

# Formulaic expressions in official Roman Republican epistolography inscribed in Greek

Christopher Joseph Haddad

BAncHist (Hons.) (Macquarie)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Masters of Research

Department of Ancient History, Faculty of Arts  
Macquarie University, Sydney

10<sup>th</sup> of October, 2014



## Declaration

I, Christopher Joseph Haddad (42106974), certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

Christopher J Haddad

---

Date: 10.10.2014



## Summary

Official Roman Republican letters inscribed in Greek have been neglected in recent scholarship on Ancient Greek and Roman epistolography, and the language of these letters in particular has not yet received satisfactory treatment. The letters have been assessed against texts which differ from them temporally, geographically, and in terms of media and text type. This has resulted in criticism of their language and their authors' capabilities. These letters are important for understanding Greek and Roman history, epistolography, languages, and bilingualism, and their language is in need of a reassessment which applies relevant *comparanda* and is sensitive to the Koine Greek of documentary evidence.

One important feature of the language of the Roman letters inscribed in Greek is the formulaic expressions. Since they require a knowledge of the language as well as familiarity with the text type, they are revealing of the authors' understanding of official epistolography in Koine Greek. This dissertation analyses the form and function of formulaic language in these Roman letters in Greek. It demonstrates the attention which the authors paid to formulaic language and the proficiency with which they applied the Greek language in their official letters.



*For Jack Purcell and Martha Haddad*

*Jack, you always made us laugh and we love you for it,  
Whenever you were around we knew it would be a good night,  
We all miss you every day.*

*My Grandmother, Martha,  
You came to this beautiful country to give us all a better life,  
From this gift all others have come,  
We are eternally grateful.*





## Acknowledgements

The Department of Ancient History has been so supportive and accommodating in each and every year of my studies, whether I was a confused first-year or an overly-keen, pestering fifth-year. None of this would have gotten off the ground without my supervisor, Dr Trevor Evans, who has been so kind, encouraging, professional, and patient; to say I could not have done this without you is one hundred percent true. I warmly thank Dr Peter Keegan for his invaluable epigraphic insights at all times, A/Prof Malcolm Choat and A/Prof Andrew Gillett for co-ordinating this degree so professionally under overwhelming pressure, A/Prof Tom Hillard and Dr J Lea Beness not only for divulging their encyclopaedic knowledge of Roman history but also for their constant encouragement and advice on all things personal and professional, Mark Hebblewhite for the tip about Pliny, Dr Genevieve Young-Evans for kindly coming to my rescue with regard to technology on multiple occasions, Prof Alanna Nobbs for always reminding me of why I chose Macquarie, Angela Abberton for being patient with my timesheets and a constant supporter, Jon Dalrymple for her confidence in me and the helpful book, Dr John Lee for his philological prowess and his help tracking down *II Maccabees*, A/Prof Boyo Ockinga for being so kind as to pass along references I may need, and of course Emeritus Prof Edwin Judge for believing in my ideas and supporting me in their research.

I am grateful to Emeritus Prof Peter J. Rhodes of the University of Durham for discussing with me the ‘Unpublished’ Dossier from Argos which appears in his *The Decrees of the Greek States*, endeavouring to locate the Dossier in publication, and allowing me access to knowledge of the texts which only he could have. You saved me a great deal of stress and I will always appreciate your efforts.

Without the support of my teachers at St Paul’s Grammar I would never have understood the importance of education and would not have discovered this path. I must single out Paul Humble for being so inspirational and encouraging, and showing us all the power of History, and Louise Goderie and Barry Ingold for believing in me when no one else (including myself) felt I could accomplish anything.

I am blessed with amazing friends who have put up with so much philology over the years. You bring me the happiness and support which I can’t do without (and you also make sure my head remains the appropriate size) and I hope I return the favour. In particular Martin Cordoba has always believed in what I do and backed me without question. Thank you to

### *Acknowledgements*

Alex Clark, Cameron Jones, Chris ‘Larry’ Kelly, Peter Labuzin, Luke Pender, James Smith, and John Sullivan for all the laughs and for reminding me of what is most important. From Macquarie, thank you to Alice Baker, Alex Chard, Marcus Chin, Sean Commons, Keira de Rosa, Matthew George, Lucinda Guzman, Andrew Hammond, Lesley McCusker, Nicole Miles, Nicole Moffatt, Olivier Rochecouste, Emmanuel Roumanis, Ellen Ryan, Janet Wade, Joan Wilcox, and Alexandra Wrathall; you are all stars, phenomenal students of history and the languages, who challenge me every day and make university a pleasure. Special thanks go to Emmanuel Roumanis for so much help with Greek fonts and to Joan Wilcox for kindly devoting time to proof reading some important sections.

I thank Shirley Smith and everyone from *Meals on Wheels* for bringing an unexpected source of joy to my life by letting me be a part of their all-important work. Thank you for working with my schedule and being so considerate in giving me time away for writing.

To everyone at *Borelli’s*, *Layaly*, and *Topiary*, whom I annoy for food and coffee far too often. Over the last few years the support you have given to someone whom you barely knew has not gone unnoticed and will not be forgotten, thanks for everything. Apologies for talking about my thesis every time we meet.

I have no words to properly describe the debt I owe to my whole family. I am blessed with a support base of aunties, uncles, and cousins who cannot be compared. You always ask about my work and wish me well, pray for my well-being and send me food at every given opportunity, but most of all you are genuine and loving people who fill me with joy whenever I hear your voices or read your words. None of this would matter without my family.

My parents, Jim and Gemma Haddad, are incredible people. I am grateful to Dad for being so helpful in reading the entire thesis, as he did with Honours. I hope it wasn’t too boring. Mum and Dad, I know that everything you both do is for me. Every moment I feel your support, and, even though I’m far away, I never feel the distance because you are so involved in everything I do. No one makes me happier than you two, and I love you so much. Thank you for giving me more than I could ever dream of having.

I thank God for all of these beautiful people and the wonderful life I have.

C.J.H.

# Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	xiii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Formulaic expressions in the Opening and Closure of the Letters	15
Chapter 2: Formulaic expressions in the Body of the Letters	49
Conclusion: The Significance of formulaic expressions in the Roman Letters	81
<i>Bibliography</i>	87
Appendix	93
<i>Introductory Remarks</i>	95
Texts	97
<i>Official Roman Republican Letters Inscribed in Greek</i>	99
<i>Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic Royal Correspondence</i>	149
<i>Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic poleis and koina</i>	201



## List of Figures

1.1 – Standard Address Formula in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus	44
1.2 – Standard Address Formula in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus	44
1.3 – Standard Address Formula in the Roman corpus	45
1.4 – The χαίρειν λέγει Address Formula in the Roman corpus	45
1.5 – Health Wishes in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus	46
1.6 – Health Wishes in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus	46
1.7 – Health Wishes in the Roman corpus	47
1.8 – Farewell Salutations in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus	47
1.9 – Farewell Salutations in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus	48
1.10 – Farewell Salutations in the Roman corpus	48
2.1 – The Embassy Formula as evidenced by the ‘control’ corpus	52
2.2 – The Roman Embassy Formula based on the best examples	62
2.3 – The Benefaction Formula based on the best examples	64



## Abbreviations

Buzón, ‘Der Briefe der Ptolemäerzeit’	Buzón, R., ‘Die Briefe der Ptolemäerzeit: Ihre Struktur und ihre Formeln’ (diss. Heidelberg 1984)
Ceccarelli, <i>AGLW</i>	Ceccarelli, P., <i>Ancient Greek Letter Writing</i> (Oxford, 2013)
Clackson, Horrocks, <i>Latin Language</i>	Clackson, J., Horrocks, G.C., <i>The Blackwell History of the Latin Language</i> (Malden, Mass., Oxford and Carlton, Victoria, 2007)
<i>CEL</i>	<i>Corpus Epistularum Latinarum</i>
<i>CIG</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
Cugusi, <i>Evoluzione</i>	Cugusi, P., <i>Evoluzione e Forme dell’Epistolografia Latina: Nella tarda Repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell’Impero, con cenni Sull’Epistolografia Preciceroniana</i> (Roma, 1983)
<i>DAA</i>	Raubitschek, A. E., <i>Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth centuries B.C.</i> , with L.H. Jeffery (Massachusetts, 1949).
<i>DGS</i>	Rhodes, P.J., with Lewis, D.M., <i>The Decrees of the Greek States</i> , (Oxford, 1997)
Halla-Aho, <i>Non-literary Latin Letters</i>	Halla-aho, H., <i>The Non-literary Latin Letters: A study of their syntax and pragmatics</i> (Helsinki, 2009)
Hercher, <i>EG</i>	Hercher, R. (ed.), <i>Epistolographi Graeci</i> (Amsterdam, 1871; repr. 1965)
Gignac, <i>Phonology</i>	Gignac, F.T., <i>A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods</i> , I: Phonology (Milan, 1976)
<i>IOLHPK</i> no.	<i>Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic poleis and koina</i> text no.

# Abbreviations

<i>IOLHRC</i> no.	<i>Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic Royal Correspondence</i> text no.
<i>ORRLIG</i> no.	<i>Official Roman Republican Letters Inscribed in Greek</i> text no.
<i>Keram.</i> III	Peek, W., <i>Kerameikos</i> , III: Inschriften, Ostraka, Fluchtafeln (Berlin, 1941).
Mayser, <i>Grammatik</i> , I <sup>2</sup>	Mayser, E., <i>Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der</i> <i>Prolemäerzeit</i> , I, 2 <sup>nd</sup> edn. by H. Schmoll (Berlin, 1970)
<i>SC</i>	<i>senatus consultum/consulta</i>
<i>s.d.</i>	<i>salutem dicit</i> ‘s/he says “greetings!”’
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
<i>SIG</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> edn.
Sherk, <i>RDGE</i>	Sherk, R.K., <i>Roman Documents from the Greek East</i> (Baltimore, 1969)
<i>TLG</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i>
PHI Online	Packard Humanities Institute Online
Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’	Viereck, P., ‘Sermo Graecus quo Senatusque Populusque Romanus Magistratusque Populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris Aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur’ (diss. Göttingen, 1888)
Welles, <i>RCHP</i>	Welles, C.B., <i>Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period</i> (Chicago, 1934)
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>



# Introduction

## 0.1 – Official letters and the Romans

As the Romans became more prominent in the Mediterranean and were involved increasingly in matters in the Greek-speaking East, they adopted from the Greeks the well-established practice of sending official letters to Greek states and associations.<sup>1</sup> The Hellenistic kingdoms, *poleis*, and *koina* were accustomed to communicating through official letters, a precedent which had been set in Alexander's time.<sup>2</sup> Such letters could be sent for many reasons, such as arbitration or announcing agreements, alliances, and policies.<sup>3</sup> Some of these letters were publicly inscribed by the recipients out of respect for the sender and as a guarantee for both parties that the agreements would be upheld.<sup>4</sup> A portion of these inscribed letters is extant, which in itself is likely to be a much smaller sample of what would have been archived on more perishable media.<sup>5</sup>

The Hellenistic states petitioned Rome through the same medium and for the same reasons as they wrote to each other. Increasingly from the early 200s BCE, the Roman Senate deliberated Greek matters and letters in reply were sent in the name of presiding magistrates.<sup>6</sup> These letters are strikingly similar to contemporaneous official Greek counterparts. Despite Roman magistrates being required to use Latin in the presence of Greeks in official circumstances,<sup>7</sup> official Roman letters to Greek states were inscribed in Greek, and the language of the Greek in these inscribed letters has been understudied and undervalued in modern scholarship.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 189.

<sup>2</sup> Welles, *RCHP*, p. xxxvii; J.V. Muir, *Life and Letters in the Ancient Greek World* (London, 2009), 92.

<sup>3</sup> Welles, *RCHP*, pp. xxxvii–xli. Sherk, *RDGE*, 190–197.

<sup>4</sup> Welles, *RCHP*, pp. xxxix–xl.

<sup>5</sup> Muir, *Life and Letters*, 27.

<sup>6</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 186–187; cf. also Muir, *Life and Letters*, 18.

<sup>7</sup> This requirement was not observed universally. J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979), 96, 110–129, esp. 110–116 for our period, 130–132 for Caesar and Augustus and Greek; J. Clackson and G.C. Horrocks, *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language* (Malden, Mass., Oxford and Carlton, Victoria, 2007), 188–189; G.C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Maldon, Mass., Oxford and Chichester, 2010), 125–126; B. Rochette, 'Language Policies in the Republic and Empire', J. Clackson, (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Maldon, Mass., Oxford and Chichester, 2011), esp. 549–557 for our period; cf. also Valerius Maximus 2.2.2.

Formulaic expressions are an important aspect of epistolography. The correct application of epistolary and non-epistolary formulae throughout a letter conveys to the recipient that the author understood the language and the text type, as each component of such expressions requires knowledge of the language and their application in the letter layout requires familiarity with epistolography.<sup>8</sup> Formulaic expressions in official Roman letters inscribed in Greek provide a useful opportunity to evaluate their authors' understanding of Koine Greek and its epistolography through one compositional feature. They are a good example of the proficiency of the language of these letters, which still has not been properly analysed. This language is often incorrectly associated with more stilted Roman documents in Greek and dismissed as having a poor command of the language. An example of this is the statement of Rochette, referring to "*senatusconsulta*, edicts, imperial rescripts, letters from emperors and magistrates", that "[t]he Greek of these texts is in general an inelegant jargon in which traces of the original Latin can be detected."<sup>9</sup> Letters generally are expressed in a language discrete from decrees, edicts, and rescripts, and in practice these official Roman letters share few similarities with the language of such documents. A treatment of all aspects of their language lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, but an analysis of their formulaic expressions in consideration of relevant *comparanda* demonstrates clearly that the language of the letters is separate from other Roman documents written in Greek.<sup>10</sup>

## 0.2 – Prior scholarship on the language of the Greek in the Roman letters

Ancient epistolography has received increasing focus in recent scholarship.<sup>11</sup> Despite the attention paid to Greek and Latin letters, Roman letters written in Greek have not been addressed in the same detail.<sup>12</sup> There appears to be a reluctance to revisit these letters,

<sup>8</sup> H. Halla-aho, *The Non-literary Latin Letters: A study of their syntax and pragmatics* (Helsinki, 2009), 44.

<sup>9</sup> Rochette, 'Language Policies in the Republic and Empire', 554.

<sup>10</sup> T.V. Evans has argued for a reassessment of the language of papyrus letters in postclassical Greek which is sensitive to the conventions of Koine Greek and draws comparison from relevant evidence, which is certainly needed for our Roman letters, see T.V. Evans, 'Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri', *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 2007* (2010), 197–205, these points are argued throughout, but see 197 for examples of such negative comments on the language of Greek papyrus letters.

<sup>11</sup> Some recent and important examples are: Muir, *Life and Letters*; Ceccarelli, *AGLW*; K. Radner, (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2014).

<sup>12</sup> In three recent publications (see note 11), there is little engagement with the topic: Muir (2009) devotes only 2 pages to the discussion of official Roman letters inscribed in Greek; Ceccarelli (2013) offers no discussion,

probably for two reasons: Roman letters in Greek are difficult to assign to *either* Greek or Roman epistolography—and publications tend to focus on one of these letter-writing practices—and earlier works which addressed the topic have been well-received.

There have been four main publications which have discussed the language of inscribed official Greek and Roman letters.<sup>13</sup> The earliest work focussing on official Roman Republican inscriptions as a corpus is Viereck's 1888 dissertation, which aimed to investigate the language of the Greek which the Roman administration used until the age of Tiberius.<sup>14</sup> This work was followed by Lafoscade's 1902 dissertation, which covered official Roman letters in Greek in inscriptions and papyri from Augustus to Constantine.<sup>15</sup> In 1934, Welles produced his important monograph which covered the official inscribed letters of Hellenistic kingdoms. His treatment of the language is superior to Viereck and Lafoscade: Welles provides a thorough linguistic analysis of his letters, and focuses on both fundamental and stylistic aspects, allowing us to better understand their authors' knowledge of Hellenistic epistolography. Official Roman epigraphic texts were revisited as a corpus in 1969 by Sherk, and his work has been authoritative since publication.<sup>16</sup> Viereck, Lafoscade, and Sherk are the three main works which deal, in varying degrees, with the language of official Roman Republican letters inscribed in Greek, but there are shortcomings in their linguistic analyses.

---

despite listing every Roman letter she could identify; and there is no paper in Radner (ed.) (2014) addressing Roman Republican state correspondence.

<sup>13</sup> There have also been some important works on the historical, political, diplomatic, and social importance of Greek and Roman letter writing in recent years, especially: (on Hellenistic correspondence) Ceccarelli, *AGLW*, 297–330 and A. Bencivenni, 'The King's Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions', Radner (ed.), *State Correspondence*, 141–171; and (on Roman Imperial correspondence) S. Corcoran, 'State Correspondence in the Roman Empire: Imperial Communication from Augustus to Justinian', Radner (ed.), *State Correspondence*, 172–209. When Ceccarelli, Bencivenni, and Corcoran discuss the language of the letters in these works, they are focused on the sender's choice of vocabulary and phraseology and the insight it provides for understanding the relationship between the two parties. The proficiency of the author is not their focus.

<sup>14</sup> P. Viereck, 'Sermo Graecus quo Senatusque Populusque Romanus Magistratusque Populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris Aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur' (diss. Göttingen, 1888).

<sup>15</sup> L. Lafoscade, 'De Epistulis (aliisque Titulis) Imperatorum Magistratuumque Romanorum, quas ab aetate Augusti usque ad Constantinum' (diss. Paris, 1902).

<sup>16</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*. In 1984, Sherk again revisited official Roman Republican documents by providing translations and (mostly historical) commentary on many of them in R.K. Sherk, *Translated Documents of Greece and Rome*, 4: Rome and the Greek East to the death of Augustus (Cambridge, 1984).

We will briefly discuss Viereck and Sherk, who dealt with formulaic expressions in the Republican letters.<sup>17</sup>

### **Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’—**

Viereck covered several linguistic phenomena in his investigation of the Greek language of inscribed Roman letters and decrees. Most of his dissertation is devoted to providing text editions,<sup>18</sup> and his linguistic analysis covers aspects such as orthography, inflection, tenses, and cases. This also includes a one-page discussion of formulae in the letters.<sup>19</sup> Viereck focuses on explaining the Roman use of Greek through comparisons with evidence from Greek literature and epigraphy, using contemporaneous material whenever possible. Despite his work being generally well-executed, there are issues with his analysis. Viereck focused on errors in the Greek, and tended only to praise linguistic features when they were similar to Classical Attic literature, rather than giving equal attention to features which are most like more comparable, postclassical documentary Greek.<sup>20</sup> Secondly, the scope of Viereck’s analysis is perhaps too broad for a short dissertation: the range of linguistic features in the letters *and* decrees is discussed in 31 A5 pages, with each feature regularly being confined to less than one page, which is not extensive enough to analyse the multifaceted phenomena presented by such linguistic material.<sup>21</sup>

There are more serious problems with Viereck’s analysis. He does not relate linguistic features in one text to earlier and later examples in the corpus, and individual letters containing such examples are not contextualized in relation to their counterparts. There is also no synthesis of all the information: Viereck offers short discussions of elements of the Greek, but there is no attempt to explore the relationship between these phenomena. Since Viereck’s work offers little discussion of the formulaic expressions in the letters, and lacks

---

<sup>17</sup> Lafoscade provides a short discussion of formulaic expressions at ‘De Epistulis’, 63–66, but only four of his letters fall within our time period (Lafoscade, ‘De Epistulis’, 1, nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4), all of which are found in Sherk, *RDGE*, and 3 are also in Viereck.

<sup>18</sup> Comprising 54 of 116 A5 pages. This is most likely because, for Viereck to discuss these documents as a corpus, he would have needed to collate and present the texts himself.

<sup>19</sup> Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 74, s.v. ‘epistularum formulae’.

<sup>20</sup> Examples can be seen at Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 78 (discussing letters of Augustus): ‘Maxime vero studium veteris sermonis Atticorum cognoscitur’ and ‘veterem Atticorum sermonem imitatus est’.

<sup>21</sup> The issues with brevity are exacerbated when one is investigating the letters, since the 31 page section is also devoted to the language of *senatus consulta* and 6 of the 31 pages do not discuss the letters.

consideration of temporal contextualisation and a synthesis of information, his work is not extensive enough to be authoritative on the subject.

### **Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East*—**

Sherk focused intently on establishing dates for the Roman inscriptions and contextualising each text within the wider *historical* context, while providing short discussions of the role of such official documents in the Roman world. He achieved these goals, with his work on dating and historical contextualisation being of high quality. In the introductory sections to the documents, Sherk also provides short discussions of their language and occasionally elaborates on particular features of some documents in short commentaries.

Sherk's linguistic analysis improved upon Viereck's by consistently relating his discussions back to the historical context and considering influences from this context on linguistic features in a letter.<sup>22</sup> He also addressed the linguistic features which he discusses in more detail, although discussing far fewer features than Viereck. However, Sherk perpetuated some of the less productive aspects of Viereck's linguistic analysis: he focuses on errors and classicising elements, devotes little significance to fundamental linguistic features which are applied correctly, and provides no discussion of the diachronic distribution of linguistic features of the letters.

Like Viereck, Sherk focused his linguistic analysis on the 'best' and 'worst' elements of the language, but, unlike Viereck, Sherk focused only on the evidence presented in the letters which he deemed to be 'best' and 'worst' overall.<sup>23</sup> This limits his conclusions on two fronts: (1) he judges each letter's overall language on their 'best' and 'worst' features, ignoring information presented in more fundamental linguistic aspects; and (2), the entire corpus is judged on the 'best' and 'worst' features of the 'best' and 'worst' texts, leaving aside the range of information provided by the other letters. After presenting this selection, and acknowledging the range of circumstances which may have influenced their creation,

---

<sup>22</sup> The section 'Language of the letters' is at Sherk, *RDGE*, 197–209.

<sup>23</sup> While Viereck does not discuss the language of each of his letters in extensive detail, he briefly discusses all 8 letters in his section on Epistulae, whereas Sherk only discussed the language of 8 letters directly and another 8 indirectly, leaving 53 of the 69 letters without discussion.

Sherk concludes that “[t]he form and the language are Greek. The spirit and the contents are Roman”, which epitomises his judgement of their language.<sup>24</sup>

When investigating the language of documentary texts from bilingual contexts it is important to consider the widest possible scope of the linguistic information in each text and to compare the data against the most relevant *comparanda*. Focussing on one aspect at the expense of another and comparing a feature in, say, a documentary text with a feature from a literary text alone, when there are more relevant texts available, will present skewed results. Errors must be contextualized alongside correct applications of linguistic features, and documentary evidence should be compared firstly with documentary texts from the same text type before seeking literary examples, which are of course important to such studies. Furthermore, conclusions on the language of a small corpus should incorporate information from all its texts.

Sherk discusses the epistolary formulae in more detail than non-epistolary formulae, and he advances upon Viereck by discussing the formulaic layout of the Roman letters. Sherk’s discussion of epistolary formulae covers greetings, health wishes, and farewells, identifying their main components and listing the texts with examples. Sherk is also conscious of establishing the link between Roman letters and their Hellenistic Greek counterparts, something which Viereck also does. While these elements of Sherk’s treatment are positive, what his discussion lacks is an in-depth exploration of the degree to which Roman practices adhere to Hellenistic conventions, and an elucidation of the significance of the Roman use of formulaic expressions. It is arguable that, for Sherk, formulaic expressions establish that the authors understood the text-type—he even states that it is evidence that the Romans learnt epistolography from the Greeks<sup>25</sup>—but he does not explore the significance of this.

The language of these letters is crucial for how we interpret official Roman epistolography in Greek, and we do not yet have a satisfactory treatment of their language. An investigation of formulaic expressions in these letters must consider all the letters in this limited corpus, seek relevant *comparanda* from documentary and literary evidence,<sup>26</sup> and

---

<sup>24</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 209. This kind of response to postclassical Greek text originating from a bilingual context is widespread, and can readily be found in discussions of the Greek of the Septuagint, see T.V. Evans, ‘Approaches to the Language of the Septuagint’, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 56, 1 (2005), esp. 25–27.

<sup>25</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 197.

<sup>26</sup> The merits of considering both documentary and literary evidence when investigating the language of letters is exemplified by H. Halla-aho, ‘Epistolary Latin’, Clackson (ed.), *Companion to the Latin Language*, 426–444.

elucidate the significance of how the Roman letters use this language, which has implications for our understanding of the history, epistolography, and languages of the Greco-Roman East.

### 0.3 – The Aims and Approach of this dissertation

I have four main aims: (1) to identify how formulaic expressions in official Roman letters inscribed in Greek were applied in respect to grammar and (2) in respect to the letter layout; (3) to ascertain whether the applications in the Roman letters conformed to or diverged from the contemporary Hellenistic practices; and (4) to more clearly define the source of the Greek of these letters and, if possible, identify evidence for how the Roman administration may have sought to project itself and their letters to Greek-speaking audiences.

I approach this investigation with a view to being more comprehensive than my predecessors, who tended to identify mistakes or literary touches, ignoring the fundamental features which were applied correctly. I assess every letter in the corpus, as well as every example of the formulaic expressions I will investigate (for which see §0.4 below). Recent scholarship, particularly in Latin philology, has emphasized the importance of not simply listing perceived ‘mistakes’; instead we must seek explanations for such occurrences.<sup>27</sup> I consider the linguistic evidence presented in the rest of the letter, as well as looking outside of the Roman corpus to relevant material to contextualize and define phenomena which occur. Philologists have also warned against counting mistakes and correct examples and extracting significance from the mere tallies.<sup>28</sup> Adams has stated however that, when working with a ‘coherent corpus’ (a collection of texts about which dates, authorship, provenance, and education level are known), significance can be gleaned from the quantity of occurrences if assessed properly.<sup>29</sup> Since my corpus (defined below) is not as ‘coherent’ as e.g. the Vindolanda tablets, but also not a random assortment of inscriptions, significance can be drawn from the quantity of occurrences of formulae and from the number of variations in the examples, but only once each occurrence has been explained and compared to relevant Hellenistic evidence.

---

<sup>27</sup> See esp. Adams’ instructive remarks on misspellings, J.N. Adams, *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC – AD 600* (Cambridge, 2007) 624–635, and id., *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2013), 32–36.

<sup>28</sup> Adams, *Regional Diversification*, 6–7 and 624–626. J. Clackson, ‘Latin Inscriptions and Documents’, Clackson (ed.), *Companion to the Latin Language*, 38.

<sup>29</sup> Adams, *Regional Diversification*, 633–635. Clackson, ‘Latin Inscriptions and Documents’, 38.

I am conscious also that although my corpus comprises all extant examples of official Roman letters inscribed in Greek, it is but a portion of those which were inscribed, let alone sent, in antiquity. This is a common limitation for historical linguists.<sup>30</sup> My focus is on the language of these particular letters rather than using this corpus to investigate Koine Greek, therefore I confine my conclusions to the corpus and only make proposals about official Roman epistolography in Greek when the evidence is consistent. Due to the paucity of evidence it is necessary to clarify many conclusions, and a definitive answer will not often emerge at the exclusion of other possibilities; but it is better to present the data in this manner than to accept a handful of examples as evidence for some broader trend, which would present a false view of Roman epistolography in Greek.<sup>31</sup>

#### 0.4 – The corpora and the analysis

I investigate six types of formulaic expressions: (1) prescripts, (2) health wishes, (3) farewells, what I have termed (4) ‘Embassy formulae’ and (5) the ‘Benefaction formula’, and (6) filiation expressions, all of which are defined in their respective sections. The first five are epistolary formulae ((4) and (5) being specific to official letters) and the last involves formulaic expressions not restricted to letters. These expressions are important because they are formulaic in grammatical construction and in their application in the letter layout, requiring understanding of Koine Greek and its epistolography.

To conduct this investigation I compiled the published texts of all identifiable official Roman Republican letters inscribed in Greek as well as a selection of inscribed official Hellenistic letters, which I use as my ‘control’ corpus for comparing the Roman letters.<sup>32</sup> I analysed both corpora in a searchable document containing all the texts (collected in the

---

<sup>30</sup> I. Manolessou, ‘On historical linguistics, linguistic variation, and Medieval Greek’, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 32, 1 (2008), 64–68, see esp. 65: “Furthermore, the compilation of the corpus does not belong to the linguist, but to chance and fate, who decide which texts will be preserved, and to the philologist, who decides which of the preserved texts are worth publishing.”

<sup>31</sup> There is a similar sentiment, though relating to a different investigation, expressed by Adams, *Social Variation*, 23: “Many of our conclusions about the evidence for social variation and about possible location of change within lower sociolects will be negative, but I make no apology for that. A false view of the history of the language may develop from partial or over-positive presentation of the evidence”.

<sup>32</sup> I have accepted the readings of the editors or collators and reproduced their *apparatus critici* when these were provided. In the case of those texts compiled in Welles and Sherk, when I could find more recent editions I took these into consideration, listing any divergences I approved in an *apparatus* of my own.



Appendix).<sup>33</sup> The importance of a ‘control’ corpus in a study which assesses the language of texts originating from a bilingual context is that it provides an external point of reference which allows the Roman data to be contextualized, compared, and evaluated. It is critical to utilise the correct body of evidence against which the Roman letters are compared. In Evans’ 2010 article ‘Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri’, which makes good use of a ‘control’ corpus for assessing the language of Greek papyrus letters, he emphasizes the importance of applying a ‘control’ corpus constituted of ‘internal evidence’—that is, post-classical documentary texts should be compared first and foremost with other post-classical documentary texts, rather than with classical literature which is geographically, chronologically, and linguistically removed from the main corpus.<sup>34</sup> Prior scholarship has not always assessed the language of Roman letters in Greek against the most relevant *comparanda*, and for this reason a relevant ‘control’ is integral to this study. The primary point of comparison for this study must be from the text type of letters and from the medium of inscriptions, which must be relatively contemporaneous and expressed in Koine Greek. Further comparisons are drawn from Greek and Latin inscriptions, papyri, and literature.

Another methodological issue in the work of Viereck and Sherk is their tendency to isolate phenomena in the Roman letters and then seek a particular comparable example, whether it was literary, epigraphic, or papyrological. I differ from their method in considering each example in relation to the wider trends of the Roman corpus, and then comparing this evidence to the corresponding trends in the epigraphic ‘control’ evidence. Even when I find comparable evidence in inscriptions, I make a point to consider relevant papyrological and literary evidence to further contextualise the epigraphic evidence.

My Roman corpus consists of 64 official Roman Republican letters inscribed in Greek in the East, from our earliest extant example dating to *c.*197 BCE to the death of Augustus in 14 CE. The sufficient quantity of examples and the regularity of their chronological distribution allows for well-founded conclusions on the form and function of formulaic expressions in such official letters throughout the later Republic. The corpus consists of 50 letters from Sherk, *RDGE*, 13 listed in Ceccarelli, *AGLW* but not in Sherk, and a further letter

---

<sup>33</sup> For an example of the use of searchable text for historical linguistics of postclassical documentary evidence, see S.E. Porter and M.B. O’Donnell, ‘Building and Examining Linguistic Phenomena in a Corpus of Representative Papyri’, T.V. Evans and D.D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford, 2010), 287–295. Their scope is of course much wider than mine, and their corpus differs from mine in that it is a sample which they have selected.

<sup>34</sup> Evans, ‘Standard Koine’, 197–206 – discussion of the construction of a relevant ‘control’ occurs throughout.

not found in Ceccarelli.<sup>35</sup> The ‘control’ corpus consists of 126 inscribed Hellenistic letters made up of two sub-corpora; a ‘Royal’ sub-corpus consisting of 67 inscribed letters of Hellenistic kingdoms,<sup>36</sup> and a ‘Non-Royal’ corpus consisting of 59 inscribed letters which were sent between Hellenistic *poleis* or *koina*. This ‘control’ corpus is well-suited to this study, since it is comprised of Greek texts matching the Roman letters chronologically, geographically, linguistically, textually, and in terms of medium. The diversity of this ‘control’ corpus, comprised of one ‘Royal’ and one ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus, means that conclusions will be even more accurate than if the Roman letters were only compared with one of the Hellenistic letter-writing practices. The 67 letters comprising the ‘Royal’ corpus were collected from Welles, *RCHP*, and the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus of 59 inscribed letters of Hellenistic *poleis* and *koina* is from Ceccarelli.<sup>37</sup>

Scholarship on formulaic expressions in Greek and Roman epistolography has been considered when evaluating both corpora, and were of particular importance to Chapter 1, to which such work was most applicable. There are six important works either focusing on or incorporating substantial sections investigating formulaic expressions in Greek letters, that of Gerhard, Ziemann, Exler, Koskeniemi, White, and Buzón.<sup>38</sup> Alongside these, I consult in

---

<sup>35</sup> There were occasional texts which appear in Sherk and Ceccarelli which are excluded from my Roman corpus, as well as texts in Welles and Ceccarelli excluded from the ‘control’ corpus. These texts were excluded because they are too fragmentary to: (1) contribute data to my study of formulaic expressions; (2) be securely identified as a letter; and/or (3) be securely attributed to Rome rather than to a Hellenistic *polis/koinon* or kingdom. I have provided such texts for each corpus/sub-corpus under ‘List of Excluded Texts’ for reference in the Appendix. Regarding the letter not included by Ceccarelli, it was excluded presumably on the grounds that it comes from Tiberius; however, it is dated to 13CE (so, while Augustus was still alive and therefore before Tiberius became *princeps*) and thus falls within the Augustan Era.

<sup>36</sup> ‘Hellenistic kingdoms’ here refers to ‘Eastern kingdoms from the Hellenistic period’; the letters included in the ‘control’ corpus are all in Greek, but the kings in whose names they were sent did not need to be of Greek ethnicity.

<sup>37</sup> I am aware of the list of 147 inscribed Hellenistic royal letters of the Attalids and the Seleukids (some of which are also in Welles and therefore in my ‘Royal’ sub-corpus) which is provided in Bencivenni, ‘The King’s Words’, 141–171. However, since my ‘control’ corpus is comprised of sub-corpora which are comparable in size not only to one another but also to my Roman corpus, and the sample of 67 of the letters from Welles is evenly distributed, both geographically and chronologically, and accurately representative of the extant material (which itself is only a minute sample of the official letters sent in antiquity), there was no need to augment what is already an effective ‘control’ corpus.

<sup>38</sup> G.A. Gerhard, ‘Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Griechischen Briefes, I: Die Formel ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν’, *Philologus*, LXIV (1905), 27–65; F. Ziemann, ‘De Epistularum Graecarum Formulæ Sollemnibus Quaestiones Selectae’ (diss. Halle, 1910); F.J.X. Exler, ‘The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in

particular the works of Lanham, Cugusi, and Halla-aho, which have either focused on or incorporated substantial sections on formulaic expressions in Latin letters.<sup>39</sup>

I draw on Buzón most, especially in Chapter 1; his 1984 dissertation on the formulae and layout of Greek papyrus letters and documents in the Ptolemaic period is my main source of papyrological *comparanda*. Buzón's work is more useful than Exler's for the study of Ptolemaic papyri firstly because it examines a higher quantity of data from this period.<sup>40</sup> Exler assessed a much broader time period than Buzón—the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE<sup>41</sup>—which means that the majority of Exler's data post-dates my corpora. The amount of Exler's cited examples dating before 1 CE is 337, including those found in the same letter.<sup>42</sup> In contrast, Buzón draws on information found in 1,107 Ptolemaic letters.<sup>43</sup>

Another advance on earlier work made by Buzón is that previous works like Exler and Ziemann considered only the occurrence of a formula in a particular letter type, but did not take into account the significance of the letter types themselves and how this influences the formula, which Buzón endeavours to do from the outset.<sup>44</sup> This is helpful for my study, as it contextualizes the use of formulae within a sub-type of Greek epistolography. Buzón advances on his predecessors by summarizing at the end of each section the progression of the

---

Greek Epistolography' (diss. Catholic University of America, 1923); H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki, 1956); J.L. White, *The Body of the Greek Letter: A Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle* (Montana, 1972), and (focused on formulaic expressions to a lesser extent) id., *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia, 1986), 198–212; R. Buzón, 'Die Briefe der Ptolemäerzeit: Ihre Struktur und ihre Formeln' (diss. Heidelberg 1984).

<sup>39</sup> C.D. Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas in Latin Letters to 1200: Syntax, Style, and Theory* (Munich, 1975; repr. Oregon, 2004); P. Cugusi, *Evoluzione e Forme dell'Epistolografia Latina: Nella tarda Repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'Impero, con cenni Sull'Epistolografia Preciceroniana* (Roma, 1983), see 47–56 (opening formulae), and 56–64 (closing formulae); Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 43–63.

<sup>40</sup> There was naturally more published letters for Buzón to examine, working 61 years later than Exler.

<sup>41</sup> Exler, 'Form of the AG Letter', 13.

<sup>42</sup> See Exler, 'Form of the AG Letter', 24–60, 78–98, 103–132. The 337 quotations consists of 161 for opening conventions, 27 for dating formulae, and 149 for the letter body. He does not list specific examples of the simple farewell ἔρρωσο.

<sup>43</sup> See Buzón, 'Briefe', 1–4, 46–47, 87–98, 149–158. This originally consisted of 123 private letters, 64 letters of recommendation, 611 business letters, and 503 administrative letters, to a total of 1,301 letters, from which 194 were excluded as drafts or copies, or on account of damage (10 Private letters (see page 4), 11 Recommendations (47–48), 67 Business letters, (98–99), 106 Administrative letters (159)).

<sup>44</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', p. III.

formulae throughout each sub-type of letters.<sup>45</sup> He also includes an overarching summary, as does Exler, but Buzón's sets out the diachronic progression of formulae from the earliest examples of all Greek letters through to the end of his corpus, providing a deconstruction of each of his key formulae.

While my first point of comparison is always the epigraphic 'control' corpus, Buzón's papyrus letters can be used to contextualize and evaluate the epigraphic material, since his data are from documentary letters contemporaneous with nearly all of the 'control' evidence as well as most of the Roman corpus. One of the values of Buzón's work for my study is the size of his corpus, far exceeding both my corpora combined. This is useful for assessing the similarities between the smaller corpus of official letters and his larger corpus of private, recommendation, business, and administrative letters. This can allow for a visualisation of the relationship between official Greek letters and wider Hellenistic Greek epistolography, which facilitates well-founded conclusions on Roman practices.

## 0.5 – A note on Authorship

For many inscriptions in the ancient world it is difficult to identify the author or how many people were involved in the process from drafting to inscribing the text.<sup>46</sup> The official letters I investigate are all held to be sent from Rome,<sup>47</sup> but this does not address the question fully. For our letters, I identify four potential main parties who could have influenced their Greek: (1) the sender; (2) professional letter writers/draftsmen employed by the Roman administration; (3) the recipient; and (4) the stonecutter. The first three are most likely to be authors of such official inscriptions; (1) and (2) can collaborate or work separately, and (3) needs to be considered in cases where the Greek presents evidence of Latin influence, which could possibly indicate a translation. It is unlikely that (4) would be an author in this context, but stonecutters are a possible influence on the final product. This dissertation will not be a discussion of authorship or 'composition vs. translation', a question which would require more space than can be devoted to it here; moreover, we must first provide a thorough analysis of all aspects of the language of these letters before we can embark on such

<sup>45</sup> This includes his 'Grundformular'—the basic layout of the particular type of letter and the appropriate formulae for each section, as evidenced by his investigation.

<sup>46</sup> See J.N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003), 84–93, and Clackson, 'Latin Inscriptions and Documents', 36–38.

<sup>47</sup> Whenever I found a text which could not be securely ascribed to Rome beyond reasonable doubt, I have excluded it and listed it in the Appendix after each sub-corpus under 'List of Excluded Texts' for reference.

discussions.<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, I am investigating the proficiency of one aspect of the language of these letters, for it is the *language* and not the *authors* which has been understudied and criticized. For this purpose, it is irrelevant whether (1) or (2) was the author, and therefore any references to ‘authors’ of these documents refers to ‘authors in the Roman administration’, whether magistrates or employees is less pressing here because we have not properly analysed the language they used. The question of the recipient as translator will be briefly addressed in the Conclusion, once the data have been discussed; but, as we shall see, it is very likely that nearly all of our letters were not translated by their recipients. The rare occurrences of possible stonecutter intervention are addressed as necessary.

---

<sup>48</sup> Sherk provides only a cursory discussion on the question of composition vs. translation, Sherk, *RDGE*, 13–19 and 208–209, but cf. my critique, C.J. Haddad, ‘The Composition and Translation of Official Roman Letters inscribed in Greek’ (Hons. diss., Macquarie University, 2013), 16: “Sherk analyses the language of 17 of the 69 letters, making explicit judgements that 3 were composed and 7 were translated, but does not offer judgements on the other 59 letters and says little on the general process... Sherk defines those letters which are most proficient in Greek and least affected by Latinisms as ‘composed in Greek’, and defines as translations from Latin those that are least proficient and most affected, offering *RDGE* 65 as an example of the former and *RDGE* 48 an example of the latter. Sherk determines that the others “fall somewhere between these two points [between *RDGE* 65 and 48], for only a few are as good as the former or as bad as the latter,” and leaves the question, for the most part, unanswered.”



# Chapter 1

## Formulaic expressions in the Opening and Closure of the Letters

### 1.1 – Opening and Closing formulae and their significance for this study

The formulae used to open and close a letter were of special importance in ancient Greek and Roman epistolography. Along with fulfilling the role of greeting and wishing the addressee well, for the recipient such formulae serve the important purpose of defining a text as a letter.<sup>1</sup> Due to this role in establishing the text type for the audience, opening and closing formulae take on the further significance of illustrating to those reading that the author understood the text type. Applying such formulae correctly also requires a sufficient understanding of the language in use, so the application of such formulae has the added function of demonstrating the author's understanding of the language. The significance of the multifaceted function of formulaic language is captured by Halla-aho in her discussion of non-literary letters in Latin:

*“If the person writing a letter knew how to compose the opening and closing part according to current epistolographical custom, he will also have known the standard ways of expressing oneself in writing. In other words, knowledge of opening and closing phrases implies familiarity with letters as a text type, even if they were dictated to scribes.”*<sup>2</sup>

How the Roman administration applied formulaic language for the letter opening and closure is an important feature of their official epistolography in Greek, which is revealing of their understanding of the language and the text type.

This chapter will investigate three types of formulaic language which are applied at the beginning and end of Greek letters: (1) prescripts, (2) health wishes, and (3) farewell salutations. Evidence from the ‘control’ corpus will be presented and discussed in relation to

---

<sup>1</sup> Muir, *Life and Letters*, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 44.

contemporary papyrological evidence before the Roman data are analysed. All three of these expressions are ‘epistolary’, being the standard expressions used in ancient Greek letters. They are formulaic both in the manner in which they are constructed as well as their placement in the layout of the letter. Due to their importance to Greek epistolography, and standardized and often complex forms and functions, these expressions are revealing of not only the Roman administration’s understanding of the Greek language, its epistolography, and its intrinsic formulaic language, but also the manner in which the Romans sought to present their letters to Greek-speaking audiences.

## 1.2 – Prescripts and Greetings

The prescript is the address of the letter: it provides the name of the person who is sending the message and the name of the recipient, and either of these parties can be individuals as well as groups. In Greek, the most common manner in which to address a letter is by placing the name of the sender first in nominative case, the name of the recipient second in dative, and then the sender will regularly (but not always) add *χαίρειν* ‘greetings!’, in what will be referred to hereafter as the ‘standard address formula’: *ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν*.<sup>3</sup> This formula can be used by senders from a higher or lower social status than their recipient.<sup>4</sup> As will become clear from our data, it is conventional to use the standard formula in official

---

<sup>3</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’ provides an in-depth study of Greek prescripts in roughly contemporaneous documentary evidence is, on which I draw most. An earlier study, that of Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, had similar focus, but has been superseded by Buzón. An important discussion of this prescript is Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 253–258, who consults literary and documentary evidence. Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 148–151 focuses more on the place and uses of the greeting. For a short discussion of the standard formula in inscribed official letters in Greek see M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* (Rome, 1969; repr. 1995), 108–109. I will note a selection of the range of works which touch upon greeting formulae and note the standard formula: Ceccarelli, *AGLW*, 1, with more extensive discussion at 89–99; H-J. Klauck, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament*, English trans. by D.P. Bailey (Texas, 2006), 17–19; Muir, *Life and Letters*, 1–5; S.K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1986), 20; M.B. Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology with Translation* (Cambridge, 2003), 34–35. White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 198–203.

<sup>4</sup> Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 253; Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 62.



letters.<sup>5</sup> The components of the address could be found in different orders,<sup>6</sup> with the order τῷ δεῖνι ὁ δεῖνα χαίρειν often being characteristic of petitions.<sup>7</sup>

Occasionally, in the literary sources as well as the epigraphic, we find prescripts with the word λέγει ‘s/he says’, without a greeting, as λέγει τόδε/ὧδε ‘says the following/speaks in this way’, but also extremely rarely as χαίρειν λέγει ‘says ‘greetings!’’.<sup>8</sup> This has been attributed to an association with messengers—the messenger would presumably have reported that his client ‘says’ (λέγει) to the addressee “greetings!” (χαίρειν)—here the infinitive χαίρειν depends on λέγει in an indirect command construction, with the original statement being the Imperative χαῖρε/χαίρετε ‘greetings!’<sup>9</sup> Regardless of whether this was the case, we do have an example of χαίρειν being governed by ἐπέστειλε.<sup>10</sup> However, from an early stage addresses with χαίρειν solely became standard.

The standard Latin address in this period is: (A) the sender in nominative case (*Gaius*), (B) the greeting (*s.d.* = *salutem dicit*), and (C) the recipient in dative (*Gaio*), though the order could vary.<sup>11</sup> It is used as the standard Latin equivalent for the conventional Greek

<sup>5</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 189. Cf. also very briefly Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 74.

<sup>6</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 239; Muir, *Life and Letters*, 2–3; Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 34–35; White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 198; Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 253.

<sup>7</sup> Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 259–261; Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 23, 60–61, 65–67; Muir, *Life and Letters*, 2–3; White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 198; cf. also Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 100 and 159.

<sup>8</sup> Gerhard, ‘Die Formel’, 27–65 (for a detailed discussion of the grammatical explanations for the standard formula, see 27–38, esp. 30–34 for discussion of greetings with λέγει). For λέγει ὧδε and the origins of the Greek address, drawing from the evidence in Herodotos, M. van den Hout, ‘Studies in Early Greek Letter-Writing’, *Mnemosyne*, 2, 1 (1949), 29–33. For discussion of the evolution of Greek address formulae more generally see Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 155–158. For an example of λέγει in a greeting in an inscribed letter see Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, 108.

<sup>9</sup> Gerhard, ‘Die Formel’, 29–30 and 51–57; van den Hout, ‘Early Greek Letter-Writing’, 29–32; Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 155–158. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, 108. Imperative χαῖρε/χαίρετε as a salutation was in place early on, and is found in Homer as a greeting: to someone who has arrived – *Iliad*, 1.334: “χαίρετε, κήρυκες...”; *Iliad*, 9.197: “χαίρετον· ἦ φίλοι ἄνδρες ἰκάνετον...”; *Odyssey*, 1.123: “Χαῖρε, ξεῖνε...”; to a lesser extent, *Odys.*, 13.228–229; by someone who has arrived – *Odys.*, 20.199: “χαῖρε, πάτερ ὦ ξεῖνε...”; to a lesser extent, *Odys.*, 24.400–402.

<sup>10</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> III 1259, the letter of Mnesiergos, which has χαίρεν καὶ ὑγιαίνεν governed by ἐπέστειλε.

<sup>11</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 48 with examples; Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas*, 17–18 with examples. Cf. also Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 44–45.

address, and the word of greeting could be omitted in Latin letters perhaps more frequently than in Greek.<sup>12</sup>

I have identified examples of the standard address formula by assessing the completeness of their three components: (1) the sender in nominative case, (2) the addressee in dative, and (3) the greeting. For an address to be included in the data as a full example of the standard formula, all three components needed to be represented by at least one complete word. For this purpose articles were deemed as acceptable as nouns unless the stone was extensively damaged. In the Figures I have listed separately addresses which have some letters in a component lost or uncertain. If a whole component was completely lost it received a separate listing too, with another section for examples with two components lost. Addresses with two components lost were only included if component (3) (χαίρειν) was completely preserved and the rest of the text allowed it to be identified as the letter opening.

### 1.3 – Prescripts and Greetings in the ‘control’ evidence

Beginning with the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus, 44 of the 67 ‘Royal’ letters were complete enough to identify a letter opening, but 23 have lost this section. There are 25 full examples of the standard formula, and the other 19 letters all presented damaged versions of the standard formula, consisting of 7 with one component partially damaged, 3 with one component lost, 3 with only χαίρειν preserved, and 6 which were more extensively damaged.<sup>13</sup>

The use of the formula is consistent in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus, both temporally and geographically, and also in form. The word order of the addresses conforms to the standard convention without deviation in all identifiable cases. All 25 of the full examples had the standard word order, and the complete sections of the damaged examples either demonstrated that they were in the standard word order, or, in more damaged examples, did not present any evidence to the contrary. The only form used as a greeting is the infinitive χαίρειν, and there is always a greeting when the section is intact.

The formula is evenly distributed temporally throughout the sub-corpus: the earliest full example—**2**—is dated to *c.*306 BCE and the latest—**66**—is from 88/87 BCE. The latest

<sup>12</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 48.

<sup>13</sup> See Figure 1.1. The extensively damaged examples are *IOLHRC* **6** (which has the recipient preserved followed by χαίρει[v]), **8** (which has only part of the sender), **27** (which has part of the sender, the recipient is preserved, and χαί[ρειν]), **55** (which has fragments of all three components), **64** (which has the recipient preserved), and **65** (which has the recipient and [χαί]ρειν).

letter in the corpus—**67**—dated to 21 CE, has the standard formula with  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon[\iota\nu]$ . There is no evidence to suggest that the geographical distribution of the kingdoms affected the expression of the address: for example, letters **2** and **66** mentioned above are not only separated by over 200 years, but **2** is from Antigonos I of Macedon and **66** is from Mithridates of Pontus. Since it is used by the various kingdoms throughout all stages of the corpus, we must conclude that the standard formula was the conventional address in official Hellenistic Royal correspondence.

Of the 59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters in the corpus, 51 were complete enough for the letter opening to be identified, but 7 were lost and 1 letter<sup>14</sup> only survives in excerpts of its body embedded in a decree. There are 31 full examples of the standard formula, and 20 other letters all provide enough information to identify an address: 3 have one component partially damaged, 7 have one component lost, 1 has only  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\iota\nu$ , and 9 were more extensively damaged.<sup>15</sup> Again, the standard formula is used consistently in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus. All 31 full examples of the standard address are in the conventional word order, while the 20 damaged letters either provided evidence that they would have been standard or presented no evidence of variation. The word of greeting is always  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\iota\nu$  by itself.<sup>16</sup>

The standard formula is used diachronically in the sub-corpus: the earliest full example is in **2** (242 BCE), while **59** (30–25 BCE) has the latest example. Geographical separation has had little effect on how the *poleis* and *koina* constructed their addresses: e.g. letters **2** and **59** were sent by Phaistos on Krete and the Dorian *koinon* respectively. These two letters also illustrate that addresses by *poleis* and *koina* in the sub-corpus are no different.

The ‘control’ data also conform to the norms presented in the Ptolemaic letters. Buzón found 908 examples of the standard formula in 1,107 letters: 53 in 113 Private letters, 35 in 53 Recommendation letters, 471 in 544 Business letters, and 349 in 397 Administrative

<sup>14</sup> *IOLHPK 50*.

<sup>15</sup> See Figure 1.2. The extensively damaged examples are *IOLHPK 17* (which has the recipient preserved), **18** (which has the sender and article of the recipient), **21** (which has fragments of the sender, the recipient is preserved, and  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\iota\nu$ ), **25** (which has fragments of the sender and recipient), **30** (which has  $[\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\iota\nu]$ ), **44** (which has the sender and  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon[\iota\nu]$ ), **45** (which has fragments of the sender, and the recipient is present), **47** (which has the article and most of the noun of the sender), and **53** (which has the sender and  $[\chi]\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\iota\nu$ ).

<sup>16</sup> There are occasional orthographic variations:  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\mu$  (with <ε> for <ει>, and ends in μ due to assimilation of the word final ν to a word initial labial π) in *IOLHPK 24*; and  $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varrho\epsilon\nu$  (with <ε> for <ει>) in **36** and **37**. Cf. Gignac, *Phonology*, 261–2, who notes that such orthographic changes are also found in papyrological evidence before nasals, as we have here. See also Mayser, *Grammatik*, I<sup>2</sup> 1, 41–44, 54–58.

letters,<sup>17</sup> as well as 45 examples of the standard formula with a variation.<sup>18</sup> There were 63 letters too damaged for a prescript.<sup>19</sup> The standard formula occurs regularly in all types of letters from the earliest to the latest examples in Buzón's Ptolemaic corpus.<sup>20</sup>

Since all the evidence shows that the standard formula was consistently used in regular form despite the temporal and geographical separation of the authors, we must conclude that it was the conventional manner in which the represented Hellenistic *poleis* and *koina* opened their letters. Furthermore, since both sub-corpora agree and mirror the practices found in the Ptolemaic papyri, we must also conclude that the standard formula was conventional for the Hellenistic kingdoms, states, and *koina* in their official epistolography.

#### 1.4 – Prescripts and Greetings in the Roman letters – Standard Addresses

There is more diversity to the prescripts of the Roman letters than in the 'control' corpus. The most common by far is the standard formula, but there are some variations, and there is also an alternative formula. The letter opening could be identified in 46 of our 64 Roman letters, but it was lost in 18 letters. Of the 46 preserved cases there are 26 full examples of the standard formula and another full example with ἐρρωσθαι added. There were 13 damaged examples of the standard formula; 5 with one component damaged, another 5 with one

<sup>17</sup> The total of examples for the Private letters is explicitly mentioned (Buzón, 'Briefe', 5), that of the Recommendation letters is implied (49: "Alle Empfehlungsbriefe bis auf Brief Nr.45 haben das Präskript, sieht von den in diesem Teil beschädigten und deswegen nicht in Betracht zu ziehenden Brifen Nr. 28, 36 und 55 ab." With Buzón Recom. nos. 2, 8, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, and 41 being excluded (see pages 47–48). The Business and Administrative letters were calculated in this way: in 544 Business letters, 31 are damaged (99), 1 is a draft without prescript (99), 1 is an ostrakon with no prescript (99), 7 letters have the order τῷ δεῖνι ὁ δεῖνα χαίρειν (100), 2 letters are without the sender mentioned (100), 9 are without a greeting (100), and 13 are without a sender or greeting (100), and 9 have a variant greeting with a second infinitive (102)); in 397 Administrative letters, 10 are damaged (159), 1 has τῷ δεῖνι ὁ δεῖνα χαίρειν (159), 3 are without the sender's name (160), 12 are without a greeting (160), 3 have πολλά χαίρειν (163), and 19 have a variant greeting with a second infinitive (163)).

<sup>18</sup> There were 11 in the Private letters (Buzón, 'Briefe', 17–18, comprised of 9 with χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρωσθαι and 2 with χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν), 3 in the Recommendation letters (2 χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρωσθαι, 1 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν (see page 50)), 9 in the Business letters (8 χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρωσθαι, 1 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν (107)), and 22 in the Administrative letters (3 with πολλά χαίρειν, 15 χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρωσθαι, 4 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν (163 and 165–166)). For χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> III 1259.

<sup>19</sup> These are made up of 19 damaged Private letters (Buzón, 'Briefe', 5), 3 Recommendation letters (see page 49), 31 Business letters (99), and 10 Administrative letters (159).

<sup>20</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 239.

component lost, and 3 were more extensively damaged.<sup>21</sup> There is no word of greeting with the standard address in **61**, our only example in both corpora.

The use of the standard formula has an even temporal distribution throughout the corpus: our earliest full example is in **1** (197–194 BCE), the latest is in **60** (5 CE). The most recent letter in the corpus—**64**—preserves a damaged example of the standard formula from 13 CE. Although there are variations, it is the dominant opening address in the corpus, found in various states of completion in 41 of the 46 letters with an identifiable opening. This conforms to the data from the ‘control’ corpus as well as that from Buzón.

With regard to the variant forms, the address ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρωσθαι appearing in **40** is not found in the ‘control’ corpus. Sherk referred to this greeting as ‘unusual’,<sup>22</sup> but it is found in the Ptolemaic papyri, though in far fewer numbers than the standard formula: in 1,107 letters, 63 of which are without an extant letter opening, Buzón found the standard formula 908 times; the variant with ἐρρωσθαι occurs 34 times.<sup>23</sup> Alongside this variant, Buzón found 7 examples of χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν and 3 examples of πόλλα χαίρειν.<sup>24</sup> There is no obvious pattern in the distribution of the ἐρρωσθαι variant, with 9 examples in 113 Buzón’s Private letters, 2 in 53 Recommendations, 8 in 544 Business letters, and 15 in 397 Administrative letters; what these quantities indicate is that it was not unacceptable in these letter types, though it was uncommon. This distribution seems to be in line with that of the Roman corpus; it appears in 1/46 or 2.2% of the Roman letters with openings extant and in 34/1107 or 3.1% of the Ptolemaic letters. Although this form is mostly

<sup>21</sup> See Figure 1.7 The extensively damaged examples are *ORRLIG 7* (which has part of the sender and all the recipient preserved), **8** (which has the sender preserved and part of the recipient), and **11** (which has the sender and [χαί]ρειν).

<sup>22</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 190, presumably ‘unusual’ in comparison to the Hellenistic Royal letters.

<sup>23</sup> Buzón found 9 examples of χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρωσθαι in 113 Private letters (Priv. nos. 90, 100, 108, 109, 111, 113, 118, 119, and 120); it is found twice in 53 Recommendation letters (Recom. nos. 61 and 64); there were 8 examples in 544 Business letters (Bus. nos. 473, 571, 574, 594, 600, 601, 602, and 605); and in 397 Administrative letters there are 15 examples (Admin. nos. 349, 414, 416, 427, 435, 442, 444, 448, 467, 469, 473, 477, 482, 487, and 498). For discussion of this variant of the formula, see Buzón, ‘Briefe’, (Private letters) 8–9 and 17–18, cf. also 32–35; (Recommendations) 50 and 53, cf. also 78–79; (Business letters) 107, (mentioned at 102 and 117 n.13), cf. also 119–135; (Administrative Letters) 163 and 165–166, cf. 176–188. See also 239 and 244 n.4 for general discussion.

<sup>24</sup> There were 2 variations with χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν in the Private letters (Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 17–18), 1 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν in the Recommendation letters (see page 50), 1 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν in the Business letters (107), and 3 variations with πόλλα χαίρειν and 4 with χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν in the Administrative letters (163 and 165–166). For χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> III 1259.

found in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, the Roman example is not without temporal *comparanda*. Dating to 45 BCE, it compares to the latest example in the Recommendation and Administrative letters respectively—Recom. no. 64 from 51 BCE and Admin. no. 605 from 1 BCE.<sup>25</sup>

Buzón explains this variation as a merger of the prescript and the ‘initial health wish’ which characteristically employs a form of the verb ἐρρωσθαι.<sup>26</sup> However, as Buzón notes, the employment of two infinitives as a greeting is not unprecedented in Greek epistolography: it is found in as early as the letter of Mnesiergos from the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE, which begins Μνησιέργος ἐπέστειλε τοῖς οἴκοι χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν.<sup>27</sup> Although greetings with two infinitives are not found in extant evidence until the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century,<sup>28</sup> their early attestation suggests perhaps these may not have been mergers of the greeting and health wish, but simply variations with a second word of greeting. While they were not overly common, prescripts with two infinitives were completely acceptable and do not appear to be confined to either private or more formal letters.

It seems fair to attribute the use of this variant in our Roman letter to a degree of familiarity with Greek epistolography. This is more likely than the variant being a Roman invention which happened to coincide with a long established variation of the standard formula. If we accept that it does reflect a familiarity with Greek epistolography, it would also indicate an author with confidence in his abilities.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 9 and 240.

<sup>26</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 239. The same view is held by White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 200, Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, 109, and Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 64 – “This formula seems to be a development of the opening phrase combined with the initial salutation or health wish. We have noticed its occurrence between ten and twenty times; all practically during the late Ptolemaic period. It was used in both familiar and official letters.” see 32 for examples. Cf. also Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 317–320. The health wish is discussed in this dissertation at §1.7 below.

<sup>27</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> III 1259 (my emphasis), cf. Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 240, cf. also 8. The variant with ὑγιαίνειν was also still in use in 4 of the Ptolemaic letters, where he notes that it is ‘striking’ (auffällig) that ἐρρωσθαι prevailed despite ὑγιαίνειν being present from the earliest stages.

<sup>28</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 238. White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 200 and n.48 with exx.

<sup>29</sup> The sender is Caesar as dictator; having studied oratory at Rhodes (Plutarch, *Caesar*, 3.1) and being noted to have a knowledge of Greek literature (cf. Kaimio, *Romans and the Greek Language*, 130–131 for a collection of references), he presumably knew Greek well, assuming of course that he wrote the letter himself. If he did not write it himself, as dictator it is very likely (though unknowable) that he had someone in his employ who knew Greek epistolography.

Regarding the absence of *χαίρειν* in **61**, this is not uncommon in either Greek or Roman epistolography, despite not being found in the ‘control’ evidence. Buzón notes that it happens occasionally in the Ptolemaic letters—in 1/53 Recommendations, 22/544 Business letters, and 12/397 Administrative letters—and that there is little significance in its absence.<sup>30</sup> For Latin letters, Cugusi does not devote much significance to prescripts without greetings, saying simply that in official letters words of greeting are often omitted.<sup>31</sup> The omission of a word of greeting is often taken to be characteristic of official letters, but sometimes it is subsequently ascribed to rulers being unwilling to lower themselves to greeting recipients: the oft-quoted example is Alexander dropping *χαίρειν* except to his closest confidants after he had secured supremacy.<sup>32</sup> While the Ptolemaic papyrological examples could reflect that the more official letter types may allow more opportunities for the omission of a greeting, it does not seem likely that **61** is an example of Roman arrogance, but rather a simple example of the author electing to leave out the greeting, which was acceptable in contemporaneous Greek and Latin epistolography. Though only two lines of the letter are extant, it does not seem that the greeting was left out through a lack of knowledge of Greek or its epistolography: the

<sup>30</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 239: “Die Umstellung der Reihenfolge erscheint zwar in einigen wenigen Fällen (sc. the order ὁ δεῖναι τῷ δεῖναι χαίρειν), **muß aber als eine individuelle Eigenheit des Absenders angesehen werden. Das gleiche gilt für das Fehlen des Namens des Absenders, des Großes χαίρειν oder von beidem zusammen, was gelegentlich vorkommt**, sowie für die Ersetzungen und Zusätze zu den Namen des Absenders und des Adressaten” (my emphasis). For the individual letters without greetings, see 49 (Recommendations), 100 (Business), and 160 (Administrative). Cf. also Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 64, who notes that it is “very rare”, appearing in only one of the private letters in his corpus.

<sup>31</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 48: “La formula di saluto, quando è usata (ma spesso è omessa), è *s.d.*” *s.d.* = *salutem dicit*.

<sup>32</sup> Plutarch, *Phocion*, 17.10: ὁ γοῦν Δοῦρις εἴρηκεν, ὡς μέγας γενόμενος καὶ Δαρείου κρατήσας ἀφείλε τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τὸ χαίρειν, πλὴν ἐν ὅσαις ἔγραφε Φωκίωνι· τοῦτον δὲ μόνον ὥσπερ Ἀντίπατρον μετὰ τοῦ χαίρειν προσηγόρευε. Cf. Muir, perhaps reading too much into this, *Life and Letters*, 3: “It was not done to leave out the formalities (sc. a greeting) and send a bare message when a proper letter was expected; that was the prerogative of autocrats. Alexander the Great, with his designs on the Persian empire accomplished and self-importance to match, is said to have decided to drop ‘Greetings’ from his correspondence, reserving the word for letters to two close associates, Antipater and Phocion, who alone, he felt, deserved the familiarity.” cf. also Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 35, who takes a similar view, but less pronounced, noting that greetings are left out “mainly in business and official correspondence” but does not quote a documentary example, though he touches on the Alexander case in n.144.

address is standard and we have a characteristically Greek expression of filiation.<sup>33</sup> Viewed in this light, the omission of the greeting may even reflect the author's confidence with the text type, understanding that doing so was acceptable.

### 1.5 – Prescripts and Greetings in the Roman letters – Χαίρειν λέγει Addresses

We have discussed the use of the standard formula and its variants in the Roman corpus, but 4/46 letters have an alternative formula. These 4 letters present, in various stages of completion, an address formula with the components: (A) the sender in nominative case, (B) the greeting (χαίρειν λέγει), and (C) the recipient in dative. While Sherk saw this as simply an expansion of the standard formula,<sup>34</sup> it is more complicated than this and needs to be explained through examination of Greek and Latin prescripts.

An early example of a Greek letter in Herodotos presents a letter opening with λέγει ὦδε.<sup>35</sup> There is also a similar example in a letter of Darius I (preserved in a later inscribed copy) which has λέγει τάδε.<sup>36</sup> However, prescripts with λέγει were abandoned at an early stage.<sup>37</sup> Conversely, the χαίρειν λέγει address in our letters is not otherwise attested,<sup>38</sup> except for 2 examples from Apollonios Dyskolos (writing 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE) in discussions of the syntactical role of the infinitive χαίρειν in prescripts, where he concludes that λέγει is

<sup>33</sup> *ORRIG* 61, 1.2: Ἀρτεμίδωρος Δημητρίου Παπᾶς. Greek filiation is most commonly expressed through the person's name in the case required by the clause, followed by their parent's name in Genitive, as we see here. Filiation is discussed later at §2.8.

<sup>34</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 190: "Simple χαίρειν is sometimes expanded to χαίρειν λέγει...and it is then placed before the name of the city and the various magistrates." Sherk is not alone in seeing χαίρειν λέγει as the expanded or more correct form of χαίρειν, cf. e.g. Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas*, 14–15; others note λέγει as understood, e.g. Ceccarelli, *AGLW*, 92 and Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 34.

<sup>35</sup> Herodotos, 3.40.1: Ἀμασις Πολυκράτει ὦδε λέγει. cf. Gerhard, 'Die Formel', 29–30 and 51–57; van den Hout, 'Early Greek Letter-Writing', 29–32; Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 155–158. Also, cf. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, p.108.

<sup>36</sup> Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, 108. The text is *IMagn.* 115 (also at Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca*, 106)

<sup>37</sup> It is possible that as letters became disassociated with messengers and emphasis was placed on the letter body, written in 1<sup>st</sup> person, that the 3<sup>rd</sup> person verb was abandoned, cf. van den Hout, 'Early Greek Letter-Writing', 31–32.

<sup>38</sup> There are no examples in the 'control' evidence, none in the Ptolemaic papyri or Exler's corpus (ending 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE), there are no examples of "χαίρειν λέγει" or *vice versa* in the documentary papyri on the Duke Databank, and the TLG shows there are only 2 literary passages where these two words co-occur and χαίρειν is being used in its epistolary function, those mentioned from Apollonios Dyskolos.



understood (ὑπακουόμενον).<sup>39</sup> We therefore should seek further explanation of χαίρειν λέγει in these Roman letters rather than immediately concluding that it is a continuation of an early precedent set somewhere between Herodotos and Mnesiergos.<sup>40</sup> We need to consider evidence from Latin epistolography.

As mentioned above, the standard Latin address in this period (with varying word order) is: (A) sender in nominative, (B) the greeting (*s.d.* = *salutem dicit*), and (C) recipient in dative.<sup>41</sup> Alongside examples in literature, there are 7 examples of the unabbreviated *salutem dicit/dicunt* in inscribed Imperial letters.<sup>42</sup> We also have an abbreviated Republican example, since 53 has a Latin version. The Latin address in 53 reads: *Vinicius proc(onsul) s.d. mag(istratibus) Cumas*, where *s.d.* is almost certainly *s(alutem) d(icit)*.<sup>43</sup> The Greek version reads: Οὐνίκιος χαίρειν λέγει ἄρχουσι Κυμαίων. Clearly the standard Latin address and the address in 53 have three corresponding components in the same order. From here one

<sup>39</sup> Apollonios Dyskolos, *On Syntax*, 3.64–66 ‘On the infinitive χαίρειν in letter addresses’, esp. 3.65: οὐ δυναμένου οὖν τοῦ τοιούτου παραλαμβάνεσθαι ἀνάγκη πᾶσα εἰς τὸ γενικὸν ἀπαρέμφρατον μεταλαμβάνεσθαι τὴν σύνταξιν, συνηθέστερον ὑπακουομένης τῆς συντάξεως τῆς λέγει ἢ εὐχεται, Τρύφων Θέωνι λέγει χαίρειν, (my emphasis). 3.77: εἵπομεν γὰρ ὡς τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀπαρεμφάτοις ὑπακουόμενόν ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ λέγει ἢ εὐχεται, Διονυσίῳ Ἀπολλώνιος λέγει χαίρειν ἢ εὐχεται (my emphasis). Cf. Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 268, and Ceccarelli, *AGLW*, 89–99.

<sup>40</sup> In discussion of variation in Medieval Greek, Manolessou makes three points on defining a variant: we must be sure that it is not an error by conducting synchronic cross-referencing of relevant material, there should not be a large gap between the supposed first attestation and the later form (meaning that e.g. χαίρειν λέγει in our letters is very unlikely to be a continuation of addresses with λέγει in Herodotos), and lastly we should consider the geographical displacement of the attestations, see Manolessou, ‘On historical linguistics, linguistic variation, and Medieval Greek’, 77–78.

<sup>41</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 48 with examples; Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas*, 17–18 with examples. Cf. also Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 44–45.

<sup>42</sup> *CIL* 2-5, 871, ll.1–6 (Vespasian); *CIL* 10, 8038, l.3 (Vespasian); *CIL* A-2-4, 1052, ll.2–3 (Vespasian); *CIL* 9 5420 (p. 687), l.5 (Domitian); *CIL* 2-5 1322, ll.1–2 (Antoninus Pius); *ZPE* 145, 266 l.5 (Galerius *et al.*); *CIL* 06, 40776, ll.1–10 (Constantine).

<sup>43</sup> Although Sherk expands *d.* as *d(at)*, *d(icit)* is almost certainly a better reading. Aside from the fact that the oldest example of a letter opening in Latin literature has *salutem dicit* (Plautus, *Persa*, l.501: ‘*salutem dicit Toxilo Timarchides*’. The section is a letter being read aloud by one of the characters), we have strong evidence from the inscribed letters of the *principes*, see n.42 above. Furthermore, a search on the Epigraphische Datenbank Clauss-Slaby for ‘salutem dat’ and *vice versa* returns 0 entries. The abbreviation *s.d.* is not treated in the lists of Latin epigraphic abbreviations in J.E. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy: An Introduction to the Latin Inscriptions of the Roman World* (Chicago, 1974), see esp. 308–309, and A.E. Gordon, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley, 1983), see esp. 222–224.

might conclude that *χαίρειν λέγει* is a literal translation of *s.d.* in our corpus; but this is not a 1:1 correspondence, we must look closer.

It seems that Plautus preserves the earliest example of *salutem dicit*, and if *Persa* is indeed modelled on a Greek antecedent, as seems very likely, this may be the earliest example of *s.d.* for *χαίρειν*.<sup>44</sup> Lanham has observed that, while *χαίρειν* and *salutem* are *equivalent* letter greetings in Greek and Latin, they are not one another's *literal* translation. She found that the Christian writers tend to use *salutem* as the standard Latin equivalent of *χαίρειν*, but concludes that *salutem* is not a "slavish rendering" of *χαίρειν* since *salutem* is an accusative noun,<sup>45</sup> whereas *χαίρειν* is an accusative verbal noun. There seems to be some value in this point: if we had such a mechanical rendering, it would probably be something like *saluere dicit*. For our purposes we can observe that if an author conveying *s.d.* into Greek used *χαίρειν λέγει*, this would not be a literal translation. We need therefore to seek further information.

We should consider the other linguistic evidence provided in the letters. Working chronologically, **9** is a very short letter with a *senatus consultum* (*SC*) appended. The consistent verb final word order after the prescript is characteristic of Latin (especially the Latin of official documents)<sup>46</sup> as well as Roman documents in Greek under pressure from

<sup>44</sup> Plautus, *Persa*, l.501. The existence of a Greek antecedent seems to be a given for Woytek in his commentary on *Persa*, cf. E. Woytek, *T. Maccius Plautus: Persa: Einleitung, Text, und Kommentar* (Vienna, 1982), 6: "Als das zentrale Problem, das der *Persa* der Plautusphilologie aufgibt, muß seit nunmehr bald neunzig Jahren die Datierung **des griechischen Originals** angesprochen werden" (my emphasis). There appears to be no recent Anglophone commentary on the *Persa*, but Nixon suspects that it had a Greek original, P. Nixon, *Plautus*, III (Massachusetts, 1924; repr. 1963), p. x. There is of course the possibility that the unknown Greek original could have had *χαίρειν λέγει* and not *χαίρειν* solely.

<sup>45</sup> Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas*, 18–22, esp. 21.

<sup>46</sup> Clackson, Horrocks, *Latin Language*, 150 (discussing *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 586): "...the regular placing of verbs in final position in their clauses, a key feature of official Latin seen also in *SCB* [i.e. *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 581]". See K.M. Coleman, 'Bureaucratic language in the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 142, 2 (2012), 228–229 for this convention in the official letters of Trajan and Pliny. For Latin word order in general and the conception of it being predominantly 'Subject-Object-Verb' in sequence, see, among others: A.M. Devine, L.D. Stephens, *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information* (Oxford, 2006), esp. 145–216; B. Frischer, et al., 'Word-Order Transference between Latin and Greek: The Relative Position of the Accusative Object and the Governing Verb in Cassius Dio and other Greek and Roman Prose Authors', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 99 (1999), 357–390. For Greek word order, especially that the verb can be placed in more of a variety of positions than Latin, see, among others: K.J. Dover, *Greek Word Order*, (Cambridge, 1960; repr. London, 2000), esp. 25–31; H. Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek*, (J.C.

Latin practices<sup>47</sup>) and examples of ‘full asyndeton’ where there is apparently no formal or stylistic reason for omitting connective particles.<sup>48</sup> The whole letter body consists of one formula, apparently of Roman invention.<sup>49</sup> The absence of a farewell with the text leading straight into the *SC*, though perfectly acceptable,<sup>50</sup> suggests that the letter was written with more thought to function than style, possibly alongside a Latin original and almost certainly with Latin conventions in mind. The appended document could have drawn focus away from the letter, the author taking more care with its composition expecting it to be the audience’s main concern: we can see that early inscribed Latin letters with appended documents do little more than announce the magistrates and the decision, without any typical epistolary phraseology.<sup>51</sup> The author of this text may have been following the Roman precedent of providing only a short preface to the document. This being said, the letter is intelligible.

Both **32** and **33** are quite damaged. The first is badly preserved, but originally only three lines long, followed immediately by a *SC*. It is possible that it was composed under similar circumstances to **9**, though the damage makes it difficult to know. Although damaged **33** would have been a long letter. We can see that there is intrinsically Roman filiation applied to a Greek name.<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, we can identify 7 connective particles despite the poor state of preservation.<sup>53</sup> This combination of evidence could reflect an author who was well-enough acquainted with Greek language to write a long letter, but perhaps not so well-acquainted with its formulaic expressions, defaulting to Latin practices without considering Greek idiom.

---

Geiben, 1995), 11; D. Matic, ‘Topic, focus, and discourse structure: Ancient Greek Word Order’, *Studies in Language*, 27, 3 (2003), 573–663.

<sup>47</sup> Horrocks, *Greek*, 143.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. revised by K.J. Dover (Oxford, 1950; repr. London, 1996), xliii: “As a general rule, Greek sentences, clause, phrases, and single words are linked by a connecting particle to what precedes. Connexion is, on the whole, not often omitted in verse, still less often in prose.” Also, J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, (Oxford, 1952; repr. London, 1997), 99. For ‘full asyndeton’ (omission of a connective particle at a heavy stop), with *exx.*, see Denniston, *Greek Prose Style*, 109–123. For the importance of particles in Hellenistic prose, despite their general decline in usage, see J. Blomqvist, *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose*, (Lund, 1969), 19 and 132–147.

<sup>49</sup> This is the ‘Roman embassy formula’, discussed at §2.4.

<sup>50</sup> Farewell salutations are discussed below at §1.10.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 581 ll.1–3 and *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 586 l.1.

<sup>52</sup> *ORRLIG* **33** l.2: Μιχαῖς Μιχαῖ υἱός. This is characteristic of Roman filiation practices with *filius* after the parent’s name in genitive case. Filiation is discussed in detail at §2.8.

<sup>53</sup> Clause connectives: δέ Col.I l.2; τε Col.I ll.6, 15, 18, 25. Sentence connectives, δέ Col.I ll.20, Col.II l.1.

Only 5 lines of **53** survive, but there are some interesting features in the extant material. We have characteristically Greek filiation, made even more significant as the corresponding Latin has characteristically Roman filiation, showing that the author was not mechanically translating.<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, alongside another possible example of Greek filiation, we have Latin *ab* + ablative expressing agency correctly rendered by Greek ὑπό + genitive.<sup>55</sup> The author is clearly thinking about the requirements of the respective languages in both versions.

Although it may never be fully known why the χαίρειν λέγει greeting has been used in these 4 letters, we can draw some conclusions. The chronological spread, ranging from the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century (**9**) to late 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE (**53**), suggests that the most likely constant influence is official Latin document writing. This need not indicate mindless translation, but rather pressure from Latin practices. Our earliest examples of official Latin epigraphy already show strong uniformity and the expression of official texts would remain homogeneous for centuries into the Empire.<sup>56</sup> It is hard to know if the letters had Latin originals, but what is important is the pressure of Latin conventions. Sherck felt that the *senatus consulta* in Greek must have been official translations produced in Rome, but he says nothing of the composition or translation of their cover-letters.<sup>57</sup> What is more important than whether the letters were composed or translated is understanding that whether the author composed or translated they would be constrained by the conventions of official Roman document writing,

<sup>54</sup> *ORRLIG 53* (Latin) ll.12–13: *Apollonides | L.f. No[race(us)]*, **53** (Greek) ll.23–24: Ἀ[πολλωνίδ]ης Λευκίου Νωρακεῖος.

<sup>55</sup> *ORRLIG 53* (Latin) l.14: *ab Lusia Diogenis f.*, **53** (Greek) l.26: ὑπὸ Λυσίου τοῦ Διογένοϋς [---]. Although Διογένοϋς is followed immediately by a lacuna (meaning we cannot know if υἱός followed), it is preceded by the definite article, commonly found in Greek filiation expressions.

<sup>56</sup> Clackson, Horrocks, *Latin Language*, 142–143, and esp. 148: “The rigid format of these documents [sc. early *senatus consulta* (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 581 and *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 586)] is eloquent testimony to an already lengthy tradition of such official writing, and indeed to the rigorous training of the senatorial draftsmen who prepared them.”

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Sherck, *RDGE*, 13, echoed by S. McElduff, *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*, (London, 2013), 31–32. Cf. in consideration of the composition and translation of the letters, Haddad, ‘Composition and Translation’, 76: “One problem with a dichotomy between composition and translation is both processes frequently overlap. Each letter presents new challenges; for example, when encountering new terminology or expressions, whether an author is composing or translating the letter is of little importance, since the author will have to rely on their skills to convey this new information, and may draw on composition and translation techniques equally. Furthermore, what distinguishes ‘bad’ compositions from ‘bad’ translations, and is this even necessary? The most important factor is how effectively the information was conveyed”.

which seems to be the main influence on these χαίρειν λέγει letters.<sup>58</sup> It seems quite likely that χαίρειν λέγει, a divergence from the standard formula, was inserted purposefully into these letter openings: instead of calquing *s.d.*, the authors elected to use χαίρειν λέγει, which is perfectly intelligible, even logical, but not idiomatic Greek. It seems likely that the use of χαίρειν λέγει results from Latin interference on authors who either overthought the prescript or did not devote enough attention to it. The former is probably the case in **53**, possibly in **33** too, and the latter probably explains **9** and **32**.

## 1.6 – Observations on the two Address Formulae in the Roman letters

With regard to the use of both the standard and the χαίρειν λέγει formula in the Roman corpus, the evidence for both formulae reflects at times intimate understanding of Greek epistolography but also authors who put thought into their work. That 41 of the 46 letters with extant openings presented, in various states of preservation, an example of the standard address formula or an acceptable variant speaks highly of Roman epistolography in Greek. It entirely conforms to the data from the ‘control’ corpus as well as the Ptolemaic papyrus letters. That there are 4 letters with an alternative address with χαίρειν λέγει, which, although not standard, is not illogical in light of Greek or Roman epistolography, does not detract from this view. At times this alternative seems to indicate a tendency on the part of the authors to reflect on their task and the languages with which they worked; unfortunately it resulted in an unidiomatic use of Greek, but an understandable one. Thus far the Roman letters have been shown to conform to the standards of Koine Greek epistolography in the vast majority, illustrating the importance which the authors of Roman letters placed on formulaic expressions.

## 1.7 – Health Wishes

Health wishes, as the name suggests, allow the sender to express their wish for the well-being of the recipient.<sup>59</sup> When included in Greek letters, they normally follow the greeting directly

---

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, 470–471, discussing the translation of idiom and word order in Roman texts in Greek and the explanation that the translators were incompetent in Greek, Adams states: “It is far more likely that the translators deliberately stuck (or were instructed to do so) as closely as possible to the wording of the originals, in disregard of the nature of Greek idiom.”

<sup>59</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 9; Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 138; Muir, *Life and Letters*, 3; Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 35; White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 200–202.

(*formula valetudinis initialis*) or immediately precede the farewell (*formula valetudinis finalis*).<sup>60</sup> Occasionally the sender will mention their health,<sup>61</sup> and will often state that their own wellbeing hinges on the recipient's. 'Health wish' henceforth refers to the initial formula, as the final formula is not found in our corpora.

The health wish generally consists of two parts<sup>62</sup>: one referring to the recipient is the protasis of a condition with εἰ, to the effect of 'if you are well...', then followed by an apodosis with ἄν '...it would be good'; if a third clause follows referring to the sender it is a direct statement, usually 'and I myself am well'. Buzón lists two versions of the health wish which are found throughout the Ptolemaic letters:<sup>63</sup> (1) εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εἴη ἄν, ὥς..., ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός and (2) εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ (καλῶς) ἂν ἔχοι, ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός. These occur mainly in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century Ptolemaic letters but continue into the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE.<sup>64</sup> We find them in inscribed official Greek letters from the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century and in their Roman counterparts from the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE.<sup>65</sup> Health wishes were formulaic but not completely rigid; the order of clauses could change,<sup>66</sup> and the author could customize the wish for particular recipients or situations.<sup>67</sup> Epistolary convention did not require a health wish in every letter, when they were used however, they needed to be applied in a roughly conventional form. Health wishes carry an intrinsically personal quality more suited to private correspondence, and this is surely why they are rare in official letters.<sup>68</sup>

Latin epistolography had a health wish which is, in the simplest form, *si vales, bene est* 'if you are well, it is good' and could also be expanded by adding *ego (quidem) valeo*.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 240–241 (*formula valetudinis initialis*), 242–243 (*formula valetudinis finalis*); Ziemann, 'De epistularum', 302–313 (*formula valetudinis initialis*), 313–317 (*formula valetudinis finalis*).

<sup>61</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 9; Muir, *Life and Letters*, 3; Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 35.

<sup>62</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 9.

<sup>63</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', for (1) 10, and for (2) 13. Exler, 'Form of the AG Letter', 106–107; Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 131, 133; Ziemann, 'De epistularum', 305–313.

<sup>64</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 241.

<sup>65</sup> Welles, *RCHP*, 291. Sherk, *RDGE*, 190 (Referring to both Hellenistic Royal and Roman letters). Both examples in the 'Non-Royal' corpus (not considered in Sherk) are from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

<sup>66</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 9.

<sup>67</sup> For example, if the sender knew the recipient to be sick, a simple wish for health may be inappropriate, and could be replaced by an expression of concern for the recipient, cf. White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 201.

<sup>68</sup> Buzón, 'Briefe', 241, in reference to administrative letters, which are essentially of the same character as official letters; Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 131; Sherk, *RDGE*, 190; Welles, *RCHP*, 248: "The health-wish is an established convention of private correspondence, but it is rare in the royal letters."

<sup>69</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 48; Halla-aho, *Non-Literary Latin Letters*, 45.

The resemblance to the Greek is clear,<sup>70</sup> and it seems likely that the Romans made the Greek practice their own, with one main difference being that the apodosis is not hypothetical, but a statement of fact. We may have an early example of Roman epistolography borrowing this formula from Greek practices in Plautus' *Persa*.<sup>71</sup> The Romans made good use of this formula, even in their official letters,<sup>72</sup> where we have more Roman epigraphic examples than contemporaneous Greek ones. The Romans also experimented with Greek health wishes and created a distinctly Roman version.

