referred to, between the different aspects (and phases) of the arbitration/reconciliation and adjudicating process, but it should be said even so that our text, or what remains of it, does not have the air of a straightforward honorific decree.<sup>30</sup>

**3.** [ἐν τ]ῶι ἱερῶι is the only plausible restoration. For foreign judges or arbitrators hearing cases in a sanctuary see the examples collected by Ph. Gauthier, *Choix d’écrits* 123. A recent inscription from Stratonikeia of the second century BC (after 166 BC) shows Myndian judges hearing a case both *in situ* on the disputed land and in the sanctuary at Labraunda: διακούσαντες ἐπιμελῶς ἐπί τε τῶν τόπων καὶ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ἐν Λαβραύνδοις.<sup>31</sup> Our text is too fragmentary and its syntax too unrecoverable to know whether we should understand that to have been the case also here or whether the publication of a document in the sanctuary is referred to. Its proximity in the text to διήτησ[αν] suggests the former. Crampa’s attempt to duplicate here part of l. 10 of no. 45 (underlined) as τ]ῶι ἱερῶι τὸ [ἀντίγραφον, ἥς Μενά]νδρος etc. founders, among many other things, on the letter which follows τ]ῶι ἱερῶι TO, of which a clear central upright is visible: an *ypsilon*, a *tau*, possibly a *ny*, but not an *alpha*. If τοῦ is to be restored, then there is no space for the expected [Διὸς τοῦ Λαβραύνδου]. Perhaps τοῦ [Διός] was deemed enough. But even ἐν τ]ῶι ἱερῶι may have been adequate, given the subject of the case at hand.<sup>32</sup>

**3–4.** Since the ethnics of the other two men are of the region (but see below), the most probable Herakleia is the city by Latmos.<sup>33</sup>

---

procedures in the Iasos-Kalymna dossier in Crowther, ‘Foreign Courts’ and in Walser, *Bauern*, 212–213 and 264–265.

<sup>28</sup> See Walser, *Bauern*, 208–217. In a Mylasan decree (*I.Mylasa* 101, l. 42–46, mid-2nd cent. BC?) the honorand Ouliades διαιτητής τε καὶ κριτής [αἰ]||ροῦμενος, [τῶν] μὲν τὰ νίκη διαλύων εἰς σύλλυσιν καὶ φιλίαν ἀποκ[α]θίστησ[ιν] τοῦς||διαφορομέ[ν]ους, τῶν δὲ τὰς δια[ί]τας [καὶ τ]ὰς [κ]ρίσεις ἀπὸ παντὸς τοῦ βελτίσ[του] ποιεῖ τε[λέως] ... κτλ. Cf. *I.Mylasa* 127, l. 9 (identical wording). He, too, operated in his own city. In both these cases the model may have been the Athenian public arbitrators: *Ar. Ath.* 53, 2–6, with A.R. Harrison, *The Law of Athens II* (1971) 66–68; P.J. Rhodes, *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaiion Politeia* (1981) 588–596.

<sup>29</sup> Steinwenter, *Streitbeendigung*, 146, with Walser, *Bauern*, 265–266 on the further complexities of the relation between internal arbitration and external ‘Überprüfung’ of such a process by foreign judges.

<sup>30</sup> Steinwenter, *Streitbeendigung*, 144–172.

<sup>31</sup> *EA* 44 (2011) 116, l. 13–14 (*SEG* 58, 1225; 61, 874).

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *I. Labraunda* 42, l. 6: ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι, without any further specification.

<sup>33</sup> A Πάνδαρος Νικίου Ἡρακλεώτης was appointed by Ptolemy II and Ptolemy ‘the Son’ as phourarch at Xanthos (260/59 BC), *Amyzon* 124–127, n° 4a. J. and L. Robert do not discuss the ethnic. M. Wörrle has recently reminded us that the city by Latmos is only one among several Herakleias, and that we have no way of deciding to which city the ethnic belongs, for the phourarch as also for another Ἡρακλεώτης in Ptolemaic service, Ἀπολλώνιος Μενίσκου, attested in a newly published list of soldiers from Limyra: Wörrle, ‘Die ptolemäische Garnison auf der Burg von Limyra im Licht einer neuen Inschrift’, in B. Beck-Brandt et al. (eds) *Turm und Tor. Siedlungsstrukturen in Lykien und*

4. The name of Πολίτης' father is problematic. According to Crampa we should read [Μεν]οί(τ)ο[υ(?)], but space is tight for 3 letters before ΟΙ if they include a *my*, and for <τ>ο[υ] after, not even with the *tau* accidentally omitted as Crampa had to assume.<sup>34</sup> Of the names that are common in the wider region, hardly any fit both the available space and the traces of a round letter followed by an upright (probably a tau) followed by a round letter: ΟΙΟ. Just before the first O the lower right-hand corner of the previous letter is visible: this would fit with a delta, or epsilon, or sigma. I see as the only possibility [Διο]δοτο[υ], a frequent name in western Asia minor.<sup>35</sup>

5. C's [-λα]σεύς γε [ύ]ποταγεί[σης πρὸς Ἀ]πολλώνιο[υ] is derived from n° 45's ll. 13–14, which is in turn restored, in rather circular fashion, on the basis of n° 51 (the underlined letters are taken from the —incorrectly restored—51):

13 [Μενοίτου Μυ]λα[σεύς γ' ύ]ποταγεί[σης]  
 14 [πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον συγγραφῆς ] κτλ.

[Μυλα]σεύς would fill the available space. The upper horizontal (sloping upward) of the first sigma can be seen; the letter before it is not securely visible. It might however be thought odd, even impossible, that a Mylaseus would serve as an arbitrator in a dispute involving his own city. Other possibilities are Πιδασεύς or Πλαδασεύς; another Ἴασεύς is surely excluded, as are ethnics in -δισεύς -εσσευς, -ασσευς (see below, 00). At the end of the line there are traces of a further letter after ΙΣ. Unlike Crampa, I do not read γε (despite seeing an upright) and do not see what its function in the sentence could be. Of the letters that follow none is even faintly certain on the photograph. In both 45 and 51 πρὸς is fully restored, but it cannot be paired with συγγραφῆ. The omicron, which is needed to give C's Ἀ]πολλώνιο[υ], could be followed by an ypsilon or could be an omega. Since the accusative form required by πρὸς is restored also in 45, we should consider it insecure, together with πρὸς itself.

6. Crampa's [αὐτοῖς ἐδάνεισαν ἐπὶ ταῖς προσόδοις: 'had lent them [money] on the security of the revenues of Zeus' is based on his (incorrect) understanding of n° 45. It is true that with προσόδοις, ἐπὶ is a frequent combination, but it is not the only possible one, and it takes us in a very specific direction, namely that of borrowing on the security of the god's revenues. Crampa's entire understanding of this text, and of 45, is that they are concerned with loans and debts. An echo of what is being done with these revenues can perhaps be found in *I.Labraunda* 5, where Philip V repeats what the Mylaseis have told him, namely that καὶ τὰ προσόδια τὰ | ἐκ ταύτης διατετελεκέναι πάντα τὸν χρόνον| λαμβάνοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων θυσίας καὶ | πανηγύρεις συντελεῖν (22–27).

---

*benachbarten Kulturlandschaften* (2015) 294, with nn. 14 and 15. In the case of an early Ἡρακλεώτης, victor at the Panathenaic Games and dedicator of a prize amphora at Labraunda (*Labraunda* II.1, 7–9, n° 1), the location of the dedication suggests that neighbouring Latmian Herakleia is more likely. The amphora was dated by P. Hellström approximately to the period between the Athenian archons Polyzelos of 367/366 BC (Kittos group) and Nikomachos (341/340 BC); cf. N. Eschbach, *Statuen auf panathenäischen Preisamphoren des 4. Jhs. V. Chr.* (1986) 30–32, 89. Recently, however, its date has been lowered to 323/322 by V. Lungu (*Anatolia Antiqua* 24, 2016, 366–368). Even this later date raises interesting questions about the foundation date of Herakleia by Latmos.

<sup>34</sup> Πολίτης is the name of the father of three brothers mentioned as neighbouring land-owners in *I.Labraunda* 8, l. 24 (240s BC), one of whom is called Μενόϊτας. Crampa assumed that the man in our document was identical with this Πολίτης, whose father would, in turn, have been called Μενόϊτας.

<sup>35</sup> A Πολίτης Μυλασεύς was honoured with *proxenia* at Delphi between 270–263 BC (*FD* III.2, 180), but the name Πολίτης is too common at Mylasa to be certain. A Πολίτ[ης] features also in the Delphic *theorodokoi* list of 230–210 BC, *BCH* 45 (1921) 1, Col. I C(a) 21: ἐν Μυλάσοις Πολίτ[ης].



7–8. For μάλιστα μὲν δια- a form of διαλύω could be suggested (an infinitive or participle form, e.g. διαλύειν, διαλύσαι, διαλυθῆναι, δι[α]λύσαντες). For the expression μάλιστα μὲν διαλύειν (‘most of all, to reconcile’) cf. *I.Iasos*. 82, ll. 33–34: [οἴτι]νες παραγενόμενοι μάλιστα μὲν διαλυσεῦντι τοὺς δ[ιαφ]ερομένους τῶν πολιτῶν.

8–9. For αὐτοῖς δικαί- Charles Crowther points out a possible parallel in the Knidian arbitration for Temnos and Klazomenai (*SEG* 29, 1130*bis* A5): ὡς ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς δικαί[ό]τατα.

9–10. The final letter in l. 9 is probably, as C. thought, an iota, and his suggestion that we have here a form of κοινωνεῖν (ἐκοινωνήσαν?) seems the most likely; cf. below, *I.Labraunda* 45, l. 3: τὰ κοινά.<sup>36</sup>

### Date and context

Against Crampa’s view that the letters of this inscription are of the Republican period,<sup>37</sup> I would argue for a date in the early third century BC, both on letter forms and because of the physical context of the block. A comparison between our text and *I.Labraunda* 43, the Chrysaoric decree of 267 BC, honouring Apollonios the Ptolemaic *oikonomos*, is instructive. We may start with Crampa’s own description (p.75) of the letters of 51: ‘The letters are 1.0 to 1.5 cm high, but omicron 0.8 cm, interlinear space 1.9 to 2.6 cm.’ ‘The letters are carved with a fine chisel, they have slightly thickened finials and vary somewhat in shape and considerably in spacing’. Of 43 he writes (p. 48): ‘the letters are ca. 1.4 cm. high, interlinear space 2.4 to 2.7 cm. The letters are carved in a shallow way and greatly variable in shape and spacing.’ The apparent shallowness of the carving of 43 is probably due to greater surface wear (see fig. 4) while the legible sections of 51 appear in comparison relatively untouched. Nothing much can be made of these broad similarities, however, without an analysis of the letter forms (fig. 5).

Both texts have ypsilons with high curved branches; both have irregularly shaped deltas. In both, the kappas are beak-like; sigmas are regular, parallel, and deeply jagged; omicrons are always smaller; omegas somewhat smaller and open; the ny is deep and with a slightly shorter right upright. Some, though not all, alphas have a distinctive curving left diagonal, with the cross-bar approximately in the middle.<sup>38</sup> A very similar pi to that in l. 1 (broad, with a hooked right hasta) is in evidence in an inscription of Amyzon; it can also be found throughout in the treaty between Latmos and Pidasa of 323–313 BC.<sup>39</sup> If anything, our inscription has the air of being

<sup>36</sup> My initial thought, that we might have here a form of κομίζω, in the sense of ‘obtain’ or perhaps rather ‘retrieve’, ‘recover’, as is not uncommon when royal officials interfere in local disputes (e.g. in the decree of Karthaia for the Ptolemaic official Philoteros son of Antiphanes: παραγενόμενος πλειονάκις εἰς τὴν πόλιν <τὴν> Καρ[θαίων] ἐπὶ τὴν κομιδὴν τῶν [δανεισμά]των (or [χρημά]των), *IG* XII 5, 1066, with Bagnall, *Administration*, 143) is less likely: there is no space on the stone for MI-.

<sup>37</sup> No justification is given for the dating. The fact that so little survives of the face of the inscription means that the irregularity of the lettering is exaggerated.