### 1.8 – Health wishes in the ‘control’ evidence

Due to health wishes being comprised of many words, several of our examples are damaged, but the lengthiness of health wishes allows us to identify them easily. Nevertheless, many complete examples have been found.

As was mentioned above, due to their personal quality health wishes are mostly found in private correspondence.<sup>73</sup> The ‘control’ evidence reflects this. While 21/67 ‘Royal’ letters were too damaged at this point to record data and 1 did not have this section provided in the edition, 45/67 could be examined and 44 of these presented clear results.<sup>74</sup> Of these 44 letters, 39 had no health wish. However, there were 3 completely preserved examples of εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ γὰρ δὲ ὑγίαινον,<sup>75</sup> 1 damaged version of the more extensive εἰ ἔρρωσαι, ἔχοι ἂν ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός,<sup>76</sup> and 1 more complete and extended version

<sup>70</sup> Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 131: “Bekanntlich hat sie eine beinahe wortgetreue Entsprechung in dem lateinischen *si uales, bene est, ego ualeo*.” Cf. also Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 305, and Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 106

<sup>71</sup> Plautus, *Persa*, ll.502–503: ‘*si ualetis, gaudeo. ego ualeo recte*’. For the Greek antecedent see n.44 above.

<sup>72</sup> A brief discussion is offered in Sherk, *RDGE*, 190. Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 74–75 does little more than mention the health wish and offer *comparanda*. A valuable discussion of the example in *ORRLIG* 45 is found at J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, (London, 1982), 45.

<sup>73</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 241, in reference to administrative letters, which are essentially of the same character as official letters; Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 131; Sherk, *RDGE*, 190. Cf. Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 45, who found only two health wishes in her corpus, Vindon. 52.2 and *CEL* 10.1.

<sup>74</sup> The remaining letter was *IOLHRC* 64, which had at ll.3–(4?): [---εἴη ἂν] ὥς βούλομαι[θα---]. Although it seems quite likely to have been a health wish the damage is too extensive to be sure.

<sup>75</sup> *IOLHRC* 52, ll.1–2 has: εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ | ἂν ἔχοι· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ γὰρ.

<sup>76</sup> The first 3 words are lost, *IOLHRC* 54, ll.1–2: [εἰ ἔρρωσαι, ἔχοι] | ἂν ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός.

of this, with εἴη instead of ἔχου.<sup>77</sup> Of the 5 examples 4 are dated between 182 and 156 BCE and were written by either Eumenes II or Attalos II to the priest Attis, with whom they appear to have been on good terms.<sup>78</sup> The remaining example from 109 BCE is from an Antiokhos to Ptolemaios IX, and the health wish was probably incorporated because both contenders fighting for control of the Seleukid realm were also vying for Ptolemaic favour.<sup>79</sup>

There were 11/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters where this section was damaged, 1 with this section not quoted in the ancient text, and 3 where the edition did not provide it, leaving 44/59 letters which were examinable for health wishes. Of these, 42 have no health wish. The 2 examples of health wishes consisted of 1 damaged example of εἰ ἔρρωσαι, ἔχου ἂν ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός, and 1 complete example of εἰ ἔρωσθε [*sic*], τὸ δέον ἂν εἴη, καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν, both from the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE.<sup>80</sup> The need for a health wish was probably felt in **40** due to the common ancestry of both parties, and in **51** on account of services rendered.<sup>81</sup>

We can conclude that it was most common for the author not to apply health wishes in the ‘control’ letters, with 81/88 having none. This conforms completely to the data from the Ptolemaic Administrative letters—our most applicable parallel for our official letters regarding health wishes, in which they seldom occur—with 5 examples in 397 letters.<sup>82</sup> This

<sup>77</sup> *IOLHRC* **63**, ll.2–3 is an extended version: εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εἴη ἂν ὥς βου[λόμ]ε[θα]· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν καὶ σοὶ ἐμνημομένομεν | [φιλοστ]όργως. **64**, ll.3–(4?) with: [---εἴη ἂν] ὥς βουλόμε[θα]--- seems very likely to have been a health wish of this kind, but it is not included in the data.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. the comments of Welles, *RCHP*, 246–247. *IOLHRC* **49** Eumenes II to Attis priest of Cybele – 182 BCE, **51** Attalos to Attis priest of Cybele – between 163 and 159 BCE, **52** Attalos to Attis priest of Cybele – between 163 and 159 BCE, **54** Attalos II (after his ascension to the crown) to Attis priest of Cybele – between 158 and 156 BCE.

<sup>79</sup> *IOLHRC* **63** Antiokhos VIII (IX?) to Ptolemaios IX Alexander – 109 BCE. For discussion of the military and political situation, see Welles, *RCHP*, 290–291.

<sup>80</sup> *IOLHPK* **40** Tyre to Delphi – 125 BCE, **51** – The *strategoi* of Lampsakos to the magistrates of Thasos – 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE

<sup>81</sup> Cf. *IOLHPK* **40**, ll.1–3: Τύρου τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου ἡ β[ουλ]ῆ | καὶ ὁ δῆμος Δελφῶν τῇ | βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ **τοῖς συγγε** | [έσιν χαίρειν---] (my emphasis), and **51**, ll.4–6: Τῶν γεγονότων || φιλανθρωπῶπων παρ’ ἡμῖν τῷ πολίτῃ ὑμῶν | Διονυσοδώρῳ Πεμπίδου κτλ.

<sup>82</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 163: “Die formula valetudinis initialis ist kein regelmäßiger Bestandteil der Verwaltungsbrieife, sondern kommt nur in Ausnahmefällen vor. Wir finden sie in fünf der 397 behandelten Briefe.” It is used once by the King and 3 times by senior officials, cf. 165. The 5<sup>th</sup> letter is too damaged to know the sender’s identity. The Business letters, 102, are closer to the Administrative with 49/544, but the Private letters with 62/113, p.9, and Recommendations with 18/53, 51, are not comparable.



shows that the use of health wishes in our ‘control’ letters is representative of the practices of the official sub-type. When health wishes are used, it is because of affection or to foster goodwill. They are found mostly in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE but continue into the 1<sup>st</sup> in the ‘control’ evidence, which also conforms to the Ptolemaic evidence.<sup>83</sup> The ‘control’ health wishes regularly apply the same basic components and variations, which fit the standard models.

## 1.9 – Health wishes in the Roman letters

The use of the health wish in the Roman letters is similar to the ‘control’ evidence. Of our 64 letters, 20 have lost this section through damage and 5 were not provided in the edition. Of the remaining 38 letters, 29 (76.6%) have no health wish; this is similar but noticeably less than the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus which has 88.7% without health wishes, and quite different to the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus which has 95.5%.

The other 10 letters present 9 certain health wishes, as well as 1 extensively damaged example which had to be excluded; this is more than the entire ‘control’ corpus. One of these health wishes is the simplest form: εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι.<sup>84</sup> The remaining 8, however, have augmented a standard Greek version by adding a distinctly Roman feature—a mention of the wellbeing of the sender and their army. The distinctly Roman addition is either: ...ὕγιαίνω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ‘and I myself *am* well with the army’ or: ...καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὕγιαίνων ‘and I myself *was* well with the army’, using the epistolary imperfect. The earliest example of a reference to the health of the Roman commander and their army is found in a Letaeian decree honouring Marcus Annius.<sup>85</sup> The earliest example from an official Roman letter is in Cicero.<sup>86</sup> It became a feature of Imperial epistolography which was important enough for Dio to notice that Hadrian, on account of

<sup>83</sup> The earliest is Buzón Admin. no. 18 from 258 BCE, Buzón, ‘Bie Briefe der Ptolemäerzeit.’, 150, and the latest is Buzón Admin. no. 382 from 116 BCE, 156.

<sup>84</sup> ORRLIG 41, 1.2 has: εἰ ἔρρω[σθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι. ---]. That this is a health wish is very likely, but how elaborate it would have been is impossible to know, so it is listed under ‘εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι’ and excluded from the data.

<sup>85</sup> SIG<sup>3</sup> 700, ll.41–43: ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτάς, οἵτινες πορευθέντες πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι παρὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ συνχαρύντες | ἐπὶ τῷ ὑγιαίνειν αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον κτλ., keenly spotted by Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 45.

<sup>86</sup> Cicero, *Ad Familiares*, 5.2.1: *si tu exercitusque ualeatis benest*, cf. also *Ad Fam.*, 5.7.1: *S.T.E.Q.V.B.E.*, which is apparently the abbreviated form of this health wish (Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 45).

severe losses in Iudaea, omitted it in a letter to the Senate.<sup>87</sup> It endured at least to Constantine in inscribed Latin letters,<sup>88</sup> and is even found in the correspondence of the Byzantine emperor Anastasius (r. 491-518 CE).<sup>89</sup> In our letters there are 2 complete and 1 damaged example of the first version,<sup>90</sup> and there are 4 clear examples of the latter in varying degrees of completion.<sup>91</sup> The final example appears to be a damaged variation of the second version.<sup>92</sup>

One example should be addressed. Sherck believed that **44** had an abbreviated form of the distinctly Roman health wish—...χαίρειν. καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος [ὑγιαίνων]—the greeting moves straight into the reference of the sender without εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι.<sup>93</sup> However, this ‘abbreviation’ results in a floating clause connected to nothing: ‘...greetings. And I myself was also well with the army’, which makes little sense. Evans has shown for 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE Greek papyrus letters of educated writers that it is standard practice not to employ a connective particle linking the letter body to the greeting.<sup>94</sup> We have no other examples where a connective follows the greeting in our corpus. If the author wanted to abbreviate the health wish, they should have removed δέ (καί is adverbial here). There is

<sup>87</sup> Cassius Dio, LXIX 14.4: πολλοὶ μέντοι ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τούτῳ καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀπώλοντο· διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἀδριανὸς γράφων πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν οὐκ ἐχρήσατο τῷ προοιμίῳ τῷ συνήθει τοῖς αὐτοκράτορσιν, ὅτι “εἰ αὐτοὶ τε καὶ οἱ παῖδες ὑμῶν ὑγιαίνετε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα ὑγιαίνομεν.” (my emphasis). Cf. A.R. Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, (London, 1997; repr. 2009), 272.

<sup>88</sup> CIL 6, 40776 ll.1–12: *Imp(erator) Caes(ar) Fl(avius) Constantinus* [...] *senatui suo salutem dicunt si vos liberique | vestri valetis bene est nos exercitusque | nostri valemus*... (my emphasis); Corcoran, ‘State Correspondence in the Roman Empire’, 193.

<sup>89</sup> *Collectio Avellana*, 113.1: *Si uos liberique uestri ualetis, bene est; ego exercitusque meus ualemus*. see Corcoran, ‘State Correspondence in the Roman Empire’, 193.

<sup>90</sup> The damaged example is *ORRLIG* **52**, ll.8–9: εἰ ἔρρω[σθε κ]αλῶς ἂν | [ἔχοι, καὶ γὰρ δὲ με]τὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγια[ί]νω.

<sup>91</sup> These are: *ORRLIG* **44**, l.4(–5?): καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος || [ὑγιαίνων]; **49**, ll.4–6: εἰ ἔρρωσθε καλλῶς ἂν ἔχοι· ν καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τ[οῦ] | στρατεύματος ὑγιαίνων; **50**, ll.75–76: εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύ[ματος ὑγί]αίνων; **51**, ll.86–87: εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς | [ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ] αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγιαίνων.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. *ORRLIG* **38**, l.3: [εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς ἂν] ἔχοι· καὶ γὰρ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύ[ματος ὑγί]αίνων.

<sup>93</sup> Sherck, *RDGE*, 190, citing as an *comparandum* **40**, ll.8–9: καὶ γ[ὰρ δὲ] μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγιαίνων] but the damage is far too extensive to be sure that this is an example. I have listed this under ‘Entirely Lost’ on the table.

<sup>94</sup> Evans, ‘Standard Koine’, 197–206, see esp. 201: “It becomes clear that it is regular to have no particle linking the body of the text to the greeting formula. And this is precisely what we should expect. Greeting and letter-body are discrete elements of the text” and 204.

the possibility that the expression including its particles had become fossilized<sup>95</sup> and the author overlooked it when they lifted out this clause, but it seems unlikely that an author employing a greeting, farewell, health wish, and another connective particle used correctly,<sup>96</sup> would have abbreviated in this way.

Although Koskeniemi believed that similar examples in papyri were the result of authors feeling it ‘onerous’ to write out the full formula,<sup>97</sup> it seems much more likely here that a section has been omitted—whether by the writer or stonecutter is unknowable. As early as Mnesiergos’ letter, we can see that when the clause referring to the sender is attached to the greeting, the greeting contains 2 infinitives.<sup>98</sup> This suggests that if **44** were an abbreviated form the greeting would be *χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι*; therefore it seems most likely that either part of the greeting or the first section of the health wish has been omitted, but if it is an abbreviation the connective has probably been retained through the fossilization of the expression.

The earliest inscribed Roman example of a health wish—**35** (73 BCE)—is much later than the ‘control’ examples, and the other 8 examples occur between 48 and 29 BCE. It seems likely that the prevalence of its counterpart in Latin letters led to its reintroduction to Roman letters in Greek. Like the ‘control’ letters, the Roman letters do not apply the health wish without cause, in all cases the sender and recipient seem to be on good terms. The first health wish was sent by the two consuls of the year announcing a decision on tax-exemption, the second was from Caesar returning a decree of friendship, and the remaining 7 come from Octavian.<sup>99</sup> Octavian seems to be on very good terms with Rhosos, referring to it as ‘holy, inviolate, and free’ in all 3 letters,<sup>100</sup> and two of these mention Seleukos, a Rhosian who

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Evans, ‘Standard Koine’, 204.

<sup>96</sup> *ORRLIG* **44**, ll.5–6: [---τ]ὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα ἐξελήφθη ἐκ στήλης ἐκ τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ Καπετωλίου | [ἄπερ ἀξιῶ] καταχωρίσαι εἰς τὰ παρ’ ὑμῖν δημόσια γράμματα. πέμψατε **δε** καὶ ἀντίγραφον κτλ. (my emphasis).

<sup>97</sup> Koskeniemi, *Studien*, 131–132.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> III 1259, ll.1–4: Μνησίεργος | ἐπέστειλε τοῖς οἴκοι | χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν· | καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως ἔφασκε [κ]ε [ἔχεν].

<sup>99</sup> **35**, Varro and Cassius to the Oropians – 73 BCE; **38**, Caesar to Mytilene – 48–47 BCE; **44**, Octavian to Rhosos – 42–34 BCE; **45**, Octavian to the Plarasians and Aphrodisians – 40–38 BCE; **48**, Octavian to Ephesos – 38 BCE; **49**, Octavian to the Mylasians – 31 BCE; **50**, Octavian to Rhosos – 31 BCE; **51**, Octavian to Rhosos – 30 BCE; **52**, Octavian to Ephesos – 29 BCE.

<sup>100</sup> *ORRLIG* **44**, ll.3–4; **50**, l.74; **51**, l.86.

earlier served as Octavian's admiral and later as an ambassador to him,<sup>101</sup> and appears to be of close acquaintance. The use of the health wish in Octavian's letters to Mylasa and Ephesos after they were ravaged by Labienus (who fought against Octavian with the Liberators) is an expression of friendship, but it would likely have been received as a kind gesture, as the importance of health would have been very real for them at that time. Ephesos later votes a decree to Octavian, and receives a reply with a health wish. The letter to the Plarasians and Aphrodisians is similar to the rest, Octavian granting privileges and expressing his fondness for their ambassador.

This evidence shows that the Roman administration used the health wish correctly in their letters, and chose the appropriate situations to apply it. It seems likely that Octavian, who uses it most, understood the gravity behind the health wish. The use of the health wish to Mylasa and Ephesos after their trials may show keen understanding of its function, and he surely understood its power to consolidate friendships and alliances after a turbulent period. The reference to the wellbeing of the army may well have assumed the new function of fostering faith in Roman protection, perhaps explaining the use of present tense ὑγιαίνω in 3 letters. All of the Roman examples come in letters from individuals (or a pair of individuals) to groups, which is the result of Roman government and its system of bestowing power upon individuals, but it also reflects the respective political situations: the pair is the two consuls in 73, the later individuals are Caesar and Octavian.

The distinctly Roman addition to the health wish demonstrates two important features of their epistolography. It shows a willingness to experiment with and personalize a Greek epistolary convention, which reflects a confidence in their epistolography in Greek. While this addition seems to have developed in Latin letters after being inspired by Greek practices, to make the transition back into their letters in Greek meant that the authors must have felt confident that they would be able to apply it grammatically and in the overall letter layout, but also that it would have been acceptable to the recipient as a feature of an official letter. The development and implementation of this health wish in Greek is an example of the proficiency and confidence with which the Roman administration applied epistolary formulae in Greek.

---

<sup>101</sup> *ORRLIG* 51, ll.87–91.

## 1.10 – Farewell Salutations

Farewell salutations both wish the recipient well after the message is conveyed and conclude the letter in doing so.<sup>102</sup> In Greek they are normally short and there are two main 2<sup>nd</sup> person imperatival forms used: (sg./pl.) ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε ‘farewell!’ and εὐτύχει/εὐτυχεῖτε ‘be fortunate!’ Ἐρρωσο is the standard farewell in private as well as official letters, and is used long before and after the chronology of our corpora: some early examples can be seen in Xenophon, Isocrates, and Philip II.<sup>103</sup> Εὐτύχει is used in a similar manner, but it is often used to stress the sender’s affection or concern for the recipient or their supplication to them, and is generally seen as a feature of petitions.<sup>104</sup> There is an early example in a letter of Philip II.<sup>105</sup> Just as a word of greeting can be omitted, so too could a farewell, without disrespect to the recipient or reflecting poorly upon the author,<sup>106</sup> and the earliest Greek letters tend not to have

<sup>102</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 25; Ceccarelli, *AGLW*, 1; Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 69; Koskenniemi, *Studien*, 151; Muir, *Life and Letters*, 1–2, 3; Sherck, *RDGE*, 197; Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 35; Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 75; Welles, *RCHP*, p. xxxix; White, *Light from Ancient Letters*, 198.

<sup>103</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 25; Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 69; Koskenniemi, *Studien*, 151. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 4.5.33: (Cyrus to Cyaxares) ἡμεῖς δὲ πειρασόμεθα παρεῖναι, ὅταν τάχιστα διαπραξώμεθα ἃ σοί τ’ ἂν καὶ ἡμῖν νομιζόμεν προαχθέντα κοινὰ γένεσθαι ἀγαθὰ. ἔρρωσο. Isocrates, *Epistula 7 (Ad Timotheum)* (Hercher (ed.), *EG*) 13.7: Ἐρρωσο, κἄν του δέη τῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν, ἐπίστελλε. Philip II, *Epistula 4* (Hercher (ed.), *EG*) (to the Athenian *boule*): ἔρρωσθε. Unlike χαίρειν from χαῖρε/χαίρετε, ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε is not found as a valediction in Homer, which uses χαῖρε/χαίρετε as a farewell: to someone leaving – *Odyssey*, 5.204–205: “οὐτῷ δὲ οἰκόνδε φίλῃν ἐς πατρῖδα γαῖαν αὐτίκα νῦν ἐθέλεις ἰέναι; σὺ δὲ χαῖρε καὶ ἔμπης.”; cf. *Odys.*, 15.151–152; by someone leaving – *Odys.*, 13.59–61: “Χαῖρέ μοι, ᾧ βασίλεια,...|...| αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ νέομαι.”; cf. *Odys.*, 13.39.

<sup>104</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 25–26; Exler, ‘Form of the AG Letter’, 71–73; Koskenniemi, *Studien*, 151, 153–154 for the affectionate quality (“ein philophronetisches Element”) of farewells.

<sup>105</sup> Philip II, *Epistula 3* (Hercher (ed.), *EG*) (to the Athenian *boule*): διόπερ τά τε νῦν καταχθέντα πλοῖα πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ, ἐὰν βούλησθε μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν τοῖς προεστηκόσιν ὑμῶν κακοήθως πολιτεύεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπιτιμᾶτε, πειράσομαι κἀγὼ διαφυλάττειν τὴν εἰρήνην. εὐτυχεῖτε.

<sup>106</sup> See especially Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 26, who rejects Ziemann’s judgement that the omission of the farewell was a sign of low intelligence (Ziemann, ‘De epistularum’, 360: “Pleraeque illarum epistularum scriptae sunt ab hominibus ineruditis, qui vel clausulam adicere obliviscebatur vel formularum epistolicarum non satis erant periti.”), and concludes, after citing examples of letters without farewells by well-educated authors, that: “Wir müssen annehmen, daß auch in anderen Fällen ohne erkennbaren Grund gelegentlich der Abschiedsgruß fehlen kann.”

farewell salutations.<sup>107</sup> This being said, papyrus letters in our period regularly have farewells.<sup>108</sup>

Although more elaborate versions exist, the standard Latin farewell is *uale* ‘farewell!’<sup>109</sup> *Vale/ualete* is similar to ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε, both meaning essentially ‘be in good health’, and they are standard equivalents. Just as with Greek farewells, Latin letters often omitted them, especially official letters.<sup>110</sup>

### 1.11 – Farewell Salutations in the ‘control’ evidence

Beginning with the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus, 40 of the 67 letters had their closing section preserved, with 27 being entirely lost. ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε is the only farewell used in the ‘Royal’ letters, with 9 examples of ἔρρωσο and 18 of ἔρρωσθε. Of the 9 examples of ἔρρωσο, the address or the text of 7 of them showed that the recipient was singular,<sup>111</sup> and the recipient was shown in the same way to be plural for 17/18 letters with ἔρρωσθε.<sup>112</sup> There were also 1 damaged ἔρρωσθε and another damaged farewell, most likely ἔρρωσ[θε].<sup>113</sup> It seems certain that the farewell in the other 3 letters was in the number relevant to the recipient. From this we learn that farewells in the ‘Royal’ letters were used according to the number of the recipient, showing that they were considered to a certain degree and not attached to the end of the letter without thought. The earliest example comes from 311 BCE, and there are regular attestations up to the latest example, dating between 163–159; with

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Letter of Akhillodoros (550–500 BCE) *SEG* 26, 845; Letter of Apatorios (c.500 BCE) *SEG* 48, 1012; Letter of Mnesiergos (4<sup>th</sup> century BCE) *SIG*<sup>3</sup> III 1259.

<sup>108</sup> See T.V. Evans, ‘Valedictory ἔρρωσο in Zenon Archive Letters from Hierokles’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 153 (2005), 157–158.

<sup>109</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 56–57; Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 52.

<sup>110</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 57: “Nelle lettere ufficiali mancano spesso i saluti,…”

<sup>111</sup> The preserved address made this clear in *IOLHRC* 9, 10, 11, 31, and 51. Forms in 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular made this clear in *IOLHRC* 48, l.6 ἔξεις, and 50, l.4 σου, l.5 σέ.

<sup>112</sup> The address showed this in *IOLHRC* 5, 12, 13, 14, 20, 25, 26, and 29. 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural forms showed that the recipient was plural in *IOLHRC* 1, l.42, l.65 ὑμᾶς, l.68, l.71 ὑμῖν; 18, l.18 ὑμᾶς, l.19 τμήσητε, l.20 ὑπολαμβάνητε; 21, l.26 ὑμῖν; 22, l.8 ὡισθε, ll.12–13 τεθείκα|τε; 32, l.4, l.10 ὑμῶν, l.5, l.7 ὑμῖν, l.11 ὑμᾶς; 34, l.14 ὑμᾶς; 42, l.9 ἔξετε; 43, l.13 ποιήσετε, l.16 ὑμῖν, l.17 φανεῖσθε; 45, l.2 ὑμῶν, l.23 ὑμ[ε]ῖν, ll.53–4 συν|τελήτε, l.54, l.72 ὑμῖν, l.55 ἔξετε, l.70 ὑμᾶς. There were misspellings in 5, l.20: ἔρρω{σ}σθε, and in 14, l.38: ἔρ<ρ>ωσθε.

<sup>113</sup> *IOLHRC* 2 should most likely have ἔρρωσ[θε], since it was addressed to a *boule*. *IOLHRC* 56 has ἔρρωσθ[ε], and ll.10–11: καλῶς ῥῆν | [ποι]ήσετε is evidence for a plural recipient.

64/67 letters coming from between 311 and 100 BCE, it is fair to say that it was used diachronically in this sub-corpus. There is a high quantity of letters with damaged closings in the latter portion of the sub-corpus.

In 11/40 letters there was no farewell. One of these—**3**—was immediately followed by another letter—**4**—which also had no farewell, so in this case it seems unlikely that the following document influenced the omission. There seems to have been no disrespect attached to the majority of these omissions, especially since in **58** Attalos II has no farewell although the letter was sent to his cousin Athenaios. Of the 11 letters without farewells, 5 occur between 204-100 BCE, and 3 after 100 BCE.

The ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus had 33/59 letters with extant closing sections, 1 letter survives only in excerpts from its body embedded in a decree, 3 do not have this section provided in the edition, and 21 have no extant ending.<sup>114</sup> There were 11 letters with complete examples of ἔρρωσθε, and there was 1 partially damaged example.<sup>115</sup> All of these letters were shown to have plural recipients either by their prescripts or from 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural forms in their text.<sup>116</sup> There were two letters both dating to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE which used εὐτυχεῖτε as the farewell, one of which was shown to have a plural recipient by its prescript,<sup>117</sup> but **4** was too damaged to tell. Due to the consistency in the ‘Non-Royal’ letters, it seems likely that **4** had a plural recipient. This reflects the same degree of care taken with applying the appropriate farewell as we saw in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus. The earliest example of ἔρρωσθε comes from 208 and the most recent from the late 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, but the high quantity of damaged letter closings means that we do not have any examples from the 1<sup>st</sup> century. We can say that this farewell was used steadily throughout the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, and with 49/59 letters dating to before 100 BCE it is fair to say that it was used regularly in the ‘Non-Royal’ letters.

The ‘Non-Royal’ letters chose to omit the farewell even more so than the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus, doing so in 19/33 letters.<sup>118</sup> There appears to have been no ill-feeling behind the general practice, and **51**, a warm letter in thanks for services done, which features a health

<sup>114</sup> *IOLHPK* **1**, **19**, and **30** may have had no farewell, but the damage makes it difficult to be certain.

<sup>115</sup> *IOLHPK* **21** has ἔρρωσθ[ε].

<sup>116</sup> The prescript determined that these letters had plural recipients: *IOLHPK* **9**, **12**, **13**, **17**, **24**, **26**, **29**, and so too for the damaged **21**. Evidence from the body showed that these letters had plural recipients: *IOLHPK* **7**, 1.8 ὑμῖν; **8**, 1.5 ποιήσετε; **14**, 1.3 ὑμᾶι; **49**, 1.2 εἰδῆτε.

<sup>117</sup> This is *IOLHPK* **11**.

<sup>118</sup> It is possible, but unlikely, that **16**, **18**, and **52** may have lost their farewell.

wish, has no farewell, but it does have a document following.<sup>119</sup> There were documents following 14 of these letters without farewells, but evidence from 7 letters which have appended documents *and* farewells suggests that it was not obligatory to omit the farewell when a document followed, but it seems likely that the attachment of a document made an author more inclined to omit the farewell.<sup>120</sup> These 7 letters with farewells and documents also show that not every stonecutter would remove farewells which preceded documents, though there is no way of knowing if or when this occurred. The omission of farewells occurs regularly throughout the sub-corpus from our 2<sup>nd</sup> letter (242 BCE) to our latest (30-25 BCE).

Regarding the Ptolemaic letters, Buzón found 774 examples of ἔρρωσο in 1,054 Private, Business, and Administrative letters, with 169/1054 being damaged.<sup>121</sup> There were 5 examples of εὐτύχει in the Personal and 8 in the Business letters, and 3 alternative farewells not found in our corpora.<sup>122</sup> There was no farewell in 99/1107 letters.<sup>123</sup> These examples appear to be evenly spread throughout the corpus and the usage seems to be regular. The use of ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε and εὐτύχει/εὐτυχεῖτε seems to be the same in the Ptolemaic and ‘control’ letters. We can conclude that in the ‘control’ evidence the standard farewell was ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε, being used in 41/73 letters with extant closings. Εὐτυχεῖτε was acceptable if uncommon, and probably reflects an extension from petition language into other epistolary types.

That there is no farewell in 8.9% of the Ptolemaic letters shows that it was an acceptable if not regular practice to omit the farewell in this period, but that 41% of the ‘control’ letters omitted farewells suggests that it was much more common in official letters of state, as omissions occur almost as often as inclusions. Appended documents did not

<sup>119</sup> Cf. for a brief word on the lack of farewell in **52** which rightly does not read too much into the omission, P. Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos* (Bonn, 1978) 52: “Am Ende des Briefes fehlt das ἔρρωσθε, wie oft in Briefen, wenn ein Dokument folgt”.

<sup>120</sup> These letters are *IOLHPK* **7, 8, 9, 17, 21, 29, and 49**.

<sup>121</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, (Private letters) 25–26, (Business letters) 114, (Administrative letters) 173. The word for farewell in the 33/53 examples in the Recommendations is not explicitly mentioned but the examples on 80–86 only have ἔρρωσο, so it seems likely that the majority would have been similar.

<sup>122</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 1 διευτύχι in a Business letter, 114; 1 ἔρρωσθαί σε εὔχομαι in an Administrative letter, and 1 ἔρρωσο ἡμῖν in another Administrative letter, 173.

<sup>123</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, (Private letters. I have not included the 3 drafts without farewells) 25–26, (Recommendations. No discussion of farewells in main text, cf. tables,) 78–79, (Business letters) 114, (Administrative letters) 173.



require the omission of the farewell, but seem to have influenced it, with 15/30 letters without farewells having documents added.

### 1.12 – Farewell Salutations in the Roman letters

The data from the Roman letters shows that they closed their letters in the same way as the ‘control’ evidence. Unfortunately, 34/64 letters have lost their letter closing through damage, and 5 do not have this section provided in the edition. There were 25 letters with their closing section preserved. Of these 11 had the farewell ἔρρωσθε and 10 were shown to have plural recipients, indicating that the remaining letter is likely to have been the same.<sup>124</sup> This shows that, like the ‘control’ letters, those writing the Roman letters took care to apply the relevant farewell form.

That we are without an example of a farewell between 190 and 51–50 BCE is surely a result of damaged closures, which are spread throughout the corpus. There are 23/33 letters dating between 190 and 51–50 BCE without the closing intact or provided in the edition. When we have farewells preserved in the early and late periods, they occur in steady chronology, suggesting that ἔρρωσθε was used regularly throughout the period for which our evidence is scant, though we cannot know for certain. What evidence we do have of the Roman letters using farewells conforms to the standards of the ‘control’ evidence. That the most common Latin farewell—*vale*—was a single word imperatival form<sup>125</sup> from a word with a similar meaning to ἔρρωσθε surely made the task of authors easier, as it would have seemed like a seamless conversion.

There were 14/25 letters without a farewell, 6 of which had an appended document. Only **47**, a terse letter from Octavian giving orders to a certain Stephanos, seems to have omitted the farewell perhaps to assert authority. This letter still has a greeting however. Letters without farewells occur regularly throughout the Roman corpus. That 56% have no farewell is more pronounced than the ‘control’ evidence but not dissimilar. Cugusi’s statement that official Latin letters often lack greetings fits our Roman letters in Greek too.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>124</sup> The prescript showed that *ORRLIG* **1, 2, 4, 44, 50, 51, 59**, and **60** had plural recipients. Plural recipients were determined by evidence from the letter body in *ORRLIG* **37**, e.g. l.41, l.46 ὑμεῖς, l.42 ἀνέσχησθε, l.47 διαποστείλησθε; and **64**, l.19 ὑμῶν, l.25 ἴστε, but l.18 τῇ γερούσι[α] in the prescript would probably have been sufficient evidence on its own. *ORRLIG* **63** was too damaged to provide any such evidence.

<sup>125</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 56–57; Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 52.

<sup>126</sup> Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 57: “Nelle lettere ufficiali mancano spesso i saluti...”

Judging by two early inscribed Latin letters followed by documents which lack epistolary formulae,<sup>127</sup> it may have been the Latin convention to do little more than preface the document. This practice may have made the Roman authors more inclined to omit farewells, especially in the case of letters with documents, when it was observed to be acceptable in Greek. This possibly explains the higher number of omissions in the Roman corpus than the ‘control’, but a paucity of examples limits our capacity to be certain, and the evidence from letter closures shows that the Roman letters generally conform to Hellenistic practices.

### 1.13 – Concluding remarks on formulaic expressions in the Opening and Closing of the Roman Letters

Before investigating the formulaic language of the letter body, we should comment on some important features of the opening and closing formulae in the Roman letters. The Roman letters produce prescripts and greetings, health wishes, and farewells to the standard of the Hellenistic ‘control’ evidence in the vast majority of Roman letters. All but 4 prescripts have corresponding examples in the ‘control’ corpus or the Ptolemaic letters; the 4 letters which have the *χαίρειν λέγει* greeting all reflect the pressure and constraint which accompanied official Roman epistolography. Nevertheless, they produced a logical alternative, which was unfortunately unidiomatic but still understandable in Greek. The Roman health wishes were applied in similar numbers and in the same situations as the Hellenistic evidence, and they were also produced in the correct form. The fact that health wishes were only applied where they belonged and the willingness to experiment with a Greek formula, create a distinctly Roman feature, and successfully apply it regularly in official letters in Greek reflect authors with sound understanding of the language and the text type. Farewells are applied and omitted in the same situations as the control evidence, and though Roman practices may have influenced the omission of farewells before documents, the Roman practices were perfectly acceptable.

Opening and closing formulae have been noted as having the significance of defining texts as letters and illustrating to the audience that the authors understood the language and the text type. The proficiency of their use in official Roman Republican letters in Greek indicates that the Romans intended to and succeeded in producing their official letters to the specifications of Greek epistolography, and their willingness to use variation and experiment reflects an understanding of the text type and confidence in their abilities. This evidence

<sup>127</sup> *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 581 ll.1–3 and *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 586 l.1–2.

clearly shows that the Romans understood the significance of opening and closing formulae and took care to apply them in their letters. Their epistolography in Greek was in the vast majority of cases well-thought out and conscious of Greek conventions, and very likely to have been designed to present Roman letters in Greek in the same form as corresponding Greek letters.

**Figure 1.1 – Standard Address Formula in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus**

<u>State of Preservation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>IOLHRC Letter no.</u>
All 3 Components Identified	25	2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 25, 26, 28, 33, 38, 49, 51, 52, 58, 60, 62, 63, 66.
Component 1 Damaged	2	29, 31.
Component 2 Damaged	1	30
Component 3 Damaged	4	7, 47, 59, 67.
Components 1 and 2 Damaged	-	-
Component 1 Lost	1	57
Component 2 Lost	1	40
Component 3 Lost	1	41
Components 1 and 2 Lost	3	32, 34, 35.
Extensively Damaged	6	6, 8, 27, 55, 64, 65.
Entirely Lost	23	1, 3, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 53, 54, 56, 61.

Key: Component 1 = the sender in nominative case (ὁ δεῖνα). Component 2 = the addressee in dative case (τῷ δεῖνι). Component 3 = the greeting (χαίρειν).

**Figure 1.2 – Standard Address Formula in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus**

<u>State of Preservation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>IOLHPK Letter no.</u>
All 3 Components Identified	31	2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 22, 23 <sup>^</sup> , 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 46, 51, 56, 59, Aux.
Component 1 Damaged	1	19
Component 2 Damaged	-	-
Component 3 Damaged	2	41, 54.
Components 1 and 2 Damaged	-	-
Component 1 Lost	3	1, 31, 42.
Component 2 Lost	3	20, 57, 58.
Component 3 Lost	1	40
Components 1 and 2 Lost	1	48
Extensively Damaged	9	17, 18, 21, 25, 30, 44, 45, 47, 53.
Entirely Lost	7	4, 7, 8, 14, 49, 52, 55.
Section Not Quoted <sup>#</sup>	1	50

Key: Component 1 = the sender in nominative case (ὁ δεῖνα). Component 2 = the addressee in dative case (τῷ δεῖνι). Component 3 = the greeting (χαίρειν). <sup>^</sup> = Some letters uncertain. <sup>#</sup> This refers to IOLHPK 50, where excerpts from the body of the letter were embedded in a decree.

**Figure 1.3 – Standard Address Formula in the Roman corpus**

<u>State of Preservation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>ORRLIG Letter no.</u>
All 3 Components Identified	26	1, 2, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 28, 29, 31, 35, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 59, 60, Aux.
All 3 Components + ἐρροῶσθαι	1	40
First 2 Components, No Greeting	1	61
Component 1 Damaged	1	45
Component 2 Damaged	-	-
Component 3 Damaged	4	22, 24, 25, 64.
Components 1 and 2 Damaged	-	-
Component 1 Lost	-	-
Component 2 Lost	1	5
Component 3 Lost	4	4, 6, 26, 57.
Components 1 and 2 Lost	-	-
Extensively Damaged	3	7, 8, 11.
Entirely Lost	18	3, 10, 17, 18, 21, 23, 27, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 56, 58, 62, 63.

Key: Component 1 = the sender in nominative case (ὁ δεῖναι). Component 2 = the addressee in dative case (τῷ δεῖναι). Component 3 = the greeting (χαίρειν).

**Figure 1.4 – The χαίρειν λέγει Address Formula in the Roman corpus**

<u>State of Preservation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>ORRLIG Letter no.</u>
All 3 Components Identified	3	9, 33, 53 <sup>1</sup>
Component A Damaged	-	-
Component B Damaged	-	-
Component C Damaged	-	-
Components A and B Damaged	-	-
Component A Lost	-	-
Component B Lost	-	-
Component C Lost	-	-
Components A and B Lost	-	-
Extensively Damaged	1	32, 34? <sup>2</sup>

Key: Component A = the sender in nominative case (ὁ δεῖναι). Component B = the greeting (χαίρειν λέγει). Component C = the addressee in dative case (τῷ δεῖναι).

<sup>1</sup> ORRLIG 53 also has a Latin version preceding, l.12 of which reads: *Vinicius proc. s.d. mag. Cumas*. This is given in unabbreviated form in Sherk's edn. as: *Vinicius proc(onsul) s(alutem) d(at) mag(istratibus) Cumas*.

<sup>2</sup> ORRLIG 32 has fragments of the sender and χαίρειν λέγει[ι]; 34 has only the sender preserved, and, although there is nothing on the stone to suggest that χαίρειν λέγει would have been the greeting, it was nevertheless restored, probably because the same sender used χαίρειν λέγει in their earlier letter—33—which is on the same monument. For this reason I have included it in this table in squared brackets and with a question mark. It does not appear in the total of data. The opening of 34 reads: Γναῖος [Κορνήλιος] Ποπλίου υἱὸς Δολαβέλλας ἀνθύπατος [χαίρειν λέγει ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ Θεασί[[ων ---].

**Figure 1.5 – Health Wishes in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus**

<u>Health Wish</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>IOLHRC Letter no.</u>
εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ γὰρ δὲ ὑγίαινον.	3	49, 51, 52.
[εἰ ἔρρωσαι, ἔχοι] ἂν ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός.	1	54
εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εἴη ἂν ὥς βουλόμεθα· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν.	1	63, 64?
No Health Wish	39	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, 40, 41, 45, 47, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67.
Entirely Lost	21	1, 3, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 53, 56.
None provided in edition	1	34

**Figure 1.6 – Health Wishes in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus**

<u>Health Wish</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>IOLHPK Letter no.</u>
εἰ ἔρρωσθε ( <i>sic</i> ), τὸ δέον ἂν εἴη, καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν	1	51
[εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εἴη ἂν ὥς] βουλόμεθα· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαί[ν]ομ[εν].	1	40
No Health Wish	42	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 53, 56, 57, 59, Aux.
Entirely Lost	11	2, 4, 8, 14, 23, 43, 47, 52, 54, 55, 58.
Section not quoted in ancient text	1	50
None provided in edition	3	32, 33, 34.

**Figure 1.7 – Health Wishes in the Roman corpus**

<u>Health Wish</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>ORRLIG Letter no.</u>
εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι	1	35, 41?
[εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς ἂν] ἔχοι· καὶ γὰρ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύμ[ατος ὑγίαινον]	1	38
εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ὑγιαίνω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος.	3	45, 48, 52.
εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγίαινον	4	44, 49, 50, 51.
No Health Wish	29	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 42, 43, 47, 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 61, 64, Aux.
Entirely Lost	20	3, 10, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 46, 56, 58, 62, 63.
None provided in edition	5	12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

**Figure 1.8 – Farewell Salutations in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus**

<u>Farewell Salutation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>IOLHRC Letter no.</u>
ἔρρωσο	9	9, 10, 11, 19, 31, 40, 48, 50, 51.
ἔρρωσθε	18	1, 5, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 32, 34, 39, 42, 43, 45.
Partially damaged ἔρρωσο	-	-
Partially damaged ἔρρωσθε	2	2?, 56.
No Farewell	10	4, 16, 30, 37, 58, 59, 60, 65, 66, 67.
No Farewell, with document following	1	3
Entirely Lost	27	6, 7, 8, 15, 17, 23, 24, 27, 28, 33, 35, 36, 38, 41, 44, 46, 47, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64.

**Figure 1.9 – Farewell Salutations in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus**

<u>Farewell Salutation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>IOLHPK Letter no.</u>
ἔρρωσο	-	-
ἔρρωσθε	11	7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 24, 26, 29, 49.
εὐτυχεῖτε	2	4, 11.
Partially damaged ἔρρωσο	-	-
Partially damaged ἔρρωσθε	1	21
No Farewell	5	10, 16, 18, 35, 42, Aux.
No Farewell, with document following	14	2, 3, 15, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 36, 38, 39, 51, 52, 59.
Entirely Lost	21	1, 5, 6, 19, 23, 30, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58.
Section not quoted in ancient text	1	50
Not provided in edition	3	32, 33, 34.

**Figure 1.10 – Farewell Salutations in the Roman corpus**

<u>Farewell Salutation</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>ORRLIG Letter no.</u>
ἔρρωσο	-	-
ἔρρωσθε	11	1, 2, 4, 37, 44, 50, 51, 59, 60, 63, 64.
Partially damaged ἔρρωσο	-	-
Partially damaged ἔρρωσθε	-	-
No Farewell	8	7, 8, 20, 28, 34, 47, 48, 58, Aux.
No Farewell, with document following	6	3, 9, 17, 27, 35, 45.
Entirely Lost	34	5, 6, 10, 11, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62.
Not provided in edition	5	12, 13, 14, 15, 16.



## Chapter 2

### Formulaic expressions in the Body of the Letters

#### 2.1 – Formulae in the letter body and their significance for this study

While it has not received the same attention as the opening and closure, some important work has been done on the phraseology of the body of Greek and Latin letters.<sup>1</sup> However, there are two limitations on the applicability of this scholarship to this study. First, most of these studies discuss many expressions which are not strictly speaking formulaic, but rather conventional.<sup>2</sup> Buzón is correct in stating, in discussion of personal letters, that truly formulaic expressions are rare, as the body is where authors are most free to express themselves.<sup>3</sup> The possible topics discussed in the letter body are unlimited,<sup>4</sup> and, since formulae usually perform specific functions, we find more ‘conventional expressions’ than true formulae in the body. However, since official letters regularly deal with reoccurring situations, this creates an environment conducive to the formation of formulaic expressions,<sup>5</sup> and as a result we have expressions which we can rightly deem formulaic.

---

<sup>1</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’ dedicates a section to the letter body in his discussions of Ptolemaic letter types. Some examples of scholarship on formulaic expressions in the body of Greek letters are J.L. White, ‘Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 90, 1 (1971); id., *Body of the Greek Letter*, 7–67 on the non-literary papyri being most relevant to this study; id., *Light from Ancient Letters*, 202–213. One study which does the same for Latin letters is Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 55–62.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout his investigation, White separates expressions into ‘formulaic’ and ‘non-formulaic’, and while he does not offer a definition of either, he frequently refers to the ‘non-formulaic’ examples as ‘expressions’ or ‘statements’, but not as ‘formulae’, cf. White, *Body of the Greek Letter*, 7–67.

<sup>3</sup> Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 19: “In diesem Teil der Briefe persönlichen Charakters sind kaum feste Wendungen oder Formeln zu finden. Vielmehr werden hier die Gedanken, Gefühle und Sorgen des Absenders in freier Form ausgedrückt.”

<sup>4</sup> Cugusi notes for Latin letters that the topics are in great number and the ancient epistolary theorists could not list them all, cf. Cugusi, *Evoluzione*, 67: “La varietà degli argomenti trattati nelle lettere pervenute ci è enorme; è intuitivo di per sé che la retorica antica non poteva prevedere tutti i possibili oggetti di comunicazione epistolare, anche se creò una casistica piuttosto minuta”.

<sup>5</sup> Coleman, ‘Bureaucratic language’, 190: “Its [sc. bureaucratic language’s] restricted lexicon arises because of the repetitive nature of bureaucratic procedures; phrases fossilize.” The same principle contributes to the formation of formulae in official letters.

Second, prior scholarship has mostly focussed on expressions found in more private correspondence, which are less frequent in official letters.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the formulaic expressions most frequently found in our official state letters appear to be specific to this epistolary subtype. This is because the topics discussed in such official letters would rarely be discussed in another epistolary subtype and would almost certainly not be discussed in the same manner. The exclusive situations require specific formulaic language, and prior scholarship has focused little on them.<sup>7</sup> Fortunately, the ‘control’ corpus provides sufficient data against which we can analyse the Roman letters. Despite official letters developing their own somewhat exclusive phraseology, we do find formulaic language in them which is not even specific to letters, especially filiation expressions.

This chapter will focus on 3 important formulaic expressions found in the Roman letters, which for convenience I have termed ‘Embassy formulae’, the ‘Benefaction formula’, and filiation expressions. These expressions are important because of their diversity. The first two are specific to the official epistolary subtype: they are truly formulaic and consist of a regular sequence of recurring components. Their application in the Roman letters is evidence for the authors’ understanding of their function in official Greek epistolography, but also of their form, as constructing both formulae requires an understanding of the grammar of each component. Filiation expressions in Latin are formulaic, but Greek filiation is idiomatic, because a literal translation of the components will not convey the full meaning of the expression. Aside from the difficulties of writing idiomatic Greek, filiation expressions can be representative of one’s culture, meaning that the Roman authors must understand more than grammar and idiom to apply them correctly. The complicated forms and functions of these epistolary and non-epistolary expressions means that they are important for analysing the Roman authors’ understanding of the language and the text type, and this evidence has been neglected by prior scholarship.

---

<sup>6</sup> Even in the administrative papyrus letters there are few *comparanda* for the formulaic language discussed in this chapter, cf. Buzón, ‘Briefe’, 166–171.

<sup>7</sup> Even works on such inscribed official letters have not dealt extensively with the formulae of the letter body. Viereck and Sherk’s discussions are quite useful, although succinct. In Welles’ otherwise thorough treatment of the language of the Royal letters, formulaic expressions feature extremely rarely. Cf. Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 74–80; Sherk, *RDGE*, 190–197; Welles, *RCHP*, pp. xxxvii–c. There are occasional notes on specific examples in individual letters found in their respective commentaries in these three works.

## 2.2 – Embassy Formulae

Embassies are a common topic of official letters. The frequency of sending and receiving embassies, and the repetitive actions they undertook, led to the creation of a formula used to inform the recipient of an embassy and its actions, hence I have termed it the ‘Embassy formula’. They are often the first statement made in the letter body, following the prescript (or health wish if one is used), as an embassy’s visit is often the motivation for writing the letter. The formula as it appears in the ‘control’ corpus occurs also in the Roman letters, and an early example can be found in a letter of Philip II.<sup>8</sup> There is also another version occurring in the Roman letters which does not appear in the Hellenistic evidence. Neither of these formulae appear in the Ptolemaic letters. It was possible to determine that the Embassy formulae were indeed ‘formulae’ because the often long series of components occur in the same sequence, with the words comprising them being in the same cases and tenses too regularly for this to be coincidental. These sequences also occur in a regular position in the layout of the letter and perform the same function. There are of course variations, but variations are common to most formulae, and the fundamental structure of the Embassy formulae remains constant.

As was mentioned in §1.9, in such epigraphic documents, the longer the formula, the more susceptible it is to sustaining damage. Nevertheless, most examples are quite well-preserved. The standard version of the Embassy formula (presented in Figure 2.1) is constructed from the components common to both the ‘Royal’ and ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpora. Features specific to either sub-corpus are discussed as ‘variants’. The first component of the formula is the ambassadors in nominative case (sometimes represented only by the definite article), and they are always clarified as being ‘from *the recipient*’ by using παρ’ ὑμῶν. Occasionally, the author will clarify further that they were ‘sent’. The next component informs the recipient that ambassadors delivered the document (usually a decree, but occasionally letters): the verb is always aorist of ἀποδίδωμι and the document is naturally in the accusative.

---

<sup>8</sup> Philip II, *Letter 3* (Hercher (ed.), *EG*), ll.1–5: Βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων Φίλιππος Ἀθηναίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν. Παραγενόμενοι πρὸς ἐμὲ οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν πρεσβευταί, Κηφισοφῶν καὶ Δημόκριτος καὶ Πολύκριτος, διελέγοντο περὶ τῆς τῶν πλοίων ἀφέσεως, ὧν ἐναυάρχει Λαομέδων.



standard vocabulary for describing the speech.<sup>9</sup> The matters in the document with which they speak in accordance are in dative. They occasionally add ‘in the (document)/decree’ in dative. The alternative to this component is that the ambassadors discussed ‘concerning the matters about which they have orders.’ This is expressed with a relative clause, introduced by *περὶ/ὑπὲρ ᾧν*, ‘concerning the matters about which’, and ‘they have orders’ is simply *ἔχουσι* + accusative *τὰς ἐντολάς*.<sup>10</sup>

This is the standard Embassy formula as it appears in the ‘control’ evidence as well as the Roman corpus. As it is a formula, the grammar of the components remains constant, while the words can vary to fit the circumstances being described (e.g. if letters were delivered instead of decrees). These interchanges are not variants. True variants are found when new components are inserted alongside or replace standard components. Such variants were required mostly when the embassy undertook actions other than those which are normally described in the formula.

### 2.3 – The Embassy Formula in the ‘control’ corpus

There were 21/67 ‘Royal’ and 17/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters too damaged to identify an Embassy formula,<sup>11</sup> and 1/67 ‘Royal’ and 4/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters did not have this section provided.<sup>12</sup> The Embassy formula is only appropriate in situations involving an Embassy which either delivered documents or made a speech, but they frequently did both. Plenty of letters were not inspired by such circumstances, so 32/67 ‘Royal’ and 29/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters did not have

<sup>9</sup> Polybios 4.23.2: οἱ καὶ συμμίζαντες ἤδη περὶ τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος ὄντι τῷ βασιλεῖ **διελέχθησαν ἀκολούθως** ταῖς ἐντολαῖς (my emphasis). 30.32.6: ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος διακούσασα τῶν πρεσβευτῶν, **ἀκολούθως** ταῖς ἐντολαῖς **διαλεγόμενον**, κτλ. (my emphasis); *CIG* II pt.14, 3047 (c.194 BCE?) ll.7–10: διελέγησαν...[...]. ἀκολούθως ἀπο[τεινόμενοι?] || τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψαφίσματι κατακεχωρισμένοις κτλ.; *CIG* II pt.14, 3048 (c.194 BCE?) ll.7–8: καὶ αὐτοὶ διέλεγ[ε]ν ἀκολούθως τοῖς γεηγραμμένοις κτλ.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Polybios 4.23.2 and 30.32.6.

<sup>11</sup> These are *IOLHRC* 1, 3, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 53, 56, and 64, and *IOLHPK* 2, 4, 8, 14, 23, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, and 59.

<sup>12</sup> *IOLHRC* 34 and *IOLHPK* 32, 33, and 34 did not have this section provided in the transcription, and *IOLHPK* 50 did not have this section quoted in the ancient text.

an Embassy formula.<sup>13</sup> There were 4 additional letters which are likely to have had an Embassy formula which has been lost through damage.<sup>14</sup>

Beginning with the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus, there are 9 letters which have an Embassy formula as shown in Figure 2.1.<sup>15</sup> All begin by mentioning the ambassadors as being ‘from the recipient’.<sup>16</sup> There are 4 letters which take the option of mentioning that the ambassadors were ‘sent’.<sup>17</sup> As delivering documents is the motivation behind all but one of these letters, 8 mention the delivery next.<sup>18</sup> On 7/8 occasions the document is a decree, the other being a letter; the verb for ‘delivered’ is aorist of ἀποδίδωμι 7/8 times, and once it is aorist of ἀνακομίζω.<sup>19</sup> The letter without documents states that a discussion took place instead.<sup>20</sup> There are two letters which mention that the embassy met with the sender before the documents were delivered.<sup>21</sup>

Each example mentions the ambassadors speaking, 7/9 putting the section on ‘speaking’ next, and 2 placing the word of ‘speaking’ in the sentence-final position, perhaps for emphasis. There are 5 examples of the aorist 1 and 2 of aorist 2 of διαλέγομαι, and 2 of

<sup>13</sup> These are *IOLHRC* 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 30, 31, 32, 33, 38, 40, 41, 49, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, and 67, and *IOLHPK* 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 46, 48, 51, and 57.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *IOLHRC* 6 ll.2?–5: [οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν | πρε]σβευταὶ Ἀντισθένη[ς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ | ἀφι]κ[ό]μ[ενοι τ]ό τε ψήφισμα [ὑμῶν ἀπέδοσαν] || ἡμῖν. 35 ll.1–4?: Ἀριστέα[ς ... | ---οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὸ ψήφισμα] α ὃ ἐγγράφειτε ὑμεῖς ... | καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγησαν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι γεγραμμένοις [ἄξιον|τες---]. 52 ll.2–6: Μηνόδωρος ἀπέδωκε μοι τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολήν,...||...|...|... ἀπελογ[ίσατο δέ]. 57 ll.2–4?: [συμμεῖξαντές μοι ἐν ... Ἀρ]τεμίδωρος Βασιλείδης Μι-||... οἱ πρεσβευταὶ πεμφθέντες ὑφ’ ὑμῶν ἀπέδωκάν μοι τὸ ψήφισμα].

<sup>15</sup> These are *IOLHRC* 14 ll.2–11 (which varies slightly from the other examples), 25 ll.3–13, 26 ll.2–12, 27 ll.3–7, 28 ll.3–11, 29 I ll.3–4, 45 I A ll.2–5, 47 ll.2–4, and 51 ll.2–6.

<sup>16</sup> In 51 the man is more of a ‘representative’ than an ambassador, as he represents a priest rather than a state.

<sup>17</sup> *IOLHRC* 25, 26, 27 (very damaged), and 29.

<sup>18</sup> *IOLHRC* 14, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 45, and 51.

<sup>19</sup> The letters which have τὸ ψήφισμα and aor. of ἀποδίδωμι are *IOLHRC* 14, 25, 26, 27, 29, and 45. The letter which has τὸ ψήφισμα and aor. of ἀνακομίζω is 28. The letter with ἡ ἐπιστολή and aor. of ἀποδίδωμι is 51.

<sup>20</sup> *IOLHRC* 47.

<sup>21</sup> *IOLHRC* 25 and 45 (which mentions that 2 ambassadors appeared before (l.4 ἀπαντήσαντες) him, though one did not meet him (l.3 οὐ συνέμειξέ μοι)).

the aorist of ἀπολογίζω ‘provide an account’.<sup>22</sup> There are 3 letters which describe them as speaking ‘accordingly’, 2 may have lost this through damage, and 4 take the option of adding ‘with keenness’, 2 of which do so alongside ‘accordingly’.<sup>23</sup> We have 4 letters stating that the ambassadors spoke in accordance with what was recorded/written—one adding ‘in this (document)’, another ‘in the decree’—and we have 2 variants—one where an agreement is discussed, the other a feeling of goodwill.<sup>24</sup> There are 2 letters noting that the ambassadors discussed ‘the matters about which they have orders’, though one of these has lost the first two components of this section; there is also 1 variant, where the ambassadors discussed the ‘matters about which they were told’.<sup>25</sup>

The same Embassy formula is found in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus, but there are some variations. The first variation replaces the mention of the ambassadors meeting the recipient, and instead mentions them ‘going to/into the assembly’ (ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ/παρελθόντες εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν). It is found in 3 letters, always preceding the ambassadors’ speech.<sup>26</sup> The next variation, occurring in one letter, mentions that the sender listened to the ambassadors’ speech.<sup>27</sup> Finally, occurring in 4 letters and always in the first section, we find the formula introduced by a genitive absolute: ‘when your ambassador(s) was/were here’: (παραγενομένου/παραγενόμενοι...)<sup>28</sup>

<sup>22</sup> The letters which have aor. of διαλέγομαι are *IOLHRC* 25, 26, 27, and 28. *IOLHRC* 29 and 47 have aor. of διαλέγω and 14 has aor. of ἀπολογίζω. *IOLHRC* 45 has the example of sentence final aor. of διαλέγομαι and 51 has sentence final aor. of ἀπολογίζω.

<sup>23</sup> *IOLHRC* 28 has ἀκολούθως. *IOLHRC* 29 and 45 possibly lost ἀκολούθως through damage, though it is not restored in the edn. of 29. *IOLHRC* 27 and 45 have μετὰ (πάσης) σπουδῆς (and it is possible 14 did too). *IOLHRC* 25 and 26 have both ἀκολούθως and μετὰ (πάσης) σπουδῆς.

<sup>24</sup> *IOLHRC* 28 and 45 mention ambassadors speaking in accordance with of the contents. *IOLHRC* 25 and 26 mention ambassadors speaking in accordance with the contents of the document. *IOLHRC* 29 states that an agreement was discussed. *IOLHRC* 14 states that a feeling of goodwill was discussed. The letters which use κατακεχωρισμένοις for the contents of the document are *IOLHRC* 25, 26, and 45. *IOLHRC* 28 uses γεγραμμένο[ις] for the contents of the document.

<sup>25</sup> *IOLHRC* 27 and 51 state that the ambassadors discussed ‘the matters for which they had orders’, although in 27 the first 2 section components are lost. *IOLHRC* 47 states that the ambassadors discussed ‘matters which they were told (to discuss)’.

<sup>26</sup> *IOLHPK* 3 ll.5–6: παρελθόντος εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. 13 l.6: ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὰν ἐκκλησίαν (preceding both the speech and the delivery of the document). 35 l.3: ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὰν ἐκκλησίαν.

<sup>27</sup> *IOLHPK* 12 l.5: διακούσαμεν παρακαλούντων κτλ.

<sup>28</sup> *IOLHPK* 3 ll.2–3: παραγενομένου Βούλωνος | τοῦ παρ’ ὧν ἀποσταλέντος πρεσβευτοῦ. 11 ll.3–4: παραγενόμενος Περίδικας ὁ παρὰ βασιλέως Φιλίππου πρεσβευτάς (interestingly, Perdikkas, an

We have 9 letters using the Embassy formula in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus, with 4 examples beginning with ambassadors ‘from *the recipient*’ and another example where the ambassador segment is lost.<sup>29</sup> There is 1 letter where we have ‘to *the recipient*’, as the formula is in 1<sup>st</sup> person, and in another the ambassadors are not ‘from *the recipient*’ as they were sent by a third party.<sup>30</sup> In 2 letters this section is placed after the delivery of the documents.<sup>31</sup> The option of describing the ambassadors as ‘sent’ is found in 3 letters.<sup>32</sup> All 9 letters refer to a delivery of documents, with 7 placing this section second (though one example has lost the verb, and only the adjective describing the document is extant in another) and 2 positioning it first.<sup>33</sup> The document is always a ψήφισμα, and 7/8 times the verb for ‘deliver’ is aorist of ἀποδίδωμι and once aorist of κομίζω.<sup>34</sup>

All 9 letters mention the ambassadors speaking: 7 times the verb is aorist 2 of διαλέγομαι and twice it is the verb παρακαλῶ ‘call upon’, once in present tense and once in future.<sup>35</sup> All but one letter describe them as speaking ‘accordingly’, and only 1 adds the optional description ‘with (all) keenness’.<sup>36</sup> Of these 9 examples, 8 mention that they spoke in accordance with what was recorded/written/voted, with 1 adding ‘in this (document)’ and 3 ‘in this decree’.<sup>37</sup> The other letter states that the ambassadors discussed ‘the matters about

---

ambassador of Philip V of Macedon, accompanied the Teans). 26 ll.4–5: παραγενόμενοι οἱ παρ’ ὑμέων πρεγγευσταί. 35 l.2: οἱ παρ’ ὑμ[ῶ]ν παραγενόμενοι. Cf. also 24 ll.2–6, which has similar phraseology, but is too varied to be classed as an example of the Embassy formula.

<sup>29</sup> *IOLHPK* 3, 7, 26, 30 (ambassador portion lost), and 35.

<sup>30</sup> The letter in first person is *IOLHPK* 21. The letter which discusses a third party is *IOLHPK* 13.

<sup>31</sup> *IOLHPK* 11 and 12.

<sup>32</sup> *IOLHPK* 3, 13, and 21 (which is extensively damaged).

<sup>33</sup> The letters with the adjective in second position are *IOLHPK* 3, 7 (which has lost the verb), 13, 21, 26, 30 (which has lost the word for ‘document’ lost, only adjective surviving), and 35. The letters with the adjective in first position are *IOLHPK* 11 and 12.

<sup>34</sup> The letters which have aor. of ἀποδίδωμι are *IOLHPK* 3, 11, 13, 21, 26, 30, and 35. *IOLHPK* 12 has aor. of κομίζω.

<sup>35</sup> The letters which have aor. of διαλέγω are *IOLHPK* 3, 7, 11, 13, 26, 30, and 35. *IOLHPK* 12 has pres. of παρακαλῶ. *IOLHPK* 21 has fut. of παρακαλῶ, as the letter is written in first person before the embassy has happened.

<sup>36</sup> The letter without ἀκολούθως is *IOLHPK* 21. The letter with μετὰ πάνσας [*sic*] σπουδᾶς is *IOLHPK* 12.

<sup>37</sup> The following letters mention the ambassador’s speech: *IOLHPK* 3, 7 (which adds ‘in this decree’), 11, 12 (which adds ‘in this decree’), 13, 26 (which adds ‘in this decree’), 30, and 35 (which adds ‘in this (document)’). The letters which use καταχεωρισμένοις for the contents are *IOLHPK* 7, 12, and 35. The letter which uses γεγραμμένοις is *IOLHPK* 13, and the one which uses ἐψηφισμένοις is 3. Only τοῖς was used or preserved in *IOLHPK* 11, 26, and 30.



which they have orders'.<sup>38</sup> One letter also added that the ambassadors omitted 'nothing of keenness or personal devotion' to their task.<sup>39</sup>

In the 'Royal' corpus, the Embassy formula tends to be spread over multiple lines, but the 'Non-Royal' versions are more compact, though there are three less compressed examples.<sup>40</sup> The sequence of the Embassy formula remains the same as we saw with the 'Royal' sub-corpus, with the exception of the variations. The vocabulary remains the same, though the 'Non-Royal' letters prefer the aorist 2 of διαλέγομαι where the 'Royal' sub-corpus preferred aorist 1.<sup>41</sup> These considerations generally indicate a high level of standardization for a long and complicated formula, used across a wide geographical range in both kingdoms and *poleis*.

The 'control' examples of the Embassy formula are all found between the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> and mid-2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BCE when it seems to have been in regular use. Our earliest certain 'Royal' example—**14**—dates after 261 BCE, and our latest—**51**—to 163–159 BCE; such temporal distribution is mirrored by the 'Non-Royal' sub-corpus, with the earliest example—**3**—from 240–230 BCE and the most recent—**35**—from the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century. We also have good numbers of examples between the earliest and latest attestations. Between these dates there is a cluster of 9 examples across both sub-corpora dating between 208–201, which are all interestingly found at Magnesia on the Maeander or Teos.<sup>42</sup> This is the result of three embassies, one from Magnesia and two from Teos.<sup>43</sup> That such a short period yielded 9 examples results from the embassy's expansiveness, but that two *poleis* have produced 9 examples is due to the fortunate preservation of both location's epigraphy. Since we have 9 individual senders for 9 Embassy formulae (though two could have come from the same chancery<sup>44</sup>) is testament to the widespread distribution of this formula in the period.

<sup>38</sup> *IOLHPK 21*. The vocabulary and phraseology of *IOLHPK 10* ll.90–93, although it is not an example, seems to have had the Embassy formula in mind.

<sup>39</sup> *IOLHPK 35* ll.6–7: σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν | ἐνλείποντες.

<sup>40</sup> *IOLHPK 11, 21, and 26*.

<sup>41</sup> Διέλεγεν in *IOLHPK 7* l.5 is aorist (= διέλεγην) which is made clear by its subject (αὐτοί) preceding it.

<sup>42</sup> *IOLHRC 25* (c.205 BCE, Magnesia), **26** (c.205, Magnesia), **27** (c.205, Magnesia), **28** (c.205, Magnesia), **29** (205–201, Teos); *IOLHPK 7* (208, Magnesia), **11** (201, Teos), **12** (201, Teos), **13** (201, Teos).

<sup>43</sup> For the Magnesian embassy seeking acknowledgement of the games and honours for Artemis Leukophryene, cf. Welles, *RCHP*, 140–152, and K.J. Rigsby, *Asyilia*, (California, 1996), 222–223. For the embassies sent out from Teos to northern Greece and Crete respectively seeking votes of inviolability for their city on account of their association with Dionysos, see Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 288.

<sup>44</sup> *IOLHRC 25* was sent from Antiokhos III and **26** was sent from Antiokhos his son.

After *c.*250, the Embassy formula seems to have been the standard way to discuss embassies delivering documents or information. We still see several examples in the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, and it is likely the formula continued for some years after our latest example. The earliest and latest of our most damaged ‘Royal’ examples support this, **6** and **57** from 285 and the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century respectively. Strengthening this idea of the Embassy formula as standard is the lack of competing formulae. In the rest of the ‘control’ corpus, the embassies mentioned in 15 other letters undertook different actions, therefore not requiring the formula.<sup>45</sup> One letter—**2** (*c.*306 BCE)—had fitting circumstances, and could have been expressed with the formula. Its vocabulary is certainly similar, but its early date perhaps testifies to a stage before the standardization of the formula.

## 2.4 – Embassy Formulae in the Roman letters

There are two Embassy formulae in the Roman corpus: the Embassy formula found in the ‘control’ corpus, and one found only in the Roman letters, hereafter the ‘Roman Embassy formula’. There is no Embassy formula found in 26/64 Roman letters,<sup>46</sup> 18/64 have lost this section through damage,<sup>47</sup> and 5 do not have this section in the edition.<sup>48</sup>

The Roman letters use the Embassy formula in mostly the same manner as the ‘control’ evidence, though it is used more frequently without documents involved. Viereck noted it as a formula, and also saw that it had come from Greek epistolography.<sup>49</sup> The Roman examples are remarkably good applications of the formula, with few variations. Where the ‘Royal’ letters occasionally mentioned the ambassadors meeting the sender and the ‘Non-Royal’ letters mentioned them entering the assembly, the Roman letters have both variants. This is because a Roman magistrate outside of Rome would be met by ambassadors, whereas

<sup>45</sup> Embassies were mentioned in different circumstances in *IOLHRC* **3**, **7**, **12**, and **20**, and *IOLHPK* **1**, **5**, **6**, **9**, **10**, **19**, **20**, **24**, **38**, **39**, and **42**. Ambassadors and embassies are also simply mentioned in *IOLHRC* **1**, **17**, **46** (in which it is possible, if the introductory sections were preserved, that there would have been an Embassy formula), and **67**, and *IOLHPK* **4**, **45**, and **56** (although all 3 *IOLHPK* letters are damaged and the context is largely lost).

<sup>46</sup> *ORRLIG* **1**, **6**, **18**, **19**, **24**, **25**, **26**, **29**, **31**, **32**, **33**, **35**, **40**, **42**, **44**, **45**, **47**, **48**, **49**, **51**, **53**, **54**, **55**, **57**, **61**, and **64**.

<sup>47</sup> *ORRLIG* **3**, **10**, **17**, **21**, **23**, **27**, **30**, **34**, **36**, **37**, **39**, **41**, **46**, **52**, **56**, **58**, **62**, and **63**.

<sup>48</sup> *ORRLIG* **12**, **13**, **14**, **15**, and **16**.

<sup>49</sup> Viereck, ‘Sermo Graecus’, 75: “Usitatissimae etiam sunt formulae ἐνέτυχόν μοι οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν πρεσβευταί..., ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν aliae, quas omnes cum apud Graecos saepissime exstent, nemo negabit ex Graecorum decretis et epistulis in Romanorum sermonem publicum graecum fluxisse.” Sherk also alludes to it at *RDGE*, 190–191, though does not call it a formula.

in Rome ambassadors would enter the Senate. The only other variant, featuring as the last part in 3 examples, describes the ambassadors as ‘omitting nothing of their personal devotion (i.e. to their embassy)’ (φιλοτιμίας οὐδὲν ἐλλείποντες).<sup>50</sup> It is found in an Embassy formula in *IOLHPK 35* and describing an ambassador in *IOLHPK 57*,<sup>51</sup> and similar phrases describing ambassadors are found in Greek inscriptions and Josephus.<sup>52</sup>

The Embassy formula is present in 11 letters, some examples of which are damaged. Another damaged letter seems likely to have had this formula.<sup>53</sup> Three letters begin by mentioning the ambassadors being ‘from *the recipient*’, and another seems to have a damaged version.<sup>54</sup> We have 3 later examples of ‘ambassadors of you’ and 2 of ‘your ambassadors’.<sup>55</sup> There are 3 letters which take the option of describing the ambassadors as ‘sent’; one of these introduces the ambassadors as ‘sent *by you*’<sup>56</sup> and another simply states ‘you sent the ambassador’. There are 2 examples where the mention of them meeting the sender comes before the first section, but 4 come after the first section and one more mentions them entering the Senate.<sup>57</sup> Of our 11 letters, 8 are concerned with delivering documents, 1 seems to have lost this through damage, and in 2 letters the ambassadors convey their information

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *ORRLIG 4* ll.6–7: οὐδὲν ἐλλείποντες | [φιλοτι]μίας. *5* ll.8?–9: [--οὐδὲν ἐλ]λείποντες φιλοτιμίας. *7* ll.5–6: φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐλλείποντες. It was also noted by Lafoscade, ‘De Epistulis’, 65–66.

<sup>51</sup> *IOLHPK 35* ll.6–7: σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν | ἐνλείποντες. Outside of the Embassy formula in *IOLHPK 57* l.9: φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐλλείπων.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *IOLHPK 21* (appended document) ll.27–28: σπουδῆς [κ]α[ῖ] φι[λο]τ[ι]μίας οὐθὲν | ἐνλείπων. *CIG* II pt.14, 3047 ll.14–18: ὁ παρὰ τῷ Βασιλλέως Ἀντιόχῳ πρεσβευτὰς ἐπὶ τὰς τῷ πολέμῳ | διαλύσεις ἀποσταλείς, οὐθὲν ἐ[λ]λείπων σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας κατ’ οὐθένα τρόπον. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 700 ll.3–10: ἐπεὶ Μάακος Ἄννιος Ποπλίου υἱός, ... ἀποσταλείς ταμίας ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων...|...|...|...σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐνλείπων (my emphasis). Josephus, *Jewish War*, 4.232: ἔδει δὲ τάχους εἰς τὴν ἀγγελίαν· εἰς ὃ μηδὲν ἐλλείποντες προθυμίας οἱ πεμφθέντες, ἐκαλεῖτο δ’ αὐτῶν Ἀνανίας ἐκάτερος, καὶ δὴ πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν Ἰδουμαίων παρῆσαν (my emphasis).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. *ORRLIG 52* ll.11–14: ...πρέσβε[ις | τῆς ἐκκλη]σίας <ἀπέδοσάν τ’> ἐμοὶ τὸ παρὰ τῆς γερουσ[ίας ψ]ήφισμα | διέλεξ[ά]ν τε ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν αὐτ[ῷ] δι[α]κε[ι]μέ[νοις].

<sup>54</sup> These are *ORRLIG 4*, *7*, and *8*. *ORRLIG 5* has ll.4–5: [οἱ || παρ’ ὑμ]ῶν πρέσβεις.

<sup>55</sup> *ORRLIG 38*, *59*, and *60* have οἱ πρέσβεις ὑμῶν. *ORRLIG 28* and *43* have πρεσβευταὶ ὑμέτεροι.

<sup>56</sup> *ORRLIG 7* uses ἀποσταλέντες like the ‘control’ evidence. *2* l.5 has: ἀποσταλείς πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρεσβευτῆς. *50* l.76 has: οἱ πεμφθέντες πρεσβευταὶ ὑφ’ ὑμῶν. cf. also Polybios, 38.10.2: οἱ(περ) ἦσαν πρεσβευταὶ πεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν παραιτησόμενοι κτλ.

<sup>57</sup> The meeting is found before the first section in *ORRLIG 4* and *5*. The meeting is mentioned after first section in *ORRLIG 28*, *38*, *59*, and *60*, and possibly *50* though it is damaged. The mention of the ambassadors entering the assembly is after first section in *ORRLIG 8*.

through speeches.<sup>58</sup> The 8 letters with this section extant position it second, the other 2 move straight to the ambassadors' speech. In one letter the word for the document is lost, we have ψήφισμα in 4 letters and 2 more damaged versions,<sup>59</sup> and the other is a letter, γράμματα. Of the 8 letters with documents, the word for 'deliver' is an aorist form of ἀποδίδωμι like the 'control' evidence in 6 letters, 1 letter is most likely [ἀπέ]δωκαν, and the other letter has ἀνέδωκεν, which, although not found in the main 'control' letters, is found in a similar context in the 'Non-Royal' auxiliary letter.<sup>60</sup>

In the 2 letters without documents, the ambassadors' speech naturally follows mention of the embassy, and they are simply mentioned as speaking.<sup>61</sup> This section follows the document delivery in 6 letters, 1 breaks off at this point, and two end the formula with the delivery of documents.<sup>62</sup> In 2 letters we have the aorist 1 of διαλέγομαι, in 3 we have the aorist 2, and in the last letter we have κατηγορῶ, as the ambassadors make accusations.<sup>63</sup> In 3 letters they are described as speaking 'accordingly', and twice 'with all keenness' is included.<sup>64</sup> Of our 11 letters, 7 refer to the ambassadors' speaking on the purpose of their embassy.<sup>65</sup> The last section is lost through damage in 1 letter, and not required by the circumstances in 3 others.<sup>66</sup> The ambassadors are described as speaking in accordance with

<sup>58</sup> The letters concerned with documents are *ORRLIG* 2, 4, 7, 28, 38 (which has lost the document but retains the verb), 43, 59, and 60. The document section is apparently lost through damage in *ORRLIG* 5, and a speech stands in for documents in 8 and 50.

<sup>59</sup> *ORRLIG* 4 l.5: τό τε [ψήφ]ισμα. 43 l.4: ψήφ[ισμα].

<sup>60</sup> The letters which have aor. of ἀποδίδωμι are *ORRLIG* 4, 7, 28, 43, 59, and 60. *ORRLIG* 38 has [ἀπέ]δωκαν and 2 has ἀνέδωκεν. Cf. *IOLHPK Aux.1* ll.2–3: Προσελθόντων μοι ὑμετέρων πρεσβευτῶν ἐν Λαοδικῇ καὶ | τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν ψηφίσματα ἀναδόντων, κτλ. (my emphasis).

<sup>61</sup> *ORRLIG* 8 and 50.

<sup>62</sup> There is a speech in *ORRLIG* 2, 4, 5, 7, 38, and 59. This section is lost in *ORRLIG* 43, and there is no speech in 28 and 60.

<sup>63</sup> We find the aorist 1 of διαλέγομαι in *ORRLIG* 2 and 38, the aorist 2 of διαλέγομαι in 4, 5, and 7, and the aorist of κατηγορῶ in 59.

<sup>64</sup> *ORRLIG* 2 l.7 ἀκολούθως and l.8 μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας. 4 ll.5–6: ἀκολού[θως]. 7 l.4 ἀκολούθως and l.5 μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς. 5 is very likely to have had ll.7–8: [ἀκο]λού[θ]ως.

<sup>65</sup> *ORRLIG* 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 38, and 50.

<sup>66</sup> The section is lost in *ORRLIG* 43. *ORRLIG* 28 and 60 have no document to discuss, and there is no discussion required in 59 as the ambassadors commence their accusation.

what was recorded/decided in 3 letters, 2 adding ‘in this (document)/decree’.<sup>67</sup> One letter says that they spoke accordingly ‘with this’, and another has ‘concerning some (matters)’ before the text breaks off.<sup>68</sup> Of the final 2 letters, 1 states that the ambassadors discussed ‘the matters about which they had orders’, and the other says they discussed ‘the matters about which you sent them’, not unlike ‘matters about which they were told’ in *IOLHRC* 47.

The temporal distribution of the Embassy formula in the Roman corpus overlaps with the latter half of the ‘control’ time-period. It is also diachronically present and consistent in form, indicating that the Embassy formula was in regular use by the Roman administration and was probably recognized as the Greek standard. The earliest example—**2**—dates to 193 BCE, and there are 4 more examples dating between this time and 186.<sup>69</sup> These 5 letters are of similar date to the 9 ‘control’ letters from between 208-201, when this formula seems to be used frequently. That the Roman administration recognized and implemented this formula in this period obviously shows attention to Greek epistolography, but it also reflects an incentive to meet contemporary standards. The latest example—**61**—is from 5 BCE, and there are 5 other examples dating between 85 and this example.<sup>70</sup> The diachronic regularity of the Roman examples seems to indicate that the Greek states were still using this formula towards the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century. Although we have no Greek evidence, it is unlikely that the Romans would have perpetuated a formula which was not current.

While the Embassy formula in the Roman letters does have some variations, they present nothing which diverges from the ‘control’ examples, which frequently have variations themselves. The Roman letters are similar to the ‘Non-Royal’ letters in keeping the sections of the formula compact; applying a simple sequence would have helped ensure that the formula was used properly. The vocabulary for all components have precedents in the ‘control’ corpus, however the Roman examples take care to use the appropriate sections to fit the situation. This shows that the Roman authors paid close attention to the form of the Embassy formula, seeking to use the proper sequence and standard vocabulary, but they were also aware of its function, being careful to apply sections only in appropriate circumstances. The complicated Embassy formula exemplifies the attention which Roman authors paid to

<sup>67</sup> The examples with an ambassadors’ speech are *ORRLIG* 4 (which adds ‘in this decree’), **5**, and **7** (which adds ‘in this (document)’). Those which use *κατακεχωρισμένοις* for the contents are *ORRLIG* 4 and **7**, and **5** uses *δεδογμέ[νοις]*.

<sup>68</sup> *ORRLIG* 2 ll. 7–8: τοῦτωι | διελέχθη. 38 l. 6: περὶ τῶν τινῶν διελέχθησαν [...].

<sup>69</sup> *ORRLIG* 4 (190 BCE), **5** (190–189 BCE), **7** (189–188 BCE), and **8** (186? BCE).

<sup>70</sup> *ORRLIG* 28 (post 85 BCE), **38** (73), **43** (44–42), **50** (31 BCE), and **59** (6 BCE).

contemporary Greek epistolography, and would have been important for presenting letters which met the standards of Greek-speaking audiences.

Outside of Embassy formulae, the embassies mentioned in 13 other letters performed different actions or were simply mentioned, thus not requiring a formula.<sup>71</sup> However, before concluding, we should discuss the Roman Embassy formula. It is found in 3 letters and consists of 3 short, asyndetic sentences.<sup>72</sup>

***Figure 2.2 – The Roman Embassy Formula based on the best examples***

Template:	πρεσβευταὶ ἐμοὶ προσήλθοσαν, ἵν' αὐτοῖς σύγκλητον δῶ. ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς σύγκλητον ἔδωκα. συγκλήτου δόγμα τόδε ἐστίν.
Translation:	Ambassadors came to me, in order that I might give the Senate to them. I gave the Senate to them. This is the decree of the Senate.
Examples:	
<i>ORRLIG</i> no.	
9 ll.5-12:	πρεσβευταὶ Ἀμβρακιῶται καὶ Ἀθαμᾶνες ἐμοὶ προσήλθοσαν, ἵν' αὐτοῖς σύγκλητον δῶ. Ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς    σύγκλητον ἔδωκα.   Συγκλήτου δόγμα τόδε ἐστίν.
11 ll.36.37:	πρεσβευταὶ Μάγνητες καὶ Πριηνεῖς ἐμοὶ προσήλθοσαν   ὅπως αὐτοῖς σύγκλητον δῶ.   τούτοις ἐγὼ σύγκλητον ἔδωκα. Συγκλήτου δόγμα]
20 ll.90-93:	[ἰόντες   Ἰτάνιοι πρεσβευταὶ καὶ ὑμέτεροι προσήλθοσαν μ[οι ὅπ]ως   αὐτοῖς σύνκλητον δῶ. ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς σύνκλητ[ο]ν ἔδωκα.   σύνκλήτου δόγμα τοῦτο γεγονός ἐστι.

Since our 3 examples present the same sequence of clauses (almost to the point where the words are in the same order) and the vocabulary is almost without variation, we clearly have a formula. They all date to the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century, when the standard Embassy formula is in full use.<sup>73</sup> Why the author chose this formula over the standard Embassy formula is probably linked to a composition process influenced by the appended documents with all 3 letters. All provide evidence that the document was the main focus of the author, and the letter served the functional purpose of introducing it. Latin interference appears to be a main factor.

<sup>71</sup> Embassies or ambassadors are mentioned in different circumstances in *ORRLIG* 6, 10, 33, 35, 42, 45, 54 (fairly similar circumstances), 62, and 64. They are simply mentioned in *ORRLIG* 24, 32, 48, and 49 (in which damage precludes certainty).

<sup>72</sup> *ORRLIG* 9, 11, and 20. Cf. also 22, which seems likely to have had the same, l.5: [---] || ὑμῖν ἐγὼ σύγκλητον ἔδωκα].

<sup>73</sup> *ORRLIG* 9 (between 175–160 BCE), 11 (c.mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE), and 20 (112 BCE).

In **9**, the Roman Embassy formula is the entire letter body, moving straight into the document. It also uses the χαίρειν λέγει greeting, which we argued in §1.5 to be an example of the pressure exerted upon authors by Latin document writing. Although **11** is very damaged, its body is also only this formula; it has no farewell, but the greeting was [χαί]ρειν. The nine-line letter **20** has only three lines without formulaic expressions before the document. In the non-formulaic sections there are no connective particles and verbs either follow their objects or are placed in clause-final position, a characteristic of official Latin documents.<sup>74</sup> It is likely that the authors did not want to risk mistakes by attempting Greek formulae, of which they may not have been fully aware, and sought to produce letters which were legible, but unidiomatic. There also seems to be a need to adhere closely to Latin convention, possibly under instruction (perhaps to minimize risk), or possibly because the well-established Latin conventions proved difficult to convey into natural Greek.<sup>75</sup> Though we have no Latin version of this formula, a passage from Sallust suggests that ‘giving’ the Senate to *legati* may have been the standard phraseology.<sup>76</sup>

The Roman Embassy formula is unlikely to be a competing alternative to the Greek one, but is more likely a result of authors defaulting to Latin mannerisms when facing a difficult task. Therefore, we can now conclude that the Greek Embassy formula was the standard for the Roman administration when required to discuss embassies throughout our corpus, with only a few exceptions written in legible but unnatural Greek. The Embassy formula’s use testifies to a majority of Roman authors in touch with Greek epistolography and in control of the language.

## 2.5 – The Benefaction formula

In official letters, the sender will sometimes state that he will try to benefit the recipient in future. Such statements were made with enough frequency for a formula to develop, hereafter

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *ORRIG* **20** ll.93–97: ὑμᾶς **θέλ[ω]** φροντίσαι εἴ τι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ ἐν ἀνφιλ[ογ]εῖᾳ οὕσῃ ἐνφ[υ]λοδομημένον **ἐστί**, ὅπως ἐκ ταύτης τ[ῆς] χώ[ρας] **καθέ[λ]ητε** οὕτως καθὼς ἡ σύνκλητος **ἐδογμάτισε** καὶ κα[[ . . . . . ]**οσε** (verb form?) (my emphasis). Cf. also Clackson, Horrocks, *Latin Language*, 150. For interference of Latin verb-final word order in Roman documents in Greek, see Horrocks, *Greek*, 143.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, 470–471 and Clackson, Horrocks, *Latin Language*, 142–143, and esp. 148.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum*, 13.9: *Igitur ubi legati satis confidunt, die constituto **senatus utrisque datur*** (my emphasis). Cf. E. García Domingo, *Latinismos en la Koiné (en los documentos epigráficos desde el 212 a. J.C. hasta el 14 d. J.C.)* (Burgos, 1979), 363.

the ‘Benefaction formula’. It is usually found at the end of the body, often preceding the farewell, after the sender has made clear his policy toward the recipient. Its status as a formula is ascertained through the regularity of its word order, vocabulary, function, and placement in the letter layout. The most basic form is presented in Figure 2.3:

**Figure 2.3 – The Benefaction Formula based on the best examples**

**Template:** ...καὶ (εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν) πειράσομαι (ἀεὶ) παρὰίτιος (τινος) ἀγαθοῦ/ἀγαθῶν γενέσθαι (ὕμῖν)

**Translation:** ...and (in the future) I will try (always) to be a cause of (some) good (for *the recipient*)

**Key:** ( ) = Optional component

The verb is always the future of πειρῶ coupled with the aorist infinitive of γίγνομαι. The subject always refers to themselves as παρὰίτιος and then adds ἀγαθοῦ/ἀγαθῶν, sometimes with τινος. A mention of the future often comes as (εἰς) τὸ λοιπὸν and ἀεὶ can be used instead or alongside it. If the recipient of the benefaction needs to be expressed, it is in the dative case. The word order given in Figure 2.3 is most common.