<sup>38</sup> Alphas with a curved left or right diagonal occur already in an inscription of Amyzon of 321/320 and in a decree from the same place for the Ptolemaic *strategos* Margos dated to 277/276. *Amyzon* 2, photo p. 97, fig. 3; and 3, p. 119, fig. 5. Some of the alphas in our no. 51 have a slightly curved cross-bar (e.g. in l. 7–end and 8–end), for which near-contemporary parallels can be found e.g. on an altar for Arsinoe II from Kaunos (*I. Kaunos* 54 with ph.) or in an inscription of Stratonikeia (*I. Stratonikeia* 1002; photo in *Amyzon* p. 121, fig. 6.) dated to the ninth year of Ptolemy II (277/276 BC).

<sup>39</sup> *Amyzon* 3, e.g. l. 8 (ἐπαιέσαι); Latmos-Pidasa: W. Blümel, *EA* 29 (1997) 29–43, with ph., e.g. l. 2: προσαγαγεῖν. L. Robert comments (*Amyzon*, 120) that it is a ‘forme très fréquente dans les papyrus de Zénon’. There are examples also in *I.Labraunda* 11 (decree of Korris and his *syngeneis*, mid-third

somewhat earlier than no. 43, which is historically possible. Despite the problems of comparing letter-forms in two texts that are incomplete (51) or excessively worn (43),<sup>40</sup> the similarities are, I hope, evident.

While bearing regional variations in mind, a useful comparison can be made also with a recently published Ptolemaic *prostagma* from Limyra<sup>41</sup> which its editor, M. Wörrle, has dated cautiously to the first half of the third century, favouring 277/276, the ninth year of Ptolemy II. He describes its letters as still displaying the same ‘schnörkellose Steife’ of a decree of the 320s on the same block, and sees similarities also with the Limyran decree in honour of two Ptolemaic *oikonomoi* of 288/7 BC.<sup>42</sup>

The anta block on which n° 51 was inscribed (B30), belonged most likely to Propylon Y, located to the east of the temple and the North stoa (fig. 1).<sup>43</sup> The first phase of this building is now thought to be late archaic.<sup>44</sup> Jesper Blid and Ragnar Hedlund, who are preparing the full publication of Propylon Y, have studied a subsequent phase of rebuilding, for which they posit a *terminus ante quem* of the early to mid third century BC, because of the date of *I.Labraunda* 44 (B 101) which is inscribed on an anta block of the same building (see fig. 6 and below, p. 00). This document mentions king Ptolemy and is probably of the same time as n° 43, the Chrysaoric decree dated to 267 BC.<sup>45</sup> The actual date of the rebuilding of Propylon Y should be somewhat earlier than this inscription, according to Blid ‘most probably already in the Hekatomnid period’.<sup>46</sup> A date in the early third century for our inscription is therefore both possible and plausible. Two further, unfortunately very badly preserved, inscriptions on anta blocks of this propylon were both dated by Crampa to the first century BC (71 and 85). N° 71 is so badly worn that only a few letters can be deciphered, and no date can be safely attributed to it beyond broadly ‘Hellenistic’. For 85, I would not disagree with Crampa’s dating.<sup>47</sup> The epigraphic

---

century?), l. 11:  $\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$ . Charles Crowther points out that it features equally in the early third century inscriptions of Priene and Samos. See e.g. *I.Priene*<sup>2</sup>, 4c (Tafel 5) of the time of Lysimachos.

<sup>40</sup> The letters of 43 are hard to capture and isolate from the photograph. In some cases there is only one sufficiently clear example. Some letters are absent (or not clear enough) in both, e.g. the phi, or ksi.

<sup>41</sup> Wörrle, ‘Epigraphische Forschungen VIII’ 359–396 at p. 360–362; photo pp. 395–396, Pl. 2 and 3.

<sup>42</sup> Wörrle, ‘Epigraphische Forschungen IV’, 224–234 with Pl. 4–5, and ‘Epigraphische Forschungen I’, 43–66, with Pl. 1 respectively; the latter’s individual letters show many similarities with those of our text, in particular the sigmas, mys, nys, alphas, kappas. The omegas are similarly shaped, but are suspended; ypsilons are high, but less curved. The decree from Sinuri, dated by the seventh year of Pleistarchos (*Sinuri* 44, with Pl. III) to sometime in the 290s, displays exactly the same, high curved ypsilons as does our text.

<sup>43</sup> Hedlund, ‘Antae’, 63, discusses and dismisses earlier attributions to the North stoa for some of the blocks.

<sup>44</sup> P. Hellström, ‘Early Labraunda. Excavations on the Temple Terrace 1949–1953’ in O. Henry (ed.) *Karia Arkhaia* (forthcoming). With thanks to Pontus Hellström for allowing me to consult this article before publication.

<sup>45</sup> According to Crampa, ad loc., the letter forms of 44 are similar to those of 43, the Chrysaoric decree.

<sup>46</sup> Personal information from Jesper Blid, who adds: ‘For the later history of the building, we know of two major restorations: one in the second century AD, and another in late antiquity when the stylobate was rebuilt on the eastern side’. On the anta blocks from Propylon Y see Hedlund, ‘Antae’, 57–70. The 14 blocks identified as belonging to the antae of the propylon are: B29/I, 62, 63, 72/I, 73/I, 79, 101/I, 216, M2, Y6, Y11, Y18, Y44 (those with an /I are inscribed). See the plan fig. 2.

<sup>47</sup> Re-use as statue bases accounts for four of the five imperial period inscriptions (*I.Labraunda* 76, 113, 115, 118 all inscribed on the sides) with one further text (56) a decree of the early imperial period concerning works in the sanctuary inscribed on a front face; there is no doubt about its date. The relevant inscriptions are (in approximate chronological order): *I.Labraunda* 44 (early 260s, inscribed on the front face; on its left and right side are 113 and 118); 51 (early 3rd century, with 76 on one of its sides); 71 (list of names, 1st century BC according to Crampa; this block was reused and inscribed on a

evidence does not, then, appear to be uniformly early Hellenistic, but we do not know to which of the two antae the individual blocks belonged.

*Menandros Kleisthenous, Hestaios Diodorou and Polites (?) Diodotou*

This document is concerned with arbitration, probably by the three men whose names feature in ll. 3–5 (that the arbitration did not concern a case in which they were involved, e.g. as lenders, will become clear from the revised text of no 45, discussed below). The men, at least two of whose cities were at this time within the Ptolemaic sphere,<sup>48</sup> acted as a trio. What was their remit? In addition to the arbitration mentioned in l. 1, they may have resolved disputes (a form of διαλύω in ll. 7–8?) and may have done so in a just manner (δικαί- in l. 8). As we will see below in the revised text of 45 (if my reading is correct) their names may also be associated with the copy (ἀντίγραφον) of a judgment (κρίσις). Their arbitration concerned the revenues of Labraundan Zeus (l. 6). If a connection can be made with Apollonios the Ptolemaic *oikonomos* mentioned in l. 5, then the three men may have been appointed for a specific purpose by him.

Can we rank Menandros, Hestaios and Polites among the early third-century cases of *dikastai* and/or *diaitetai*, in particular those specifically selected and sent by a king or a high royal official? Panels of judges consisting of men of different ethnics were common (L. Robert called them ‘tribunaux panachés’);<sup>49</sup> and several small panels so constituted (three, or five, different ethnics) are either directly or indirectly attested.<sup>50</sup> Although a three-headed panel is therefore a distinct possibility we should nevertheless ask if the men may instead have been royal officials whose competence

---

short side with no 115, of which only a few letters survive); 85 (late first century BC according to Crampa; there is a ligature in l. 2, end); 56 (early imperial). The most recent text inscribed on a front face (i.e. presumably when the antae were still in place) is 56, of the early imperial period. On the re-use of the blocks and their later inscriptions see Hedlund, ‘Antae’ 68–69. On their position on the antae see *ibidem*, 66–67.

<sup>48</sup> Herakleia by Latmos: (*SEG* 37, 857): an Athenian κατασταθε[ις ἐπὶ] τ[ῆς πόλ]εως ὑπὸ Βασιλέως Πτο[λεμαίου]: Ptolemy II or III; Iasos: *I. Iasos* 3, with A. Giovannini, Le traité entre Iasos et Ptolémée I<sup>er</sup> (IK 28,1, 2–3) et les relations entre les cités grecques d’Asie mineure et les souverains hellénistiques’, *EA* 37 (2004) 69–87, Bagnall, *Administration* 89–92. Cf. *ibidem*, 232, on the principle of sending of judges from cities under Ptolemaic control. As for the third ethnic, if Πιδιασεύς, his city, again independent after the failed synoikismos with Latmos (on which see M. Wörle—below, n. 58) would very likely have been within the Ptolemaic sphere at this time.

<sup>49</sup> E.g. ‘Juges étrangers’ 772 (= *OMS* V, 144); *CRAI* 1972, 436.

<sup>50</sup> Since many honorific decrees are for individuals who served as judges or arbitrators, it is not usually possible to reconstruct the panels they were members of. Clear cases of panels whose (three, or five) members came from different cities are listed by P. Hamon, ‘Juges thasiens à Smyrne: I. Smyrna 582 complété’, *BCH* 123 (1999) 188, nn. 46 and 47. See *ibidem*, p. 189, for instances where the individual honoured was almost certainly a member of a panel so constituted. Examples of judges sent by kings or royal officials: a single judge sent by Ptolemy II to Karthaia: *BCH* 78 (1954) 336–338, n° 13 (Bagnall, *Administration*, 145); a single judge sent to Kalymna by the same king, *Tit. Cal.* 17. Panels of judges from a single city: Antigonos Monophthalmos sent a panel of Magnesians judges to Kyme: *I. Kyme* 1 (311–306 BC); the Ptolemaic nesarch Bacchos sent four judges from Kos to Naxos: Holleaux, *Études* III, 27–37, Bagnall, *Administration*, 149–150 (the obvious rule that panels needed to be odd in number suggests that these four may have been allotted to different panels with men from other cities); five judges from Iasos to Kalymna on the orders of Ptolemy II, above, p. 00 and n. 25. Soon after 280 BC, Myndian, Halikarnassian and Milesian judges were sent to Samos at the request of Philokles of Sidon, *IG* XII 6.1, 95, at least two judges were despatched by each city (evidence based on the surviving decree for the two Myndians). Further examples in Gauthier, ‘Rois hellénistiques’. See also L. Robert, ‘Juges étrangers’ 780–781 (= *OMS* V, 152–153); on the Ptolemies, Bagnall, *Administration*, 232, Cassayre, *Justice*, 108–116.

stretched to arbitration and the resolution of conflict. If so, what was their title? N° 51, fragmentary as it is, does not tell us.

*I.Labraunda* 43, the honorific decree for Apollonios, the *oikonomos* of Ptolemy Philadelphos, shows that, even though as *oikonomos* his main competence will have been in the area of finances,<sup>51</sup> administering justice, giving verdicts and hearing cases was evidently an integral part of his rôle, with διαδικάζει, οὐθένα Χρυσαιορέων παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον καλεῖ and οὐ[δ]ὲ κρίσιν κατ' οὐθενὸς ἐ[πὶ]π[ρ]ο[σ]κεν παρὰ τὸ δ[ί]κ[α]ιον (ll. 6–11)<sup>52</sup> all pointing in that direction. That this interconnection of the financial/fiscal and the judicial—or perhaps rather the lack of precisely defined remits—was part and parcel of the higher echelons of the Ptolemaic service under the first three Ptolemies has been emphasized by Bagnall and others.<sup>53</sup> Whether such lack of precision may also have been the practice at the lower levels of the administration is much harder to ascertain. Since Menandros, Hestaios and Polites remain without a title, we can only guess at their specific brief, and cannot go much further than speculating that they were ‘subordinates’, or ‘agents’, of Apollonios or perhaps had been directly delegated by the king, either in a judicial or in some other capacity.

As for their belonging to three different cities, we may look for comparison at a recently published inscription from nearby Pidasa in the Latmos region, dated to the third year of Arrhidaios (322/321 BC) and the satrapy of Asandros.<sup>54</sup> In it, two (or less likely three: ‘un trio d’agents’ according to the editors)<sup>55</sup> men appointed as *epistatai*

---

<sup>51</sup> What ‘province’ was his we do not know: the Chrysaoric decree implies that it was more extensive than just Labraunda and Mylasa, though not necessarily Karia-wide. Crampa, assumed (p. 52) that he was the *oikonomos* ‘in Caria’, as does Cassayre, *Justice*, 60 (who wrongly assumes that the honouring authority in *I.Labraunda* 43 are the Mylaseis). Bagnall does not pronounce (*Administration* 92–93 with nn. 49 and 50); L. Robert, *Amyzon* 224 called him ‘un économiste lagide’ (similarly P. Debord, ‘Cité grecque’ 136); V. Gabrielsen sees in him ‘the *oikonomos* of Ptolemy Philadelphus’ (‘Chrysaoreis of Caria’, 335) but does not specify what he thinks the geographical extent of his remit may have been. The question of Ptolemaic administration in Karia at the time of the first Ptolemies has to be seen in tandem with that in Lycia, which has produced evidence for *oikonomoi*, even if not (yet) for a *strategos*. M. Wörrle (‘Epigraphische Forschungen I’, 57–62; ‘Epigraphische Forschungen VIII’, 380–384) has several times discussed the role of Ptolemaic *oikonomoi*, on the basis of growing epigraphic evidence from Limyra and Telmessos. In Limyra, two *oikonomoi* appointed under Ptolemy I were each designated *oikonomos tes choras*, and Wörrle suggests that they were each responsible for a part of the Lycian *chora*, very likely east and west, the *chora* here referring to the entire Lycian territory. We have no such detailed information for Karia. See for the *oikonomos* also Huss, *Verwaltung*, 140–178, and see now, for the question of a *strategos* or *oikonomos* in Pamphylia (and Cilicia?) in 281 BC the discussion in Meadows and Thonemann, ‘Ptolemaic Administration’, 225–226.

<sup>52</sup> There are uncertain restorations in the lines of this inscription, and, without the possibility of achieving a better reading on the basis of the existing photograph I prefer to give only those words that are securely legible or are relatively securely restored. Note, alongside the judicial terms, συμπερ[ό]ντος οἰκ[ο]νομ[ε]ῖ σύμπαν[τα] in l. 12, and compare this with the οἰκονομῖαι (‘règlements d’administration’: Gauthier, ‘Rois hellénistiques’, 171) with which the nesarch of the league of islanders, Bacchon, had attempted to settle disputes at Karthaia on Keos: *IG XII* 5, 1065, with Bagnall, *Administration*, 144.

<sup>53</sup> ‘To make a real distinction between administrative and judicial activities of a bureaucrat is probably to impose a modern conception on the ancient situation’ (Bagnall, *Administration*, 7) cf. Cassayre, *Justice*, 60–67: ‘les agents les plus actifs sont les différents contrôleurs des finances et de la fiscalité (60). See also, and especially, Ph. Gauthier, ‘Rois hellénistiques’, and Wörrle, ‘Epigraphische Forschungen I’, 57–58.

<sup>54</sup> Kızıl et al., ‘Pidasa et Asandros’. The text is to be read with the corrections (including to the date) and improvements of W. Blümel, *EA* 49 (2016) 106–108.

<sup>55</sup> Referred to as ‘gouverneurs de cité’ (399) which seems not to fit well either with the number of *epistatai* or with their remit, which has the appearance of being a temporary sorting out of matters internal to Pidasa.

by the Karian satrap are honoured by the small city of Pidasas.<sup>56</sup> One, [. . . .]ης Μικίωνος was from Methymna on Lesbos, the other, Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀπολλοδώρου, a Χαλκιδεὺς [ἀπ'] | [Εὐ]ρ[ί]που.<sup>57</sup> They appear to have been engaged especially in the regulating of Pidasas's finances, revenues and expenditure: δ[ι]ωρθώσ[α]γτο τὰς πολιτικὰς προσόδου[ς καὶ τὰ ἀν]αλώματα. They also rescued sacred vessels that had been abducted from the sanctuary of the Pidasans' deity Toubassis. It is conceivable and perhaps even likely (although the text's editors do not discuss the possibility) that their appointment was in preparation for the *synoikismos* between Pidasas and Latmos, orchestrated by Asandros, which took place sometime between the date of this decree and the end of his satrapy, in 313 BC.<sup>58</sup> Why otherwise send two (three?) men to deal with a relatively insignificant small polis? Our Labraundan trio may have in common with the Asandrian appointees (and, of course, also with foreign judges) a certain element of non-permanence, and ad hoc intervention.

We know nothing further about Menandros Kleisthenous or about Polites Diodotou. Hestaios Diodorou, on the other hand, is possibly the honorand in an early third-century inscription from Olymos.<sup>59</sup> *I.Mylasa* 866 and 867 are two separate and near-identical decrees of the Olymeis, inscribed on the same building block. 866 honours a certain Πολίτης Θυσσου, Τερσωγασσεύς; 867 honours Ἐστιαῖο[ς] Διοδώρου, whose ethnic ΙΣ[- - - ] the ed. pr. was not able to restore. However, on the photograph (here fig. 7), after ΙΣ, I read ΕΥΣ, and since the ethnic Ίσευς does not exist, I suggest that the cutter accidentally omitted the alpha of Ἰ(α)σεύς. The fact that the territory of Olymos adjoined that of Labraunda makes the activities of Hestaios in both places plausible. The decree of the Olymeis is not informative about the reasons for Hestaios' honours, and neither is the almost identical one for Polites son of Thussos.<sup>60</sup> Both are rewarded with *politeia* and related privileges for having 'continuously provided services to individuals and community alike', διατελεῖ χρείας

<sup>56</sup> The text does not explicitly say that they were appointed *epistatai* in Pidasas - their remit may have been larger and may, for instance, have included the neighbouring city of Latmos.

<sup>57</sup> The third name, Σιμαλίων (without ethnic or patronym) following immediately on that of Ἀπολλόδωρος Χαλκιδεὺς [ἀπ'] | [Εὐ]ρ[ί]που has puzzled the editors. I consider it most likely that it is a second name of Ἀπολλόδωρος (the name is common in Boiotia even if not known from Euboian Chalkis itself), and not that of a third individual. Blümel's suggestion (*EA* 49, 2016, 107) that he may have been a Pidasan (hence the lack of an ethnic) is contradicted by the granting of *politeia*: why would he need that if he was already a Pidasan? The editors suggest that Σιμαλίων was the son of Apollodoros and restore [ὁ | υἱὸς αὐτ]οῦ, but this too has to be rejected, since the stone shows clearly [Εὐ]ρ[ί]που. (so also now D. Knoepfler, *BE* 2016, 268).

<sup>58</sup> *SEG* 47, 1563. On the *sympoliteia* see in particular M. Wörle, 'Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos III' *Chiron* 33 (2003) 121–143 and *idem*, 'Pidasas du Grion et Héraclée du Latmos: deux cités sand avenir', *CRAI* 147 (2003) 1361–1379.

<sup>59</sup> The date of the two decrees is based partly on 'Schrift und Sprachduktus' (W. Blümel, with whom I fully agree: on letter forms alone the inscriptions could even be late fourth century; see fig. 7), and partly on the fact that the Olymeis granted citizenship to the two honorands which included their attribution to a *phyle*. At the incorporation of the Olymeis into Mylasa, their *phylai* were demoted to *syngeneiai*. On the likely date of that incorporation (after 246 BC) see G. Reger in S. Colvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East, Politics, Culture, Society* (2004) 144–180, at 164–168. Hestaios is not known from Iasos itself, either in published or unpublished inscriptions (information from Roberta Fabiani).

<sup>60</sup> I have, of course, checked whether Θυσσου followed by Τερσωγασσεύς can be restored in our two Labraundan inscriptions, not only because of the coincidence of the name Πολίτης but also because the ethnic Τερσωγασσεύς ends in -σεύς, as does that in l. 5 of our Labraundan inscription. Θύσσος would be a perfect short patronym. The surviving traces do not however match, and the space at the beginning of l. 5 does not accommodate the long ethnic (on whose Karian credentials see Blümel's comments *ad loc.*).

παρεχόμενος.<sup>61</sup> In the case of Polites, however, the services are qualified as μεγάλας, while he received the additional honour of being named [εὐ]εργ[έ]της. Providing services, even great ones, is a stock phrase in many a proxeny decree, but it is perfectly in place also in honorific decrees for men in the service of a king, such as Apollonios himself (*I.Labraunda* 43, l. 7: [ἀ]εὶ τὰς χρείας παρε[χόμε]νος).<sup>62</sup> We find it also in a decree of Alinda for two men, Dionytas and Apollas (ethnics lost) who δια]τρίβοντες [π]αρ' Ὀλυμπίχῳ τῷ στρατηγῳ ἐν τῷ ἐπιστωλαγραφίῳ, πολλοῖς τῶν πολιτῶν χρείας παρείσχηται καὶ κοινῆι καὶ ἰδίαι.<sup>63</sup> The wording is very similar to the Olymean decrees and so are the privileges granted (*politeia, enktesis*); only at Alinda the position of the two men is clearer: they were among the personnel in Olympichos' chancellery.<sup>64</sup>

## 2.1. *Labraunda* 45

Anta block (Inv. 42B/127) probably from the east anta of the Stoa of Maussollos. Found, according to Crampa, 'in front of the North Stoa, in a wall of which it originally formed part'. Crampa thought that the inscription was on the front, but it was probably on the left side.<sup>65</sup> The other sides are uninscribed. Photo fig. 9a and b. H. 0.39 m, w. 0.69 m, d. 0.415 m (left), 0.47/48 (right).<sup>66</sup> There may have been anathyrosis on the upper surface, but this is now badly eroded. There is a round hole of a clamp cutting at the left part of the rear edge, 0.11 m from the left, 0.8 m from the back. The face is broken on all sides; not very much is lost on either the l. or the r.; the text is badly worn at the top and eroded through surface breakage after l. 12. Above the preserved l. 1 there is space for three lines, the letters of one of which are faintly visible; below l. 14 there is space for three lines (Crampa). Letters 1.0 cm, omicron 0.8 cm; interlinear space 1.9/2.0 cm.<sup>67</sup> The letters are finely carved and have thickened wedge-shaped extremities, 'similar to those of the series of letters published in Part I' [the Olympichos dossier], according to Crampa, but the letters are distinctly smaller and there are other differences.<sup>68</sup> The line-length varies between 27 (ll. 3, 10) and 33 (l. 7). The restorations underlined are taken from 51.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>61</sup> In both texts the words are partly, but securely, restored.

<sup>62</sup> Identical words e.g. in *IG XII* 6.1. 119, ll. 2–4 for Pelops, son of Alexandros, τεταγμένο[ς] ἐπὶ δυνάμειω[ς] at Samos; the decree for the phrourarch Pandaros at Xanthos (above, n. 33), both under Ptolemy II, or Sosias, son of Sokrates, Herakleotes, at Kolophon, τασσόμενος ὑπὸ τῷ βασιλεῖα Πτολεμαῖου, between 240 and 220 BC (Ph. Gauthier, 'Deux décrets hellénistiques de Colophon-sur-mer' *REG* 116, 2003, 470–485; *SEG* 53, 1301).

<sup>63</sup> A. Laumonier, *BCH* 58, 1934, 291–298, no. 1, ll. 1–3, with J. and L. Robert, *Amyzon* 147–150.

<sup>64</sup> A similar differentiation in the level of honours to that of Polites and Hestaios can be seen in two Iasian decrees, one for Eupolemos Potalou, Makedon, and the other for Demetrios Artemonos of Amphipolis, issued on the same day of the same year, sometime in the 70s or 60s of the third century BC. R. Fabiani, 'Eupolemos Potalou o Eupolemos Simalou?', *EA* 42 (2009) 61–77, at 65–66.

<sup>65</sup> Information from P. Hellström.

<sup>66</sup> Measurements and details as given by P. Hellström; Crampa's are slightly different.

<sup>67</sup> For Crampa's definition of 'interlinear space' see above n. 21.