Such promises for the future were present in Greek epistolography early enough for Xenophon to have a similar statement in a letter of Cyrus.<sup>77</sup> However, despite the seemingly early roots of the Benefaction formula, we only find two full examples in the ‘control’ corpus, though the ‘Royal’ letters present frequent examples of statements of benefaction. Contrariwise, the Roman letters present 6 full examples. The extant evidence suggests that the Benefaction formula most likely originated in Greek documents. Firstly, we have several precursors to the formula in the ‘control’ corpus and also examples from Greek decrees and the Septuagint.<sup>78</sup> Concurrently, an equivalent could not be found in inscribed Latin letters.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>77</sup> Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 4.5.33: ἡμεῖς δὲ πειρασόμεθα παρῆναι, ὅταν τάχιστα διαπραξώμεθα ἃ σοὶ τ’ ἂν καὶ ἡμῖν νομίζομεν πραχθέντα κοινὰ γένεσθαι ἀγαθὰ. ἔρρωσο.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. *II Maccabees* (Septuagint), 11.19 (letter of Lysias to the Jews): ...ἐὰν μὲν οὖν συντηρήσητε τὴν εἰς τὰ πράγματα εὐνοίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν πειράσομαι παρὰίτιος ἀγαθῶν γενέσθαι (my emphasis). *CIG* II, xiv, 3047 (c.194 BCE?) II.11–12: ...καὶ | τινος ἀγαθῶ παραιτίους γίνεσθαι κτλ. *CIG* II, xiv, 3048 (c.194 BCE?) II.13–14: ...καὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ | παραιτίους γίνεσθαι τῷ δάμῳ, κτλ. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 700 (117 BCE, in an honorary decree for a Roman, M. Annius) II.43–45: καὶ παρακαλέσουσιν ἀποδεξάμενον μετ’ εὐνοίας τὴν τοῦ δήμου προαίρεσιν νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν μετὰ ταῦτα χρόνον ἀγαθοῦ τινος ἀεὶ παρὰίτιον || γίνεσθαι τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν (my emphasis).



The Benefaction formula is certainly not a necessary component of official letters, but it is well-suited to the official sub-type. We do not find it in Buzón's Ptolemaic letters, most likely because it would not be suited for more private correspondence.

## 2.6 – The Benefaction formula in the ‘control’ evidence

Since statements of benefaction are not a necessary component, it should not surprise that we only find 8 examples in the ‘control’ letters, and that only 3 of these use the Benefaction formula. We also have 2 damaged letters which appear to have had benefaction statements with the phraseology of the formula.<sup>80</sup> There were 30/67 ‘Royal’ and 30/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters with at least the second half of the letter preserved and no Benefaction formula,<sup>81</sup> 5 ‘control’ letters did not have this quoted,<sup>82</sup> and 27/67 ‘Royal’ and 23/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters either lost the second half and the first had no such formula, or the whole letter was too damaged to provide any such evidence.<sup>83</sup>

The ‘Royal’ letters have 6/8 benefaction statements, and 1 of the examples of the formula is in **57**, applying the same sequence and vocabulary presented in Figure 2.3, including three optional components, though *πειράσομαι* and *γενέσθαι* are damaged and only 3 letters of *παράτιος* survive.<sup>84</sup> When the ‘Royal’ letters do not apply the exact Benefaction formula, they utilize its phraseology and vocabulary: all 5 use the future of *πειρῶ* with infinitives which generally have beneficent meanings (such as *φιλανθρωπεῖν*), 1

---

<sup>79</sup> A search on the Epigraphische Datenbank Clauss-Slaby for each of the components of the reconstructed Latin equivalent ‘*semper alicuius boni auctor uobis fieri*’ provided by García Domingo, *Latinismos*, 578 does not yield any Latin epigraphic *comparanda*. This indicates that if there are any Latin *comparanda*, they are rare.

<sup>80</sup> *IOLHRC* 41 ll.10: [καὶ παρεκαλέσατε ἐμὲ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν] || παρατίον ἔσ[εσθαι ἀγατοῦ τινος]. **56** ll.3–4: [καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν | πειρᾶ]σόμεθα κοινῇ τε τῷ δήμῳ συνά[τι]τοι ἀγα[θῶν] γίνεσθαι].

<sup>81</sup> The letters which have at least the latter half preserved are *IOLHRC* 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 25, 30, 31, 32, 37, 40, 45, 48, 51, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, and 67, and *IOLHPK* 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21 (letter), 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 51, 52, and 54.

<sup>82</sup> *IOLHRC* 34 and *IOLHPK* 32, 33, and 34 do not have this section quoted in modern transcription. The section is not quoted in ancient text of *IOLHPK* 50.

<sup>83</sup> The following letters were too damaged to contribute data: *IOLHRC* 2, 6, 7, 8, 17, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 61, and 64, and *IOLHPK* 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 17, 20, 23, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59.

<sup>84</sup> *IOLHRC* 57 ll.14–15: καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν π[ει]ράσομαι ἀεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ π[α]ρά[ί]τι[ος] γείνε[σθαι] ἐπὶ τῷ συμφ]έρῳ[ντι] ὑμῶ[ν].

of which also uses εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν and another has πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν παρὰίτιον ὑμῖν γενόμενον, which is similar to the Benefaction formula.<sup>85</sup>

One ‘Non-Royal’ letter contains the other 2 Benefaction formulae—**13**—though there is an example in the document following **21**.<sup>86</sup> The first Benefaction formula in **13** applies all the standard vocabulary in the proper forms with the exception of πειράσομαι, since the formula is being reported, and the optional εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν. The example in the decree following **21** is the same, though it has ἐ[ν πα]ντὶ κα[ι]ῶι. This passage refers to the contents of the ambassadors’ speech, which is likely to have used the formula itself. The second Benefaction formula in **13** is made by the sender, so it has πειράσομαι and the other components except for optional εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν.

The ‘control’ corpus examples of the Benefaction formula show that, while infrequently applied, once the formula had received a standard form the Hellenistic states would use it in their official documents where necessary. There is only one other example in the ‘Royal’ corpus where the Benefaction formula could have been appropriate, though it seems the author wanted to write a more personal statement.<sup>87</sup> Only one ‘Non-Royal’ letter has a similar statement for the future, but it is a military promise for which the Benefaction formula is unsuitable.<sup>88</sup>

Our ‘Royal’ epistolary examples seem to indicate that benefaction statements were originally freer in composition, whereas the examples in decrees and ‘Non-Royal’ letters are more uniform. Their temporal distribution is revealing: our 3 examples date to 201 and the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, whereas the 5 freer benefaction statements date between 311 and 205

<sup>85</sup> *IOLHRC* **1** ll.66–69: πειρασόμεθα δὲ | καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν ὅτι ἂν ἔχωμεν τῶν συμφερόντων καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλήσιν παρὰσχευάζειν. **13** ll.3–5: ὡς προσήκον ἦν | διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸμ πατέρα τὸν ἡμέτερον ὁρᾶν οἰκείως τὰ πρὸς τῇ πόλιν διακείμενον καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν παρὰίτιον ὑμῖν γενόμενον, and ll.11–12: καὶ πειρασόμεθα ἀ[μ]ύγεσθαι τὸν δῆμον εὐεργετοῦντες. **20** ll.30–33: πειρασόμεθα καὶ ἰδίαι ἐκάστωι καὶ κοινῇ πᾶσι φιλανθρωπεῖν καθ’ ὅσον | ἡμεῖς δυνατοὶ ἐσμεν. **21** ll.23–27: καὶ εἰς | τὸ λοιπὸν δὲ πειρασόμεθα || τῶν καθ’ ἡμᾶς ὄντων ἐν ἡσυχίαι μὴ ἀχαριστεῖν ὑμῖν | ἐν τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις. **26** ll.20–22: καὶ | [τὸ λ]ο[ι]π[ὸν] πειράσομαι | ...συναύξειν ὑμῖν.

<sup>86</sup> *IOLHRC* **13** ll.12–13: καὶ αὐτὸς συναύξεν καὶ αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθῶ παρὰίτιος γενέσθαι τῷ δάμωι, and in full at ll.22–24: καὶ πει[ρα]σόμεθα αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθῶ παρὰίτιος γίνεσθαι τῷ δάμωι | καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίαι. **21** (appended decree) ll.23–24: [ἀ]εὶ τ[ιν]ος | ἀ[γ]αθοῦ π[α]ρὰίτιος γιν[όμε]νος ἐ[ν πα]ντὶ κα[ι]ῶι.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *IOLHRC* **42** ll.8–10.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *IOLHPK* **26** ll.42–45.

BCE.<sup>89</sup> We also see that by 200 BCE this formula is being applied in decrees.<sup>90</sup> It seems likely that the frequency of benefaction statements in speeches, decrees, and letters led to the development of the Benefaction formula by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, and the more convenient and easily recognisable formulaic version ousted freer statements. Our evidence shows that it was used in Hellenistic correspondence and it is perhaps a result of the limited opportunities to apply the formula that we have so few examples. However, that the Romans apply the standard word order and vocabulary of the formula shows that Greek epistolography applied the formula frequently enough for them to learn the standard form, indicating that the formula was probably applied with more frequency than is shown by extant letters.

## 2.7 – The Benefaction formula in the Roman letters

We have 6 examples of the Benefaction formula in the Roman corpus, 2 coming in the same letter, and 1 benefaction statement not using the formula.<sup>91</sup> There is also a damaged example likely to have been a benefaction statement with similar phraseology.<sup>92</sup> There were 21/64 letters with at least the second half preserved (where the Benefaction formula is often found) and no example,<sup>93</sup> the letter body was not provided for 5 letters,<sup>94</sup> and 31 either lost the second half or were generally too damaged for certain interpretation.<sup>95</sup>

The verb is *πειρασόμεθα* in 3 examples, with 2 losing it through damage, and the other uses *δύνωμαι* ‘should I be able’; the verb is always followed by a form of *γίγνομαι*, except in one example where it and *πειρασόμεμαι* are lost.<sup>96</sup> Though sometimes damaged, we

<sup>89</sup> The Benefaction formula is found in *IOLHRC* 57 (mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE) and *IOLHPK* 13 (201 BCE). Freer benefaction statements are found in *IOLHRC* 1 (311 BCE), 13 (c.275? BCE), 20 (c.240 BCE), 21 (c.240 BCE), and 26 (c.205).

<sup>90</sup> Cf. *CIG* II pt.14 3047 (c.194 BCE?); *CIG* II pt.14 3048 (c.194 BCE?); *IOLHPK* 21 (appended document) (190 BCE).

<sup>91</sup> *ORRLIG* 4 (*bis*), 7, 28, 40, and 50. The benefaction statement is in *ORRLIG* 2.

<sup>92</sup> *ORRLIG* 39 ll.3–5?: ἔν τε [τοῖς λ]οι[ποῖς χρόνοις---τὴν] πόλιν αἰεὶ τινος [ὕμ]ιν ἀ[γαθοῦ] θέ[[λω] γενέσθαι].

<sup>93</sup> *ORRLIG* 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 17, 20, 25, 32, 35, 37, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 58, 59, 60, and 64.

<sup>94</sup> *ORRLIG* 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

<sup>95</sup> *ORRLIG* 5, 10, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, and 63.

<sup>96</sup> *ORRLIG* 4 ll.13–14 and 7 have *πειρασόμεθα* and pres. inf. *γίνεσθαι*. *ORRLIG* 4 ll.8–12 has *πειρασόμεθα* and aor. part. *[γεν]όμενοι*. *ORRLIG* 50 has lost *πειρασόμεμαι* but retains the pres. inf. *γείνεσθαι*. *ORRLIG* 28 has *δύνωμαι* and aor. inf. *γενέσθαι*. *ORRLIG* 40 has *πειρασόμεμαι* although the form of *γίγνομαι* is lost.

can identify *παράίτιος τινος ἀγαθοῦ* in every example, *ἀεί* is present in 5 examples, a mention of the future in 3, and a dative beneficiary in 4.<sup>97</sup> The author of the other benefaction statement seems to be alluding to the formula by applying some of its phraseology: it has *πειρασόμεθα* with the infinitive *συνεπαύξειν*, emphasizes ‘honours and privileges’ which the Romans bestowed, and then asks the recipient to maintain their goodwill towards Rome ‘in future’.<sup>98</sup> A formula would have been too constraining to convey the details of such a message, but the use of the formula’s phraseology would have made this an obvious declaration of benefaction.

Our earliest examples of the Benefaction formula—**4** (190 BCE) and **7** (189-188)—are contemporaneous with the high point of the formula’s use in the ‘control’ evidence, indicating that the authors of the earliest official Roman letters were aware of the current Greek formulaic expressions, and could apply them successfully. Our 3 later examples dating between 85 and 31 BCE are testament to the formula’s perseverance.<sup>99</sup> That the formula is not found in great frequency corresponds to the ‘control’ practices and is likely to be due to the lack of appropriate opportunities for the formula. The Romans seem to have understood the gravity of these words—promising future benefaction was apparently reserved for close allies: the formula is used once reporting the speech of ambassadors and elsewhere only in letters to those on good terms with the sender.<sup>100</sup> That the formula is reproduced in the Roman letters in the manner of their Hellenistic counterparts reflects keen observance of Greek epistolography and solid grasp of the language. It is also probably the result of the Romans being exposed to uniform, formal versions in Greek speeches, decrees, and letters when the

<sup>97</sup> The examples which have *ἀεί* are *ORRLIG 4* ll.8–12 and ll.13–14, **7**, **28**, and **40**. *ORRLIG 7* has *εἰς τὸ λοιπόν*, **40** has [*εἰς τὸ μέλλον*], and **4** ll.13–14 has [*ἐν τῷ οἷς ἄλλοις*]. There is a dative recipient in *ORRLIG 4* ll.13–14, **7**, **40**, and **50**.

<sup>98</sup> *ORRLIG 2* ll.21–24: *καὶ τὰ τε εἰς | τὸν θεὸν τίμια καὶ τὰ εἰς ὑμᾶς φιλόανθρωπα πειρασόμεθα συνεπαύξειν, διατηρούντων ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς τὸ | μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοιαν* (my emphasis).

<sup>99</sup> *ORRLIG 28* (post 85 BCE), **40** (45 BCE), and **50** (31 BCE).

<sup>100</sup> The letter reporting the speech of ambassadors is *ORRLIG 7*, and the recipient seems to be on good terms with Rome (note the Embassy formula). The contents of the other letters demonstrate the good relationship of both parties: **4** (which has an Embassy formula and also expresses goodwill to all Greeks) ll.7–8: *ἡμ[εῖ]ς δὲ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας εὐνῶς διακείμεν[οι] | τυγχάνομεν*. **28** (which has an Embassy formula and notes that the recipient sent soldiers to Oppius) ll.22–26: *ὑμᾶς ἔπεμψα γράμματα ὅφ[ε] | στρατιώτας πρὸς με ἀποσ[τέ]λλητε, ἐν πρώτοις ἀπεστε[ί]λλατε*. **40** (which has the greeting *χαίρειν καὶ ἐρῶσθαι*, and Caesar also mentions a decree of friendship) l.11: *φιλίας δόγ[μα]τος*. **50** (which has a health wish and Embassy formula, and Octavian mentions honours and a crown voted to him) l.79: *καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καὶ τὸν στέφανον δέδεγμαί*.

formula was standardized. Adopting this form rather than making more round-about statements would allow the authors to express promises of benefaction effectively and also demonstrate their grasp of contemporary Greek epistolography. After over 100 years they still used the formula in a consistent form, which suggests that it became a standard formula in official Roman epistolography in Greek.

## 2.8 – Filiation expressions

Ancient Greek and Roman filiation expressions clarify a person's identity by providing their lineage. Filiation is found in Greek literary and documentary texts of all periods, including our official letters. Greek filiation had become idiomatic by the classical era, and in Homer we can see that it was already transitioning from the fuller expression: 'X the son/daughter of Y', to the idiomatic form used thereafter: 'X the (son/daughter) of Y'. The person in question will be in the case required by the clause, with the article sometimes repeated after their name. They can then be described as 'son/daughter/child' (υἱός/θυγάτηρ/παῖς,) 'of *their father*' (and occasionally 'of *their mother*'), whose name is added in genitive case.<sup>101</sup> If the grandfather is added for further clarification, his name is attached with article + genitive.<sup>102</sup>

Already in Homer we can see that the word for 'son/daughter' is becoming less necessary and the genitive of the father's name serves.<sup>103</sup> The father's name in genitive with or without a preceding article (the former being more frequent) will become the standard manner of filiation in literary prose spanning our period and beyond. For example, such filiation practices are found quite frequently in Herodotos<sup>104</sup> and Thucydides.<sup>105</sup> Although

<sup>101</sup> The genitive of possession is used for filiation as well as marriage ties and patron-freedman/woman relationships, cf. H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, revised by G.M. Messing (Massachusetts, 1956) §1301. For some early epigraphic examples with a word for 'son/child', see Raubitschek, *DAA*, 112 (c.480 BCE, Athens, Akropolis) l.1: [Θρά]συλλος : καὶ Γνάθιος : Μνέσονος : ηυιέ, and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 5220 = Keram.* III A 26 (433/2 BCE, Athens, Kerameikos) l.4: Σιληνὸς παῖς Φώκο.

<sup>102</sup> Some examples of the grandfather's name being added are at Herodotos 1.7.2: Ἄγρων μὲν γὰρ ὁ Νίνου τοῦ Βήλου τοῦ Ἀλκαίου, and 1.73.3: Κυαζάρης ὁ Φραόρτεω τοῦ Δηόκεω.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. e.g. *Iliad*, 2.552: υἱὸς Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς; *Odyssey*, 1.399: Εὐρύμαχος, Πολύβου πάις; 1.429: Εὐρύκλει', Ὡπος θυγάτηρ Πεισηνορίδαο; 2.296: Ἀθηναίη, κόρη Διός. Cf. also e.g. *Iliad*, 2.527: Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας; *Odyssey*, 1.259: Ἴλου Μερμερίδαο.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. e.g. Herodotos, 1.59.3: Λυκούργου Ἀριστολαΐδεω (as mss., however, cf. Schaefer, retained by Hude (OCT): Λυκούργου <τοῦ> Ἀριστολαΐδεω); 1.1.3: Ἴοῦν τὴν Ἰνάχου.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. e.g. Thucydides, 1.24.2: Φαλῖος Ἐρατοκλείδου; 1.3.2: Ἕλληνας τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος.

used much less frequently, they are still present in Polybios<sup>106</sup> in the Republican period and Plutarch<sup>107</sup> in the Imperial, and they are also used in the New Testament.<sup>108</sup> It seems that from Herodotos onwards words for ‘son/daughter’ tend only to be included in filiation in literature for clarity.<sup>109</sup>

Roman filiation remains constant from the earliest to the latest stages, though it is more common in certain text-types than others. The formula consists of the person’s name in the relevant case, then their father’s name in genitive, and the word for ‘son/daughter’ (*filius/filia*) abbreviated to *F* in inscriptions.<sup>110</sup> This sequence is consistently reproduced in all periods. Examples of filiation in Latin literature are rare, probably due to the developing *tria nomina* system already providing sufficient clarification, with the narrative contributing further contextualization. Nevertheless, we find standard Roman filiation in rare literary occurrences contemporary with our corpus, as early as Plautus and later in Caesar and Livy.<sup>111</sup> In Roman inscriptions, however, filiation is widespread, and in official or public inscriptions it approaches ubiquity. We find it from the earliest epitaphs, dedications, honorifics, and inscriptions on public works, and it continues long into the Empire.<sup>112</sup> When an author feels it

<sup>106</sup> I found only 1 example in Polybios book 1, at 1.30.1: τὸν τ’ Ἀννωνος Ἀσδοῦβαν.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. e.g. Plutarch: *Romulus*, 2.1 (*bis*), 2.2, 16.8; *Publicola*, 14.1; *Demosthenes*, 20.3, 25.7; *Alexander*, 48.1; *Caesar*, 3.1.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. e.g. Matthew 4.21; Mark 2.14; Luke 6.15; John 6.71.

<sup>109</sup> Adams found this occurring in bilingual Latin and Greek inscriptions from Delos where υἱός was inserted to distinguish filiation from the patron-freedman relationship, see J.N. Adams, ‘Bilingualism at Delos’, J.N. Adams, M. Janse, S.C.R. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society* (Oxford, 2002), 119–120. For examples from literature, see Herodotos 1.35.3: Γορδῖεω μὲν τοῦ Μίδεω εἰμι παῖς, and 1.74.4: Ἀλυάττεα γὰρ ἔγνωσαν δοῦναι τὴν **θυγατέρα** Ἀρῶνιν Ἀστυάγεϊ τῷ Κυαξάρεω **παιδί** (my emphasis), see also 1.103. Plutarch seems to do this to differentiate the two men named Aruns, see *Publicola*, 9.1 Ἀρῶν ὁ Ταρκυνίου παῖς and 19.3: Ἀρῶν ὁ Πορσῖνα υἱός (cf. Ἀρῶν in Υ), however there seems to be no need for clarity at *Demosthenes* 15.2, which seems to be done for emphasis, as the word order may suggest: τὸν Χαβρίου παῖδα Κτήσιππον.

<sup>110</sup> Should the grandfather be added, his name is in genitive followed by *N(epos)*.

<sup>111</sup> Plautus, *Asinaria*, 751: “*Diabolus Glauci filius*”. Caesar, *Gallie War*, 1.47: *C. Valeri Caburi filium*. Livy 1.3.1: *Ascanius Aeneae filius*, see also 1.3.6 and 1.3.9.

<sup>112</sup> See these early examples: (epitaphs) *CIL* 6, 1284 (post 290 BCE, the date of his censorship) l.1: [*L(ucius) Corneli]o(s) Cn(aei) f(i)lius Scipio*. *CIL* 6, 1286 (post 258 BCE, the date of his censorship) l.1: *L(ucius) Corneli(o)s L(uci) f(i)lius Scipio*. (dedicatory inscriptions). *CIL* 14, 2892 (c.250 BCE?) l.1: *L(ucius) Gemenio(s) L(uci) f(i)lius Pelt(uino?)*. *CIL* 6 438 (236 BCE?) ll.1–2: *P(ublius) Corn[elios] | L(uci) f(i)lius co(n)so[I]*. A later example with the grandfather and great-grandfather mentioned: *CIL* 6, 1282 (post 52 BCE) ll.1–3: *P(ublius) Claudius P(ubli) f(i)lius | Ap(pi) n(epos) Ap(pi) pron(epos) | Pulcher*. Domitian is still using this type of filiation, *CIL* 9, 5420 ll.1–2: *Imp(erator) Caesar diui Vespasiani f(i)lius | [Domitianus] Augustus*.

necessary to convey a Roman name into Greek with Roman style filiation, the standard equivalent of *filius* is υἱός, which should be applied after the father's name as seen in Greek literature.

In our official Roman letters in Greek, filiation expressions are examples of formulaic expressions not restricted to letters. In our letters, filiation is revealing of the authors' understanding of the Greek and Latin languages in official inscriptions, but it is equally revealing of how the Roman administration sought to project themselves to Greek-speaking audiences. The authors creating these letters were under pressure from Greek and Latin practices in respect to idiomatic conventions but also in respect to the sense of identity encapsulated by filiation. I must also stress from the outset that we should not conceive of filiation in the Roman corpus as "Greek filiation with genitive = 'correct', Roman-style filiation with υἱός = 'incorrect'": the distinction is not so simple, and the application of filiation in the Roman corpus is often subtly nuanced, with language and identity both considered.

There has been little scholarship on filiation expressions.<sup>113</sup> Filiation expressions are mostly found in texts originating from monolingual contexts, where they are almost always grammatically straightforward and easily explained. Furthermore, filiation in monolingual contexts is not overly revealing of the author and their use of language. However, in bilingual contexts the choice of a particular filiation expression and its execution becomes important for analysing the author's understanding of both languages and the identity they projected.<sup>114</sup> J.N. Adams demonstrates the usefulness of filiation expressions for analysing language choice and linguistic proficiency in a bilingual context in discussion of bilingual Latin and Greek inscriptions at Delos.<sup>115</sup> Since his study assesses roughly contemporary Latin and Greek documentary inscriptions it is necessary to consult his work in this section. Sherk offers only

---

<sup>113</sup> Rizakis and Zoumbaki note a general lack of interest in scholarship and reluctance to brave the difficulties of studying Roman names in epigraphic evidence from the Greek-speaking East, see A.D. Rizakis and S. Zoumbaki, *Roman Peloponnese I: Roman Personal Names in their Social Context*, with M. Kantirea (Athens, 2001), 38.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. the comments of Rizakis and Zoumbaki on the significance of the use of names as a symbol of identity (although not referring to filiation), *Roman Peloponnese I*, 38–39.

<sup>115</sup> Adams, 'Bilingualism at Delos', 103–127. Another study which draws on the valuable information provided by filiation expressions (in this case, in documentary Demotic and Greek texts) is B. Muhs, 'Language Contact and Personal Names in Early Egypt', Evans and Obbink (eds.), *Language of the Papyri*, 187–197, see for discussion of filiation esp. 191–195.

2 paragraphs on filiation in *senatus consulta* in Greek, but no discussion of the letters.<sup>116</sup> We will profit from greater attention to this feature of the letters, where the form and function of filiation is often stimulated by multiple linguistic features and cultural conventions. Since prior scholarship is limited, we will therefore draw on data from the ‘control’ evidence, similar inscriptions, and appropriate literature to analyse the application of filiation expressions in the Roman letters.

## 2.9 – Filiation expressions in the ‘control’ evidence

Filiation expressions are not required for every name, only those which the author felt a need to clarify. We have 58/67 ‘Royal’ and 41/59 ‘Non-Royal’ letters without any example of filiation in the preserved text,<sup>117</sup> and 1 ‘Royal’ and 3 ‘Non-Royal’ letters do not have any example provided in the edition.<sup>118</sup> There are 8 examples of filiation with genitive in the ‘Royal’ sub-corpus, 4 having genitive only and 4 having article + genitive (one of which is female),<sup>119</sup> and a further 3 examples of the grandfather being added with article + genitive.<sup>120</sup> We have also a damaged example likely to have been article + genitive.<sup>121</sup> Finally, there is 1 secure example of θυγάτηρ and 1 of υἱός being added to article + genitive filiation for clarity, no different to the practice found in literature.<sup>122</sup> There are 25 examples of filiation

<sup>116</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 117.

<sup>117</sup> These are: *IOLHRC* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, and 64. *IOLHPK* 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58, and 59.

<sup>118</sup> These are *IOLHRC* 34 and *IOLHPK* 32, 33, and 34.

<sup>119</sup> The examples of filiation with genitive only are *IOLHRC* 47 l.3: Ναλαγλόας Κιλαρίου, 62 ll.6–7:

Δημήτριος | Δημητρίου τοῦ Μνασαίου, 65 l.3: Χα[ιρ]ήμων Πυθοδώρου, 66 l.2: Χαίρημων Πυθοδώρου.

The examples with article + genitive are *IOLHRC* 30 l.19: [Βερ]ενίχη, ἡ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου, 67 l.8: Πετάσου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου, l.11: Πετάσου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου, and l.11 (*iterum*): Ἀριστομένους τοῦ Φιλίππου.

<sup>120</sup> *IOLHRC* 30 l.19: [Βερ]ενίχη, ἡ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου, 31 ll.4–5: Βερενίκην || τὴν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου, 62 ll.6–7: Δημήτριος | Δημητρίου τοῦ Μνασαίου.

<sup>121</sup> *IOLHRC* 67 ll.7–8: [Ἀριστομένους] | τοῦ Φιλίππου.

<sup>122</sup> *IOLHRC* 31 ll.4–5: Βερενίκην || τὴν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου θυγατέρα (cf. Homer, *Odyssey*, 1.429: Εὐρύκλει’, ὦπος θυγάτηρ Πεισηνορίδαο, and Plutarch, *Caesar*, 14.5: Καλπουρνίαν θυγατέρα Πείσωνος.), and 59 ll.1–2: [Ἀθή]ναιος ὁ Σωσάνδρου υἱός. There is also a damaged example with υἱός + genitive which is more likely to be a general statement than filiation (since υἱός should follow its genitive in filiation, e.g. Plutarch, *Publicola*, 19.3: Ἄρρουν ὁ Πορσίνᾶ υἱός), but damage impedes more certain conclusions, cf. 23 l.4: [---]ος υἱὸς Ἀλέξανδρος.



with genitive in the ‘Non-Royal’ sub-corpus, 17 using genitive only and 8 using article + genitive.<sup>123</sup> There are 3 damaged examples likely to have had filiation with genitive only.<sup>124</sup>

Aside from there being more filiation examples in the ‘Non-Royal’ letters, the usage is uniform across both sub-corpora and found diachronically throughout. The earliest example of filiation in the ‘Royal’ letters has article + genitive and is in **30** (204 BCE) and the latest is in **67** (21 CE). The earliest example with only genitive dates to c.160 BCE and the latest to 88/7 BCE, in **47** and **66** respectively. The earliest ‘Non-Royal’ example of filiation uses genitive only and is in **3** (240-230 BCE). The most recent example—in **56** (37-36 BCE)—is the same type of filiation. Our 8 ‘Non-Royal’ filiation expressions with article + genitive come from three letters: **38** (186 BCE), **39** (2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE), and **56** (c.157 BCE). There does not seem to be significance in the use of either filiation method, and it may have been simply a stylistic choice of the author. It is unlikely to be due to the chronology of these letters, as the ‘Non-Royal’ auxiliary letter from post 38 BCE has article + genitive filiation. The ‘control’ data suggest that filiation without the article was perhaps more common in inscribed official letters than in literature,<sup>125</sup> however it appears that in the Gospels both types

<sup>123</sup> The examples of filiation with genitive only are *IOLHPK* **3** 1.5 Ἀδμητον Βόκρου, **6** 1.2: Ἐρμίας Ἐμμενίδα, **7** 1.3: [Φ]ιλίσκος Πυθαγόρου, **10** 1.91: Λαμπρίαν [Π]αγκλέος, **10** 11.91–92: Αἴνετον | Πολύτα, **10** 1.92: Φηγέα Σωτίωνος, **17** 1.4: Δαμοκράτη Ἀσσυτέλε<ο>ς, **21** 11.3–4: Ἀντίσκ[ω]ν[α | Μελ]ανθίου, **21** 1.4: [Ἀ]λέξανδ[ρ]ο[ν Μ]ονί[μ]ου, **21** 1.6: Ἐπίνω Σ[ω]π[άτ]ρου, **22** 1.7: Μηνοφάντωι Ἀρτεμιδώρου, **25** 1.5: Γλαύκωι Εὐδώρου, **26** 1.5: Ἡρόδοτος Μηνοδότω, **26** 11.5–6: Μενεκλῆς | Διονυσίω, **28** 1.2: Πόλλις Ἐπιστράτου, **51** 1.6: Διονυσοδώρῳ Πεμπίδου, **56** 1.20: Παμμένην Ζήνωνος. The examples with article + genitive are *IOLHPK* **38** 1.32: Μηνοδώρου τοῦ Διονυσίου, 1.32 (*iterum*): Φιλοίτου τοῦ Κρατίου, **39** 1.44: Διονυσίου τοῦ Νύμφιδος, 1.45: Θυμοτέλου τοῦ Φιλο[κλέους], 1.46: Ἐλπινίκου τοῦ Ἐπικράτου, 1.47: Φιλίωνος τοῦ Φιλομήλου, and 1.48: Ἀρίστωνος τοῦ Ζήνωνος, **56** 1.19: Διοτ[ίμου] τοῦ Διοδώρου Ἀλαίεως. We also have the same in *Aux.* **1** 1.10: Πύθου τοῦ Οὐμανίου.

<sup>124</sup> *IOLHRC* **7** 1.4: [Λάμπετο]ς Πυθαγόρου, **21** 11.4–5: Ἀσκληπ[ι]ά[δ]η[ν] | [Λεω]νί[δ]ου, **57** 1.4: [Διοδώρ]ωι Δωροθέου.

<sup>125</sup> Herodotos, Thucydides, and Plutarch seem to prefer article + genitive. I found 1 example of filiation with genitive only (which was not accepted by Schaefer, who is followed by Hude (OCT)) and 28 examples with the article in the first 100 chapters of Herodotos bk. 1. In the first 100 chapters of Thucydides bk. 1 I found 1 example without the article and 20 with it. Of the examples of filiation without a word for ‘son/daughter’ from Plutarch cited in n.107, all but one (*Demosthenes*, 20.3) had article + genitive, cf. *Romulus*, 2.1 (*bis*), 2.2, 16.8; *Publicola*, 14.1; *Demosthenes*, 25.7; *Alexander*, 48.1; *Caesar*, 3.1. Cf. also, *Alexander*, 16.18: Ἀλέξανδρος [ὁ] Φιλίππου (Ziegler).

were equally acceptable.<sup>126</sup> It is possible that the article was removed with a view to saving space on the stone, though we cannot prove this or ascertain at which point this could have occurred. Our 3 examples of filiation with the grandfather's name added by article + genitive corresponds to the examples from Herodotos and is surely in the conventional manner.<sup>127</sup>

It seems fair to conclude that both types of filiation were equally acceptable in the 'control' corpus, with the genitive alone being more common in the 'Non-Royal' letters. The similarities of these results to the literary examples demonstrates that these examples largely conform to the filiation conventions of higher-level language, but are perhaps more similar to the Gospels. They could well be characteristic of official letters and are suitable *comparanda* for analysing filiation expressions in the Roman letters.

## 2.10 – Filiation expressions in the Roman letters

Greek and Roman filiation practices converge in the official Roman letters in Greek, and therefore we have different manners of filiation. The most popular by far are the intrinsically Greek filiation for Greek names, and Roman-style filiation in Greek for Romans, and exceptions are rare. We have 27/64 Roman letters without examples of filiation in the extant text,<sup>128</sup> and 5 letters do not have the body provided in the edition.<sup>129</sup> The higher quantities of letters with examples of filiation expressions themselves probably results from the combination of Roman naming practices incorporating filiation more often than Greek and a possible concern on the part of the Romans to be specific when referring to Greeks.

We have 39 examples of natural Greek filiation with Greek names, 34 of which use genitive only and 5 use article + genitive, and we also have 4 examples of the grandfather's name added by article + genitive.<sup>130</sup> There are also 5 damaged examples likely to have had

<sup>126</sup> Matthew has two examples with article + genitive filiation (4.21, 10.2) and Mark has 4 (1.19, 2.14, 3.17, 3.18). Luke has 1 with the article (3.2) and 2 without (6.15, 6.16). John has 3 without the article (6.71, 13.26, 21.15).

<sup>127</sup> See Herodotos, 1.7.2 and 1.73.3.

<sup>128</sup> *ORRLIG* 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 30, 36, 39, 40, 41, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 62.

<sup>129</sup> *ORRLIG* 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

<sup>130</sup> The examples of filiation with genitive only are *ORRLIG* 7 l.3, ll.3–4, 19 l.8, l.21, and l.23, 24 C ll.47–48, C ll.48–49, C ll.49–50, and C l.50, 26 ll.16–17, 28 ll.8–9, l.9, l.10, and ll.10–11, 37 l.58, 38 l.4 (*bis*) and l.5, 42 l.5, ll.5–6, l.6, ll.6–7, l.7 (*bis*), l.8 (*bis*), and l.9, 43 l.2, 45 ll.14–15, 53 ll.23–24, 60 l.23 and l.24, 61 l.3, and 64 l.19. The examples with article + genitive filiation are *ORRLIG* 53 l.26, 59 ll.6–7, l.8, l.10, and l.13. The examples with the grandfather added with article + genitive are *ORRLIG* 24 C l.48 and ll.50–51, 42 ll.8–9, and 60 l.24.

genitive only filiation and 1 more likely to have added the grandfather with article + genitive.<sup>131</sup> In the ‘control’ corpus, we had 17/25 examples of filiation with genitive only and 8/25 with article + genitive; our Roman data, with 34/39 and 5/39 conform to the trends of the ‘control’ evidence. The Roman authors perhaps noticed the prevalence of plain genitive filiation for Greek names in their letters. The diachronic presence of this expression shows that it was the standard filiation for Greek names in the corpus: the earliest example—7—is from 189-188 BCE and the latest—64—is from 12/13 CE. The 4 examples of the grandfather’s name being added via article + genitive conforms completely to the ‘control’ evidence. We also have 2 examples of intrinsically Greek filiation with plain genitive applied to a Roman name.<sup>132</sup> Aside from the names being Roman, these examples are no different from their Greek counterparts, though accidental omission is always possible.

There are 29 examples in the Roman corpus of intrinsically Roman filiation in Greek (using υἱός for *filius*) for Roman names, none of which have the article.<sup>133</sup> The Roman names in genitive always use Greek morphology. There are no examples of Latin interference affecting the genitive of our Roman names. Although it was not the idiom in postclassical Greek literature and documents to use a word for ‘son/daughter’ except for clarification, the use of υἱός for *filius* was the acceptable practice in official Roman documents. Adams found that in inscriptions at Delos filiation with υἱός for Romans became popular after the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, although these were not official inscriptions.<sup>134</sup> The earliest example of υἱός for *filius* in an official Roman document in Greek is in *ORRLIG* 6 (189 BCE) and is found again in a *senatus consultum* from 170 (alongside standard Greek filiation for a Greek woman),<sup>135</sup> perhaps suggesting that it was standard practice in official Roman documents in Greek by the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century. Since we can observe Greeks accommodating Romans by using Roman-

<sup>131</sup> The damaged examples of filiation with genitive only are *ORRLIG* 21 l.13: Ξανθίαι Ξανθίου[υ---], 24 C l.13: [---]||-σον Φυλοτίμου, C l.47: Ἰκέσιον Ἀρτεμιδώρου[υ], and C ll.51–52: [ῚΕρμιπ]πτον Μενοίτου, 28 ll.7–8: Ἀντίπατ[ρος] | ? Ἀδρά]στου. The damaged example with the grandfather added with article + genitive is *ORRLIG* 26 ll.16–17: Διόδοτον [δὲ Διοδό?]του τοῦ Ἀθηνίωνος.

<sup>132</sup> *ORRLIG* 2 l.2: Μᾶρκος Οὐαλάριος Μάρκου, 19 l.3: Κόιντος Φάβιος Κοίντου Μάξιμος.

<sup>133</sup> *ORRLIG* 6 l.1, 9 ll.1–2, 20 l.89, 28 ll.1–2, 29 ll.2–3, 34 l.4, 35 l.1, ll.6–7, l.7, l.8, ll.8–9, l.10, ll.10–11, l.11, ll.12–13, l.13, ll.13–14, l.14 (*bis*), ll.14–15, l.15, and ll.15–16, 42 l.3 and ll.13–14, 43 l.1, 44 l.2, 48 l.1, 49 ll.1–2, and 64 l.17. υἱός seems to have been lost through damage in *ORRLIG* 11 l.35, 24 A l.26, 31 l.1, 32 l.1, 33 l.1, 35 ll.1–2.

<sup>134</sup> Adams, ‘Bilingualism at Delos’, 123.

<sup>135</sup> *Senatus consultum de Thisbensibus*, cf. *RDGE* 2 l.1, l.4, l.5, l.15, ll.15–16, l.16, (Sherk, *RDGE*, 27–28). For the example of Greek filiation, see *RDGE* 2 l.48: Δαμοκρίτα Διονυσίου. Even if it is ‘wife of Dionysios’ and not ‘daughter’ (cf. translation at Sherk, *Translated Documents*, 21) it would still be applying the Greek idiom.

style filiation e.g. in the honorific inscription for Marcus Annii (117 BCE) and in the document appended to *IOLHPK 38* (c.138), it was probably recognized by at least some Greeks as the standard filiation for Romans.<sup>136</sup> The manner in which υἱός is added conforms to the precedent set in Greek literature, and, although the Romans were not imitating Homer, their application of υἱός corresponds to literary *comparanda*.<sup>137</sup> Therefore, Roman υἱός filiation followed the rules of Greek grammar and expression, but not the Greek idiom. It is found throughout the timespan of the corpus (the earliest example being **6** (189 BCE) and the latest being **64** (12/13 CE)) and is surely the standard filiation expression for Roman names. There are also 5 certain examples of Roman-style filiation applied to Greek names and 1 damaged example.<sup>138</sup> These filiation expressions are constructed no differently to Roman-style filiation for Roman names, and all the certain examples occur in letters with Roman-style filiation for Roman names.

That 39/44 examples of Greek names with filiation use idiomatic Greek expressions speaks highly of the authors' grasp of Greek, especially when we consider that 19 of these examples occur in letters with intrinsically Roman filiation for Roman names.<sup>139</sup> Although there is a Roman name with υἱός filiation earlier in the letters with these 19 Greek names, it seems unlikely that the Greek names would have originally had υἱός which was then omitted. Sherk argued that, in lists of *Roman* names in *senatus consulta*, the stonecutter would omit superfluous examples of υἱός after the first name, but this assumes a high level of literacy and understanding of Greek idiom for these stonecutters.<sup>140</sup> Furthermore, the stonecutter for **35**

<sup>136</sup> See *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 700 (Letaean decree) ll.3–4: Μάαρχος Ἄννιος Ποιπλίου υἱός, and *IOLHPK 38* (doc.) ll.42–43: Κόϊν|τος Καλιπόρνιος Γαΐου υἱός (cf. *IOLHPK 38* (doc.) l.41: Εἰρηνίου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδο[υ], l.61: Εὐδαμίδα τοῦ Εὐθυκλέος, ll.61–62: Νίκ<ων>|ος τοῦ Νίκωνος).

<sup>137</sup> Cf. the example from *ORRLIG 6* l.1: Σπόριος Ποστόμιος Λευκίου υἱός, with Homer, *Iliad*, 2.638: Θόας Ἀνδραίμονος υἱός, *Odyssey*, 2.386: Φρονόιοι Νοήμονα φραΐδιμον υἱόν, and Plutarch, *Publicola*, 19.3: Ἄρρων ὁ Πορσίνα υἱός, although Plutarch includes the article. Cf. also *IOLHRC 31* ll.4–5: Βερενίκην || τὴν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου θυγατέρα and esp. *IOLHRC 59* ll.1–2: [Ἀθή]|ναιος ὁ Σωσάνδρου υἱός.

<sup>138</sup> *ORRLIG 33* l.2: Μικᾶς Μικᾶ υἱός, **35** l.16: Ἐρμόδωρος Ὀλυνπίχου υἱός, l.18: Ἀλεξίδημος Θεοδώρου υἱός, and l.18 (*iterum*): Δημαίνετος Θεοτέλου υἱός, and **48** l.4: Σόλων Δημητρίου υἱός. It seems very likely that we have Roman filiation with a Greek name at *ORRLIG 25* l.2: ([X]αίρημων Πυ[θοδώρ]ου υ[ι]ός. There is also another possible example in *ORRLIG 63*, though, due to damage, it is hard to be certain of the ethnicity of the name, see **63** l.7: [---Ποτάμ]ωνος υἱόν [---].

<sup>139</sup> These are *ORRLIG 24* (x4), **28** (x4), **42** (x9) **43**, and **64**.

<sup>140</sup> Sherk, *RDGE*, 17. For this to be feasible the stonecutter would first need to be able to read υἱός and then evaluate its function. While some stonecutters may have been capable of this, it is difficult to believe it could ever be universal.

retained υἱός in 16 Roman names.<sup>141</sup> If υἱός was consciously retained with the first name to contextualize the list and the remaining superfluous examples were removed, the author is more likely to have done this, since they are more likely to understand the language and its idioms than the stonecutter.<sup>142</sup> Adams warns of the possibility of υἱός being omitted by mistake by the stonecutter, which of course cannot be excluded for every example,<sup>143</sup> but conscious omission is better ascribed to the author. Sherk's statement was also in regard to lists of *Roman* names, but we have Roman and Greek names with the respective, intrinsic filiation types. Furthermore, if we consider **42**, we find intrinsic Roman filiation, then 8 examples of idiomatic Greek filiation for Greek names, and then another example of a Roman name with Roman-style filiation. The author of this letter understood the filiation practices of both cultures and applied them accordingly. Since we have no evidence to the contrary, it is fair to conclude that the letters presenting Greek and Roman names with their respective filiation expressions reflect sound understanding of Greek and Roman languages and epistolography.

The examples of Roman names with Greek filiation in **2** (193 BCE) and **19** (115) seem to be consciously applied, and could reflect authors who sought to project the sender as no different to the Greek recipients. Adams found that Romans at Delos electing to use Greek filiation could indicate a desire to present themselves as 'insiders'.<sup>144</sup> It is possible that the author of **2** sought to linguistically accommodate the recipient, which would be fitting at the early stages of Roman influence in the East, and that this letter seems to be quite warm and well-written (using the Embassy and Benefaction formulae) lends support to this. Judging by the 3 examples of idiomatic Greek filiation in **19**, it is clear that the author understood the language, but accommodation could be behind the Roman name with Greek filiation as the letter discusses a quashed (apparently Anti-Roman) revolution and it seems wise for Romans to present themselves to Dyme as 'insiders'.

<sup>141</sup> There are two examples of dittography in this section of the letter, which may indicate that the stonecutter did not fully recognise what he was copying, cf. *ORRIG* **35** ll.8–9 and l.14.

<sup>142</sup> We have a comparable list in Luke's Gospel. Luke lists Jesus' lineage, consisting of 77 names all attached consecutively with genitive. υἱός (though not in a filiation expression) is used in the preceding sentence. See Luke 3.23–38: Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἡλὶ τοῦ Μαθθαίου... (71 other names)... τοῦ Σὴθ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Even though grandfathers are not commonly attached using υἱός, we can see that υἱός at the introduction contextualizes the list as one of lineage.

<sup>143</sup> Adams, 'Bilingualism at Delos', 124.

<sup>144</sup> Adams, 'Bilingualism at Delos', 123.

Although the Roman-style filiation with υἱός is done as an allusion to Roman filiation in Latin, the manner in which it is applied is perfectly correct in Greek. The genitives of Roman names in these filiation expressions always have Greek morphology, not transliterated Latin morphology, and the placement of υἱός in the expression conforms to the sequence found in literature, even if it mirrored Latin practices. This indicates that Roman names with υἱός filiation are not examples of ‘bad Greek’ even though they are not the contemporary Greek idiom. That we find Roman-style filiation in 29/31 examples always in a regular form, as well as in *senatus consulta* in Greek, suggests that υἱός filiation received standardisation for Roman names in official Republican documents in Greek, and surely became a mark of Roman identity. Although some authors may not have considered Greek idiom before applying υἱός filiation, there are 5 letters with intrinsic Roman and Greek filiation with the appropriate names for which we can conclude that υἱός filiation was a conscious decision. While certainty is difficult for all examples, we should not take υἱός filiation as an automatic sign of poor understanding of Greek, but consider that it may have been applied to project Roman identity into letters written in Greek.

We have 5 examples of Greek names with Roman-style filiation, and 1 damaged example likely to be the same. Two of these letters show evidence of Latin interference on their Greek. While there is a χαίρειν λέγει greeting in **33**, a sign of Latin interference (see §1.5), we find 7 connective particles in a long but damaged letter. This suggests that the author understood Greek but did not take particular care with formulaic expressions, which is the likely cause of the Greek name receiving Roman-style filiation. The pressure of Latin documents is clear in **35**, which conveys a decision, law, and two *senatus consulta*, as well as a list of Roman names with υἱός filiation, but it also contains a health wish. Latin interference seems to have caused υἱός to be added to the 3 Greek names subconsciously, either through proximity to the list of Romans or because they were copied from a list in Latin. The authors of the remaining example in **48** and the damaged example in **25** possibly sought to present the Greeks with υἱός filiation as accepted by the Romans. In **48**, Octavian responds kindly to the Ephesians after their ambassador Sosos related their suffering at the hands of Labienus, Octavian’s enemy. Octavian possibly wished to express Sosos’ acceptance and his favour for the *polis* by naming him with Roman-style filiation. We see a similar circumstance in **25**, where Khairemon, wanted by Mithridates for aiding the escape of Romans he sought to

execute, receives Roman-style filiation.<sup>145</sup> The Romans could well have wanted to present such a man as an ‘insider’, and similar practice could be present in **48**.

We can conclude that filiation expressions in the Roman letters mostly adhere to Greek idiom or apply an acceptable alternative which expressed Roman identity. Some divergences from the standard filiation expressions for each culture indicate authors reflecting on the subject matter and are sometimes quite purposeful. Occasionally, the pressure of Latin documents results in Roman-style filiation where it does not belong, but these occurrences are remarkably rare. The evidence from the Roman letters reflects authors with sound understanding of the form and function of Greek and Roman filiation expressions and the abilities to apply them correctly.

## 2.11 – Concluding remarks on formulaic expressions in the Body of the Roman Letters

Before presenting the overall conclusion, we should note briefly some important features of formulaic expressions in the Roman corpus. The evidence from the Roman letters demonstrates that the vast majority of the authors were capable of applying formulaic expressions in the letter body in the manner of their Hellenistic counterparts.

The Embassy formula is lengthy and often complicated: the Roman authors applied it using the same vocabulary, components, and sequences found in the ‘control’ corpus. The formula is also applied with the same function as the ‘control’ examples. The rare examples of the Roman Embassy formula are probably the result of pressure from official Latin document writing, and the 11 examples of the Embassy formula applied in the manner of the ‘control’ evidence indicate that this formula was the standard one in official Roman epistolography in Greek. There are 6 examples of the Benefaction formula in the Roman letters, all of which are applied in the same form and for the same function as the Hellenistic examples. The standardization of its usage reflects attention to Greek epistolography and a conscious decision to meet its standards. The authors of the Roman letters were capable of applying idiomatic Greek and Roman style filiation expressions in Greek for the appropriate

---

<sup>145</sup> Cf. *IOLHRC* **65** and **66**, which are effectively the death warrants from Mithridates for this same Khairemon.

names in almost every example. The filiation expressions in the Roman letters reflect a high number of authors who understood how to construct and apply filiation for both Greek and Roman names, but also understood the significance of filiation as a projection of identity.

The formulaic expressions found in the body of the Roman letters reflect generally authors who understood the form and function of the formulaic expressions used in this section of official Koine letters. They also indicate that most authors possessed a sound understanding of the language and the text type. Furthermore, the application of these expressions in the body of the Roman letters illustrates that the Roman administration sought to construct all sections of their letters at the standard of Hellenistic epistolography, not simply the openings and closures. This indicates that it was important to the Roman administration to present their official letters to Greek-speaking audiences in the form expected by this audience.



## Conclusion

### The Significance of formulaic expressions in the Roman Letters

We are now able to analyse the significance of the application of formulaic expressions in official Roman epistolography in Greek and address the four aims of this dissertation. The first three aims were to identify how formulaic expressions in official Roman letters inscribed in Greek were applied in respect to grammar and the letter layout, and ascertain whether these applications conformed to or diverged from the contemporary Greek practices. The vast majority of the Roman letters meet the standards of the ‘control’ evidence in applying formulaic expressions throughout the entire letter.

Of the 46 Roman letters with extant prescripts, 41 presented, in varying levels of preservation, either the standard address formula or an acceptable variant which conformed to the ‘control’ examples. We had health wishes in 9 of the 38 Roman letters with the introductory section preserved, which is more than the 7 examples in 88 ‘control’ letters. Like the ‘control’ evidence, health wishes were only sent to recipients on good terms with Rome. While these health wishes have precedents in the ‘control’ evidence, 8 have a distinctly Roman variation, which demonstrates the authors’ control of the language and attention to official Koine epistolography. Of the 25 Roman letters with the closure intact, 11 had the farewell ἔρρωσθε, showing that the Roman letters used farewell salutations in the manner of the ‘control’ evidence, which had 38 examples of ἔρρωσο/ἔρρωσθε in 73 letters with extant closures. There is no farewell in 14/25 Roman letters, which is not dissimilar to the ‘control’ corpus, having 30/73 letters without farewells. These data demonstrate the authors’ understanding of the form, function, and application of formulaic expressions used at the opening and closure of official Koine letters.

The efficiency with which the authors of the Roman letters applied formulaic expressions extends to the letter body. The Embassy formula was found in 18/79 ‘control’ letters with sufficient preservation; in the Roman letters, we have 11 examples from 40 letters with this section intact, a higher ratio than the ‘control’ corpus, and they are no different to the ‘control’ examples. Regarding the Benefaction formula, only 2/60 ‘control’ letters with enough text provided had this formula (comprising 3 examples), though there was another

example in an appended document and 5 letters made general benefaction statements. In the Roman corpus we have 5 letters with Benefaction formulae in the standard form (comprising 6 examples) in 27 letters with enough text provided, meaning we have more examples and a higher ratio in the Roman letters than the ‘control’. The ‘control’ corpus used idiomatic Greek filiation with plain genitive for 21 names, article + genitive for 12, and article + genitive with υἱός/θυγάτηρ for clarification in 2 names. The Roman corpus used plain genitive for 34 Greek names and article + genitive for 5, meaning that 39/44 Greek names with filiation used idiomatic Greek; 1 of the complete Greek names with Roman-style filiation may have been intended to present the person as an ‘insider’.<sup>1</sup> There were 29 Roman names receiving Roman-style filiation in Greek, which has been shown to be standard practice for Romans in official documents, and the expression is constructed in light of Greek practices and uses Greek morphology. The authors behind the 2 Roman names with Greek filiation may perhaps have wished to represent these Romans as accommodating their Greek recipients. The evidence from the letter body reflects authors who understood how to construct formulaic expressions required in this section of Greek letters. This is significant because it may have been easy to observe formulaic expressions at the opening and closure and neglect the body, but this evidence shows that the authors of the Roman letters sought to craft the entire letter in idiomatic Greek.

Occurrences of Latin interference are remarkably rare, found only in four χαίρειν λέγει greetings, three examples of the Roman Embassy formula, and four examples of (probably) unintentional Roman-style filiation for Greek names. That there are only 11 such examples in 7 of our 64 letters is significant as it shows that most of these expressions come from a few (possibly inexperienced) authors. The χαίρειν λέγει greetings (*ORRLIG* 9, 32, 33, and 53) are likely to be a result of interference from Latin *salutem (dicit)*. This greeting is not a calque of the Latin equivalent. The infinitive χαίρειν was probably understood to depend on a verb such as λέγει, and the authors may have felt that they were using the correct form, χαίρειν alone being the abbreviation.<sup>2</sup> This was probably done by authors who were either unfamiliar with Greek expressions or did not devote particular attention to drafting the letter. The association of 9 and 32 with documents, after considering two early inscribed Latin letters which merely preface the document and have no epistolary formulae,<sup>3</sup> suggests that this Roman practice has interfered with the expression of these letters in Greek. All 3

<sup>1</sup> There was also a damaged example likely to be the same in *ORRLIG* 25 1.2: ([X]αιρημων Πυ[θοδώρ]ου υ[ιό]ς.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Apollonios Dyskolos, *On Syntax*, 3.65.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 581 and *CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 586.

examples of the Roman Embassy formula, which is intelligible but stilted in Greek, are found in letters with appended documents (**9**, **11**, and **20**). The whole of **9** consists of a *χαίρειν λέγει* greeting and the Roman Embassy formula immediately followed by the document; **11** has sustained damage, but its body was also only the Roman Embassy formula. The more substantial text of **20** presents consistent object-verb and verb-final word order, and no connective particles. Both **11** and **20** have the standard address formula however. The authors of these three letters may have been unversed in Greek idiom or unconfident in their abilities, and fell back on more Latinate conventions, but the letters are readable, if unidiomatic. That **33**, which presents a Greek name with Roman-style filiation, has a *χαίρειν λέγει* greeting suggests that Latin interference may have led an author who was capable of applying 7 connective particles to falter on formulaic expressions, reflecting perhaps an author who understood the language but was less-experienced with the text type. The author of **35** began with the standard address and a health wish, and it was perhaps the list of Roman names which introduced Latin interference into the filiation of the Greek names; perhaps conveying several Latin documents into Greek further confused the Latin and Greek expressions. The author of **48** was perhaps borrowing Roman-style filiation to present a Greek individual as accepted by the Romans. This is probably not an example of interference.

The application of these expressions is significant because they require understanding of the grammar of each component and the function of the entire formula in the letter, meaning they are revealing of the authors' understanding of Koine Greek and official epistolography. We can conclude that the evidence of formulaic expressions in 57 of the 64 Roman letters reflects authors who understood the form, function and application of formulaic expressions used in official Koine epistolography, showing keen understanding of and attention to the language and the text type. The diachronic regularity of formulaic expressions throughout the corpus indicates that the Roman administration made expressing their official letters in Greek to contemporary Greek standards a priority in our corpus. The 7 letters with formulaic expressions which are unnatural in Greek still display an understanding of Greek through the application of natural formulae, with only **9** and **32** offering scant evidence to the contrary; nevertheless, these letters are intelligible. That these letters are spread in a random chronology in the corpus suggests that they are exceptions to what is an otherwise high standard of epistolography. The formulaic expressions applied from the earliest to the latest Roman letters demonstrate a remarkable adherence to the standards of the Hellenistic evidence, and we can justifiably conclude that the majority of official Roman epistolography inscribed in Greek met contemporary standards of the language and the text type.

The application of formulaic expressions in official Roman letters inscribed in Greek is significant for evaluating the authors' fundamental understanding of the language and the text type, which allows us to define more clearly the source of the letters. Consequently, it allows for conclusions on the possible manners in which the Roman administration sought to project itself and its letters to Greek-speaking audiences, which is the final aim of this dissertation. We must first address the question of authorship. Ascertaining whether a letter was composed or translated by Romans, Greeks working within the Roman administration, or Greeks working for the recipient is a difficult undertaking, and, since scholarship has not fully analysed the language of these letters, we are not yet prepared to form conclusions. Nevertheless, this analysis of formulaic expressions facilitates some considerations on authorship. The remarkable consistency of the application of formulaic expressions in the Roman letters suggests that the majority of these letters is likely to have left the Roman administration in Greek (for now, whether they were compositions or translations is less important than the quality of their language). We have 57 of the 64 Roman letters applying the formulaic expressions of official Koine epistolography from the earliest to the latest stages of the corpus. On the other hand the examples of Latin interference occur at random intervals and appear in the same forms. This is strong evidence that we have a regular source for nearly all of these letters. The alternative, that these letters were translated from Latin by the recipients, relies on various Greek states across the East to be consistently rendering Latin formulaic expressions into Greek equivalents (and using the same equivalents, as our evidence shows) for over 200 years. While rare letters may have received such treatment, it seems more likely that the majority of letters came from the same source and that the general practice involved the Roman administration using authors educated in Roman and Greek epistolography.<sup>4</sup>

Due to the importance of formulaic expressions to Ancient Greek and Roman epistolography,<sup>5</sup> the consistently high level of application of epistolary and non-epistolary formulae in the opening, closure, and body of the letters, which meets the standards of the Hellenistic 'control' evidence in the vast majority, shows that the Roman administration

---

<sup>4</sup> Sherck certainly believed the *senatus consulta* in Greek left the administration in Rome in the form in which we find them (see Sherck, *RDGE*, esp. 13, with more in depth discussion of their language at 13–19), though he does not make a definitive statement on the letters. Sherck's statement at *RDGE*, 209, that "On the whole we may say that these letters were originally intended, from beginning to end, to appear in Greek, but the method used to produce the Greek text was not always the same" seems accurate and is supported by the evidence from their application of formulaic expressions. Cf. Kaimio, *Romans and the Greek Language*, 114, who echoes this point.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Halla-aho, *Non-literary Latin Letters*, 44.

sought to present their official letters in Greek as in no way different to those of Greek-speakers. Even the letters which fall back on Latin conventions still produce letters which are intelligible in Greek. It seems clear that properly applying the conventions of official Koine epistolography was central to official Roman epistolography in Greek, and, if this were not possible, to at least provide readable Greek. The diachronic consistency of the application of formulaic expressions in these letters in Greek indicates that the Roman administration sought to accommodate their Greek-speaking audiences from the earliest stages of their interaction with the East and this remained constant even after consolidating Roman power. It also reflects that the Romans understood just how entrenched the Greek language was in the East,<sup>6</sup> and it was surely recognised that, to have any standing in the East, the Romans must master Greek. The evidence from formulaic expressions in these letters indicates that the Romans sought to accommodate their Greek-speaking recipients as far as packaging their information in a Greek manner. When we interpret Rome's relationship with the East, we should consider the effort expended in creating these documents and the proficiency with which the formulaic expressions were executed, and perhaps rethink the impression of the unaccommodating Roman magistrate of which we read in Valerius Maximus.<sup>7</sup>

In closing, formulaic expressions are an aspect of official Roman letters inscribed in Greek which has been undervalued and understudied by modern scholarship. The evidence they present indicates that the vast majority of these letters applied formulaic expressions, a central aspect of Greek letters, to the standards of official Koine epistolography. It is likely that most letters originated in this form from the Roman administration, and that the Roman administration sought to and were successful in using formulaic expressions to create letters in Greek which met the standards of Hellenistic epistolography.

---

<sup>6</sup> Horrocks, *Greek*, 125–126.

<sup>7</sup> Kaimio notes that much of the epigraphic evidence presents a different view to that presented in Valerius Maximus 2.2.2, cf. Kaimio, *Romans and the Greek Language*, 96, 110–111. Adams found that the bilingual inscriptions at Delos do not support the view of Roman 'linguistic arrogance' found in Valerius, cf. Adams, 'Bilingualism at Delos', 124.



# Bibliography

## *Text editions*

- Allen, T.W. (ed.), *Homeri Opera*, III: *Odysseae libros I–XII*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1917; repr. 1962)
- Homeri Opera*, IV: *Odysseae libros XIII–XXIV*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1919; repr. 1963)
- Boissevain, U.P. (ed.), *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt*, III, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Berlin, 1955)
- Briscoe, J. (ed.), *Valeri Maximi: Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, I (Leipzig, 1998)
- Buettner-Wobst, T. (ed.), *Polybii Historiae*, I–II (Stuttgart, 1962)
- Polybii Historiae*, IV, (Stuttgart, 1964)
- Du Pontet, R. (ed.), *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentariorum*, I (Oxford, 1900; repr. 1970)
- Gärtner, H. (ed.), *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, I, i, 5<sup>th</sup> edn. (Leipzig, 2000)
- Guenther, O. (ed.), *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, XXXV, ii: *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum inde ab. a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur Collectio* (Leipzig, 1898)
- Hercher, R. (ed.), *Epistolographi Graeci* (Amsterdam, 1871; repr. 1965)
- Hude, C. (ed.), *Herodoti Historiae*, I, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. (Oxford, 1927; repr. 1967)
- Kapler, W., Hanhart, R. (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, IX, ii: *Maccabaeorum liber II* (Göttingen, 1976)
- Kritzius, F. (ed.), *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1856)
- Lindsay, W.M. (ed.), *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*, I (Oxford, 1904; repr. 1968)
- T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*, II (Oxford, 1905; repr. 1966)
- Marchant, E.C. (ed.), *Xenophontis Opera Omnia*, IV: *Institutio Cyri* (Oxford, 1910)
- Monroe, D.B. (ed.), *Homeri Opera*, I: *Iliadis libros I–XII*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. revised by T.W. Allen (Oxford, 1920; repr. 1963)

Niese, B., *Flavii Iosephi opera*, VI (Berlin, 1895; repr. 1955)

Ogilvie, R.M. (ed.), *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita*, I (Oxford, 1974)

Purser, L.C. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*, I: Epistulae ad Familiares (Oxford, 1901; repr. 1968)

Raubitschek, A. E., *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth centuries B.C.*, with L.H. Jeffery (Massachusetts, 1949).

Stuart Jones, H. (ed.), *Thucydidis Historiae*, I (Oxford, 1898)

Uhlig, G. (ed.), *Apollonii Dyscoli De Constructione Libri Quattuor*, Schneider, R., Uhlig, G., *Grammatici Graeci*, II: Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt (Leipzig, 1910)

Ziegler, K. (ed.), *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, I, ii, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. revised by H. Gärtner (Leipzig, 1994)

——revised by Gärtner, H., *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, II, i, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Leipzig, 1993)

——revised by Gärtner, H., *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, II, ii, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Leipzig, 1994)

### *General bibliography*

Adams, J.N., Janse, M., Swain, S.C.R. (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society* (Oxford, 2002)

Adams, J.N., ‘Bilingualism at Delos’, Adams, J.N., Janse, M., Swain, S.C.R. (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society* (Oxford, 2002), 103–127

——*Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003)

——*The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC – AD 600* (Cambridge, 2007)

——*Social Variation and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2013)

Bencivenni, A., ‘The King’s Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions’, Radner, K. (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2014), 141–171

Birley, A.R., *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor* (London, 1997; repr. 2009)

Blomqvist, J., *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose* (Lund, 1969)

Buzón, R., ‘Die Briefe der Ptolemäerzeit: Ihre Struktur und ihre Formeln’ (diss. Heidelberg 1984)



- Ceccarelli, P., *Ancient Greek Letter Writing* (Oxford, 2013)
- Clackson, J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Maldon, Mass., Oxford and Chichester, 2011)
- ‘Latin Inscriptions and Documents’, Clackson, J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Malden, Mass., Oxford and Chichester 2011), 29–39
- Clackson, J., Horrocks, G.C., *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language* (Malden, Mass., Oxford and Carlton, Victoria, 2007)
- Coleman, K.M., ‘Bureaucratic language in the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 142, 2 (2012), 189–238
- Corcoran, S., ‘State Correspondence in the Roman Empire: Imperial Communication from Augustus to Justinian’, Radner, K. (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2014), 172–209
- Cugusi, P., *Evoluzione e Forme dell’Epistolografia Latina: Nella tarda Repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell’Impero, con cenni Sull’Epistolografia Preciceroniana* (Roma, 1983)
- Denniston, J.D., *The Greek Particles*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. revised by K.J. Dover (Oxford, 1950; repr. London, 1996)
- *Greek Prose Style*, (Oxford, 1952; repr. London, 1997)
- Devine, A.M., Stephens, L.D., *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information* (Oxford, 2006)
- Dik, H., *Word Order in Ancient Greek* (Amsterdam, 1995)
- Dover, K.J., *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge, 1960; repr. London, 2000)
- Dunant, C., Pouilloux, J., *Recherches sur l’histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, II (Paris, 1958)
- Evans, T.V., ‘Approaches to the Language of the Septuagint’, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 56, 1 (2005), 25–33
- ‘Valedictory ἔρωσο in Zenon Archive Letters from Hierokles’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 153 (2005), 157–158.
- ‘Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri’, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor 2007* (2010), 197–205
- Evans, T.V., Obbink, D.D. (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford, 2010)

- Exler, F.J.X., 'The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography' (diss. Catholic University of America, 1923)
- Frisch, P., *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos* (Bonn, 1978)
- Frischer, B., Andersen, R., Burstein, S., Crawford, J., Gallucci, R., Gowing, A., Guthrie, D., Haslam, M., Holmes, D., Rudich, V., Sherk, R.K., Taylor, A., Tweedie, F., Vine, B., 'Word-Order Transference between Latin and Greek: The Relative Position of the Accusative Object and the Governing Verb in Cassius Dio and other Greek and Roman Prose Authors', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 99 (1999), 357–390
- García Domingo, E., *Latinismos en la Koiné (en los documentos epigráficos desde el 212 a. J.C. hasta el 14 d. J.C.)* (Burgos, 1979)
- Gerhard, G.A., 'Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Griechischen Briefes, I: Die Formel ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνι χαίρειν', *Philologus*, LXIV (1905), 27–65
- Gignac, F.T., *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*, I: Phonology (Milan, 1976)
- Gordon, A.E., *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley, 1983)
- Guarducci, M., *Epigrafia Greca* (Rome, 1969; repr. 1995)
- Haddad, C.J., 'The Composition and Translation of Official Roman Letters inscribed in Greek: Inscribed Letters from the Greek East c.197 BCE to the Age of Augustus' (Hons. diss., Macquarie University, 2013)
- Halla-aho, H., *The Non-literary Latin Letters: A study of their syntax and pragmatics* (Helsinki, 2009)
- 'Epistolary Latin', Clackson, J. (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language* (Maldon, Mass., Oxford and Chichester, 2011), 426–444
- Horrocks, G.C., *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Maldon, Mass., Oxford and Chichester, 2010)
- Kaimio, J., *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979)
- Klauck, H.-J., *Ancient Letters and the New Testament*, English trans. by D.P. Bailey (Texas, 2006)
- Koskenniemi, H., *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki, 1956)

- Lafoscade, L., 'De Epistulis (aliisque Titulis) Imperatorum Magistratuumque Romanorum, quas ab aetate Augusti usque ad Constantinum' (diss. Paris, 1902)
- Lanham, C.D., *Salutatio Formulas in Latin Letters to 1200: Syntax, Style, and Theory* (Munich, 1975; repr. Oregon, 2004)
- Levick, B., Mitchell, S., *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, IX (London, 1988)
- Manolessou, I., 'On historical linguistics, linguistic variation, and Medieval Greek', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 32, 1 (2008), 63–79
- Matić, D., 'Topic, focus, and discourse structure: Ancient Greek Word Order', *Studies in Language*, 27, 3 (2003), 573–663
- Mayser, E., *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Prolemäerzeit*, I, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. by H. Schmoll (Berlin, 1970)
- McElduff, S., *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source* (London, 2013)
- Muhs, B., 'Language Contact and Personal Names in Early Egypt', Evans, T.V., Obbink, D.D. (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford, 2010), 187–197.
- Muir, J.V. *Life and Letters in the Ancient Greek World* (London, 2009)
- Nixon, P., *Plautus*, III (Massachusetts, 1924; repr. 1963)
- Peek, W., *Kerameikos*, III: Inschriften, Ostraka, Fluchtafeln (Berlin, 1941)
- Porter, S.E., O'Donnell, M.B., 'Building and Examining Linguistic Phenomena in a Corpus of Representative Papyri', Evans, T.V., Obbink, D.D. (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri* (Oxford, 2010), 287–311.
- Radner, K. (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 2014)
- Reynolds, J., *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1982)
- Rhodes, P.J., *The Decrees of the Greek States*, with D.M. Lewis (Oxford, 1997)
- Rigsby, K.J., *Asylia* (California, 1996)
- Rizakis, A.D., Zoumbaki, S., *Roman Peloponnese I: Roman Personal Names in their Social Context*, with M. Kantirea (Athens, 2001)
- Rochette, B., 'Language Policies in the Republic and Empire', Clackson, J. (ed.), *A*

- Companion to the Latin Language* (Maldon, Mass., Oxford and Chichester, 2011), 549–563
- Sandys, J.E., *Latin Epigraphy: An Introduction to the Latin Inscriptions of the Roman World* (Chicago, 1974)
- Schneider, R., Uhlig, G., *Grammatici Graeci*, II: Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt (Leipzig, 1910)
- Sherk, R.K., *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore, 1969)
- Translated Documents of Greece and Rome*, 4: Rome and the Greek East to the death of Augustus (Cambridge, 1984)
- Smyth, H.W., *Greek Grammar*, revised by G.M. Messing (Massachusetts, 1956)
- Stowers, S.K., *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1986)
- Trapp, M.B., *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology with Translation* (Cambridge, 2003)
- van den Hout, M., ‘Studies in Early Greek Letter-Writing’, *Mnemosyne*, 2, 1 (1949), 19–41
- Viereck, P., ‘Sermo Graecus quo Senatusque Populusque Romanus Magistratusque Populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris Aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur’ (diss. Göttingen, 1888)
- Welles, C.B., *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (Chicago, 1934)
- White, J.L., ‘Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol.90, no.1 (1971), 91–97
- The Body of the Greek Letter: A Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle* (Montana, 1972)
- Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia, 1986)
- Woytek, E., *T. Maccius Plautus: Persa: Einleitung, Text, und Kommentar* (Vienna, 1982)
- Ziemann, F., ‘De Epistularum Graecarum Formulis Sollemnibus Quaestiones Selectae’ (diss. Halle, 1910)

## Appendix



## Introductory Remarks

This Appendix contains the published texts of the letters discussed in the dissertation. It has been compiled **solely for the convenience of the marker for reference only, and does not constitute any portion of the dissertation submitted for examination**. These texts were included with my supervisor's approval since the letters in question are scattered across numerous publications, which would have been inconvenient and time consuming for the marker to locate.

**There has been no attempt to re-edit the published texts of these letters.** Any *apparatus critici* in quotation marks are those of the editor who is named. Any occasional comments outside of these quotation marks are my own. In the case of competing editions, I have added any points of divergence between them outside of the quoted *apparatus* of the editor. When there was a need to comment within the quoted *apparatus* of the editor, I have marked these comments with my initials (CJH). Any identifiable typographic errors have been noted outside of the editor's *apparatus*. The bibliographic information provided is in no way intended to be exhaustive.

All the dates and locations of the inscriptions in *Official Roman Republican Letters Inscribed in Greek* are from Sherck, *RDGE*, unless otherwise noted. Likewise, all the dates and locations of the inscriptions in *Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic Royal Correspondence*, are from Welles, *RCHP*, unless otherwise noted. All locations of the inscriptions in *Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic poleis and koina* are from Ceccarelli, *AGLW*, unless otherwise noted, and the source of the date is always named. When no date was offered in the publication, I include an inferred date with an asterisk (\*) and a short note in the *apparatus* section.

Any features of formulaic language discussed in the main text are presented in **bold** typeface. It has been my practice throughout to abbreviate the documents appended to the letters in question unless a feature of their language is discussed in the main text. Features which are discussed are shown in **bold** typeface. Documents which are not discussed are abbreviated usually to their first sentence only. Some of these undiscussed documents were over 100 lines long and would have been of no aid to the marker.

There were some texts presented as inscribed official letters in Sherck, Ceccarelli, or Welles which I have excluded for three possible reasons. They were too fragmentary to: (1)

contribute data to my study of formulaic expressions; (2) be securely identified as a letter; and/or (3) be securely attributed to Rome, a Hellenistic *polis/koinon*, or a Hellenistic kingdom at the exclusion of the other two possibilities. For completeness, I have included the reference to such texts with a reason for exclusion at the end of each sub-corpus under ‘List of Excluded Texts’. The two Auxiliary Letters (one each for the *ORRLIG* and *IOLHPK* corpora) did not meet the criteria of the corpora, but there was no reason not to include them as *comparanda*. Each has an explanation provided and they are listed after the relevant collection.

I should note 8 texts from the ‘Unpublished’ Dossier from Argos (*ORRLIG* **12**, **13**, **14**, **15**, and **16**, and *IOLHPK* **32**, **33**, and **34**), all found in Rhodes, P.J., *The Decrees of the Greek States*, with D.M. Lewis (Oxford, 1997). Unfortunately, the letters in this Argos Dossier are still unpublished and no other transcription is available, even to the author of *DGS*, who was also unable to locate them in publication. For this reason I have reproduced the texts as they appear in *DGS*. I express my sincere gratitude to Emeritus Professor Peter J. Rhodes of the University of Durham, author of *DGS*, for kindly discussing these texts with me, endeavouring to locate them in publication, and providing me with the revised reading of *ORRLIG* **14** by M. Pierart which does not appear in *DGS*.

I would like to thank Dr Trevor Evans and Dr Peter Keegan for their advice on the compilation and presentation this Appendix. All mistakes are my own.

C.J.H.



Texts



# Official Roman Republican Letters Inscribed in Greek

## 1 – T. Quinctius Flamininus to the magistrates and *polis* of the Khyretians – 197-194 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 33 = Viereck ‘SG’ I = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘Appendix 3’ R1

Τίτος Κοϊνκτίος, στρατηγὸς ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων Χυρετιέων  
τοῖς ταγοῖς καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν  
φανερὰν πεποήκαμεν τὴν τε ἰδίαν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων  
προαίρεσιν ἣν ἔχομεν εἰς ὑμᾶς ὁλοσχερῶς, βεβουλήμεθα καὶ  
5 ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἐπιδεῖξαι κατὰ πᾶν μέρος προεστηκότες  
τοῦ ἐνδόξου, ἵνα μὴδ’ ἐν τούτοις ἔχωσιν ἡμᾶς κατα-  
λαλεῖν οἱ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου εἰωθότες ἀνα-  
στρέφεσθαι. Ὅσαι γάρ ποτε ἀπολείπονται κτήσεις  
ἔγγειοι καὶ οἰκίαι τῶν καθηκουσῶν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον  
10 τὸ Ῥωμαίων, πάσας δίδομεν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ πόλει,  
ὅπως καὶ ἐν τούτοις μάθητε τὴν καλοκαγαθίαν ἡμῶν  
καὶ ὅτι τελέως ἐν οὐθενὶ φιλαργυρῆσ[α]ι βεβουλήμεθα,  
περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενοι χάριτα καὶ φιλοδοξίαν. Ὅσοι μέν-  
τοι μὴ κεκομισμένοι εἰσὶν τῶν ἐπιβαλλόντων αὐτοῖς,  
15 ἐὰν ὑμᾶς διδάξωσιν καὶ φαίνωνται εὐγνώνται λέ-  
γοντες, στοχαζομένων ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ γεγραμ-  
μένων ἐγκρίσεων, κρίνω δίκαιον εἶναι ἀποκαθίστασ-  
θαι αὐτοῖς.

Ἔρρωσθε.

All dates for *RDGE* texts are Sherk’s unless noted. Found near (mod.) Demeniko (Thessaly) (all notes on the places of *RDGE* inscriptions are from Sherk unless otherwise noted). “Text based on the one by Viereck (notes). 4 Viereck puts comma before ὁλοσχερῶς. 13-14 μέντοι, Leake, but *MENTON*, stone (cf. L. Cohn, *Hermes*, 17 [1882]: 645). 19 Ἔρρωσθε was inscribed twice, the first one being erased.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 212.

## 2 – M. Valerius Messala, the tribunes, and the Senate to the *boule* and *demos* of the Teans – 193 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 34 = Viereck ‘SG’ II = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R2

Ῥωμαίων.

Letter Μάρκος Οὐαλάριος Μάρκου στρατηγὸς καὶ  
δήμαρχοι καὶ ἡ σύνκλητος Τηίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ  
δήμῳ χαίρειν· ν Μένιππος ὃ τε παρ’ Ἀντιόχου τοῦ βα-  
5 σιλέως ἀποσταλεῖς πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρεσβευτῆς προ-  
χειρισθεὶς καὶ ὑφ’ ὑμῶν πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ τῆς πόλεως,  
τό τε ψήφισμα ἀνέδωκεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκολούθως τούτῳ  
διελέχθη μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας· ἡμεῖς δὲ τόν τε ἄν-  
δρα ἀπεδεξάμεθα φιλοφρόνως καὶ διὰ τὴν προγεγενη-

- 10 μένην αὐτῶι δόξαν καὶ διὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσιν καλοκα-  
γαθίαν περὶ τε ὧν ἡξίου διηκούσαμεν εὐνόως. καὶ ὅτι  
μὲν διόλου πλεῖστον λόγον ποιούμενοι διατελοῦ-  
μεν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείας, μάλιστ' ἂν τις στο-  
χάζοιτο ἐκ τῆς συναντωμένης ἡμεῖν εὐμενείας
- 15 διὰ ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ δαιμονίου· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἄλ-  
λων πλειόνων πεπείσμεθα συμφανῇ πᾶσι γεγονέναι  
τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὸ θεῖον προτιμίαν. διὸ καὶ διὰ τε ταῦ-  
τα καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐνοίαν καὶ διὰ τὸν ἡξιω[μέν]ον  
πρεσβευτὴν κρίνομεν εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν γώ-  
20 ραν ἱερὰν, καθὼς καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ ἀφορο-  
λόγητον ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων καὶ **τά τε εἰς**  
**τὸν θεὸν τίμια καὶ τὰ εἰς ὑμᾶς φιλόανθρωπα πειρασό-**  
**μεθα συνεπαύξειν**, διατηρούντων ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς τὸ  
μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαν. νν **Ἔρρωσθε.**

Inscribed at Teos. “Text by Viereck (notes). 1 In larger letters. 3 σύγκλητος, Dittenberger, repeated by Hiller, but Boeckh and Le Bas-Waddington indicate a *nu* instead of a *gamma*. 4 τοῦ omitted by Le Bas-Waddington, Dittenberger, and Hiller. 6 ὑπὲρ, Boeckh; περὶ, Le Bas-Waddington. 7 ἀ[π]έδωκεν, Boeckh, but cf. Holleaux, *Etudes*, I, 357. 16 πᾶσι omitted by Le Bas-Waddington, Dittenberger, and Hiller. 17 προτιμίαν, stone, but Sauppe preferred to write προθυμίαν; however, since one finds τὰ εἰς τὸν θεὸν τίμια (sic) in ll. 21-22, as Hiller observed, the reading of the stone should be retained.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 215.

### 3 – M. Acilius Glabrio to the Delphians – early 190 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 37 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R3

- [ - - - - - ] ὑπάρχ[ει]ν [κατά]λυμα τοῖς ἡμετέροις πολίταις.  
Ὑμεῖς δὲ φροντίσατε]  
[ἴν]α ταῦτα πάντα ἀναγραφέντα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην ἀνατεθῇ ἐν [τῶι ἱερῶι.  
Ἐὰν δέ τινες ἀντι]-  
[ποι]ῶνται περὶ τῶν κτήσεων ἢ τῶν ἐκ τούτων καρπῶν ἢ οἰκιῶν ἢ τῶ[ν  
ὑπαρχόντων, φά]-  
[μεν]οι ἑαυτῶν εἶναι, περὶ τούτων, ὅσαι μὲν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γεγόνασιν κρίσεις,  
κ[ύριαι] ἔστωσαν· ὑμεῖς δέ,]  
5 [κριτ]ήριον ἀποδείξαντες τὸ μέλλον ὀρθῶς διαλήμψεσθαι, διεξαγάγ[ετε τὰς  
λοιπὰς - - - - -]  
[ . . ] Ἥγγεταί μοι μερισμούς τε γίνεσθαι ἀπὸ τούτων εἷς τινας [λάθραι καὶ  
ὠνάς, ἀναφορᾶς]  
[μὴ γ]ενομ[έ]νης ἐπὶ τὸ κοινόν· στοχάσασθε οὖν ὅπως μηδὲ ἐν τοιοῦτο γίνηται  
[τοῦ λοιποῦ. Περὶ δὲ]  
[τ]ῶν κατὰ τὸ ἱερόν, ἐάν τε Θεσσαλοί, ἐάν τε ἄλλοι τινὲς πρεσβεύωσι,  
[πειράσομαι ἐν Ῥώμῃ ? κατὰ]  
[τ]ὰ ἐμ[α]υτοῦ φροντίσαι ἵνα ὑμῖν κατὰμονα ᾦ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρχοντα  
πάτ[ρ]ια, σωζομένης ? τῆς]  
10 τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ αὐτονομίας.

Inscribed at Delphi. Followed by lists. “Text based on that of Roussel. 1 [κατά]λυμα, Pomtow; cf. *I.G.*, V, 1, 869. 3 [ἀντιποι]ῶνται περὶ; cf. *P.Berl.* 993. col. III. 12. 4 Daux, op. cit., p.229, n.2, reads κύ[ριαι] since he

sees the *upsilon*. 4-5 [τοῦ δὲ λοιποῦ, κριτ]ήριον ἀποδείξαντες..., διεξαγάγ[ετε τὸ δίκαιον is an alternative. 9-10 πάτ[ρια τὰ περὶ τῆς] is an alternative. 17 Perhaps Λεπάρα, as Daux reads, *op. cit.*, p.229, n.1.” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 226.