<sup>68</sup> In the Olympichos dossier, nos 1 and 3 (of the 240s) have letters of 1.1–1.8 cm; nos. 4–7 have letters of 1.6–1.8, with omicron at 1.5 and phi and psi 2.2–2.3 cm. In general, the letters in the Olympichos inscriptions have very pronounced, forked, apices, while those in 45 have, as Crampa also noted, thickened, wedge-shaped extremities. There are differences also in some individual letters, e.g. the phi, which is rounded and somewhat flattened in our text (ἀντίγραφον, l. 10), but on the whole umbrella-shaped in the Olympichos texts. The latter's letters are somewhat more advanced and ornate than those of 45.

<sup>69</sup> Crampa's original underlinings have been removed, especially towards the end.

[. . . c.11. . . .] ΟΣΤΩ[.] ΔΙΕΤΕ[.] Ε[. . . . c.6.]  
[. . . . . προ]φερόμενοι τὰς γεγενημ[ένας]  
[ὕμῖν εἰς] τὰ κοινὰ δαπάνας μηδ[έπο]-  
4 [τε] ἀποκαταστήσαι τοῖς προκεχρ[ηκό]-  
[σ]ιν ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς εἰσπράσσεσθαι δι[ὰ τὸ]  
[τ]ὸν ἱερῆ καὶ τὸν νεωκ[ό]ρον μὴ οἴεσθ[αι]  
8 [δε]ῖν εἶναι ὕμῖν ἰσοτελεῖς, καὶ διὰ τα[ῦτα]  
μηδ' ὕ[μᾶ]ς ὑπομένειν καταδιαίρεισθ[αι]  
[τ]ὸ δ[α]πάνημα· ἐπέδειξαν δέ μοι ΚΑ[3-4]-  
[.] ΕΩΣΤΙ ἀντίγραφον ἧς Μένανδρ[ος]  
[ν. Κ]λεισθένους Ἡρακλεώτης καὶ Ἐ[στι]-  
12 [αῖος] Διοδώρου Ἰασε[ῦς] καὶ Πολίτη[ς]  
[Διοδότου - ?] ΛΑ[σεύς . . .] ποταγεν[. . .]  
[-----] ΥΤΟ[. . . .]  
[-----]  
16 [-----]

1. [- - -έκά(?)στω[ι]; [δ]ιετέ[λ]ε[σαν C. ; 2. [- - προφ]ερ(?)όμενοι C.; 3. [ὕμῃν?] εἰς C.; 9. end: κα[ὶ] C.; 10. [ἄλλ]ο τι C.; 11. [τε Κ]λεισθένους C.; 13. [Μενοίτου Μυ]λα[σεύς γ' ὕ]ποταγε[ί]σης C.; 14. [πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον συγγραφῆς α]ὐτο[ῖς ἐδά]- C.; 15. [νεισαν ἐπὶ ταῖς προσόδοις τοῦ Διὸς] C.; 16. [τοῦ Λαβραύνδου- - -] C.

. . . . . they continuously [. . . ? . . .], alleging that they never repaid the expenses which you had incurred for the common funds to those who had advanced them, but that they (the advancers) are having to recoup the money for themselves, because the priest and the neokoros do not think that they are subject to the same imposition as you yourselves, and for that reason do not accept for you to divide the expenditure between you. They also showed me the copy of the judgment which Menandros son of Kleisthenes, Herakleotes, and Hestaios son of Diodoros, Iaseus, and Polites [son of Diodotos, [?]aseus. . . . . (or: They also showed me (?) recently a copy of the . . . ? . . . which Menandros etc.).

#### Notes on the text

1. Crampa suggested [- - ἐκ]ά(?)στω[ι]: ‘(against) everybody’, but the top of a round letter is visible before ΣΤΩΙ. A numeral (e.g. εἰκοστῶι) is the most obvious reading, but its meaning in the sentence is unclear; the division [- - ]ος τῶι or [- - ]ως τῶι does not make sense. If [δ]ιετέ[λ]ε[σαν is right, it need not be linked with προ]φερόμενοι as in Crampa’s translation.

2. On ὕμῖν in preference to αὐτοῖς, which is also possible, see the general discussion below. On the form suggested by Crampa (ὕμῃν not ὕμῖν) see the justification p. 60, but given that there is ὕμῖν in l. 7, this is unnecessary; C’s [- - προφ]ερόμενοι, ‘allege’, seems right in the context.

2–3. τὰς γεγενημ[ένας] . . . δαπάνας, ‘the money produced’ in Crampa’s translation, but δαπάναι are ‘costs’, ‘expenditure’ and γεγενημένας means ‘incurred’; τὰ κοινά: according to Crampa to be seen in a Chrysaoric context, but the word may also refer to something common for which Mylaseis and Labraundeis were jointly liable or jointly responsible. Cf. in no 51, l. 8-end: ἐκοι-, a possible form of κοινωνεῖν.

4–5. τοῖς προκεχρ[ηκόσ]ιν: Crampa’s ‘to the lenders’ is too neutral a translation: ‘to those who had advanced the funds’. Cf. *Amyzon* 28, ll. 8–9: καὶ τοῖς συνεισ[πράξασιν] μεθ’ αὐτῶν. The verb usually has the meaning ‘lend without interest’: see Migeotte, *Emprunt*, 201, and n. 210 (on the combination with ἀποκατάστασις) and 44, n. 105; 268.

5. εἰσπράσσεσθαι: ‘to exact for oneself’; here ‘to recoup’, perhaps by legal means (even arbitration?).<sup>70</sup> C. understands the form in a passive sense: ‘they were charged’, which radically changes the meaning of the text. The effort to recover the advanced money is apparently still going on: see comments below under 8.

6–7. (μὴ) οἷεσθ[αι |δε]ῖν: ‘consider it (un)necessary’. The expression occurs a few times in the Olympichos dossier, cf. *ILabraunda* 3, l. 31 (Olympichos); 6B, l. 2 (Olympichos); 7, 8 (Philip V), but cannot be said to be characteristic of any one author; it is used frequently e.g. by Antigonos Monophthalmos in his letters to Skepsis and Teos (*RC* 1 and 3–4).

8. ὑπομένειν here in the sense of ‘to submit to’, ‘to accept’. The subject of this verb, *pace* Crampa, has to be ‘the priest and the neokoros’, who do not accept that you, the Mylaseis, divide up the expenses between the different parties (which evidently included the Labraundeis). καταδιαίρεισθ[αι]: ‘to distribute among themselves’ (*LSJ*, citing *Pol.* 2.45.1 and *D.S.* 3.29). The verb, like those immediately preceding it in ll. 5–7, but unlike those in ll. 2–4, is in the present: the issue is ‘live’: the priest and neokoros are not accepting *at this moment* that they and the Mylaseis are jointly responsible for the contribution.

9–10. ΚΑ[3-4][.]ΕΩΣΤΙ ἀντίγραφον: Crampa supplemented [ἄλλ]ο τι ἀντίγραφον, ‘another copy’ or ‘some other copy’, reading an omicron before τι. However, on the stone, before τι, the upper parts of what I read as the letters ΕΩΣ are visible (horizontal, rounded letter, then another, slightly sloping, horizontal; although of the sigma only the top can be confirmed): this may indicate the genitive feminine of a word ending in -ις, which would certainly be welcome given the relative ἧς that follows ἀντίγραφον. Κρίσις (κρί-|σεως) would fit the general context suggested by n<sup>o</sup> 51’s διήτησ[αν], but not the indefinite τι; we would expect the τι to follow ἀντίγραφον. One way out of this is to assume a scribal error and to correct TI to TO: τ<ὸ> ἀντίγραφον: ‘they showed me the copy of the (a?) judgment which....’. The only alternative I can see, namely to read [ν]εωστί, ‘recently’ at the beginning of 10, and κα[ί] at the end of 9: ‘they also showed me recently a copy of.....which Menandros etc.’ results in an unresolvable construction, or at least one that I cannot work out, with a noun and a verb both having to find a space after the names of the three men. The word νεωστί is never used in epigraphic Greek, not even in the sometimes idiosyncratic prose of letters. At the end of 9, κα[ί] by itself is quite short for the space: measured by the position of the letters at the end of l. 8 and 10 there is space for up to four (slim: including two iotas) letters after ΚΑ which would result in 30 letters in total. L. 8 has 31 letters; l. 7 (if correctly restored) has 33; 4 has 29; 5 has 30. I therefore prefer the κρί|σεως solution but without certainty.

13. I earlier restored the patronymic Διοδότου in l. 4 of no. 51; the required no. of letters (c. 8) before ?Μυ]λα[σεύς] (or [Πι]δα[σεύς], or [Πλα]δα[σεύς] comfortably accommodates that name. Two triangular letters ΛΛ seem to exclude the possibility of restoring Ὑδισεύς. After the three names, Crampa restored ὕ]ποταγέ[σης], seeing the last visible letter as an iota, and linking the participle to the (hypothetical) συγγραφή, to which he also linked ἧς. But the upright may be that of a ny, and we should leave open the possibility of a masculine ending: ἄ]ποταγέ[τες], qualifying the three men, rather than a feminine noun. There is space for the article after [?Μυ]λα[σεύς], which would give 28 letters in l. 12 against 29 in l. 13; [οἱ ἄ]ποταγέ[τες ὑπό]: ‘who were appointed’, or perhaps ‘delegated’, by X. The verb is

<sup>70</sup> ‘Med. is frequently interchangeable with act.’ *LSJ*. Cf. Wörrle, *Epigraphische Forschungen VIII*, 361 (*SEG* 40, 1536), l. 6–7: καί μεθὲν παρ[ὰ τῶν] καθηκόντων εἰσπράσσονται: ‘and that nothing is exacted over and above that which is owed’.



nowhere near as commonly used as τεταγμένος or κατασταθείς, and more usually has the meaning ‘setting aside’, ‘detach’ (as in funds, or military detachments). I have wondered if its use here is intended to indicate a temporary assignment, but cf. *I.Sinuri* 46a-c: οἱ ἀποτεταγμένοι ταμίαι, or *SEG* 34, 558, 53: τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τούτου ἀποταγέντας.

### *Date and context*

This document, although without a beginning and an end, is a letter, addressed by an individual to a body in the plural (ll. 7, and perhaps 3: ὑμῖν and 8: ὑ[μᾶ]ς). There is an implicit reference to ‘they’ in ll. 1–2 as the subject of [δ]ιετε[λ]ε[σαν] and [προ]φερόμενοι, and to another ‘they’, αὐτούς, linked to εἰσπράσσεσθαι, in l. 5. The letter’s author refers to himself only once, using the first person singular, in l. 9: ἐπέδειξαν δέ μοι.<sup>71</sup> He may consistently have used this form or alternated it with the first person plural, we cannot know. Alternating use of ‘I’ and ‘we’ within one letter often depended on meaning and context and was not uncommon among either kings or royal officials. Ptolemaic kings generally used the first person singular.<sup>72</sup> Their officials did not always follow suit. Two letters, inscribed one after the other on the same stele, addressed by two officials of Ptolemy I, Aristoboulos and Asklepiodotos, to the *boule* and *demos* of Iasos, show this. Aristoboulos, whose letter predates that of Asklepiodotos, alternates ‘I’ and ‘we’, while Asklepiodotos uses the plural only.<sup>73</sup> The use of μοι cannot therefore tell us anything about the status or identity of our author—other than that he was not Seleukos II, whose one surviving letter to the Mylaseis uses the royal ‘we’ throughout; or Olympichos in his Seleukid phase (240s BC), who did the same.<sup>74</sup> I return to the question of his identity (and the date of the letter) below.

Less problematic is the question of the addressee. Given what we know more generally about the relationship between the priest at Labraunda and the Mylaseis from the Olympichos dossier, the Mylaseis must be the collective to whom the letter is addressed (ὑμῖν in l. 7, and—restored—in l. 3).<sup>75</sup> Crampa’s suggestion, that it was the Chrysaoreis to whom the anonymous author wrote, cannot be entirely excluded, but it seems to me less likely, as I explain below. The ‘they’ implied in ll. 1–2 must be assumed to be representatives who, having arrived at our anonymous author, presented him with an exposé of some kind (ll. 1–2) and also showed him the copy of a document (ll. 9–10).