#### 4 – L. and P. Cornelius Scipio (?) to the *boule* and *demos* of the Herakleians on the Latmos – 190 BCE

= Sherck *RDGE* 35 = Viereck ‘SG’ III = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R4

- [Λεύκιος Κορνήλιος Σκιπίων] στρατηγὸς ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων  
 [καὶ Πόπλιος Σκιπίων ἀδελ]φὸς Ἡρακλεωτῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δή-  
 [μῳ χαίρειν·] ἐνέ[τυχον] ἡμῖν οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν πρέσβεις Διᾶς, Διῆς, Διονύ-  
 [σιος, - -] ἰάμ[αν]δρος, [Εὐ]δημος, Μόσχος, Ἀριστείδης, Μένης, ἄνδρες κα-  
 5 [λοὶ κάγαθοι] οἱ τό τε [ψήφ]ισμα ἀπέδωκα καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγησαν ἀκολού-  
 [θως τοῖς] ἐν τῷ [ψήφ]ισματι κατακεχωρισμένοις οὐδὲν ἐλλείποντες  
 [φιλοτι]μίας· ἡμ[εῖς] δὲ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς Ἑλληνας εὐνόως διακείμενοι  
 [τυγχά]νομεν καὶ πειρασόμεθα, παραγεγονότων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέρα[μ]  
 [πίστιμ,] πρόνοιαν ποιῆσθαι τὴν ἐνδεχομένην, **αἰεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ παρα[ί]-**  
 10 [τιοι γεν]όμενοι· συγχωροῦμεν δὲ ὑμῖν τὴν τε ἐλευθερίαν καθότι καὶ  
 [ταῖς ἄ]λλαις πόλεσιν, ὅσαι ἡμῖν τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν ἔδωκαν, ἔχουσιν ὑ[φ’]  
 [αὐτοὺς π]άντα τὰ αὐτῶν πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς ὑμετέρους νόμους,  
 [καὶ ἐν τ]οῖς ἄλλοις πειρασόμεθα εὐχρηστοῦντες ὑμῖν **αἰεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ**  
 [παραίτ]ιοι γίνεσθαι· ἀποδεχόμεθα δὲ καὶ τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν φιλάνθρωπα καὶ τὰς  
 15 [πίστεις, κ]αὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ πειρασόμεθα μηδενὸς λείπεσθαι ἐγ’ χάριτος ἀποδόσει·  
 [ἀπεστ]άλκαμεν δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς Λεύκιον Ὀρβιον τὸν ἐπιμελησόμενον τῆς  
 [πόλεως κ]α[ὶ] τῆς χώρας ὅπως μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς παρενοχλήῃ. **Ἐρρωσθε.**

Found at Heracleia on the Latmos (Viereck ‘SG’ p.2 – “Epistulam Heracleae ad Latmum repertam edidit...Boeckh”). “1 Before στρατηγὸς Haussoullier believed that he could see a *nu*, but Holleaux found no trace of it on the stone. 2 ἴρος, Judeich and Haussoullier. Holleaux disagreed with their identification of the *rho*. It was actually part of the *phi*: ἀδελ[φ]ός. 4 [Ἀναξί]μ[αν]δρος, Judeich and Dittenberger; but [Παλ]άμ[αν]δρος, Haussoullier; [Σκ]άμ[αν]δρος, De Sanctis; [Εὐ]δημος, Haussoullier. 7 προθυ[μίας, Haussoullier. 9 Boeckh and Waddington restored [αἴρεσιν]; Dittenberger and Viereck, [πίστιμ]; Holleaux, παρα[ί]τιοι. 10 γιν[όμενοι, Henzen and Viereck (notes); γεν]όμενοι, Holleaux and Haussoullier; but γενησ[όμενοι, Boeckh. 11-12 ὑ[φ’ αὐτοὺς, Holleaux and Viereck. 15 [πίστεις], Boeckh.” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 218.

#### 5 – L. and P. Cornelius Scipio (?) to the Kolophonians – 190-189 BCE

= Sherck *RDGE* 36 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R5

- [Λ]εύκιος Κ[ορνήλιος Σκιπίων στρατη]-  
 [γὸς] ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων καὶ [Πόπλιος Σκι]-  
 [πίων] ἀδελφὸς Κολοφονίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ  
 [τῷ δή]μῳ χαίρειν· ἐνέτυχον ἡμῖν οἱ  
 5 [παρ’ ὑμ]ῶν πρέσβεις Ἀγαμήδης καὶ [- -]  
 [ἄνδρ]ες καλοὶ κάγαθοί, <οἱ> τό τε [ψήφ]ισμα  
 [ἀπέδω]καν καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγησ[αν ἀκο]-  
 [λούθ]ως τοῖς ὑφ’ ὑμῶν δεδογμέ[νοις, οὐ]-  
 [δὲν ἐλ]λείποντες φιλοτιμίας καὶ [- - -]  
 10 [- <sup>ca.5</sup> - εἰ]ναι (?) τὸ ἰερὸν ἄσυ[λον - -]

Inscribed at Kolophon (?) (implied at Sherk *RDGE* p.220 n.2 “Colophon would hardly have erected the stele if the request had not been granted.”). “Text by Picard and Holleaux. 3 Κολοφονίων for Κολοφωνίων, perhaps an engraver’s error. 6 <οἱ>, Holleaux. 9-10 καὶ [σπουδῆς περὶ || τοῦ εἶ]ναι κτλ, Picard; καὶ [ἡξί]ουν εἶ]ναι τὸ ἱερὸν ἄσυ[λον τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κλαρίου suggested by Holleaux; καὶ [περὶ τοῦ || διαμει]ναι ? τὸ ἱερὸν ἄσυ[λον ἡξί]ουν ἡμᾶς | πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι (*vel similia*) κτλ], *S.E.G.*” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 220.

## 6 – Spurius Postumius to the *koinon* of the Amphiktiones – 189 BCE

(on the same monument as **Excl.T. 1**) = Sherk *RDGE* **1(ii)** = Viereck ‘SG’ X = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R7**

B Letter	Frag. Ulrichs	Frag. A	Frag. B
-------------	---------------	---------	---------

**Σπόριος Ποστόμιος Λευκίου υἱός, στρατηγὸς Ῥωμαίων, τῷ κοι|νῷ τῶν Ἀμφικτιόνων** [ν χαίρειν· οἱ Δελφῶν πρεσβευ]-  
ταὶ Βούλων, Θρασυκλῆς, Ὀρέστας περὶ τῆς ἀ|συλίας τοῦ ἱεροῦ κα|ῖ] | τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς [χώρας διαλεχθέντες]  
καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ ἀνεισφορ[ί]ας ἡξίουν ὅπως αὐτοῖς ἐπιχωρηθῇ πα[ρὰ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων·]  
γινώσκετε οὖν δεδογμένον τῇ συγκλή[τ]ῳι τό τε ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου [υ ἄσυλον εἶναι καὶ]  
5 τὴν πόλιν τῶν Δελφῶν καὶ τὴν χώραν, καὶ Δ[ελφοῦ]ς αὐτονόμους καὶ ἐλευθέρους καὶ ἀνεισφόρους, οἰκοῦν]-  
τας καὶ πολιτεύοντας αὐτοὺς καθ’ αὐ[τοὺς καὶ] κυριεύ[ν]τας τῆς τε ἱερᾶς χώρας καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λι]-  
μένος, καθὼς πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς [ἦν· ὅπως ο]ὖν εἰδ[ῆ]τε, ἔκρινον ὑμῖν γρά[ψαι περὶ τούτων.]

C sc	Frag. Ulrichs	Frag. B
---------	---------------	---------

Πρὸ ἡμερῶν τεσσάρων νωνῶν Μαί[ων ἐν Κομετίῳ ? - - ] Ὀχτάσιος Γναίου στρατ[ηγὸς? συνε]-  
Βουλεύσατο τῇ συγκλήτῳι. κτλ.

D	[Λ]εύκιος Φούριος Λ[ευκίου υἱός, στρατηγὸς - - - - - ] [Δε]λφῶν ἐ[λευθερίας - - - - - ]
---	--

Found at Delphi. “Text by Holleaux, who showed that it is a case of two case of two letters, not one. He restored Document A from Document B. B 2 διαλεχθέντες, L. Robert, adopted by Holleaux in place of Viereck’s διελέγησαν. C 1 Ὀχτάσιος: Holleaux previously thought of Βαί- or Βέ]βαιος, but a revision of the stone made the present reading almost positive. At the end of this line could be στρατ[ηγὸς or στρατ]ηγὸς ὑπατος (*sic*).” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 23.

## 7 – C. Liuius (Salinator) to the Delphians – 189-188 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* **38** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R8**

[Γάιος Λίβιος Μάαρκου στ]ρατηγὸς ὑπ[ατ]ος Ῥ[ω]μ[αίων καὶ δή]-  
[μ]αρχοὶ καὶ [ἡ σύγκλ]ητος Δελφῶν τοῖς ἄρ[χο]υσι καὶ τῇ πό[λει χαίρειν·]  
οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀποσταλέντες πρεσβεύται Ἦρως Εὐδῶρου, [Δ]αμο[σθέ]-  
νης Ἀρχέλα τά τε γράμματα ἀπέδωκαν καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγησαν ἀκολούθως

- 5 τοῖς ἐν αὐτοῖς κατακεχωρ[ις]μένοις μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς, φιλοτιμίας οὐ-  
θὲν ἐλλείποντες, ἐνεφάνιζον δὲ καὶ δι[ι]ότι τόν τε ἀγῶνα τὸν γυμνικὸν  
καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν συνετελέσατε· καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος τὴν διάνοιαν  
προσέσχευεν τε καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ τε τῶν πρότερον πρεσβευτῶν  
Βούλωνος, Θρασυκλέος, Ὀρέστα, τῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς μὲν ἀφικομένων, ἐν δὲ  
10 τῇ εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῇ διαθωνησάντων, γράψαι πρὸς Μάαρχον Φόλουιον  
τὸν ἡμέτερον στρατηγόν, ἵνα φροντίσῃ ὅπως, ὅταν καθ' ἡμᾶς γένηται  
τὰ κατὰ τὴν Σάμην πράγματα, ἀναζητήσῃ τοὺς ἀδικήσαντας καὶ φρον-  
τίσῃ ἵνα τύχωσιν τῆς καθηκούσης τιμωρίας καὶ τὰ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν  
15 ὑπάρχοντα ἀποκατασταθῇ πάντα τοῖς οἰκείοις αὐτῶν· ἔδοξεν δὲ καὶ  
πρὸς Αἰτωλοὺς γράψαι περὶ τῶν γινομένων παρ' ὑμῖν ἀδικημάτων, ἵνα  
νῦν μὲν τὰ ἀπηγμένα ἅπαντα ἀναζητήσωσιν καὶ ἀποκαταστήσω-  
σιν ὑμῖν, τοῦ δὲ λοιποῦ μηθὲν ἔτι γίνηται· καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς κα-  
τοικούντων ἔχειν ὑμᾶς ἐξουσίαν ἐφῆκεν ἡ σύγκλητος ἐξοικίζειν  
[ο]ὕς ἄν βούλησθε καὶ ἐὰν κατοικεῖν παρ' ὑμᾶς τοὺς εὐαρεστούοντας τῶι  
20 [κ]οινῶι τῶν Δελφῶν· τὰς δὲ δοθείσας ἀποκρίσεις τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν πρὸς  
[ἡ]μᾶς ἀφικομένοις παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταῖς ἀνεδώκαμεν αὐτοῖς καθὼς  
[ἡ]ξιοῦν ἡμᾶς, καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν δὲ πειρασόμεθα ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ  
[παρ]αίτιοι τοῖς Δελφοῖς γίνεσθαι διὰ τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ δι' ὑμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὸ  
πάτριον ἡμῖν εἶναι τοὺς θεοὺς σέβεσθαι τε καὶ τιμᾶν τοὺς ὄντας πάν-  
25 των αἰτίους τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

Inscribed at Delphi. 1.12. πράγματα, surely for πράγματα, but Sherk makes no comment. “1 Μάαρχου] υἱ[ός, Pomtow; Μάαρχου υἱός στ]ρατηγός, Viereck. 4 ἀπέδωκαν, Pomtow, ἀπέδωσαν in Homolle’s copy; ἀκολούθως, Homolle. 6 διότι, Pomtow; δ.ότι, Homolle; καί, ὅτι, Viereck. 15 γινομένων, Pomtow; γενομένων, Homolle. 22 ἀεὶ [π]ειρασόμεθα ἀεὶ, Pomtow; δὲ πειρασόμεθα ἀεὶ, Homolle. 23 καὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, Homolle.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 226.

## 8 – A certain Licinius and the Senate to the Amphiktionες – 186 BCE?

= Sherk *RDGE* 39 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R9

- [Μάαρχ]ος Λικίνιος Μαάρχ[ου (?) Λεύκολλος (?) στρατηγός (?) καὶ δή]-  
[μα]ρχοι καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος Ἀμφικτί[σι] χαίρειν· οἱ ἀπεσταλ[ι]-  
[μέ]νοι παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ Αἰακίδα[ς, . . . . . ]  
[. Α]ς, Μνασίδαμος, ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοί, εἰσελ[θόν]τες  
5 [ε]ἰς τὴν σύγκλητον, διελέγησαν περὶ ᾧ αὐτο[ὺς] ἀπε]-  
[σ]τάλκετε καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος ἀπεδέξατό τε α[ὐτοὺς]  
[φ]ιλοφρόνως καθότι προσῆκεν παρ' ἀνδρῶν κα[λῶν]  
κἀγαθῶν ἀπεσταλμένους καὶ διήκουσεν ἐπιμ[ελῶς]  
[π]ερὶ τῶν κριτηρίων καὶ ψήφων τῶν Ἀμφικτιον[ 3-4. ]  
10 [περ]ὶ τούτων ἔδοξεν οὕτως ἀποκριθῆναι ὅτ[ι]  
[οὗ]τε ἀφαιρεῖσθαι οὔτε διδόναι νομίζομε[ν δεῖν].

Inscribed at Delphi. “Based on Daux. 1 Daux restores the official’s name without mark of interrogation. Pomtow restores Λικίνιος Μαάρχ[ου] υἱός Γέτας, ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων and refers the entire document to the “Scandal of 125” when a huge deficit in the treasury was discovered. 4 κἀγαθοί, Flacelière. 6 Couve transcribed ΑΠΕΔΕΙΞΑΤΟ, which was followed by Colin, Holleaux, and Roussel. Daux reports that there is no *iota* on the stone. 9 Ἀμφικτιον[ι]κῶν or Ἀμφικτιόν[ων]. 11 νομίζομε[νοι, Blum; νομίζομε[ν], others; νομίζομε[ν δεῖν], Daux, followed by Flacelière.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 230.

## 9 – P. Cornelius Blasio to the arkhons and *demos* of Korkyra – between 175 and 160 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 4, cf. *SEG* 47, 604 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R11**

Letter	<b>Πόπλιος Κορνήλιος Π[ο]- πλίου υἱὸς Βλασίῳ στρατηγὸς χαίρειν λέγει ἄρχουσι δῆμῳ 5 τε Κορκυκαίων· πρεσβευ- ταὶ Ἀμβρακιῶται καὶ Ἀθαμᾶμες ἐμοὶ προσ- ήλθοσαν, ἵν’ αὐτοῖς σύγ- κλητον δῶ. Ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς 10 σύγκλητον ἔδωκα. Συγκλήτου δόγμα τό-</b>	sc	<b>δε ἐστίν.</b> Πρὸ ἡμερῶν τριῶν νωνῶν Κοιγκτι- λίῳ ἐγ κομετίῳι· κτλ.
--------	--	----	--

Inscribed at Korkyra. “1 Κορν[ή]λιος, Viereck (notes); others, Κορ[νή]λιος. 1-2 Π[ο]πλίου, Klaffenbach, but Holleaux, Γαίου.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 35. This text was followed on the stone by other documents, including the letter of Korkyra to the Ambrakiotai which is given as *IOLHPK* 30. The text of *SEG* 47, 604 on *SEG* Online exhibits an important error: what appears on *SEG* Online to be lines 12-15 are actually lines 5-8, which have somehow been moved from between original lines 4 and 9 to between original lines 14 and 15. Sherk has the correct reading which I have reproduced here.

## 10 – A magistrate or a legate to the Amphiktionones – 171-170 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 40 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R10**

A. Pomtow, following Nikitski

	[.....]τ[-.....]	
	[.....]οντα υ[-.....]	
	[. . τῶν κ]αθεστακό[των] ὑ[-.....]	
	[ . . . . . ] ὅπως αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀ[μφικτίονες] .....	
5	[ . . . . . ] νητε τοῖς θεοῖς κα[-.....]	
	[ . . . ] δ[ιοι]κῆτε καθὼς ἐπιβά[λλει] .....	
	Περσέα παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος εἰς Δελφοὺς παρελθεῖν ἐν τῇ ἐκχειρίαι]	
	[τῶ]μ Πυθίων· οὐ δίκαιον δὲ συνόλως ἦν ἔαν ἐκεῖνον οὔτε παρίεναι οὔτε τοῦ χρηστηρίου μετέχειν]	
	οὔτε θυσιῶν οὔτε ἀγώνων ο[ὔ]τε τοῦ Ἀμφικτιονικοῦ συνεδρίου τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ]	
10	ἐπεσπάσατο τοὺς πέραν τοῦ Ἰστροῦ οἰκοῦντας βαρβάρους, οἳ καὶ πρότερόν ποτε ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ μὲν]	
	οὐθενί, ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει δέ [τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων συναθροισθέντες εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐνέβαλον καὶ]	
	ἐπιστρατεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, διανοοῦμενοι διαρπά[-	
	[σ]αι καὶ ἀνελεῖν αὐτό, ἔτυχον π[αρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς προσηκούσης τιμωρίας, καὶ	



- οἱ πλεῖστοι ἀπώλοντο.]  
 παρέβη δὲ καὶ τὰ γενόμενα τὰ ὑ[φ'] ἡμῶν τῶι πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ὅρκια καὶ τὰς  
 συνθήκας, ὥς αὐτὸς ἀνενεώσατο.]
- 15 [κ]αὶ Θρᾷκας μὲν ὄντας ἡμετ[έρου]ς φίλους καὶ συμμάχους καταπολεμήσας  
 ἀναστάτους ἐποίησεν. Ἀβροῦ]-  
 πολιν δέ, ὃν ἡμεῖς περιελάβομεν τα[ῖς] πρὸς αὐτὸν συνθήκαις φίλον ἡμῶν ὄντα  
 καὶ σύμμαχον, ἐξέ]-  
 βαλεν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας. πρεσβε[υτὰς] δὲ παρὰ τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν  
 βασιλέων ἀποστελλομένους]  
 εἰς Ῥώμην περὶ συμμαχίας τῶν [μὲν] Θηβαίων κατεπόντισεν, ἄλλους δὲ ἄλλως  
 ἐκποδὼν ποιῆσαι ἐπεβάλετο.]  
 [π]λὴν εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθεν ἀπονοίας [ὥστε] καὶ τὴν σύγκλητον ἡμῶν φαρμάκοις  
 ἀναλῶσαι ἐν νῶι εἶχε. Δόλοπες δὲ ἀφη]-
- 20 ροῦντο τὴν ἐλευθερίαν διὰ τῶν ἐκείνου εἰσβολῶν. ἐν δὲ Αἰτωλῖαι πόλεμόν τε  
 καὶ φόνους ἐβουλεύ]-  
 [σατο] καὶ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος εἰ[ς] ταρ[α]χὰς καὶ στάσεις κατέστησεν. καὶ κατὰ  
 πάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος χεῖ]-  
 [ρισ]τα πρᾶσσων διετέλει, ἄλλα [τε] κακὰ ἐπινοούμενος καὶ καταδεχόμενος  
 τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πόλεων φυγάδας.]  
 [κα]ὶ διαφθείρων τοὺς προεστηκότ[ας], ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὰ πλήθη θεραπεύων,  
 χρεωκοπίας τε ἐπηγγέλλε]-  
 [το] καὶ νεωτερισμοὺς ἐποίει κατὰ δ[η]λον ποιούμενος ἦν ἔχει προαίρεσιν πρὸς  
 τε τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ τοὺς Ῥω]-
- 25 [μαί]ους. ἐξ ὧν συμβέβηκε[ν] τοῖς Πε[ρ]ραιβοῖς καὶ τοῖς Θετταλοῖς καὶ τοῖς  
 Αἰτωλοῖς ἀνιάτοις περιπε]-  
 [σεῖν] συμφοραῖς, τοὺς τε βαρβάρους φο[βε]ρωτέρους ἔτι καταστῆναι τοῖς  
 Ἕλλησιν. πρὸς δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐκ πολλοῦ χρό]-  
 [νου] ἐπιθυμῶν πόλεμον, ὅπως ἀβοηθήτους ἡμᾶς καταλαβὼν μηδενὸς  
 ἐναντιούμενου τὰς Ἑλλη]-  
 [νίδας] πόλεις καταδουλώσεται π[ά]σας, τὸν τε Γένθιον τὸν Ἰλλυριὸν χρήμασιν  
 ἀναπεύσας καθ' ἡμῶν]  
 [ἐ]πανεστήσε[ν]. Εὐμένεά τε τὸν βασιλ[έα], φίλον ἡμέτερον ὄντα καὶ σύμμαχον,  
 δι' Εὐάνδρου ἐπεβού]-
- 30 [λευ]εν ἀνελεῖ[ν], καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἀπολυόμενος τὴν εὐχὴν εἰς Δελφοὺς  
 ἐπορεύετο, οὐδὲν φροντίσας οὐδὲ]  
 [τῆς] παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς παραγινόμενοις πρὸς αὐτὸν δεδομένης  
 ἀσφαλείας οὐδὲ ἐν λόγῳ ποιησά]-  
 [μενος, ὅτι] ὑπάρ[χ]ε[ι] ἢ παρὰ πάντων ἀνθ[ρώ]πων νενομισμένη καθιέρωσις καὶ  
 ἀσυλία τῆς πόλεως τῶν Δελφῶν]  
 [τοῖς] τε Ἕλλησιν] καὶ βαρβάρους ἐκ παντ[ὸς] χρόνου - - - - - 23 - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ἐσ]τιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ πλε[ῖ]στον - - - - - 29 - - - - - ]  
 35 [ . . . . . ] κοινῶν εἶνα[ι] - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ] τῶν ἄλ[λ]ων - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ] μ[ ] - - - - - ]

## B. Colin

- [ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ]τ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ]οντ[ο - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ]πρ[ο]εστακό[ . . ] νῦ[ν - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ]ς] ὅπως αὐτο[ῖ] οἱ δι[ - - - - - ]  
 5 [ . . . . . ]θ]ῆτε τοῖς θεοῖς κα[ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . ] δ[ιοι]κῆτε καθὼς ἐπιβά[λλει ὑμῖν. – Ἴστε μὲν οὖν πρῶτον]  
 [Περ]σέα παρὰ τὸ καθήκον μ[ετὰ στρατιᾶς ἐλθόντα εἰς ἐορτὴν]  
 [τῷ]μ Πυθίων· οὐ δίκαιον δὲ σ[αφῶς ἐκεῖνον ἦν κοινωνεῖν ὑμῖν]  
 [οὔ]τε [θ]υσιῶν οὔτε ἀγώνων ο[ὔ]τε πανηγυρίδων οὐδαμῶς, ἐπεὶ]  
 10 ἐπεσπάσατο τοὺς πέραν τοῦ Ἴστρου βαρβάρους, οἱ ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ μὲν]  
 οὐθενί, ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει δέ [τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ πρὶν ἐφωρμήθησαν, καί,]  
 ἐπιστρατεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερ[ὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, διανοοῦμενοι συλῆ]-  
 σαι καὶ ἀνελεῖν αὐτό, ἔτυχον π[αρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀξίας τιμωρίας.]  
 Παρέβη δὲ καὶ τὰ γενόμεν[α] τῷ[ι] πατρὶ ὄρκια, ἃ αὐτὸς ἀνεκαίνισεν.]  
 15 [κ]αὶ Θρᾷκας μὲν ὄντας ἡμετέ[ρους] συμμάχους, ἐκράτησε· Ἀβρού]-  
 [π]ολιν δέ, ὃν ἡμεῖς περιελάβομεν [ταῖς πρὸς Φίλιππον συνθήκαις, ἐξέ]-  
 [β]αλεν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας. πρ[ε]σβε[υτὰς δὲ παρὰ Θηβαίων ἐσταλμένους]  
 [εἰ]ς Ῥώμην περὶ συμμαχίας τῷ[ι] ναυαγίας δόλωι ἐκποδὼν ἐποιήσατο.]  
 [Π]λὴν εἰς τοῦτο ἦλθεν ἀπονοίας [ώ]στε, μέγα τι ἡγούμενος παρὰ τοὺς ὄρ]-  
 20 [κ]ους τὸ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν διὰ τῷ[ν] ἡμετέρων στρατηγῶν δοθεῖσαν ἀφανί]-  
 [ζε]ιν τῷ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος εἰς ταρ[α]χὰς καὶ στάσεις ἐμβάλλειν, οὐδὲν εἰ μὴ]  
 [φα]ῦλα πράσων διετέλει, ἀλλὰ, [πάντα συγγέων, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος θεραπεύων,  
 [καὶ] διαφθείρων τοὺς προεστηκό[τας, χρεωκοπίας τε ἀλογίστως ἐπηγγέλλε]-  
 [το κ]αὶ νεωτερισμοὺς ἐποίει κατάδ[εικνὺς ἦν] σχοίη ἀπέχθειαν πρὸς τοὺς βελ]-  
 25 [τίστ]ους· ἐξ ὧν συμβέβηκε[ν] τοῖς Περ[ρ]αίβοις καὶ Θεσσαλοῖς δειναῖς ἐμπε]-  
 [σεῖν σ]υμφοραῖς, τοὺς τε βαρβάρους φο[βε]ρωτέρους ἔτι ἐπιστῆναι. Καί, μεγὰ]-  
 [λου ἐπιθυ]μῶν πολέμου, ὅπως ἀβοηθ[ή]τους ὑμᾶς καταλαβὼν, τάχα τὰς ἑλλη]-  
 [νίδας πό]λεις καταδουλώσῃται π[ά]σας, Ἀρθεταύρωι τε τῷ Ἰλλυρίωι φόνον  
 ἐπε]-  
 [βούλευσε]ν, Εὐμένεά τε τὸν βασιλ[έα, φίλον ἡμῖν καὶ σύμμαχον ὄντα, ἐτόλμη]-  
 30 [σεν ἐνεδρεῦ]ειν [κ]αθ’ ὃν καιρὸν, ἀπολυόμενος εὐχὴν, εἰς Δελφοὺς ἦκεν, οὐ  
 φρον]-  
 [τίσας τῆς τοῦ] θεοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς παραγινομ[ένοις] νενομισμένης καθιερώσεως,  
 οὐδὲ]  
 [τηρήσας ἦν] σχοίη παρὰ πάντων ἀνθ[ρώπων] ἀσφάλειαν τὸ ὑμέτερον ἱερὸν ἐν  
 τοῖς]  
 [Ἑλλησιν ὁμοίως] καὶ βαρβάρους ἐκ παντὸς χρόνου - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ] ἐσ]τιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ πᾶσ[ι - - - - - ]  
 35 [ . . . . . ]ν κοινωνεῖ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ] τῷ]ν ἄλλ[ων - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]

Inscribed at Delphi. Since Sherk provides the editions of both Pomtow and Colin, I saw fit to reproduce them here. “There is room on the stone for two lines before the visible *tau* of our first line. 2 Pomtow read οντὰ γ[- -, but this is almost certainly wrong. Colin says, “peut-être trace d’un O après ONT,” and from the photograph one can clearly see that the pitted surface of the stone led Pomtow into thinking of an *alpha*. Dim and receptive traces

of grooves are visible at this point on the stone. 3 Viereck (notes) follows Colin here, as everywhere in the present text. 5 Colin believes the letter before  $\eta\tau\epsilon$  is round. 6 The restorations of the text from here to l.33 are all based on the edition by Nikitski. His restorations were made only to illustrate the general meaning and were not intended to be exact and accurate in detail. Pomtow used them for the edition in *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup>, and Colin accepted many of them. However, Colin believed that the stele had been built into the monument of Aemilius Paulus in Delphi. He was forced, therefore, according to his calculations of the space available on the monument, to shorten the length of each line of the inscription. This is an assumption on his part and is not to be accepted as fact (cf. Daux, *op. cit.*, p.320, n.2). 14 After  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu[\alpha]$  Colin notes that “un T est sûr, et ensuite un  $\Omega$  est probable,” but Reinach agrees with Pomtow’s reading. 20 Colin thinks he sees  $\text{ΟΥΣΤΟ}$  at the beginning of the line with only enough space before it for one letter. Nikitski read nothing before  $\text{ΤΗΝ}$ . Reinach adopted  $\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron$  from a reading by Bourguet. Colin seems able to distinguish  $\text{INT}\Omega$  at the beginning of l.21, but Reinach reads  $\text{ΚΑΙ}$ . In 22 the traces of letters are very difficult to read as far as  $\text{ΑΣΣΩΝ}$ , but Colin thinks of  $\text{ΥΔΑ}$  or  $\text{ΥΛΑ}$  before  $\text{πράσσω}$ , not  $\text{ΠΙΣΤΑ}$ ; Reinach has  $\text{τα πράσσω}$ . 25 Colin sees  $\text{ΤΟΥΣ}$ , not  $\text{ΤΟΙΣ}$ . 27 The *theta* of  $\alpha\beta\omicron\eta\theta$  - - seems to have been superimposed on a *tau*, almost totally obliterating it. 30 The engraver first engraved  $\text{ΑΠΟΛΛΟΜ}$ , but then an *upsilon* was engraved on the second *lambda*. 31 The brackets are missing in *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup> for this line. 32 Colin believes that Pomtow’s original reading of  $\text{ΣΧΟΙΗ}$  is more reasonable than Nikitski’s  $\text{ΡΧΕΙΗ}$ . 33 Colin sees the trace of a round letter at the end. 34 “à la fin,  $\text{ΠΑΣ}$  très net,” Colin; it is visible on the photograph. Reinach,  $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \pi\lambda\epsilon[\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ -\ -\ ]$  – Sherck, *RDGE*, 236–237.

# 11 – M. Aemilius to the Magnetans – c. mid 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= Sherck *RDGE* 7 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R12**

- [ - - Δόγμα τὸ κομισθὲν παρ]ὰ τῆς συγκλήτου{υ} Ῥω[μαίων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποσταλέντων πρεσβευτῶν]
- 35 Letter [ὑπὲρ τῶν πρὸς Πριηνεῖς.] **Μάαρχος Αἰμύλιος Μαάρχου** [υἱὸς στρατηγὸς [Μυλασέων βουλῇ καὶ δήμῳ χαί]ρειν. πρεσβευταὶ **Μάγνητες** καὶ Πριηνεῖς ἐμοὶ προσήλθοσαν]
- SC [ὅπως αὐτοῖς σύγκλ]ητον δῶι· **τούτοις ἐγὼ σύγκλητον** ἔδ[ωκα. Συγκλήτου δόγμα· πρὸ ἡμε]-
- [ρῶν - - - - - ]βρίων ἐγ κομετίῳ· γραφομένου παρήσ[αν - - - - - ]
- [ - - - - - Φο?]ντήιος Κοίγκτου Παπειρία, Τίτος Μάλλιος Φα[ - - - - - ]
- 40 [ - - - - - ] περὶ ὧν Μάγνη[τε]ς πρεσβευταὶ Πυθόδωρος Ἡράκλ[ειτος - - - - - ἄν]-
- [δρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ παρὰ δήμου καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φίλου συμ[μάχου τε ἡμετέ]-
- [ρου κατὰ πρόσω]πον λόγους ἐποιήσαντο καὶ περὶ ὧν Πριηνεῖς πρε[σβευταὶ - - - - - ]
- [ - - - - - ]νης ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φίλοι παρὰ δήμου καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ φί]-
- [λ]ου σ[υ]μμάχου τε ἡμετέρου κατὰ πρόσωπον λόγους ἐποιήσαντο περὶ ἧς
- 45 χώρας ἐξεχώρησαν Μάγνητες καὶ τὴν κατοχὴν ταύτης τῆς χώρας ἐξεχώ[ρησαν]
- Document Δήμῳ Πριηνέων κατὰ τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα ὅπως κριτήριον δοθῇ· περὶ το[ύτου τοῦ]
- πράγματος οὕτως ἔδοξεν· κτλ.

Inscribed at Magnesia. “36 ἐμοὶ προσήλθον or προσήλθοσαν, Holleaux, also Viereck (notes); λόγους ἐποιήσαντο Hiller. 39 Φα[λέρνα or Φα[βρία, Kern, Holleaux. 40 Μάγνη[τε]ς, Hiller; Μάγνη(τε)ς, Kern. The squeeze is next to useless at this particular point. Two, not three, names followed. 43-44 Perhaps καὶ φίλ]ου should be omitted.” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 45.

## 12 – L. Mummius to the arkhons and *polis* of the Argives – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED

(on the same monument as 13, 14) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.69-70 (A. ii) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R13

(A. ii) Δ\* στρατηγός, ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων  
/ Ἀργείων το[ῖς] ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ  
πόλει χαίρειν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. The texts of the Unpublished Dossier from Argos are as they appear in Rhodes, P.J., with Lewis, D.M., *Decrees of the Greek States*, (Oxford, 1997). In order to compile an immense set of data, the texts in *DGS* are abbreviated (I provide the abbreviations below). Unfortunately, in the case of this Argos Dossier, these letters are still unpublished and no other transcription is available, even to the author. I would like to thank Emeritus Professor Peter J. Rhodes for being so kind as to discuss these texts with me and for his efforts to locate them in publication. Ceccarelli in *AGLW* (2013) still referred to them as ‘unpublished’. Even in abbreviated form, we can still ascertain address formulae, so these letters are still useful to this study.

Abbreviations and other relevant information from the *DGS* Catalogue ‘Introduction’: “An oblique stroke (/) is used as a punctuation mark to separate items within a document; occasionally double oblique strokes (//) are used to indicate a major break.” – Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.65. Δ = ὁ δεῖναι (article given when needed to make case clear): person’s name. M = indication of month. ΔΔ = unspecified number of names. “...dotted letters are normally not indicated; uncertainties are discussed where necessary.” – Rhodes with Lewis, *DGS*, 66

## 13 – L. Mummius to the arkhons and *polis* of the Argives – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED

(on the same monument as 12, 14) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.69-70 (A. iii) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R14

(A. iii) Δ\* στρατηγός, ὑπατος  
Ῥωμαίων / Ἀ[ργείων τοῖς] ἄρχουσι καὶ  
τῇ πόλει χαίρειν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. For Abbreviations of this and other *DGS* texts, see notes to *ORRLIG* 13. Here, Δ\* refers to L. Mummius, but there is no indication in *DGS* of anything further, such as filiation.

## 14 – L. Mummius to the arkhons and *synhedroi* of the Argives – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED

(on the same monument as 12, 13) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.69-70 (A. iv) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R15

(A. iv) Δ\* στ[ρα]τ[η]γός, ὑπατος  
Ῥωμαίων / Ἀργείων το[ῖς] ἄρχουσι καὶ  
τοῖς συνέδροις χαίρειν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. For Abbreviations of this and other *DGS* texts, see notes to *ORRLIG* 13. Here, Δ\* refers to L. Mummius, but there is no indication in *DGS* of anything further, such as filiation. The above text is the revised form of that appearing in *DGS*, which is: Δ\* στ[ρα]τ[η]γός, ὑπατος | Ῥωμαίων / Ἀργείων το[ῖς] ἄρχουσι καὶ | τῇ πόλει χαίρειν. I have to thank the author Emeritus Professor Peter Rhodes for kindly passing on the note of M. Pierart for the revised reading of the text (personal correspondence, 14.08.2014).

**15 – L. Mummius to the arkhons and *synhedroi* of the Sikyonians – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED**

(on the same monument as *IOLHPK 32*, *IOLHPK 33*, *IOLHPK 34*) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.76 (A. v. b.) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R16**

(A. v. b.) **L. Mummius, στρατηγός,  
ὑπατος Ῥωμαίων / Σικυωνίων τοῖς  
ἄρχουσι καὶ τοῖς συνέδροις χαίρειν**

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. For Abbreviations of this and other *DGS* texts, see notes to *ORRLIG 13*. Here, ‘L. Mummius’ should not be taken to imply that the name was inscribed in Latin, it is simply a convention of *DGS*.

**16 – Q. Fabius Maximus to the arkhons and *synhedroi* of the Dymaiaians – 144 BCE – UNPUBLISHED**

= Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.97 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R17**

(A. vi. c) **Q. Fabius Maximus ἀ[νθύπατος]  
Ῥωμαίων / Δυμαίων τ[οῖς] ἄρχουσι  
καὶ συνέδροις χαίρειν**

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. For Abbreviations of this and other *DGS* texts, see notes to *ORRLIG 13*. Here, ‘Q. Fabius Maximus’ should not be taken to imply that the name was inscribed in Latin, it is simply a convention of *DGS*.

**17 – A Roman magistrate to the Dionysian *tekhnitai* – last half of 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE  
(on the same monument as **18**) = Sherk *RDGE 44(i)* = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R19****

[ - - - - - ] ΟΥΪΕ[ . ] ΟΙ[ . . . ]  
[Μακεδονίαι] τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐπαρχείαι καὶ ἥς ἐπάχουσ[ιν]  
[τῆς Ἑλλάδος] συγχωρῶ ὑμῖν ἔνεκεν τοῦ Διονύσου κα[ὶ]  
[τῶν ἄλλων θε]ῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐπιτηδεύματος οὗ προεστήκ[ατε]  
5 [ὑμᾶς παντάπα]ςιν ἀλειτουργήτους εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπισταθ-  
[μεύτους καὶ ἀτελ]εῖς καὶ ἀν[ει]σθό[ρ]ους πάσης εἰσφορᾶ[ς]  
[καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γ]υναῖκας καὶ τέκνα ἕως ἂν εἰς ἡλι[κίαν]  
[ἀνδρικὴν ἐξί]κω]γται καθὼς παρεκαλεῖτε. *vacat*

Found at Thebes. 1.7. Sherk’s edn. has εἰς, which I have changed to εἰς. “3-4 for the combination “Dionysus and the other gods” Klaffenbach refers to *Fouilles de Delphes*, III, 2, 7, 1.45. 6 The new squeeze clearly shows AN. .ΣΦΟ.ΟΥΣ. 7-8 ἡλι[κίαν ἀνδρικὴν, Wilamowitz; ἡλι[κίαν ἔλθωσι, Dittenberger; ἡλι[κίαν τὴν προσήκουσαν, Viereck (notes).” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 250.

**18** – A Roman magistrate to the Dionysian *tekhnitai* – last half of 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE  
(on the same monument as **17**) = Sherk *RDGE* **44(ii)** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R20**

*vacat* [ἀ]γαθῇ τύχῃ. *vacat*

10 [ - - 13-14 - - - ] στρατηγὸς ὑπάτος Ῥωμαίων, τῷ  
[κοινῷ τῶν περὶ] τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπ’ Ἴω]-  
[νίας καὶ Ἑλλησπό]γτου καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Καθηγεμό]-  
[να Διόνυσον - - - - - ] KPAT[ - - - - - ]

Found at Thebes. “10 [Λεύκιος Μόμμιος], Klaffenbach; [Μάαρκος Λεΐβιος], Accame. 13 Klaffenbach suggest καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ Κράτ[ωνος Ζωτίχου συν]ηγμένοις Ἀτταλισταῖς χαίρειν *aut similia*.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 250.

**19** – Q. Fabius Maximus to the arkhons, *synhedroi*, and *polis* of Dyme – 115 BCE?

= Sherk *RDGE* **43** = Viereck ‘SG’ IV = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R18**

Ἐπὶ θεοκόλου Λέωνος, γραμματέ-  
ος τοῦ συνεδρίου Στρατοκλέος.

Letter **Κόιντος Φάβιος Κοίντου Μάξιμος ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων Δυμαίων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ συνέδροις καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν**· τῶν περὶ

5 Κυλλάνιον συνέδρων ἐμφανισάντων μοι περὶ τῶν συντελεσθέντων παρ’ ὑμῖν ἀδικημάτων, λέγω δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμπρήσεως καὶ φθορᾶς τῶν ἀρχέων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων γραμμάτων, ὧν ἐγγόνει ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ὅλης συγχύσεως **Σῶσος Ταυρομένεος** ὁ καὶ τοὺς νόμους γράψας ὑπεναντίους τῇ ἀποδοθείσῃ τοῖς

10 [Α]χαιοῖς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολιτ[ε]ία[i], περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος διή[λ]θομεν ἐν [Π]άτραις μετὰ τοῦ πα[ρ]όν[το]ς συμβουλίου· ἐπεὶ οὖν οἱ διαπρα[ξά]μενοι ταῦτα ἐφαίνοντό μοι τῆς χειρίστης κα[τα]σ[τά]σεως [κα]ὶ ταραχῆς κα[τα]σκευῆν ποιούμενο[ι] τοῖς Ἑλλησι πᾶσ[ιν]· οὐ μόν[ον] γὰρ τῆς περὶ τὸ ἀλλήλου[ς] ἀσυναλλ[α]ξί[α]ς καὶ χρε[ω]κοπίας οἱ[ν] [κε]ία], ἀλλὰ καὶ [τ]ῆς ἀποδεδομένης κατὰ [κ]οινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλη[σιν] ἐλευθερίας ἄλλοτριά καὶ τῆ[ς] ἡμετέ[ρα]ς προαιρέσεως· ἐγ[ὼ] πα[ρ]α-  
15 ραχομένων τῶν κατηγορῶν ἀληθινὰς ἀποδείξεις Σῶ-  
σον μὲν τὸν γεγονότα ἀρχηγὸν [τ]ῶν πραχθέντων καὶ νομογραφῆσαντα ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς ἀποδοθείσης πολιτεί-  
20 [α]ς κρίνας ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτῳ πα[ρ]εχώρισα, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ [Φορ]μίσκον Ἐχεσθένης τῶν δαμιοργῶν τὸν συμπράξαντα [τοῖ]ς ἐμπρήσασιν τὰ ἀρχεῖα καὶ δημόσια γράμματα, ἐπεὶ καὶ [αὐτὸς] ὡμολόγησεν· **Τιμόθεον δὲ Νικία** τὸμ μετὰ τοῦ Σώσου [γεγονό]τα νομογράφον, ἐπεὶ ἔλασσον ἐφαίνετο ἡδικηκῶς, ἐ-  
25 [κέ]λευσα[ν] προάγειν εἰς Ῥώμην ὀρκίσας, ἐφ’ [ὧ]ν τῇ νομηνίᾳ τοῦ ἐν-  
[ά]του μηνὸς ἔστα[ν] ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐμφανίσας τ[ῷ] ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων στρατη-  
[γῷ] τὸ δόξαν, [μὴ] π[ρ]ότερον ἐπά[ν]εισ[ιν] εἰς οἶκον, ἐὰ[ν] μ[ὴ] ΑΥ

Inscribed at Dyme. “1-2 The letters here are larger than in the rest of the text. There is a very small *epsilon* before Ἐπὶ. 7 APXΩN, stone. 12 I follow Beasley’s reading of διή[λ]θομεν ἐν [Π]άτραις. 13 κα[τα]σκευῆν, Colin, followed by Hiller and Viereck (notes), the latter previously having restored κα[τα]βολῆν;

κα[τάπειραν], Dobree and Hicks. ποιούμενο[ι τοῖς Ἑλλησι παῖσιν], Wilamowitz (among the works of Viereck), followed by Hiller and Viereck (notes); ἡ κολαστέα ἐστ[ιν], Dobree, followed by Boeckh and Hicks; οὐ μὴ[νον γὰρ], Wilamowitz, ὥς, Dobree; ἄτε, Boeckh. 14 ἀσυναλλ[α]ξ[ίας], Beasley, followed by Hiller and Viereck (notes); χρ[ε]ωκοπίας], Foucart (among the works of Beasley); χρ[ε]ίας τῆς κατ' ἰδίαν], Dobree and Hicks. 14-15 οἰκειά], Beasley, who says he made out a bar that might be part of the *alpha*. 16 Hicks saw the *gamma* of ἐγ[ώ]. 20 πα[ρ]εχώρ(η)σα, Beasley, who could not see the *rho*; this is apparently the only occurrence of the verb and is equivalent to παρ[ε]δωκα. 21 Φορ[μ]ίσκον, Boeckh. 22 Beasley saw the *sigma* of τοῖς. 25-26 τοῦ ἐν[άτου μηνός], Dittenberger, followed by others. 27 Dobree restored ὅπως ἂν [μὴ] π[ρ]ότενον ἐπ[ά]ν[εισ]ι π[ρ]ὸς οἶκον, ἐὰν μ[ὴ]; but Viereck objected to ὅπως ἂν with the future indicative. Wilamowitz (among the works of Viereck) suggested τὸ δόξ[αν].” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 247.

## 20 – L. Calpurnius Piso to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Hierapytnians – 112 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 14 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R22

Λεύκιος Καλοπόρνιος Λευκίου υἱὸς Πείσων ὑπάτος Ἱεραπυ-  
 90 τνίων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· [ιό]ντες  
 Ἱτάνιοι πρ[ε]σβευταὶ καὶ ὑμέτεροι προσήλθοσάν μ[οι ὅπ]ως  
 αὐτοῖς σύνκλητον δῶ. ἐγὼ αὐτοῖς σύνκλητ[ο]ν ἔδωκα.  
 συνκλήτου δόγμα τοῦτο γεγονός ἐστι· ὑμᾶς θέλ[ω] φροντί-  
 σαι εἴ τι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ ἐν ἀνφιλ[ογ]εῖᾳ οὔσῃ ἐνφ-  
 95 κοδομημένον ἐστί, ὅπως ἐκ ταύτης τ[ῆς χώ]ρας καθέ-  
 λητε οὕτως καθὼς ἡ σύνκλητος ἐδογμάτισε καὶ κα-  
 [ . . . . . ]ωσε. ἀπὸ συμβουλίου γνώμης γνώ[μην ἀ]πεφηνάμην.

*vacat*

Found at Erimupolis (Itanos). This text was preceded by the speech of the Hierapytnian ambassadors to the Senate (Il.1-55), the subsequent *Senatus Consultum* (Il.55-74), and a decree of Piso to Magnesia (Il.75-88), all of which I have not reproduced here. 1.96. Sherk's edn. has ἐδογμάτισε, which I have changed to ἐδογμάτισε. “97 Before ]ωσε is either Γ or Π or Τ.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 82-83.

## 21 – A Roman magistrate (?) to the Karystians or Euboians – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= *IG* xii 9, 5 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R23

[ . . . . . ]Γ[ . . . ]ΙΣ[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ]ς ἐν τῇ ἐπισ[τ]ολεῖ [ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . το]ῦ στρα[τη]γοῦ ἔσχατον . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . εἰ]σάγουσιν κα[ . . . . . ]  
 5 [ . . . . . ] ἐχέτω τέλος [ . . . . . ]  
 [ἡ δίκη . . ὅταν] παρ[α]γ[γ]ένωνται εἰς]  
 [Κάρυστον? . . . ]ος· ἐὰν δὲ Καρ[ύ]στιοι?]  
 [ . . . . . σὺ]ν τό[κ]ῳ δεκάτῳ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ]σις[τ]αι ἕως σα[ . . . . . ]  
 10 [ . . . . . Εὐβ]ουλίδει Πολυκρ[άτους . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . συ]μφώνου καὶ εὐαρ[έ]στου . . . . . ]  
 [γενομένου . . ]χειρόγραφον ἐ[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ]ΙΣ Ξανθία Ξανθί[ο]υ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] τὸ ὑπόμνημα τὸ περὶ τούτων . . ]  
 15 [ . . κατα]μερίσατε εἰς τὰ παρ' ὑμεῖν δημόσια γράμματα.]

[ τοῦ δεῖνος - - ] *vac.* ἄρχοντος.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Karystos (Ceccarelli). “*Athenis* in museo. Fragmentum tabulae marmoreae superne, a dextra et sinistra fractae inventum Carystii iuxta domum Georgii Deligeorgis ad litus maris, A. 0,52, l. 0,26, cr. 0,12. Litt. a. 0,08, saec. II a. Chr. Ed. Lolling *Ath. Mitt.* IV 1879, 226 VII. Exscripsi. *Ect.* [...] Litteras magistratus Romani ad Carystios sive ad Euboeensium foedus datas esse Wilamowitz perspexit. Idem supplavit vs. 7.10—13. 18. 20.—8. 15. 17. 19. 23. 29 suppl. Hiller. Cum litteris mittebantur ὙΠΟΜΝΗΜΑ de rebus quibusdam, quod Carystii iubentur in tabulario publico deponere vs. 15 (cf. Dittenberger OGIS 453<sub>50</sub> ἔστιν δὲ ἀντίγραφα τῶν γεγονότων ὑμῖν φιλανθρωπῶν τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα· ὃ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις τοῖς παρ’ ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἐντάξει; Joseph. Ant. XIV 319).” – Ziebarth, *IG* xii 9, 5, page 2. This Roman letter is followed by the letter of the *grammateus* Xenon and a *hypomnema*, which are recorded as *IOLHPK* 44.

## 22 – P. Sextilius to the *boule* of a certain *polis* – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE?

= Sherk *RDGE* 8 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R24**

Letter **Πόπλιος Σεξτίλιος** [ - - - - - στρα]-  
**τηγὸς Ῥωμαίων, ΚΟ** [ - - - - - τοῖς ταγοῖς]  
**καὶ τῇ βουλῇ χαίρειν** [ - - - - - πρά]-  
 γματος καλῶς γινώσκω? [ - - - - - ]  
 5 **ὑμῖν ἐγὼ σύγ** [ κλητον ἔδωκα - - - - - ]  
 τε Τρικκαί [ - - - - - ]  
 SC **πρὸ ἡμέρ[αν vel ὦν** [ - - - - - ]  
**ἐγ κομε[τίω· γραφομένου παρῆσαν** [ - - - - - ]  
**μαρακ[** [ - - - - - Σεξτίλι]-  
 10 **λιος** [ - - - - - ]

Found at (mod.) Trikkala (Thessaly). “Text by Robert. Viereck (notes) had recognised it as a *senatus consultum*. 8 Alternative spelling, γραφομένω.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 48.

## 23 – A letter of a Roman magistrate (?) about a judgement of an arbitration – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 45 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R25**

[ - - - - - ] ΝΣΥΝ [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ἐπὶ τὰ π[ρ]ὸς Τρί[κ]καν μέρη καὶ ἀγαγόντες ἡμᾶ[ς] ἐπὶ  
 [ - - - - - ] τόπον ἐπέδειξαν ἡμῖν τὸ <ν> οἰκεῖον πα[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ν ὡς ἄφ’ ἡλίου δυσμῶν τῇ χώρῃ ταύτῃ [ - - - - - ]  
 5 [ - - - - - ] ἔφασαν εἶναι [ Ἀγαθ]ομένους καὶ καλ[εῖσθαι] ὑπὸ τῶν  
 [ - - ἐγδίκω]ν Δερκαίαν [ . . . . . ] πλειστ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπὶ [ . . . ] Π[ . . . . . ] νοις [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ὁ Ἀγαθομένης [ . . . . ] εἰον τοῦ [τ]είχ[ους] [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] πεδείαν [ . . . . . ] τούτου τ[οῦ] [ - - - - - ]  
 10 [ - - - ὅμ]ορον ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς Τρί[κ]καν μερ[ῶν] [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ἡμῖν οἱ ἔγδικοι τήν τε Ἀ[στ]ακίδα καὶ ἡ [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - γειτο]νεούσας ταύτῃ χώρῃ, ἣν αὐτοὶ [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] καὶ συνήγοςαν [ἐπὶ (?)] τὰ γειτόσυνα κα[ὶ] [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ὑπάρχει, ἣν αὐτοὶ λέγουσι Δερκαίαν [ - - - - - ]  
 15 [ - - - - - ] λ[αβὼν] δὲ καὶ Ἀγαθομένης τὸν λόγ[ον] [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ἔγδ]ικοι ἔφασαν καλεῖσθαι Δερκαί[αν] [ - - - - - ]



[ - - - - - ]ν καλεῖσθαι Βουκολικὸν τήν μ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]οση[ν] πηκτὴν, ἣν οἱ ἔγδικοι τη[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] τήν τε ὁδόν, ἐφ' ἣ τή[ν] καλουμένην - - - - - ]  
 20 [ - - - - - ] ναι, ἣν οἱ ἔγδικοι ἐπ[ . . . . . ]!Υ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ὥς ἀπὸ με[ρῶν - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]EXONT[ - - - - - ]

Found at (mod.) Trikkala (Thessaly). “The text is that of Kern and Viereck (notes.) 2 κα[τ]αγόντες, Wilamovitz. 3 ΤΟΠΟΙΚΕΙΟΝ, stone, corrected by Wilamovitz. 8 [τ]οῦ [τ]είχ[ους, Hiller.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 254.

## 24 – Q. Mucius Scaeuola to the boule and demos of Ephesos – 98/97 or 94/93 BCE

(on the same monument as **Excl.T. 5**) = Sherk *RDGE* 47(ii) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R27**

Col.2

A	<p><b>Κόιντος Μού</b>[χιος Ποπλίου υ]ἱὸς <b>Σκαιό</b>[λας,]  <b>ἀνθύπατος</b> Ῥω[μαίων, Ἐφεσί]ων <b>τῇ βουλ</b>[ῇ καὶ]  <b>τῷ δήμῳ</b> <b>χαί</b>[ρειν· τῶν ἐν τῇ]ι φιλίαι κριθέ[ντων]          δήμων τε καὶ ἐ[θνῶν ψηφισαμέ]νων τιθέναι θυμ[ε]-          30 λικοὺς καὶ [γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶ]να&lt;ς&gt; πενταετηρι-          [κοὺς βουλευσαμένων - - - - - α]ι περὶ τοῦ          [ - - - - - ]πρ[ο]τρεψο-          [ - - - - - ]</p>	B
---	---	---

*quot versus exciderint incertum*

C	<p>[ - - - - - ]ΕΝΟΣ[ - - - - - ]          35 [ - - - - - ]Σαρδια]νῶν τι ταρ[ασσ- - - - ]          [ - - ἔχ]θραν καὶ διαφορὰν κα[ - - - - - ]          ἐπιφανεστέρας καὶ ἐνδοξ&lt;ο&gt;τ[έρας, ἵνα οἱ ἀφ]-          εστηκότες αὐτῶν δῆμοι μετ[ὰ πάσης εὐνοί]-          ας εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ{υ} συμπορεύοιντο, ἐπέμ[ψαμεν - - ]          40 <b>σον Φυλοτίμου Ἀθηναῖο</b>[ν τ]ῶν ε[ - - - - ]          ἄνδρα κ[αλ]λὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸ[ν] καὶ τῆς [μεγίστης ἀξι]-          ούμενον πίστεως παρ' [ἡμ]ῖν, πρὸς [τε τὸν ὑμέ]-          τερον δῆμον καὶ τὸν Σαρδιανῶ[ν, τὸν παρ]ακα]-          λέσαντα δοῦναι τ[ὰ]ς χεῖρας ἡμῖν εἰ[ς σύ]λλυσιν.]          45 συγκαταθεμένων δὲ τῶν δῆμων [ἐκατέρων]          τοῖς παρακαλουμένοις καὶ πεμψάντω[ν πρ]ες]-          βευτὰς ὑμῶν μὲν <b>Ἰκέσιον Ἀρτεμιδώρο</b>[υ, Ποσει]-  <b>δώνιον Ποσειδωνίου τοῦ Διονυσίου, Ἀ</b>[ριστο]-  <b>γείτονα Πάτρωνος, Ἀρτεμίδωρον Ἀρτ</b>[εμιδώ]-          50 <b>ρου, Μενεκράτην Μενε</b>[κρά]τ[ου] <b>τοῦ Ἀρ</b>[τεμι]-  <b>δώρου, Ἀπολλόδ</b>[ωρον Ἐρ]μοκρ[άτου, Ἐρμιπ]-  <b>πον Μενοίτου, Σα</b>[ρδιανῶν δὲ τοὺς στρατη]-          γοὺς <b>Μενεκράτην Διοδώρου, Φοίνικα Φοίνικος,</b>  <b>Ἀρχέλαον Θεο</b>[φίλου - - - - - ]</p>
---	---

55 κῆσαι τὰ πρ[ - - - - - ]  
 τε μεσιτε[ύειν - - - - - ]  
 συμφέρε[ιν - - - - - ]

Found at Pergamon. Il.29-30. Sherk's edn. has θυμ[ε]λλικὸς, I have removed the first grave. "28 τῶν νυν]ι φυλῆαι, Fränkel. 29 καὶ ἐ[τέρων κοινω]νῶν κτλ., Fränkel. 30 NA, stone. 37 ENΔΟΞΟΤ, stone." – Sherk, *RDGE*, 258. At the end, we have several lines missing, then an agreement between the Ephesians and Sardians.

## 25 – C. Cassius to the arkhons of Nysa – 88-87 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 48 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' R28

Γάιος Κάσιος [ς Ν]υσαέων ἄρχουσι χαίρειν·  
 [Χ]αιρημῶν Πυ[θοδώ]ρου υἱ[ός], πολέτης ὑμέ[τερος],  
 πρὸς ἐμὲ ἦλθ[εν ἐ]ν Ἀπαμῆα ἡρώτησέν τε [ὅπως]  
 ἐξουσίαν αὐ[τῷ] [π]οιήσω ἐπὶ τοῦ συνβουλίου·  
 5 τούτῳ ἐγὼ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκα οὕτως, ἐπε[ὶ] τῷ  
 συνβουλί[ῳ] ὡμολόγησεν καταλογῆς τῆς [συν-]  
 κλήτου καὶ δ[ήμου] Ῥωμαίων ἐπὶ τοῦ στρατοπέ[δου]  
 δώσειν δῶ[ρον ἀλ]εύρων μοδίους ἑξακισμυρί[ους].  
 [ἐγὼ δὲ] περὶ [τούτ]ου τοῦ πράγματος ἀπεκρίθη[ν κα]-  
 10 λῶς [αὐ]τὸν πε[ποι]ημέναι καὶ τάξει ἐματόν τε δ[ώσειν]  
 ἐργα[σίαν], ὅπ[ως ἐ]πιγνῶ ταῦτα ἡμεῖν χάριτα εἶν[αι].  
 [ἡ]μεῖς δὲ καὶ τ[αῦτα τ]ῇ συνκλήτῳ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ῥωμαί-  
 ων διασαφήσομεν (?). *vacat*

Found at (mod.) Akça, in Caria. Ceccarelli lists *RDGE* 49 as a concordance for her R28, but read *RDGE* 48. "I have examined the Berlin squeeze and have collated it with the texts by F. Hiller von Gaertringen and Viereck (notes). The dossier begins with the heading [ὁ δῆ]μος [ὁ Νυσαέων καὶ ἡ βουλὴ ἐ]τίμησαν | Χ[αίρ]ημ[ον]α Πυθοδώρου. 5-6 Dittenberger (*S.I.G.*<sup>2</sup>, 328) had read οὐτ[ο]ς ἐπὶ [τοῦ] συνβουλίου], which Viereck (notes) preferred, although he did not introduce it into his text. 13 Hiller, but it remains uncertain." – Sherk, *RDGE*, 261. The text is followed by two letters of Mithridates to his satrap Leonippos.

## 26 – Lucullus to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of Mopsuestia – 86 BCE

(on the same monument as 27) = Rigsby *Asyilia* 217(ii) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' R30

Λεύκολλος ταμίας καὶ ἀντιστρά[τηγος τοῖς]  
 10 Μοψεατῶν ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ [χαίρειν· τὸ]  
 ἱερὸν τῆς Ἰσίδος καὶ τοῦ Σαράπιδ[ος σεμνότα]-  
 τον καὶ ἑνδοξὸν ὑπάρχον, ἐν πάσῃ τ[ε πόλει]  
 καὶ χώρῃ δοξαζόμενον καὶ παρ' ὑμε[ῖν τει]-  
 μῆς τῇ[ς] μεγίστης κατηξιωμένον, κ[έκρικα]  
 15 καὶ αὐτὸς καθ' ἃ καὶ οἱ π[ρ]ὸ ἡμῶν αὐ[τοκρά]-  
 τορες ἐπέκ[ρι]ναν ἄστυλον εἶναι· Διόδοτον [δὲ Διοδό?]-  
 του τοῦ Ἀθηνίωνος τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Σα[ράπιδος]  
 καὶ τῆς Ἰσ[ίδος] κα[θη]λεληφὼς ἄνδρα χρήσι[μον, ?θρης]-  
 κωδέστα[τα] Εἰ. διαφέροντα τοῖς τε θεο[ῖς] λυσίτε]-  
 20 λέστατ[α πα]ρεδρεύοντα καὶ τὰς θεραπε[ίας] ποιού]-  
 μενον εὐσεβεστάτας καὶ ἱεροπρεπέ[στατα τὰ τῶν]

- θεῶν τεῖμια ἐπαύξοντα καὶ τὸν τόπ[ον ?τῇ ἰδι]-  
 αι ἐπιμελεία κοσμοῦντα ἀποδεξάμε[νος τιμῶν? αὐ]-  
 τὸν βούλομαι. ἐπείπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ τε[ίμιόν]  
 25 τι πεποιήκατε πολλῶι μᾶλλον κα[τάξιον]  
 χάριν τειμῆς καὶ καταλογῆς τῶι δῆ[μῳ ἐν]  
 ταῖς διαπράξεσι τῶν ὄντων ποιοῦντ[ες πα]-  
 [ρ]αίρεσιν κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τε καὶ γυνα[ικὸς καὶ]  
 [υῖ]ῶν τριῶν καὶ τῆς ὑπαρχο<ύ>σης αὐ[τῶι οὐσίας]  
 30 [ . . . . . ]IT[ . . . ]ΟΥΡΙΟ[ - - - - - ]

Date: Ceccarelli. In Adana museum, assigned to Mopsuestia due to the emblem of the fire altar (Rhodes, cf. p.466 esp. n.22). This text appears on the same monument as **27** and, though predating it, appears after it on the stone. “Rome: Lucullus and Sulla | Marble block in the Adana museum, preserved only on the left; h. 0.60, w. 0.38, th. 0.16; letters 0.01. [p.466] | M.H. Sayar, P. Siewert, and H. Taeuber, *Tyche* 9 (1994) 113-130. *Squeeze* (Vienna). | Photograph: *Tyche* pls. 20-23. | Cf. Gauthier, *Bull. épig.* 1995, 601. |...| 2. The editors suggest as possible περὶ τῆς ἀνανεώ[σεως] or προαιρέ[σεως]. | 3 Rigsby: ἀσυλ[ίαν - - - ] edd. 4 ἦν (ἦν) edd.) and and τετιμημένον Rigsby. 5 Rigsby: θεὰν καὶ κατὰ τὴν] edd. 6 Rigsby: [τοῦ ταμίου ἐμοῦ? edd. 7 Rigsby: [ἱερὸν τὸ. . . . ] or [τέμενος τὸ] or το[ῦτο τὸ ἱερὸν] edd. 12 Gauthier: τ[ῇ] edd. 22 end Rigsby. 29: ΟΨΗΣ” – Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 466–467.

## 27 – L. Cornelius Sulla(?) to Mopsuestia – post 85 BCE

(on the same monument as **26**) = Rigsby *Asyilia* **217(i)** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R29**

- [ - - - ]ῶσαντ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - ]σεως τῆς[ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . ] τῆς Ἰσιδος ἀσυλ[ - - - - - , καθὼς?]  
 [τὸ] ἱερὸν ἦν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλ[έων τετιμημένον? διὰ]  
 5 [τ]ὴν εὐσέβειαν τὴν πρὸς τῇ[ν θεάν· ἐγὼ οὖν τὴν]  
 πα[ρ]άκλησιν τὴν Λευκόλλου [ταμίου ὑπακούσας?]  
 συνεχώρησα ἄσυλον εἶναι τὸ [παρ’ ὑμεῖν ἱερὸν]  
 τῆς Ἰσιδος.

Date: Ceccarelli. In Adana museum, assigned to Mopsuestia due to an emblem (cf. Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 466 esp. n.22). This text appears on the same monument as **26** and, though postdating it, appears before it on the stone.

## 28 – Q. Oppius to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Plarasians and Aphrodisians – post 85 BCE\*

= Reynolds *AR* 3 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R31**

Plate I, 2-3	<b>Κόϊντος Ὀππιος Κοϊντου</b>	30	τῶν τε ἀποσταλέντων,
<i>a</i>	<b>υἱὸς ἀνθύπατος Ῥωμαίων</b>		πρεσβευτῶν ἐργασία
<i>On the capital</i>	<b>στρατηγὸς Πλαρασέων καὶ</b>		καλῇ καὶ πλείστη ἐχρη-
	<b>Ἀφροδισιέων ἄρχουσιν,</b>		σάμην ν. δι’ ἧς αἰτίας ν.
5	<b>βουλῇ, δῆμῳ χαίρειν</b>		φροντίζω [?καὶ ἐν ἄρ]-
<i>b</i>	[ . . c. 14 . . ] ΕΔΟ[ . . . ]	35	χῇ καὶ ἰδίῳ β[ί]ω? [?ῶ]-
<i>On the pilaster</i>	[ . . c. 12..], Ἀντίπατ[ρος]		περ ἂν σωζομέν[ης]
	[? Ἀδρά]στου, Περείτας Ἀπολλω-		τῆς ἐμῆς πίστ[ε]-
	[νίου]υ, Ἀρτεμίδωρος Μύωνος,		ως ποιῆσαι ὑμῖν δύ-
10	<b>Διονύσιος Μήνιδος, Τειμο-</b>		<b>νωμαι</b> τοῖς τε δημο-
	<b>κλῆς Ζήνωνος, πρεσβευταὶ</b>	40	σίοις πράγμασιν ὑ[μ]ε-
	<b>ὕμέτεροι, ἄνδρες καλοὶ καὶ</b>		τέροις εὐχρηστῆσαι,
	<b>ἀγαθοί, συνέτυχόν μοι ἐν</b>		<b>καὶ αἰεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ</b>
	<b>Κῶ καὶ συνεχάρησαν, τό τε</b>		<b>παραίτιος γενέσθαι.</b>
15	<b>ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν ἐν ᾧ δι-</b>		ὅπως τε τῇ συνκλήτῳ
	εσαφεῖτο χαίρειν ὑμᾶς με-	45	τῷ τε δῆμῳ τὰ ἀφ’ ὑμῶν
	γάλως ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμῇ παρουσίᾳ,		πεπραγμένα ἐστίν <i>sic</i>
	ὅπερ ἐγὼ ὑπὲρ ὑμετέρας		ὅταν εἰς Ῥώμην παρ-
	θελήσεως εἷς με τά τε δημό-		γένωμαι διασαφίσω.
20	σια πράγματα ἡμέτερα ἀσφα-	50	οὐ αὐτοὶ πρεσβεῖς παρ-
	λῶς πιστεύω· καθ’ ὃν γὰρ και-		κάλεσαν ὅπως ἔξῃ τῇ
	ρὸν ἐκ Λαοδικῆς πρὸς ν. ὑ-		ἐμῇ πατρωνήᾳ καὶ ὑμῖν
	μᾶς ἔπεμψα γράμματα ὅπ[ω]ς		χρησθαι· τούτους ἐγὼ
	στρατιώτας πρὸς με ἀποσ[τέ]-		ἀνεδεξάμην, καταλο-
25	λητε, ἐν πρώτοις ἀπεστε[ί]-		γῆς ἔνεκεν τῆς ὑμετέ-
	λατε, τοῦτο δὲ ἐποιήσατε κ[α]-	55	ρας πόλεως, ἐμὲ τοῦ δή-
	θῶς ἐπέβαλλεν συμμ[ά]-		μου τοῦ ὑμετέρου πά-
	χοις ἀγαθοῖς καὶ φίλοις δή-		τρωνα ν. ἔσεσθαι ν.
	μου Ῥωμαίων ποιῆσαι,		

\*I have inferred this date from the discussion at Reynolds *AR* p.18, since she does not explicitly give a date. Inscribed at Aphrodisias (Reynolds). “*a* Pilaster capital (inv. no. 67. 550; 0.98 × 0.27 × 0.74) inscribed on the moulding of one face (inscribed area 0.395 × 0.13), found loose in excavation at the north end of the stage front; it indubitably fitted above *b*, a pilaster (c. 0.81 × 0.61) *in situ*, terminating the south wall of the north parodos at the stage end, inscribed on two faces. The inscriptions given below is cut on the face which looks [p.16] towards the archestra; this face is in two planes, one stepped back from the other (each containing one column of text), has been damaged above and along all edges and pierced by a round hole near the left edge towards the top. [...] Letters, second cent. A.D.: *a* av. 0.018; *b* av. 0.02.” – Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 16–17.

**29** – L. Cornelius Sulla to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Koans – c.84 BCE

(on the same monument as **30**) = Sherk *RDGE* **49(i)** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R32**

- A  
 Ἀγαθαὶ Τύχαι.  
 [Λ]εύκιος Κορνήλιος Λευκίου υἱὸς Σύλλας Ἐπα-  
 φρόδειτος δικτάτωρ Κόων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ  
 δῆμῳ χαίρειν· Ἐγὼ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Λαοδικεῖ κι-  
 5 θαριστῇ, ἀνδρὶ καλῷ καὶ ἀγαθῷ καὶ φίλῳ ἡμε-  
 τέρῳ, πρεσβευτῇ παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν περὶ τὸν Διό-  
 [ν]υσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου  
 [καὶ τ]ῶν περὶ τὸν Καθηγεμόνα Διόνυσον ἐπέτρε-  
 [ψα στήλην] παρ’ ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ἐπισημοτάτῳ τόπῳ ἀναθή-  
 10 [σεσθαι ἐν ἧ] ἀναγραφῇσεται τὰ ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ δεδομένα  
 [τοῖς τεχνίταις] φιλάνθρωπα· πρεσβεύσαντος δὲ  
 [νῦν αὐτοῦ εἰς Ῥώμην], τῆς συγκλήτου δὲ δόγμα περὶ  
 [τούτων ψηφισαμένης, ὑμᾶς] οὖν θέλω φροντίσαι ὅπως ἀπο-  
 [δειχθῇ παρ’ ὑμῖν τόπος ἐπισ]ημότατος ἐν ᾧ ἀναθή-  
 15 [σεται ἡ στήλη ἡ περὶ τῶν τεχνιτῶ]ν. Ὑπογέγραφα δὲ  
 [τῆς παρ’ ἐμοῦ ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ τε δόγματος] τῆς συνκλή-  
 [του τὰ ἀντίγραφα - - - - -] NTΩ

Inscribed at Kos. “Text by Segre. A 2ff. Cf. Sulla’s letter to Stratonicea with the *senatus consultum* of 81 B.C. ([*RDGE*] No. **18**) for the heading. 8-9 ἐπέτ[αξα] was considered by Segre and then rejected. 11 Segre also considered and then rejected [αὐτοῖς τίμια καὶ] φιλάνθρωπα. 12 [τούτων δογματισαμένης ὑμᾶς] would be too long.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 264.

**30** – L. Cornelius Sulla to the Koans – c.81 BCE

(on the same monument as **29**) = Sherk *RDGE* **49(ii)** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R33**

- B  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . ]δεῖ σὺν δὲ καὶ ἦν ἔχετε πρὸς [ἡμ]ᾶς [εὖ]γο[ιαν,]  
 ὑμᾶς οὖν θέλω [ἐ]πεγνωκέναι ἐμὲ ἀπὸ συμβο[υ]-  
 λίου γνώμης γνώμην ἀποπεφάνθαι, ἃ φιλάνθ[ρ]-  
 [ω]πα κα[ὶ] τιμᾶς ἀλειτουργησίας τε ὑμῖν καταλο-  
 5 [γῇ] τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ τῶν Μουσῶν καὶ τῆς πο[λι]-  
 τείας ὑμῶν χάριτα σύνκλητος ἄρχοντές τε [ἦ ἀν]-  
 τάρχοντες ἡμέτεροι ἔδωκαν σ[υνεχώ]-  
 ρησαν, ἵνα ταῦτα ἔχετε, καὶ κ[αθώς] καὶ πρὶν  
 πάσης τε λειτουργίας ἀλε[ιτούργητοι] ἦτε  
 10 στρατείας τε, μήτε τινὰ [εἰσφορὰν ἢ δαπά]-  
 νας εἰσφέρητε, μήτε [ἐ]ν[ο]χλεῖσθε ὑπὸ τινος  
 παροχῆς ἔνεκεν τ[ε] καὶ ἐπισταθμείας, μήτε  
 τινὰ δέχεσθ[αι] καταλύτην ἐπαναγκάζησθε.]  
 ἵνα δὲ καὶ [ - - - - - ]  
 15 [ . . . ]IONII[ - - - - - ]  
 ἀναγ[ρ - - - - - ]

Inscribed at Kos. “B 4-5 καταλο[γῆς], Segre; καταλο[γῆ], Robert. For privileges accorded to the Artists and athletes see the letters of the Roman magistrate(s) to the Artists at Thebes ([RDGE] No. 44), the letter of M. Antonius to the Greeks in Asia ([RDGE] No. 57) and the series of documents in *B.G.U.*, IV, 1074; cf. Segre, *op. cit.*, pp.259-62, and R. Herzog, *Sitzungsberichte der Koniglich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1935, pp.974ff.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 264.

### 31 – L. Cornelius Sulla to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of Stratonikeia – 81 BCE

(on the same monument as **Excl.T. 7**) = Sherk *RDGE* 18(i) = Viereck ‘SG’ XVI = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R34

Frag. AB<sup>1</sup> [Λεύκιος Κορνήλιος Λ]ευκίου [υἱὸς] Σύλλας Ἐπαφρόδιτος  
 [δικτάτωρ Στρατονι]κέων ἄρχ[ο]υσι βουλῇ δῆμῳ χαίρειν·  
 [οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν ὑμᾶς] διὰ προ[γ]όνων πάντα τὰ δίκαια  
 [πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν] ἡγεμ[ον]ίαν πεποιηκότας καὶ ἐν  
 5 [παντὶ καιρῷ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς πί[σ]τιν εἰλικρινῶς τετηρηκότας  
 [ἔν τε τῷ πρὸς Μιθραδά]την π[ο]λέμῳ πρώτους τῷ ἐν τῇ  
 [Ἀσίᾳ ἀντιτεταγμένους κα]ὶ διὰ ταῦτα κινδύνους πολλοὺς  
 [τε καὶ παντοδαποὺς] ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων δημοσίων  
 [πραγμάτων προθυμό]τατα ἀ[ν]αδεδεγμένους  
 10 [ - - - - - ] καὶ τ[οὺς] κοινούς καὶ τοὺς ιδιωτικούς  
 [φιλίας ἔ]νε[κεν] πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίας τε  
 [καὶ χάριτος, καὶ ἐν τῷ τοῦ πολέ]μου καιρῷ πρὸς τε  
 [τὰς ἄλλας τῆς Ἀσίας πόλεις πεπρ]εσβευκότας καὶ πρ[ὸς]  
 [τὰς τῆς Ἑλλάδος - - - - - ]

Inscribed at Lagina in Caria. “The text is that of Dittenberger except where noted. 7 [Ἀσίᾳ ἀνθεσταμένους, Diehl and Cousin. 8-9 [καὶ μεγάλους ὑφεστηκότας] ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων δημοσίων πραγμάτων καὶ δεινό]τατα ἄ[λλ]α δεδεγμένους, Diehl and Cousin; πολλούς [τε καὶ παντοδαπούς], Dittenberger; προθυμό]τατα ἀ[ν]αδεδεγμένους, Bases, followed by Dittenberger and Viereck (notes); πολλούς [τε καὶ δεινοτάτους, Wilamowitz. 13a Added by Viereck.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 109.

### 32 – L. Cornelius Sulla to Thasos – 80 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 20 = Dunant-Pouilloux *Thasos* 174 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R36

A. Col. I Λεύ[κ]ιος Κορνή[λ]ιος Λευκίου [υἱὸς] Σύλλας Ἐπαφρόδιτης ὕπατος]  
 Letter τὸ δεύτερον[ο]ν χαίρειν λέγε[ι] Θασίων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δῆμῳ·]  
 ἐγὼ πρεσβευταῖς ὑμετέροις [τὸ τῆς συνκλήτου δόγμα παρέδωκα· τὸ]  
 SC δόγμα τοῦτο γεγονός ἐστιν πρὸς [ἡμερῶν - - - - - ἐν τῷ]  
 5 [ . . ]μητηρίῳ. κτλ.

Inscribed at Thasos. I have not included the very damaged and largely restored fragments B-J of the following *senatus consultum* here. “A 5 [Τι]μητηρίῳ (?), Taylor, but [πολε]μητηρίῳ, Bousquet. A 5-6 Taylor restored the name; cf. E. Badian, *Athenaeum*, n.s., 40 (1962): 356-58.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 118.

**33 – Cn. Cornelius Dolabella to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Thasians – between 80 to 78 BCE\***

(on the same monument as **34**) = Sherk *RDGE* **21 (i)**, cf. Dunant-Pouilloux *Thasos* **175** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R37**

- Col.I [Γναῖ]ος Κορνήλιος Ποπλίου [υἱὸς Δολαβέλλας ἀνθύπατ]ος χαίρειν λέγει  
 ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ Θασί-  
 ων· Μικᾶς Μικᾶ υἱός, Σα[ - - - καθ’ υἰοθεσία]ν Εὐρυμενίδου, φύσει δὲ Λυήτου,  
 πρεσβευταὶ  
 ὑμέτεροι, ἄνδρες κα[λοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ παρὰ δήμου κα]λοῦ τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ  
 φίλου συμμάχου τε ἡμε-  
 τέρου, ἐν Θεσσαλο[νίκη] ἐντυχόντες μοι - - - ]ον τὴν σύγκλητον τοῦ δήμου τοῦ  
 Ῥωμαίων  
 5 ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρ[ας πόλεως δόγμα περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ δημόσι]α πράγματα  
 καταλογῆς ὑμῶν ἐσχηκέναι·  
 τοῦτό τε τὸ δόγ[μα - - - - - ]  
 του ἐπέγνων τ[ - - - - - ]  
 τερον ἐσχηκέ[ναι - - - - - ]  
 ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ [ - - - - - τα-]  
 10 λαιπωρίαις περι[πeseῖν ? - - - - - ]  
 ἱμπεράτοράς τε [ - - - - - ]  
 ὑμῶν ὑμῖν χάριτα [φιλίαν συμμαχίαν ἀνανεῶσασθαι - - - - - 23 - - - - - ]  
 ὅπερ ὑμᾶς ἐπεγν[ - - 7 - - ]γον τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς Ἀβδηριτῶν ᾧ τρόπῳ Λεύ[κ]-  
 κιος Κορνήλιος Σύλ[λας - 9 - διέ]κρινεν καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος δίκαιον διέλαβεν, ὁ δη-  
 15 μός τε Ῥωμαίων ἐκέλ[ευσεν - - - - - ]ΜΟ. .ΟΞΝ.Λ.  
 ΧΟΙΣΕΤΟΥΣΕΝΑΠΟΣΤΕΛΕ. . ὑπή-  
 κοοι ὑμῖν ᾧσιν τᾶς τε π[ - - ]ΔΕΝ . . . . . ΣΝΕ . Εἰ προσόδους ἡ σύγκλητος [ἡ  
 Ῥω]-  
 μαίων συνεχώρησεν ἵνα χρασ[θ- - 7 - τ]ούτοις τοῖς ΤΟ . . ΙΝΑ γίνηται ν . . . . .  
 ὁμ-  
 οίως τε καὶ Πεπαρηθίοις καὶ [Σκιαθίοις] γράμματα ἀπέστειλα ἵνα ὑμῖν  
 ὑπήκοοι ᾧσιν ᾧ τρόπῳ ἡ σύγ-  
 κλητος ἡμετέρα ἠθέλησεν. *vacat*  
 20 Εἰ δὲ περὶ τῆς χώρας ἦν ὁμοροῦσαν Ἰσμαρον (?) [ . . ]ΕΝΕ.ΑΙΕ τὴν χώραν ἐμὲ  
 σταθ[ῆν]αι ΝΤΟ[ - - - ]  
 ὑμῖν σχολάζουσιν, παταδοῦναι δέ τινα σχολάζουσα[ν - - c. 19 - - ]ΑΙΩΝΙΔΑ καὶ  
 πρὸς οὓς [ . . . ] γράμ-  
 ματα ἀπέστειλα ἵνα περὶ ταύτης τῆς χώρας ΝΟΤΗ .Ν. ΟΝΟ .Π .Ε.  
 ΕΝΑΜΗΒΙΗΤΙΝΕΣΕΝΠΑΚΗΠΗ ἀποχω-  
 [ρ]ήσωσιν ὑμῖν τε σχολάζουσιν παραδῶσιν καθὼς .Ω[ - - c. 11 - - ]ΙΝ[ - c. 9 - ]  
 ΤΟΠΟΙ . . . ΑΝΕΙΝ εἶν-  
 [α?]ί τε εἴ τινα Ῥοιμηταλκας ἢ Αβλουπορις ἢ Τυτα Κ. .ΣΕΤ .ΚΑ .Ο. .ΡΤ. .  
 ὑμέτερα διακατέχο[υ]-  
 25 [σ]ιν ταῦτα ὑμῖν σχολάζοντα ἀποδοθῶσιν· ὁμοίως τε ΑΜ[ - - 14 - 15 - - ]  
 ΤΑΙΗΠ . ΑΣΙΝΩΤΙΑΠ  
 [ . ]ν ὑμέτερα ταῦτα ὑμῖν ἀποκατασταθῆναι φροντίσαι [ - - - - ] ὑπὲρ τούτων  
 τῶν πραγμάτων ὑμ[ετ]-

[έρων] δημοσίαι ἡ ἰδίαι ἵνα πρὸς ἐμὲ ΤΑ.Σ[ - - c. 9 - - ]ΥΤ[ - - - - - 19 - - - - - ]  
[ - - - - - ]

Col.II Περὶ δὲ τῶν καταλειπομένων, ἐὰν εἰς ἀμφιλογίαν [ - - - - - 24 - - - - - ]  
τοῦ πράγματος πρεσβευταὶ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐλθέτωσαν | [ - - - - - 24 - - - - - ]  
αἵτινες ἐν τῇ φιλίαι τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων ἔμεινα[ν - - - - - 20 - - - - - ]

\*I have inferred this date myself from the dates of Dolabella's governorship in Macedonia, 80-78 BCE (cf. Sherck *RDGE* p.122), since Sherck does not offer a date. Inscribed at Thasos. The numbers in square brackets indicate the number of dashes in Sherck's edn. "13-14 ΛΕΥΚ[ΚΙΟΣ. 15 ]ΜΟ . . ΟΣΝ .Λ (or O) κτλ.. 16 Π[ - - ]Δ (or Υ) κτλ.; Dunant and Pouilloux suggest τάς τε π[ολιτείας χωρία λι]μέν[ας κόμα]ς τε [κ]αὶ προσόδους κτλ. 17 Dunant and Pouilloux suggest with great reservation τ[ούτοις τοῖς ἔθ]ε[σιν] ἃ γίνηται κτλ. 20 ΕΜΑΡΟΝ . . Ε (or Σ) ΝΕ (or Π or Γ) κτλ. 21 [Π]αιονίδα? suggested by Dunant and Pouilloux. 22 In the middle Dunant and Pouilloux suggest the possibility of τι[ν]ε[ς] ἐν (sic) Ἀμφίβη, τινὲς ἐν Πακηπτη (or Πακηι τῇ); But the place names are unknown. 23 . . .ΑΝΕ (or O) ΙΝ κτλ. 24 Κ (or Ε). 25 ΑΜ (or ΑΝΝΙ or ΑΙΠ), and, later, ΑΣΙΝ (or Λ)." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 121.

### 34 – Cn. Cornelius Dolabella to Thasos – between 80 to 78 BCE\*

(on the same monument as 33) = Sherck *RDGE* 21 (ii) = Dunant-Pouilloux *Thasos* 175= Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' R38

Col.II Γναῖος [Κορνήλιος] Ποπλίου υἱὸς Δολαβέλλας ἀνθύπατος [χαίρειν λέγει  
ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ Θασί]-

5 [ων - - - - - ] σ[υμμ]άχῳ ἀποκριν[ - - - - - ]

*Spatium versuum quinque*

[ - - - - - ] ὑμᾶς θέλω φροντίσαι[ι - - - - - ]

[ - - - - - ]ωσιν ὑπήκοοι ἦτε οὕτως [ - - - - - ]

[ - - - - - ]σαι τέ τι ὑπεναντίον τουτ[ - - - - - ]

[ - - - - - ]η αὐτὴ Σκιαθίος.

*vacat*

\*I have inferred this date from the dates of Dolabella's governorship in Macedonia, 80-78 BCE (cf. Sherck, *RDGE*, 122), since Sherck does not offer a date. Inscribed at Thasos.

### 35 – M. Terentius Varro and C. Cassius Longinus to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Oropians – 73 BCE

= Sherck *RDGE* 23 = Viereck 'SG' XVIII = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' R39

Μ[άαρχ]ος Τερέντιος Μάαρχου υἱὸς Ουάρεων Λεύκολλος, Γάιος Κάσιος  
Λευκί[ου υἱὸς Λον]-

γῖνος ὑπατοὶ νν Ὀρωπίων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν  
ἔχ[οι].

ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι βουλόμεθα ἡμᾶς κατὰ τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα τὸ γενόμενον ἐπὶ  
Λευκί]-

ου Λικινίου Μάαρχου Αὐρηλίου ὑπάτων ἐπεγνωκέναι περὶ ἀντιλογιῶν τῶν  
ἀνὰ μ[έσον]

5 θεῶι Ἀμφιαράῳ καὶ τῶν δημοσιωνῶν γεγονότων {ἐπεγνωκέναι}. νν πρὸ μιᾶς  
εἰ[δυῶν]



- Ὀκτωμβρίων ἐμ βασιλικῇ Πορκία· ἐν συμβουλίου νν παρήσαν **Μάακος Κλαύδιος Μαάρκ[ου]**  
 υἱὸς Ἀρνήσης **Μάακελλος**, νν **Γάιος Κλαύδιος Γαίου υἱὸς Ἀρνήσης**  
**Γλάβερ**,  
**Μάακος Κάσιος Μαάρκου υἱὸς Πωμεντίνα**, νν **Γάιος Λικίνιος Γαίου υἱὸς**  
 {**Πωμεντίνα**, νν **Γάιος Λικίνιος Γαίου υἱὸς**} **Στηλατίνα{ς} Σακέρδως**,  
 10 **Λεύκιος Οὐολύσκιος Λεύκιου υἱὸς Ἀρνήσης**, νν **Λεύκιος Λάρτιος**  
**Λευκίου υἱὸς**  
**Π<α>πιρία**, νν **Γάιος Ἀνναῖος Γαίου υἱὸς Κλυτομίνα**, νν **Μάαρκου Τύλλιος**  
**Μαάρκου υἱὸς**  
**Κορνηλία Κικέρων**, ν **Κόιντος Ἄξιος Μαάρκου υἱὸς Κυρίνα**, νν **Κόιντος**  
**Πομπήμιος Κοίν-**  
 του υἱὸς Ἀρνήσης **Ρούφος**, **Αὔλος Κασκέλλιος Αὔλου υἱὸς {ὁ υἱὸς}**  
**Ῥωμιλία**,  
**Κόιντος Μυνύκιος Κοίντου υἱὸς Τηρηντίνα Θέρμος**, ν **Μάαρκος Ποπλίκιος**  
 15 **Μαάρκου υἱὸς Ὀρατία Σκαίουας**, νν **Τίτος Μαΐνιος Τίτου υἱὸς** νν **Λεμωνία**,  
 ν **Λεύκιος**  
**Κλαύδιος Λευκίου υἱὸς Λεμωνία**. νν περὶ ᾧν Ἑρμόδωρος Ὀλυνπίχου υἱὸς  
 ἱερεὺς  
 Ἀμφιαράου, ὅστις πρότερον ὑπὸ τῆς συνκλήτου σύνμαχος προσηγορευμέ-  
 νος ἐστίν, καὶ **Ἀλεξίδημος Θεοδώρου υἱὸς**, **Δημαίνετος Θεοτέλου υἱὸς**  
 πρεσβευ-  
 ταὶ Ὠρωπίων λόγους ἐποίησαντο· νν ἐπ<ε>ὶ ἐν τῷ τῆς μισθώσεως νόμῳ αὐταὶ  
 αἱ  
 20 χῶραι ὑπεξειρημέναι εἰσίν, ἃς Λεύκιος Σύλλας θεῶν ἀθανάτων ἱερῶν τεμενῶν  
 φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν συνεχώρησεν {ὑπεξειρημέναι εἰσίν}, νν ταύτας τε τὰς προσ-  
 ὄδους, περὶ ᾧν ἄγεται τὸ πρᾶγμα, Λεύκιος Σύλλας τῷ θεῷ Ἀμφιαράῳ  
 πρ<ο>σώρι-  
 σεν, ὅπως ὑπὲρ τούτων τῶν χωρῶν πρόσδοτον τῷ δημοσιῶνῃ τελῶσιν·  
 καὶ περὶ ᾧν Λεύκιος Δομέτιος Αἰνόβαλβος νν ὑπὲρ δημοσιωνῶν εἶπεν·  
 25 ἐπεὶ ἐν τῷ τῆς μισθώσεως νόμῳ αὐταὶ αἱ χῶραι ὑπεξειρημέναι εἰσίν,  
 ἃς Λεύκιος Σύλλας θεῶν ἀθανάτων ἱερῶν τεμενῶν φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν  
 συνεχώρησεν, νν οὔτε ὁ Ἀμφιάραιος, ᾧ αὐταὶ αἱ χῶραι σθνκεχωρημέναι  
 λέγονται, θεός ἐστιν, ὅπως ταύτας τὰς χώρας καρπίζεσθαι ἐξῆ  
 τοὺς δημοσιώνας· νν ἀπὸ συμβουλίου γνώμης γνώμην ἀπεφηνά-  
 30 μεθα, ὃ ἐπέγνωμεν, τῇ συνκλήτῳ προσανοίσομεν, νν τοῦτο ὃ καὶ  
 εἰς τὴν τῶν ὑπομνημάτων δέλτον κατεχωρίσαμεν· νν περὶ χώρας  
 Ὠρωπίας, περὶ ἧς ἀντολογία ἦν πρὸς τοὺς δημοσιώνας, κατὰ τὸν τῆς  
 Μισθώσεως νόμον, αὕτη ὑπεξειρημένη ἐστίν, ἵνα μὴ ὁ δημοσιώ-  
 νης αὐτὴν καρπίζεται· κατὰ τὸ τῆς συνκλήτου δόγμα ἐπέγνωμεν·  
 35 ἐν τῷ τῆς μισθώσεως νόμῳ ὑπεξειρημένην δοκεῖ εἶναι οὕτως·  
*Lex* ἐκτός τε τούτων ἢ εἴ τι δόγμα συνκλήτου αὐτοκράτωρ αὐτοκράτορές τ[ε]  
*censoria* ἡμέτεροι καταλογῆς θεῶν ἀθανάτων ἱερῶν τεμενῶν τε φυλακῆς  
 καρπίζεσθαι ἔδωκαν κατέλιπον, ν ἐκτός τε τούτων, ἃ Λεύκιος  
 Κορνήλιος Σύλλας αὐτοκράτωρ ἀπὸ συμβουλίου γνώμης θεῶν  
 40 ἀθανάτων ἱερῶν τεμενῶν τε φυλακῆς ἔνεκεν καρπίζεσθαι ἔδωκεν,  
 ὃ τὸ αὐτὸ ἢ σύνκλητος ἐπεκύρωσεν, οὔτε μετὰ ταῦτα δόγματι

- Sulla's Proclamation 45 συνκλήτου ἄκυρον ἐγενήθη. ν Λεύκιος Κορνήλιος Σύλλας ἀπὸ συν-βουλίου γνώμης γνώμην εἰρηκέναι δοκεῖ. νν τῆς εὐχῆς ἀποδόσεως ἔνεκεν τῷ ἱερῷ Ἀμφιαράου χώραν προστίθημι πάντη πάντοθεν πόδας χιλίους, ἵνα καὶ αὕτη ἡ χώρα ὑπάρχη ἄσυλος· ὡσαύτως τῷ θεῷ Ἀμφιαράῳ καθιερωκέναι τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας λιμένων τε τῶν Ὠρωπίων τὰς προσόδους ἀπάσας εἰς τοὺς ἀγῶνας καὶ τὰς θυσίας, ἃς Ὠρώπιοι συντελοῦσιν θεῷ Ἀμφιαράῳ, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἃς ἂν μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπὲρ τῆς νίκης καὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων συντελέσουσιν, 50 ἐκτὸς ἀγρῶν τῶν Ἑρμοδώρου Ὀλυνπίχου υἱοῦ, ἱερέως Ἀμφιαράου, τοῦ διὰ τέλους ἐν τῇ φιλίᾳ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων μεμενηκός· περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος δόγμα συνκλήτου ν ἐπὶ Λευκίου Σύλλα Ἐπαφροδίτου, Κοίντου Μετέλλου Εὐσεβοῦς ὑπάτων ν ἐπικεκυρωμένον δοκεῖ εἶναι, ὅπερ ἡ σύνκλητος ἐδογμάτισεν {καὶ} εἰς τούτους τοὺς λόγους· ὅσα τε θεῷ 55 Ἀμφιαράῳ καὶ τῷ ἱερῷ αὐτοῦ ν Λεύκιος Κορνήλιος Σύλλας ἀπὸ συ<ν>βουλίου γνώμης προσώρισεν συνεχώρησεν, τὰ αὐτὰ ἡ σύνκλητος τούτῳ τῷ θεῷ δοθῆναι συνχωρηθῆναι ἡγήσατο· ἐν τῷ συμβουλίῳ παρήσαν οἱ αὐτοὶ οἱ ἐμ πραγμαμάτων συμβεβουλευμένων δέλτῳ πρώτῃ, 60 κηρώματι τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῳ. ν Δόγμα συνκλήτου τοῦτο γενόμενον ἐστίν· πρὸ ἡμερῶν δεκαεπτὰ καλανδῶν Νοενβρίων ἐν κομετίῳ· γραφομένου παρήσαν ν Τίτος Μαίνιος Τίτου υἱὸς Λεμωνία, Κόιντος Ῥάγκιος Κοίντου υἱὸς Κλαυδία, Γάιος Οὐσέλλιος Γαίου υἱὸς Κυρίνα Οὐάρρων. νν Περὶ ὧν Μάαρκος Λεύκολλος, Γάιος Κάσιος ὑπάτοι ἐπιγνόντες ἀπήγγειλαν περὶ Ὠρωπίας χώρας καὶ τῶν 65 δημοσιωνῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεγνώκηναι, ὡσαύτως τὴν Ὠρωπίων χώραν ὑπεξειρημένην δοκεῖν εἶναι κατὰ τὸν τῆς μισθώσεως νόμον, μὴ δοκεῖν τοὺς δημοσιώνας ταῦτα καρπίζεσθαι, οὕτως καθὼς ἂν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων πίστεώς τε τῆς ιδίας ἐφαίνετο, ἔδοξεν.

Inscribed at Oropos. “4 ἀνὰ μ[έσον, Bases; ἀνὰ μ[έρος, Mommsen. 5 γεγονότων for γεγονυῖων, Viereck (notes); ἐπεγνώκηναι repeated by error. 8 Μάαρκος Κα<ι>στος suggested by E. Badian, *Historia*, 13 (1963): 135. 9 The stone-cutter has repeated a line or so from his draft; cf. Badian, *loc. cit.* 11 ΠΗΠΙΡΙΑ stone. 13 ὁ υἱός not dittography according to Bormann. 14 Between the *eta* and *nu* in the middle of Τηρηντίνα there is a tiny worn or damaged area on the stone. 35 Mommsen changed to ὑπεξειρημένον. 36 Bases changed δόγμα to δόγματι; Viereck (notes) thinks he is [p.135] right, but he retains the reading. 37 Bases added ἔνεκεν at the end after φυλακῆς, but it is not necessary. 54 Bases deleted καί. 62 Οὐσέλλιος, Bases, Dittenberger, Viereck; Οὐ<ι>σέλλιος, others.” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 135–136.

### 36 – A letter of a Roman magistrate about the lands of the Mytilenai – post 55 BCE

= Sherck *RDGE* 51 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R40

- Col.1 [ - - - - - 26 - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 23 - - - - - ] αρχισ  
 [ - - - - - 21 - - - - - ] αὐτῶν  
 [ - - - - 20 - - - - - τ]οῦ Ῥωμαίων  
 [ - - - - 20 - - - - - π]εριπεπτω-  
 5 [κ - - - 19 - - - - ]α καὶ παν

- [ - - - - 20 - - - - ] τη πρὸς πρεσ-  
 [βείαν - - 17 - - - ] πεφευγέναι  
 [ - 15 - τοῦ αὐτο]κράτορος ἡμῶν  
 [ - - - 18 - - - κ]αὶ τῶν λοι-  
 10 [πῶν - 17 - - ] αἱ [ . ] ασιμιπῶν  
 [ - - 19 - - ] και βίωι καὶ  
 [ - 16 - Κορνήλ]ιον Σύλλαν  
 [ - - - 20 - - - ] σε καὶ τὸν  
 [ - - 19 - - - ] νο[ . ] οχε  
 15 [ - - 19 - - - ] νοις τε  
 [ - - - 20 - - - ] εραι τῇ με  
 [ - - - 20 - - - ] τι διὰ το  
 [ - - - 20 - - - ] ἱλησμενη  
 [ - - - 20 - - - ] ιε[ - - ] λαυ  
 20 [ - - 17 - - τῆς] αὐτῆς μητρὸς  
 [ - - - - - 26 - - - - - ]  
 Col.2 φιλα[ - - - - - 25 - - - - - ]  
 τόπου [ - - - - - 24 - - - - - ]  
 κειω δεδ[ - - - - - 23 - - - - - ]  
 σομένους [ - - - - - 23 - - - - - ]  
 25 αν τειμῆς φιλα[ - - - - - 20 - - - - - ]  
 αι σοι ἔδωκαν [ - - - - - 20 - - - - - ]  
 ταύτην τε τὴν [χώραν - - - - 15 - - - - πλέ]-  
 θρων δισχιλίω[ν - - - - - 17 - - - - - εὐερ]-  
 γεσίας ἀρετῆς [τε - - - - - 18 - - - - - ]  
 30 ωι δὲ δικαίως [ - - - - - 20 - - - - - ]  
 μεν ἀκόντως σ[ - - - - - 20 - - - - - ]  
 οὐδένα δε[ - - - - - 19 - - - - - αὐτο]-  
 κράτωρ [ - - - - - 23 - - - - - ]  
 τούτων [ - - - - - 23 - - - - - ]  
 35 γυναικὸς [ - - - - - 22 - - - - - ]  
 προνομίαν κλε[ - - - - - 21 - - - - - ]  
 καθὼς Γναῖ[ος Πομπήιος - 12 - ἀπὸ συμ-  
 βουλίου γνώμη[ς γνώμην ἀπεφην - 13 -]  
 οὕτως τε ὑμῶν [ - - 11 - - ἔχειν κατέχειν τε]  
 40 καρπίζεσθαί [ τε ἐξεῖναι (?) - - - 14 - - - ]  
 καὶ περὶ τοῦ κ[ - - - - - 20 - - - - - ]

Found at Mytilene. The numbers in square brackets indicate the number of dashes in Sherk's edn.  
 "Restorations are by F. Hiller von Gaertringen except where noted. 1 - - ]αι χισ[ - - , Evangelides; - - ]αρχισ[ - - , Hiller. 10 ἀγ[ωνι]σ[α]μ[ένων] (?), Hiller; καθὼς γ[ . ]αι[ - - ], Evangelides; Γ[ρ]αι[ - - ], Hiller; Γναῖ[ος Πομπήιος, Accame." – Sherk, *RDGE*, 270.

**37** – A Roman magistrate to the *koinon* of the Greeks, including Miletos, Ephesos, Tralles, Alabanda, Mylasa, Smyrna, Pergamon, Sardis, and Adramyttion – 51-50 BCE?

= Sherk *RDGE* **52** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R41**

226 c and 226 b

[ - - - - ]ρα . . . σι[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ἡ]μεῖς τα[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ι καὶ γὰρ δὲ [ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ν κατὰ [ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 5 [ - - τῇ]ς ἐπαρχε[ιας - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]γαι ψευ[δ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - ] φερει[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - ] ἔλασσ[ον - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - ]τησεμ[ . . . . . ]γολο[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 10 [ - - - - ]α εμο[ . . . . . ]ν ἡμελλο[ν - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - ἐπαρ]χεῖας [ . . . . . ]εσθαι ποιη[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ν Ἐφεσ[ . . . . . ] ταύτης καὶ [ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]το ησ[ . . . . . ]στιον ἐπιΓ[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ενοι || [ . . . . . ]τοὺς νόμους [ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 15 [ - - - ]τε[ . . . . . ] | γων καὶ του[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]λε[ . . . . . ]ματα καὶ πυ[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ουμ[ . . . . . ]μοι κατὰ τη[ν - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ]ον [ . . . . . ]ῆνε]γκάμην ὑπ[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - ] -σ[ . . . . . ] τὴν σπουδ[ὴν - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 20 [ - - - - - - - ]γι καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς Γ[ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - - - ]εἰδέναι θέλω καὶ [ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - - - α]ὐτὸς τὴν ἐπα[ρχεῖαν (?) - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - - - ] ἐπὶ ξένωι [ - - - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - ]

(12 lines missing)

226 a

[ . . . . . ]ο Κοῖν[τ]ου Τ[ . . . . . ]ο[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . ]ρας [ . . . . . ] ἐπ’ ἀκυρώσει ὧ[ν] ἀνεῖλ[ηφε καὶ Μάρ]-  
 κωι Κικέρ[ων]ι συντυχῶν εὐχαρίστησε [τὰ ταχ]-  
 40 θέντα ἐπιμελῶς συντηρῶν τὰ ἐπ’ ἐμ[οὶ μὴ δια]-  
 λύειν. ὅθεν πῶς ὑμεῖς τὴν τινων περὶ [ταῦτα ἀ]-  
 ναίδειαν ἀνέσχησθε, τεθαύμακα· δι’ ἧς [αἰτίας]  
 πρὸς τε τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων γέγραφα, [πρὸς]  
 [ὑ]μᾶς, Ἐφεσίους, Τραλλιανούς, Ἀλαβανδεῖς, Μ[υ]-  
 45 [λ]ασεῖς, Σμυρναίους, Περγαμηνούς, Σαρδιανο[ύς],  
 Ἀδραμυτηνούς, ἵνα τε ὑμεῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐν τῇ δ[ιοι]-  
 [κ]ήσει τῇ ἰδίᾳ πόλεις διαποστείλησθε ἕν τε τῷ ἐπ[ι]-  
 φανεστάτῳ τόπῳ ἐν στυλοπαραστάδι ἐπὶ  
 λίθου λευκοῦ ἐνχαράχθῃναι φροντίσητε τ[αυ]-

- 50 τα τὰ γράμματα, ἵνα κοινῶς πάσῃ τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ[ι τὸ]  
 δίκαιον ἐσταμένον ἦι εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον, αἵ τε ἄλ-  
 λαι πᾶσαι πόλεις καὶ δῆμοι τὸ αὐτὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς  
 ποιήσωσιν, εἷς τε τὰ δημόσια ἀποθῶνται νομο[φυλά]-  
 κια καὶ χρηματιστήρια. τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἑλλη[νι]-  
 55 κοῖς ἔγραψα, μὴ ἐπιζητήσητε· κατὰ νοὺν γὰρ [ἔσ]-  
 χον, μή τι παρὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἔλασσον τὰ [γεγραμ]-  
 [μ]ένα νοῆσαι δύνῃσθε· τὴν δὲ ἐπιστολὴ[ν ἔδωκα]  
 [Τι]μοκλῆι Ἀναξαγόρου καὶ Σωσιγράτῃ Πυ[θίωνος]  
 [πρ]εσβευταῖς Μαγνήτων τῶν πρὸς τ[ῶι Μαιάν]-  
 60 [δρ]ωι. νν ἔρρωσθε. *vacat*  
*vacat*

Found at Priene. “Restorations by Friedrich, Wilamowitz, and Rehm. 23 I suggest στρατηγός] ἐπὶ ξένω[v] (?) . 51 Prienean copy begins with εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ κτλ. 55 Prienean copy has ἔσ[χον]. 58 Τιμοκλεῖ Ἀναξα[γόρου], Σωσιγ[ράτῃ] Πυθίωνος, Priene. 60 Prienean copy lacks ἔρρωσθε but employs the paragraphos in its place.” – Sher, *RDGE*, 274.

### 38 – C. Iulius Caesar to Mytilene – between 48 and 47 BCE

(on the same monument as 39, 40) = Sher *RDGE* 26 (i) = Viereck ‘SG’ XXXI = Lafoscade ‘De Epistulis.’ 4 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R43

- Col. a [Γράμματα Καίσαρος Θεοῦ]  
 [Γάιος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ αὐτοκράτωρ ὑπάτος τὸ] δε[ύτε]ρον Μυτι[ληναίων]  
 ἄρχουσι  
 [βουλῇ δῆμω χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς ἂν] ἔχοι· **κἀγὼ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ**  
**στρατεύμ[ατος]**  
 [ύγαινον. Ποτάμων Λεσβώνακτος, - 7 - ]καφένους, Κριναγόρας Καλλίπ[που,  
 Ζ]ώιλο[ς]  
 [Ἐπιγένους - - - - - 24 - - - - - Σω]τᾶς Δικαίου, Ὑβρίας Διοφάντου,  
 Ἰστιαῖος  
 5 [ - - - - - 33 - - - - - Δημή]τριος Τιμαίου, οἱ πρ<sup>ε</sup>σβευταὶ ὑμῶν,  
**συνε-**  
 [τυχόν μοι . . . 9 . . . καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ὑμῶν ἀπέ]δωκαν καὶ περὶ τῶν τινῶν  
**διελέχθησαν**  
 [ - - - - - 41 - - - - - ]ν κατωρθώκαμεν, καὶ  
 εὐχαριστήαντες  
 [ - - - - - 37 - - - - - ἐνέ]τυχον μετὰ πολλῆς φιλοτιμίας  
 καὶ εἰς  
 [ - - - - - 41 - - - - - ]ων ἔχειν. Ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς τε ἄνδρας  
 ἐπῆνε-  
 10 [σα διὰ τὴν προθυμίαν αὐτῶν καὶ φιλοφρόν]ως ἀπεδεξάμην, ἥδέως τε τὴν  
 πόλιν  
 [ὑμῶν εὐεργετεῖν πειράσομαι καὶ κατὰ τ]οὺς παρόντας καιροὺς καὶ ἐν τοῖς  
 μετὰ ταῦ-  
 [τα χρόνοις - - - - - 29 - - - - - ]αν ἐπιστάμενος ἦν ἔχοντες  
 εὖνοι-

[αν - - - - - 38 - - - - - ] τὸν Ποτάμωνα. νν [Ἔτι] τε τὴν  
 προ-  
 [ - - - - - 44 - - - - - ] αὐτὸν ἐπ[ὶ τ]οὺς [ . . . ]οντα[ - - - ].

Inscribed at Mytilene. The numbers amidst the restorations indicate the number of dashes or dots in Sherck's edn. "Col. a Restored by Cichorius, except where noted. 1 Paton, but I have added ὑπατος. 4 Σω[τ]ῆς Hiller. 7 [ἄς ἐψηφίσασθέ μοι καὶ περὶ τοῦ πολέμου ὃ]ν κατωρθώκαμεν, Sherck. 11 Cichorius had [ὕμῶν εὐεργετεῖν βούλομαι κτλ., but Paton changed the verb to πειράσσομαι. 12-13 εὖνοι[αν διατελεῖτε, Cichorius. 13 (end) προ[θυμίαν?], Cichorius." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 152. Either 14 or 17 lines are missing at the end.

**39** – A letter of a Roman magistrate (possibly Caesar) – probably 47-46 BCE  
 (on the same monument as **38**, **40**) = Sherck *RDGE* 26 (ii) = Lafoscade 'De Epistulis.' **4** =  
 Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **R44**

Col. b [ - - - - - 20 - - - - - ] οὐδὲ [ - - - - - 22 - - - - - ] οτε[ - - - 12 - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - β]ουλόμενος [ὕ]μῶν κεκομίσ[θαι τὴν [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ἐπικαρπία]ν (?) τῆς φιλίας ἀσφάλειαν, **ἐν τε** [τοῖς λ]οι-  
 [ποῖς χρόνοις - - - - - τὴν] πόλιν αἰεὶ τινος [ὕμ]ιν ἀ[γαθοῦ] **θέ-**  
**5** [λω γενέσθαι. Θαρροῦντες οὖν περὶ π]άντων ἐντυγχάνετε ἡμῖν. [Ἔρρωσθε].

Inscribed at Mytilene. The numbers in square brackets in l.1 indicate the number of dashes in Sherck's edn. "Col. b 1-5 Paton. 5 θαρροῦντες κτλ. Restored by Cichorius." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 152.

**40** – C. Iulius Caesar to the demos of Mytilene – 45 BCE  
 (on the same monument as **38**, **39**) = Sherck *RDGE* 26 (iii) = Lafoscade 'De Epistulis.' **4** =  
 Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **R45**. *SC* Excerpt ll.14-19 = Viereck 'SG' XXX

Col. b [Γράμματα] Καίσαρος Θεοῦ.  
 cont. [Γάιος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ αὐτοκράτ]ωρ δικτάτωρ τ[ὸ τ]ρίτον, καθε[σταμέ]-  
 [νος τὸ τέταρτον, Μυτιληναίων ἄρχουσι βο]υλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν καὶ  
**ἐρρωσθαι· καὶ** [ὡ δὲ μετὰ]  
 [τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγίαινον. Βουλόμενος] εὐεργετεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ οὐ μόν[ον]  
**10** [φυλάττειν τὰ φιλόφθωπα ἃ διεπράξ]ασθε δι' ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ συναυ[ξάνειν]  
 [αὐτὰ - - - - - ]ος τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, φιλίας δόγ[ματος]  
 [τοῦ ἡμῖν συν κεχωρημένου δι]απέπομφα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ ἀ[ντίγραφον].

*Praescriptio erasa.*

*SC* excerpt [Περὶ ὧν π]ρεσβευταὶ Μυτιληναίων Ποτάμων Λεσβώνακτος, Φαινίας  
 Φαινίου τοῦ Καλλί[π]-  
**15** [που, Τ]έρφης Διοῦς, Ἡρώδης Κλέωνος, Διῆς Ματροκλέους, Δημήτριος  
 Κλεωνύμου,  
 Κριναγόρας Καλλίππου, Ζώϊλος Ἐπιγένους λόγους ἐποίησαντο, χάριτα  
 φιλίαν συμμα-  
 χίαν ἀνενεοῦντο, ἵνα τε ἐν Καπετωλίῳ θυσ[ί]αν ποιῆσαι ἐξῆι ἃ τε αὐτοῖς  
 πρότερον ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου συγκεχωρημέ[ε]να ἦν, ταῦτα ἐν δέλτῳ χαλκῇ  
 γεγραμμένα προσηλῶσαι ἵνα ἐξῆι· περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος οὕτως  
**20** ἔδοξεν· χάριτα φιλίαν συμμαχίαν ἀνανεώσασθαι, ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς καὶ φί-  
 λους προσαγορεῦσαι, ἐν Καπετωλίῳ θυσίαν ποιῆσαι ἐξεῖναι, ἃ τε αὐτοῖς πρό-  
 τερον ὑπὸ συγκλήτου φιλόφθωπα συγκεχωρημένα ἦν, ταῦτα ἐν δέλ-

- τωι χαλκῇ γεγραμμένα προσηλῶσαι ἐξεῖναι, ὅταν θέλωσιν· ἵνα τε Γάιος  
 Καῖσαρ αὐτοκράτωρ, ἐὰν αὐτῷ φαίνεται, τόπους χορήγια αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὸ  
 25 τῶν προγόνων ἔθος ταμίαν μισθῶσαι κελεύσῃ, ὅπως ὡς ἂν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν δη-  
 Caesar's μοσίων πραγμάτων πίστεως τε τῆς ιδίας φαίνεται. Ἔδοξεν. [Ἐπ]εὶ δὲ καὶ  
 Decision πρότερον ἐνετύχετέ μοι καὶ ἔγραψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, πάλιν ὑπέμ[νας]αν οἱ  
 (returning [ὑμέτεροι πρεσβευταὶ μη]δένα δεῖν ἀτελῇ εἶ[ναι] παρ' ὑμῖν ἀκολούθ[ως τοῖς]  
 to the letter) [ὑμετέροις νόμοις καὶ τοῖς] φιλανθρώποις ἃ ἔχετε παρ' ἡμῶν τοῖς τε [πρότε]-  
 30 [ρον καὶ τοῖς διὰ τούτου το]ῦ δόγματος δεδομένοις τὸ ἐξεῖναι ὑμῖ[ν - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ταῖς] τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς χώρας προσόδοις καθ'  
 ἡ[συχίαν]  
 [χρηθῆσθαι. Βούλομαι οὖν] ἀποφύνασθαι ὅτι οὐδενὶ συγχωρῶ οὐδὲ συγ[χωρή-  
 [σω ἀτελεῖ παρ' ὑμῖν εἶναι. Ο]ὔτως οὖν πεπεισμένοι θαρροῦντες χρησθ[ε - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 23 - - - - - ἀνεμποδ]ίστως· ἐγὼ γὰρ ταυτά τε ἡδέως πεποίηκα  
 ὑ[πὲρ]  
 35 [ὑμῶν καὶ πειράσομαι εἰς τ]ὸ μέλλον αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιος ὑμῖν  
 [γεν]-  
 [έσθαι].

Inscribed at Mytilene. The number in square brackets in l.34 indicates the number of dashes in Sherck's edn. This letter is followed by unrelated documents, including two *senatus consulta* from 25 BCE. l.30. Sherck's edn. has καθ, which I have changed to καθ'. "6-12 Restored by Cichorius, except for ll.8-9, where F. Ziemann (*De epistularum graecarum formulis solemnibus quaestiones selectae* [Diss., Halle, 1910], p.267, n.1) suggested the formulation given. 11 ἡσύχως, Cichorius, but Paton read - - ]ος, not clear on the Berlin squeeze. 14-27 restored by Cichorius. 27 ὑπέμ[νας]αν, L. Robert, *R.É.G.*, 53 (1940): 215; earlier, in *R.É.G.*, 42 (1929): 427, he had suggested ὑπέμ[νης]αν. 29 ὑμετέροις νόμοις, Hatzfeld. 30-35 Paton, but in l.35 Robert suggested πειράσομαι." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 152.

#### 41 – C. Iulius Caesar to the Pergamenans – post Pharsalus

= Sherck *RDGE* 54 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' R46

- [Γάιος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ] αὐτοκ[ράτωρ, ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ δικτάτωρ τὸ β'  
 Περγαμηνῶν ἄρχουσι]  
 [βουλῇ δῆμῳ χαίρει]ν· εἰ ἔρρω[σθε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ὑγίαινον δὲ αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ  
 στρατεύματος.]  
 [ὑμῖν ἀντίγραφον τ]οῦ ἐπικρίμα[τος ἀπέσταλκα τοῦ γεγονότος περὶ τῆς  
 χώρας τῆς ὑμῖν]  
 [προσωρισμένης· περὶ ὧν Μιθ[ραδάτης Μηνοδότου πολίτης ὑμέτερος καὶ  
 φίλος μου]  
 5 [λόγους ἐποιήσατ]ο, περὶ τούτ[ου τοῦ πράγματος οὕτως ἐπέκρινα· vacat ]  
 [τήν τε πόλιν Π]έργαμον καὶ χ[ώρας ὅσον βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος βασιλέως  
 Εὐμένους τῇ πόλει]  
 [προσώρισεν, ἐ]κτὸς βασιλικο[ῦ - - - - - , ἐλεύθερα αὐτόνομα  
 ἀνείσθορα?]  
 [ἀφορολόγητά] ? τε εἶναι δοκε[ῖ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ας τε τούτων [ - - - - - ]  
 10 [τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων δῆμ[ου - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] τε φαίνεται θέλ[ειν - - - - - βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος]  
 [βασιλέως] Εὐμένους υἱὸς [ - - - - - ]

- [ - - - - - ]σαναστε ἄσυλ[ία - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ων ὑφέστησαν [ - - - - - ]  
 15 [ - - προυγ?]ραψαν ἔκρειναν [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ὕ]περ τῶν ἱερῶν ἡ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - Ῥωμα]ῖος ἅ τε ἄλλα π[άντα - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - α]ὕτων ἀπάντ[ων - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] κρίσις τοῦ μ[ - - - - - ]  
 20 [ - - - - - ]γοῖτωτα[ - - - - - ]

Inscribed at Smyrna. “Restorations by Passerini and Segre. 1-8 The restorations of Segre are followed. 1 Σμυρμαίων ἄρχουσι κτλ., Passerini. 3-4 περὶ ἐκείνων τῶν πραγμάτων περὶ ὧν Μιθ[ραδάτης] ? ἐμοὶ λόγους ἐποιήσατο, Passerini. 7 After βασιλικοῦ perhaps a noun such as κήπου, παραδείσου, *aut similia*, Segre. 9-20 As given by Passerini. 16 Robert thinks of a phrase such as τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 281. Sherk’s edn. 1.2 has εὖ, which I have corrected to εἶ.

## 42 – P. Seruius Isauricus to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Pergamenans – 46-44 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 55 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R47

- Ἀγαθῇ Τυχῇ.  
 Ἐπίκριμα περὶ τῆς ἀσυλίας.  
 [Πό]πλιος Σεροίλιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Ἰσαυρικός ἀνθύπατος  
 [ἄ]ρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ Περγαμενῶν χαίρειν.  
 5 **Κλεῖτος Τίμωνος** πρύτανις : **Ἀσκληπιάδης Μάτρω-**  
**νος** ἱεπεύς : **Μοιροφάνης Μητροδώρου** : **Μενέμαχος**  
**Ξενοκλείους**, **Ἡρώδης Ἡρώδου** : **Νέων Μελεάγρου**,  
**Ἀπολλοφάνης Ὀρέστου** : ἄρχοντες : **Περσεὺς Περσέως**  
**τοῦ Δίωνος** γραμματεὺς δήμου : **Κρίτων Μηνοδώρου**,  
 10 γυμνασίαρχος : ὁμοίως τε καὶ πρεσβευταὶ ὑμέτεροι, ἄν-  
 δρες ἀγαθοὶ ἐμοὶ προσήλθον ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ Ἀσκλη-  
 πιοῦ ἱερῶν νόμων ἀσυλίας τε. νῦν ἦτις ὑμεῖν ἀντίστα-  
 σις ὑπὲρ τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ δικαίων πρὸς **Μάρκον Φάννιον**  
**Νεμερίου υἱὸν Τηρετεῖνα** ὑπῆρχεν, ὑπὲρ τούτ[ου τοῦ]  
 15 πράγματος, τῆς ὑποθέσεω[ς ἐξ ἀντικαταστάσεως ὑφ’]  
 ἐκατέρων ῥηθείσης, [ - - - - - ἐπέκριναν· περὶ]  
 ὧν Μάρκος Φά[ννιος Νεμερίου υἱὸς Τηρετεῖνα ἐνε]-  
 φάνισεν [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - ]ΟΝ[ - - - - - ]

Found at Pergamon. “Note the marks of punctuation in 5-10. 12 At first Segre thought that ΤΕΗΤΙΣ was corrupt and that the correct reading was ΠΕΡΙΗΣ, but later, on the basis of a photograph, he changed his mind and punctuated as shown here. 15 ὑποθέσεω[ς ἀκριβέστατα ἐ]κατέρων, Wiegand, but Segre, with reference to *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup>, 785, 7ff., and Josephus *Ant.* 14. 246, suggests ὑποθέσεω[ς ἐξ ἀντικαταστάσεως ὑφ’] ἐκατέρων. 17-18 ἐνε]φάνισεν, L. Robert among the works of Segre.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 286.



**43** – L. Sestius Quirinalis to the *demos* of the Thasians – 44-42 BCE  
 = Sherk *RDGE* 56 = Dunant-Pouilloux *Thasos* 176 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R48

Λεύκιος Σήστιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Κυρίναλ[ις - - - - - Θασίων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ]  
 δήμῳ χαίρειν· Ἰκέσιος Πυθίωνος, Κτ[ησι - - - - - ὁ]  
 πρεσβύτερος πρεσβευταὶ ὑμέτερο[ι ἐνέτυχόν μοι - - - - - ]  
 ἀπέδο[σ]άν τε τὸ παρ’ ὑμῶν ψήφ[ισμα - - - - - 29 - - - - - ]  
 5 ἀποσταλέντα δημόσια γράμματα [ - - - - - 35 - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 64 - - - - - ]

Inscribed at Thasos. The numbers in square brackets indicate the number of dashes in Sherk’s edn. “3-4 See the letter of the dictator Caesar to Mytilene in 48 B.C. ([*RDGE*] No.26), ll.5-6; the letter of M. Antonius to the koinon of Asia ([*RDGE*] No.57), ll.5ff.; the letter of Augustus to the Cnidians ([*RDGE*] No.67), ll.7-8; and the letter of Augustus to Sardis ([*RDGE*] No.68), l.24, with συνέτυχον.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 288.

**44** – Octavian to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Rhosians – 42-34 BCE  
 (on the same monument as 50, 51) = Sherk *RDGE* 58(i) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R52

Letter Ἔτους . . , μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίου [ - - - - - ]  
 [Αὐτοκρά]τωρ Καῖσαρ, θεοῦ Ἰουλίου υἱὸς, αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ τέταρτον,  
 ὕπ[ατος]  
 [τὸ δεύτ]ερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἀποδεδειγμένος, Ῥωσέων τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ  
 ἀσύλου καὶ  
 [αὐτονόμ]ου ἄρχουσι, βουλῇ, δήμῳ χαίρειν· καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ  
 στρατεύματος  
 5 [ὕγιανον· τ]ὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα ἐξελήφθη ἐκ στήλης ἐκ τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ  
 Καπετωλίου  
 [ἄπερ ἀξιῶ] καταχωρίσαι εἰς τὰ παρ’ ὑμῖν δημόσια γράμματα. πέμψατε δὲ καὶ  
 ἀντίγραφον  
 [αὐτῶν εἰς] Ταρσέων τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον, Ἀντιοχέων τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν  
 δῆμον,  
 [Σελευκέω]ν τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ὅπως καταχωρίσωσιν. νν Ἔρρωσθε.  
 Decree [? Καῖσαρ α]ὐτοκράτωρ, τριῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως τῶν δημοσίων  
 πραγμά-  
 10 [των, κατὰ ν]όμον Μουντάτιον καὶ Αἰμίλιον πολειτείαν καὶ ἀνεισφορίαν  
 πάντων τῶν  
 [ὑπαρχόντ]ων ἔδωκαν εἰς τούτους τοὺς λόγους. *vacat* κτλ.

Found at Rhosos. “The numbers of letters which have disappeared on the left varies from line to line because of the irregular engraving, but a maximum of 9-10 and a minimum of 5 may be used as a working rule. 1 After ἔτους can be seen traces of H or IP, probably H (see commentary). 6 [ἄπερ ἀξιῶ], Schönbauer with Wilhelm; [ἄ δεῖ ὑμᾶς] or [ἄ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς], Roussel. 7 [Σελευκέω]ν, De Visscher; [Ἐφεσίω]ν, Schönbauer.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 298.

**45** – Octavian to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Plarasians and Aphrodisians – between 40 and 38 BCE\*

= Sherk *RDGE* 28 = Viereck ‘SG’ V = Reynolds *AR* 6 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R51**

A	[?Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ] [?θεοῦ Ἰουλίου υἱὸς, [ὑπάτος ἀποδεδει]- <b>γμένος τὸ β’ καὶ</b> [τὸ γ’] 5 [τῶν] <b>τριῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς&gt;</b> <b>τῶν δημοσίων πρα-</b> <b>γμάτων διατάξεως</b> <b>Παρασέων καὶ Ἀφρο-</b> <b>δεισιέων ἄρχουσιν</b> 10 <b>βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν·</b> <b>εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εὖ ἂν ἔ-</b> <b>χοι· ὑγιαίνω δὲ καὶ</b> <b>αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρα-</b> <b>τεύματος. Σόλων</b> 15 <b>Δημητρίου &lt;ὕ&gt;μέτερος</b> πρεσβευτῆς, ἐπι- μελέστατα πεφρον- τ<ι>κῶς τῶν τῆς πό- λεως ὑμῶς πραγ- 20 μάτων, οὐ μόνον ἡρέσθη ἐπὶ τοῖς [γ]- εγονόσιν οἰκονο- [μή]μασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ [ή]- μᾶς παρεκάλε- 25 [σ]εν εἰς τὸ τοῦ γεγο- νότος ὑμεῖν ἐπι- κρίματος καὶ δόγμα- 30 τος καὶ ὀρκίου καὶ νό- μου ἀντιπεφωνημέ- να ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων δέλτων ἐξαποστεῖ- λαι ὑμεῖν τὰ ἀντί- γραφα <i>stop</i> ἐφ’ οἷς ἐπαινέ- σας τὸν Σόλωνα μᾶ[λ]- 35 λον ἀπεδεξάμην ἔσ- χον τε ἐν τοῖς ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ γεινωσκομένοις, ὧ καὶ τὰ καθήκοντα ἀπεμέρισα φιλάν- 40 θρωπα, ἄξιον ἡγη- σάμενος τὸν ἄν- δρα τῆς ἐξ ἡμ<ῶ>ν [[τει]]- τειμῆς, ὑμεῖν τε συ[v]- ήδομαι ἐπὶ τ<ῶ> ἔχειν 45 τοιοῦτον πολεΐτην. ἔστιν δὲ ἀντίγραφ[α] τῶν γεγονότων ὑ- μεῖν φιλανθρωπῶν τὰ ὑπογεγραμ(μ)ένα· 50 ἃ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις τοῖς παρ’ ὑμεῖν γράμμασιν ἐντάξαι[ι]. 55 γράμματα Καίσαρος <i>leaf</i>
[ - - - - - ]	
B. SC	[ - - ]ι ἄγεσθαι ἀτελ[εῖς κ]α<ί> ἐλευθέρους εἶναι, τῷ [τε] δικαίῳ καὶ ταῖς [κρίσεσιν ταῖς ἰδίαις τὴν πό]- [λιν] τὴν Παρασέων καὶ Ἀφροδεισιέων χρῆσθαι μήτε ἐγγύην εἰς Ῥώμην αὐτοὺς κατὰ δόγμα τι] [κ]αὶ κέλευ<σ>ιν ὁμολογεῖν· κτλ.

\*I have inferred this date from the discussion at Reynolds *AR* p.44. Inscribed at Aphrodisias. ll.1-5 above are Sherard in Reynolds; Sherk has ll.1-3. [Μάρκος Ἀντωνίου Μάρκου υἱὸς αὐτοκράτωρ ὑπάτος ἀποδεδειγμένος τὸ β’ καὶ [τὸ γ’] τῶν] τριῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς]. l.52 as I have it above (ἃ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι | ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις | [l.52] τοῖς παρ’ ὑμεῖν | γράμμασιν ἐντάξαι.) is from Sherk, but it does not appear in Sherard’s transcription in Reynolds. Reynold’s translation does not seem to imply that she rejects/ignores this line, but if it were left out by mistake one may expect her l.54 to be labelled l.55. Nevertheless, I have included it. Letter (Sherk): “Text based on that by Dittenberger except where noted. | A 1 Perhaps two lines instead of one? (cf. the Sherk’s ll.1-3., which I have given above – CJH.) 3 [τῶν], Viereck. 31 (my l.33 – CJH) After ἀντίγραφ|φα there is a small, raised *omicron* in Sherard’s copy, according to Boeckh, which appears to be a mark of punctuation.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 166. Letter (Reynolds): “l.4, T, bar above the figure, S.; l.5, THΔ., S., C.

τῆ[ς], other edd.; l.15, ΗΜΕΤΕΡΟΣ, S., <ύ>μέτερος, edd.; l.18, ΤΗΚΩΣ, S., τ<ι>κως, edd. l.21, ligatured HP, S. C.; ll.21-2, Γ om. E. who shows E as the first letter of l.22, γεγονόσιν, edd.; l.23, ΜΤΑΣΙΝ, S., [ΜΗ]ΜΑΣΙΝ, edd.; ll.22-3, Η om. S. who shows M as the first letter of l.23, ἡμᾶς, edd.; ll.24-5, Σ om. S. who shows ·EN at the beginning of l.25, παρεκάλεσ/εν, edd.; ll.32-3, ΑΝΤΙ/ΓΡΑΦΑ, S. (cf. *lapis*) corr. from ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑ/ΦΑ, ἀντίγρα/φα, edd.; small circular stop, S. (cf. *lapis*). l.34, Λ om. S., μᾶλ, edd.; l.42, ΗΜΩΝ, S., ΗΜΩΝ, S.<sup>2</sup>, ἡμῶν, edd., ΤΕΙ, S. who shows the [p.44] same letters also at the beginning of l.43, τει/μῆς, edd.; ll.43-4, Ν om. S. who shows Η as the first letter of l.44, συ/νήδομαι, edd.; l.44, ΤΟ, S., ΤΩ, S.<sup>2</sup>, τῷ, edd.; l.46, ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦ., S., ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΑ, S.<sup>2</sup>, ἀντίγραφα, edd.; l.49, ΥΠΟΓΕΓΡΑΜΕΝΑ, S., ὑπογεγραμμένα, edd.; l.50, ΒΟΥΛΟΜΑΙ·, S., ΒΟΥΛΟΜΑΙ ΚΑΙ, S.<sup>2</sup>, βούλομαι, edd.; l.52, unfilled space for two letters, S., ignored by edd., ΕΝΤΑΞΑ, S., ΕΝΤΕΞΑΙ, S.<sup>2</sup>, ἐντάξει, edd.; l.54 aligned with rest, S., C., displaced to right, other edd., concluding leaf S., ignored, edd.” – Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 43–44 (‘S.<sup>2</sup>’ refers to Sherard’s later notes on his original transcription, to which Reynolds has had access). The text of the *senatus consultum* is Sherk’s.

#### 46 – A Roman magistrate to the Mylasians – post 39 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 59 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R55**

<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>[ - - - - - ]</p> <p>καὶ [τ]ὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν δημοσίων κτήσεις εἷς τε τὸν κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως καρφισμὸν τινῶν ἀνα[στά]σεις ὑπονοθεύειν, οἷς δὴ κἂν ἐπιτρέπωμεν φορολογεῖν τὴν [Μυ]λασέων πόλιν εἰς δουλικὴν περιουσίαν, ἡμεῖν μὲν ἂν ἴσως ἢ ἐφ[ορῶ]σιν αἰσχροῦ τε καὶ ἡμῶν ἀνάξιος, ἀδυνατος δὲ ἂν ὁμοῦς κἀκεί[ν]οις γένοιτο πράξουσιν δημοσίαι</p> <p>5    τοὺς δημοσίου κυρίους, μ[ή]τε χρημάτων μήτε προσόδων δημοσίων ὑποκειμέν[ω]ν, εἰ μὴ κατὰ τελῶν ἐπίρειψιν λογεύειν τοὺς ἐνὸς ἐκάστου [λόγο]υς (?) τάς τε κεφαλὰς ἐπιτελωνεῖν θέλοιεν, τῆς πόλεως οὐδ[ὲ] τὴν] ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν ἐκ τῆς Λαβιήνου</p> <p>10    ληστήας ἐρειπίων ἐτοίμως ἀ[ν]αφεροῦσης, ὃ δὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ προϋδόμενοι προδανεισμοῖς ἰδιωτῶν ἸΓ χρέα δημόσια τὴν πόλιν ὑπηγάγοντο, οὐ διὰ τὸ καθ’ ὑπαλλαγῇ[ν - -]οματων τὴν Καίσαρος ὑπὲρ Μυλασέων</p> <p>[ - - - - - ]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">B</p>
---	--------------------------------------

Inscribed at Mylasa. “Briot’s new readings in Capitals. 1 [ἐπι]κτήσεις (?), Johnson; at the end, ΤΗΣ. 2 ἐπιΤΡΕ-. 3 περιΟΥ-. 4 ἀΔΥ-. 5 πράξουσιν. 6 προσόδων. 7 λογΕΥ-. 8 ἐπιτελωνεῖν. 9 Λαβιήνου. 10 προϋδόμενοι. 11 Le Bas-Waddington show ΙΔΙΩΤΩΝΙΓ at the end of the line in stone A; Johnson has [εἰς]; perhaps <τὰ> (?) ὑπηγάγον- at the end of the line in stone B. 12 ἀναλ]ομάτων (?), Johnson; ]οματων, Briot; Μυλασέων, Briot.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 309.

#### 47 – Octavian to Stephanos – late 39 or early 38 BCE

= Reynolds *AR* 10 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R56**

Plate XI    *vacat* **Καῖσαρ Στεφάνῳ** *v. χαίρειν* *vacat*

Ὡς Ζωίλον τὸν ἐμὸν φιλῶ ἐπίστασαι· τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ἡλευθέρωσα καὶ Ἀντωνίῳ συνέστησα.

*v.* Ὡς Ἀντώνιος ἄπεστιν δὸς ἐργασίαν μή τις αὐτοῖς ἐπιβάτησις γένηται· Μίαν πόλιν ταύτην

ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἀσίας ἐμαυτῷ εἵληπα. *v. v.* Τούτους οὕτω θέλω φυλαχθῆναι ὥς ἐμοὺς πολεΐτας.

5    *vacat* Ὅψομαι ὥς τὴν ἐμὴν σύνστασιν ἐπὶ πέρας ἀγάγῃς *vacat*

Date: Reynolds. Inscribed at Aphrodisias (Reynolds). “Cut on the top inscribed course of column 4 of the archive wall (inscribed area,  $1.92 \times 0.185$ ). | Letters, second-third cent. A.D.: av. 0.02; ligatured THN in l.2, NMH, NH in l.3, HN in l.4, MH in l.5. | Brief description by F. Millar, *JRS* 63 (1973), 56, no.11. | Acknowledgments for discussion to Robert Tannenbaum (all aspects), A. Giovannini (l.4). |...| l.3. As the initial letter γένηται of the cutter wrote E and then erased the lower bars.” – Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 96.

#### 48 – Octavian to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Ephesians – probably early 38 BCE

= Reynolds *AR* 12 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R58**

Plate X **Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ Ἰουλίου υἱὸς Ἐφεσίων ἄρχουσι**  
**βουλῇ δῆμῳ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε εὖ ἂν ἔχοι, ὑγιαί-**  
**νω δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ τοῦ στρατεῦματος** *vac.*  
**Σόλων Δημητρίου υἱὸς** πρεσβευτῆς Πλαρασέων  
5 καὶ Ἀφροδισιέων ἐνεφάνισέν μοι ὅσα ἐν τῷ πο-  
λέμῳ τῷ κατὰ Λαβιῆνον ἢ πόλιν αὐτῶν πέπονθεν  
ὅσα τε διηρπάγη δημόσια τε καὶ ἰδιωτικά, περὶ ὧν  
πάντων Ἀντωνίῳ τε τῷ συνάρχοντι ἐντολὰς  
δέδωκα ὅπως ὅσα ποτὲ ἂν δύνηται ὁ ἂν εὖρη ἀ-  
10 ποκαταστήσῃ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖν τε ἔκρεινα γράψαι  
ἐπεὶ ἔχετε πόλιν εὐκαιρον ἐπιβοηθεῖ[α]ν αὐτοῖς  
ἐὰν σώματος ἢ ἐτέρου τινὸς τῶν ἰδίων ἐπιλαμβάνωνται *arabesque*  
Ἀπηνγέλη δέ μοι ὅτι ἐκ τῆς διαρπαγῆς Ἔρως χρυσοῦς ὁ ὑ-  
πὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῇ Ἀφροδείτῃ ἦν ἀνατεθεὶς εἰς ὑμᾶς  
15 ἀνενήνεκται καὶ ὥς ἀνάθημα τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι τέθειται.  
Ἵμεῖς οὖν καλῶς ποιήσετε καὶ ἀξίως ὑμῶν ἀποκαταστή-  
σαντες τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἀνάθημα τῇ Ἀφροδείτῃ  
δεδομένον· καὶ γὰρ οὐ χαρίεν ἀνάθημα Ἔρως Ἀρτέμιδι.  
Ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι Ἀφροδισιέων ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν οὕς τη-  
20 λικαῦτα εὐεργέτηκα ἦν καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀκούειν νομίζω.

Date: Reynolds. Inscribed at Aphrodisias (Reynolds). In ll.5, 14, and 19, Ἀφροδισιέων, Ἀφροδείτη and Ἀφροδισιέων are underlined as well as dotted in Reynolds. “Inscribed on the middle courses of column 3 of the archive wall (inscribed area :  $0.955 \times 0.655$ ). | Letters, second-third cent. A.D.: ll.1-4, av. 0.02, ll. 5f., av. 0.018; ligatured HM in l.2, HMH, TH in l.4, HN, NH, NΠE in l.6, HM in l.7, NH in l.9, NE twice in l.11, HE, TE, NE, MB, NT in l.12, ΠΗNT, TH in l.13, TH, TE l.14, NE, NHNE, TH in l.15, NK, TE, TH in l.16, NTE, HM, TH in l.17, ME, NK, HM in l.18, NK, ΗΓ, ΠΠ, TH in l.19, THK, HNK in l.20; apices in ll. 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13; arabesque at the end of l.12. The final letter of l.1 is cut on the ridge which at this point divides columns 2 and 3.” – Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 101.

#### 49 – Octavian to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Mylasians – 31 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 60 = Viereck ‘SG’ VI = Lafoscade ‘De Epistulis.’ 1 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R59**

A **Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ Ἰουλίου**  
**υἱὸς ν ὑπατός τε τὸ τρίτον κατεσ-**  
**ταμένος ν Μυλασέων ἄρχουσι βου-**  
**λῇ δῆμῳ χαίρειν· νν εἰ ἔρρωσθε κα-**  
5 **λῶς ἂν ἔχοι· ν καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τ[οῦ]**

- στρατεύματος ὑγίαινον.** ν κα[ῖ πρό]-  
 τερον μὲν ἤδη περὶ τῆς κατ[ασχού]-  
 σης ὑμᾶς τύχης προσεπέ[μψατέ]  
 μοι, ν καὶ νῦν παραγενωμένω[ν τῶν]  
 10 πρεσβευτῶν, νν Οὐλιάδ[ου - - ]  
 B [ - - ]ς τῶν πολεμίων πταῖσαι καὶ κρατη[θεί]-  
 σης τῆς πόλεως, ν πολλοὺς μὲν αἰχμαλώτο[υς]  
 ἀποβαλῖν ν πολίτας, οὐκ ὀλίγους μὲν φονευθέ[ν]-  
 τας ν τινὰς δὲ καὶ συνκαταφλεγέ<ν>τας τῇ πόλε[ι],  
 5 τῆς τῶν πολεμίων ὁμότητος ν οὐδὲ τῶν  
 ναῶν οὐδὲ τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν ἁγιοτάτων ἀ-  
 ποσχομένης· ν ὑπέδιξαν δέ μοι καὶ περὶ  
 τῆς χώρας τῆς λελεηλατημένης νν καὶ τῶν  
 ἐπαύλεων τῶν ἐμπεπρησμένων, ὥστε ἐμ  
 10 πᾶσιν ὑμᾶς ἡτυχηκέναι· ν ἐφ' οἷς πᾶσιν συνε[ῖ]-  
 [δον παθόντες] ταῦτα πάσης τειμῆς καὶ χάρι-  
 [τος ἀξίους ἄνδρας γενομέν]ους ὑμᾶς πε[ρὶ]  
 [Ῥωμαίους - - - - - ]

Found at Mylasa. “Restorations by Waddington and Dittenberger. A 4 (at the end) The copy of Le Bas-Waddington shows K'. B 1 κρατη[θεί]σης is correct and was read also by Dittenberger (*S.I.G.*<sup>1</sup> [1883], 271) and followed by Viereck (including his notes). F. Hiller von Gaertringen (*S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup>) has προατη[θεί]σης, which must be a mistake, but one which subsequent editors (except Malcovati) have followed. The copy in Le Bas-Waddington here shows that the first letter of the word must be a *kappa*, for we see the vertical bar and the lower oblique *hasta*. 4 Stone, ΣΥΝΚΑΤΑΦΛΕΗΕΤΑΣ. 10-12 Restored by Dittenberger; Waddington had suggested συνέ[γνων ἀτυχήματα] ταῦτα πάσης τειμῆς καὶ χάρι[τος καὶ εὐνοίας ὄντας ἀξί]ους ὑμᾶς πε[πονθέναι - - -].” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 311.

## 50 – Octavian to the *boule* and *demos* of Rhosos – 31 BCE

(on the same monument as 44, 51) = Sherk *RDGE* 58(iii) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R53

- [Ἔτους] . . . μηνὸς Δύστρου ἱε· αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ, θεοῦ υἱός, αὐτοκράτωρ  
 τὸ ἔκτον, ὕπατος  
 [τὸ τρί]τον, ἀποδεδειγμένος τὸ τέταρτον, Ῥωσέων τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου  
 καὶ αὐτονόμου  
 75 [ἄρχουσι], βουλῇ, δῆμοι χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ  
 μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύ-  
 [ματος ὑγί]αινον· οἱ πεμφθέντες πρεσβευταὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν Σέλευκος ναύαρχος  
 ἐμός, Ἡρᾶς Καλλι-  
 [ . . . . ]έρως, Σύμμαχος, ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί, παρὰ δῆμου ἀγαθοῦ, φίλου  
 συμμάχου τε ἡμετέρου,  
 [ἀποδημήσ]αντες εἰς Ῥώμην πρὸς με διελέχθησαν περὶ ᾧν εἶχον τὰς  
 ἐντολάς· ἐγὼ οὖν τοὺς  
 [ἄνδρες ἀπ]εδεξάμην εὐρῶν φιλοπατρίδας καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καὶ τὸν  
 στέφανον δέδεγμαι,  
 80 [πειράσομ]αί τε ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους ἐλθὼν ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ὑμεῖν γείνεσθαι  
 παραίτιος καὶ συντηρησθαι

[τὰ φιλάνθ]ρωπα τῇ πόλει, καὶ ταῦτα ἤδειον διὰ Σέλευκον τὸν ναύαρχόν μου ποιήσωι συνεστρατευμέ-

[νον μοι π]άντα τὸν τοῦ πολέμου χρόνον καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἡριστευκότα καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπόδειξιν εὐνοίας

[τε καὶ πίσ]τεως παρεσχημένον, ὃς οὐδένα καιρὸν παρελέλοιπεν ἐντυγχάνων ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶ-

[οαν εἰσφ]ερόμενος σπουδὴν καὶ προθυμίαν ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑμῶν συμφερόντων.  
**Ἔρρωσθε.**

Found at Rhosos. l.74, Sherck's edn. has καὶ, which I have accented. The commentary in Sherck refers only to *RDGE* 58(i) and (ii), cf. Sherck, *RDGE*, 298–299.

## 51 – Octavian to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of Rhosos – 30 BCE

(on the same monument as 44, 50) = Sherck *RDGE* 58(iv) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **R54**

85 [Ἔτους . . .] μὴνὸς Ἀπελλαίου θ'· αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ, θεοῦ υἱός,  
αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἔκτον, ὕπατος τὸ τέταρ-

[τον, Ῥωσέ]ων τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου καὶ αὐτονόμου ἄρχουσι, βουλῇ, δῆμῳ  
χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε, καλῶς

[ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ] αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγίαινον. Σέλευκος ὁ καὶ ὑμέτερος πολεῖ-

[της καὶ ἐμ]ὸς ναύαρχος ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς πολέμοις συνεστρατευσάμενός μοι καὶ πολλὰς ἀπο-

[δείξεις κ]αὶ τῆς εὐνοίας καὶ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας δεδωκώς, ὥς καθῆκον ἦν τοῖς

90 [συνστρατευ]σαμένους ἡμεῖν καὶ κατὰ πόλεμον ἀριστεύσαντας, κεκόσμηται φιλανθρώποις

[καὶ ἀνείσφ]ορίαι καὶ πολειτεῖαι· τοῦτον οὖν ὑμεῖν συνίστημι· οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ἄνδρες καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰς

[πατρίδας] εὐνοίαν προθυμότεραν ποιοῦσιν· ὥς οὖν ἔμου πάντα δύνата ποιήσαντος ὑμεῖν ἤδει-

[ον διὰ Σέλ]ευκον, θαρροῦντες περὶ ὧν ἂν βούλησθε πρὸς με ἀποστέλλετε.  
**Ἔρρωσθε.**

Found at Rhosos. The commentary in Sherck refers only to *RDGE* 58(i) and (ii), cf. Sherck, *RDGE*, 298–299.

## 52 – Octavian to the *boule* and *demos* of Ephesos – 29BCE

= *SEG* 43.758 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **R62**

[Αὐτ(οκράτωρ) Καῖσαρ Θε]οῦ υἱός, ὕπατος τὸ ε', αὐτο[κράτ]ωρ τὸ ζ',  
[Ἐφεσίων βο]υλῇ, δῆμῳ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρω[σθε κ]αλῶς ἂν

[ἔχοι, κἀγὼ δὲ με]τὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγια[ί]νω· Θεόδω-

10 [ρος, Μένων (?), Πρ]ωτογένης, Ἡρακλείδης, Σώπα[τρ]ος, Ἄσκλη-  
[πιάδης,] Ἀριστίων, Ἀγαθήνωρ, Μηνόδο[τος] πρέσβε[ις]

[τῆς ἐκκλη]σίας <ἀπέδοσάν τ'> ἐμοὶ τὸ παρὰ τῆς γερουσ[ίας ψ]ήφισμ[α]  
[διέλεξ]άν τε ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν αὐτ[ῷ δι]ακε[ιμέ]-

[νοις· διὸ τό] τε σύστημα τῆς γερουσίας [ἀποδέχομαι,]

- 15 [τηρήσω τε] . [ . . . . . ] τοὺς ὑμετ[έρου] νόμους]  
[καὶ τὰ τεῖμια καὶ] φιλάνθρωπα· [ἔρρωσθε]

Date: *SEG* Online, Ceccarelli. Found at Ephesos (Ceccarelli). “7. 29 B.C.; in the early summer of this year Octavian returned from Asia Minor to Rome via Greece (cf. Dio 51.21.1), edd.pr. | 9. For the formula καὶ γὰρ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ὑγιαίνω see *RDGE* nos. 58 and 60; J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London 1982) nos. 6 and 12, edd.pr. | 9-11. four ambassadors were former prytaneis: Memnon, Protogenes, Agathenor and Asklepiades (cf. *LEph.* 9 N LL.45, 47, 49 and 51 in 35/34, 34/33, 33/32 and 32/31 B.C. respectively); Theodoros was apparently prytanis in 29/28 B.C.; Herakleides is probably γραμματεὺς of *I.Eph.* 14; Ariston is known as grammateus from coins under Augustus, and Sopatros from coins dated 48-27 B.C., edd.pr. | 12. perhaps ἀπέδοσάν τέ μοι, S.Follet in *L'Année Épigraphique* (1993) [1996] no.1461.” – *SEG* online.

**53 – A certain Vinicius to the arkhons of Cyme – 27 BCE**  
= Sherk *RDGE* 61 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R63**

- Latin [ . ] **Vinicius proc(onsul) s(alutem) d(at) mag(istratibus) Cumas. Apollonides**  
version **L.f. No[race(us)]**  
[c(iuis) u(ester)] me adeit et demonstauit Liberei Patris fanum nom[ine]  
[uen]ditiones possidere ab **Lusia Diogenis f.** Tucalleus c(ue) [u(estro)],  
15 [et c]um vellent thiaseitae sacra deo restituere iussi Au[gu]-  
[s]ti Caesaris pretio solute quod est inscriptum fano,  
[ . . ]berei ab Lusia. **E(go) u(olo) u(os) c(urare)**, sei ita sunt, utei Lusias quod  
[est] positum pretium fano recipient et restituat deo fa-  
[num e]t in eo inscribatur Imp. Caesar Deivei f. Augustu[s] re[sti]-  
20 [tuit. Sei] autem Lusia contradeicit quae Apollonides pos[tu]-  
[lat, uadi]monium ei satisdato ubi ego ero. Lusiam prom[it]-  
[tere magi]s probo. Ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Φανίτου  
Letter [ - - - ος] **Οὐνίνκιος χαίρειν λέγει ἄρχουσι Κυμαίων.** Ἀ[πολ]-  
[λωνίδ]ης **Λευκίου Νωρακεῖος** πολεΐτης ὑμέτερό[ς] μοι]  
25 [προσῆλ]θεν καὶ ὑπέδειξεν Διονύσου ἱερὸν ὀνόματι]  
[πράσεως κ]ατέχεσθαι **ὑπὸ Λυσίου τοῦ Διογένους** [Τυχάλ]-  
[λεως πολεΐτου ὑμέτερο]ν, καὶ ὅτε ἡβού[λοντο οἱ θιασεῖ]-  
[ται - - - - - ]

Found at Cyme. I have changed the lowercase ‘v’ in the Latin text of Sherk’s edn. to ‘u’. This text was preceded by an unrelated document (edict?) of Augustus and Agrippa, which has not been included. “12 Pleket, Kunkel, and Arangio-Ruiz have [L.]. 14 Read [ven]ditionis. 16-17 Punctuation by Oliver, making *satisdato* third person imperative. In 17 Pleket has [Li]berei, which Oliver changed to [ha]berei. 21-22 Kunkel, prom[ittere magi]s probo. 23 Kunkel and Arangio-Ruiz, [Λεύκιος].” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 314.

**54 – C. Norbanus Flaccus to the arkhons, boule, and demos of the Aizaneitans –**  
between 19 and 10 BCE  
= *MAMA* IX 13 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R66**

- ἐκ Περγάμου  
**Γάιος Νόρβανος Φλάκκος ἀνθύπατος Αἰζανειτῶν** v. ΤΟΥΝΔΙΣ[ - - - ]  
**ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ v. χαίρειν.** v. ΔΕΥΙΑΤΑ[ - - - ]  
Μενεκλῆς καὶ Ἰέραξ καὶ Ζήνων οἱ πρεσβευταὶ ὑμῶν v. [....]Η[ - - - ]  
5 ἀνέδωκαν μοι Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος ἐπιστολήν ἐν ἧ[ι] v. [ - - - ]

ἐγγέγραπτο· συνκεχώρηκεν ΑΣΥ[.]ΠΙ[....]ΔΗΣΙΑΝ v. [ - - - ]  
 ΣΥΠΙΑΓ[.]ΟΦΙΛΑΒΙΟΙΩΙΟΝΕΠΙΩΡΟ[.]Σ[.]Ω[ - - 11 or 12 - - ]  
 ΠΕΚΛ[.]ΝΞΕΚΑΜΕΙ συνχωρησ[.]Α[ - - 13 - - ]  
 πόλιν. ἐγὼ οὖν συναύξειν βουλο[μ]ΑΙ[.]Σ[.]C[.]ΙΑ[ - 6 - ]  
 10 ΠΑ. . . . πόλεως ὑμῶν ἐπιτρέπω κατὰ τὸ [ - 5 or 6 - ]ΩΠΙΜΑ

Date: Ceccarelli (cf. “soon after 12 BC” of Levick and Mitchell). Inscribed at Aizanoi (Ceccarelli). In l.10, following ΠΑ, I could not reproduce in this document the shapes given in Levick and Mitchell, which appear to be drawings of uncertain markings on the stone, represented in my copy by ‘. . . .’ since I could not equate the markings with letters. The same applies for the point made in their commentary concerning Σεβαστοῦ and ἐν ἡ[ι] in l.5, where I have given the letters which I would have judged as present were I making an edition working from their drawing. “13 Yağdıgîn | In a court; said to have been brought 20 years previously from the necropolis of Aezani. | Slab of grey-white marble; letters worn very faint, often traceable only from discolouration of stone. | Ht. 0.49; width 1.48 till broken; thickness 0.29; letters 0.02. Pl. II (squeeze). [p.6] Soon after 12 BC (see below). | 1. ἐκ Περγάμου; for this formula cf. P10, [ἀπὸ Β]ονωνίας (apparently not part of the letter but recorded by the city as giving weight to its contents), P11 ἀπὸ Ῥώμ(ης). |...| 5. ... Σεβαστοῦ: the copy reads [ΣΕΒ]ΑΣΤΟΥ. At the end of the line the copy has ΕΝ(?)Η////. [p.7] 6. ἀσυ[λ]ία[ν καὶ ἀ]λησίαν? On ἀλησία synonymous with ἀσυλία see *LSJ*. Aezani has a ἱερὸς καὶ ἄσυλος δῆμος in P20 (Caracalla), cf. P35. The right of asylum often figures in correspondence between Greek cities and Roman governors: see Sherk, *Docs.* Index s.vv. ἀσυλία, ἄσυλος; J.M. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London 1982), nos. 8, 35, and 41. For attempts to restrain abuse of it, see Tac. *Ann.* III, 60ff. | 9f. βούλο[μ]αι is most consistent with the traces on the stone; but a principle seems to be required: perhaps βουλό[μ]ε[ν]ος [τ]ῷ [φ]ιλ[άνθρω]π[ο]ς τῆς [π]όλεως; cf. the letter of M. Messala to teos, 193 BC, Sherk, *Docs.* 34, l.22 (also on asylum): ...τὰ εἰς ὑμᾶς φιλόφρονος πειρασόμεθα συνεπαύξειν; and *Aphrodisias* no.41. | 10f. The squeeze suggests ΟΥΠΙΜΑ; although there is no hesitation in the copy over Ω one would be happy to read ἐπίκριμα (see L. Robert, *Ant. Class.* Xxxv (1966), 406ff.). These letters and those that survive in the first line of the next column are very faint; perhaps there is a reference to the decision τοῦ Κραίσ[αρος].” – B. Levick and S. Mitchell, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*, IX, (London, 1988) 6–8.

## 55 – M. Agrippa to the *gerontes* of Argos – 17-16 BCE?

= Sherk *RDGE* 63 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R64

Γερόντων  
 Ἀγρίππας Ἀγρείων γέρουσι τοῖς ἀπὸ  
 Δαναοῦ καὶ Ὑπερμήστρας χαίρειν.  
 Ἐγὼ τοῦ τε διαμεῖναι τὸ σύστημα  
 5 ὑμῶν καὶ φυλάξαι τὸ παλαιὸν ἀξίωμα  
 τὴν αἰτίαν ἐματῶ σύννοια παρῃ  
 μένῃ καὶ πολλὰ τῶν καταλελυμένων  
 ὑμεῖν ἀποδεδοκότι δικαίων πρὸς τε  
 τοῦπιον προνοεῖν ὑμῶν [προθύμως]  
 10 ἔχω καὶ τὴν [ - - - - - ]  
 νομίζ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]

Found at Argos. “After the *zeta* in l.11 the upper part of the O or Ω is visible on the stone. 5-8 For the phrase φυλάσσειν τὰ δίκαια in Roman imperial letters see L. Robert, *Revue de Philologie*, 84 (1958): 30.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 324.



**56 – Augustus to Eresos – post 15 BCE**= Sherk *RDGE* 64 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R65**

Letter	[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Θεοῦ υἱὸς Σεβαστὸς δημαρχι]κῆς ἐξουσ[ίας τὸ - - ] [ - - - - - αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ - - δέ]κατ[ον Ἑρ]εσίων ἄρχο[υσι βουλῇ]
15	[δήμῳ χαίρειν· - - - - - ]α τὸ παρ’ ὑμῶν ψή[φισμα - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ]μ[ . ] καὶ ὑπερεθέμην [ - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ]ινω καὶ αὐτὸν [ - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ] καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς [ - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ] Ἀγρίππας ὁ διαφέρων [ - - - - - ]
20	[ - - - - - ]όμενος τῷ θεῷ Καίσαρι [ - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ] τὸ παρ’ αὐτὸν ἀπ’ ἀμ[φοτέρων - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ]ω Κάλλιππον ΔΙΑ[ - - - - - ]

Found at Eresos. The letter is preceded by a document, most likely of a Roman source, but it is so fragmentary that it offers little information; I have therefore not included it. “15 Perhaps τὸ παρ’ ὑμῶν ψή[φισμα ἀπέδωκεν? David thought he saw an *alpha* at the beginning of the text, but Paton could no longer see it. 22 David alone has read the *omega* at the beginning.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 326.

**57 – P. Cornelius Scipio to the Thyateirene arkhons – 10-6 BCE**= Sherk *RDGE* 66 = Viereck ‘SG’ VIII = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R68**

	<b>Πόπλιος Κορνήλιος Σ</b> [κιπίων ἀνθύπατος ‘Ρωμαίων] <b>Θυατειρηνοῖς ἄρχουσ</b> [ι βουλῇι δῆμῳι χαίρειν.] Δίκαιον εἶναι νομίζω ὑ[μᾶς - - ca. 14 - - ὥς] καὶ νόμιμόν ἐστιν τ[ὰς γενομέμας ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰε]-
5	ρῶν χρημάτων κρίσε[ις - - - - ca. 21 - - - ] γῆς δικαστῶν κελευ[ - - ca. 16 - - - καὶ οὐ]- δὲν πλέον τοῖς ἐπικαλ[ουμένοις - - ca. 10 - ὑπε]- ρωνθηῖσι τὸ παραβόλ[ιον - - - ca. 15 - - ὁ]- πόση τοῖς φυγοδικοῦσ[ι - - - - ca. 20 - - ]
10	ἐμὴν ἅπαντα [ - - - - - ] Εἰσηγησαμένου Αὔλου Ῥαυο[ - - - - - ] [ - - - - - ]

Found at Thyateira. “Restored by Clerc except where noted. 1 Viereck added ‘Ρωμαίων. 3 ὥς added by Wilamowitz, among the works of Viereck. 5 κρίσε[ις διατηρεῖν, Clerc; omitted by Viereck. 6 κελευ[σάντων, Clerc. 8 παραβόλ[ιον, Wilamowitz. 8-9 ὁ[π]ό[σ]η, Wilamowitz; Viereck reported |||OPH on the stone, but clerics saw ΟΣΗ there. 9-10 Δεῖ κατὰ τὴν γνώμην] ἐμὴν ἅπαντα [γίγνεσθαι, Clerc, but omitted by Viereck. Unfortunately, Clerc did not indicate whether the beginning of l.10 was unengraved. He does, however, say that the stone is complete on the left except for one or two letters at the beginning of lines 9 and 11. 11 Ῥαυο[ίου, Clerc; Ῥαυ(ί)ο[υ, Viereck. Clerc believed he was probably Aulus Ravus Iulianus, mentioned in a Pergamene dedication (*C.I.G.*, 3543; cf. M. Fränkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, II [Berlin, 1895], 513), but of whom nothing else is known. For the spelling and the name see W. Dittenberger, *Hermes*, 6 (1872): 304.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 339.

# 58 – A letter of Paulus Fabius Maximus concerning the provincial calendar – c.9 BCE?

= Sherk *RDGE* 65 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R67

## A. The Proconsul’s Letter

- [ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . παρ]ὰ τῶν πρότ[ερ]ον παρειλ[ή]φαμεν - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ] τῶν θεῶν [ε]ὐμενῆς κα[ὶ] - - - - - ]  
 [πότ]ερὸν ἡδείων ἢ ὠφελ[ι]μω]τ[έ]ρα ἐ[σ]τὶν ἢ τοῦ θειοτάτου Καίσαρος γενέ-  
 5 θλιος ἡμέρα, ἣν τῇ τῶν πάντων ἀρχῇ ἴσην δικαίως ἂν εἶναι ὑπ[ολά]βοιμεν,  
 καὶ εἰ μὴ τῇ φύσει, τῷ γε χρησίμῳ, εἴ γε οὐδὲ[ν ο]ὐχὶ διαπεῖπτον καὶ εἰς  
 ἄτυ-  
 χὲς μεταβεβηκὸς σχῆμα ἀνώρθωσεν, ἐτέραν τε ἔδωκεν παντὶ τῷ  
 κόσμῳ ὅψιν, ἥδιστα ἂν δεξαμένῳ φθορὰν, εἰ μὴ τὸ κοινὸν πάντων εὐ-  
 τύχημα ἐπεγεννήθη Καίσαρ. διὸ ἂν τις δικαίως ὑπολάβοι τοῦτο ἄτῳ  
 10 ἀρχὴν τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ζωῆς γεγονέναι, ὅ ἐστιν πέρας καὶ ὅρος τοῦ με-  
 ταμέλεσθαι, ὅτι γεγέννηται. καὶ ἐπεὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἂν ἀπὸ ἡμέρας εἴς  
 τε τὸ κοινὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἴδιον ἕκαστος ὄφελος εὐτυχεστέρας λάβοι  
 ἀφορμὰς ἢ τῆς πᾶσιν γενομένης εὐτυχοῦς, σχεδὸν τε συμβαίνει  
 τὸν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ πόλεσιν καιρὸν εἶναι τῆς εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσόδου,  
 15 δηλονότι κατὰ τινὰ θῆαν βούλησιν οὕτως τῆς τάξεως προτετυπωμέ-  
 νης, ἵνα ἀφορμὴ γένοιτο τῆς εἰς τὸν Σεβαστὸν τιμῆς, καὶ ἐπεὶ δύσκο-  
 λον μὲν ἐστὶν τοῖς τοσούτοις αὐτοῦ εὐεργετήμασιν κατ’ ἴσον εὐχαρισ-  
 τεῖν, εἰ μὴ παρ’ ἕκαστα ἐπινοήσασιν τρόπον τινὰ τῆς ἀμείψεως,  
 ἥδειον δ’ ἂν ἄνθρωποι τὴν κοινὴν πᾶσιν ἡμέραν γενέθλιον ἀγάγοι[εν]  
 20 [ἐ]ὰν προσγένηται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἰδία τις διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡδονή, δοκεῖ μοι  
 πασῶν τῶν πολειτηῶν εἶναι μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν νέαν νομηνίαν  
 τὴν τοῦ θηοτάτου Καίσαρος γενέθλιον, ἐκείνη τε πάντας εἰς τὴν  
 ἀρχὴν ἐνβαίνειν, ἣτις ἐστὶν πρὸ ἐννέα καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων, ὅπως  
 καὶ περισσώτερον τιμηθῇ προσλαβομένη ἔξωθέν τινος θρησκείας καὶ  
 25 μᾶλλον πᾶσιν γείνηται γνῶριμος, ἣν οἶομαι καὶ πλείστην εὐχρηστίαν  
 τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ παρῆξασθαι. ψήφισμα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας δεή-  
 σει γραφῆναι πάσας ἐνπεριελληφὸς τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τὸ ἐπινοη-  
 θὲν ὑφ’ ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ μείνῃ αἰώνιον. προστάξω  
 δὲ χαράχθαι <ἐν> τῇ στήλῃ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἀνατεθῆναι, προστά-  
 30 ξας τὸ διάταγμα ἐκατέρως γραφέν.

Published in numerous cities in Asia. Copies found at Priene, Apameia, Eumonia, Dorylaion, and Maeonia. I have changed the lowercase ‘v’ in the Latin text of Sher’s edn. to ‘u’. The letter is followed by decrees of two provincial councils. “A. The Proconsul’s Letter. This is a composite text based on the copies from Apameia, Priene, and Maeonia. I have consulted the Berlin squeeze of Priene, Of the heading which preceded the Apameian copy of the Greek text only the following words have survived: - - ]νεσ καθιερωθείσας εἴτε διὰ θρησκείαν - - - - ]. 4 ὠφελ[ι]μω[τ]έρα, Dittenberger, but ὠφελ[ι]μω]τ[έ]ρα, stone (Priene). 5 ἴσην, Apameia; ἴση, Priene. 6 φύσει, Apameia; φύσι, Priene. 9 ἐπεγεννήθη, Apameia and Maeonia; -θη, Priene; ἄτῳ, Apameia; ἄτῳ, Maeonia. 15 θῆαν, Priene and Maeonia; θείαν, Apameia. 16 [καὶ ἐ]πεὶ δύσκολον, Maeonia; καὶ ἐπε[ - - ]ν, Priene. 17-18 εὐχαριστεῖν, Maeonia. 18 ἀμείψε[ως καὶ κοινόν], Priene, and Hiller’s restoration, but Maeonia shows [ἀμεί]ψεως ἥδειο[ν κτλ. 19 ΝΘΡΩΠΟΙΤ, stone A and thus Dittenberger, but ἀνθρώποι[ς] ἦν, Hiller; ἀγάγοι[εν - - ], Maeonia, but ἀγαγ[εῖν], Wilamowitz and Hiller on the basis of Priene; however, Dittenberger correctly restored ἀγά[γοιεν]. 22 ἐκείνη, Apameia; ἐκείνην, Priene. 24 τιμηθῇ, Apameia; τιμηθῇ Priene. 25 γείνηται, Apameia; γέννηται, Priene. 29 ἐν seems to have been omitted by the engraver. In

l.30 the proconsul's letter was followed immediately, without intervening space, by the first of the provincial decrees in the copy from Priene. In the copy from Apameia, however, it was followed by a different document, extant only in a very mutilated form." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 333.

## B. The Latin Fragments of the Proconsul's Letter

- Apameia [ - - - iucundior an salubrior principis notri natalis - - - - - 25 - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] cumque non ullo ex die feliciora et priuatim singulis et uniuersis publice trahi  
 possint auspicia - - ]  
 [ - - - ] quem Graeci suo nomine diem nean numenian appellant eum clarissimi uiri  
 Caesaris natalem - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] nonus XXX decumus XXXI undecumus XXX duodecumus XXXI interkalaris  
 interponetur - - - - - ]  
 5 [ - - ] νεξ καθιερωθείσας εἴτε διὰ θρησκευ[ίαν - - - - - ]
- Dorylaion [propterea recte homines existimant hoc sibi principium]  
 <uitae, q>uod paenitendi <f>uerit natos se esse <fi>nis.  
 c<u>m<q>ue non u<l>lo ex die feliciora et <p>riuatim sin<g>ulis et uni-  
 uersis publice trahi possint aus<pici>a <q>uam ex eo, <q>uem felicissi-  
 mum communiter (credunt), fere autem omnium in Asia <ci>uitatum idem  
 5 temp<us>an(n)l noui in(i)tiumq<u>e magist{e}ratuum sit, in <q>uod <f>o<rt>ui-  
 to, uidelice<t> ut hono(r)are(t)ur, <p>rin<ci>pis nostri nata<l>is incidit, uel  
 <q>uia tot er<g>a diuina merita <g>rat<um> esse di<ff>icile est nisi omnis  
 pietatis temptetu<r> materia, uel <q>uia <dies est> pro<p>ria <cuiq>ue  
 <l>aetitia in<g>ressui honor<i>s <st>atu<t>us, publicum uidetu<r> diem  
 10 [ - - - - - ]um  
 [ - - - - - ]om
- [ - - - - - ]AVNIA TNSA  
 [ - - - - - ] ha<b>ebit u<til>itatem et  
 [ - - - - - ]tissimo dierum IC autem E  
 15 [ - - - - - ]<q>ue <G>raecos DERICI NVN  
 [ - - - - - ]NRIA LI Ca<e>saris trahentis  
 [ - - - - - ] H L Caesar ANOC ARNXX S  
 [ - - - - - ]

The number in the square bracket in l.1 of the Apameia copy represented the number of dashes in the *RDGE* edn. "B. The Latin fragments (Apameia). Lines 1-3 correspond to line 4, 10-11, and 21-22 of the Greek version. Thus the Latin portion must have been engraved in lines of quite unusual length. 4 In Mommsen's view it ought to read *undecumus XXXI duodecumus XXX*. The Dorylaion fragment. 1 TIVIA OVOD; only in one place (l.5) is the letter *Q* correctly engraved; elsewhere it is *O*. EVERIT; at the end, ELNIS .Δ .Δ .Δ. 2 CYMOVE; VILO; ORIVATIM; SINOVLIS. 3 AVSELIPA. 4 ELVITATIVM. 5 TEMRY MANI; INTIVMQYE; PONEVITO. 6 LICEP; ORINOPIS; NATACIS. 7 ERCA; CRATIN; DIPEICILE. 8 TEMPTETUA; VELSOVIA IVVOVIS PROCRIAVISOVE. 9 IAETITIA INCRESSVI HONORES. RATVIVS. 12 HAREBIT VILEITATEM. 15 CRAECOS. 16 CAOSARIS." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 333.

## C. The Appendix (?) to the Proconsul's Letter in the Apameian Copy

- Col.I [ - - - - - ] γραφέν. Τοὺς  
 [ - - - - - ] τὸν ἀριθμὸν  
 [ - - - - - ]ς ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸ  
 [ - - - - - ] Καίσαρος ὡς  
 10 [ - - - - - ] ΑΙΟΝΠΕΙΚΑΙ

[ - - - - - ] ΙΣΣΙΙΝ τὸν Σε-  
 [βαστὸν (?) - - - - - ]ιον[ - - - ]λλ  
 [ - - - - - ] ΛΑΤΙΗΕΟΜ  
 [ - - - - - ]

Col. II μηδὲ ἔσται μία ἡμέρα δύο μέσων γενομένων [ἐτῶν]  
 κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαϊ[κ]ὴν συνήθηαν.  
*vacat*

This text is followed by decrees of two provincial councils. “C. The appendix. The text is that of *C.I.G.*, 3957, with additions by Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p.279. The lines are numbered here from the beginning of the column in the Apameia copy. 6 γραφέν. This is the last word in the proconsul’s letter (cf. A, l.30, of the Prienean copy) (The argument that, since γραφέν is common to these two texts, this must be the appendix to the letter is not an argument I find persuasive—Col. I and II are definitely indicating a relationship with Roman affairs, but is it necessary to say that C is the appendix to A?—nevertheless I have included the text since Sherck felt that there was sufficient reason to do so. I feel that he was wise to include the Question Mark (?) after ‘Appendix’ – CJH). 8-9 Wilamowitz suggested to Mommsen: ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸ [έννέα μεν (sic) καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων, γενεθλίου δὲ] Καίσαρος [ - - - .” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 333.

**59** – Augustus to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of Knidos – last half of 6 BCE  
 = Sherck *RDGE* 67 = Viereck ‘SG’ IX = Lafoscade ‘De Epistulis.’ 3 = Ceccarelli *AGLW*  
 ‘App.3’ **R69**

[ - - - - - ]  
 [ἐπὶ δαμι]ωργοῦ δὲ Καιρογένεος Λευ[κα]θέου (?).  
**Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ** θεοῦ υἱὸς **Σεβαστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς**  
**ὑπάτος τὸ δωδέκατον ἀποδεδειγμένος**  
**καὶ δημορχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ὀκτω{ι}καιδέκατον**  
 5 **Κνιδίων ἀρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν· οἱ πρέσ-**  
**βεις ὑμῶν Διονύσιος β’ καὶ Διονύσιος β’ τοῦ Διονυ-**  
**σίου ἐνέτυχον ἐν Ῥώμῃ μοι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀποδόντες**  
**κατηγόρησαν Εὐβούλου μὲν τοῦ Ἀναξανδρίδα** τεθνε{ι}-  
 ὤτος ἥδη{ι}, Τρυφέρας δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ παρούσης  
 10 περὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ **Εὐβούλου τοῦ Χρυσίππου**. ἐγὼ{ι}  
 δὲ ἐξετάσαι προστάξας Γάλλῳ Ἀσινίῳ τῷ ἐμῷ φίλῳ  
 τῶν οἰκετῶν τοὺς ἐνφερομένους τῇ αἰτίᾳ διὰ βα-  
 σάνων ἔγνων **Φιλεῖνον τὸν Χρυσίππου** τρεῖς νύ-  
 κτας συνεχῶς ἐπεληλυθότα τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῇ Εὐβού-  
 15 λου καὶ Τρυφέρας μεθ’ ὕβρεως καὶ τρόπῳ τινὶ πολι-  
 ορκίας, τῇ τρίτῃ δὲ συνεπη{ι}γμένον καὶ τὸν ἀδελ-  
 φὸν Εὐβουλον, τοὺς δὲ τῆς οἰκίας δεσπότας Εὐβου-  
 λον καὶ Τρυφέραν, ὥς οὔτε χρηματίζοντες πρὸς  
 τὸν Φιλεῖνον οὔτε ἀντιφραττόμενοι ταῖς προσ-  
 20 βολαῖς ἀσφαλείας ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῶν οἰκίᾳ τυχεῖν ἠδύναν-  
 το, προστεταχ{χ}ότας ἐνὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν οὐκ ἀποκτεῖ-  
 ναι, ὥς ἴσως ἂν τις ὑπ’ ὀργῆς οὐ[κ] ἀδίκου προήχθη{ι}, ἀλ-  
 λὰ ἀνείρξαι κατασκεδάσαντα τὰ κόπρια αὐτῶν, τὸν  
 δὲ οἰκέτην σὺν τοῖς καταχεομένοις εἴτε ἐκόντα  
 25 εἴτε ἄκοντα—αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐνέμεινεν ἀρνούμενο[ς]—

- ἀφεῖναι τὴν γάστραν, [κα]ὶ τὸν Εὐβουλον ὑποπεσεῖν δικαιο-  
 [τ]ερον ἂν σωθέντα τὰ{ι} δελφοῦ. Πέπονφα δὲ ὑμεῖν καὶ α[ὐ]-  
 [τ]ὰς τὰς ἀνακρίσεις· ἐθαύμαζον δ' ἄν, πῶς εἰς τόσον  
 ἔδεισαν τὴν παρ' ὑμεῖν ἐξετασίαν τῶν δούλων οἱ φ[εύ]-  
 30 γοντες τὴν δίκην, εἰ μὴ ποι σφόδρα αὐτοῖς ἐδόξ[ατε]  
 χαλεποὶ γεγονέναι καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία μισοπόνη[ροι,]  
 μὴ κατὰ τῶν ἀξίων πᾶν ὀτιοῦν παθεῖν, ἐπ' ἄλλο[τρίαν]  
 οἰκίαν νύκτωρ μεθ' ὕβρεως καὶ βίας τρις ἐπεληλυ[θό]-  
 των καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων ὕμων ἀσφάλειαν [ἄναι]-  
 35 ρούντων ἀγαναχτοῦντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῶν καὶ ἡγ[ί]κ' ἡ-  
 μύνοντο ἡτυχηκότων, ἡδικηκότων δὲ οὐδ' ἔστ[ιν ὅ τι.]  
 ἀλλὰ νῦν ὀρθῶς ἄν μοι δοκεῖτε ποιῆσαι τῇ ἐμῇ [περὶ (?) τού]-  
 των γνώ[ι]μη προνοήσαντες καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς δημ[οσίοις]  
 ὕμων ὁμολογεῖν γράμματα. **ἔρρωσθε.**

Found at Astypalaea. II.20-21. Sherck's edn. has ἡδύναντο, which I have changed to ἡδύναντο. "The text followed here is that of F. Hiller von Gaertingen (*S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup>) as approved by Viereck (notes), but I have checked each reading with the Berlin squeeze." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 343.

**60** – Augustus to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Sardians – 5 BCE  
 = Sherck *RDGE* 68 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **R70**

- Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ θεοῦ υἱὸς <σ> Σεβα<σ>τός, ἀρχιερέως, δημαρχικῆς  
 ἐκξουσίας ιθ',  
 Σαρδιανῶν ἀρχουσι βουλῇ δῆμοι χαίρειν· οἱ πρέσβεις ὕμων Ἰόλλας τε  
 Μητροδόρου καὶ  
 Μηνογένης Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Μηνογένους συνέτυχον ἐν Ῥώμῃ μοι καὶ τὸ παρ'  
 ὕμων  
 25 **ψήφισμα ἀπέδωσαν** δι' οὗ τά τε δόξαντα ὑμεῖν περὶ ὕμων δηλοῦντες καὶ  
 συνήδεσθε ἐπὶ τῇ τε-  
 λειώσει τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου μου τῶν παίδων· ἐπαινώ οὖν ὑμᾶς φιλοτειμουμένους  
 ἀνθ' ὧν εὐεργε-  
 τήσθε ὑπ' ἐμοῦ εὐχαρίστους ἀτοῦς εἷς τε ἐμὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς πάντας  
 ἐνδείκνυσθαι·  
**ἔρρωσθε.**

Inscribed at Sardis. "22 υἱὸς <σ> Σεβα<σ>τός: *sigma* had been omitted. 24 Μηνογένης: the *sigma* at the end is engraved over a *nu*." – Sherck, *RDGE*, 346.

**61** – Cn. Cornelius Lentulus to the arkhons of the Nysaians – 1 BCE  
 = Sherck *RDGE* 69 = Viereck 'SG' XXIV

- Ἐπὶ Διομήδους τοῦ Ἀθήναγόρου μηνὸς Δαισίου ιζ'.  
 [Γ]ναῖος Λέντλος Αὐ<γ>ου<ρ> ἀνθύπατος Νυσαέων ἀρχουσι. ἐ<π>-  
 ηρ<ώ>τ<η>σε Ἀρτεμίδωρος Δημητρίου Παπᾶς <ε>ἰ χ<ρῆ> (?)  
 [ - - - - - ]

Stone now lost, presumably found at Nysa. “Text by F. Hiller von Gaertringen. ... II 2 ΑΥΤΟΥΠΙ, and at the end EA. 3 HPOTEIH, and at the end IXIHZ.” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 349.

## 62 – A proconsul to Khios – c.4/5 CE?

= Sherck *RDGE* 70 = Viereck ‘SG’ XXVII

METAME . . . ΚΛ . . . . . [έντ]ευχθεῖς ὑπ’ Α[ . . . . . ]ΚΩ[ - - ]  
 Σταφύλου ὑπαρχόντων πρὸς τοὺς Χείων πρέσβεις, ἀναγινωσκόντων  
 ἐπιστολὴν Ἀντιστίου Οὐέτερος τοῦ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀνθυπά[του]  
 ἀνρδὸς ἐπιφανεστάτου· κατακολουθὼν τῇ καθολικῇ μου [προ]-  
 5 θέσει τοῦ τη[ρ]εῖν τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀνθυπάτων γραφέντα [φυ]-  
 λάττειν καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων φερομένην ἐπιστολὴν Οὐέτε[ρος]  
 εὐλογον ἡγησάμην· ὕστερον δὲ ἑκατέρου μέρους ἐξ ἀντικα[τα]-  
 στάσεως περὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ζητημάτων ἐντυχόντος διήκ[ου]-  
 10 σα καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν συνήθειαν παρ’ ἑκατέρου μέρους ἐπιμελ[έσ]-  
 τερα γεγραμμένα ἤτησα ὑπομνήματα· [ἃ λ]αβὼν καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιβ[άλ]-  
 λον ἐπιστήσας εἶδρον τοῖς μὲν χρόνοις ἀρχαιότατον δόγμα[τος]  
 συνκλήτου ἀντισφράγισμα γεγονότος Λουκίῳ Σύλλῳ τὸ δε[ύτε]-  
 15 ρον ὑπάτω, ἐν ᾧ μαρτυρηθεῖσι τοῖς Χείοις ὅσα ὑπὲρ ‘Ρωμαίων διέ[θη]-  
 κάν τε Μιθριδάτην ἀνδραγαθοῦντες καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἔπαθον ἢ σύγκ[λη]-  
 20 τος εἰδικῶς ἐβεβαίωσεν ὅπως νόμοις τε καὶ ἔθεσιν καὶ δικαίοις χ[ρῶν]-  
 ται ἃ ἔσχον ὅτε τῇ ‘Ρωμαίων φιλίᾳ προσήλθον, ἵνα τε ὑπὸ μήθ’ ὧτινι[οῦν]  
 τύπῳ ὧσιν ἀρχόντων ἢ ἀνταρχόντων, οἱ τε παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὄντες ‘Ρωμ[αῖ]-  
 οὶ τοῖς Χείων ὑπακούωσιν νόμοις· Αὐτοκράτορος δὲ θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σ[ε]-  
 βαστοῦ τὸ ὄγδοον ὑπάτου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Χείους γραφοντ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . . ]Ρ[ . ]ΕΙΝ ἀμφι[ . . . . . ] τῆς περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθ[ερίας]  
 [ - - - - - ]

Inscribed at Khios. “Text by W. G. Forrest (*S.E.G.*, XXII, 507), but I have checked each reading on the Berlin squeeze. In several important areas, however, the squeeze is of little value, especially in l.20. At the beginning of l.1 former editors had read Μ . . Α . . ΝΑ. 19 ἐπιστολὴν - - - - γράφοντος τοῦ δεῖνος or ἐπιστολὴ - - - - , κτλ. 20 Forrest thinks of some form of ἀμφισβήτησις. L. Robert here had ἰεπεν τὴν; former editor, ις . . εν τὴν.” – Sherck, *RDGE*, 352.

## 63 – A Roman magistrate (?) to the Mytilenans – age of Caesar or Augustus

= Sherck *RDGE* 76

[ - - - - - τῇ]ς εὐεργ[εσίας - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - π]ρὸς αὐτὸν [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - φιλαγ]άθως οὐδὲ [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]των ἐν ασ[ - - - - - ]  
 5 [ - - - - - ]. ἂ [τῶ]ν εἰσφο[ρῶν - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ἰων. Ἔρρωσθε. [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - Ποτάμ]ωνος υἱὸν [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - τὴν δ]ὲ γυναι[ῖκα - - - - - ]

Found at Mytilene. l.5. Sherck’s edn. has εἰσφο[ρῶν], which I have changed to εἰσφο[ρῶν].

**64** – Tiberius to the *gerousia* of the Ephesians – probably 12/13CE  
= *SEG* 43.759

- [Τιβέριος Καῖσαρ Σ]εβαστοῦ υἱός, ἀρχιερεὺς, δημ(αρχικῆς) [ἐξουσί(ας) τὸ  
 ι',]  
 [αὐτοκράτ]ωρ τὸ ζ', Ἐφεσίων τῇ γερουσί[α χαί]ρειν·  
 [παρὰ. Κο]υρτίου Πρόκλου τὸ πεμφθὲν [ὑ]φ' ὑμῶν  
 20 [ψήφισμ]α δηλοῦν τὴν τῶν γερόντων[ν] πρὸς τε  
 [τὸν ἐμὸν πα]τέρα καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἡμῶν ἅπ[αν]τα διά-  
 [νοιαν ἡδέω]ς ἀποδέχομαι πεπεισμένος [τῆς αὐτ]ῆς  
 [ὑμᾶς καὶ πρ]ὸς ἐμαυτὸν εὐνοίας διαπρονο[εῖσθαι βου]-  
 [λομένου]ς· ἃ τεῖμια καὶ φιλάνθρωπα ὅ τε πά[ππος μου καὶ]  
 25 [ὁ πατήρ] ἐπε]βεβαίωσαν, ταῦτα ἴστε καὶ με δια[φυλάξειν]  
 [παρεσκευ]ασμένον· ἔρρωσθε

Date: *SEG* Online. Presumably inscribed at Ephesos. Since the letter is dated to 12/13 CE, this would mean that Tiberius sent it while Augustus was still alive. I have therefore included the letter, as it is within the scope of this dissertation, despite Ceccarelli not listing it with her Republican letters. “24-25. For the restoration cf. LL.45/46, edd.pr.” – *SEG* online.

## Auxiliary Letter

### The letter of Marcus Antonius recorded on papyrus

“This text was written on the *verso* of a British Museum medical papyrus (P.Lond.137)...Part of the beginning (ll.1-5) is also extant in a very mutilated form, in an inscription said to have been found in Tralles (Keil, *op. cit.* [*Jahreshefte*, 14 (1911)], cols. 123-27).” (Sherk, *RDGE*, 290).

Since the more extensive version is a papyrus (and the text itself does not completely correspond to the epigraphic version, v. Sherk’s apparatus), and the inscriptional version is too fragmentary for me include on its own merit, I could not include the text in this study of inscribed letters. However, there is no reason why it cannot be used for comparison outside of the main data.

**Aux. 1** – Marcus Antonius to the *koinon* of the Greeks from Asia – 42-41 or 33-32 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* 57 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R50**

Μάρκος Ἀντώνιος αὐτοκράτωρ  
 τριῶν ἀνδρῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων  
 ἀπὸ καταστάσεως, τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἀ-  
 πὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλλήνων χαίρειν· καὶ  
 5 πρότερον ἐντυχόντος μοι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ  
 Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Ἀρτεμιδώρου, τοῦ  
 ἐμοῦ φίλου καὶ ἀλείπτου, μετὰ τοῦ ἐ-  
 πωνύμου τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς  
 οἰκουμένης ἱερωνικῶν καὶ στεφα-  
 10 νειτῶν ἱερέως Χαροπείνου Ἐφεσίου,  
 περὶ τοῦ <τὰ> προϋπάρχοντα τῇ συνό-  
 δῳ μένειν ἀναφαίρετα, καὶ περὶ τῶν  
 λιοπῶν ὧν ἡτεῖτο ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τιμίων  
 καὶ φιλανθρωπ<ων> τῆς ἀστρατευσίας  
 15 καὶ ἀλειτουργησίας πάσης καὶ ἀνεπι-  
 σταθμείας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν πανή-  
 γυριν ἐκεχειρίας καὶ ἀσυλίας καὶ  
 πορφύρας, ἵνα συνχωρήσ<ω> γράψαι  
 παραχρῆμα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, συνχωρῶ{ν}  
 20 βουλόμενος καὶ διὰ τὸν ἐμὸν φί-  
 λον Ἀρτεμίδωρον καὶ τῷ ἐπωνύ-  
 μῳ αὐτῶν ἱερεῖ εἷς τε τὸν κόσμον τῆς  
 συνόδου καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν αὐτῆς χα-  
 ρίσασθαι. καὶ τὰ νῦν πάλιν ἐντυ-  
 25 χόντος μοι τοῦ Ἀρτεμιδώρου ὅπως



ἐξῆ ἀυτοῖς ἀναθεῖναι δέλτον χαλ-  
 κῆν καὶ ἐνχαράξαι εἰς αὐτὴν περὶ  
 τῶν προγεγραμμένων φιλανθρώπων,  
 ἐγὼ προαιρούμενος ἐν μηδενὶ καθ-  
 30 υστερεῖν το<υ> Ἀρτεμίδωρο<υ> περὶ <τού>των  
 ἐντυχόντος ἐπεχώρησα τῇ[ν ἀνά]-  
 θε<σ>ιν τῆς δέλτο(υ) ὥς παρακαλεῖ [με].  
 ὑμῖν δ(ἐ) γέγραφα περὶ τούτων.

cf. Tralles version from J. Keil, *Jahreshefte*, 14 (1911), cols. 123-27 given in Sherk's apparatus—

[Μᾶρκος Ἀν]τώνιος αὐτοκρά[τωρ τριῶν ἀνδρῶν δημοσί]-  
 [ων πραγμάτων] ἀπὸ καταστά[σεως τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀ]-  
 [σίας Ἑλλήνων] καὶ τοῖς προέ[δροις] - - - - χαί-  
 [ρειν· καὶ πρότε]ρον ἐντυχόν[τος μοι]

Found at Tralles. “3-4 The copy on stone at Smyrna, originally found at Tralles, reads as follows for this section (Keil, *op. cit.*, col. 127): Μᾶρκος Ἀν]τώνιος αὐτοκρά[τωρ τριῶν ἀνδρῶν δημοσί]ων πραγμάτων ἀπὸ καταστά[σεως τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀ]σίας Ἑλλήνων] καὶ τοῖς προέ[δροις] - - - - χαί[ρειν· καὶ πρότε]ρον ἐντυχόν[τος μοι κτλ. **Note that τοῖς προέδροις is missing in the papyrus.** The phrase ἀπὸ καταστάσεως has a partial parallel in the letter of Octavian to Rhosus ([RDGE] No. 58, II 9), where, however, the preposition is ἐπὶ. Cf. also *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* I. 12: ἐπὶ τῇ καταστάσει τῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων. 14 Papyrus has φιλανθρώπου. 18-19 The papyrus has συνχωρήση - - - - συνχωρῶν, which Kenyon emended. 30-31 τὸν Ἀρτεμίδωρον περὶ τῶν | ἐντυχόντος ἐπεχώρησα τῇ[ν - - ]θεξιν, papyrus. The change from the accusative to the genitive [p.291] in the envoy's name, first suggested by Oliver, appears correct and in agreement with the verb governing it (καθυστερεῖν). Kenyon, περὶ τούτων ἐντυχόντα; Brandis, περὶ ὧν ἐνέτυχέ μοι. The editors of *Sammelbuch* (I[1915], 4224) suggest περὶ τ<ιν>ων ἐντυχόντ<α>, which is followed by Ehrenberg-Jones. At the end of the phrase (II.32) Kenyon has expanded - - ]θεξιν, a reading confirmed by Skeat (*per litteras*), to κά]θεξιν κτλ (*sic*); Amelotti corrected it to ἀνάθε<σ>ιν.” – Sherk, *RDGE*, 291–292 (my emphasis).

## List of Excluded Texts

The following texts are presented in Sherck *RDGE* and/or listed in Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘Appendix 3’ as inscribed official Roman Republican letters, but I have excluded them from my corpus for one or more of the three possible reasons listed in the preface to the Appendix. I have included such texts here for completeness and for the convenience of the marker.

### **Excl.T. 1 – Spurius Postumius (?) to the Delphians – 189 BCE**

(on the same monument as **6**) = Sherck *RDGE* **1 (i)** = Viereck ‘SG’ X = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R6**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Delphi.

### **Excl.T. 2 – A Roman magistrate (?) to Eresos – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE**

= Sherck *RDGE* **41**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Eresos.

### **Excl.T. 3 – A Roman magistrate to the Amphiktionones – c.125 BCE?**

= Sherck *RDGE* **42** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R21**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Delphi.

### **Excl.T. 4 – An individual (Greek or Roman?) to Kyparissos (?) – 2<sup>nd</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE**

= *IOLHPK* **Excl.T. 5** = Sherck *RDGE* **46**, cf. *SEG* 11, 1025 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **53** and **R25bis**

Reason for exclusion: it is debated as to whether it is Greek or Roman, and therefore has been **excluded from both ORRLIG and IOLHPK corpora**. Date: Sherck, Ceccarelli. Found at Christianoi in Messenia (Sherck).

### **Excl.T. 5 – A letter of Q. Mucius Scaeuola (?) about a treaty of the Sardians and Ephesians – 98/97 or 94/93 BCE**

(on the same monument as **24**) = Sherck *RDGE* **47(i)** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R26**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Pergamon.

### **Excl.T. 6 – A polis or a Roman proconsul to Sparta (?) – 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE**

= *IOLHPK* **Excl.T. 7** = *IG* v i, 9 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **59** and **R31bis**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. It is also debated as to whether it is Greek or Roman, and therefore has been **excluded from both ORRLIG and IOLHPK corpora**. Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Sparta (Ceccarelli). “**Litterae vel Urbis cuiusdam vel proconsulis Romani**” (‘A letter either of a city or of a Roman proconsul’, my emphasis and translation) – Kolbe *IG* v i, 9

**Excl.T. 7** – L. Cornelius Sulla to Stratonikeia – 81 BCE

(on the same monument as **31**) = Sherk *RDGE* **18(ii)** = Viereck ‘SG’ XVI = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R35**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Inscribed at Lagina in Caria.

**Excl.T. 8** – A Roman magistrate to the people of Ilion – 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* **53** = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R42**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Ilion.

**Excl.T. 9** – Marcus Antonius – 44/43 BCE

= Rigsby *Asyilia* **214**, cf. *SEG* 39.1290 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R49**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Sardis (Ceccarelli).

**Excl.T. 10** – A Roman (?) to the *gerousia* of Ephesos – second half of 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE

= *SEG* 43.768 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R60**

Reason for exclusion: status as a Roman letter is uncertain. Date: *SEG* Online. Found at Ephesos (Ceccarelli). “**Possibly the beginning of the letter in *SEG* 43 757 (Excl.T. 11)**”. – *SEG* Online (my emphasis).

**Excl.T. 11** – Caesar (?) or Octavian (?) to Ephesos – second half of 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE\*

= *SEG* 43,757 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **R61**

Reason for exclusion: status as a Roman letter is uncertain. I have inferred this date, since no specific date is given on *SEG* Online, and it is presumably later than **Excl.T. 10**. Found at Ephesos (Ceccarelli). It would appear the the two first person singular verbs in l.2 are the reason for this text being classed as a letter. “**Possibly *SEG* 43 768 belongs to this letter (Excl.T. 10)**”. – *SEG* 43 online (my emphasis).

**Excl.T. 12** – A letter (?) of Augustus (?) to the Samians – (July?) 19 BCE

= Sherk *RDGE* **62**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Inscribed at Samos (?) (implied at Sherk *RDGE* p.322: “Why else would Samos have erected the stele?”).

**Excl.T. 13** – A letter (or three letters?) of a certain *Imperator* to the Mytlenans – Augustan era?

= Sherk *RDGE* **72**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Mytilene.

**Excl.T. 14** – A treaty and a letter – (no date given)

= Sherk *RDGE* **73**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Mytilene.

**Excl.T. 15** – A Roman magistrate (?) to the Mytilenans – age of Caesar or Augustus

= Sherk *RDGE* 74

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Mytilene.

**Excl.T. 16** – A letter to the Mytilenans – age of Caesar or Augustus

= Sherk *RDGE* 75 = Viereck 'SG' XXXII = Lafoscade 'De Epistulis.' 4

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Mytilene.

**Excl.T. 17** – A Roman magistrate (?) to the Mytilenans – age of Caesar or Augustus

= Sherk *RDGE* 77

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Mytilene.

**Excl.T. 18** – A letter of a Roman magistrate (?) (Cn. Pompeius Magnus?) – (no date given)

= Sherk *RDGE* 78

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Mytilene.

**Excl.T. 19** – Referred to as: 'Letter of an unidentified polis or king/emperor/consul to Sparta, very fragmentary, **Sparta, date?**' (Ceccarelli, p.378)

= *IOLHPK Excl.T. 10* = *SEG* 47, 355, cf. *IG v i*, 10 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 69

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. It is also debated as to whether it is Greek or Roman, and therefore has been **excluded from both ORRLIG and IOLHPK corpora**. Inscribed at Sparta. "IG V.1.10. G.Shipley, in W.Cavanagh et al., edd., *op.cit.* (*SEG* 47 354) 215/216 no. 4 (ph.), presents the following new text after study of the stone. He favors as the author either **Augustus or another emperor**, or else his correspondent." – *SEG* Online (my emphasis).

# Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic Royal Correspondence

## 1 – Antigonos to Skepsis – 311 BCE\*

= Welles *RCHP* 1

- [ . . . . . σπουδὴν] ἐποιού[μ]εθα [περὶ τῆς τῶν]  
[Ἑλλήνων ἐλ]ευθερίας, ἄλλα τε οὐ μικ[ρ]ὰ δι[ὰ]  
[τοῦτο συγχ]ωροῦντες καὶ χρήματα προσδια-  
[διδόντες, κα]ὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων συναπεστείλαμε[ν]  
5 [μετὰ Δημά]ρχου Αἰσχύλον. ἕως δὲ συνωμολογ-  
[εῖτο ἐπὶ τ]ούτοις τὴν ἔντευξιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἑλλη[σ]-  
[πόντου] ἐπ[ο]ιούμεθα, καὶ εἰ μὴ κωλυταί τι-  
[νες ἐγέ]γοντο, τότε ἂν συντελέσθῃ ταῦτα.  
[νῦν δὲ] γενομένων λόγων Κασσάνδρῳ καὶ Πτο-  
10 [λεμαί]ωι ὑπὲρ [δ]ιαλύσεων καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς πα-  
[ραγε]νομένων Πρεπελάου καὶ Ἀριστοδήμου  
[ὑπὲρ] τούτων, καίπερ ὁρῶντες τινα ὧν ἡξί-  
[ου] Κάσσανδρος ἐργωδέστερα ὄντα, ἐπεὶ τὰ  
[περὶ τοὺς Ἑλληνας συνωμολογεῖτο ἀναγ-  
15 [κ]αῖον ὥμεθα εἶναι παριδεῖν ἵνα τοῦ τὰ ὅ-  
λα συντελεσθῇ τὴν ταχίστην· ἐπεὶ πρὸ  
πολλοῦ γ' ἂν ἐποιησάμεθα ἅπαντα διοικῆσα[ι]  
τοῖς Ἑλλησιν καθὰ προειλόμεθα, διὰ τὸ δὲ  
μακρότερον τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, ἐν δὲ τῷ χρο-  
20 νίζειν ἐνίοτε πολλὰ καὶ παράλογα συμβαί-  
νειν, φιλοτιμεῖσθαι δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὰ πρὸς το[ὺς]  
Ἑλληνας συντελεσθῇ, ὥμεθα δεῖν μηδὲ  
μικρὰ κινδυνεῦσαι τὰ ὅλα μὴ διοικηθῇ.  
ὅσῃν δὲ σπουδὴν πεποήμεθα περὶ ταῦτα, φανε-  
25 ρὸν οἶμαι ἔσεσθαι καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις  
ἅπασιν ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν διοικημένων. ὄντων δ' [ἡ]-  
μῖν τῶν πρὸς Κάσσανδρον καὶ Λυσίμαχον συν-  
τετελεσμένων, πρὸς <ᾗ> Πρεπέλαον ἔπεμψαν αὐ-  
τοκράτορα, ἀπέστειλεν Πτολεμαῖος πρὸς ἡ-  
30 μᾶς πρέσβεις, ἀξιῶν καὶ τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν διαλυ-  
θῇ καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ὁμολογίαν γραφῆναι.  
[ἡ]με<ῖ>ς δὲ οὐ μικρὸν μὲν ἐ[ω]ρῶμεν τὸ μεταδιδό-  
[ναι φιλ]οτιμίας ὑ[π]ὲρ ἧς πράγματα οὐκ ὀλίγα  
ἐσχ[ή]καμεν κ[α]ὶ [ἡ] χρήματα πολλὰ ἀνηλώκαμε[ν],  
35 καὶ τα[ῦτ]α τῶν πρὸς Κά[σ]σανδρον καὶ Λυσί[μα]-  
χον ἡμῖν διοικημένων καὶ εὐχερεσ[τέρας]  
οὔσης τῆς λοιπῆς π[ρ]αγματείας· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ  
διὰ τὸ ὑπολαμβάνειν καὶ τῶν πρὸς τοῦτον  
συντελεσθέ[ν]των τὰ πρὸς Πολυπέρχοντα

- 40 θᾶσσον ἂν διοικηθῆναι, μηθενὸς αὐτῷ συν-  
ορκοῦντος, καὶ διὰ τὴν οἰκειότητα τὴν ὑπάρ-  
χουσιν ἡμῖν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς ὁ-  
ρῶντες κα[ὶ] τοὺς ἄλλους συμμάχους ἐνοχλου-  
μένους ὑπὸ τε τῆς στρατείας καὶ τῶν δαπανη-  
μάτων, ὧμεθα καλῶς ἔχειν συνχωρῆσαι καὶ  
45 τὰ[ς] διαλύσεις ποιήσασθαι καὶ πρὸς τοῦτον.  
σ[υνο]μολογησόμενον δὲ ἀπεστείλαμεν Ἀρι-  
στό[δη]μον καὶ Αἰσχύλον καὶ Ἡγησίαν· οὗτοι  
τε δὴ παρεγένοντο λαβόντες τὰ πιστὰ καὶ οἱ  
50 παρὰ Πτολεμαίου οἱ περὶ Ἀριστόβουλον ἡλ-  
θον ληψόμενοι παρ' ἡμῶν. ἴστε οὖν συντετε-  
λεσμένας τὰς διαλύσεις καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην γε-  
γεννημένην. γεγράφαμεν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ  
55 σεῖν ἀλλήλοις τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτ[ο]-  
[ν]ομίαν, ὑπολαμβάνοντες ἐφ' ἡμῶν μὲν ὅσα ἀν-  
[θ]ρωπίνῳ λογισμῷ διαφυλάσσεσθαι ἂν τα[ύ]-  
[τ]α, εἰς δὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἐνόρκων γενο-  
μένων τῶν τε Ἑλλήνων πάντων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς  
60 [π]ράγμασιν ὄντων μᾶλλον ἂν καὶ ἀσφαλέστε-  
[ρ]ον διαμένειν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.  
[κ]αὶ τὸ συνδιαφυλάξειν δὲ προσομνύναι ἃ ἡ-  
[μ]εῖς ὁμολογήκαμεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οὐκ ἄδο-  
ξον οὐδὲ ἀσύμφορον τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἐωρῶμεν  
65 ὄν. καλῶς δὴ μοι δοκεῖ ἔχειν ὁμόσαι ὑμᾶς  
τὸν ὅρκον ὃν ἀφεστάλακαμεν. **πειρασόμεθα δὲ  
καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν** ὅτι ἂν ἔχωμεν τῶν συμφε-  
ρόντων καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν πα-  
ρασκευάζειν. ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων καὶ γράψαι μοι  
70 ἐδόκει καὶ ἀποστεῖλει Ἄκιον διαλεξόμε-  
νον· φέρει δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ τῆς ὁμολογίας ἥς πε-  
ποίημεθα καὶ τοῦ ὅρκου ἀντίγραφα. **ἔρρωσθε.**

All dates are by Welles unless otherwise noted. Found at Skepsis (all notes on the places of inscriptions are from Welles). “3/4. προσδια[διδόντες], *W*; πρὸς δια[λύσεις] or δια[δόσεις], Munro; δια[πομπάς], Dittenberger; προσδια[ιροῦντες], Koehler. 6. [ἐπὶ τ]ούτοις, Schubart; ; [ἐν τ]ούτοις, Munro; [τι τ]ούτοις, Dittenberger. 28. ἃ, added by Dittenberger. 32. MEHΣ, on the stone.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 5.

2 – Antigonos to the *boule* and *demos* of Eresos – c.306 BCE= Welles *RCHP* 2

c	Πρότανις Μελίδωρος.	10	μῶν ἐπιστολήν, ἣν ἐγρ[ά]-
Letter	<b>Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος</b>		ψαμεν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀγωνίπ-
	<b>Ἐρεσίων τῇ βουλῇ</b>		που υἱῶν, ψήφισμά τε π[ο]-
	<b>καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν·</b>		[ή]σασθαι, ὃ ἀνέγνωσα[ν]
5	παρεγέγοντο πρὸς ἡ-		[ήμῃ]ν, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀπε-
	μᾶς οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρέ[σ]-	15	[σταλκέναι τ]ᾶς τε [κρί]-
	βεις καὶ διελέγοντ[ο],		[σεις τῶν δικαστηρίων]
	φάμενοι τὸν δῆμον		[ἐμφανιοῦντας - - ]
	κομισάμενον τὴν παρ' [ή]-		
-----			
d	[ . . . . . ]ΠΙ/ΗΜΟ . ΗΚΛ[ . . . . . ]ΔΙ . ΠΙΤΗ[ . . . . . ]		
	ΟΙΞ[ . . . ]Χ . ΝΑΙΔ[ . . . . . ]Ν Ἀλεξάν[δρῳ ἐν]-		
	τυγ[χ]αν[οντ . . . . . ] ἔρρωσ[θε].		

Found at Eresos. “c 15-17. τάς τε, κτλ., *W*; ΑΣΣΕ, Paton. Only the upper part of the letters is preserved, and the second Σ may be a Τ. I cannot understand a present infinitive here, τάσσειν or, as Paton, πρᾶσσειν. d. The traces as given by Paton; on the squeeze, nothing is visible on the left, and on the right, in l.1, only the ΠΙ and Η. Dittenberger: δ]ήμο[ν] ἡ κα[ὶ] - - - ]αι [ἐ]πὶ τῇ[ι] - - - ]οιε . . . . . ναι - - - ν Ἀλεξάν[δρῳ ἐν]τυγ[χ]άν[οντες].” – Welles, *RCHP*, 13. In fragment ‘d’, Welles reproduces the shapes of parts of uncertain letters, apparently as they appear on the stone, I could not reproduce these shapes in this document, so I represent them by underlining the letter they most resemble.

## 3 – Antigonos to Teos – c.303 BCE

(on the same monument as 4) = Welles *RCHP* 3

	§1. [ - - - - - ]ΝΤΕΠΕ [ - - - - ]		
	[ . . . . . ὅστις δ' ἂν] εἰς τὸ Πανιώνιον ἀποστέ[λλεται, ὡίό]μεθα δεῖν		
	[πρᾶξαι πάντα τὰ]		
	[κο]ινὰ τὸν ἴσον χρόνον, σκηνοῦν δὲ τοῦτον καὶ πανηγυράζειν μετὰ τῶν		
	παρ' [ὑμῶν ἀπεσταλμέ]-		
	νων καὶ καλεῖσθαι Τήϊον. §2. ὡίόμεθα δὲ δεῖν καὶ οἰκόπεδον ἐκάστωι τῶν		
	Λ[εβεδίων δοθῆναι]		
5	παρ' ὑμῖν ἴσον ὧι ἂν καταλίπηι ἐν Λεβέδωι. ἕως δ' ἂν οἰκοδομήσωνται,		
	[ἅπανσι δοθῆναι]		
	[ο]ικίας τοῖς Λεβεδίοις ἀμισθί, ἐὰν μὲν διαμένῃ ἡ ὑπάρχουσα πόλις, τὸ		
	τ[ρίτον μέρος τῶν]		
	ὑπαρχουσῶν οἰκιῶν, ἐὰν δὲ δεῖ κατασκάπτειν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαιν πόλιν,		
	[καταλειφθῆναι]		
	[μέ]ν τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν τὰς ἡμισείας, τούτων δὲ τὸ τρίτον μέρος δοθῆ[ναι]		
	τοῖς Λεβεδίοις, τὰ]		
	[δ]ὲ δύο μέρη ἔχειν ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως κατασκάπτηται, [καὶ		
	ἱκαναὶ ὧσιν αἱ κατα]-		
10	λειπόμεναι δέξασθαι καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ τοὺς Λεβεδίους, δοθῆναι τοῖς Λεβ[εδίοις		
	τούτων τὸ]		
	[τρίτον μέρος· ἐὰν δὲ αἱ καταλειπόμεναι μὴ ἱκαναὶ ὧσι δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς [τε		

καὶ τοὺς Λεβεδίους, οἱ]-

[κί]ας καταλειφθῆναι τῶν μελλουσῶν κατασκάπτεσθαι τὰς ἱκανά[ς, ὅταν δὲ συντελεσθῶσιν]

[ἰκ]αναὶ οἰκίαι ἐν τῇ [κ]ατασκευαζομένῃ πόλει, κατασκάψαι τὰς οἰκίας τὰ[ς καταλειπομένας, ὅ]-

[σαι] ἂν ἔξω πίπτωσι τῆς περιβαλλομένης πόλεως. οἰκοδομ[εῖν δὲ τοὺς Λεβεδίους]

- 15 [πάν]τας τὰ οἰκόπεδα ἐ[ν] ἔτεσιν τρισίν· εἰ δὲ μή, δημόσια εἶναι τὰ [οἰκόπεδα. ὠióμεθα δὲ]

δεῖν καὶ τὰστέγας τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀποδοθῆναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις, [ὅπως τάχιστα κατασκευά]-

[ζω]νται αἱ οἰκίαι, [ἐν ἔτε]σιν τέσσαρσιν πρὸς μέρος ἐκάστου ἐν[αυτοῦ. §3. ὠióμεθα]

[δὲ] δεῖν καὶ τόπον ἀποδειχθῆναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις οὗ θάψουσι το[ὺς νεκρούς. §4. ὅσα δὲ εἰς τόκους]

[ὁ]φεί<λ>ει ἡ Λεβεδίων πόλις, ταῦτα διορθωθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κοιν[ῶν προσόδων κατ' ἐνιαυτόν.]

- 20 [τὰ] δὲ δάνεια ταῦτα εἰς τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν, ὅπως οἱ Λεβ[έδιοι ὥφειλον, παραλαβεῖν.]

§5. καὶ ὅσοι δὲ πρόξενοί εἰσι τῆς Λεβεδίων πόλεως ἢ εὐεργέτ[αι ἢ πολιτεῖ]-[αν] ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ δωρεὰν ἢ τιμὴν ἔχουσιν παρὰ τῶν Λεβεδίων, τ[ὰ αὐτὰ ἔχειν καὶ παρ']

[ὕ]μιν, καὶ ἀναγραφῆναι τούτους ὅπου καὶ οἱ ὑμέτεροι πρόξεν<ο>ι [καὶ εὐεργέται εἰσὶν ἀνα]-

[γε]γραμμένοι, ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ. §6. τὰ δὲ ἐγκλήματα καὶ τὰ συμβόλαια [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἕκα]-

- 25 [τέ]ροις, αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτοὺς διαλυθῆναι ἢ διακριθῆναι κ[ατὰ τοὺς ἑκατέρων]

[ν]όμους καὶ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν διάγραμμα ἐν δυσὶν ἔτεσι ἀφ' οὗ ἂ[ν τὸ διάγραμμα ? προ]-

[τ]εθῇ. ὅσα δὲ ἐστὶν <ὕμιν> πρὸς τοὺς Λεβεδίους ἢ τοῖς Λεβεδίοις π[ρὸς ὑμᾶς, ποεῖν ἀμφοτέ]-

[ρ]ους συνθήκην, γράψασθαι δὲ τὴν συνθήκην, καὶ ἂν τι ἀντιλ[έγεται πρὸς τὴν]

[σ]υνθήκην, ἐπικριθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλήτῳ <ἐν> ἐξαμήνῳ· ἐκκλητον [δὲ πόλιν γενέσθαι, κα]-

- 30 [θὰ] ἀμφοτέροι συνωμολόγησαν, Μιτυλήνην. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα ὑπ[ολαμβάνομεν ἐπὶ τοιούτοις]

[γ]ράφειν τοὺς συνθηκογράφους οἷς ἂν ποτε γινώσκωσιν· ἐπεὶ [δὲ τοσαῦτα τὸ πλήθος ἄ]-

χοούμεν εἶναι τὰ συναλλάγματα καὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα ὥστε, ἂν τῷ [νόμῳ διακριθῇ διὰ παν]-

τὸς τοῦ χρόνου, μηθένα ἂν δύνασθαι ὑπομεῖναι – καὶ γὰρ ἔως το[ῦδε οὐ δοκεῖ προκοπὴν εἶ]-

ληφέναι ταῦτα {ἅπερ} οὐδὲ αἱ συν[θῆκ]αι συντετελέσθαι διὰ τὸ ἐ[κ πολλοῦ ἀδίκαστα]

- 35 εἶναι ὑμῖν τὰ συναλλάγματα—καὶ ἂν προστιθῶνται οἱ τόκοι πα[ρ']



ἕκαστον ἔτος, μηθενὶ]

[δ]υνατὸν εἶναι ἀποτεῖσαι. οἰόμεθα δὲ δεῖν, ἂν μὲν ἐκόντες ἀπο[τείσωσιν οἱ ὀφεί]-

[λο]ντες, γράφειν τοὺς συνθηκογράφους μὴ πλεῖον διπλασίου ἀποδ[οῦναι τοῦ χρέους]-

ἂν δὲ εἰς δίκην ἐλθ<ό>ντες ὀφείλωσι, τριπλάσιον. §7. ὅταν δὲ ἡ συνθήκη [ἡ ἐπικυρωθῇ, γρά]-

ψασθαι τὰς δίκας καὶ ἐγδικάσασθαι ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ. ὅσοι δ' ἂν μὴ γράψων[ται ἢ ἐγδικάσων]-

40 [τα]ι ἐν τῷ γεγραμμένῳ χρόνῳ, δικῶν οὐσῶν, μηκέτι εἶναι γράψασθαι μηδ' [ἐγδικάσασθαι. ἐὰν δέ]

[τις] τῶν ὑμετέρων ἢ τῶν Λεβεδίων μὴ ἐπιδημῇ ἐν ταῖς προσθεσμίαις, ἐξ[έστω τὸν ἀποδημοῦντα]

[πρ]οσκαλέσασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας, δηλοῦντα τῷ [ἄρχοντι - - ]

ἡ ἐναντίον κλητόρων δύ[ο] ἀξιό[χ]ρεων. §8. εἰς δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ διδόναι [καὶ λαμβάνειν δίκας κατὰ νό]-

μους οὓς ἂν ὑπολαμβάνοιτε ἴσους ἀμφοτέροις εἶναι. ἀ[ποδείξαι δὲ ἐκατέρους]

45 νομογράφους τρεῖς μὴ νεωτέρους ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα [ὄντας ἀνεριθεύ]-

[τους· οἱ δὲ αἰρεθέντες ὁμοσάντων γράφειν νόμους οὓς ἂν νομίσωσιν βελ]-  
τίστους εἶναι καὶ συνοίσειν τῇ πόλει. ὅταν δὲ ὁμόσωσιν, [γραψάντων οὓς ἂν ἡγή]-

[σώ]νται ἴσους ἀμφοτέροις ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἐνεγκάντων ἐντὸς ἑξαμήνου· εἶναι δέ]

[καὶ ἄλλῳ τῷ βουλομένῳ γράψαντι νόμον ἐσφέρειν· τῶν δὲ [εἰσενεχθέντων ὅσα]

50 μὲν ἂν ἐξ ὁμολογουμένων ὁ δῆμος ἐπικυρώσῃ, χρᾶσθαι τού[τοις, ὅσα δὲ ἀντιλεγό]-

μενα ἦι, ἀναπεμφθῆναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅπως ἡ αὐτοῖ ἐπικρίνωμεν [ἢ πόλιν ἀποδείξω]-

[μ]εν τὴν ἐπικρινοῦσαν· ἀναπέμψαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς συνομολογηθέν[τας νόμους, καὶ δια]-

σαφεῖν τοὺς τε ὑπὸ τῶν νομογράφων εἰσενεχθέντας καὶ τοὺς [ὑπ' ἄλλων γραφέντας,]

[ὅπως ἐάν τινες φαίνωνται μὴ τὰ βέλτιστα νομογραφοῦντες ἄλλ' [ἀνεπιτήδεια, αὐτοῖς]

55 ἐπιτιμῶμεν καὶ ζημιῶμεν· ταῦτα δὲ συντελέσαι ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ. [ἔως δ' ἂν οἱ σύμπαν]-

[τε]ς νόμοι συντελεσθῶσιν, οἱ μὲν παρ' ὑμῶν ὥιοντο δεῖν τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν [νόμοις χρᾶσθαι, οἱ δὲ παρὰ]

[τ]ῶν Λεβεδίων ἡξίουσιν ἐξ ἐτέρας τινὸς πόλεως μεταπεμφαμένους [χρᾶσθαι· ἐπεὶ δὲ δικαί]-

ότερον ὑπολαμβάνομεν εἶναι ἐξ ἄλλης πόλεως μεταπέμψασθ[αι νόμους, κελεύσαντες μὲν ἂμ]-

φοτέρους λέγειν ἐκ ποίας πόλεως βούλονται χρᾶσθαι νόμοις, συνο[μολογησάντων δέ]

- 60 [ἀ]μφοτέρων ὥστε τοῖς Κώϊων νόμοις χρῆσθαι, ἐπικεκρίκαμεν, τοὺς [δὲ Κώϊους παρεκαλέσα]-  
 [μ]εν πρὸς τοὺς νόμους ὅπως δῶσιν ὑμῖν ἐγγράψασθαι. οἰόμεθα δὲ [δεῖν ἀποδειχθῆ]-  
 ναι τρεῖς ἄνδρες εὐθὺς ὅταν [ἡ] ἀπόκ[ρι]σις ἀναγνωσθῇ, καὶ ἀποστ[αλῆναι] ἐς Κῶν ἐν ἡμέ[-  
 [ρα]ις τρισὶν ἐκγράψασθαι τοὺς νόμους, τοὺς δὲ ἀποσταλέντας ἐ[π]α[νενεγκεῖν τοὺς νό]-  
 μους ἐσφραγισμένους τῇ Κώϊων σφραγίδι ἐν ἡμέραις τρι[άκοντα]· ἐπανενεχθέν[-
- 65 [τω]ν δὲ τῶν νόμων ἀποδείξαι τὰρχεῖα ὑμᾶς τε καὶ τοὺς Λεβε[δίους ἐν ἡμέραις]  
 δέκα. §9. ὅσοι δὲ κεχορηγήκασιν ἢ τετρηραρχήκασιν ἢ ἄλλην [λητουργίαν παρ' ἑκα]-  
 τέροις λητουργήκασιν, τούτους οἰόμεθα δεῖν μηκέτι τῇ [αὐτῇ] λητουργίᾳ ἐνέχεσθαι. ἡξί[-  
 [ο]υν δὲ οἱ παρὰ τῶν Λεβεδίων καὶ χρόνον τινὰ αὐτοὺς ἀφεθῆναι [τῶν λητουργιῶν ἐν ᾧ]  
 συνοικίζονται· ἡμεῖς δὲ οἰόμεθα δεῖν, ἅμ μὲν ὑμεῖς πάντες μέ[νητε ἐν τῇ παλ]-  
 70 αῖᾳ, ἀτελεῖς εἶναι τοὺς Λεβεδίους τῶν λητουργιῶν ἔτη τρία· ἐ[ὰν δέ] τινες ὑμῶν]  
 μετοικίζονται εἰς τὴν χερσόνησον, καὶ τούτους ἀτελεῖς εἶναι τὸν [αὐτὸν χρόνον, ὅσων]  
 [δ' ἂν αἱ] οἰκία<i> μὴ μεθαιρῶνται (?), τούτους λητουργεῖν. §10. ἔφασαν δὲ οἱ παρὰ τῶν Λ[εβεδίων] δεῖν ἐς σί[-  
 [τ]οῦ παρὰθεσιν ἐξαιρεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν προσόδων χρυσοῦς τετρακοσί[ους καὶ χιλίους,]  
 [ὥς]τε τὸμ βουλόμενον λαβόντα τὸ χρυσίον τοῦτο εἰς ὑποθήκην [εἰσάγειν σῖτον εἰς]  
 75 [τῇ]μ πόλιν καὶ πωλεῖν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ὁπότεν βούληται, ὅταν δὲ ὁ ἐ[νιαυτὸς] τελευτήσῃ, ἅ[-  
 [π]οδίδοσθαι τὸ χρυσίον τῇ πόλει αὐτὸ καὶ τοὺς τόκους ἐφ' οἷς ἂν λάβῃ. ᾧν ἀξιούντων ἄλλως τε συν]-  
 τάξαι ἡμᾶς καὶ νῦν τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, ὅπως ὑπάρχει σί[του] πληθὸς ἱκανὸν ἐν τῇ πό]-  
 [λ]ει—οὐ γὰρ ποεῖν ὑμᾶς ἱκανόν—ᾧοντο δεῖν καὶ οἱ παρ' ὑ[μῶν] ταῦτο γενέσθαι, ἡξίου δὲ]  
 καὶ τὸ χρυσίον πλεῖον συνταχθῆναι, ἐπειδὴ ὁ συνοικ[ισμὸς] συντελεῖται καὶ πλέο]-  
 80 [ν]ες γίνεσθε εἰς ταῦτ' ἐλθ[ό]ντες. ἡμεῖς δὲ πρότερον μὲν οὐ[κ] ἐβουλόμεθα μηδεμιᾷ πό]-  
 λει δίδοσθαι τὰ σιτηγήσια μηδὲ σίτου γίνεσθαι παρὰθε[σιν], οὐ θέλοντες τὰς]  
 [π]όλεις εἰς ταῦτα ἀναλίσκειν χρήματα συχνὰ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα [ὄντα, ἐβουλόμεθα δὲ]  
 [ο]ὐδὲ νῦν ποεῖν τοῦτο, πλησίον οὔσης τῆς φορολογουμέ[νης] χώρας ὥστε

- ἐὰν χρειά]
- [γ]ίνηται σίτου, εὐχερῶς οἰόμεθα εἶναι μεταπέμπεσθαι ἐκ [ταύτης ὀπόσ]-
- 85 [ο]ν ἂν τις βούληται. ἐσπουδάζομεν δὲ ὑπὲρ τούτων ταῖς [πόλεσιν  
βουλόμενοι συν]-  
[ε]νεγκεῖν, ἐπεὶ ὅτι γε ἰδία ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος οὐθὲν γί[νεται] ἡμῖν,  
γινώσκετε]
- [ὕ]μεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, ἀλλὰ συντάσσομεν ταῦτα θε[ωροῦντες] ὅπως  
ᾧν ὁ]-  
[φ]εῖλουσιν αἱ πόλεις ἐλεύθεραι γένωνται. νομίζον[τες γὰρ ὑμᾶς τό γε ἐφ’  
ἡμῖν]
- εἶναι τᾶλλα ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους πεποιηκέν[αι, ἐφροντίζομεν ὅπως  
τού]-
- 90 [τ]ων ἐπιμέλειάν τινα ποιῶμεθα, ἵνα ἀποδοθῇ τὴν ταχίστ[ην]. ἐπεὶ δὲ  
συμφέροντα φαί]-  
νεται τὰ περὶ τὴν παρὰθεσιν τοῦ σίτου, ὥστε μὴθὲν δια[λιπεῖν] ὃ δίκαιον  
μέν, τῶι]
- δὲ δῆμῳ συμφέρον ἐστίν, οἰόμεθα δεῖν γίνεσθαι τὰ[ς παραθέσεις τοῦ σί]-  
του ὥσπερ οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Λεβεδίων ἔλεγον, ὑπολαμ[βάνοντες χρυσί]-  
[ο]ν δίδοσθαι εἰς ὑποθήκην τὸ πᾶν χρυσοῦς χιλίου[ς καὶ τετρακοσίους. §11.  
τῶν δὲ σίτων]
- 95 καὶ εἰσαγωγὴν καὶ ἐξαγωγὴν πάντων ἀποδειχθῆνα[ι ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τῆς ἀγο]-  
ρᾶς, ὅπως ἑάν τισι μὴ λυσιτελῇ κατάγουσιν εἰς τὴν ἀ[γορὰν ἀπὸ ταύτης  
ποιεῖσ]-  
θαι τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν, ἐξουσία ἡ θεῖσιν τὰ τέλη ἐπὶ τῶν [ἐν τῇ ἐγορᾷ  
ἀποδει]-  
χθέντων ἐξάγειν. ὅσαι δ’ ἂν χῶμαι ἢ ἐπαύλια ᾧσιν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως  
[ὕ]μῶν, νομίζομεν δεῖν προσαφορισθῆναι ἐκάστωι ἐγγράφαι μὲν ὀπόσους  
ἂν καρ-
- 100 [που]ς ἐξάγειν βούληται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορικίας, ἐπαγγεῖλαντα δὲ τῶι  
ἀγορανόμῳ καὶ τὰ  
[τ]έλη διορθωσάμενον ἐξάγειν. §12. ἡξίου δὲ οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν [καὶ οἱ παρὰ  
τῶν Λεβε]-  
δίων καὶ ἄνδρας ἀποδειχθῆναι παρ’ ἑκατέρων τρεῖς, οἵτιν[ες εἴ τινα] ἔτι  
παραλέλειπ]-  
ται τῶν συμφερόντων εἰς τὸν συνοικισμὸν γράψουσιν. [ἡμῖν οὖν  
συμφερόντως δο]-  
[κε]ῖ ἔχειν ἀποδειχθῆναι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν ἡμέραις τριάκοντ[α ἀφ’ ἧς ἂν ἡ  
ἀπόκρι]-
- 105 [σ]ις ἀναγνωσθῇ. τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθέντας γράψαι τὰ παραλελειμμένα ὑφ’  
ἡμῶν,]  
τῶν δὲ {τῶν δὲ} γραφέντων τοὺς μὲν ὑπ’ ἀμφοτέρων συνομ[ολογηθέντας  
κυρίους εἶ]-  
[ν]αι, τὰ δὲ ἀντιλεγόμενα ἀναπεμφθῆναι ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἄλλῃ διμ[ήνῳ], ὅπως  
ἀμφοτέρων ἂ]-  
κούσαντες ἐπικρίνωμεν καθ’ ἂν ὑπολαμβάνωμεν ἀμφο[τέρους] συμφέρειν.]

ἀναγεγραμμένοι, Dittenberger. 23. ΕΝΘΙ, stone. 27. ὑμῖν, supplied by Feldmann. 29. ἐν, 34. ἄπερ, bracketed by Dittenberger. ἀδίκαστα, Robert (*Bull. Corr. Hell.*, L, 1926, 472 n.3); παρελκόμενα, Dittenberger. 38. ΘΩΝ, stone. 71/71. ὅσων, κτλ., Feldmann; [ὅσοι δ' ἂν τὰ] οἰκία μὴ μεθαίρωνται, Hiller. Perhaps <κα>θαίρωνται. 81. οὐ θέλοντες, W; οὐκ ἐώντες, ed. 107. διμ[ήνωι], W; διμ[ηνίαι], ed. See Appendix, s. v. 108. καθ' ἂν (= καθὰ ἂν), W; καθ' ἂν, ed." – Welles, *RCHP*, 20.

#### 4 – Antigonos to the *boule* and *demos* of Teos – c.303 BCE

(on the same monument as 3) = Welles *RCHP* 4

- [Βασ]ιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος Τηϊῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· ἡμεῖς τὸ  
[πρότερον σκοποῦντες]  
ὅπου τάχιστ' ἂν συντελεσθεῖη ὁ συνοικισμός, οὐκ ἐωρῶμεν τὰ [ἀναγκαῖα  
ὑμῖν]  
[χ]ρήματα πόθεν πορισθῇ τοῦ ἔχειν Λεβεδίο[ι]ς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν οἰ[κιῶν  
τάχιστα ἀποδοῦ]-  
ναι, διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐκ τῶν προσόδων γινόμενα κατὰ χρόνους προσπορεύ[εσθαι  
ὑμῖν μακροτέρους· δεξάμε]-  
5 [ν]οὶ δὲ τοὺς τε παρ' ὑμῶν καὶ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν Λεβεδίων διαπυνθανόμε[νοί  
τε αὐτῶν εἴ τινα ἔχουσιν ἢ]-  
μῖν πόρον εἰσηγεῖσθαι, ο[ὐ φ]αμένων δὲ ἔχειν ἔξω τῶν περὶ τὰ τέλη,  
ἐπισ[κεψάμενοι τὰ δεδογμένα]  
αὐτοῖς εὐρίσκομεν ἀεὶ μ[όν]ον [πρ]οεισενεγκεῖν ὑμῶν τοὺς εὐπορωτά[τους·  
ἡμῖν οὖν καλῶς δο]-  
[κ]εῖ ἔχειν, τοὺς μὲν γε εὐποροῦντας εἶναι ἑξακοσίους, προεισενεγκεῖν [δὲ  
τούτους - - - ]  
κατὰ τὰς οὐσίας, ὥστε γενέσθαι τὸ τέταρτον μέρος τῶν τιμῶν τάχιστ[α  
τοῖς Λεβεδίοις,]  
10 τὴν δὲ κομιδὴν γενέσθαι τοῖς προεμπορίσασιν πρώτοις ἐκ τῶν προσόδω[ν  
τῆς πόλεως ἔτους]  
[δ]ιεστῶτος πασῶν συντασομένων. τοὺς μὲν ἄξοντας τοὺς τιμήσοντα[ς τὰς  
οἰκίας καὶ τοὺς]  
[ἐκ]γραφομένους τοὺς νόμους ἐκ Κῶ αἰρεθῆναι εὐθὺς ὅταν ἡ ἀποψήφισι[ς]  
γένηται, καὶ ἀπο]-  
[στ]αλῆναι ἐν ἡμέραις πέντε ἀφ' ἧς ἂν αἰρεθῶσι[ν, κ]αὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς  
νόμο[υς ἀποσταλέντας κομι]-  
[σ]αμένους ἐκ Κῶ ἀνενεγκεῖν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αἷς γεγράφαμεν ἐν τῇ  
ἀπο[κρίσει· τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς]  
15 [τι]μητὰς ἀποσταλέντας ἄγειν τοὺς τιμητὰς ὡς ἂν ἐνδέχεται τάχιστα.  
οἰόμεθα δὲ δεῖν . . . . ]  
ὡ ἐξαριθμηθῆναι τὰς παρ' ὑμῖν οἰκίας ἃς δεῖ δοῦναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις εἰς  
π[αροικίαν ἐν ἡμέραις]  
δεκαπέντε ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡ ἀπόκρισις ἀναγνωσθῇ, τοὺς δὲ ἐξαριθμήσοντ[ας  
τὰς οἰκίας καὶ δῶ]-  
[σ]οντας τοῖς παροικιζομένοις αἰρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρ'  
ἐκάς[της φυλῆς].

Inscribed at Teos. “5. τε, added by *W*. 6. ἐπισ[κεψάμενοι, Robert; ἐπισ[κοπούμενοι, ed. 7. καλῶς, *W*; οὕτως, Waddington. 8. τούτους οἰόμεθα δεῖν, Feldmann; εὐθὺς ἐκ καταλόγου, Waddington. 10. τῆς πόλεως, *W*; τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς, Koehler.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 24.

## 5 – Seleukos I to the *boule* and *demos* of Miletos – 288/287 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 5

Note	Ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ποσειδίππου,
of the	ταμιευόντων τῶν ἱερῶν χρημά-
publishing	τῶν Τιμέα τοῦ Φρύσωνος, Ἀρισταγόρα
Official	τοῦ Φιλήμονος, Κλεομήδους τοῦ Κρέ-
5	σωνος, Φιλίππου τοῦ Σωσιστράτου, Ἀλεξάν-
	δρου τοῦ Λοχήγου, Πολυξένου τοῦ Βάβωνος,
	Ἀντίοχος τὰ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ γε-
	γραμμένα.
Letter	<b>Βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος Μιλησίων τῇ βουλῇ</b>
	<b>καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν·</b> ἀφεστάλκαμεν εἰς
	τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Διδύμοις
	τὴν τε λυχνίαν τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ποτήρια
5	χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ εἰς ἀνάθεσιν τοῖς θεοῖς
	τοῖς Σωτήρσι κομίζοντα Πολιάνθην, ἐπι-
	γραφὰς ἔχοντα. ὑμεῖς οὖν ὅταν παραγέ-
	νηται, λαβόντες αὐτὰ ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ
	ἀπόδοτε εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, ἵνα ἔχητε σπένδειν
10	καὶ χρᾶσθαι ὑγαινόντων ἡμῶν καὶ εὐτυχούν-
	των καὶ τῆς πόλεως διαμενούσης σώας ὥς ἐγὼ
	βούλομαι καὶ ὑμεῖς εὖχεσθε. τὰ ἐπεσταλμένα
	δὲ Πολιάνθῃ καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν ποιούμενοι
	τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων συντελέσατε τὴν θυσίαν
15	ἣν συντετάχαμεν αὐτῷ. Συνεπιμελήθητε
	οὖν ἵνα γένηται κατὰ τρόπον. τῶν δὲ ἀφες-
	ταλμένων χρυσωμάτων καὶ ἀργυρωμάτ-
	ων εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ὑπογέγραφα ὑμῖν τὴν γραφήν,
	ἵνα εἰδῆτε καὶ τὰ γένη καὶ τὸν σταθμὸν
20	ἐκάστου. <b>ἔρρω{σ}θε.</b>
List	Γραφὴ χρυσωμάτων τῶν ἀπεσταλμένων. κτλ.

Inscribed at Branchidae (Didyma). “For the history of the text see the notes of Dittenberger. 12. εὖχεσθε. τὰ ἐπεσταλμένα, *W*; εἰσδέχεσθε, Haussoullier; εὖχεσθε <κατὰ> τὰ ἐπεσταλμένα, Dittenberger.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 35.

## 6 – Lysimakhos to the *demos* of Priene – c.285 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 6

A	[Βασιλεὺς Λυσίμαχος Πριηνέων τῇ βουλῇ]
	[καὶ] <b>τῷ δήμῳ χαίρει</b> [ν· οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν]
	[πρε]σβευταὶ <b>Ἀντισθένης</b> [ς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ]

- [ἀφι]κ[ό]μ[ενοι τ]ό **τε ψήφισμα** [ὑμῶν ἀπέδοσαν]  
 5 **ἡμῖν** κ[αὶ α]ὐτοῖς συνησθέντες ἐ[πὶ τῷ]  
 ἐρρῶσθαι ἡμᾶς τε καὶ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὰς]  
 δυνάμεις καὶ τὰ πράγματα κατὰ [πᾶσαν τὴν]  
 χώραν διελέγησαν παραπλησίως τοῖς ἐν τῷ  
 [ψηφί]σματι γεγραμμένοις, ἐμφανίζοντες περὶ  
 10 [τε τῆ]ς εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχει ὁ δ[ι]ή[μ]ος εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ ὅτι  
 B ἐπιστειλά[ντ]ω[ν ἡ]μῶν πειθαρχεῖν Σω[σθένους (?) τοῦ]  
 στρατηγοῦ [ὑπ]ήκουσεν προθύμως καὶ ο[ὐ]θενὸς]  
 ἀφίσταται τῶν ἡμῖν χρησίμων, καίπ[ερ πο]ροῦ-  
 μένης τῆς [χ]ώρας ὑπὸ τε Μαγνήτων [ . . . . . ]  
 15 [κ]αὶ τῶν σ[τ]ρατιω[τῶν τῶν συνεπιπορ]ευσμένων].  
 C [βουλόμενοι οὖν καὶ κοινῇ] πάντων καὶ ἰδίᾳ[ι]  
 [ἐκάστου ὑμῶν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, λυσιτ]ελὲς δὲ ἡμῖν  
 [ἡγούμενοι ὑμᾶς ἡμῖν ὥσπερ] καὶ πρότερο[ν]  
 [φίλους εἶναι, συγχωροῦμεν ὥ]σπερ ἤξιω[σαν]  
 20 [οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ - - - ]
- D ἡμῖν  
 τῇ τε θ[ε]ωρ[ί]αι  
 ὑμᾶς ποιουμ[ι]  
 εὐχαρίστους  
 5 [θυγ]ατρὸς καὶ ὑῶ[ν]  
 [φιλανθρ]ώπων βασι[λ]ε[ως]  
 αμενα  
 ἡμ[εῖς]
- E PKA F ΝΕΠΙ  
 NKAIG BATOY

Inscribed at Priene. “Unless otherwise noted, restorations are by Hicks. 2. οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν, *W*; cf. *OGIS* 751, 2; οἱ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, Hicks; οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πεμφθέντες, Ditt., for which there is insufficient room. 3. ἐπὶ τῷ διὰ παντός, Hiller. 6. φίλους ἡμῶν καί, Hiller. 7. κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν, Hiller. 12. οὐθενός, Holleaux; οὐδαμῶς, Hicks. 13/14. τεμνομένης, Ditt. 14. Μαγνήτων αὐτῶν, Hicks; Μαγνήτων καὶ Πεδιέων, Hiller. 16-20. Restored by Ditt.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 42.

## 7 – Lysimakhos to the *boule* and *demos* of Samos – 283/282 BCE = Welles *RCHP* 7

- Βασιλεὺς Λυσίμαχος Σαμίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρει[ν].**  
 κατέστησαν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς οἱ τε πρέσβεις οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ παρὰ τῶν Πριηνέων ἀποσταλέντες ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας ἧς ἐτύχανον ἡμφισ-  
 βητηκότες πρ[ό]τερον ἐφ' ἡμῶν. εἰ μὲν οὖν προείδειμεν τήγ-  
 5 δε τὴν χώραν ὑμᾶς ἐκ [τ]οσοῦτων ἐτῶν ἔχειν καὶ νέμε[ι]ν κ[αθ']  
 ὅλον οὐκ ἂν ἐπεσπασάμεθα τὴν κρῖσιν· νῦν δὲ ὑπελαμβάνομεν  
 ὑπογούου τινὸς χρόνου παντελῶς γεγονέναι τὴν ἐπέμβασι[ν].  
 οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐποιοῦντο τὴν μνείαν ἐν τοῖς πρότερον λόγοις οἱ  
 τῶν Πριηνέων πρέσβεις· οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ παρήσαν οἱ τε παρ' ὑμῶ[ν]

- 10 [καὶ οἱ παρὰ τῶν Πριηνέων, ἀναγκαῖον ἦν διακοῦσαι ἃ ἀποδίδοτα[ι παρ' ἐ]-  
[κατέ]ρων. οἱ μὲν οὖν Πριηνεῖς τῇ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγεννημένην αὐτοῖς  
[κτῆσι]ν τῆς Βατινήτιδος χώρας ἐπεδείκνυν ἔκ τε τῶν ἱστοριῶ[ν καὶ]  
[τῶν ἄ]λλων μαρτυριῶν καὶ δικαιωμάτων μ[ε]τὰ τῶν ἐξετῶν σ[πον]δῶ[ν].  
[ῥ]υστερον δὲ συνωμολόγουν Λυγδάμεως ἐπελθόντος ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰω[νί]-  
15 [αν μετὰ δ]υνάμεως τοὺς τε λοιποὺς ἐγλιπεῖν τὴν χώραν καὶ Σαμ[ί]-  
[ους εἰς τὴν ν]ῆσον ἀποχωρῆσαι· τὸν δὲ Λύγδα[μιν κ]ατασχόντα [τρί]α (?)  
[ἔτη αὐτοῖς] πάλιν ἀποδιδόναι τὰς αὐτὰς κτήσεις τοὺς δὲ Πριη-  
[νέας παρειληφέ]ναι, Σαμίων δὲ οὐθέναι παραγενέσθαι παντε[λῶς τό]-  
[τε πλὴν εἴ τις ἐ]τύγχανεν παρ' αὐτοῖς κατοικῶν· τοῦτον δὲ τ[ῶ]ν  
20 [ἀγρῶν τὸ γινόμε]νον προσενέγκασθαι Πριηνεῦσιν· ῥυστερον δ[ὲ]  
[ὑποστρέψαντας μετὰ β]ίης Σαμίους παρελέσθαι τὴν χώραν· ἀπ[ο]-  
[σταλῆναι οὖν παρὰ τῶν] Πριηνέων Βιάντα περὶ διαλύσεων τοῖς Σα[μίοις αὐ]-  
[τοκράτορα· τοῦτο]ν δὲ διαλύσαι τε τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοὺς οἰκ[οῦντ]ας ἀ-  
[ποχωρῆσαι τῆς Βα]τινήτιδος χώρας. πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἔ[φασαν]  
25 [τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῖς] μένειν ἐν τούτοις καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἐσχάτου χρό-  
[νου κρατεῖν τῆς χώρ]ας· νῦν δὲ ἡξίου ἡμᾶς κατὰ τῇ[ν ἐ]ξ ἀρχῆς [κτῆ]-  
[σιν ἀποδιδόναι αὐτοῖς] τὴν χώραν. οἱ δὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀποσταλέντες  
[πρέσβεις τὴν κτῆσιν τῇ]ν γεγεννημένην αὐτοῖς τῆς Βατινήτιδος[ς]  
[χώρας ἔφασαν ἐκ προγόνων] παρειληφέναι. μετὰ δὲ τὴν Λυγδάμ[εως]  
30 [εἰσβολὴν ἐγλιπεῖν συνωμ]ολόγουν ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ αὐτοὶ  
[τὴν χώραν, ἀποχωρῆσαι δὲ εἰ]ς τὴν νῆσον· ῥυστερον δὲ Ο[ . . . . . ]  
[ . . . . . ] <sup>11</sup> [ . . . ] οἱ[κε]ῖν χιλίους Σ[αμίοις] . . . . . ]

Inscribed at Samos. The underlined letters in Welles' *apparatus* represent those closest to the forms he provides, which I could not reproduce in this document. 1.32. There are two vertical lines in Welles' edn. which were difficult to represent, the left line being about half as long as the right. "Text, unless otherwise noted, is that of Hiller, based on a squeeze, a photograph, and a revision by M.N. Tod. 5. νέμε[ι]ν κα[θ']', *W*; νέμε[σ]θ[αι καθ']', editors, for which there is no room. 6. ὑπελαμβάνομεν [ἐξ], editors; there is hardly room for the ἐξ. 10. ἀποδίδοτα[ι παρ' ἐ-] *W*; [λέγεται] παρ' ἐ-, ed; Δ. ΔΙΑ . Γ . , on the stone. 18. παρειληφέ[ναι], *W*; ὑποστρέψαι, Hiller; νέμεσθ[αι], Hicks-Dittenberger; ΔΙΑΙ on the stone: i.e., either MAI or NAI. παντε[λῶς], *W*; παρὰπ[αν], ed; ΠΑΔΠΗ[ ], on the stone. 20/21. ῥυστερον δ[ὲ] | ὑποστρέψαντος, *W*; ὑποστρέψαν[τας] δὲ ῥυστερον, Hiller. 21/22. ἀπ[ο]σταλῆναι οὖν παρὰ τῶν, *W*; α[ὐ]τῶν. | [πεμφθῆναι οὖν παρὰ], ed. 22/23. Σα[μίοις αὐ]τοκράτορα, τοῦτον, *W*; Σα[μίοις] πρεσβευτήν· τόν, Hiller. There is room for two letters after Σαμίοις. 31. Final letter O, Θ or Ω. 32. Σ[αμίοις], *W*." – Welles, *RCHP*, 47.

## 8 – Seleukos I and his son Antiochos to an official – 281 BCE = Welles *RCHP* 9

- [ - - - - - Βασιλε]ὺς Σέλευκος καὶ Ἀντίοχος Σωπάτ[ρωι χαίρειν·]  
[ἀποστειλάντων περ]ὶ ἡμᾶς Ἀθυμβριανῶν περὶ τῆς [ἰκεσίας καὶ ἀσυ]-  
[λίας καὶ ἀτελείας] Ἰατροκλέα Ἀρτεμίδωρον Τειμόθ[εον] πρέσβεις, - ]  
[ - - - - - ] ἡμεν τὰ κα[τὰ μ]έ[ρ]ος καὶ σοὶ γεγρά[φ]αμεν ἵνα διὰ  
5 [πλείονων αὐτοῖς] χρηματίσης. [προαιρούμ]ε[θα γὰρ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων]  
[πόλεων ἀεὶ τοῖς πολ]ίταις μὲν εὖε[ργετοῦντες] χαρίζεσθαι, οὐχ ἥκισ-  
[τα δὲ καὶ σὺν εὐ]σεβείᾳ συναύξειν τὰς τῶν θε[ῶν] τιμᾶς, ὥστ' εὐμέ]-  
[νειαν τοῖς μεθ' ἡμ]ᾶς παραδόσιμον εἶ[ς] τὸν αἰῶνα περ[ι - - - - - ἡμῖν]  
[γενήσεσθαι. πεπ]εῖσμεθα μὲν καὶ διὰ τῶν προτέρω[ν χρόνων] πολλὰς  
10 [καὶ μεγάλας ἀ]ποδείξεις δεδωκέναι τῆς ἰδίας [ἡμῶν εὐσεβείας,]

[βουλόμενοι δὲ καὶ] νῦν σύμφωνοι γενέσθαι τοῖς ἐξ [ἀρχῆς πεπραγ]-  
[μένους ἐπιτρέπ]ομεν πᾶσιν μὲν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τοῖς ἀσ[υλίαν κεκτημένοις(?)]

Inscribed at Nysa. “1. Restored by Hiller. 2/3. (as far as Τειμόθεον) Wilamowitz. 3-12. I have restored, with the kind assistance and advice of Professor Wilhelm, one the basis of a line averaging 54 letters. 4. διελέ]γηνεν – γεγρά[φωμεν, Wilamowitz. 5-12. Hiller: [ - ὅπως] χρηματίσης [ - - βουλόμενοι τοῖς πολίταις μὲν εὐεργεσίαις - - τοῖς δὲ θεοῖς εὐ]σεβή[α συναύξε]ιν τὸ]ν θω[ - - - ] ας παραδόσιμον ε[ - - ] | ων ἀπο[λείπειν - - πεπ]είσμεθα μὲν καὶ δίχ[αίας] (sic) πρότερο[ν - - ἀ]ποδείξεις δεδωκέναι τῆς ιδίας [ - - βουλόμενοι δὲ καὶ νῦν σύμφωνοι γενέσθαι τοῖς ἐ]πηγγεμένοις ὑφ’ ἡμῶν ἐπιτρέπ]ομεν πᾶσιν μὲν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τοῖς ἀσ[ύλοις - - ].” – Welles, *RCHP*, 55.

## 9 – Antiokhos I to the governor Meleagros – c.275 BCE?

(on the same monument as 11, 12, 13) = Welles *RCHP* 10

### Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μελεά-

γρῶι χαίρειν· δεδώκαμεν Ἀριστοδικίδει τῶι Ἀσσίῳ  
γῆς ἐργασίμου πλέθρα δισχίλια προσενέγκασθαι  
πρὸς τὴν Ἰλιέων πόλιν ἢ Σκηψίων. σὺ οὖν σύνταξον  
5 παραδείξει Ἀριστοδικίδει ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμορούσης τῇ  
Γεργιθίαι ἢ τῇ Σκηψίαι, οὗ ἂν δοκιμάζηις, τὰ δισχίλια  
πλέθρα τῆς γῆς, καὶ προσορίσαι εἰς τὴν Ἰλιέων ἢ τὴν  
Σκηψίων. ἔρρωσο.

Found at Hisarlik, Troy. “2 and 5. Ἀριστοδικίδει, not -δηι: corrected by Schmidt.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 61.

## 10 – Antiokhos I to the governor Meleagros – c.275 BCE?

(on the same monument as 10, 12, 13) = Welles *RCHP* 11

### Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μελε-

ἀγρῶι χαίρειν· ἐνέτυχεν ἡμῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης ὁ  
Ἄσσιος, ἀξιῶν δοῦναι αὐτῶι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐφ’ ἐλλησ-  
πόντου σατραπείαι τὴν Πέτραι, ἡμ πρότερον  
5 εἶχεν Μελέαγρος, καὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς Πετρί[δ]ος  
ἐργασίμου π<λ>έθρα χίλια πεντακόσια, καὶ ἄλλα  
γῆς πλέθρα δισχίλια ἐργασίμου ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμο-  
ρούσης τῇ πρότερον δοθείσης αὐτῶι μερίδι.  
καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν τε Πέτραι δεδώκαμεν αὐτῶι, εἰ  
10 μὴ δέδοται ἄλλῳ πρότερον, καὶ τὴν γῶραν τὴν  
πρὸς τῇ Πέτραι καὶ ἄλλα γῆς πλέθρα δισχίλια  
ἐργασίμου, διὰ τὸ φίλον ὄντα ἡμέτερον παρεσ-  
χῆσθαι ἡμῖν τὰς καθ’ αὐτὸν χρείας μετὰ πάσης  
εὐνοίας [κ]αὶ προθυμίας. σὺ οὖν ἐπισκεψάμενος,  
15 εἰ μὴ δέδ[ο]ται ἄλλῳ πρότερον αὕτη ἢ Πέτρα, πα-  
ράδειξον αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτῇ γῶραν Ἀρι-  
στοδικίδει, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς χώρας τῆς ὁμ[ο]-  
ρούσης τῇ πρότερον δεδομένη γῶραι Ἀριστοδ[ι]-  
κίδει σύνταξον καταμετρήσαι καὶ παραδείξαι  
20 αὐτῶι πλέθρα δισχίλια, καὶ ἐᾶσαι αὐτὸν προσενέγ-



25    κασθαι πρὸς ἣν ἄμ βούληται πόλιν τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ[ι]  
 τε καὶ συμμαχίαι. οἱ δὲ βασιλικοὶ λαοὶ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ τό-  
 που ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ Πέτρα ἐὰμ βούλωνται οἰκεῖν ἐν τῇ[ι]  
 Πέτραι ἀσφαλείας ἕνεκε, συντετάχαμεν Ἀριστο-  
 {το}δικίδη ἐὰν αὐτοὺς οἰκεῖν. **ἔρρωσο.**

Found at Hisarlik, Troy. “8. μερίδι, as Wilhelm suggested; the editors read μεριδίωι. 13. καθ’ αὐτόν, not κατ’ αὐτόν. 15. Πέτρα, not μερίς. 17. The editors read τοδικικίδηι. 20. αὐτόν, not αὐτῶι.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 62.

**11 – Antiochos I to the governor Meleagros – c.275 BCE?**  
 (on the same monument as **10, 11, 13**) = Welles *RCHP* **12**

5    **Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μελεάγρῳ χαίρειν·** ἐνέτυχεν ἡ-  
 μῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης, φάμενος Πέτραν τὸ χωρίον καὶ τὴν  
 χώραν τὴν συνκύρουσαν, περὶ ἧς πρότερον ἐγράψαμεν  
 διδόντες αὐτῶι, οὐδ’ ἔτι καὶ νῦν παρειληφέναι διὰ τὸ Ἀθη-  
 10    ναίωι τῶι ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυστάθμου ἐπιγεχωρήσθαι, καὶ ἡξί-  
 ωσεν ἀντὶ μὲν τῆς Πετρίτιδος χώρας παραδειχθῆνα[ι]  
 αὐτῶι τὰ ἴσα πλέθρα, συγχωρηθῆναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πλέ-  
 θρα δισχίλια, προσενέγκασθαι πρὸς ἣν ἄμ βούληται  
 15    τῶμ πόλεων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρῃ συμμαχίαι, καθά-  
 περ καὶ πρότερον ἐγράψαμεν. ὁρῶντες οὖν αὐτόν  
 εὖνουν ὄντα καὶ πρόθυμον εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα πράγμ[α]-  
 20    τα βουλόμεθα πολυωρεῖν τὰνθρώπου, καὶ περὶ  
 τοῦτων συγκεχωρήκαμεν. φησὶν δὲ εἶναι τῆς  
 Πετρίτιδος χώρας τὰ συγχωρηθέντα αὐτῶι  
 25    πλέθρα χίλια πεντακόσια. σύνταξον οὖν κατα-  
 μετρήσαι Ἀριστοδικίδηι καὶ παραδεῖξαι γῆς  
 ἐργασίμου τά τε δισχίλια καὶ πεντακόσια πλέ-  
 θρα καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν Πέτραν ἄλλα ἐργα-  
 σίμου χ[ί]λια πεντακόσια ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς χώ-  
 20    ρας τῆς συνοριζούσης τῇ ἐν ἀρχῇ δοθείσῃ  
 αὐτῶι παρ’ ἡμῶν· ἐάσαι δὲ καὶ προσενέγκασθαι[ι]  
 τὴν χώραν Ἀριστοδικίδην πρὸς ἣν ἄν βούληται[ι]  
 πόλιν τῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρῃ συμμαχίαι, καθά-  
 περ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρότερον ἐπιστολῇ ἐγράψαμε[ν].  
 25    **ἔρρωσο.**

Found at Hisarlik, Troy. “2. τήγ, not τήμ (Schliemann). 22. τήγ, not, as the editors, τήν.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 63.

**12 – Covering letter of the governor Meleagros – c.275 BCE?**  
 (on the same monument as **10, 11, 12**) = Welles *RCHP* **13**

**Μελέαγρος Ἰλιέων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι δήμῳ χαί-  
 ρειν· ἀπέδωκεν ἡμῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης ὁ Ἄσσιος ἐπι-**

στολὰς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου, ὃν τάντίγρα-  
 φα ὑμῖν ὑπογεγράφαμεν· ἐνέτυχεν δ' ἡμῖν καὶ αὐ-  
 5 τὸς φάμενος, πολλῶν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐτέρων διαλε-  
 γομένων καὶ στέφανον διδόντων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ-  
 μεῖς παρακολουθοῦμεν διὰ τὸ καὶ πρεσβεύσαι ἀ-  
 πὸ τῶν πόλεων τινὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, βούλεσθαι τὴν  
 10 χώραν τὴν δεδομένην αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀν-  
 τίοχου καὶ διὰ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὖνοι-  
 αν προσενέγκασθαι πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν. ἃ  
 μὲν οὖν ἀξιοῖ γενέσθαι αὐτῷ παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, αὐ-  
 τὸς ὑμῖν δηλώσει. καλῶς δ' ἂν ποιήσαιτε ψηφισάμε-  
 νοί τε πάντα τὰ φιλάνθρωπα αὐτῷ καὶ καθ' ὅτι ἂν  
 15 συγχωρήσῃ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ποιησάμενοι καὶ στη-  
 λώσαντες καὶ θέντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, ἵνα μένῃ ὑμῖν  
 βεβαίως εἰς πάντα τὸν χρόνον τὰ συγχωρηθέντα.  
 ἔρρωσθε.

Found at Hisarlik, Troy. “13. ποιήσαιτε, not, as the editors, ποιήσαιτε. 16. θέντες, corrected by Schmidt for δέντες (Schliemann).” – Welles, *RCHP*, 69.

### 13 – Ptolemaios II to the *boule* and *demos* of Miletos – c.262-261 BCE = Welles *RCHP* 14

Βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος Μιλησίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν·  
 καὶ πρότερον τῇμ πᾶσαν ἐποιούμην σπουδὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν  
 καὶ χώραν διδοὺς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐπιμελούμενος, ὥς προσῆκον ἦν  
 5 διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸμ πατέρα τὸν ἡμέτερον ὄρᾶν οἰκείως τὰ πρὸς τὴμ πόλιν δια-  
 κείμενον καὶ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν παραίτιον ὑμῖν γενόμενον καὶ φόρων τε  
 σκληρῶν καὶ χαλεπῶν ἀπολύσαντα καὶ παραγωγίων παρ' ὑμῖν, ἃ τινες  
 τῶμ βασιλέων κατέστησαν, νυνὶ τε ὑμῶν τῇμ πόλιν καὶ τῇμ πρὸς ἡ-  
 10 μᾶς [φ]ιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν οἰκείως διατετηρηκότων – γέγραφεγ γάρ  
 μοι ὅ τε υἱὸς καὶ Καλλικράτης καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι φίλοι οἱ παρ' ὑμῖν ὄντες ἦν ἀ-  
 πόδειξιν πεποίησθε τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίας – καὶ αὐτοὶ παρακολουθοῦν-  
 15 τες ἐπαινοῦμεν ὥς ἔνι μάλιστα καὶ πειρασόμεθα ἀ[μ]ύγεσθαι τὸν δῆ-  
 μον εὐεργετοῦντες, παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον τὴν αὐ-  
 τὴν ἔχειν αἴρεσιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς τοιούτων ὑμῶν ὄντων ἐπὶ πλεόν  
 τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς πόλεως ποιῶμεθα. τὰ δὲ πλεί[ω] συντετάχαμεν Ἑγεστρά-  
 15 τῳ περὶ τε τούτων διαλεχθῆναι καὶ ἀσπάσασθαι παρ' ἡμῶν. ἔρρωσθε.

Found at Didyma. “8. γέγραφεγ γάρ, proposed by Rehm as an alternative reading, is to be preferred to γέγραφεν. 4. (sic) τά, not τε, as Rehm.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 72.