---

<sup>71</sup> Crampa (p. 58–59) argued at some length, but not convincingly, that the author was Olympichos, writing c. 220 BC.

<sup>72</sup> On the use of ‘I’ or ‘we’ see Welles, *RC*, 137–138, who points at Ptolemaic usage of ‘I’; cf. pp. 10 and 38. See also B. Virgilio, *Le roi écrit; le correspondance du souverain hellénistique, suivie de deux lettres d'Antiochos III à partir de Louis Robert et d'Adolf Wilhelm* (2011) 179–266, especially 207–211 and 223–230.

<sup>73</sup> *I.Iasos* 3, 1–18 and 19–28. We do not know their official position. Bagnall (*Administration*, 90) suggests they were successive ‘regional or provincial governors, imposed by the king’ with ‘wide competence and responsibility over military and financial affairs’; and on p. 101 ‘It is not improbable that Aristoboulos and Asklepiodotos, high officials with jurisdiction over Iasos in the fourth century, held the position if not the title of the later strategoi’. A. Giovannini (above, n. 48) 74: ‘gouverneur, officier’; cf. *ibidem*, 77, 79).

<sup>74</sup> Among the letters addressed by Olympichos to the Mylaseis, those of the 240s (*I.Labraunda* 3, 8) consistently use the first person plural throughout; no 4, of the 220s, uses the singular throughout, no. 6 uses both (though mostly the singular). Seleukos II consistently uses the plural, as do Antiochos III and his vice-roy Zeuxis in their communications with Amyzon; Philip V uses the singular throughout in his Mylasan correspondence.

<sup>75</sup> So also B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (2002) 209, n. 466.

The letter falls into two parts. The first part (ll. 1–9) describes a procedure elsewhere referred to as *prodaneismos*, or *proeisphora*, in which a small number of wealthy individuals advance a sum of money for a communal purpose, with the expectation of being reimbursed at some later stage.<sup>76</sup> The individuals who had initially advanced the money (which was never returned to them) must be the same men as the αὐτούς who, in l. 5 are actively engaged in recouping it: εἰσπράσσεσθαι, now in the present tense. They must be individual Mylaseis, separated out from, but also a subsection of, the ὑμῖν who are the Mylaseis collectively. *I.Amyzon* no. 28, of the late third or early second century, may be compared for the mechanism.<sup>77</sup> Here the purpose of the money advanced by a small group of men was to pay for the Amyzoneis' contribution to the Chrysaoric League. The reimbursement happened by means of an ad hominem *eisphora* of 5 drachmai imposed on all male Amyzoneis of adult age (ἡβη[δόν], l. 3). In order to recoup the money from those who defaulted on their obligation, a committee of four men was set up who were expressly permitted to go about exacting the money (τὴν δὲ πρᾶξιμ εἶναι . . . κτλ.) as they saw fit, 'without punishment and without being liable to action'.<sup>78</sup>

In an article of 1999, Philippe Gauthier published a Mylasan decree for five foreign judges from Kolophon, which he dated, on solid grounds, 'assez haut dans le III<sup>e</sup> s. . . . , à l'époque de la domination lagide'.<sup>79</sup> It is the earliest Mylasan decree for foreign judges thus far known.<sup>80</sup> Gauthier notes that, unusually, '*praktōres* and *tamiai*' are named as officials responsible for the inscribing of the decree: ἀναγράψαι {δὲ} τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς | πράκτορας καὶ ταμίας κατὰ τὸν [ν]όμον (ll. 22–26). The wording (no article before ταμίας) implies that one set of officials carried both titles at the same time. *Praktōres*, rare outside Athens, are not otherwise attested at Mylasa.<sup>81</sup> At Athens, their function was to recover public debts and fines owed to the state, more generally, to carry out lawful confiscations on behalf of the state. Having recovered what were often substantial sums, the *praktōres* occasionally served as treasurers/paymasters.<sup>82</sup> With 'some reservation' but with a good deal of plausibility, Gauthier suggest that the Kolophonian judges may have been involved in resolving litigation 'opposant la cité de Mylasa à des particuliers ou à des groupes'. I give the relevant passage in full: 'il se pourrait que les juges colophonien aient donné gain de

<sup>76</sup> See e.g. L. Migeotte, 'Note sur l'emploi de *prodaneizein*', *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 219–226, especially with n. 25 on variations in terminology, and Ph. Gauthier, 'Ἀτέλεια τοῦ σώματος', *Chiron* 21 (1991) 54–55; 63–64 (= *Choix d'écrits*, 252–253; 263–264), on the relation between ἀτέλεια τοῦ σώματος and the obligation to provide *proeisphorai*. Neither in our inscription, nor at Amyzon, is there an indication that there was an obligatory aspect to this. L. Robert, *Amyzon*, 223, compares the Milesians' urgent appeal to Knidos to advance money when the second instalment of their 'downpayment' (καταβολή) to Lysimachos was due and they were unable to pay it. Migeotte, *Emprunt* no. 96.

<sup>77</sup> For the date—not necessarily at the time of Antiochos III's presence in the region, perhaps even as early as the end of Ptolemaic control, or perhaps after 188 BC, under Rhodian domination—see *Amyzon* p. 226.

<sup>78</sup> Similar expressions occur e.g. in the Athenian arrangements for Iulis of 362/361, *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 111, ll. 13–14: εἰσπράτ[τ]εν τὰ ὀφειλόμενα χρήματα . . . . . τρόπ[ω]ι ὅτῳ ἂν ἐπίστωνται. Also immune from any action would be those 'who will be collaborating with them in recovering the money': (ll. 8–9) καὶ τοῖς συνεισπράξασιν μεθ' αὐτῶν (*Amyzon* 28, with the comments of L. Robert, p. 221–223).

<sup>79</sup> The reference to '*ateleia* for all time, from those taxes over which the city has control' (15–17), implies other taxes due to a royal power, over which the city has no control. Gauthier dated the decree, also on letter forms, and on the evident lack of control of city over sanctuary—on which see below—to the time of Ptolemaic rule, before the Seleukid take-over of the city, 'vers le milieu du III<sup>e</sup> s.'.

<sup>80</sup> Gauthier, 'Claros'; (*SEG* 49, 1503). On the date see 29–31.

<sup>81</sup> P. 27 with n. 107 for the references.

<sup>82</sup> Examples, p. 27.

cause, dans des procès de cette sorte, à la cité de Mylasa et qu'ainsi les *praktores* aient eu à recouvrer et à encaisser des sommes importantes. Faisant alors fonction de trésoriers, ils auraient eu à verser (notamment) l'argent nécessaire à l'achat puis à la gravure de la stèle honorant les juges grâce auxquels la cité avait recouvré ses droits'.<sup>83</sup>

Our Labraundan text does not refer directly to the resolution of the dispute by external jurisdiction, and we cannot without further evidence connect the two cases, despite their likely closeness in date (on which see below). The point is, however, worth making that the situation set out in our document would fit perfectly that envisaged by Gauthier, with the 'particuliers ou groupes' in this case being the priest and the *neokoros* (and the community they represented), and the duped lenders acting as a sub-group of the 'cité de Mylasa'.

Was the purpose of the sum advanced in the Labraundan document a contribution to the Chrysaoreis, as at Amyzon? The physical proximity, on the antae of the stoa of Maussollos, of our document to the Chrysaoric decree for the *oikonomos* Apollonios (*I.Labraunda* 43), constituted for Crampa a strong argument in favour of this interpretation.<sup>84</sup> The words used (l. 3): δαπάνας [εἰς] τὰ κοινά and (l. 8): [τ]ὸ δ[α]πάνημα point away from a payment due to a king, which would have been more specifically phrased,<sup>85</sup> δαπάνημα or δαπάνη rather having the meaning of 'cost', 'expenditure', and τὰ κοινά implying a shared or common fund, which may or may not have been Chrysaoric. The precise meaning of ἰσοτελής in l. 6–7: μὴ οἴεσθ[αι] δεῖν εἶναι ὑμῖν ἰσοτελεῖς, is however crucial. Crampa's translation, 'to have to bear burdens equal to you', is imprecise and ambiguous.<sup>86</sup> In epigraphic documents the quite specific meaning 'subject to the same taxes' is the only one current and we should assume that this is its meaning also here.<sup>87</sup>

But what were the priest and the *neokoros* referring to, both in terms of the general privilege claimed and the specific financial contribution at stake here? Could they have been referring to the ἀτέλεια which features in the extremely fragmentary, not necessarily Chrysaoric, but irrefutably Ptolemaic, document which is *I.Labraunda* 44? The ramifications of that *ateleia* were surely much wider and must have concerned taxes payable to a royal treasury. With Crampa I think that an obligatory contribution (τέλος or εἰσφορά) to the Chrysaoreis (in the Amyzonian document [χρήματα] τὰ ἀπεσταλ[μ]ένα εἰς Χρυσαιορεῖς) is more plausible as far as the *specific* contribution is concerned.<sup>88</sup> That it was a contribution to be shared by the Mylaseis

---

<sup>83</sup> Quotations from p. 27 and 28 respectively.

<sup>84</sup> *I.Labraunda*, ad loc. p. 58–59, but with the additional assumption that the addressees of the letter were the Chrysaoreis themselves. The expression τὰ κοινά, occurs in a Chrysaoric context in Strabo (14.2.25) with the meaning 'the common concerns, the common business' about which the delegates from the member cities conferred, but the word is protean and need not refer to Chrysaoric κοινά.

<sup>85</sup> The Milesians appealing to Knidos for a loan to cover tribute payable to Lysimachos are more specific: above, n. 76, l. 6–7: ὑπὲρ τῆς προεγγυήσεως καὶ τοῦ προδανεισμοῦ τῶν χρημάτων ὧν δεῖ ἀποδοῦναι βασιλεῖ Λυσιμάχῳ εἰς τὴν δευτέραν καταβολήν. The Iaseis wanted to be freed of paying *syntaxis* to Ptolemy I (*I.Iasos* 3, 4–9; 13–15).

<sup>86</sup> The translation is taken directly from *LSJ*. Crampa does not discuss the words further.

<sup>87</sup> The privilege is a stock ingredient of proxeny grants, together with γῆς ἐγκτησις, ἀσυλία, ἀσφάλεια etc. See also the discussion of the relationship between *ateleia* and *isoteleia* in proxeny decrees of the Hellenistic period, in A. Bresson, *The making of the ancient Greek Economy: Institutions, Markets, and Growth in the City-states* (2016) 290, and, specifically for developments in Athens and Boiotia, D. Knoepfler, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (2001) 56–60.

<sup>88</sup> *Amyzon* 28, l. 2–3. L. Robert points out (p. 225), rightly in my view, that 'la confédération est assez forte pour pouvoir exiger sans retard la participation financière des villes' and that failure to contribute would result in 'excommunication' from all Chrysaoric rites. Cf. also Ph. Gauthier, 'Claros' 29 with n.

and the sanctuary at Labraunda (and possibly other communities in Mylasan territory), is the implication of our text. This in turn would validate Louis Robert's demonstration, based on a combination of epigraphic evidence and Strabo's much quoted passage on the Chrysaoreis, that the Chrysaoric league was made up of cities, whose voting strength was based on the number of 'villages' in their territory. It would only be logical that the city served as the principal unit contributing on behalf of its constituent 'village', in this case Labraunda.<sup>89</sup> Perhaps, because the priest and *neokoros* saw Labraunda primarily as a sanctuary of the Chrysaoreis rather than a constituent 'village' of Mylasa, they considered that they could lay claim to a special fiscal status.<sup>90</sup> And here the *ateleia* referred to in *I.Labraunda* 44 may well have some relevance.

For a revised edition of this inscription see below, Appendix 1, to which I here refer. Not much can be made of this very damaged and largely illegible text, which, according to Crampa, is a second decree of the Chrysaoreis, and which he dated, like n° 43, to the early 260s.<sup>91</sup> Although the approximate date is not in dispute, there is no reason to see in this text a decree, indeed, it is just as likely a letter from a royal official (though not from a king, given the reference to βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος in l. 6).