### 14 – Antiochos II to the *boule* and *demos* of Erythrai – post 261 BCE? = Welles *RCHP* 15

Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Ἐρυθραίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ  
 χαίρειν· Θαρσύνων καὶ Πυθῆς καὶ Βοττᾶς οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσ-

βευταὶ τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν καθ' ὃ ἐψηφίσασθε  
 τὰς τιμὰς, καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἀνήγενκον ᾧ ἐστεφανώ-  
 5 σατε ἡμᾶς, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ εἰς τὰ ξένια, καὶ  
 αὐτοὶ ἀπολογισάμενοι περὶ τῆς εὐνοίας ἣν διὰ παντὸς  
 εἰσχήκατε εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν οἰκίαν, καὶ καθόλου περὶ τῆς εὐχα-  
 ριστίας τοῦ πλήθους ἣι χρῆται πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς εὐερ-  
 γέτας, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῇμ προαγωγῇ ἐν ἣι γέγονεν ἡ πόλις ἐπὶ τῶν πρό-  
 10 τερον βασιλευσάντων, ἡξίου μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς τε καὶ  
 προθυμίας φιλικῶς διακεῖσθαι ὑμῖν καὶ <ὁ>μοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνή-  
 κουσι πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν συναύξειν τὰ τῆς πόλεως. τάς  
 τε δὴ τιμὰς καὶ τὸν στέφανον δεδέγμεθα οἰκειῶς, ὁμοίως δὲ  
 καὶ τὰ ξένια, καὶ ὑμᾶς ἐπαινοῦμεν εὐχαρίστους ὄντας ἐμ πᾶ-  
 15 σιν· φαίνεσθε γὰρ καθόλου ἀγωγῇ ταύτῃ χρῆσθαι. διὸ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ  
 τε αἰρούμενοι δι<ε>τελοῦμεν τῇμ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐνοίαν, θεωροῦν-  
 τες ἀπλάστως καὶ ἀληθινῶς ἐμ πᾶσι προσφερομένους, καὶ νῦν  
 πολὺ τι μᾶλλον ἐπεσπάσμεθα, κατανοοῦντες τὸ εὐγενὲς  
 ὑμῶν καὶ ἐξ ἐτέρων μὲν πλεόνων, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ ἔκ τε τοῦ ψη-  
 20 φίσματος τοῦ ἀποδοθέντος ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ῥηθέντων ὑπὸ  
 τῆς πρεσβείας. καὶ ἐπειδὴ οἱ περὶ Θαρσύνοντα καὶ Πυθὴν καὶ Βοτ-  
 τᾶν ἀπέφαινον διότι ἐπὶ τε Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ἀντιγόνου αὐτό-  
 [ν]ομος ἦν καὶ ἀφορολόγητος ἡ πόλις ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρόγο-  
 [νοι] ἔσπευδον ἀεὶ ποτε περὶ αὐτῆς, θεωροῦν<ν>τες τούτους τε κρῖ-  
 25 [ναν]τας δικαίως καὶ αὐτοὶ βουλόμενοι μὴ λείπεσθαι ταῖς εὐερ-  
 [γες]ίαις, τὴν τε αὐτονομίαν ὑμῖν συνδιατηρήσομεν καὶ ἀφορο-  
 [λογ]ήτους εἶναι συγχωροῦμεν τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀπάντων καὶ  
 [τῶν εἰς] τὰ Γαλατικὰ συναγομένων· ὑπάρξει δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ ἡ  
 [..... καὶ ἐὰν] τι ἄλλο φιλάνθρωπον ἢ ἡμεῖς ἐπινοήσωμεν ἢ  
 30 [ὑμεῖς ἀξιόσητ]ε. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς μνημονεύον-  
 [τας ἡμῶν ἀεὶ (?) τ]ὴν ἐκτενεστάτην πεῖραν εἰληφόντων ΑΣΔΙΑ  
 [ - - 12-14 - - ] Ε εὐνοίαν καθάπερ δίκαιόν ἐστι καὶ Υ  
 [ - - 15-17 - - - ] τε καὶ τοῖς προγεγενημένοις ὑμῖν ἀκο-  
 [λουθ - 10-12 - ὑφ' ὧν ε]ὑεργέτησθε μνημονεύσειν ἀξίως.  
 35 [τὰ δὲ πλείονα περὶ τούτων καὶ] τῶν ἄλλων ὧν συλλελαλή-  
 [καμεν ἀναγγελοῦσιν ὑμῖν οἱ] πρεσβευταί, οὓς διὰ τε τὰ ἄλ-  
 [λα ἃ ἔπραξαν ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν ἣν ἐποιοῦν-  
 [το περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων τῷ δήμῳ]. ἔρ<ρ>ωσθε.

Decree  
 Of  
 Erythrae

5

Ι Σ Σ Τ Ρ Α Τ Η Γ Ω Ν  
 [Β] Α Σ Ι Λ Ε Υ Σ Α Ν  
 Κ Α Ι Ε Ν Δ Ο  
 Κ Α Ι Π Ο Λ  
 Π Ο Λ Ε

Inscribed at Erythrai. "16. δι<ε>τελοῦμεν, A. M. Harmon; the stone reads διατελοῦμεν. 30. [ὑμεῖς ἀξιόσητ]ε *W*; [αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς αἰτήσησθ]ε, Dittenberger. 31. Restored by *W*. 34-36. Restored by *W*. 33/34. ἀκο[λούθως], Ditt. 36. ἀναγγελοῦσιν ὑμῖν, *W*; ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ὑμέτεροι, Ditt." – Welles, *RCHP*, 79.

**15 – Antiokhos II to the governor Metrophanes – 254-253 BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 18

- Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μητροφάνει χαίρειν·** πεπ[ρά]-  
καμεν Λαοδίκη Πάννου κόμην καὶ τὴν βᾶριν καὶ τὴν προσοῦ-  
σαν χώραν τῇ κόμῃ, ὅρος τῇ τε Ζελειτίδι χώρῃ καὶ τῇ Κυζικ-  
ηνῇ καὶ τῇ ὁδῷ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ, ἣ ἡμὲν ἐπάνω Πάννου κόμης, σ[υ]-  
5 [ν]ηροτρία[σμένη δὲ ὑπὸ τῶ]ν γεωργούντων πλησίον ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἀ-  
ποτεμέσθαι τὸ χωρίον – τῇ μὲν Πάν[νου κόμην ὑπάρ]χουσιν συμβαί-  
νει ὕστερον γεγενῆσθαι – καὶ εἴ τινες <ε>ἰς τὴν χώ[ρα]ν ταύτην ἐμ[πί]-  
πτουσιν τόποι καὶ τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας αὐτο[ῖς λ]αοῦ[ς πα]-  
νοικίους σὺν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν πᾶσιν καὶ σὺν ταῖς [τοῦ ἐ]-  
10 νάτου καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ ἔτους προσόδοις, ἀρ[γυ]-  
ρίου ταλάντων τριάκοντα – ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες ἐ-  
[κ] τῆς κόμης ταύτης ὄντες λαοὶ μετεληλύθασιν εἰς ἄλλου-  
ς τόπους – ἐφ' ὧν οὐθὲν ἀποτελεῖ εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν καὶ κυρία ἔ[σ]-  
ται προσφερομένη πρὸς πόλιν ἢ ἂν βούληται· κατὰ ταῦτα δ[ὲ]  
15 καὶ οἱ παρ' αὐτῆς πριάμενοι ἢ λαβόντες αὐτοὶ τε ἔξου-  
σιν κυρίως καὶ πρὸς πόλιν προσοίσονται ἢ ἂν βούλω[ν]ται,  
ἐάμπερ μὴ Λαοδίκη τυγχάνει πρότερον προσενηνε-  
γμένη πρὸς πόλιν, οὕτω δὲ κεκτῆσονται οὗ ἂν ἡ χώρα ἢ προ-  
σωρισμένη ὑπὸ Λαοδίκης. τὴν δὲ τιμὴν συντετάχα-  
20 μεν ἀνενεγκεῖν εἰς τὸ κατὰ ΣΤΡΑΤΕΙΑΝ γαζοφυλάκ[ι]-  
ον ἐν τρισὶν ἀναφοραῖς, ποιουμένου<ς> τῇ μὲν μίαν ἐν τῷ Αὐ-  
δναίῳ μηνὶ τῷ ἐν τῷ ἔξηκοστῷ ἔτει, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐ[ν]  
τῷ Ξανδικῷ, τὴν δὲ τρίτην ἐν τῇ ἐχομένῃ τριμήνῳ.  
σύνταξον παραδείξαι Ἀρριδαίῳ τῷ οἰκονομοῦντι τὰ Λαοδί-  
25 κης τὴν τε κόμην καὶ τὴν βᾶριν καὶ τὴν προσοῦσαν χώραν  
καὶ τοὺς λαοὺς πανοικίους σὺν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῖς  
πᾶσιν, καὶ τὴν ὥνῃ ἀναγράψαι εἰς τὰς βασιλικὰς γραφὰς  
τὰς ἐν Σάρδεσιν καὶ εἰς στήλας λιθίνας πέντε· τού-  
των τῇ μὲν μίαν θεῖναι ἐν Ἰλίου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς,  
30 τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ ἐν Σαμοθράκῃ, τὴν δὲ ἑτέ-  
ραν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ τε-  
τάρτην ἐν Διδύμοις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, τὴν  
δὲ πέμπτην ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος· εὐ-  
35 [αναγρά]ψαι τὸν περιορισμὸν εἰς τὰς στήλας τὰς [προσ]-  
[ειρημένας. ἔρρωσο. νθ'] Δίου ε'.

Inscribed at Didyma. “36. ἔρρωσο. νθ (*sic*), restored by *W*.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 88.**16 – Covering Letter of the governor Metrophanes – 254-253 BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 19

[ - - - ] ΑΗ [ - - τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦ]  
[προστάγματος τοῦ γραφέντος ὑφ' αὐτοῦ - - -]  
[ - - - ] τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις [ - - - ]

- [ - - - θεῖν]αι τὰς στήλας ἐν τ[αῖς δεδηλωμέ]-  
 5 ναις πόλεσιν. σὺ ρ[ὺ]ν ἐπακολουθήσας τῇ παρὰ το[ῦ βα]-  
 [σιλέω]ς ἐπιστολῇ ἀπέγδοσιν ποιῆσαι καὶ σύντα[ξον]  
 [άν]αγράψαι τὴν τε πρῶσιν καὶ τὸν περιορισμὸν εἰς [στ]-  
 ἥλας λιθίνας δύο, καὶ τούτων θεῖναι τῇ μὲν μ[ίαν]  
 ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν  
 10 ἐν Διδύμοις ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, τὸ δὲ ἀνά[λω]-  
 μα τὸ ἐσόμενον εἰς ταῦτα δοῦναι ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικο[ῦ].  
 ἵνα δὲ στηλωθῇ τὴν ταχίστην ἐπιμελὲς σοι γεν[έ]-  
 σθω, καὶ ὥς ἂν συντελεσθῇ γράψον καὶ ἡμῖν. ἐπεστά[λ]-  
 καμεν δὲ καὶ Τιμοξένῳ τῷ βυβλιοφύλακι καταχω[ρί]-  
 15 σαι τὴν ὥνῃ καὶ τὸν περιορισμὸν εἰς τὰς βασιλικὰς γρα-  
 φὰς τὰς ἐν Σάρδεσιν, καθάπερ ὁ βασιλεὺς γέγραφε[εν. νθ']  
 Δαισίου.

Inscribed at Didyma. “1-5. Restored by *W.* 5. Λ . . I ἐπακ, Wiegand. 6. ποιῆσαι καὶ σύντα[ξαι καί], Wiegand. 16. νθ’, supplied by *W.*” – Welles, *RCHP*, 101.

**17 – Seleukos II to the *boule* and *demos* of Miletos – c.246 BCE**  
 = Welles *RCHP* 22

- Βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος Μιλησίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν·**  
 τῶμ προγόνων ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας  
 εὐεργεσίας κατατεθειμένων εἰς τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν διὰ τε  
 τοὺς ἐγδεδομένους χρησμοὺς ἐκ τοῦ παρ’ ὑμῖν ἱεροῦ  
 5 τοῦ Διδυμέως Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν  
 συγγένειαν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὐχαριστίαν,  
 ὁρῶντες καὶ αὐτοί ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων τῶμ πεπολιτευμένων  
 ὑμῖν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου πρὸς τὰ ἡμέτερα πρᾶγματα,  
 παραθέντων ἡμῖν τῶμ πατρικῶ<μ> φίλων, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀπολογισμοῦ  
 10 [ο]ῦ ἐποίησαντο Γλαύκιππος καὶ Διόμανδρος οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν  
 [κ]εκομικότες τὸν ἱερὸν στέφανον τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀδύτου ᾧ  
 ἐστεφανώκει ἡμᾶς ὁ δῆμος, εἰλικρινῇ καὶ βεβαίᾳ ποιουμένους  
 ὑμᾶς πρὸς τοὺς φίλους ἀπόδεξιγ καὶ μεμνημένους ὧν ἂν εὖ  
 πάθητε, ἀπεδεξάμεθα τὴν αἴρεσιν τοῦ πλήθους καὶ  
 15 προθυμούμενοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ἡγούμεν[οι τὴν πόλιν ὑμῖν]  
 εἰς ἐπιφανεστέραν διάθεσιν ἀγαγεῖν κ[αὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν]  
 φιλάνθρωπα ἐπίδ[οσιν λαβόντα ἣν προαιρεῖσθε ἐπαῶξαι]

Found at Didyma. “9. πατρικῶγ, stone. 15. [τὴν πόλιν ὑμῖν], Holleaux; [καὶ καλλίστοις], Haussoullier. 16. [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν], Hol.; [τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν], Haus. 17. ἐπίδ[οσιν, κτλ.], Hol.; ἐπὶ δ[ὲ τούτοις - - - - -], Haus.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 101.

**18 – Eumenes to Pergamon – mid. 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE?\***= Welles *RCHP* 23 (ll.21-39, Decree = Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, 18 ll.20a-39)

Letter [Εὐμένης Φιλεταίρου Περγαμηνῶν τῷ δήμῳ χαίρ]ειν.  
 [Παλάμανδρος, Σκύμνος, Μητροδόωρος, Θεότιμος, Φίλ]ισκος,  
 [οἱ κατασταθέντες ἐφ' ἱερῆως . . . . .] στρα[τηγ]οὶ φαίνοντα[ι]  
 [ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ καλῶς προεστηκότες] τῆς ἀρχῆς· τῶν τε γὰ[ρ]  
 5 [κατ' αὐτὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄλλα] μὲν πεπολίτευνται δικαίως,  
 [καὶ οὐ μόνον πάσας τὰς] τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς προσόδους  
 [τὰς οὖσας] ἐφ' αὐτῶν ὠικονομήκασι συμφερόντως τῷ δήμῳ καὶ  
 [το]ῖς θεοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ παραλελειμμένα ὑπὸ τῶν πρότερον  
 10 ἀρχείων ἀναζητήσαντες καὶ οὐθενὸς τῶν κατεσχηκότων  
 τι φεισάμενοι ἀποκατέστησαν τῇ πόλει, ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ  
 καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐπισκευῆς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀναθημάτων, ὥστε τούτων  
 εἰς ἀποκατάστασιν ἀγγοχότων τὰ προγεγραμμένα καὶ τοὺς  
 ἐπιγινόμενους στρατηγούς ἐπακολουθοῦντας τῇ ὑφηγήσε[ι]  
 15 εὐχερῶς δύνασθαι διοικεῖν τὰ κοινά. κρίνοντες οὖν δίκαιον εἶναι  
 μὴ ὀλιγωρεῖν τῶν οὕτως ἐπιστατούντων ἵνα καὶ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα  
 δεικνύμενοι πειρῶνται κατὰ τρόπον προίστασθαι τοῦ δήμου,  
 αὐτοὶ τε διεγνώκαμεν τοῖς Παναθηναίοις στεφανοῦν αὐτοὺς  
 καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὥμιθεθα δεῖν γράψαι περὶ τούτων, ὅπως ἐν τῷ  
 20 μεταξὺ χρόνῳ βουλευσάμενοι τιμήσητε αὐτοὺς καθότι ἂν  
 ἀξίους ὑπολαμβάνητε εἶναι. **ἔρρωσθε.**

*vacat*

Decree ἔγνω δῆμος· Ἀρχέστρατος Ἐρμίππου εἶπεν· κτλ.

\*I have inferred this date from the discussion at Welles *RC* p.112 – “there is no reason why this transaction should not have occurred at any time in the period 260-245 B. C.” Inscribed at Pergamon. Letter: “5. Restored by Wilhelm; ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν πάντα] μὲν, Fränkel; no restoration by Dittenberger. 6. καὶ . . . πάσας τὰς, Wilhelm; δὲ τὰς τε, Fränkel; καὶ τὰς τε κοινὰς, Ditt. 7. τὰς οὖσας, Fränkel; οὐ μόνον, Ditt.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 111.

**19 – Attalos I (?) to an official – second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> cen. BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 24, cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, 40

<p>5 [ὁ δ' ἀεὶ] λαχὼν φορεῖτω          [χ]λαμύδα λευκὴν καὶ σ[τέ]-          φανον ἐλάας μετὰ ταιν[ι]-          δίου φοινικιοῦ καὶ λαμβά-          νέτω τῶν θυομένων γέ-          ρα τὸ δέσμα καὶ κωλέαν          καὶ τῶν ἐργαστηρίων ὧν          ἀνατέθηκα τὴν πρόσο-          δον· μισθοῦτ' δ' ἀεὶ ὁ λα-          10 χὼν, ἐπεσκευασμένα          δὲ παραδιδότω ὁ ἑξι-</p>	<p>15</p> <p>20</p>	<p>ὦν ἢ ἀποτινέτω τὸ γε-          νόμενον εἰς τὴν ἐπι-          σκευὴν δαπάνημα.          ἀφείσθω δὲ καὶ τῶν λη-          τουργιῶν πασῶν, ὃν ἂν          χρόνον ἔχῃ τὸν στέ-          φανον. τὰ δὲ ἀργυρώμα-          τα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ ἄλ-          20 λα ἀναθέματα τηρή-          σας τῷ εἰσιόντι παρα-          διδότω. <b>ἔρρωσο.</b></p>
--	---------------------	--

Found at Pergamon. Welles is generally less willing to accept letters as certain than Fränkel is, but there are some exceptions in this edition: l.13 νόμενον, Welles; νόμενον, Fränkel. l.16 ἂν, Welles; ἄν, Fränkel.

**20** – Letter of Ziaelas, King of Bithynia, to the *boule* and *demos* of Kos – c.240 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 25

- Βασιλεὺς Βιθυνῶν Ζιαήλας**  
**Κώϊων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δῆ[μ]-**  
**μοι χαίρειν· Διόγειτος Ἀριστό-**  
**λοχος Θεύδοτος οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν**  
 5 **παραγενόμενοι ἡξίου**ν τὸ ἱερὸν  
 τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τὸ ἰδρυμένον πα-  
 ρ' ὑμῖν ἀποδέξασθαι ἄσυλον καὶ  
 τὰ λοιπὰ φιλανθρωπεῖν τῇ τό-  
 λει, καθόπερ καὶ Νικομήδης ὁ  
 10 πατὴρ ἡμῶν εὐνόως διέκει-  
 το τῷ δήμῳ. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάν-  
 των μὲν τῶν ἀφικνουμένω[ν]  
 πρὸς ἡμᾶς Ἑλλήνων τυγχάνο-  
 μεν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιούμε-  
 15 νοι, πεπεισμένοι πρὸς δόξαν οὐ  
 μικρὸν συμβάλλεσθαι τὸ μέρος  
 τοῦτο· πολὺ δὲ μάλιστα τῶν  
 πατρικῶν φίλων διατελοῦ-  
 μεν πολυωροῦντες καὶ ὑμῶν  
 20 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸμ πατέρα <ή>μῶν  
 ὑπάρχουσιν πρὸς τὸν ὑμέτε-  
 ρον δῆμον γνῶσιν, καὶ διὰ τὸ  
 τὸμ βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον  
 οἰκείως διακεῖσθαι τὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς,  
 25 ὄντα ἡμέτερον φίλον καὶ σύμ-  
 μαχον· ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς παρ' ὑμῶν  
 ἀπεσταλμένους φιλοτιμότε-  
 ρον ἀπολογίσασθαι τὴν εὐνοίαν  
 ἣν ἔχετε εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἔν τε τοῖς λοι-  
 30 ποῖς καθ' ὃ ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀξιῶτε, **πειρασό-**  
**μεθα καὶ ἰδίαί ἐκάστωι καὶ κοι-**  
**νῇ πᾶσι φιλανθρωπεῖν καθ' ὅσον**  
**ἡμεῖς δυνατοί ἐσμεν**, καὶ τῶν  
 πλειόντων τὴν θάλασσαν  
 35 ὅσοι ἂν τυγχάνωσιν τῶν ὑμε-  
 τέρων προσβάλλοντες τοῖς  
 τόποις ὧν ἡμεῖς κρατοῦμεν,  
 φροντίζειν ὅπως ἡ ἀσφάλει[α]  
 αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχη· κατὰ ταῦτά [δὲ]  
 40 καὶ οἷς ἂν συμβῇ πταίματός [τι]-  
 νος γενομένου κατὰ πλοῦν  
 προσπεσεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέ[ραν],  
 πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι ἵν[α]

μηδ' ὑφ' ἐνὸς ἀδικῶνται. ἀποδ[εχό]-  
 45 μεθα δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἄσυλον κ[αθό]-  
 περ ὤιεσθε δεῖν, καὶ Διογείτῳ [καὶ]  
 Ἀριστολόχῳ καὶ Θευδότῳ πε[ρὶ]  
 τῶν τούτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλω[ν ὧν]  
 ἡβουλόμεθα ἐντέταλμαι ἀν[αγ]-  
 50 γεῖλαι ὑμῖν. **ἔρρωσθε.**

Inscribed at Kos.

## 21 – Seleukos II (?) to Kos – c.240 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 26 = Rigsby *Asylia* 9

<p>5 [τὰ ν]ομιζόμε[να συνετέ]-          λεσαν καὶ τὰ πε[ρὶ τὰς θύ]-          σίας καὶ τὸν ἀγῶ[να διέ-?]          θηκαν. ἀπό τε τού[των γε]-          νόμενοι ἀπῆντων [ἡμῖν]          καὶ διὰ πλεόνων ὑπέρ [τε]          τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς πόλεω[ς]          διελθόντες ἡξίου[ν] ἀσυ-          λίαν τοῖς ἐπὶ τὰ Ἀσκληπί-          10 εια παραγινομένοις [ . . . . . ]          καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἱερῷ παρ' ἡμῶν          ὑπάρξει. ἡμεῖς δὲ τόν τε          δῆμον ἐπηνούμεν διὰ          τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐ-</p>	<p>15          20       25</p>	<p>σέβειαν καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ τὰ πρὸς          ἡμᾶς φανερὰ ποεῖν καὶ Διό-          γειτον ἀπεδεξάμεθα          διὰ τὸ ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρί-          δος ὁρᾶν πᾶν τὸ βέλτισ-          τον καὶ λέγοντα καὶ πράτ-          τοντα. παραδεχόμεθα          δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν καθό-          τι ὁ δῆμος ἡξίωσε καὶ εἰς          τὸ λοιπὸν δὲ πειρασόμεθα          τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ὄντων ἐν ἡ-          συχίαι μὴ ἀχαριστεῖν ὑμῖν          ἐν τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις.  <b>ἔρρωσθε.</b></p>
--	--	--

Inscribed at Kos. 1.5 Welles and Rigsby have [ἡμῖν], which I have changed to [ἡμῖν]. 1.16 ἡμᾶς, Rigsby; ἡμᾶς, Welles. “3. διέ|θηκαν, Robert, doubtfully; ἀνέθηκαν, Herzog.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 126.

## 22 – Ptolemaios III to Kos – c.240 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 27

<p>5 [ . . . . . ] εἰς τὸν ἄπαγ[τα]          [χρόνον . . ] καὶ ἔφασαν          [χαρίσασθ]αι τῷ δήμῳ          [συγκατ]ασκευάσαντα          [τὴν ἀσ]υλίαν. ἡμεῖς δὲ          [καὶ] διὰ τὸν θεὸν καὶ διὰ          [τὴ]ν πόλιν προσδεδέ-</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>[γ]μ[ε]θα καθάπερ ὤιεσθε          δεῖν καὶ τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμᾶς τασσο-          μένοις παραδώσομεν ἄ-          συλον ἡγεῖσθαι τὸ ἱερὸν          ὥς τοὺς ὄρους τεθείκα-          τε. <b>ἔρρωσθε.</b></p>
--	-----------	---

Inscribed at Kos. “Herzog restores: [ὑπέμνησαν δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἡμετέρου πατρὸς τοῦ ποιησαμένου πρὸς ὑμᾶς φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν εἰς τὸν ἄπαγ[τα χρόνον, ὃν] καὶ ἔφασαν [βοηθῆσ]αι” – Welles, *RCHP*, 128.



**23 – Attalos I (?) to Mylasa – 228-223 BCE?**= Welles *RCHP* 29

]εϛ τῖμῶν ἐμῶν τῶι εἰς πολ[  
 ] ἐσοικίσσαι συνεβούλευσα καὶ χώραν πο[  
 ]ν ὑμῖν προσορίσαι ἐμοὶ πάντα ἐπηγγε[λ  
 ]ος υἱὸς Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ θεοῖς χαριστ[ήριον

Found at (mod.) Milas. “1. Reading based on notes and a photograph sent me (sc. Welles) by L. Robert (cf. n.1).” – Welles, *RCHP*, 134. 1.2. Welles’ edn. has καὶ, which I have accented.

**24 – Prolemaios IV (?) to a provincial governor – Late 3<sup>rd</sup> cen. BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 30

..... NOI, σὲ μὲν οὐκ ἐσχολακέναι οὐδε-  
 μίαν ἐπίσκεψιν ποιήσασθαι, τὴν δὲ πόλιν οὐ με-  
 τρίως κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος θλίβεσθαι. χωρὶς  
 μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀτάκτως κατε-  
 5 σκηνωκότων οὐ μόνον τὴν ἔξω πόλιν ἀλλὰ καὶ  
 τὴν εἴσω κατέχεσθαι, ἣν οὐδ’ ἐπ’ Ἀλεξάνδρου  
 τοῦ βασιλέως οὐδέποτε ἐπισταθμευθῆναι,  
 μάλιστα δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔξω τάξεων ἐνοχλεῖσθαι,  
 τοὺς γὰρ κατέχοντας τὰ πολλὰ τῶν οἰκημάτων  
 10 τούτους εἶναι. οἶμαι μὲν οὖν καὶ παρόντι σοι π[ερὶ]  
 τούτων ἐντολὴν πεποιῆσθαι· οὐ μὴν ἀλ[λ’ εἴ]-  
 περ μὴ γέγονεν, σοὶ κα[θηκο]ν ἦν πᾶσ[αν ἐπιμέ]-  
 [λειαν ποιεῖσθαι - - - - - ]

Found at Mersina. 1.1 The dots ‘.’ each represent marks appearing to be the bottom halves of letters which Welles provided and I was unable to reproduce in this document. In Welles’ *apparatus*, the underlined letters represent those closest to the forms Welles provides (appearing to be the top halves of these letters) which I could not reproduce in this document. “12. At end, restored by *W*; *KΛ/Α*. . . . . *ITΛ/Α* - . . . . ., facsimile.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 137.

**25 – Antiokhos III to the *boule* and *demos* of the Magnetans – c.205 BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 31. cf. Kern *Inscr. Magnesia am Maeander* 18; McCabe *Magnesia* 111

βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μαγνή-  
 των τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῶι δήμῳ χαί-  
 ρειν· Δημοφῶν καὶ Φιλίσκος καὶ Φέ-  
 5 ρης οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν πεμφθέντες πρὸς  
 ἡμᾶς θεωροὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἐπαγγεῖ-  
 λαι τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τᾶλλα ᾧ ἐψήφισ-  
 ται ὁ δῆμος συντελεῖν τῇ ἀρχηγέ-  
 τιδι τῆς πόλεως Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυ-  
 ηνῇ, συμμείξαντες ἐν Ἀντιοχείαι  
 10 τῆς Περσίδος τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδω-  
 καν καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέχθησαν μετὰ σπου-

- δῆς ἀκολούθως τοῖς κατακεχωρισμέ-  
 νοις ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι, παρακαλοῦντες  
 ἀποδέξασθαι στεφανίτην ἰσοπύθιον  
 15 τὸν ἀγῶνα ὃν τίθετε τῇ θεᾷ διὰ πεν-  
 [τ]αετηρίδος. ἔχοντες οὖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς περὶ  
 τοῦ δήμου τὴν φιланθρωποτάτην διάλ[η]-  
 ψιν διὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν ἣν τυγχάνει ἀποδε-  
 20 δειγμένος ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς καιροῖς εἷς τε ἡ-  
 μᾶς καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ βουλόμενοι φρα-  
 νερὰν ποιεῖν τὴν ἐαυτῶν προαίρεσιν ἀπο-  
 δεχόμεθα τὰς ἐψηφισμένας ὑφ' ὑμῶν τ[ι]-  
 μὰς τῇ θεᾷ, πρόκειται τε ἡμῖν συναύξειν  
 25 αὐτοὶ ἐπινοῶμεν· γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ  
 τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τεταγμένοις,  
 ὅπως καὶ αἱ πόλεις ἀκολούθως ἀπο-  
 δέξωνται. **ἔρρωσθε.**

Inscribed at Magnesia. “6. τ[ὰ] ἄλλα, Kern.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 141.

**26 – Antiochos son of Antiochos III to the *boule* and *demos* of the Magnetans – c.205 BCE**

= Welles *RCHP* 32. cf. Kern *Inscr. Magn. am Maeander* 19; McCabe *Magnesia* 112

- βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μαγνήτων  
 τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· Δη-  
 μοφῶν καὶ Φιλίσκος καὶ Φέρης οἱ πα-  
 5 ρ' ὑμῶν πεμφθέντες πρὸς τὸν πατέ-  
 ρα θεωροὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἐπαγγεῖλαι  
 τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ τᾶλλα ἃ ἐψήφισται  
 ὁ δῆμος συντελεῖν διὰ πενταετη-  
 ρίδος τῇ ἀρχηγέτιδι τῆς πόλεως  
 Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυγῇ **ἀπέδωκαν**  
 10 **καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἐμὲ ψήφισμα καὶ διελέχθη-**  
**σαν μετὰ σπουδῆς ἀκολούθως τοῖς**  
**ἐν τούτῳ κατακεχωρισμένοις** παρα-  
 καλοῦντες ἀποδέξασθαι στεφανί-  
 την ἰσοπύθιον τὸν ἀγῶνα ὃν τίθετε τῇ  
 15 θεᾷ. ἔχοντος οὖν τοῦ πατρὸς περὶ  
 τοῦ δήμου τὴν φιλανθρωποτάτην δι-  
 [άλη]ψιν καὶ ταῦτα ἀποδεδεγμένου, θέ-  
 [λων] καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκολουθεῖν τῇ προαιρέ-  
 [σει αὐτ]οῦ, νῦν τε ἀποδέχομαι τὰς ἐψη-  
 20 [φισμένας] ὑφ' ὑμῶν τιμὰς τῇ θεᾷ **καὶ**  
**[τὸ λ]ο[ιπ]ὸν πειράσομαι** κατακολουθῶν  
 [τῇ τοῦ π]α[τρ]ὸς ὑφηγήσει **συναύξειν ὑμῖν**  
 [ἐν οἷς ἂν π]α[ρ]ακαλήτε ἡ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπινοῶ.  
**ἔρρωσθε.**

Inscribed at Magnesia. ll.2-3. Δημοφῶν, Welles; Δημοφῶν, McCabe. ll.19-20. ἐψη[[φισμένα]ς, McCabe; ἐψη[[φισμένα]ς, Welles. l.21. [τὸ λο[ιπ]όν, Welles; [εἰς τὸ λο[ιπ]όν, McCabe. While εἰς τὸ λοιπόν is what we may expect in the Greek, McCabe's restoration (likely to be following Wilhelm) makes the line approx. 3 letters longer than the others, which is almost certainly why Welles rejected it (cf. Welles' *apparatus* at RC p.143). ll.22 [τῇ τοῦ πα[τρ]ός, McCabe; [τῇ τοῦ] πα[τρ]ός. "21. [τὸ λο[ιπ]όν, Dittenberger; [εἰς χρ]ό[ν]ον, Kern. There is hardly room for [εἰς τὸ λο[ιπ]όν (Wilhelm)." – Welles, *RCHP*, 143.

## 27 – Ptolemaios IV to the *demos* of the Magnetans – c.205 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 33, cf. Kern *Inschr. Magn. am Maeander* 23, and McCabe *Magnesia* 114

- [B]ασιλεὺς [Πτολε]μαῖ[ος]  
**Μαγνήτων** [τῇ βουλ]ῇ **καὶ**  
**τῷ δήμῳ** χαίρειν· οἱ **παρ'** ὑ-  
**μῶν ἀποστα**[λέντες] **πρεσβ**[ευ]-  
5 **ταὶ Διοπείθ**[ης . . . . . ]  
**καὶ Ἰθαλίδης** [ . . . . . ]**δῆμο**[υ]  
**τὸ ψήφισμά** [μοι] **ἀπέδωκαν ἐν ᾧ**  
[ . . . . . ] **τῷ** [ . . . . . ]**ων π**[ . . . ]  
[ἀγ]ῶνα τῷ [Λευκοφρυηνῶν κ]ατὰ τὸν  
10 **χρησμὸν τοῦ** [θεοῦ ὃν συν]τελε[ῖτε]  
**τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι** [τῇ Λευκοφρυ]ην[ῇ καὶ]  
**περὶ** [τοῦ] **νομίζειν** τὴν πόλιν κ[αὶ τὴν]  
**χώραν** ἱερὰν κα[ὶ ἄ]συλον· . . . . . **δὲ**  
**καὶ ἐγὼ ἀποδέξασθαι** τὸν ἀγῶνα σ[τε]-  
15 **φανίτην** [ἰσ]οπ[ύθιον ταῖς τιμ]αῖς οἱ-  
[ο]ν ἡμῖν ἐπ[ηγγέλκατε αὐ]τόν· [οἱ δὲ παρ']  
**ὑμῶν ἀπο**[π]εμ[φθέντες καὶ α]ὐτοὶ **διελέ-**  
**χθησαν μετὰ πά**[σης σπ]ουδῆς [καὶ κατὰ]  
**τάλλα ἐν τῷ** ψηφίσματι **περὶ ᾧ** εἶχον  
20 **[τ]ὰς ἐντολὰς**. [ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τόν τε ἀγῶνα]  
**[στ]εφανίτην** καθά[περ ἤξι]ο[ῦτε] **ἀπο-**  
**[δέ]δεγμαι** καὶ τ[ . . . . . 18 . . . . . ]  
[ . . . ]χο[ . . . ]λο[ . . . . . 19 . . . . . ]  
[ . c.5 . ] ὑμᾶς κ[ . . . . . 20 . . . . . ]

l.13. κα[ὶ ἄ]συλον· ἔγνωκα δέ], McCabe (apparently following Kern). "7. μοι, added by *W*. 13. ἔγνωκα δέ, Kern. 18. κατὰ, *W*. 19-21. Restored by *W*." – Welles, *RCHP*, 144.

## 28 – Attalos I to the *boule* of the Magnetans – c.205 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 34, cf. Kern *Inschr. Magn. am Maeander* 22, and McCabe *Magnesia* 113

- βασιλεὺς Ἀτταλός** [Μα]-  
**γνήτων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ** [δή]-  
**μοι χαίρειν**· **Πυθίων καὶ Λυκ**[ο]-  
**μήδης οἱ παρ'** ὑμῶν **ἀνεκόμι-**  
5 **σαν πρὸς με ψήφισμα**, καθ' ὃ **πα**[ρ]α]-  
**καλεῖτε** τὸν ἀγῶνα ὃν τίθετε  
**τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι** τῇ Λευκοφρυην[ῇ]  
**μουσικὸν καὶ γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵπ-**  
**πικὸν ἀποδέξασθαι** στεφανίτ[ην]

- 10 ἰσοπύθιον, καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέχθησ[αν]  
 ἀκολούθως τοῖς γεγραμμένοις·]  
 ἡξίουσαν δὲ καὶ τὰς ὑπ' ἐμὲ πόλεις]  
 ἀποδέξασθαι ὁμοίως· θεωρῶ[ν δὲ]  
 τὸν δῆμον μεμνημένον τῶν [ὑπ' ἐ]-  
 15 μοῦ γεγενημένων εἰς αὐτὸν εὐ[εργε]-  
 σίων καὶ ὁμιλοῦντα ἐμ Μούσαις δει]-  
 νῶς, τὸν τε ἀγῶνα ὥσπερ παρα[καλεῖ]-  
 τε ἀποδέχομαι καὶ ἀπαρχὴν ἐγ[ὼ τε ἔτα]-  
 ξα δοῦναι, καὶ αἱ πόλεις δὲ αἱ π[ειθόμε]-  
 20 ναι ἐμοὶ ποιήσουσιν ὁμοίως· [ἔγραψα]  
 γὰρ αὐταῖς παρακαλῶν, κα[ὶ] . . . . . ]  
 νοῖς δὲ καθ' ὅσον ὁ δῆμος [αἰτεῖται]  
 [συνα]βξήσω τὸν ἀγῶνα [ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] τὴν π[ . . . . . ]

Inscribed at Magnesia. I.1. Ἀτταλος, McCabe; Ἀτταλος, Welles. II.18-19. ἐγ[ὼ προσέτα]ξα; II.21-11 [Περγαμη]νοῖς, McCabe (presumably following Kern). I.21. κα[ὶ], McCabe; κα[ὶ], Welles. “13. δέ, Dittenberger; δ' ἐγώ, Kern. 21. [Περγαμη]νοῖς, Kern.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 145.

## 29 – Kings Theodoros and Amynandros of Athamania to the *boule* and *demos* of Teos – 205-201 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 35

- I Ἀθαμ[άν]ω[ν].  
 [B]ασιλεὺς Θ[ε]οδόωρος [κα]ὶ Ἀμύνανδ[ρο]ς Τ[η]τῶν τῇ βουλῇ [κα]ὶ  
 τ[ῶ]ι δήμῳ  
 χαίρειν· Πυθαγό[ρ]ας κα[ὶ] Κλεῖτος οἱ ἀποσταλέντες πα[ρ'] ὑμῶν  
 π[ρ]ο[ε]σ[τ]-  
 βευταὶ τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκαν [καὶ αὐ]τ[οῖ] δι[ε]λέγησ[αν] πρὸς ἡμᾶς  
 π[ρ]ο[ε]σ[τ]-  
 5 τοῦ συγχωρηθῆναι παρ' ἡμῶν τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἰε[ρ]ᾶν τῷ  
 Διονύσει καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ ἀφορολόγητον· ὧν [δι]ακούσαντες προθύ-  
 μως ἅπαντα τὰ ἀξιούμενα ὑπακηκόαμεν καὶ σ[υ]γχωροῦμεν εἶναι καὶ τὴν  
 πόλιν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἰερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον καὶ ἀφορολόγητον· καὶ τοῦτο  
 πράσσομεν καὶ διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἅπαντας μὲν τοὺς Ἑλλήνας οἰκείως  
 10 ἔχοντες τυγχάνειν, ὑπαρχούσης ἡμῖν συγγενείας πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν  
 ἄρχηγον τῆς κοινῆς προσηγορίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ δι-  
 ἄ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν φιλόστρογον διάληψιν ἔχειν· ἔτι  
 δὲ καὶ μέλλοντες ἅμα καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἡξιωκόσιν τὴν χάριν διδόναι  
 καὶ τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐμένειαν ὡς ὑπολαμβάνομεν περὶ ποιεῖσθαι  
 (Probably one or two lines missing)

- II ]ειν παν[  
 ]ν τῶν πολ[  
 ]ορισμένα τοῖς πα . . [  
 ] ἀκριβεστέραν τὴν [  
 5 I[ ]εἰς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπε-[

] ΙΛΞΙ[ . . ] ἔρρωσθε.

Inscribed at Teos.

**30** – Antiochos III to the governor Anaximbrotes – spring, 204 BCE  
= Welles *RCHP* 36

- [Βασιλε]ὺς Ἀντίοχος Ἀναξ[ι]μβρότῳ χαίρειν·  
[βουλόμεν]οι τῆς ἀδελφῆς βασιλίσσης Λαοδίκῃ[ς]  
[τ]ὰς τιμὰς ἐπὶ πλεῖον αὖξιν καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγ-  
[καίό]τατον ἑαυτοῖς νομίζοντες εἶναι διὰ τὸ  
5 [οὐ μ]όνον ἡμῖν φιλοστόργως καὶ κηδεμονι-  
[κῶς] αὐτὴν συμβιοῦν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θε[ί]-  
[ον εὐ]σεβῶς δια[κ]εῖσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὲν  
[ὅσα] πρ[ι]έπει καὶ δίκαιόν ἐστι παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτῇ  
[ἀπα]γτᾶσθαι δια[τ]ελοῦμεν μετὰ φιλο-  
10 [στρογί]ας ποιοῦντε[ς, κρ]ίνομεν δὲ καθάπερ  
[ἡμ]ῶν [ἀπο]δείχ[ν]υ[ν]ται κατὰ τὴν βασιλεί-  
[αν ἀ]ρχ[ι]ερεῖς, καὶ ταύτης καθίστασθαι  
[ἐν] τοῖς αὐτοῖς τόποις ἀρχιερείας, αἱ φο-  
[ρή]σουσιν στεφάνους χρυσοῦς ἔχοντας  
15 [εἰκόνας] αὐ[τ]ῆς, ἐπιγραφῆσονται δὲ καὶ ἐν  
[τοῖς] συναλλάγμασι μετὰ τοὺς τῶν  
[Προγόν]ων καὶ ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεῖς· ἐπεὶ οὖν  
[ἀποδ]έδεικται ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ σὲ τόποις  
[Βερ]ενίχῃ, ἡ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου  
20 τῷ [ . . . ]οντος, ἡμῖν κατὰ συγγένειαν θυγατὴ[ρ],  
συντελείσθω πάντα τοῖς προγεγραμμέ-  
νοις ἀ[κο]λούθως, καὶ τὰ ἀντίγραφα τῶν  
ἐπιστολῶν ἀναγραφέντα εἰς στήλας  
ἀνατεθήτω ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις  
25 τόποις, ὅπως νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν  
πᾶσιν φανερὰ γίνηται ἡ ἡμετέρα καὶ ἐν τού-  
[τοις] πρὸς τὴν ἀδελφὴν π[ρ]οαίρεσις.

Found at (mod.) Eriza (Caria) “9. [ἀπα]γτᾶσθαι, *W*; [ἀεὶ ? ὑ]πάρξει, Holleax. 11. [ἡμ]ῶν  
[ἀπο]δείχ[ν]υ[ν]ται, *W*; [ἡμῶν - - - ]υγ[ ], Holl. 17. [προγόν]ων, *W*; [τε θε]ῶν, Holl. 20. <τοῦ>  
[προσήκο]ντος, Holl.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 158.

**31** – Covering letter of the governor Anaximbrotes to the hyparch Dionytas –  
spring, 204 BCE  
= Welles *RCHP* 37

[Ἀναξίμ]βροτος Διονυτᾷ χαίρειν· τοῦ γρα-  
[φέν]τος παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως προστάγματος  
[περὶ] τοῦ ἀποδεδείχθαι τῆς βασιλέσσης  
[ἀ]ρχιέρειαν τῶν ἐν τῇ σατραπείᾳ Βερενίχῃ

- 5 **τὴν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λυσιμάχου θυγατέρα**  
κατακεχώρισται τὸ ἀντίγραφον. ἐπακολουθῶν  
οὖν τοῖς ἐπεσταλμέν[ο]ις συντέλει καθ' ἃ  
[ο]ῖται δεῖν, ἵνα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀντίγραφα ἀναγρα-  
φέντα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην ἀνατεθῇ ἐν τῷ  
10 ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τόπῳ π[ρο]νοήθητι  
**ἔρρωσο. ηρ', Ἀρτεμισίου ιθ'.**

Found at (mod.) Eriza (Caria).

### 32 – Antiochos III to Amyzon – May 24, 203 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 38

- [Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Ἀμυζονέων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ **χαίρειν**· ἡμεῖς  
καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μὲν πάντας  
[διατελοῦμεν εὐεργετοῦντες (?) - - - - - ὅσοι αὐτοὺς πιστεύσαντες ἡμῖν  
ἐνεχέρισαν τὴν πᾶσαν αὐ-  
[τῶν πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι (?) - - - - - πρὸς] τὸ μένοντας ἐπὶ τῶν ιδίων ἐν τῇ  
πάσῃ ἐνα{ν}-  
[ναστρέφεσθαι (?) - - - - - οὐχ ἥκιστα] δὲ πρόκειται ἡμῖν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν  
φροντίζειν  
5 [συνδιαφυλάσσουσι τὰ φιλόφροντα - - - - - τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν τὰ τε ἄλλα ἃ  
καὶ ἐν τῇ Πτολεμαίου  
[συμμαχίᾳ ὑπῆρχεν καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν (?). καλῶς οὖν] ποήσετε ὄντες  
εὐθυμοὶ καὶ γινόμενοι πρὸς τῷ  
[ἐπιμελεῖσθαι (?) - - - - - ] τῶν ιδίων· διαφυλάσσουσι γὰρ ὑμῖν  
τὴν εἰς τ<οὺ>ς  
[θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς πίστιν εἰκὸς π]αρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ'  
ἡμῶν πάντα συγκατασκευ-  
[ασθήσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς - - - - - κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκο<ν>τα.  
γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ  
10 [ - - - - - ὅπ]ως ἀντιλαμβάνωνταί τε ὑμῶν  
[ - - - - - καὶ μηθεὶς ἐπιτρέπωσιν ἐ]νοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς. **ἔρρωσθε. θρ',**  
**Δα<ι>σίου ιε'.**

Found at Amyzon. Welles includes an edition of this inscription by Wilhelm alongside his own, which I have not included here.

### 33 – Antiochos III to generals, cavalry officers, infantry officers, soldiers, and rest – c.203 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 39

**Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος στρατηγοῖς,  
ἱπάρχαις, πεζῶν ἡγεμόσι, στρα-  
{στρα}τιώταις, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις,**

- χαίρειν· τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλω-  
 5 [νος καὶ τῆς Ἀρτ]έμιδος τὸ ἐν

Found at Amyzon.

**34 – A letter to the *polis* Amyzon – end of 3<sup>rd</sup> cen. BCE**  
 = Welles *RCHP* 40

“The stone bearing this inscription (*sic*, sc. inscription) was found, early in the nineteenth century, by W.J. Hamilton near the ruins of Amyzon, and later re-examined by Leake. He reported it as very badly preserved, with a script of ‘about the time of the first wars of the Romans in Asia.’ The shape of one letter only was recorded (Intro., III, 1 A)...No transcription of this text has come down to us. Hamilton’s copy was never published, and Leake has recorded only a few phrases which he was able to recognize. There are five of these, take it seems at random from different parts of the inscription.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 171 (preceding *RCHP* 40).

- Ἀμυζονέων χαίρειν  
 τὸ ἱερὸν ἄστυλον  
 βασιλέως εὖνοϊαν  
 καὶ μηθενὶ ἐνοχλεῖν ὑμᾶς  
 5 ἔρρωσθε

Found near Amyzon.

**35 – Antiokhos III to Seleukia-Tralles – pre 201 BCE?**  
 = Welles *RCHP* 41

- [Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Σελευκέων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμ]οι χαίρειν·  
 Ἀριστέα[ς . . . . .]  
 [ - - - 14 - - οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὸ ψήφισμα] α ὃ ἐγγεγράφειτε ὑμεῖς .  
 . . . ]  
 [καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγησαν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσ]ματι γεγραμμένοις  
 [ἄξιον]-  
 [τες - - - - κατὰ τοὺς ἐπὶ - - - - - Ἀντιό]χου περιορισμοὺς [ . . . . .]  
 5 [ - - - - - 43 - - - - - ]ομένων δεκάτην ἀ[φεῖναι?]  
 [ - - 10 - - καὶ ἡμεῖς βουλόμενοι διὰ τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ] δι’ ὑμᾶς ποιεῖν πάντ[α  
 τὰ συμ]-  
 [φέροντα ὑμῖν - - - - - 29 - - - - - ἐν Ἀ]πολλωνία σὺν τοῖς [ . . . . .]  
 [ - - 10 - - ἀφήκαμεν? ὑμῖν τὴν ἀποτελουμένην εἰς τὸ] βασιλικὸν δεκάτην  
 τῶ[ν . . . ]  
 [ - - - 26 - - - - - γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ Θε]μιστοκλεῖ τῷ στρατηγ[ῶι ὅ]-  
 10 [πως - - - - 23 - - - - - φροντίζηι περὶ τῶν π]ρογεγραμμένων κα[ὶ . . . . .]

Found near (mod.) Aydin. “1-3. Restoration substantially as outlined by Haussoullier. 2. ΛΟ, fascimile (*sic*), ψήφισμα] α ὃ, Holleaux. ΨΠΕ, fascimile (*sic*); ὑπέ[ρ, Sterrett. 9. Restored by Haus. Other restorations by W.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 173.

**36 – Antiokhos III (?) to the city of Ilion – early 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 42

τε πρὸς τὸ σ[υ]γκατασκε[υά]σασθαι πάν]-  
 τα τὰ πρὸς ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ εὖνοιαν ἀνή]-  
 κοντα· πειρασόμεθα γὰρ οὐ μόνον τὰ δι]-  
 ἅ προγόνων προϋπηργμ[ένα] πρὸς τὸν δῆ]-  
 5 μον συντηρεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἵνα τῶν πρὸς]  
 δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἀνηκ[όντων] μηθενὸς]  
 ὕστερῃτε ποιεῖσθαι τ[ὴν] πᾶσαν πρόνοι]-  
 [αν] καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἐκ[άστου] . . . . . ]  
 [συγχω]ροῦμεν δὲ καὶ τα [ - - - - - ]

Found at (mod.) Çiblak (near Troy). “1. [ἐτοιμῶς ἔχομεν - - - ] τε, Brückner. 2. εὖνοιαν, *W*; καταλογὴν, Br. 6. μηθενός, *W*; cf. *SIG* 685 (Magnesia, 139 B.C.), 30/31: χάριν τοῦ μηθενὸς ὕστερῃσαι δικαίου μηθένα τῶν κρινομένων. ἐν μηδενί, Br. 7. πᾶσαν, *W*; μεγίστην, Br. 9. [συγχω]ροῦμεν, *W*.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 176.

**37 – Antiokhos III to a governor – October 12, 189 BCE**= Welles *RCHP* 44

[ - - - - - ἄ]-  
 δελφῶι γεγεννημένον ἐν τιμ[ῇ] καὶ πίσ[τει] καὶ  
 τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰ πράγματ[α] αἰρέσεως πολ]-  
 λὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀποδε[ίξ]εις πεποιημένον  
 ἐκτενῶς, καὶ οὔτε τῆς ψυχῆς οὔτε τῶν ὑπαρ]-  
 5 χόντων πεφεισμένον εἰς τὰ ἡμῖν συμφέροντα,  
 διεξαγηχότα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐγκειρισθέντα αὐτῶι  
 ὥς ἦν προσήκον, καὶ κατὰ τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγόμενον ἁ]-  
 ξίως τῶν προϋπηργμ[ένων] ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ πρά]-  
 10 γματα, ἡβουλόμεθα μὲν ἔτι ἐπισυνέχειν συ[μ]-  
 πράσσοντα ἡμῖν· πολλάκι δὲ αὐτοῦ προφερο-  
 μένου τὴν περὶ τὸ σῶμα γεγεννημένην ἀσθέ-  
 νειαν διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς κακοπαθίας, ἀξιοῦν-  
 τός τε ἡμᾶς ἐᾶσαι αὐτὸν ἐφ’ ἡσυχίας γενέσ-  
 15 θαι ὅπως τὸν ἐπίλοιπον χρόνον τοῦ βίου ἀπε-  
 ρισπᾶστως ἐν εὐσταθείᾳ τοῦ σώματος γέ-  
 [ν]ηται, συμπεριηνέχθημεν θέλοντες καὶ ἐν  
 [τ]ούτοις φανερὰν ποιεῖν ἣν ἔχομεν πρὸς]  
 [α]ὐτὸν αἵρεσιν. ἵνα μὲν οὖν καὶ εἰς τὸ λο[ι]-  
 [π]ὸν τυγχάνῃ πάντων τῶν εἰς τιμὴν κα[ὶ]  
 20 [δ]όξαν ἀνηκόντων ἡμῖν ἔσται ἐπιμελέ[ς],  
 [ἐ]πειδὴ, τις ἀρχιερωσύνης τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος  
 [καὶ] τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῶν Δαιττῶν καὶ τῶν  
 ἄλλων ἱερῶν ὧν τὰ τεμένη ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς  
 25 Δάφνης προσδεομένης ἀνδρὸς φίλου, δ[υ]-  
 νησομένου δὲ προστῆναι ἀξίως τῆς ὑ-  
 πὲρ τοῦ τόπου σπουδῆς ἣν ἔσχον οἱ τε πρό-



- γονοι καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ τῆς ἐξ ἡμῶν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον  
 εὐσεβείας, ἀποδεδείχαμεν αὐτὸν ἀρχι-  
 ερέα τούτων πεπεισμένοι τὴν περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ  
 30 ἐξαγωγήν μάλιστ' ἂν διὰ τούτου συν-  
 τελεσθήσεσθαι δεόντως. σύνταξον  
 ἔν τε τοῖς χρηματισμοῖς καταχωρίζειν  
 αὐτὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν δεδηλωμένων ἱερῶν  
 καὶ προτιμᾶν τὸν ἄνδρα ἀξίως τῆς ἡμε-  
 35 τέρας κρίσεως, καὶ ἐὰν εἷς τινα παρακαλῇ[ι]  
 τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς ταῦτα, συνεπιλαμ-  
 βάνεσθαι τοὺς τε πρὸς τοῖς ἱεροῖς γινομέ-  
 νους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους οὓς καθήκει πε[ι]-  
 θαρχεῖν αὐτοῦ – συστήσαι παραγγείλαν-  
 40 τας ὑπακούειν περὶ ὧν ἂν γράφηι ἢ συντά[σ]-  
 σι – ἀναγραφῆναι δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς  
 τὸ ἀντίγραφον εἰς στήλας καὶ ἀναθεῖναι[ι]  
 ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις τόποις.  
 δκρ', Δίου ιδ'.

Found at Daphne. “2. αἰρέσεως, *W.* [δ]ια[θ]έ[ε]ς[ε]ω[ς], Waddington; [σ]αφες[τάτα]ς, Hadley. 9. ἔτ[ι] συνέχειν, Dittenberger; ἔτ[η], Waddington; ἔτε[ι], Hadley. 10 πολλά · [ἀ]λ[λ’], Ditt.; πολλα. *ΙΛ.ΑΥΤΟΥ*, Hadley. 14. At end, *ΛΓ*, Hadley; [ἀδία]σπάστως, Ditt. 31. 31. σύνταξον [οὖν] Ditt. 23. ἐπ[ὶ] Δάφνης, editors.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 181.

### 38 – Seleukos IV to the arkhons and *polis* of Seleukia in Pieria – 186 BCE = Welles *RCHP* 45

- Decree Θεοφίλου ἐπιστάτου καὶ ἀρχόντων γνώμη. κτλ.  
 ...  
 Letter **Βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος Θεοφίλῳ καὶ Σελευκέων**  
**τῶν ἐμ Πιερίαι τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν·**  
 Ἀριστόλοχον τῶν τιμωμένων φίλων παρειασχημέ-  
 νον τὰς χρείας μετὰ πάσης εὐνοίας τῷ τε πατρί  
 5 ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαι-  
 οτάτοις καιροῖς πεποιημένον ἀποδείξεις ἐκτε-  
 νεῖς τῆς πρὸς τὰ πράγματα αἰρέσεως, καὶ κατὰ τὰ  
 λοιπὰ μὲν προμηθεύμεθα ἀξίως ἥς προσφέρεται  
 [εὐνοί]ας, καὶ εἰκόνι δὲ χαλκῇ ἐστεφανώσαμεν  
 10 [αὐτὸν . . . . . ] ἣν βουλόμεθα σταθῆναι παρ’ ὑ-  
 [μῖν - - - - - ]. ς εἰς αὐτὴν ὥς

Found at Seleukia in Pieria.

= Welles *RCHP* 46. cf. Hiller von Gaertingen *Inscr. Priene* 27; McCabe *Priene* 34

A. Letter

ἀποτ]ξίσῃ πρὸς τὸ [δημόσιον (or βασιλικόν)  
] ὑπ' ἐκείνων καὶ μ[  
ὥρισμέ]νῃ προθεσμίᾳ[ι  
Ἀ]λγίμου, Ἀντ[  
5 ]ας Ἐπινίκο[υ  
]ΝΙΑ[

B.	[ - - - - - ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας γέ]γραπφα τὴν ἐπιστολὴν [ - - - - - ἐν ἡμέρ]αῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι. <b>ἔρρωσθε.</b>
Judgement of Smyrna	[κατὰ τὰδε Μιλησίοις καὶ Πρι]ηνεῦσιν ὅρια στησάτωσαν [οἱ ὀρισταί, καθὼς ἔκρινεν ὁ Σμ]υρναίων δῆμος ἐν αὐτοῖς
5	[τοῖς τόποις, παρόντων μαρτύρ]ων παρὰ τε Μιλησίων καὶ Πριη- [νέων, ὅπως ἂν - - - - - ]ει προνοηθῇ, ἵν' ἕκαστα πραχθῇ [κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σμυρναίων δ]ήμου κρίσιν· κτλ.

C γέγ]ραπ[ται  
          ]ΟΙΤΑΠΡΟ[  
          ]ΡΣ[

Inscribed at Priene. “A.1. δημόσιον, κτλ., *W.* 6. ΝΙΛ; the traces can seem reasonably sure. B.1. ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας, Robert (*Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LIII, 1929, 156 n.2). 6. εἰ; the ε is represented only by the end of the upper cross-stroke. For other restorations, see notes of Hiller, *ad loc.*” – Welles, *RCHP*, 189.

**40** – Attalos, brother of Eumenes II, about the *katoikoi* of Apollo Tarsenus – February 6, 185 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 47

Letter **Ἄτταλος** [ . . . . . ] **χαίρειν**. ἀνεδώκαμ ἡμῖν  
[ἀξίωμα . . . . . ὁ ἀρχ]ιερεὺς τοῦ Ταρσηνοῦ  
[Ἀπόλλωνος] καὶ οἱ συμπορευόμενοι τῆς γινομέ-  
νης . . . . . κά[τοικοι] δ[ί]και' ἀξιούντες,  
5 [καὶ ἡμεῖς δεδώκαμ]εν αὐτοῖς ἀτέλειαν προβά-  
[των ὥστε μηκέτι τελ]εῖν [τ]ῇν ἀπὸ τούτων προσ-  
[δεομένην (?) δεκάτην·] βούλονται δὲ τὰ συγχωρη-  
[θέντα . . . . . ἀνα]γραφῆναι εἰς στήλην  
[λιθένην. σύνταξον οὖν ἀνατ]εθῆναι αὐτὴν ὑπὸ  
10 [ . . . . . εἰς τὸ ἱερ]ὸν καὶ ἀναγραφέντων  
[ - - - - - 17 - - - - ] ὑπὲρ τούτων πεμφθῆναι  
[ - - - - 12 - - - - - ] ΣΑΝΙΤΡΟΝΙ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γενέ-  
[σθαι - - - - ] **ἔρρωσο.**  
ιβ', Δύστου ιϛ' .  
15 Μένανδρος ἐκ Περγάμ[ου].

Found at Soma. "2-4. Restored by Schuchhardt; ἄξιωμα (1.2) added by *W*. 5. [καὶ ἡμεῖς δεδώκαμ]εν, *W*; [ - - - ὑπάρχ]ειν, Sch., but his facsimile gives ]EN. 6. [ὥστε μηκέτι τελ]εῖν [τ]ήν, *W*; [καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοὺς

ἀποτ[ίν]ειν, Sch. 7. Restored by W. 9. [ἀνατ]εθῆναι, Sch. (ΣΘΗΝΑΙ in the facsimile); otherwise restored by W. 10. [εἰς τὸ ἱερ]όν, W.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 190.

## Following Document

Document? [ - - - - - 29 - - - - - ] ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ οἱ μ[ε]-  
Possibly a [τ’ αὐτοῦ συμπορευόμενοι κάτοικοι τ]οῦ Ταρσηνοῦ [Ἀπόλ]λων[ος]  
Letter? \* [ - - - - - 30 - - - - - ] ΠΠΟΥΕΚΛΛΦΙΟ  
[ἀξίωμα ἀπέδωκαν ἀξιοῦντες ἀτέλει]αν καὶ προβάτων  
5 [καὶ - - - - - 12 - - - - - Ἄτταλ]ος ἔδωκεν  
[ - - - - - 28 - - - - - ] ταῦτα ἐν στήλῃ συγ-  
[αναγγραφέντα (?) - - - - - 14 - - - - - ἀνατέ]θεικεν ΟΦΑΛ  
[ - - - - - 10 - - - - - καλῶς οὖν ποιήσετε (?) ] προσεμφανίζοντε[ς]  
[ἐν ταῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς . . . . . σωτ]ηρί[ας] ἐπιτελουμέναις θυ-  
10 [σίαις ἦν ἔχετε εὐνοίαν τοῖς σ]υνάξιν τ[ὰς προσ]όδοις  
[καὶ τὰ τίμια τοῦ θεοῦ φιλοτιμουμένοις - - - - - ]

\*“The letter (47 above – CJH) was followed by ten lines of a document dealing with the same subject. Its character is obscure. From its position on the stele it would be most naturally a decree of the *catoeci* praising the royal family for the grant;... On the other hand, the remains suggest, as Robert has noted, a *letter* of some sort, though it is hard to think of the ordinary type of covering letter, which, in any case, regularly precedes its inclosure when published on stone (cf. 13, 19, 37).” – Welles *RC* p.191 (my emphasis). I have not reproduced the apparatus for this document, found at Welles, *RCHP*, 192.

41 – Eumenes II to the *boule* of Temnus – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE\*

= Welles *RCHP* 48, cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon*, I 157

A ἐπὶ πρυτάνιος Ἡρακλείδου τοῦ Ἑρμαγόρου, μη[νὸς . . . . . ]  
Letter βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης Τημνιτῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τ[ῷ] δήμῳ χαίρειν . . . . . ]  
[Ἀ]πολλᾶς, Θεόδωρος, Ἀθήναιος, - - - - - 32 - - - - - ]  
[οὓς] ἀπεστάλκετε πρ[ε]σβ[ευτὰς] πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀπέδωκαν τὸ παρ’ ὑμῶν  
ψήφισμα]  
5 [καλὸν καὶ ἐκ]τε[νὲς ἐν ᾧ πρῶτον μὲν ἐνεφανίσατε τὰ πρότερον δεδομένα  
τῇ πόλει φιλαν[θρωπα] ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν προγόνων - - - - - 16 - - - - - καὶ]  
τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὐ[χαριστίαν] - - - - - 33 - - - - - ]  
συντάξαντα α[ - - - - - 44 - - - - - ]  
ἐν οἷς δυνατῶ[ - - - - - 15 - - - - - καὶ παρεκαλέσατε ἐμὲ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν]  
10 παρ[αίτιον] ἔσ[εσθαι] ἀγατοῦ τινος - - - - - 28 - - - - - ]  
[ . . . ] κομιεῖ[σθε] - - - - - 43 - - - - - ]  
  
B [πρ]οειρημ[ C λειο  
[ . . ]ς περὶ αυ[ ντε διατελο  
[ . . ]τε τῶν δε[ ειτο σπεύδων  
δώσετε τ[ μων συγ  
5 τοι εἰς φυ[ 5 γαρ  
συνχωρ[  
νωντω[  
πόλιν φ[  
καὶ εγ[  
10 φας τ[  
διχω[

πρ[

- D [ - - - - - 27 - - - - - ] ως καὶ . . [ - - - - 12 - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 25 - - - - - πε]πραμένης χ[ώρας . . . . . ]  
 [ - - - - - 26 - - - - - μ]έρη τῆς δεκ[άτης . . . . . ]  
 [ - - - - - 18 - - - - - εἰς τὴν διο]ίκησιν τῆ[ς π]όλεως καὶ [ . . . . . ]
- 5 [ - - - - - 27 - - - - - ]υργ[ . . . . . ]ι κατὰ πόλιν σ[ . . . . . ]  
 [ - - - - - 35 - - - - - ]το ταῖς ἄλλ[αις - - 7 - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 27 - - - - - ἀποδείκν]υνται τατ[ - - 10 - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 14 - - - - ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφ]ίσματ[ι κατακεχωρισ]-  
 [μένοις - - - - - ]
- 10 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 25 - - - - - δί]δωμι δὲ καὶ - - - - 18 - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 18 - - - - τὰ ἀπ' αὐτ]ῆς χρήματα [- - - - 19 - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - 23 - - - - - μ]έρος δώσετ[ε εἰς . . . . . ]σιν τῷ ἐπ-
- 15 [ - - - - - 18 - - - - - μηνὶ (?) δ]εκάτῳ κατ' ἐνια[υτὸν τὸ] ἐπιβάλλον, τὸ δὲ  
 [ - - - - - 21 - - - - - ]τω τασσόμενο[ι κατ' ἐνια]υτὸν τὸ καθήκον  
 [ - - - - - 20 - - - - ] . μοι τὴν Βωμίτιν [ . . . . . ]σιν ὑμῖν κοινοὶ πρὸς  
 [ - - - - - 17 - - - - - καὶ] ἡ καταμέτρησις [δὲ τῆς] χώρας ὅπως γένη-  
 [ται τὴν ταχίστην - - γέγραφα] τῷ Πύρρῳ περὶ τε τῷ γ' μετὰ τῶν παρ' ὑ-
- 20 [μῶν πρεσβευτῶν ὁμολογηθέντων τῶν εἰς τ]ὴν παραλη[ψιν συν]εργούντων  
 ὥς συμ-  
 [φέρει τῷ δήμῳ καὶ περὶ - - - - - ]ιας[ - - - - κ]αὶ τῇ πόλει τὸ πλη-  
 [ - - - - - ] τὰ συ]γκεχωρημένα τῇ  
 [πόλει - - - - - ] ἐ]πεύξεται διὰ τὴν εὖ-  
 [νοιαν - - - - - ] ὥς παρε]κάλουσιν ἀναγρ-
- 25 [ - - - - - ] στ]ήλας ἀναθεῖναι  
 [ - - - - - ] καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ  
 [ - - - - - ] ἔρρ[ω]σθε].

\*Since Welles does not offer a date, this date is my inference from the date given on PHI Online—197-159BCE—presumably from Fränkel. Like in 46 (below) it seems clear that the inscription was dated by the reign of Eumenes II, who reigned 197-159BCE. Found at Pergamon. “Restorations by *W.* D 25-27. [ψαμένους δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς τὸ δόγμα τόδε εἰς . . . . . στ]ήλας ἀναθεῖναι [ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερῷ καὶ ἐν Περγᾶμῳ ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ [ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος - - - - -], Fränkel.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 195.

## 42 – Eumenes II to a Carian *polis* – spring, 182 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 49

- Letter [βουλόμενοι δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς μ]ετ[έ]χιν τῶν θυσιῶν καὶ [τῶν ἀγώνων πεπόμενα]-  
 [μεν θεωροὺς Μ]έγωνά τε τῶν φίλων Ἐφέσιον, ἐν τιμῇ [τῇ πρώτῃ ὄντα, ὁ]-  
 [μοίως δ]ὲ καὶ Κάλαν Περγαμηνόν, κρινόμεν καὶ ὑφ' ἡ[μῶν μὲν ἄξιον, ὥς δὲ  
 πολί]-  
 [την] τετευχότα κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν τῶν προσηκόντων, καὶ προκεχειρισμέ]-  
 5 [νον] ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως διὰ τὸ καταγγέλειν μεθ' ἡμῶν τ[αῦτα. καλῶς οὖν]  
 [πο]ιήσετε πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὴν θεόν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ δι' ἡ[μᾶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν τε φι]-  
 [λοφρόγως διακούσαντες καὶ ἀποδεξάμενοι τά τε Ν]ικηφόρια καὶ τὴν  
 ἀσυλίαν.]

- [τ]αῦτα γὰρ πράξαντες τὰ μὲν ἐκήνης τίμια φανεῖσ[θε συναύξοντες, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν]
- [ἡμᾶς] ὥς ἐνδέχεται μάλιστα προθύμους ἔξετε κατὰ τ[ὸ δυνατὸν εἰς πάν]-
- 10     τα τὰ συμφέροντα τῷ δήμῳ. τὰ δὲ πλείονα περὶ τούτων ἀκο[ύσετε παρ'] αὐτῶν].
- ἔρρωσθε.** ἀπέδωκεν Μέγων Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἔκτηι.
- Decree   Ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Διογένου, Ἀνθεστηριῶν[ος ἔκτηι ἱσταμένου.]
- [ἔ]δοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· κτλ.

Inscribed at (a certain *polis* in?) Caria. Letter: “Losses on the left may be accurately measured. Losses on the right average 14-17 letters, with the lacuna about 4 letters greater in ll.6/7. 1-5. Restored by *W*. The first letter in l.3 must either be E or Σ. Lambrino’s restorations: A. .Ξ A. .ΩIN; [ – – ἐπέμψαμεν | οὖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς M]έγωνα; [τῇ πρώτῃ παρ’ ἡμῶν ὄντα]; ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν τιμῶν; [ν οἱ ἀπεδείχθησαν]; τ[ὰς θυσίας]. Herzog’s restorations: [ – – τὴν ἀνανέω]σιν; [πεπόμφαμεν θεω]ροὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς M]; [τῇ πρώτῃ τεταγμένον] παρ’ ἡμῶν; ἡμῶν μὲν, φιλότιμον δὲ πολίτην; [ν, προκεχειρισμένον δὲ] καί; τ[ὰ Νικηφόρια]. 6. τῶν ἀνδρῶν, H; τούτων, L.8/9. Restoration by *W*; μεθ’ ἡμῶν συναύξοντες, | ἡμᾶς δέ, L; συναύξοντες, ἡμᾶς δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν (?), H. 9. τ[ὸ δυνατὸν], L; τ[ὴν δύναμιν], Robert; π[άντα καιρὸν], H.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 198.

### 43 – Eumenes II to Kos – spring, 182 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 50

- Letter   [ - - - - - καὶ νῦν διεγνωκότες στεφανί]-
- [τας τ]οὺς ἀγῶνα[ς τῶν Νικηφορίων συντελεῖν σὺν]
- [ἄπα]σι τοῖς ἐκτενεσ[τάτοις ἡμῖν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐπι]-
- [τευ]γμάτων μεγάλω[ν κατὰ τοὺς πολέμους γεγονότων,]
- 5     πεπόμφαμεν θεωρ[οὺς πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸν δεῖνα Μάγνη]-
- τα τυγχάνοντα παρ’ ἡμῖν τιμῆς τε τῆς πρώτης καὶ προ]-
- εδρίας δι<α> τὴν καλοκ[αγαθίαν καὶ τὸν δεῖνα     ]
- Μυριναῖον καὶ Μέγωνα [Ἐφέσιον τῶν φίλων τῶν προ]-
- τιμωμένων παρ’ ἡμῖν [καὶ τὸν δεῖνα καὶ Κάλαν Περγα]-
- μηνοὺς καὶ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν με[ν κρινομένους ἀξίους, ὥς]
- 10     δὲ πολίταις τετευχ[ότας κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν τῶν προση]-
- κόντων, προκεχειρισ[μένους δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως]
- διὰ τὸ καταγγέλε[ιν μεθ’ ἡμῶν τὰ Νικηφόρια. καλῶς]
- οὖν ποιήσετε πρῶ[τομ μὲν διὰ τὴν θεόν, ἔπειτα δὲ]
- καὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀνδ[ρῶν τε φιλοφρόνως διακούσαν]-
- 15     τες καὶ ἀποδεξάμεν[οι τά τε Νικηφόρια καὶ τὴν ἀσυλίαν, ὥς]-
- περ ὑμῖν ἀρμόζει· ταῦτ[α γὰρ πράξαντες τὰ μὲν ἐκείνης τί]-
- μια φανεῖσθε συναύξ[οντες, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀκολούθως τῇ]
- παρ’ ἡμῶν ὑπαρχούση[ι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ὑμῶν εὐνοίαι]
- ὥς ἐνδέχεται μάλισ[τα προθύμους ἔξετε τὸ λοιπὸν κατὰ]
- 20     πάντα καιρὸν πρὸς τ[ὰ συμφέροντα ὑμῖν. τὰ δὲ πλείονα]
- περὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος [ἀκούσετε παρ’ αὐτῶν τῶν θεω]-
- ρῶν. **ἔρρωσθε.**
- Decree   [Ἐδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δάμῳ·]
- γνώμα προστατᾶν· [ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης ἀπέσταλκε]
- θεωροὺς [ - - - - - ]

Found at Kos. Letter: “1-3. Restorations by *W. Herzog*: [καὶ τ]ρὸς ἀγῶνα[ς ? – – – | . . . ] – ι τοῖς ἐκτενε[τάτοις – – τετευχότες ἐπι?]τευ[μάτων μεγάλω]ν τὴν ἀνανέωσιν τῶν θυσιῶν καί[?]. 9. κρινομένους ἀξίους, ὥς, restored by *W*; κρινομένους, φιλοτίμους, H.21. ἀκούσετε, *W*, ἀκούσεσθε, H. Other restorations by H.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 203.

#### 44 – An Attalid King to Military Cleruchs – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 51, cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, 158

A [ - - - - - ]μενο . ΚΑΡΑΙ [ . . . . ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ΕΛΕΙΤΕ τά τε καταμε[τ]-  
 [ρηθέντα - - - - - ]ων ψιλῆς πλέθρα  
 [ - - - - - ]Ι πρότ[ε]ρο[ν . . . ]  
 5 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]  
 B [ - - - - - ]ΙΥ . . . ΙΝΥΠ[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - 14 - - - - τοῖς τὸ ἀξίωμα ὑμῶ]ν ἀναδεδωκόσ[ιν - - 10 - -]  
 10 [ - - - - - ]στρατευσ[?]ένοις τοὺς κλήρους ψιλῆς πλ[έ]-  
 [θρα ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι πέντε, ἀμπέλω]γ δεκα δύο ἡμίπλεθρον τὰ μεγ-  
 [ιστα - - - - - ]το]ὺς τοιούτους οὐ βουληθέντας ἐν  
 [τῇ πόλει τῶν στέγων? ]εν τοῖς πλείοσι κοινωνεῖν, τῶν δὲ ἄλ-  
 [λων τοῖς ἐστεγνοποιημέ]νοις ἐν τῇ πόλει ψιλῆς πλέθρα ἑκατόν,  
 15 ἀμπέλων π[λέθρα δέκα, τῶν] δὲ μήπω ἐστεγνοποιημένων ἐκά-  
 στῶι ψιλῆς [πλέθρα πεντήκ]οντα, ἀμπέλων πέντε, τελοῦσιν ἐκ  
 τούτων εἰ[κοστήν, ἐκ δὲ το]ῦ τε σίτου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν καρπῶν δεκά-  
 την. τῶ[ν δὲ ἀμπέλων? κα]ὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐγγαίων ὧν ἀπέδοτο Δη-  
 μαρχ[ος ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν, ἐὰν δὲ κ]αί τινες ἄλλοι τῶν τὰ βασιλικὰ πραγματευ-  
 20 [ομένων ἄλλους ἐγγαίους μετὰ] ταῦτα πωλῶσιν, ἔσονται αἱ τε κτήσεις κύ-  
 [ριαι - - - - - ]κατὰ τὰ συγχωρη]θέντα ἐκάστοις, εἰς δὲ τὰ τεμένη τὰ εἰς  
 [τὴν τῶν θεῶν θεραπείαν ἃ προσετ]ετάχεν πρότερον Δημάρχῳ παραδει-  
 [ξαι - - - - - ] καὶ τὴν ἀτέλην αὐτῶν ἐπεχώρησα  
 [ὑμῖν . . . . . ] καὶ τῶν ἐγγαίων] ὧν ἔδωκα τοῖς νέοις εἰς τὸ ἔλαιον.  
 25 [συνεχώρησα δὲ ὑμῖν καὶ ὅτι αἱ κλ]ηρονομίαι τῶν ἀτέκνων φαίνον-  
 [ται? κύριαι ἀποτελεσάντων ὅσα τελέ]σματα εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν καθή-  
 [κει - - - - - 29 - - - - - ] ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ ἐν τού-  
 [τοις - - - - - 30 - - - - - ] αὐτας ὑμῖν καὶ ἀτέλειαν  
 [ - - - - - 31 - - - - - ] τῶν μισθοφόρων τοῦ ἐν  
 30 [ . . . . . φρουρίου - - - - - ] ξητε ἐπωνύμους ὧν  
 [ - - - - - 35 - - - - - ] Ι ἀναγράψαντας εἰς στή-  
 [λας δύο ἀναστήσαι τὴν μὲν μίαν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθη]νᾶς, τὴν δὲ ἐγ  
 Γρυνεί-  
 [ωι ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. ἔρρωσθε.]

Found at Pergamon. “14-16. Restored by Fränkel. 17. εἰ[κοστήν, ἐκ δὲ το]ῦ, Robert; ἐ[κ μὲν τοῦ οἴνου το]ῦ Fr. 26. τελέ]σματα, Rostovtzeff; κτ[ή]ματα or χρ[ή]ματα, Fr. 30. τά]ξητε, Fr. 32/33. Restored by Fr. Other restorations by *W*.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 206.