After my new reading of l. 7, we now have a repeated reference to the sanctuary of Zeus at Panamara: in l. 2: [τὸ ἱερόν [τὸ κατὰ] Παναμαρα [- c. 5 -] and in l. 7–8, [Πα]ναμαρα. The additional restoration of ἀτελῆ in the same line suggests, more strongly than in Crampa's original text, that a comparison is being made between the tax-free status of two sanctuaries, that at Panamara and that at Labraunda, and it is a real possibility that this is done in a Chrysaoric context.<sup>92</sup> The ἀτέλεια τῆ[ς χώρας] τοῖς προγόνοις αὐτοῦ ἐπιχωρηθῆ[ναι ἀεὶ] ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, 'the freedom from taxation of the territory granted to his (the priest's) ancestors for all times by the kings', is quoted by Philip V in his letter to the Mylaseis as having allegedly been acknowledged by his father Antigonos Doson in a (forged?) letter to the Chrysaoreis, πα[ρὰ τοῦ] πατρὸς πρὸς Χρυσσαορεῖς (*I.Labraunda* 5, ll. 6–7). Forged or not, the concession 'by the kings' clearly resonates in the much earlier 44 and has to be understood as going back to before the Seleukid liberation of the city, i.e. to the time of the Ptolemaic king(s), or even before.

---

121. On contributions imposed by federations on their member cities see the useful discussion in Mackil, *Common Polity*, 295–304, from which, however, it would be rash to extrapolate given the different nature of the Chrysaoric federation. V. Gabrielsen's ('Chrysaoreis of Caria', 337) translation of ll. 66–67 of the big Chrysaoric decree found at Lagina (*SEG* 53, 1229): [ἐν τῇ γενεθ]λίῳ [ἐορτῆ]ι τῇ συντ[ελ]ουμένη, as 'which is financed from joint contributions', is incorrect and cannot be used in support of this point; the expression simply means 'which they celebrate'. In addition, the first part of this sentence should not be [ἐν τῇ γενεθ]λίῳ [ἐορτῆ]ι but should be replaced by [ἐν τῇ ?κατ' ἐνιαυτὸ]ν θυ[σί]α: 'during the sacrifice which they carry out (?) annually' cf. P. Hamon, *BE* (2012) 381, at p. 652.

<sup>89</sup> Strabo 14.2.25; *I.Labraunda* 43, συνελθόντων Χρυσσα[ορέω]ν τῶ[ν ἀπὸ] τῶν π[ό]λεων. *Amyzon* 16, l. 2–3: [μετουσία καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπ]άντων ὧν καὶ Ἀ[μυζονεῖς μετέχουσιν ἐν τ]αῖς Χρυσσαορέων πόλ[εσιν], with the discussion of L. Robert, pp. 223–226. It also chimes with M. Wörrle's assessment that, for the author of the letter concerning the maladministration of taxes in Lycia, 'das Land, um das er sich Sorgen macht, Lykien allein, oder zusammen mit einem Konglomerat weiterer ptolemäischer Besitzungen in der Region, aus Poleis [besteht]' : Wörrle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen VIII', 389.

<sup>90</sup> For Ptolemy II as possible founder of the Chrysaoreis, see especially P. Debord, 'Cité grecque', 137, and see below, n 95.

<sup>91</sup> Above, p. 00.

<sup>92</sup> ἀτελῆ requires a feminine (or male) accusative or a neuter plural. I do not think that Παναμαρα, though probably a neuter plural and thus compatible with ἀτελῆ, would be used in this sense without any further qualification, however. For the syntax of this line see the Appendix, ad loc.

Whatever the *neokoros* and the priest were wriggling themselves out of, their appeal may well have been to an *ateleia* granted equally to Zeus at Labraunda and to Zeus at Panamara by Ptolemy II, as a special privilege negotiated by and for the sanctuaries of the Chrysaoric League, quite separate, therefore, from the obligations to the crown of its constituent cities.<sup>93</sup> Their argument may have been that this status extended to any contributions payable to the Chrysaoric League.<sup>94</sup>

Did Labraunda and its sanctuary belong to Mylasa at this time or to the Chrysaoreis (and were those two statuses mutually exclusive)? In a discussion of the ‘foreign judges’ decree for the five Kolophonian judges (above, 00), Philippe Gauthier has pointed out that at the time that decree was issued, Mylasa did not administer the sanctuary at Labraunda, because the location where the decree was to be set up was ‘the sanctuary of Zeus’ tout court, i.e. that of Zeus Osogollis in Mylasa itself, while in documents of the later third century both sanctuaries, that of Zeus Labraundos and that of Zeus Osogōllis are stipulated as places of publication.

The question may not, however, have such a clear-cut answer, for at stake during the decades of Ptolemaic control (and before?) may already have been precisely the status of the sanctuary vis-à-vis the city, for the Mylaseis presented their own, very similar, claims in their representation to Philip V (*I.Labraunda* 5), namely that the sanctuary had always belonged to the *demos* ‘from the beginning’ because it had been founded by their ancestors: φάμενοι τὸ ἱερὸν ὑμέτερον εἶναι ἰδρυθὲν ὑπὸ τῶν | προγόνων καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν κατὰ | Λαβράνδῃ εἶναι τοῦ δήμου καὶ τὰ προσόδια τὰ | ἐκ ταύτης διατετελεκέναι πάντα τὸν χρόνον | λαμβάνοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων θυσίας καὶ | πανηγύρεις συντελεῖν (22–27). And a few lines later (33–36): καὶ | Σέλευκον δὲ ἀφιέντα τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθέρην ἀποδοῦναι ὑμῖν τὰ τε λοιπὰ χωρία τὰ προσόντα τῇ πόλει κα[ὶ] | [τ]ὸ ἱερόν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἶχετε. They read out decrees concerning the matter, and even presented accounts of the revenues of the sacred land (27–31). The origin of certain phrases and expressions in the dossier of the 240s and 220s can already be heard in these earlier, Ptolemaic, documents, however fragmentarily they may have survived.

#### *The second part of the letter, and the identity of its author*

The second part of the letter refers to a copy of a decision, or judgment, pronounced (or perhaps conveyed) by the trio of men named also in *I.Labraunda* 51 and whose identity was discussed in the first part of this paper. This places no 45 chronologically after 51, though by how much is still an open question, to be addressed here. The arbitration mentioned in 51, l. 1, and the reference to the revenues of Labraundan Zeus point to a disagreement about who controlled those revenues, which appears to prefigure the mutual accusations aired in the correspondence and diplomatic representations made first to Seleukos II and then to Philip V. As has become clear, we cannot do much more than feel our way around the issues brought up in these two documents, and the same may be true for establishing their respective dates.

*I.Labraunda* 51, like 43 and 44, belongs to the period during which the Chrysaoric League took shape, or developed, or was reinvented,<sup>95</sup> under the guiding

<sup>93</sup> As the expression ‘δεδοσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀτέλειαν . . . ὧν ὁ δῆ(μ)ός ἐστι κύριος (ll. 15–17) in the decree for the Kolophonian judges (above, n. 62) makes perfectly clear.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Gauthier, ‘Claros’, 30, on *I.Labraunda* 43: ‘il est clair que le sanctuaire appartient alors à la Confédération chrysaorienne, sans doute créée ou revigorée par les rois lagides’.

<sup>95</sup> So also Gauthier, previous n. with reference to J. and L. Robert, *Amyzon*, 223–225: ‘cette confédération. . . ne remontait pas plus haut que l’époque hellénistique’; and to P. Debord, ‘Essai sur la

hand of Ptolemaic officials. That the Ptolemaic kings used leagues as an instrument of control, or administrative convenience, is often said,<sup>96</sup> though it is not easy to see how quite the Chrysaoreis would have served or facilitated the kings' main interest in this as in other regions, which was fiscal.<sup>97</sup> That much of the negotiating between Chrysaoreis, sanctuaries and higher royal officials was concerned with taxation, is made clear by the repeated references in our documents to *prosodoi* and *ateleia*. The copy shown to our anonymous author may have been an earlier adjudication between Mylasa and the sanctuary at Labraunda concerning some issue of fiscal obligation and/or control over revenues, as the surviving fragments of n° 51 suggest. It may have referred to an aspect of Ptolemaic legislation concerning the *ateleia* that had been granted to Zeus at Labraunda, and it is possible that the issue at stake was precisely whether that *ateleia* had been granted directly to the priest, or to the Mylaseis.

Who then, was the author of this letter to whom the Mylaseis turned with their complaints about the disagreement with the priest and *neokoros*? Crampa's decision to see in the letter one more document in the Olympichos dossier was based on a complicated assessment of the circumstances that could have rekindled the old feud between city and priest and which he connected to the intervention of Philip V in the conflict that opposed Mylaseis and Chrysaoreis in their claim to control the sanctuary.<sup>98</sup> I have argued above that, on letter forms, this document does not appear to belong to the Olympichos dossier, since its letters are a different size. (Although *I.Labraunda* 1, a letter of Seleukos II, 240s BC, has letters that are somewhat smaller than those of the rest of this dossier, these, too, are clearly different from those of n° 45: see figs. 8, 9a and 10.) At the same time, they have features that lead me to put them later than n°s 51, 43 and 44.<sup>99</sup> The difference in terms of decades, as between the 270s and 240s is not great however, and precision based on letter forms is not possible, when there were clearly different hands at work. We are justified therefore in exploring the obscure years between the likely date of no 51 (which may predate the Chrysaoric decree of 267 by up to a decade—we do not know when Apollonios was first appointed *oikonomos*—and the first Seleukid letter of the mid to late 240s.<sup>100</sup>

In *I.Labraunda* 3, a letter of the late 240s BC,<sup>101</sup> Olympichos, at this stage *strategos* in the service of Seleukos II, refers to the Mylasan ambassadors having shown him 'other documents, including those written by Sophron to you and by

---

géographie historique de la région Stratonicee' *Mélanges Lévêque* 8 (1994), 111, 'Il me paraît quasi assuré que c'est au moment de la prise de contrôle de la région par Ptolémée II que fut créée la Ligue chrysaorieenne'. Note however that in neither publication is there solid proof, only assumption.

<sup>96</sup> E.g. A. Meadows, 'The Ptolemaic League of Islanders', in K. Buraselis et al. (eds) *Ptolemy, the Sea and the Nile*. (2013) 34: 'In Caria, the Chrysaoric League, which like the Nesiotic served a useful, unified administrative purpose'; cf. with a different emphasis Bagnall, *Administration*, 92–93: 'local leagues that would in turn support Ptolemaic power'.

<sup>97</sup> M. Wörle's masterful discussion of the Ptolemaic *prostagma* from Limyra (above, n. 41) has made this eminently clear at least for Lycia, and we may expect a similar purpose to have governed the organization of the Karian possessions, even if the details of the fiscal legislation that governed this region do not emerge as dramatically as they do in the Lycian evidence.

<sup>98</sup> *I. Labraunda*, ad loc., p. 59.

<sup>99</sup> The ends of the individual letters have quite pronounced wedge-like thickening; the *pi* has an overhanging horizontal on occasion (e.g. l. 12: Πολίτη[ς]). But the straight-barred *alpha* (with an occasional curved diagonal, as in no 51, see above, 00), the deep *ny* and *my*, the dotted *theta* and open *omega*, *sigma* with divergent arms, curved *psilon* and the generally well-spaced and airy aspect of the text all point to a date before, or around the middle of, the third century.

<sup>100</sup> On the date see especially A. Bencivenni, *Progetti*, 260–270; 281–282, and *passim* for the wider context.

<sup>101</sup> See Bencivenni, previous n., for the date.

Ptolemy the brother of king Ptolemy, as well as those measures taken by us at the time when king Seleukos wrote to us to liberate your city’ (ll. 3–7: ἐπέδειξαν δὲ ἡμῖν οἱ πρε<σ>βευταὶ καὶ χρηματισ[μο]ῦς ἄλλους τε καὶ τὰ παρὰ Σώφρονος γραφέντα πρὸς[ς] | [ύμ]ας καὶ Πτολεμ[α]ίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως Πτολε[μ]αίου, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα οἰκονομηθέντα ὑφ’ ἡ[μ]ῶν).<sup>102</sup> Much ink has been spilled over the identity of these two men, starting with Crampa’s own two chapters in the first volume of *I. Labraunda*: ch.V on Ptolemy ‘the Son’, and VI on Sophron,<sup>103</sup> which have in turn generated a multitude of ingenious but not always convincing scenarios.<sup>104</sup>

Following Chr. Habicht, whose discussion of this first volume of *I. Labraunda* is still indispensable, and against Crampa’s own interpretation, I take Ptolemy, ‘the brother of king Ptolemy’, to be the brother of the Ptolemaic king (III) who ruled at the time of Mylasa’s liberation by Seleukos II, and the son of, and joint ruler with, Ptolemy II between 266 and 259 BC (more usually known as ‘Ptolemy the Son’).<sup>105</sup> He disappears from Ptolemaic records around the year 259 BC. According to Habicht, his ‘Labraundan’ date must have been close to 259 BC, because Olympichos in his letter mentions Sophron before Ptolemy, something the royal protocol would not have allowed unless a chronological sequence was specifically intended. Sophron, according to Habicht, could therefore only have been a Ptolemaic official active before Ptolemy ‘the Son’, not the Seleukid commander ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐφέσου of the same name, who, in the fateful year 246 BC went over from the Seleukid to the Ptolemaic camp.<sup>106</sup>

This interpretation has been countered by M. Domingo Gygax with the argument that Olympichos may well have referred first to an immediate *Seleukid* predecessor—namely Sophron, the same man as the treacherous commander at Ephesos—and then to the latter’s own *Ptolemaic* predecessor, i.e. Ptolemy the son/brother; in other words, no such chronological restrictions need apply, and Ptolemy’s letter(s) may well date to the 260s. Gygax does not however address the question why Mylasa had to be ‘liberated’ by Olympichos, at the request of Seleukos II (above, 00) if it was already in Seleukid hands and under the supervision of a Seleukid official during the time of Antiochos II.<sup>107</sup> Gygax’ (and others’) only proof

<sup>102</sup> The fact that the Mylasan ambassadors produced these documents obviously means that they were favourable to the city.

<sup>103</sup> Pp. 97–120 and 121–123 respectively.

<sup>104</sup> See especially, and in first place, Chr. Habicht’s critical review of Crampa’s historical reconstruction: *Gnomon* 44 (1972) 162–170, at 168–169. The best summary of the extensive literature concerning the identity of these two individuals is now in A. Bencivenni, *Progetti*, 260–261 (who prefers Habicht’s interpretation, as does Ph. Gauthier, below, n. 106). For the different Ptolemies: ‘the Son’, ‘the Brother’ ‘of Ephesos’ and ‘Andromachou’ and their identities, the evidence is conveniently collected in W. Huss, ‘Ptolemaios der Sohn’, *ZPE* 121 (1998) 229–250 and (largely) convincingly discussed in Gygax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder’.

<sup>105</sup> See prev. n. So also Gygax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder’.

<sup>106</sup> Followed by Ph. Gauthier (*BE* 1995, 523): ‘il semble désormais (i.e. since *I. Labraunda* 3, with its ref. to Sophron and Ptolemy the Son) établi que dans les années 260 la région de Mylasa dépendait des Lagides, sous l’autorité de «Ptolemée le fils» et de Sôphrôn, ce dernier étant peut-être στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Καρίας.’ Bencivenni’s additional point is that Olympichos, in *I. Labraunda* 8b, ll. 15–16, states his wish to be ‘second to none’ in his benefactions to Mylasa. That, Bencivenni argues (260, n. 8), could only have been said if he was measuring himself against a non-Seleukid predecessor. On Sophron, see the discussion in Gygax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder’ with all references.

<sup>107</sup> Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1994, no. 528, discussing the letter written in 246 BC by the Ptolemaic official Tlepolemos to Karian Kildara (above, nn. 7 and 23) argues that Kildara would have been Ptolemaic already before 246 BC. W. Blümel, its ed. pr., had argued that the Kildareis, in sending an embassy to Tlepolemos, had decided to change sides, at the outbreak of the ‘Laodikeian war’ leaving that of

that Mylasa had come into Seleukid hands already under Antiochos II, namely that coins of that king were issued in the city, rests on an argument, subsequently rescinded, of G. Le Rider: the coins in question should be attributed to Bargylia.<sup>108</sup> Never specifically mentioned in any discussion is the fact that Olympichos states, in the mid 240s (*I.Labraunda* 8, ll. 17–20) that he had bought estates near Labraunda ‘from Queen Laodike’, who can hardly be any other than wife of Antiochos II.<sup>109</sup>

Despite the uncertainties that remain, it seems to me that we may tentatively identify one of these two high officials, on present evidence most likely Ptolemy ‘the Brother/Son’, active in the 260s, as the author of our letter.<sup>110</sup>

### *The neokoros*

Finally, the presence at Labraunda of a *neokoros* needs briefly to be mentioned. In the entire, by now quite extensive, Olympichos dossier, in which the priests of Zeus Labraundos (Korris in the 240s, then Hekatomnos in the 220s), played a central role, there is not a whisper about a *neokoros*. For the position, a decree from Amyzon is relevant, in which the Persian-named Bagadates is appointed *neokoros* of Artemis and given *politeia*, together with his son, at the emphatic ‘invitation’ (Ἀσάνδρου γνώμη) of the Macedonian satrap Asandros (321/320 BC) and after the satrap’s consultation of the oracle at Delphi. His may have been a newly created post.<sup>111</sup> To paraphrase L. Robert’s comments, his task would have been to take care of the sanctuary’s maintenance, keep order during celebrations and make sure the sacred rules were respected, all under the authority of the priest (who, incidentally, is never explicitly

---

Laodike and Seleukos II and embracing that of Ptolemy III (προσιέναι πρὸς τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως πράγματα) but G. writes that, despite the expression, ‘il me paraît probable que les Kildaréens (comme les Mylasiens et les Halicarnassiens) aient été, dès avant 246, dans la dépendance des Lagides’. See also *idem*, ‘Claros’ 29–31, equally postulating Ptolemaic control over Mylasa until 246 BC, as does Habicht.

<sup>108</sup> Gygax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder, 361; Le Rider, ‘Antiochos II à Mylasa’ *BCH* 114, 1990, 543–551 and ‘Note additionnelle’, *BCH* 120, 1996, 775–777. Houghton and Lorber, *Seleucid Coins* vol. I, 195–196, also reject Mylasa, but hang fire on Bargylia. On two recently auctioned coins (May 10 and June 28, 2017, both Classical Numismatic Group, Auction 105, lot 412, and Electronic Auction 400, lot 319) however, the Artemis Kindyas with her ribbons crossed over her chest is clearly identifiable, though the monogram is erased. The main question is moved sideways, for it is perhaps even more surprising that Bargylia, on the coast, should have become Seleukid under Antiochos II, and perhaps already under Antiochos I, if F. Delrieux’ attribution of posthumous Alexander coinage from that city, to Antiochos I, is accepted. The relevant coins are discussed by H. Seyrig, ‘Monnaies hellénistiques XI’, *RN* 6.6 (1964) 7–8 (with fig. 1) and, most recently, by F. Delrieux, *RSN* 77 (1998) 41–52. See also W. Weiser in *I.Iasos* II, p. 181. Additional evidence for Seleukid control in Bargylia in *I.Iasos* 608; cf. Holleaux *Études* III (1938) 35; Robert, *OMS* 24–26; 1053.

<sup>109</sup> Van Bremen, ‘Olympichos and Mylasa, 16–17, discussing the extent of the land, probably located between Labraunda and Olymos.

<sup>110</sup> Whether we should connect the so-called Ptolemaic ‘Funktionärsbrief’ from Euromos, published by M. Errington in *EA* 21 (1993) 20 Nr. 3 (*SEG* 43, 705), with either of these two individuals, as was suggested by Ph. Gauthier (*BE* 1995, 523) remains an open question. Despite the corrections to Gauthier’s suggested readings by P. Herrmann (*EA* 27, 1996, 55–56, with W. Blümel, *ibidem*, 61–62 for the improved text) the Ptolemaic context remains unchallenged (mention of Theodotos, the *dioiketes*, reference to *philanthropa*, letter forms distinctly of the early third century).

<sup>111</sup> The presence of another Macedonian, Menandros, as συνεπιμεληθέντος, whose name is listed after the treasurer of the goddess, perhaps as ‘chargé de mission’ of Asandros to oversee the appointing process (and regulate the finances?), also suggests this. Bagadates’ position was intended to be hereditary, since his son, Ariarames, was included in the grant of *politeia*; this implies that there had not been a *neokoros* before him. Under Antiochos III, an Ariarames was *neokoros*: *Amyzon* 18, l. 18, presumably a descendant.



named at Amyzon); his job was not, in this case, to administer the resources of the sanctuary, since that was the preserve of the *tamias* of the goddess, the sacred treasurer, also mentioned in the decree.<sup>112</sup> At Amyzon we should probably think in terms of an expansion and/or reorganization of the sanctuary's personnel. Something similar may have taken place at Labraunda at the very beginning of the Hellenistic period, also under the aegis of Asandros. We have no direct evidence for Labraunda for the period of Asandros' satrapy, although his activity is now well-documented for several neighbouring cities, and his presence in Mylasa is as good as assured.<sup>113</sup> Was the Labraundan *neokoros* another innovation of that energetic Macedonian?

\*\*\*

Between the period of Asandros (ends 313 BC) and the liberation of Mylasa at the behest of Seleukos II (246 BC), two episodes that are remarkably (and increasingly) brightly illuminated, the history of Labraunda lies in the dim halflight for almost half a century. But for two decades, between the early 270s and 259, the contours of the Ptolemaic administrative and fiscal 'machine', which we know increasingly well from neighbouring Lycia, are discernable also here. Quite how the main characters, Apollonios the *oikonomos*, the *strategos* Margos based at Amyzon, Ptolemy 'the Son', and perhaps another Ptolemaic *strategos* called Sophron, managed<sup>114</sup> those under their controscapes us, but the familiar ingredients are all there: *ateleia*, arbitration, judgments, 'fair' and 'just' management, the resolution of conflict, copies of documents, delegations. Most obscure remains the Chrysaoric league: closely involved during several conflict-ridden episodes in the sanctuary's history, but whose instrument it was remains an open question.

#### Appendix 1: *I.Labraunda* 44

Anta block (Inv. 25/B101). Part of a re-used statue block, now identified as an anta block of Propylon Y (fig. 2). Found 4 m. SW of Propylon Y; now in the depot at Labraunda. 44 is inscribed on the front and is the original inscription; on the l. and r. sides are nos 113 and 118, both fragments; early imperial and 2nd cent. AD respectively. Photo (fig. 6); squeeze Uppsala University Library. H. 0.28 m, w. 0.69 m, d. 0.24m (left); 0.29 m (right); back is broken. Two square dowel holes on top; previous anathyrosis on r. side seen by Crampa; no visible signs of anathyrosis on top; anathyrosis on bottom 0.05 m at front; 0.065 m at back (physical description from Hedlund, 'Antae', p. 60). The front face is very badly worn (already in Crampa's time), especially on the left and in the middle; it is broken above and right. There is space on the stone for two lines above the preserved l. 1; l. margin is c. 1.2 cm; the letters

---

<sup>112</sup> L. 6 for the treasurer. Robert's comments at p. 110. No priest is mentioned in this inscription. At Labraunda, his involvement in financial matters suggests that, unlike at Amyzon, a concern with the sanctuary's resources was clearly part of the *neokoros*' brief. It is not until the Roman imperial period that we come across the position again, in *I.Labraunda* 60.

<sup>113</sup> The presence of Asandros at Mylasa has been assumed from an inscription of Stratonikeia, *Amyzon* p. 99–100, in which ambassadors from Hierakome 'sont allés trouver Asandros à Mylasa' (p.100); in *I.Mylasa* 21, of 317 BC, dated to Philip Arrhidaios and Asandros' satrapy, a palaistra 'of' Nikanor and a gymnasium are referred to. On Asandros see most recently Kızıl et al., 'Pidasa et Asandros' with all references, and M. Wörrle, 'Synoikismos' 139–143.

<sup>114</sup> See n. 52 for such *oikonomiai*.

are 1.2 to 1.5 cm h., interlinear space<sup>115</sup> c. 2.4 cm; the letters ‘have the same shape as in 43’ (description from Crampa, ad loc.).

Cf. F. Piejko, ‘Labraunda’, 143, many of whose restorations I do not indicate in the app. crit.

4 [- - - - - ]ΟΥΜΕΝΟ[- c. 4 -]ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟ[- - c. 7 - -]  
 [- - - - - τὸ ἰ]ερὸν [?τὸ κατά] Παναμαρα [- - c. 5 - - -]  
 [- - - - - ]  
 [- - - - - ]  
 [- - - - - ]  
 ΜΝΑΙ[- - - - - c. 24 - - - - - ]βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος [c. 3 ]  
 8 ?Δὶ [Λ]αβρα[ύ]ν[δωι - c. 10 - - - Παν]αμαρα ἀτελῆ πάντ[ω]ν εἰς τὸν  
 ἅπ[αντα χρόνον c. 10-12 - - - - ]λαγ πρότερον Εἰ[- - - - -]ΩΝ  
 [. . . c. 8. . . ]λης [. . . c. 6 . . .]α ὅπ[ω]ς ταῦτα γίνηται κατὰ [τ]ὸν [νόμον]  
 [.]ετ[- - - - - c. 19 - - - - -]εν ἀτέλεια ἀπὸ τοῦ[- - - - -]

1 ΟΥΜ ΝΟΣ κατὰ τοῦ ἀπε C.; 2 ἰ]ερὸν [- c. 5 - ] Παναμαρα C.; 6 μνᾶς π C.; 7 Δὶ [Λ]αβρα[ύ]ν[δωι]; [τὸν] βα[σ]ι[λ]έα, ἄτε δὴ πάντ[ω]ν εἰς τὸν C.; εἶναι τὸν ἱερ]έα ἀτελῆ πάντ[ω]ν εἰς τὸν ἅπ[αντα] χρόνον Piejko; 8 ἅπ[- - - - - c. 25 - - - - - εἰσήγγει]λαγ(?); end: εἰς βο[υ]λὴν τ[.]ν[.] C.; 9 κατὰ [τ]ὴν C.;

#### Notes on the text

According to Crampa this is a decree of the Chrysaoreis. There is so little left of the text (seven fragmentary lines) that we can neither confirm its status as a decree nor its issuing authority as the Chrysaoreis.

1. The final omicron of ΑΠΟ is clearly visible. Although far from certain, we might think of restoring Ἄπο[λλώνιος] or Ἄπο[λλωνίου], given his presence in *I.Labraunda* 43 and 51. None of the letters of Crampa’s κατὰ is legible on the photo.

2. τὸ ἰ]ερὸν [?τὸ κατά] Παναμαρα. This seems the only restoration possible at least here. So also Piejko, ‘Labraunda’, at p. 143.

6. Crampa’s μνᾶς does not make sense here (and the sigma is not legible) but I have no alternative to suggest. There is space for an iota between the M and N, giving [ύ] |μῖν or [ή] |μῖν, but no trace is visible.

7. Piejko, *Labraunda*, 143, also saw ἀτελῆ πάντ[ω]ν; his [εἶναι τὸν ἱερ]έα before it is ingenious but it does not match the letters on the stone, which clearly read αμαρα. The letters of ἀτελῆ are quite securely visible on the photo, and to turn a *delta* into a *lambda* requires very little; εἰς τὸν | ἅπ[αντα χρόνον] then seems the obvious continuation. ἀτελῆ requires a feminine or male accusative or a neuter plural. I do not think that Παναμαρα, though probably a neuter plural and thus compatible, would be used in this sense without any further qualification. There seems to be no space for e.g. [τὴν χώραν τὴν κατὰ Παν]αμαρα. The syntax of the sentence remains unclear, with only about ten letters missing between Δὶ [Λ]αβρα[ύ]ν[δωι] (assuming that this reading is correct, which it very well may not be) and Παν]αμαρα.

8. At the end, C’s is not visible on the stone, and I doubt that his reading is correct. The final letters I see are omega (omicron?) and ny.

9. The expression in l. 9: ὅπ[ω]ς ταῦτα γίνηται κατὰ [τ]ὸν [νόμον]<sup>116</sup> imposes itself. It would suit a letter from a royal official just as well as a decree.

<sup>115</sup> For Crampa’s interlinear spaces see above, n. 21.

<sup>116</sup> Crampa read [τ]ὴν and suggested κατὰ [τ]ὴν [ἐντολὴν], citing Welles, *RC*, p. 331, but the omicron is clear on the photo: [νόμον] suggests itself. Piejko, ‘Labraunda’, 143 also saw in this document a letter from a royal official.

**10.** Despite the extreme fading of the stone's surface and the near-illegibility of the words, ἀτέλεια ἀπὸ του[- -] can be confirmed here. The use of ἀπό with ἀτέλεια is anomalous, and we should probably separate the two words.<sup>117</sup>

RIET VAN BREMEN

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

---

<sup>117</sup> Crampa was equally puzzled, citing *RC* 47, 5–7: ἀτέλειαν προβά[των ὅστε μηκέτι τελ]εῖν [τ]ὴν ἀπὸ τούτων προσ[δεομένην ? δεκάτην] as the closest approximation.

## Abbreviations

- Amyzon* J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d’Amyzon en Carie. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions* vol. I, Paris (1983).
- Bagnall, *Administration* R. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden (1976).
- Bencivenni, *Progetti* A. Bencivenni, *Progetti di Riforme costituzionali nelle epigrafi greche dei secoli IV-II A.C.*, Bologna (2003).
- van Bremen, ‘Olympichos’ R. van Bremen, ‘Olympichos and Mylasa’, *EA* 49 (2016), 1–26.
- Carless Unwin, Henry, ‘New Olympichos’ N. Carless Unwin, O. Henry, ‘A new Olympichos Inscription’ (*I.Labraunda* 137), *EA* 49 (2016) 27–45.
- Cassayre, *Justice* A. Cassayre, *La Justice dans les cités grecques. De la formation des royaumes hellénistiques au legs d’Attale*, Rennes (2010).
- Crowther, ‘Foreign Courts’ Ch. Crowther, ‘Foreign courts on Kalymna in the third century B.C.’, *JAC* 9 (1994) 33–55.
- Crowther, ‘Iasos III’ Ch. Crowther, ‘Iasos in the second century BC: foreign judges from Priene’, *BICS* 40 (1995) 91–138.
- Debord, ‘Cité grecque’ P. Debord, ‘Cité grecque–village carien: des usages du mot koinon’, *Studi Ellenistici* 15, 115–180.
- Fabiani, *Decreti Onorari* R. Fabiani, *I decreti onorari di Iasos. Cronologia e storia*, Munich (2015).
- Gabrielsen ‘Chrysaoreis of Caria’ V. Gabrielsen, ‘The Chrysaoreis of Caria’ in L. Karlsson and S. Carlsson (eds) *Labraunda and Karia. Boreas* vol. 32 (2011) 332–353.
- Gauthier, *Choix d’écrits* Ph. Gauthier, *Études d’histoire et d’institutions grecques. Choix d’écrits*. ed. D. Rousset, Paris (2011).
- Gauthier, ‘Claros’ Ph. Gauthier, ‘Nouvelles inscriptions de Claros: décrets d’Aigai et de Mylasa pour des juges colophonien’, *REG* 112 (1999) 1–36.
- Gauthier, ‘Rois hellénistiques’ Ph. Gauthier, ‘Les rois hellénistiques et les juges étrangers: à propos de décrets de Kimôlos et de Laodicée du Lykos’, *JS* 1994, 165–195 (= *Choix d’écrits* 113–144).
- Grzybek, *Calendrier* E. Grzybek, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque. Problèmes de chronologie hellénistique*, Basel (1990).
- Gygax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder’ M. Domingo Gygax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder des Königs Ptolemaios III. Euergetes, und Mylasa. Bemerkungen zu I.Labraunda Nr. 3’, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 354–366.
- Hedlund, ‘Antae’ R. Hedlund, ‘Antae in the Afternoon: notes on the Hellenistic and Roman architecture of Labraunda’ in L. Karlsson et al. (eds), *ΑΑΒΡΥΣ. Studies presented to Pontus Hellström. Boreas* vol. 35 (2014), 57–70.
- Holleaux, *Études III* M. Holleaux, *Études d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecque, vol. III: Lagides et Séleucides*, Paris (1968).

- Houghton and Lorber, *Seleucid Coins* A. Houghton and C. Lorber, *Seleucid Coins. A Comprehensive Catalogue. Part I Seleucus I through Antiochos III*. 2 vols., New York (2002).
- Huss, *Verwaltung* W. Huss, *Die Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Reichs*, Munich (2011).
- Isager, 'Epigraphic tradition' S. Isager, 'The epigraphic tradition at Labraunda seen in the light of *I.Labraunda* inscription no. 134: a recent addition to the Olympichos file', in L. Karlsson and S. Carlsson (eds) *Labraunda and Karia. Boreas* vol. 32 (2011) 199–215.
- Isager-Karlsson, 'New Inscription' S. Isager, L. Karlsson, 'A new inscription from Labraunda. Honorary decree for Olympichos: *I.Labraunda* no. 134 (and no. 49) *EA* 41 (2008) 39–52.
- Kızıl et al., 'Pidasa et Asandros' A. Kızıl et al., 'Pidasa et Asandros: une nouvelle inscription', *REA* 117 (2015) 371–409 (with an appendix by I.-J. Adiego, 'Un nouveau théonyme carien: Toubassis', 404–409).
- Mackil, *Common Polity* E. Mackil, *Creating a Common Polity. Religion, Economy, and Politics in the making of the Greek Koinon*, Berkeley/Los Angeles (2013).
- Meadows, 'Ptolemaic Annexation' A. Meadows, 'The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia: SEG 27.929' in K. Dörtlük et al. (eds) *Proceedings of the III Symposium on Lycia* (2006) 459–47.
- Meadows and Thonemann, 'Administration' A. Meadows, P. Thonemann, 'The Ptolemaic Administration of Pamphylia', *ZPE* 186 (2013) 223–226.
- Migeotte, *Emprunt* L. Migeotte, *L'Emprunt public dans les cités grecques: recueil des documents et analyse critique* Québec/Paris (1984).
- Piejko, 'Labraunda' F. Piejko, 'To the Inscriptions of Labraunda', *OA* 18 (1990) 133–156.
- Robert, 'Juges étrangers' L. Robert, 'Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque *Xenion*', *Festschrift Pan. I. Zepos* (1973) 765–782 (= *OMS* V 137–154).
- Robert, *OMS* L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta: Epigraphie et antiquités grecques* vols. 1–7, Paris (1969–1990).
- Scafuro, A. 'Foreign judges' 'Decrees for foreign judges: judging conventions—or Epigraphic habits?', in M. Gagarin and A. Lanni (eds.), *Symposion 2013* (2014) 365–395.
- Steinwenter, *Streitbeendigung* A. Steinwenter, *Die Streitbeendigung durch Urteil, Schiedsspruch und Vergleich nach griechischem Rechte*. 2nd ed., Munich (1971).
- Walser, *Bauern* V. Walser, *Bauern und Zinsnehmer. Politik, Recht und Wirtschaft im frühhellenistischen Ephesos*, Munich (2008).
- Welles, *RC* C.B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, New Haven (1934).
- Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen I' M. Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens I' *Chiron* 7 (1977) 43–66.
- Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen II' M. Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II', *Chiron* 8 (1978) 201–246.
- Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen IV' M. Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur

- Geschichte Lykiens IV. Drei griechische Inschriften aus Limyra' *Chiron* 21 (1991) 203–239.
- Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen VIII' M. Wörle, 'Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens VIII. Ein ptolemäisches Prostagma aus Limyra über Mißstände beim Steuereinzug' *Chiron* 40 (2010) 359–396.
- Wörle, 'Synoikismos' M. Wörle, 'Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos III. Der Synoikismos der Latmioi mit den Pidaseis', *Chiron* 33 (2003) 121–143.