**45 – Eumenes II to the Ionian *Koinon* – winter, 167/6 BCE**  
 = Welles *RCHP* 52

- 1A **Βασιλεὺς Εὐ[μένης Ἰώνων τῶι κοινῶι χαῖρειν·]**  
**τῶν παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευτῶν Μενεκλῆς [με]]ν**  
**οὐ συνέμειξέ μοι, Εἰρηνίας δὲ καὶ Ἀρχέλαος**  
**ἀπαντήσαντες ἐν Δήλῳ ἀπέδωκαν**
- 5 **ψήφισμα καλὸν καὶ φιλόανθρωπον, ἐν ᾧ**  
 καταρξάμενοι διότι τὰς καλλίστας ἀπὸ τῆς  
 ἀρχῆς ἐλόμενος πράξεις καὶ κοινόν ἀναδείξας  
 ἑμαυτὸν εὐεργέτην τῶν Ἑλλήνων πολλοὺς μὲν  
 καὶ μεγάλους ἀγῶνας ὑπέστην πρὸς τοὺς
- 10 βαρβάρους, ἅπασαν σπουδὴν καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιούμε-  
 νος ὅπως οἱ τὰς Ἑλληνίδας κατοικοῦντες πόλε[ις]  
 διὰ παντὸς ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τῇ βελτίστῃ καταστάσ[ει]  
 ὑπάρχωσιν, ἀντικαταλλασ<σ>όμενος [δὲ πρὸς] τῶ[ν]
- 1C **ἐπ[α]ρχ[ολουθ]οῦντα κίνδυνον καὶ [ἐκτενῆς καὶ φιλόδο]-**  
 15 **[ξος εἶναι προε]λόμεν[ος ἐν τ]οῖς [πρὸς τὸ κ]οινὸν ἀκολού-**  
**θως τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς προ[α]ιρέσει ἐν πολλοῖς φανεράς**  
**πεποίημαι τὰς ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀποδείξεις κοινῇ τε**  
**καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν πρὸς ἐκάστην τῶν πόλεων εὐνοϊκῶς**  
**διακείμενος καὶ πολλὰ τῶν πρὸς ἐπιφάνειαν**
- 20 **καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων συνκατασκευάζων**  
**ἐκάστη, ἅπερ διὰ τῶν ἔργων τὴν ἐμὴν τε φιλοδο-**  
**ξίαν . [ . ] . . ἐν καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ κοινοῦ·**  
**διόπερ ἔ[δο]ξεν ὑμ[ε]ῖν, ὅπως ἀεὶ φαίνεσθε τὰς**  
**καταξίας τιμὰς τοῖς εὐεργέταις ἀπονέ-**
- 25 **μοντες, στεφανῶσαι μὲν ἡμᾶς χρυσῷ στεφά-**  
**νῳ ἀριστεΐῳ, στήσαι δὲ εἰκόνα χρυσὴν ἐν ᾧ ἄμ**  
**βούλωμαι τόπωι τῆς Ἰωνίας, ἀναγγεῖλαί τε τὰς τιμὰς**  
**ἐν τε τοῖς ὑφ' [ὑ]μῶν συντελουμένοις ἀγῶσιν**  
**καὶ κατὰ τὰς πόλεις ἐν τοῖς τιθεμένοις ἐν ἐκάστη,**
- 1D 30 **[καὶ ἀσπᾶσασθαι δέ μ]ε παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ [καὶ συνησθῆναι]**  
**[ἐπὶ τ]ῶι καὶ με κα[ὶ τ]οὺς ἀναγκαίους ἐρρεῖ[σθαι εἶναί τε]**  
**τὰ πράγματα κατὰ λόγον, παρακαλεῖν τ[έ] με θεωροῦντα]**  
**τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ πλήθους τὴν κ[αθήκουσαν πρό]-**  
**νοιαν ποιεῖσθαι δι' ᾧ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰ[ώνων ἐπαυξηθῇ]-**
- 35 **σεταί τε καὶ διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῇ ἀρί[στη καταστάσει ὑπ]ᾶρ-**  
**ξει· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα με πάν[των τεύξεσθαι τ]ῶν**  
**εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων. ἀ[κολούθως δὲ πᾶσιν]**  
**τοῖς κατακεχωρισμένοις καὶ οἱ πρ[εσβευταὶ μετὰ π]λει-**  
**ονος σπουδῆς διελέχθησαν ἐξηγο[ύμενοι σύμπα]]ν-**
- 40 **τος τοῦ πλήθους πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκτενε[στάτην τε καὶ]**  
**εἰλικρινῇ τὴν εὐνοίαν. τά τε τίμια φιλο[φρόνως ἀποδέ]-**  
**χομαι κα<α>ὶ οὐδέποτ' ἐλλελοιπῶς κατὰ [γε τὴν ἐμὴν]**  
**δύναμιν εἰς τὸ περιποιεῖν ἀεὶ τι καὶ κ[οινῇ πᾶσιν]**  
**καὶ κατὰ πόλιν ἐκάστοις τῶν πρὸς [τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν]**





ἐὰμ μή τινες αὐταὶ τ[ηρεῖν τὰ] δέοντ]α ἐπιστρέ-  
πτως ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀγ[ιστῶσι | τὰς δει]νὰς ἐν ἀλλή-  
λαις διαφορὰς, ἐξ ὧν ταραχὴ | [τε καὶ] κοινὰ βλάβαι  
5 συμβαίνουσιν, σφόδρα θεῶι | [ζημιω]δῶς, καὶ μά-  
λιστα μὲν δι' ἐαυτῶν θέλειν | [συλλῦσ]αι· εἰ δὲ μή, διδό-  
ναι οὕτως ἐμαυτόν, ὅπως εἰς ὅ[μ[όνοι]α]ν ἀποκατα-  
στήσας βεβαί[ω ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ]ν λοιπ[ὸν] χρόνον  
[τὰ ε]ἰς εἰ[ρη]νὴν καὶ εὐνομί[αν] συντείνοντα - - - ]

(One course missing)

(Three lines missing)

1B [ - - - - - ] ξως ἔσεσ-  
5 [θαι - - - - - | . . . . . ἀν]αφέρουσιν αἱ ἀντιλογί-  
[αι - - - - - | - - - - - ] εἰς πολυχρόνια γράμ-  
[ - - - - - | - - - - - διορθ]ῶσαι δὲ μόνον  
[ - - - - - | - - - - - ] γνῶμη καὶ δι-  
[ - - - - - | - - - - - ] ῥῳτε  
  
1C [ . . . . . ] τις Α[ - - - - - ]  
σ[υ]λ[λ]ε[γ]χ[ω]ρ[η]μεν[ - - - - - ]  
σ[ε]ι[ν]. κα[τ]α[ξ]ιου[δ]ιν δ' ἐμὲ γράψαι ὅπως ἐὰν - - - ἐν]  
τῇ χώρῃ πανήγ[υριν - - - - - ἢ ἄλ]-  
5 λο τι συναλλασσ[ητε . . . προσεστῶσιν οἱ αἰρεθέντες]  
ὑφ' ὑμῶν πανηγυριάρχαι κατὰ τε τὴν ὑμ[ῶν] αὐτῶν]  
τῆς πανηγύρεως ἐπαγγελίαγ καὶ κα[τὰ] τὰ προστάγμα]-  
τα τῶν βασιλέων, ἕτερος δὲ μηδεὶς τ[ῆς] αὐτῆς τῆς]  
ἀρχῆς ἀντιποῖται. φροντίσαι δὲ ὡσαύτ[ῃ] [ως καὶ περὶ]  
10 τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατακεχωρισμένων ἐν τ[ῇ] ψηφίσματι]  
ὡς καταπλεονεκτουμένων ὑμῶν, ταῦτ[ῃ] [α δ' ἐν οἷς ἡμάρ]-  
τανε ποῆσειν ἀκόλουθα τῇ πρὸς τοὺς Τ[ῆ] ἡίους προαι]-  
ρῆσει· οἱ δὲ Τήϊοι διὰ τοῦ ψηφίσματος ἀν[α]δεξάμε]-  
νοι τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ διασαφηθέντ' αὐτοῖς ἐν τ[ῇ] πρῶ]-  
15 τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, δι' ἧς ἐμφανισάντωμ μοι[ι] καὶ τῶν παρ' ὑ]-  
μῶν πρεσβευτῶν ὅτι κεχειροτόνηντ[αι] - - - ]

(One course missing)

II A τοὺς νόμους [ . . . . . ] ΙΝΣ [ - - - - 15 - - - - ] . ΕΙΣ  
τῇ πρόνοιᾳ ποιεῖσ[θ]αι πρὸς τ[ὸ] διατηρηθῆναι] πάν-  
τα τὸν χρόνον αὐτοῖς. διοικεῖσθαι] δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸ  
κοινοδίκιον ὥσπερ συνέθεντο πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὀρκιζο-  
5 μένων τῶν δικαστῶν ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἔμπροσθεν.  
εἰ δὲ προσδεῖται διορθώσεως ὁ ὑπὲρ τούτου νόμος,  
καὶ πρότερον ἐτοίμως ἔχειν συνδιορθοῦσθαι, καὶ  
νῦν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦντα[ς μεθ'] ἡμῶν εὐρεθήσεσθαι  
[ἀμέμπτους ὄντας - - - - - ]

D [ - - - - - ] δανείων

	θαι ὑπὸ	ωντων ομ
	Σ νόμους	10 τοὺς εγγ
	Προσεχρ	πως ἐπὶ ΤΩ
5	[τ]ῆμ πανή[γυριν]	Ω καθ' οὗς Ε
	ὁμολογο	Α μετεχο
	Α λοιπὰ Σ	
II B	[ . . . ] ΑΙΩΝΛΕ . . . . [ . . . ] . . . [ . . . ] ΤΩΝ [ - - - - - οἱ]-	
	[κ]ονομήσασθαι· ἃ δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν Τηϊῶν, οὐ κοινήν	
	[πο]ησαμένων τὴν συντέλειαν αὐτῆς, ἀλλ' ὑμετέ-	
5	ρα μὲν κεκρικότων ἰδίαν, εἰ δέ τι πρὸς τὰς προσ-	
	όδους συνέτεινε τῆς πόλεως τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιού-	
	των συγχώρησιν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς διειληφότων ἀν-	
	ήκειν, ὃ καὶ ἦν δίκαιον· καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀλοσχερῇ πρὸς τὴν	
	ἀμφισβήτησιν ἦν ἐδόκει μοι διάνοιαν ἔχειν καὶ	
	ἀφ' ἧς αἰτίας ἕκαστα συνσταθῆναι ταῦτ' ἐστίν. τῶν	
10	[δὲ - - - - - ] φ[ - - - - - ] Σ [ - - - - - ]	
II C	[ - - - - - ] νεως αὐτῶ[ν]	
	[ - - - - - ] ΕἰΝ τὰ ἐπιβαλλό-	
	[μενα χρήμ]ατ[α . . . . .   . . . . . τ]ῶν ἐγγυητῶν ἢ πρα-	
	[ξ . . . . . ] χετω[ . . . . .   πρὸ τ]ῆς πανηγύρεως ἐν ἄλ-	
5	[λαις ἡμ]έραις δέ[κα . . . π]ρασ[ς]όντων ὧι ἂν τρόπῳ	
	[δύνω]νται, ὅπως μ[ηδεῖς   τῶ]μ παραγινομένων ξέ-	
	[νων] εἰς τὴμ πανή[γυριν   ἐγκα]λέσας τινὲ τῶν τοιού-	
	τωγ καὶ μὴ τυχ[ῶν τῶν   δικαίω]ν ἀπαλλάσσηται, μη-	
	δ' ἢ παγήγυρις κ[ατὰ τ]οῦτο τὸ μέ[ρος διαβάλληται. ἄρ-	
10	χει μ[έντο]ι γε τ[οὺς παν]ηγυριάρχας αὐτῶν τῶν	
	Διον[υσίων ? - - - - -   . . ἐν τοῖ]ς περικειμένοις λι-	
	μέσ[ιν εἰς οὗς οἱ ἀφικνούμενοι εἰ]ς τὴμ πανήγυριν κα-	
	θορμ[ίζονται . . . . . ἐν   δὲ τῇ ἐ]κτὸς χώραι πολυπρα-	
	γμο[νεῖν ὥς καὶ ἔμ]προσ[θεν τοὺς] τῆς πόλεως ἄρχον-	
15	τας [ - - - - - ] κρίνω δὲ καὶ τοὺς στρα-	
	τηγ[οὺς . . . . . τῶν περὶ   τὴν παν]ήγυριν οἰκονομουμένων	

(One course missing)

III A	[ - - - - - ]	
	κα, εἰθισμέναις δ' ἀμφοτερ[αῖς οἰκεῖν μεθ' ἐτέ]-	
	ρωγ γενῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἦσσαν τα [ - - - - - ]	
	ταις καὶ ἐν ἐτέροις πλείοσιν ἐπί[δοσις ἐτοί]-	
	μη ἀμφοτέροις ἐστίν, ὅμοια καὶ ταῦτα [φαίνον]-	
5	τα τοῖς μὴ ἀπαιδεύτοις. τὸ αὐτὸ δὴ κ[αὶ ἀεὶ]	
	σχεδὸν ἐώρωγ γεγονὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐξ [ἡμῶν αἰ]-	
	ρεσιν, διὰ τε τοῦτο καὶ συνθήκηγ γρα[φῆναι κέκρι]-	
	κα παρ' ἐκ[ατέρων εἰ]ς τὸν συνοικισμὸν [ - - - - - ]	
	[ - - - - - ] σταθὲν οἷς ε . [ - - - - - ]	

(One course missing)

III B [ - - - - τοὺς πανηγυριάρχας ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέ]-  
 ρῶν νόμῳ καὶ ἐθισμ[ῶμ μόν]ον συντελεῖν τήν]  
 πανήγυριν μὴ ὑπευθύνους | [ὄντας τοῖς τῆς]  
 πόλεως, εἰς ἣμ πάρεσιν. κε[ιμένους νόμοις]  
 οὐ φαίνεται μοι ἀγνωμονεῖ[ν. περὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦ]  
 5 ὄρκου, ὃμ πρότερον εἴθιστο τ[ι] οὐδὲ δικαστὰς ὄρ]-  
 κίζεσθαι περιέχοντα δικάσ[ειν κατὰ τοὺς]  
 νόμους καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς τ[ῶμ βασιλέω καὶ]  
 τὰ ψηφίσματα τοῦ δήμου κ[ρίνω ὡς καὶ ἐν]  
 πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν ἔμπροσθεν [ - - - - - ]

III C [ - - - - - ] ΙΞΑΙ ἱερέως  
 [ - - - - - ] Σ ἀγωνοθέτης  
 [ - - - - - καὶ] Δίφιλος δο-  
 κιμάζω[σι - - - - - ] συγγραγέντι  
 5 ὑπ' Ἀριστομάχου [τοῦ Περγα]μηνοῦ τοῦ παρ' ἡ-  
 μῶν ἀποσταλέντος καὶ τῶμ Τητίων ἐξ ἐκατέ-  
 ρων τριῶν ἀνδρῶν, κεκυρωμένῳ δ' ὑφ' ὑ-  
 μῶν, ὅπερ κρίνω ἀναγραφῆναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν  
 10 τοῦ Διονύσου, ὅπως ὑμῖν ἀσφαλὲς καὶ ἴσον  
 τοῖς νόμοις εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ὑπάρ-  
 χη, τὸ δὲ συνυποκείμενον ἄκυρον εἶ-  
 ναι. Προσαναγράφεσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐάν τι-  
 να μετὰ ταῦτα κοινῇ κρίνοντες μετὰ  
 15 τοῦ πεμπομένου ἀεὶ ἐπὶ τὴν διεξαγωγὴν

(Four courses missing)

(Eight lines missing)

IV C [ἀναγράψαι ἐμ Περγάμῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς]  
 10 Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ ἐν τ[ῶ]ι τ[ε]μένει [ - - - - - ]  
 Ἀρτέμιδος· οὕτω [γὰρ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἀσφα]-  
 λεστέρων ὑπολα[μβάνω διαμεῖναι ἂν τὴν τῶν μελλόν]-  
 των ἔσσεσθαι [ - - - - - ]

\*Since Welles does not offer a date, this date is my inference from the date given on PHI Online—197-159BCE—presumably from Fränkel. Like in 41 (above) it is clear that the inscription was only datable by the reign of Eumenes II, who reigned 197-159BCE. Inscribed at Pergamon. “Col. I A. 2-7. Restored by Fränkel. 1, 8/9. Restored by *W*. Col. I B. Restored by Fränkel. Col. I C. 1-7. Restored by *W*; Fränkel: [τ]ις [ἄλλος], σ . . . κε[ν εἰ]ρημεν, σ . . . ν. κα[τ]αξιοῦ[μεν], [ἐν] τῇ χώρῃ πι[α]ν[η]γυρ[ε], [ἄλ]λο τι συναλλασ[σ], [ὅ]πως καθιστῶνται] ὑφ' ὑμῶν, τὴν ὑμ[ετέραν ὑπέρ] τῆς, κ[ατὰ τὰ δόγμα]τα. 8/9. Restored by Fränkel. 10. τ[ῶ]ι ψηφίσματι, *W*; τ[ῇ] γραφῇ, Fränkel. 11. ταῦτ[α δ' ἐν], Holleaux; ταῦτ'[ἐν], Fränkel. 12/13. Restored by Fränkel. 14/15. Restored by Holleaux; Fränkel: ἐντ[υχόντος] τῇ, μο[ι καὶ τῶν ἐ]μῶμ. Col. II A. 2. Restored by *W*. 8. [μεθ'] ἡμῶν, *W*; [παρ'] ἡμῶν, Fränkel. Col. II B. 1. [παλ]αιῶν [ἀ]ε[ί?], Fränkel. Col. II C. 1-5. Restored by *W*. 6-9. Restored by Wilhelm. 10. μ[έντο]ι γε *W*; μ[έν] - - ], Wilhelm. 11-13. Restored by Wilhelm; in 13, [ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐ]κτός, added by *W*. 14. Restored by *W*. 15. κρίνω, *W*; the copy of Pittakis gave ΙΟΙΝΩ. 16. Restored by Wilhelm. Col. III A. Restored by *W*. 4/5. [συνε]τά, Fränkel. Col. III B. [τοὺς πανηγυριάρχας ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέ]ρων, *W*; [τῶν ἱε]ρῶν, Fränkel. 1, 5-7. Restored by Fränkel. Other restorations by *W*. 2. [ταῖς

ἀρχαῖς τῆς], Fränkel. Col. III C. 4. κινά(ζ)ω [δ' ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ?], Fränkel. Col. IV C. Restored by *W*; Wilhelm: οὕτω [γὰρ - - - ἀσφα]λεστέραν ὑπολα[μβάνω].” – Welles, *RCHP*, 225.

#### 47 – Attalos to the *polis* and elders of Amlada – c.160 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 54

- Ἄτταλος Ἀμλαδέων τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖς γεραιοῖς [χα]ίρει[ν·]  
οἱ παρ' ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ Ὀπρασάτης Κίλα[ . . . . . ]  
νου, Ναλαγλόας Κίλαρίου, Μεννέας συμμείξ[αν]τε[ς] ἡμῖν  
[κ]αὶ [δι]αλεγέντε[ς] περὶ ὧν ἐνετετάλ[κ]εῖτε αὐτοῖς ἡξίουσα[ν]  
5 ὁμηρὰ τε ὑμῶν ἀπολυθῆναι [κ]αὶ ἐν τῷ Γαλατικῷ πολέμῳ  
ὡς προσωφείλετε δραχμὰς ἐνακισχιλίας ἐπισκευ[ῆς] ἐνε-  
[κ]ε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ταλάντων ἃ τελεῖτε κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν [κου]-  
φίσαι ὑμᾶς, ἐπεὶ θλιβέντες ἐμ πλείοσιν ἀσθενῶς [νῦν] ἔ-  
χετε. θεωρῶν οὖν ὑμᾶς μετανενοηκότας τε ἐπὶ τοῖ[ς]  
10 προημαρτημένοις καὶ τὰ ἐπιστελλόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν  
προθύμως ἐπιτελοῦντας πρόνοιαν ὑμῶν ἔ[σχον] καὶ  
χαρισάμενος τῷ τε Ὀπρασάτ[η] καὶ τῇ πόλ[ει] πρὸς]-  
τέταχα ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ φόρου καὶ τε[λέ]σ[ματ]ος  
[δραχ]μὰς τρισχιλίας καὶ ἄλλας δραχμὰς ἐνακισχιλίας [ἅς]  
15 [προσ]ωφείλετε ἡμῖν. ἀπέλυσα δὲ καὶ ὁ[μηρ]α ὑμῶν

The larger half found at (mod.) Kizilça-köy, the smaller at (mod.) Yenice-köy. “6/7. ἐπισκευ[ῆς] ἐνεκ]ε, Holleaux; ἐπισκευ[ ]ε, Jüthner, etc.; ἐπ<έ>σκ<η>[ψαν δ]έ Dittenberger. 8/9. [νῦν] ἔ]χετε Holleaux; [σχή]σετε, Ditt.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 238.

#### 48 – Eumenes II to Attis, priest of Cybele – September 5, 163 BCE

(on the same monument as 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54) = Welles *RCHP* 55

- [ - - - - - ] μενους συστῆ-  
σαι [ . . . . . ] διὸ καὶ νῦν τὴν τα-  
χίστην π[αραγ]ενόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς τό-  
πους καὶ ἐπισκεψάμενος πάντα σα-  
5 φῶς διασάφησόν μοι πόσων ἔτι χρει-  
αν ἔξεις στρατιωτῶν. καὶ τοὺς Πес-  
σόγγους δὲ ἐὰν δύνῃ πρᾶξικοπῆσθαι,  
γράφει μοι τίνων ἐστὶ χρεία· ἱεροῦ γὰρ τοῦ  
χωρίου ὄντος ληπτέον ἐστὶ πάντως.  
10 **ἔρρωσο.** δλ', Γορπιαίου ζ' ἀπιόν(τος).

Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

#### 49 – Eumenes II to Attis, priest of Cybele – between 163 and 159 BCE\*

(on the same monument as 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54) = Welles *RCHP* 56

Βασιλεὺς Εὐμένης Ἄττιδι χαίρειν·  
εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· κάγω δὲ ὑγίαινον.

ἐκομισάμην τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολήν,  
 ἐν ἣι διεσεσαφήκεις μοι περὶ τῶν [τ]ε κα-  
 5 τὰ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου Αἰοιόριγα γεγραμ-  
 μένων. ὀρθῶς οὖν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν δι-  
 ἴστω. καὶ ὄφελομ μὲν ἢ θεὸς ἐπιστρα-  
 φεῖσα τῶν ἐαυτῆς ἱερῶν ὑβρισμένων  
 καὶ ὑβ[ριζομ]ένων στερεῆσαι τὸν ταῦτα  
 10 πο[ήσαντα ὦν] μάλιστα ἐπιθυμεῖ· εἰ δὲ  
 μ[ή, ὑγιῆς γενόμε]νός γε τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ  
 θ[εοσεβῆς τὰ ἀνα]θήματα πεμπέτω κα-

\*I have inferred this date from its position below the previous document on the monument and Eumenes II's death in 159 BCE. Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

**50** – Attalos to Attis, priest of Cybele – between 163 and 159 BCE\*  
 (on the same monument as **48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54**) = Welles *RCHP* 57

Ε [ . . . . . ] ΟΙΣΔΕ [ . . . ] ΩΤΩ [ . . . . ]  
 δώρῳ καὶ τῷ ἀδελ[φῷ] ἐληλυθότ[ι] π[ροσ]-  
 φάτως ἐπὶ τ[ὸ] σ[τ]ρα[τό]πεδον προσαγ[α]-  
 γὼν καὶ τὴν αἵρε[σ]ίν σου ἐμφανίσας ἀπέ-  
 5 λυσ' αὐτὸν πρὸς σέ. **ἔρρωσο.**

\*I have inferred this from Welles' discussion at *RCHP*, 247–251. Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

**51** – Attalos to Attis, priest of Cybele – between 163 and 159 BCE\*  
 (on the same monument as **48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54**) = Welles *RCHP* 58

Ἄτταλος Ἄττ[ι]δι ἱερεῖ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρω-  
 σαι, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· καὶ γὰρ δὲ ὑγίαινον. Μηνόδω-  
 ρος, ὃν ἀπεστάλκεις, τὴν τε παρὰ σοῦ  
 ἐπιστολήν ἀπέδωκέ μοι, οὐσαν ἐκτε-  
 5 νῇ καὶ φιλικήν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ ὧν ἔφη-  
 σεν ἔχειν τὰς ἐντολὰς διὰ πλειόνων  
 ἀπελογίσατο. ἀποδεξάμενος οὖν τὴν  
 παρὰ σοῦ αἵρεσιν διὰ τὸ θεωρεῖν ἐμ παντὶ  
 καιρῷ σε πρόθυμον ὄντα πρὸς τὰ ἡμέτερα  
 10 πράγματα καὶ αὐτὸς τούτῳ ἅπερ ἐνόμιζον  
 ἀναγκαῖον εἰδέναι σε κεκοινολογημένος εἴρη-  
 κα ἀναγγέλλειν. **ἔρρωσο.**

\*I have inferred this from Welles' discussion at *RCHP*, 247–251. Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

**52** – Attalos to Attis, priest of Cybele – between 163 and 159 BCE\*  
(on the same monument as **48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54**) = Welles *RCHP* 59

Ἄτταλος Ἄττιδι ἱερεῖ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εὖ  
ἂν ἔχοι· ὑγίαινον δὲ κάγω. Μηνόδορος ἀπέδω-  
κέ μοι τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐπιστολήν, ἐν ᾗ ἐγεγράφεις  
ὅτι πυθόμενος ἐληλυθέναι τὸν ἀδελφὸν  
5 ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῖς θεοῖς ἔθυσας[ς ὑπὲρ]  
τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας· ἀπελογ[ίσατο δὲ]

\*I have inferred this from Welles' discussion at *RCHP*, 247–251. Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

**53** – Attalos II to Attis, priest of Cybele – between 158 and 156 BCE\*  
(on the same monument as **48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54**) = Welles *RCHP* 60

[                    ] INΔΙΟΜΕΝ [                    ]  
[ . . . . . ] Ἰ εὐλαβεῖαι· τὰ δὲ γράμματα λύσας  
[καὶ ση]μνη[ά]μ[ε]νος πάλιν ἀπέσταλκά σοι. εἰ-  
[πον γ]ὰρ ὅτι, ἐὰν ὁμοίως ἀναπέμψω, οὐ μὴ  
5 [δυν]ηθῆς αὐτὰ λύσαι. σὺ καὶ π[ρ]οσδέχου δὴ  
[αὐτ]ὰ καὶ πέμφ' οὐς βούλῃ καθὰ παρακαλοῦ-  
[σιν], ὥς ἡμῶν εἰδόντων ὅτι, ἅπερ ἂν πράσσης,  
[ἐπὶ] τῷ συμφέροντι τῷ ἡμετέρῳ ποιήσεις.  
[δ]ιὸ τὸν ἐνηνοχότα <τά>δε τὰ γράμματα, ἐπεὶ  
10 [βο]ύλεται σοι συμμεῖξαι, μετάπεμψαι πάντως.  
[χρ]ήσιμον γάρ ἐστι πρὸς τᾶλλα καὶ ἀκοῦσαι  
[πα]ρ' αὐτοῦ ἃ φησι θέλειν εἰπεῖν σοι καὶ συν-  
[πε]μψθῆναί τινα αὐτῷ παρὰ σοῦ εἰς τοὺς ἅ-  
[νω] τόπους τὸν τά τε διδόμενα ληψόμενον –  
15 [ἀμ]αθία γὰρ ἀποτρίβεσθαι – καὶ τὴν [τῶ]ν ἐκεῖ γνώ-  
[μη]ν ἀγγελοῦθ' ἡμῖν ἐπιμε[λέστερον . . . . ]

\*I have inferred this from Welles' discussion at *RCHP*, 247–251. Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

**54** – Attalos II to Attis, priest of Cybele – between 158 and 156 BCE\*  
(on the same monument as **48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53**) = Welles *RCHP* 61

[Βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος Ἄττιδι ἱερεῖ χαίρ]ε[ι]ν· [εἰ ἔρρωσαι, ἔχοι]  
ἂν ὥς ἐγὼ βούλομαι· ὑγίαινον δὲ καὶ αὐτός. ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν  
εἰς Πέργαμον καὶ συναγαγόντος μου οὐ μόνον Ἀθήναιον  
καὶ Σώσανδρον καὶ Μηνογένην, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέρους πλείο-  
5 νας τῶν ἀναγκαίων, καὶ προτιθέντος περὶ ὧν ἐν Ἀπαμείαι ἐ-  
βουλευόμεθα, λέγοντ[ό]ς τε περὶ ὧν ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν, πολλοὶ μὲν  
ὑπεραγόντως ἐγίνοντο λόγοι, καὶ τὸ πρῶτον πάντες κατέρρε-  
πον ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῖν γνώμην, Χλῶρος δ' εὐτονώτατος ἦν  
τὰ Ῥωμαϊκὰ προτείνων καὶ οὐθενὶ τρόπῳ συμβουλευὼν οὐ-

- 10      θέν ἄνευ ῥκείνων πρᾶσσειν. ὦι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὀλί<γ>οι μετεῖ-  
 χον, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐν ἄλλαις καὶ ἄλλαις ἡμέραις ἀεὶ δι-  
 ασκοποῦσιν ἥπτετο μᾶλλον ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸ προπεσεῖν ἄ-  
 νευ ῥκείνων μέγαν ἐδόκει κίνδυνον ἔχειν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπιτυ-  
 χοῦσιν φθόνον καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ ὑφοψίαν μοχθηράν. ἦν  
 15      καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἔσχοσαν, καὶ ἀποτυχοῦσιν ἄρσιν  
 πρόδηλον. οὐ γὰρ ἐπιστραφήσεσθ' ἐκείνους, ἀλλ' ἡδέως ὄψεσ-  
 θαι, ὅτι ἄνευ ἑαυτῶν τηλικαῦτ' ἐκινούμεθα. νῦν δέ, ἂν καὶ – ὃ  
 μὴ γίνωιτ' – ἐλασσωθῶμεν ἐν τισιν, μετὰ τῆς ἐκείνων  
 γνώμης ἕκαστα πεπραχότας βοηθείας τεύξεσθαι καὶ ἀ-  
 ναμαχεῖσθαι μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐνοίας. ἔκρινον οὖν εἰς  
 20      μὲν τ[ῆ]ν Ῥώμην ἀεὶ πέμπειν τοὺς συνεχῶς ἀναγγελοῦν-  
 [τας] τ[ὰ] δισ[τ]αζόμενα, αὐτοὺς δὲ παρασκευάζεσθαι[ι]  
 [ἡμᾶς ἐπιμελῶς, ὥς εἰ δέοι βοηθήσ]οντας ἑαυτο[ῖς] . . . . ]

\*I have inferred this from Welles' discussion at *RCHP*, 247–251. Found at (mod.) Sivrihissar.

**55 – Attalos II (?) to the *boule* and *demos* of Ilion – between 158-138 BCE\***  
 = Welles *RCHP* 62

- [B]ασι[ι]λε[ὺς Ἀτταλ]ος Ῥιλιέ-  
 [ων] τῇ βουλ[ῇ] καὶ τῷ δήμ[ω]  
 χα[ί]ρ[ε]ιν· ἦν ἔχων δια[τελῶ αἴ]-  
 [ρεσ]ιν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ περὶ τῆς  
 5      πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας  
 καὶ μάλιστα πρὸς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν  
 ἐκ τῆς πρότερον γραφείσης  
 ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς πέ-  
 πεισμαι πᾶσι φανερὸν πε-  
 10      φυκέναι, καθ' ἣν τάς τε βοῦς καὶ  
 τοὺς βουκόλους ἀνετίθειν,  
 [κ]αὶ νῦν δὲ χώραν ἡγόρακ[α]

\*Since there is no date offered in Welles, I have inferred this date from the period of Attalos II's reign. Found at (mod.) Bunarbaşı, on the site of Troy.

**56 – Orophernes, supposed son of King Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia, to Priene – c.157 BCE**

= Welles *RCHP* 63. cf. Hiller von Gaertingen *Inscr. Priene* 25; McCabe *Priene* 135

- [ἐπακολου]θοῦντες ἡμ[ῶν] ταῖς ἐντολαῖς διασαφήσουσιν οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν]  
 [πρὸς ὑμ]ᾶς πεμφθέντες Ἑτεοκλῆς καὶ Ῥπεράνθης . . . . . ]  
 [ὥς ἀεὶ β]ουλόμεθα σὺν [τ]ῇ τῶν θεῶν εὐνοί[α] καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν]  
 [πειρ]α[σόμεθα κοινῇ τε τῷ δήμῳ συναίτιοι ἀγα]θῶν γίνεσθαι]  
 5      [καὶ κ]ατ' ἰδίαν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τῶν [ὕμ]ετέρων· [ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . ] . . . Ἑτεοκλῆν τῶν τιμωμένων καὶ Ῥπεράνθη[ν] [ . ]ε[ . ]α[ . . . . . ]  
 [τῆς ἀν]δρογαθίας τῶν συγκεκινδυνευκότων ἡμῖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀναγ[-

- [καιο]τάτοις καιροῖς, πίστεως καὶ εὐνοίας ἀποδε[ίξεις φαν]ερά[ς]  
 [ἀπ]οδείξ[α]γτας, καὶ εἰς τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ δήμου ἣν ἐποι[ησάμ]εθα ὑ-  
 10 [πανα]λώσαντας Ἀλεξανδρείας δραχμὰς τρισχιλίας. χαλῶς οὖν  
 [ποι]ήσετε διαφυλάσσοντες τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς αἴρεσιν καὶ τὴν πᾶ[σαν]  
 [πρόνο]ιαν τῆς ἀναθέσεως τοῦ ἀνδριάντος προνοήσαντες. **ἔρρωσθ[ε].**

Found at Priene. “1-6. Restored by *W*. 1. ουντες ἡμῖ[ν], Hicks. 2. πεμφθέντες Ετεο[κ]ΑΙ(?)ΩΡ, Hiller. 3. [βου]λόμεθα... εὐ[νοίαι], Hiller. 4. [βου]λόμεθα... [παραιτ]ιο[ι ἀγαθῶν γίνεσθαι, Wilhelm. 5/6. ἐντυγχάνουσι[ν τῶν ὑμετέρων πολιτῶν καὶ? ἀπεστάλ]κα[μεν Ἐτεοκλῆν... κ[αὶ] Ἐπίγ[ονον? ἐμφανιοῦντας, Wilhelm. 7. [τὴν ἀνδρ]αγαθίαν, Hicks. 7/8. [κατὰ τοὺς δυσ]χερε[ς]τάτους καιροὺς, Hiller; [ἀναγ]καιο[τάτους, Wilhelm. 8. ἀποδ[ε]ί[ξεις καλλίστας], Wilhelm. 10/11. [κα]λ[ῶς οὖν | ποιήσετ]ε, Wilhelm. 11. ἀρ[ετ]ήν, Hicks.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 256.

**57 – A Hellenistic King to the *boule* and *demos* of Nysa – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE**  
 = Welles *RCHP* 64

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| A  | B   |
|    | [Βασιλεὺς . . . . . Νυσαέων τῇ β]ουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν·          |
|    | [συμμεῖξαντές μοι ἐν . . . . . Ἀρ]τεμίδωρος Βασιλείδης Μι-          |
|    | [. . . οἱ πρεσβευταὶ πεμφθέντες ὑφ' ὑ]μῶν ἀπέδωκάν μοι τὸ ψήφι[σ]-  |
|    | [μα παρ' ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέχθησαν] μὲν μετὰ [φιλοτιμ]ίας          |
| 5  | [ἀκολούθως τοῖς γεγραμμένοις περὶ] τῆς ἰκεσίας καὶ ἀσυλίας          |
|    | [καὶ ἀτελείας, παρακαλοῦντες καὶ ἐμ]ῇ ἴσον τι (?) συ[χωρ]εῖν καθότι |
|    | [συνεχωρήθη καὶ πρότερον ὑπὸ τῶν ἔμ]πρ[ο]σθεν βα[σι]λέων τῷ ἱερῶ[ι] |
|    | [τῷ παρ' ὑμῖν Πλούτωνός τε καὶ Κόρης.] βουλόμενος [οὗ]ν ἐπαύ-       |
|    | [ξιν τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς φιλ[ίαν καὶ ἐκ] τῶν   ἀποδειχθέντων μοι ὑπὸ      |
| 10 | τῶν πρεσβευτῶν θεωρῶν ἀπ[ὸ παλ]αιῶν   χρόνων ὑπάρχουσιν τὴν         |
|    | ἰκεσίαν καὶ ἀσυλίαν καὶ ἀτέλιαν, συ[νεχώρησα] ὥς οἱ περιεστη-       |
|    | λωμένοι ὄροι ὑπὸ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν βασιλέων συνεχώρησα<ν>, καὶ τὰ       |
|    | ἄλλα δὲ πάντα φιλάνθρωπα καὶ τείμια  ὅσα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν βασιλεῖς συν-  |
|    | εχώρησαν ἐπιτρέπω καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν π[ει]ρᾶσθαι ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ    |
|    | π[αραί]-  |
| 15 | [τι]ος γείνε[σθαι ἐπὶ τῷ συμφ]έρῳτι ὑμῶ[ν].                         |

Found near Nysa. “1-9. I have restored on the basis of a 29 letter column. Hiller: [Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Νυσαέων τῇ β]; [οἱ ἀφικόμενοι παρ' ὑμῶν πρέσβεις Ἀρ] (Wilamowitz); ψήφι[σμα]; μὲν κ[ατ]ὰ τῆς ἀτελείας; καθότι [καὶ – – ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμ]; ἐπαύ[ξιν τὴν πρόσο]δόν τε φρ[ουρεῖν ἐκ] τῶν. 3. First letter in B is uncertain: read as P (Pringsheim) and as N (Kubitschek); on the squeeze **M**\* (so also Hiller). 6. Beginning of B: [ . . . ]ONTIΣΥΝ[χωρεῖ]N (Pr.), ΕΙΣΟΠΩΣΥΙ. APXEI (Kub.); the squeeze shows nothing, as Hiller remarked, reading ΕΙΣΟΝΤΙ. 9. Read as ΔΟΝΤΕΦΙΟ (Pr.); the squeeze shows nothing except ΦΙ, which is quite clear. 12. συνεχώρησα<ν>, Wilamowitz. 15. Restored by Wilhelm. On B, clear space.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 261.

\* The shape Welles gives, which I cannot reproduce, appears to be the right half of a letter M.



Text preceding *IOLHRC* 64 (v. Welles, *RCHP*, 261).

A	B
Possibly . . . . . ΗΛΕΕΥΟΠ . ΙΟΙΖΟΛ[ . . . . . ] . ΙΛΠΟΠΟΠΠΟ	
a Letter? . . . . . ΤΕ . . . . Γ . . . . ΤΟΤ . . . . ΤΑ καὶ Ἀθυμβριανοῖς . . .	
. . . . . Ι . Ι . . . . [ . . Ἀντι]όχου δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου	
	]ου ιζ'.

Here, the underlined letters were the closest recognisable letter to the shapes given in Welles, which could not be replicated in this document.

## 58 – Attalos II to Athenaios his cousin – December 25, 142 BCE

(on the same monument as 59, 60) = Welles *RCHP* 65. cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, 248 ll.5-25

Decree	[ - - - - - ἀναγράψαι εἰς στήλην λίθοῦ λευ]- [κ]ου καὶ τεθ[ῆ]ναι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς . . . . ἐγγρά]- [ψ]αι δὲ καὶ εἰς [το]ῦ[ς] ἱερούς νόμους [τοὺς τῆς] [πό]λεως [τ]όδ[ε] τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ χρῆσθαι αὐτῷ νόμῳ κυρίῳ εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον.
Letter	<b>Βασιλεὺς Ἀτταλος Ἀθηναίῳ τῷ ἀνεψίῳ χαίρειν.</b> Σωσάνδρου τοῦ συντρόφου ἡμῶν, σοῦ δὲ γαμβροῦ κατασταθέντος ὑπὸ τὰ- δελφοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Καθηγεμόνος Διονύσου ἱερέως καὶ συν- τετελεκότος τὰ ἱερὰ ἐμὲ πολλὰς σφόδρα τριετηρίσιν εὐσεβῶς
5	μεγ καὶ ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ, προσφιλῶς δὲ τῷ τε ἀδελφῷ καὶ ἡμῖν [κ]αὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασι, συνέβη ἐν ταῖς πρότερον Τριετηρίσι παρε- [ν]οχληθέντα αὐτὸν ὑπὸ νευρικῆς διαθέσεως τὰς μὲν θυσίας συ[ν]- τελεῖν μεθ' ἡμῶν, τὰς δὲ πομπὰς καὶ τινα ἄλλα τῷ πρὸς τὰ ἱερὰ
10	[δ]ιατεινόντων μὴ δύνασθαι, τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Ἀθήναιον ἐκρίν[α]- [με]ν προῖεράσθαι, ὅπως ὅσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωσάνδρου ἀδύνατα ἦγ [γίνε]σθαι, ὑπὸ τούτου ἐπιτελῆται. ἐπεὶ οὖν τότε μὲν τὰ καθήκον- [τα] ὡς ἔπρ[ε]πεν ὁσίως συνετελέσθη, νῦν δὲ μετηλλαχότος
15	τοῦ Σωσάνδρου ἀ]ναγκαῖόν ἐστι κατασταθῆναί τινα ἱερέα, κεκρίκαμεν ἀγῶ καὶ Ἀττ[α]λος ὁ τῶν ἀδελφῶν υἱὸς διαμε<ῖ>ναι Ἀθηναί[ωι] τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἱερεωσ[ύν]ηγ καὶ ταύτην, ἐπεὶ καὶ κατὰ συντ[υ]- χίαν ζῶντος ἔτι τοῦ πατρὸς κα[τ]εσ[π]είσθη ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ, ὑπολαμβ[ά]- νοντες καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Διόνυσον οὕτω [βε]βουλῆσθαι ἄξιόν τε αὐ-
20	τὸν εἶναι καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προστασίας κα[ὶ] ὅλ[ο]υ ἡμῶν τοῦ οἴκου. ὅ- πως δὲ καὶ σὺ εἰδῆς ὅτι περιτεθείκαμεν τῇ[ν] τιμῇ καὶ ταύτ[ην] τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ, ἔκρινον ἐπιστεῖλαί σοι. ιη', Αὐδναίου ιθ'. Ἀθηναγόρας ἐκ Περγάμου.

Inscribed at Pergamon. Letter: “17. οὕτω (sic), Dittenberger; οὕτω[ς], Fränkel. 18. ὅλ[ο]υ, Ditt; {τ[υ]οῦ}, Fr.” – Welles *RC* p.265. The text and restorations for the decree are at Welles, *RCHP*, 267–268.

## 59 – Attalos III to the *boule* and *demos* of Cyzicus – October 8, 135 BCE

(on the same monument as 50, 60) = Welles *RCHP* 66. cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, 248 ll.26-44

**βασιλεὺς Ἀτταλος Κυζικηνῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν.** Ἀθή-  
ναιος ὁ Σωσάνδρου υἱός, τοῦ γενομένου ἱερέως τοῦ Καθηγεμόνος Δ[ι]-  
ονύσου καὶ συντρόφου τοῦ πατρός μου, ὅτι μὲν ἡμῶν ἐστὶ συγ-

- γενής, οὐ πείθομαι ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, εἴ γε ὁ Σώσανδρος γήμας τὴν Ἀθηνάου θυγατέρα τοῦ Μειδίου, ὃς ἦν Ἀθήναιος ἀνειψιὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου, τοῦτον ἐγέννησεν, ὃι καὶ γενομένῳ ἀξίῳ τοῦ οἴκου ἡμῶν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον Ἄτταλος ὁ θεῖός μου σὺν καὶ τῇ ἐμῇ γνώμῃ ζώντος ἔτι τοῦ Σωσάνδρου ἔδωκε διὰ γένους ἱερωσύνην τὴν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σαβαζίου τιμιωτάτην οὖσαμ παρ' ἡμῖν, ὕστερον δὲ μεταλλάξαντος τοῦ Σωσάνδρου διὰ τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν οὖσαγ καλοκαγαθίαγ καὶ περὶ τὸ θε[ί]-  
 10 ον εὐσεβείαγ καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίαγ καὶ πίστιγ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Καθηγεμόνος Διονύσου ἱερωσύνης ἡξιώσαμεν αὐτόν, κρίναντες αὐτὸν καὶ ταύτης εἶναι ἄξιον τῆς τιμῆς καὶ προεπόντως προστήσ<ε>σθαι μυστ[ηρί]-  
 15 ων τηλικούτων κἀγὼ καὶ Ἄτταλος ὁ θεῖός μου, ὡς διασαφεῖται, ἐν τῷ[ι] ιη' ἔτει τῆς ἐκείνου βασιλείας. εἰδὼς οὖν ὅτι πρὸς μητρὸς καὶ ὑμ[έ]-  
 τερός ἐστι πολίτης, ἔκρινα ἐπιστεῖλαι ὑμῖν πέμψας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ προστάγματα καὶ φιλάνθρωπα τὰ γραφέντα ὑφ' ἡμῶν περὶ τούτου, ὅπως εἰδῆτε ὡς ἔχομεν φιλοστοργίας πρὸς αὐτόν.  
 δ', Δίου ζ'. Μένης ἐκ Περγάμου.

Inscribed at Pergamon.

**60** – Attalos III to the *boule* and *demos* of Pergamon – October 5, 135 BCE  
 (on the same monument as **58**, **59**) = Welles *RCHP* **67**, cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, **248** ll.45-61

- βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος Περγαμηνῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν·** ἐπεὶ  
 βασ[ί]-  
 λισσα Στρατονίκη ἡ μήτηρ μου, εὐσεβεστάτη μετ' γενομένη πασῶν, φιλ[ο]-  
 στοργοτάτη δὲ διαφερόντως πρὸς τε τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πρὸς ἐμέ,  
 5 πρὸς ἅπαντας μὲν τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς προσηνέχθη, μάλιστα δὲ  
 πρὸς τὸν Δία τὸν Σαβάζιον, πατροπαράδοτον αὐτὸν κομίσασα εἰς  
 τὴν πατρίδα ἡμῶν, ὃν καὶ ἐμὲ πολλαῖς πράξεσι καὶ ἐμὲ πολλοῖς κινδύ-  
 νοις παραστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν ἡμῖν γενόμενον ἐκρίναμεν διὰ τὰς ἐξ αὐτοῦ  
 γενομένας ἐπιφανείας συγκαθιερωσαί τῇ Νικηφόρῳ Ἀθηνᾷ, νομίσαν-  
 10 τες τοῦτον αὐτῷ ἄξιον καὶ πρόποντα τόπον ὑπάρχειν, διεταξάμε-  
 θα δὲ ἀκολούθως τούτοις καὶ περὶ θυσιῶν καὶ πομπῶν καὶ μυστηρίων  
 τῶν ἐπιτελουμένων πρὸ πόλεως αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι καιροῖς καὶ τόποις,  
 ἐποίησαμεν δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἱερέα διὰ γένους Ἀθήναιον τὸν ἐμόν, εὐσεβείαι κα[ί]   
 καλοκαγαθίαι διαφέροντα καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἡμᾶς διηνεκεῖ πίστει· κρίνομεν διὰ  
 ταῦ-  
 15 τα, ὅπως ἂν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἀκίνητα καὶ ἀμετάθετα μένηι τά τε πρὸς  
 τὸν θεὸν τίμια καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἀθήναιοι φιλάνθρωπα, τὰ γραφέντα ὑφ' ἡμῶν  
 προστάγματα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς νόμοις φέρεσθαι παρ' ὑμῖν.  
 δ', Δίου δ'. Λύτος ἐκ Περγάμου.

Inscribed at Pergamon.

**61** – Attalos III to a governor – post 138 BCE?  
 = Welles *RCHP* **69**

[Βασιλεὺς Ἄττα]λος . . . . . [χαίρειν·]  
 [ - - - - - ]ος τοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἱερῇ Κώμῃ

- [ - - - - - ἀνέ]δωκεν ἀξίωμα δι' οὗ ἐδέ-  
 [οντο - - οἱ τὸ - - ]ισιον Ἱερῶς Κ<ω>μης κατοι-  
 5 [κοῦντες - - - - - τὰ] ἰδρυμένα τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι  
 [ - - - - - εἰ]ς τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείας  
 [ - - - - - καθ]ὼς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἶχεν. ἐγὼ δὲ  
 [θέλων βεβαιοῦν τὰ ὑ]πὸ τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ βασι-  
 [λέων συγχωρηθέντα, α]ὔξειν τε καὶ τὰ τῶν θε-  
 10 [ῶν τίμια, ἔδωκα αὐτοῖς ὡς ἡξίου]ν τὴν [ἀτέ]-  
 [λειαν - - - - - ]

Found near (mod.) Kōsk. The dots in l.1 of Welles' *apparatus* represent shapes of letters provided in his text which could not be reproduced in this document. "1. . . - . . - . . . . . , Sterrett. 3. ἐδέ[οντο], Robert. 3-5. ἐλε[υθέρους ἀφῆκε τοὺς πλησίον Ἱερῶς Κώμης κατοικ[οῦντας], Waddington. Other restorations by *W.*" – Welles, *RCHP*, 277.

**62 – King Antiochos to Euphemos, an official – Late 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE?**  
 = Welles *RCHP* 70

- Ἐπιστολὴ Ἀντιόχου βασιλέως.  
**Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Εὐφῆμῳ χαίρειν·** ἐδόθη ὁ κατακεχωρισ-  
 μένος ὑπομνηματισμός. γενέσθω οὖν καθότι δεδήλωται περὶ ὧν δεῖ διὰ σοῦ  
 συντελεσθῆναι.  
 Προσενεχθέντες μοι περὶ τῆς ἐνεργ[ε]ίας θεοῦ Διὸς  
 Βαιτοκαίης  
 5 ἐκρίθη συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτῷ εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον ὅθεν καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ  
 θεοῦ κατάρχεται κώμην τὴν Βαιτοκαί[κη]ν, ἣν πρότερον ἔσχεν  
**Δημήτριος**  
**Δημητρίου τοῦ Μνασαίου** εντουργωνα τῆς περὶ Ἀπάμιαν σατραπείας,  
 σὺν τοῖς  
 συνκύρουσι καὶ καθήκουσι πᾶσι κατὰ τοὺς προϋπάρχοντας περιορισμούς  
 καὶ σὺν τοῖς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἔτους γεν[ν]ήμασιν, ὅπως ἡ ἀπὸ ταύτης  
 10 πρὸσοδος  
 ἀναλίσκῃται εἰς τὰς κατὰ μῆνα{ς} συντελουμένας θυσίας καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ  
 πρὸς αὔξη-  
 σιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ συντείνοντα ὑπὸ τοῦ καθεσταμένου ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερέως ὡς  
 εἴ-  
 θισται, ἄγωνται δὲ καὶ κατὰ μῆνα πανηγύρεις ἀτελεῖς τῇ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ  
 καὶ  
 τριακάδι, καὶ εἶναι τὸ μὲν ἱερὸν ἄσυλον τὴν δὲ κώμην ἀνεπίσ<τ>α<θ>μον,  
 μηδεμιᾶς  
 ἀπορρήσεως προσενεχθείσης· τὸν δὲ ἐναντιωθησόμενόν τισι τῶν προγε-  
 15 γραμμένων ἔνοχον εἶναι ἀσεβείᾳ· ἀναγραφῆναί τε καὶ τὰ ἀντίγραφα ἐν  
 στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ τεθῆναι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἱερῷ. δεήσει οὖν γραφῆναι οἷς εἴ-  
 θισται, ἵνα γένηται ἀκολούθως τοῖς δηλουμένοις.

Inscribed at Baetocaece. I have reproduced the line spacing for lines 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13 as they appears in Welles. "Von Oppenheim's examination showed that the stone had been much worm since the visit of Rey. 7.

εντουργωνα, Lucas; εντουριωνα, Waddington. 9. γεν[ν]ήμασιν, Lucas; γενήμασιν, Wad. 10. μήνα{ς}, Lucas.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 281.

**63 – Antiochos VIII (IX?) to Ptolemaios IX Alexander – summer, 109 BCE**  
= Welles *RCHP* 71

[B]ασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ καὶ  
[Ἀλ]εξάνδρῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εἴη ἂν ὡς βου-  
[λόμ]εθα· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν καὶ σοῦ ἐμνημομεύομεν  
[φιλοστ]όργως. Σελευκεῖς τοὺς ἐν Πιερίαι τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου  
5 [ἐξ ἀρχῆς] μὲν τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν προσκληρωθέντας καὶ τὴν  
[πρὸς αὐτ]ὸν εὐνοίαν μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν συντηρήσαν-  
[τας ἐμμείνα]ντας δὲ καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἡμᾶς φιλοστοργίᾳ καὶ ταύ-  
[την διὰ πολλῶ]ν καὶ καλῶν ἔργων καὶ μάλιστ’ ἐν τοῖς ἐπεί-  
[ληφόσιν ἀναγκαι]οτάτοις καιροῖς ἀποδειξαμένους καὶ κα-  
10 [τὰ τὰ ἄλλα μεγαλ]οψύχως καὶ αὐτῶν ἀξίως ἐπαυξήσαντες  
[εἰς ἐπιφανέστερον πρ]οηγάγομεν ἀξίωμα· καὶ νυνὶ δὲ τῆς πρῶ-  
[της καὶ μεγίστης εὐεργ]εσίας καταξιῶσαι σπουδάζοντες  
[αὐτούς, ἐκρίναμεν εἰ]ς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐλευθέρους  
[εἶναι, καὶ περιελάβομεν αὐτοῦ]ς αἷς ἐποησάμεθα πρὸς ἀλλή-  
15 [λους συνθήκαις, νομίζοντες οὕτ]ως καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα  
[εὐσεβὲς καὶ μεγαλομερεῖς ἡμῶν] ἐκφανέστερον ἔσεσθαι.  
[ὅπως δὲ καὶ σὺ τὰ συγχωρηθέντα παρ]ακολουθῆς, καλῶς ἔχειν  
[ἔδοξεν ἐπιστεῖλαί σοι. ἔρρω]σθε. (ἔτους) γς’, Γοργιαίου κθ’.

Found at (mod.) Kuklia, near Paphus in Cyprus. “Restoration is the work of many hands, chiefly Paton, Wilcken, Wilhelm, and Dittenberger. See the notes on *OGIS* 257 I. 8/9. ἐπειληφόσιν, Wilhelm; ἐπείγουσι, editors, approved most recently by Robert. 18. ἔδοξεν, *W*; ἐκρίναμεν, editors.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 289.

**64 – Antiochos VIII (IX?) to Seleukia in Pieria – summer, 109 BCE**  
= Welles *RCHP* 72

[Βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Σελευκέων τ]ῶν ἐν Πιερίαι τῆς ἱε-  
[ρᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ βο]υλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ  
[χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρρωσθε ὑμεῖς καὶ ἡ πόλις, εἴη ἂν] ὡς βουλόμε-  
[θα. ἐπέμψαμεν ὑμῖν ἀντίγραφον τῆς τε ἐπιστολ]ῆς ἥς γε-  
5 [γράφαμεν πρὸς βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὴν Π]ωμαί-  
[ων σύγκλητον, ἵνα - - - - - παρ]ακολου-  
[θῇτε - - - - - ]

Found at (mod.) Kuklia, near Paphus in Cyprus. “1-3. This is the restoration of Paton and Dittenberger. 4-6. Restored by Dittenberger, from suggestion of Wilcken.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 290.

**65** – Mithridates the Great to the satrap Leonippos – 88/87 BCE  
(on the same monument as **66**) = Welles *RCHP* 73

**Βασιλ[εὺς Μιθριδ]άτης Λεωνίππῳ σατράπῃ**  
**[χαί]ρειν·**  
ἐπεὶ **Χα[ίρ]ήμω[ν Πυ]θοδώρου** ἐκχθρότατα κα[ὶ]  
πολεμιώτα[τα πρ]ὸς τὰ ἡμέτερα πρᾶγματα δια[κείμε]-  
5 **νος** ἀπ' ἄρχ[ῆ]ς τε τοῖς ἐκχθίστοις πολεμίοις [συνή]-  
ει, νῦν τε τῇ[ν] ἐ[μῇ]ν παρουσίαν ἐπιγνοὺς τοὺς [τε υἱ]-  
οὺς Πυθόδω[ρ]ον καὶ Πυθίων[α] ἐξέτο καὶ αὐ[τὸς πέ]-  
φευγεν, κήρ[υ]γ[μα] ποιῆσαι ὅπως ἐάν τις ζῶντ[ας ἀ]-  
γάγῃ **Χαιρήμ[ο]να** ἢ Πυθόδωρον ἢ Πυθίωνα, λάβῃ [τάλαν]-  
10 **τα** τεσσαράκογτα, ἐὰν δέ τ[ις] τὴν κεφαλὴν τινος [αὐτῶν]  
ἐνέγκῃ, λάβῃ τάλαντα εἴκοσι.

Found at (mod.) Akça. “1. [Μιθριδ]άτης, not [Μιθρα]δάτης; cf. [RC]74, 1.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 295.

**66** – Mithridates the Great to the satrap Leonippos – 88/7 BCE  
(on the same monument as **65**) = Welles *RCHP* 74

**Βασιλεὺς Μιθριδάτης Λεωνίππῳ χαίρειν·**  
**Χαιρήμων Πυθοδώρου** πρότερον μὲν τοὺς διαφυ-  
γόντας Ῥωμαίων σὺν τοῖς παισὶν εἰς τὴν Ῥοδίῳ ἐξέ-  
θετο πόλιν, νῦν τε τὴν ἐμὴν παρουσίαν πυθόμενος  
5 **εἰς** τὸ τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν καταπέφευγεν  
ἐντεῦθεν τε γράμματα πρὸς τοὺς κοινούς πολε-  
μίους διαπέμπεται Ῥωμαί<ους>. ἔστιν δὲ ἡ τούτου  
ἄδηα τῶν γεγενημένων ἀδικημάτων ὀρυμ-  
τήριον τῶν καθ' ἡμῶν πραττομένων. φρόντι-  
10 **σον** ὅπως μάλιστα μὲν ἄγῃς αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς  
ἢ ἐν φυλακῇ καὶ εἰργμῷ ὑπάρχει ἄχρι ἂν ἀπὸ τῶν  
πολεμίων ἐμὲ γενέσθαι.

Found at (mod.) Akça. “1. Μιθραδάτης, editors. 7. Ῥωμαίων, stone.” – Welles, *RCHP*, 295.

**67** – Artaban III, King of Parthia, to the arkhons Antiokhos and Phraates and the  
*polis* in Susa – December 17, 21 CE  
= Welles *RCHP* 75

Heading ἐξελήφθη ἐγδόου ἐξηκοστοῦ διακοσιοστοῦ ὥς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἄγει, ὥς δὲ  
πρότερον τρ[ί]του τριακοστοῦ τριακοσιοστοῦ].

Letter **Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων Ἀρσάκης Ἀντιόχῳ καὶ Φραάτει ὄντοι ἐν Σούσις**  
**[τ]οῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν·** ἐπειδὴ Ἐστιαῖος Ἀσίου τῶν  
ὑμετέρων πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν πρώτων καὶ προτιμωμένων φίλῳ[ν κ]αὶ τῶν  
σ[ω]ματοφυλάκων ἄρξας ταμειυ[τικὴν] ἀρχή[ν ἐν τῷ κατὰ τοὺς προτέρους]  
ἀριθμοὺς ἐνάτῳ εἰκοστῷ τριακοσιοστῷ ἔτει ἀνεστράφη ἐν ταύτῃ

- ἄριστα καὶ δικαιοτάτα καὶ μετὰ πάσης καθαρε[ιότητος μηδὲν ἀναλωμα]  
 ὑποστειλάμενος παρ' ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως δαπάνην, δὶς τε τῆς  
 πόλεως ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν προ[εσβευτοῦ ἐσχηκυίας ἀπεδήμησεν]  
 5 αὐτὸς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν ἰδίων ἐν οὐδενὶ θέμενος καὶ τὰ τῆς πόλεως  
 προυγιαίτερα ἡγούμενος καὶ οὔτε χρημάτων οὐδὲ πόνων φεισάμ[ενος  
 ἀπροφασίστως ἑαυτὸν]  
 ἐπέδωκαν εἰς ἀμφοτέρως τὰς πρεσβείας καὶ τὰ συμφέροντα τῇ πατρίδι  
 διωκήσας τέτευχεν τῶν πρεπουσῶν τιμῶν ὥς καὶ τὰ ψηφ[ισθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς  
 πόλεως]  
 ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ τριακοσιοστῷ ἔτει μαρτυρεῖ· ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐνὶ τριακοστῷ  
 τριακοσιοστῷ ἔτει χρεῖας γενομένης ἀγα[θ]ο[υ] ἀνδρὸς πάλιν προυβλήθη]  
 εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς τὸ δεύτερον τριακοστὸν τριακοσιοστῷ ἔτο[ς] καὶ  
 ἐκ πολλῆς δοκιμασίας, αἰρεθέντος ἄρχοντος **Πετάσου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου** μετὰ  
 Ἀριστομένους]  
 τοῦ **Φιλίππου**, παρελθὼν προηνέγκατο διακεκλειῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν  
 διηγ[ο]ρευμένων δις ἄρξαι τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν ἐὰν μὴ διαλείπη ἔτη τρία· ἡ δὲ πόλις  
 [πρότερον πεπειραμένη]  
 10 τῆς ἀγαθῆς προαίρεσεως καὶ διὰ μνήμης ἔχουσα τὴν διοίκησιν τῆς  
 προδηλουμένης ἀρχῆς ἔκρεινεν αὐτὸν αἰρεῖσθαι ἄρχοντα, ὅθεν εἰρέ[θη ἐπὶ τὸ  
 δεύτερον]  
 τριακοστὸν τριακοσιοστῷ ἔτος **Πετάσου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου** καὶ  
 Ἀριστομένους τοῦ **Φιλίππου**· ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν μὲν Ἑστιαῖον ἐπὶ τοῖς  
 προδηλουμένοις ἐπ[α]νηνέγκατε εἰς ἡμᾶς,]  
 τὴν αἵρεσιν αὐτοῦ κρεῖνομεν εἶναι κυρίαν καὶ μὴ παραδιώκεσθαι αὐτὸν τῷ  
 μὴ διαλείποντα ἔτη τρία ἄρξαι τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν μηδ' ἄλλωι ὠιτινιῶν  
 ἐ[πιφερομένωι]  
 περὶ τούτων ἐπιτάγματι, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πά[ν]των παρητημένης πάσης  
 ἀπορ<ρ>ήσεώς τε καὶ ἐπιζητήσεως τῆς τε ἄλλης καὶ ἧς δεῖ τὴν π[α]ρανομίαν τὴν]  
 γρασθεῖσαν ἐπ' ὀνόματος λελύσθαι. ηξσ', Ἀυδναίου ιζ'.

Two following notes in smaller characters.

Note 1 ἔστησεν δὲ αὐτοῦ <τοῦ> Ἑστιαίου τόνδε τὸν  
 ἀνδριάντα Ἄσιος Δημητρίου  
 ὁ καὶ Εἰσαγωγεὺς ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κατὰ τοὺς  
 προτέρους ἀρ<ι>θμοὺς ζλτ' ἔτει.

Note 2 Λεονίδης Ἀρτέμωνος Σελευκῆως τῆς προ[δ]ς τῷ Εὐλαίωι]  
 ἔγραψεν τὴν στήλην.

Found at Susa. I.11. Welles' edn. has Ἑστιαῖον, which I have changed to Ἑστιαῖον. "The text is restored by MM. Cumont and Holleaux. The margin at the right was very uneven. 1. τῶν τε, Cumont. 6. ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, alternative reading of Cumont, who prefers περὶ αὐτοῦ. 9. αὐτόν, W; αὐτόν, Cumont. 11. ἐπανεγκάτε εἰς ἡμᾶς, Rostovtzeff; cf. Polyb., 1, 17 1: ἐπανεγκαισὼν δὲ τῶν συνθηκῶν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην; ἐπητιάσαντο ἀδίκως, Cumont; Holleaux suggester ἐπῆνεσεν ἡ πόλις. 12. ἐπιφερομένωι ἄν, Cumont. 13. παρονομίαν τὴν, W; πρόσκλησιν αὐτοῦ, Cumont, but πρόσκλησις in Koine means "summons," not "charge," cf. BGU 1131, 54 (13 B.C.), etc." – Welles, *RCHP*, 300.

## List of Excluded Texts

The following texts are presented in Welles *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* as inscribed official letters of Hellenistic kingdoms, but I have excluded them from my corpus for one or more of the three possible reasons listed in the preface to the Appendix. I have included such texts here for completeness and for the convenience of the reader.

**Excl.T. 1** – A Hellenistic king to Priene – 3<sup>rd</sup> cen. BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 8, cf. Hiller von Gaertingen *Inscr. Priene* 16; McCabe *Priene* 139

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Inscribed at Priene.

**Excl.T. 2** – Eumenes to members of his army – c.260 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 16, cf. Fränkel *I.Pergamon* I, 7

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Pergamon.

**Excl.T. 3** – A certain king Antiokhos to Ephesos – c.255 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 17

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Ephesos.

**Excl.T. 4** – Ptolemaios II to Kos – pre 250 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 21

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Kos.

**Excl.T. 5** – Attalos I (?) to Kos – c.240 BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 28

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Kos.

**Excl.T. 6** – Antiokhos III, concerning privileges at Nysa – early 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= Welles *RCHP* 43

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Found at Nysa.





# Inscribed Official Letters of Hellenistic *poleis* and *koina*

## 1 – The magistrates and *polis* of Istron to the Koans – 242BCE

(on the same monument as 2) = SEG 51, 1056, cf. IG xii 4,1 214, A ll.1-13 = Ceccarelli AGLW ‘Appendix 3’ 1

A Letter [Ἰστρωνίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Κωίων τῷ βωλῷ καὶ τῷ]  
**δάμῳ χαίρειν· ἀπεστή[λατε παρ’ ἡμῶν θεωροὺς Χά]-**  
**ριππον, Δίωνα, Πλάτωνα,** [οἱ ἐπήγγειλαν τὰν τε θυ]-  
σίαν καὶ τὰν πανάγυρ[ιν τὰν γινομένην τῷ Ἀσ]-  
5 κλαπιῷ καὶ παρεκάλο[υν ἡμῶν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀσ]-  
κλαπιῷ τὸ ἐγ Κῶι ἄσυ[λον δέχεσθαι· ἀγαθὰ τύχαι·]  
δεδόχθαι τῇ πόλει τῷ Ἰστρωνίων δέχεσθαι καθά[  
πρακαλοῦντι τὰν τε θυσίαν καὶ τὰν πανάγυ]-  
ριν καὶ τὰν ἐκχειρίδα[ν, καὶ ἄσυλον ἡμεῖν τὸ ἱερὸν]  
10 τοῦ Ἀσκλαπιῷ ὑπὸ τε [Ἰστρωνίων καὶ τῶν κατοικόν]-  
των ἐν Ἰστρῶνι· τὸ δὲ ψ[άφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι ἐν τῷ]  
πρυτανεῖῳ νῦν ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τόπῳ· τοῖς δὲ]  
θεωροῖς ἐς ἀπαρχὰν [δόμην στατήρας δέκα(?) *vacat*(?)].

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Kos (all notes on the places of inscriptions are from Ceccarelli). “A 1. ἀπεστή[λατε ποθ’ ἡμῶν Χά]-, H. | 2. [θεωροὺς οἵτινες τὰν τε θυ]-, H. 3-4. restorations by H., to which ἡμῶν was added by edd.pr. | 6. in fine, [δόμην Κώϊοις ἂ], H. | 7. restored by K. | 9. restored by K. | 11. τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ - - - ], H.” – SEG online.

## 2 – The *kosmoi* and *polis* of Phaistos to the Koans – 242BCE

(on the same monument as 1) = SEG 51, 1056, cf. IG xii 4,1 214, A: ll.14-18, B: ll.19-24 = Ceccarelli AGLW ‘App.3’ 2

A (front)

Letter 2 **Φαιστίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ [ἡ πόλις Κωίων τοῖς ἄρχουσι]**

15 **καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν·** ἐπ[εὶ Κῶιοι ἀποστείλαντες θεω]-  
[ροῦ]ς τὰν τε ἄσυλ[ίαν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ Ἀσκλαπιῷ καὶ τὰν θυ]-  
[σίαν κα]ὶ τὰ λοιπά, ὧγ | [- - -, ἀξιοῦντι δέχεσθαι - - -]  
[. . . . .] τ[α]ῦτα δε.[ - - - - - ]

B (back)

[ - - - - - ὅπως? τὸ]  
[ἱερὸν τῷ Ἀσκλαπιῷ ἄσυλον] ὑπάρχῃ ὑπὸ τε Φαισ[τίων]  
[καὶ τῶν κατοικόντων ἐμ Φα]ιστῶι· **ἀγαθὰ τύχαι·** ἡ[μεῖν]  
[ἄσυλον τὸ ἱερὸν τῷ Ἀσκλαπ]ιῷ τῷ ἐγ Κῶι ὑπὸ τε Φαιστ[ί]-  
5 Document [ων καὶ τῶν κατοικόντων ἐ]μ Φαιστῶι· τὸ δὲ ψάφισμα  
[τόδε ἀναγράψαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ Ἀπόλ]λωνος τῷ Πυθίῳ· κτλ.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Kos. “B 2. initio, H. | 4. initio, H. (but παροικ-)|” – SEG online.

## 3 – The Thessalonikeis to the Delians – 240-230BCE? or c.230 BCE

= *IG* xi 4, 1053, cf. *IG* x 2, 1, 1028 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 3

- Letter ἡ πόλις Θεσσαλονικέων Δηλίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ  
 τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· παραγενομένου Βούλωνος  
 τοῦ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀποσταλέντος πρεσβευτοῦ καὶ τὰ  
 τε ψηφίσματα ἀποδόντος δι’ ὧν ἐτετιμήκατε  
 5 Ἄδμητον Βόκρου καὶ παρελθόντος εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησί-  
 αν καὶ διαλεγέντος ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐψηφισμένοις  
 ταῦτά τε προθύμως προσεδεξάμεθα καὶ τοῦ ψηφίσμα-  
 [τ]ος καθ’ ὃ συνεκεχωρήκαμεν τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀξιώ[μα]-  
 [τ]α, πεπόμφαμεν ὑμῖν τὸ ἀντίγραφον ὅπως εἰδῆτε·  
 10 Doc. Σωσίπατρος ὁ ὑπεπιστάτης καὶ οἱ ἀ[ρμ]οσταὶ Μέναν-  
 δρος, Νικόδημος, Φιλόδημος, Ἰππίας, [Π]άϋσων εἶπαν· κτλ.

Date 1: PHI. 2: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delos.

## 4 – Lappa (Krete) to Tenos – c.300-250 BCE

= *IC* 2 xvi 2, cf. Rigsby *Asyilia* 59 and *IG* xii, 5, 868A = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 4

- [ - - - - - ]  
 1 [ - - - - - ] . ιω[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ε γεγραμ[μ]εν[ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ε ἀ[ν]ανέωνταί τε τὰν ἀσυλίαν τῷ ἰρῶ τῷ  
 [Ποτειδάωνος καὶ τῆς Ἀ]μφιτρίτας καὶ τὰν [ - - - - - ]  
 5 [ - - - - - ] παρακαλῶντι Την[ι - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] καὶ τὰ λο]ιπὰ παρὰ Λαππαίων [ - - - - - ] ἐπαινῶντι  
 [δὲ καὶ τὼς πρεσβευτ]ᾶς καὶ τὸν συνεσδεδαμ[ηκότα αὐτοῖς - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ἐπ[ὶ] τῇ ἀναστροφῇ ἂν ἐπο[ιήσαντο ἀξίως ἀμφοτε]-  
 [ρῶν τε τὰν πολίων καὶ α]ὐτῶν· ἐποισάμεθα δὲ αὐτ[ - - - - - ]  
 10 [ - - - - - ] τῷ θεῷ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς [ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] .ε καιρὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ[ι τῶν  
 Κρηταίων]  
 [ - - - - - ] . τῷ θεῷ. εὐτυχεῖτε.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Tenos.

5 – The *kosmoi* and *polis* of Knossos to the Koans – 221-219BCE= *IC* 1 viii 7, cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 528, and *IG* xii 4,1 247 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 5

- Κνωσίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Κώϊων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δ-  
 ᾶμῳ χαίρειν. ἐπειδὴ πρεσβυσάντων Γορτυνίων πρ-  
 ὸς ὑμὲ ὑπὲρ ἱατροῦ καὶ ὑμῶν φιλοτίμως σπυσάντων  
 καὶ ἀποστειλάντων αὐτοῖς Ἑρμίαν ἱατρόν, στάσιος δ-  
 5 ἐ γενομένης ἐγ Γόρτυνι καὶ ἐλθόντων ἀμίων κατ[ὰ]  
 τὰν συμμαχίαν ἐς τὰμ μάχαν τε[ὰν] Γορτυνίοις γεν[ε]-  
 [ομένα]ν ἐν τῇ πό[λει, συνέ]βα τινὰς τῶμ πολι[τῶν καὶ τ]-  
 ῶν ἄλλων τῶν συνελθόντων παρ’ ἀμίων ἐπὶ [τὰμ μά]-

- 10 χαν τραυματίας τε γενέσθαι καὶ πλείους ἐκ τ[ῶν]  
 τραυμάτων ἁρωστίαις οὐ ταῖς τυχούσαις πε[ριπε]-  
 σεῖν, Ἑρμίας ὑπάρχων ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ τότε τε πᾶσ[αν σ]-  
 πουδὰν ἐποίησατο ὑπὲρ ἀμίων καὶ διέσωσε αὐτο[ὺς ἐγ]-  
 μέγαλων κινδύνων ἔν τε τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀπροφα[σίστ]-  
 15 ως διετέλει συναντῶν τοῖς παρακαλοῦσι [αὐτό]-  
 ν, πάλιν τε γενομένης μάχας περὶ Φαιστὸν π[ολλ]-  
 ῶν τραυματιῶν γενομένων καὶ ὡσαύτως πολλ[ῶν κι]-  
 νδυνεύσαντων ἐν ταῖς ἁρωστίαις πᾶσαν [σπου]-  
 δὰν ἐν ταῖς θεραπαίαις ποιούμενος διέ[σωσε αὐτοὺς]  
 20 ἐγ' μεγάλων κινδύνων ἔν τε [τοῖς λοιποῖς παρέχων]  
 [αὐτὸν πρόθ]υμον τ[οῖς παρακαλοῦσι αὐτὸν - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Kos.

## 6 – Gortyna to the Koans – 218 BCE(?)

= IC 4 168, cf. IG xii 4, 1 248 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 6

- Γορτυνίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Κώιον τῇ βουλῇ κα[ὶ τ]-**  
**ῷ δάμῳ χαίρειν·** ἐπειδὴ Ἑρμίας Ἑμμενίδα, χε[ιρο]-  
 τονηθεὺς ὑφ' ὑμίων καὶ ἀποστευθεὺς παρ' ἀμὲ ἰα-  
 τρός, ἀξίως πεπόηται τὰν παρ' ἀμῖν ἐπιδαμίαν  
 5 ὑμίων τε τῶν ἀποστειλάντων καὶ αὐτοσαυτῶ, ἔ-  
 τι δὲ καὶ ἀμίων τῶν δόντων ὑμῖν τὰν ἐπιτροπὰν  
 τῆς αἰρέσιος τῷ ἰατρῷ, ἀνέγκλητος ἰὼν ἐμ πᾶσι τ-  
 ᾶν ἐπιδαμίαν πεποίηται ἔτια πέντε ἐπιμελόμε-  
 10 ενός τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατοικιό-  
 ντων Γόρτυνι φιλοτιμίως τε καὶ ἐντενίως κατὰ τὰ-  
 ν τέχνην καὶ τὰν ἄλλαν ἐπιμέλειαν πολλὸν ἔ-  
 σωσε ἐς μεγάλων κινδύνων οὐδὲν ἐλλείπω-  
 ν προθυμίας, συμμάχων τε ἀμῖν πολλῶν παραγε-  
 γονότων καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἐπολεμίομεν καὶ τούτων  
 15 τὰν αὐτὰν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποίησατο καὶ ἔσωσε ἐς  
 μεγάλων κινδύνων βωλόμενος εὐχαριστῆν τᾶ-  
 ῖ ἀμῇ πόλει, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπευθὼν ἐπὶ τὰν ἐσκλησίαν  
 ἀξίωσε ἀμὲ ἀφέμεν αὐτὸν ἐς τὰν ἰδίαν, ἐπεχω-  
 [ρ]ήσαμεν συναπεστήλαμέν τε τῶν πολιτῶν  
 20 [α]ὐτῷ Σόαρχον καὶ Κύδαντα, βωλόμενοι αὐτῷ εὐ-  
 [χαρι]στῆν, ἔδοξέ τε ἀμῖν ἐπαινέσαι Ἑρμίαν ἁρε-  
 [τᾶς ἔ]γεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τᾶς ἐς τὰν πόλιν, ἐπαινέ-  
 [σαι δὲ καὶ] Κ[ώ]ιονς ὅτι καὶ ἰατρὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ {ι} ἄνδρα ἀξ[ι]-  
 [ό]λογον ἀμῖν ἀπέ]στηλαν· οἱ δὲ καὶ πάντες γινώσκ-  
 25 [ωντι ὅτι ἐπιστάμ]ε[θ]α χάριτας ἀποδιδόμεν, ἔδοξ[ε]  
 [ἀμῖν καὶ πολιτείαν δ]όμεν α[ὐ]τῷ καὶ ἐκγόνοις  
 [ - - - - - ]

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Kos.

## 7 – Argos to Magnesia on the Maeander – 208 BCE

= *I.Magnesia* 40 = Rigsby *Asyilia* 90 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 7

- Letter [ - - - - - Μαγνή]των τᾷ βουλ[ᾷ]  
[καὶ τῷ δάμῳ χαίρειν· οἱ παρ’ ὑ]μῶν πρεσβευταὶ καὶ  
[θεαροὶ παραγενόμενοι Φ]ιλίσκος Πυθαγόρου, Κόνων  
[Διονυσίου, Λάμπετο]ς Πυθαγόρου τό τε ψάφισμα  
5 [ἀπέδωκαν τῷ δά]μῳ καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγεν ἀκολού-  
[θως τοῖς ἐν τῷ] ψαφίσματι κατακεχωρισμένοις πε-  
[ρὶ τοῦ ἀγῶν]ος [τ]ῶν Λευκοφρυηνῶν· ὑπογεγράφαμες οὖν  
ὑμῖν τὸ ἀντίγραφον τοῦ ψαφίσματος τοῦ δοχθέντος  
τῷ δάμῳ. **ἔρρωσθε.**  
10 Doc. πρεσβευτᾶν παραγενομένων παρὰ τοῦ δάμου τῷ  
Μαγνήτων τῶν πρὸς τῷ Μαιάνδρῳ Φιλίσκου τοῦ  
Πυθαγόρου, κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Magnesia.

8 – Knossos to Magnesia on the Maeander – end 3<sup>rd</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE or 208 BCE?= *IC* 1 viii 10, cf. *I.Magnesia* 67 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 8

- Letter [ - - - - - κρ]ίνοντεν ἀξίονες [ - - - ]  
[ - - - - - τῶ]ν παρ’ ἀμῖν τιμίων  
[ - - - - - ] ἀμὶν διασαφησα[ν]-  
[τ- - - -]ων· ὑπογεγ[ρ]άφαμεν δὲ τῷ ψαφίσμα-  
5 [τος τὸ ἀ]ντίγραφον· εὖ οὖν ποιήσετε ἀναγράψαν-  
[τες ἐς τ]ὰν στωιὰν καὶ ὑμέν· ἀνεγράψαμεν  
γὰρ καὶ ἀμὲν ἐν στάλῃ λιθίνει καὶ ἐθήκαμεν  
ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ Ἀπέλλωνος τῷ Δελφιδίῳ. **ἔρρωσθε.**  
Document ἐπὶ τᾷς Ἀρχήϊας κοσμιόντων τῶν σὺν Ζω-  
10 ἄρχῳ ἔδοξεν Κνωσί[ω]ν [τ]οῖς κόσ[μοις] καὶ  
τῷ πόλι· κτλ.

Date 1: PHI. 2: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Magnesia.

9 – Magistrates and *synhedroi* of the Aitolians to the *boule* and *demos* of Xanthos – 206/205 BCE(on the same monument as 10) = *SEG* 38, 1476 ll.79-88 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 9

- Decree Βασιλεύοντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ  
of Βερενίκης Θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ Πτολεμαί-  
Xanthos ου, (ἔτους) ιζ΄, κτλ.

...

- Decree Ἔδοξε τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς  
of the πρεσβείας δόμεν τοῖς Δωριέοις ποτὶ τε τὰς πόλεις τὰς  
Aitolians συγγενεῖς καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἡρακλέος Πτολε-  
76 μαῖον καὶ Ἀντίοχον· κτλ.

...  
 Letter  
 80 **Ἀγέλαος, Πανταλέ-**  
**ων, Μόλοσσοι καὶ οἱ σύνοδοι τῶν Αἰτωλῶν Ξανθίων τῇ βου-**  
**λαί καὶ τῷ δάμῳ χαίρειν·** Λ[α]μπρίας, Αἴνετος, Φηγέως, οἱ ἀπο-  
 δεδωκότες ὑμῖν τὴν ἐπιστολάν, ἐντὶ μὲν Δωριεῖς ἐκ Κυ-  
 τενίου, παραγεγόναντι δὲ ποθ' ὑμὲ πρὸς βεβύοντες παρὰ  
 τῶν Αἰτωλῶν περὶ τειχισμοῦ τῆς τῶν Κυτενιέων πόλιος· κα-  
 85 λῶς οὖν ποιήσετε καὶ ἔνεκεν ἀμῶν καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Αἰτω-  
 λῶν καὶ τῆς ποτὶ Δωριεῖς οἰκειότατος ὑμῖν ὑπαρχούσας,  
 διακούσαντες αὐτῶν μετὰ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἐν τὰ ἀξιούμε-  
 να προθύμως ὑπακούσαντες· ν" **Εἰρησθε·** ν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Xanthos. "(LETTER) 79-80. Cf. app.crit. of B ad L. 73; Agelaos is on record as federal strategos in 217/216 B.C., between 217/216 and 206/205 (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 554) and now for the third strategia in 206/205 B.C., ed.pr." – *SEG* online.

**10 – The Kytenians to the *boule* and *demos* of Xanthos – 206/205 BCE**  
 (on the same monument as 9) = *SEG* 38, 1476 ll.88-110 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 10

**Δωρ[ι]έων τῶν ἀπὸ**  
**Ματροπόλιος οἱ πόλιν Κυτένιον οἰκέοντες Ξανθίων τῇ βου-**  
 90 **λαί καὶ τῷ δάμῳ χαίρειν·** Ἀπεστάλκαμες ποθ' ὑμὲ πρὸς-  
**βεις καὶ ἄμεις καὶ τοὶ Αἰτωλοὶ Λαμπρίαν [Π]αγκλέος, Αἴνετον**  
**Πολύτα, Φηγέα Σωτίωνος τοὺς διαλεγησομένους περὶ ὧν**  
**ἔχοντι τὰς ἐντολάς·** συμβαίνει γὰρ ἀμῶν, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν  
 ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος ἐνέβαλε ἐν τὴν Φωκίδα, τῶν τε  
 95 τειχέων μέρη τινὰ καταπεπτῶκειν ὑπὸ τῶν σεισμῶν πα-  
 σᾶν τὰμ πολίων καὶ τοὺς νεωτέρους εἰσβοαθοήκε<ι>ν ἐν τὸ ἱερὸ[ν]  
 τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς· παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ βασι-  
 λεὺς ἐν τὴν Δωρίδα τὰ τε τείχη ἀμῶν κατέσκαψε πασᾶν  
 τὰμ πολίων καὶ τὰς οἰκίας κατέκαυσε· ἀξιάζομες οὖν ὑμὲ  
 100 μνασθέντας τὰς συγγενείας τὰς ὑπαρχούσας ἀμῖν  
 ποθ' ὑμὲ μὴ περιδεῖν τὰμ μεγίσταν τὴν ἐν τῇ Ματροπόλ[ι πό]-  
 λιν Κυτένιον ἐξαλειφθεῖσαν, ἀλλὰ βοαθοῆσαι ἀμῖν ἐν [τὸν]  
 τειχισμὸν τῆς πόλιος καθ' ὃ κα δυνατὸν ὑμῖν φαίνεται εἰ[ν]-  
 μεν, καὶ φανερὰν ποιῆσαι τοῖς Ἑλλάνοις τὰμ παρ' ὑμῶν εὐνοια[ν]  
 105 ποτὶ τε τὸ ἔθνο<ς> ἀμῶν καὶ τὰμ πόλιν, συναντιλαβομένους ἀξίως  
 καὶ τῶν προγόνων καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέος καὶ τῶν ἀπογόν-  
 ων αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἄμεις δὲ χάριτας ἀποδωσειμεν καθ' ὃ κα παρακά-  
 λητε· γινώσκετε δὲ οὐ μόνον ἀμῖν εὐχαριστῆς ἐόντες ἀλλὰ καὶ  
 [το]ῖς Αἰτωλοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Δωριεῖσι πᾶσι καὶ μάλιστα βασιλεῖ  
 110 Πτολεμαίῳ διὰ τὸ συγγενῇ ἀμῶν εἶμεν κατὰ τοὺς βασιλεῖς.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Xanthos. "93. ἀμῶν instead of ἀμῖν, ed.pr. | ... | 96. HKEN, lapis; εἰς (βε)βοαθοήκε(ι)ν is the correct form, ed.pr. | 99. ἀξιάζω: new word, ed.pr. | 105. ΕΘΝΟΝ, lapis | 110. space was lacking for τοὺς ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους Ἀργεάδας after βασιλεῖς, ed.pr. (cf. LL. 42 and 49)." – *SEG* online.

## 11 – Sybrita (Crete) to the Teians – 201 BCE

= IC 2 xxvi 1 = Rigsby *Asyilia* 141 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 11

Συβριτίων.

Συβριτίων ἃ πόλις καὶ οἱ κόσμοι Τηίων τῷ βωλῷ καὶ τῷ  
 δάμῳ χαίρειν *vac.* παραγενόμενος Περδίκκας ὁ παρὰ βασι-  
 λέως Φιλίππου πρεσβευτὰς τό τε ψήφισμα ἀπέδωκεν  
 5 ὃ ἔφερον οἱ παρ’ ὑμῶν πρεσβευταὶ ἐπεὶ αὐτοῖς συνε-  
 [πρέσβευσεν], ἐν ᾧ ἐγράψατε ἅμιν περὶ τῆς οἰκειότα-  
 τος καὶ τῆς φιλίας, καὶ ὅτι καλῶς κα ποιήσαιμεν προσ-  
 δεξάμενοι τὰν τε ἀνιέρωσιν τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ τὰν ἀσυ-  
 λίαν τῆς τε πόλιος καὶ τῆς χώρας [ὑμῶν - - - - - ]  
 10 [ . . . . ] πράσσειν· διελέγη δὲ [καὶ Περδίκκας ὁ ὑμέτερος]  
 [πολί]τας ἀκολούθως τοῖς γ[εγραμμένοις μετὰ πάσας]  
 σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας· πρό[θυμοι οὖν καὶ ἀπὸ προ]-  
 γόνων πρὸς πάντα τὰ [θεῖα διακείμενοι - - - - - τὰν]  
 ἀνιέρωσιν τῷ Διονύσῳ κ[ - - - - - ]  
 15 [ . . ] βουλόμενοι ὑμῖν π[ - - - - - ]  
 [καὶ τ]ᾶλλα τίμια [καὶ ἔνδοξα - - - - - ]  
 [καὶ τὰ]ν ἀσυλίαν [τῆς πόλιος καὶ τῆς χώρας - - - - - ]  
 [ . . . . ] ἰο[ - - - - - ]  
 πάντα. εἰ δέ τινές κα τῶν ὀρμι<ο>μένων ἐξυβρί[σ]τας ἀδι-  
 20 κήσωσιν τινα Τηίων ἢ τῶν παροίκων ἢ κοινῶι ἢ ἰδίαι πα-  
 ρὰ τὸ γραφέν δόγμα περὶ τῆς ἀσυλίας ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεος  
 τῶν Συβριτίων, ἐξέστω τῷ παραγενομένῳ Τηίων  
 ἢ τῶν παροίκων τῶν ἐν Τέῳι ἐπιλαβέσθαι καὶ τῶν σω-  
 μάτων καὶ χρημάτων, εἴ τις κα ἄγῃ· οἱ δὲ κόσμοι οἱ τόκα  
 25 ἀεὶ κοσμίοντες ἐπαναγκαζόντων ἀποδιδό-  
 μεν τοὺς ἔχοντας, ἀζήμιοι ὄντες καὶ ἀνυπόδι-  
 κοι πάσας ζαμίας. *vac.* εὐτυχεῖτε.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Teos. l.3. Rigsby has no *vac.* after χαίρειν. l.19. ὀρμισμένων ἐξυβρίτας, Rigsby. l.21. Rigsby has πόλεως. l.23. I have followed Rigsby with Τέῳι, Guarducci has Τέφ. l.26. Rigsby has no *vac.* before εὐτυχεῖτε. “6 Boeckh from Sherard’s copy (line omitted by Chishull and Hessel): init. Holleaux: συνέ[[βη ἅμα ἐπιδημεῖν] Waddington; τῆς τ’ Boeckh, T omitted by Le Bas. 9-10: [καὶ παρακαλεῖτε | περὶ τούτων] Waddington. 10 end Muttelsee: ὑμῶν Waddington. 13 [θ. δ. καὶ τὰν], 14 κ[αὶ Περδίκκαι χαρίζεσθαι], 15 γ[ε τὰ λοιπὰ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ], 16 [κ. ἔ. διαφυλάζομεν ἀπροφασίστως], 17-18 χ. καὶ τὰν ἀνιέρωσιν τῷ Δ[ι]ο[νύ]σῳ δίδομεν νῦν τε καὶ ἀεὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον] Waddington. 19: OPMIS Sherard, Hessel, Le Bas, OPMΩ Chishull, ὀρμι<ο>μένων Boeckh; BPIΣΤΑΣ Hessel, BPITIAS Chishull.” – Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 303.

## 12 – Polyrrhenia to the Teians – 201 BCE

= IC 2 xxiii 3 = Rigsby *Asyilia* 137 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 12

Πολυρρηνίων.

Πολυρρηνίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἃ πόλις Τηίων τῷ δάμῳ  
 καὶ τῷ βωλῷ χαίρειν. κομισάμενοι τὸ ψάφισμα τὸ παρ’  
 ὑμῶν ἀνέγνωμεν καὶ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν Ἀπολλοδό-  
 5 {δο}τω{ι} καὶ Κωλῳτά{ι} διακούσαμεν παρακαλούντων μετὰ  
 πάνσας σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ

ψαφίσματι κατακεχωρισμένοις. περὶ δὲ τούτων δεδό-  
 χθαι Πολυρρηνίων τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τῇ πόλει· ἀποκρίνασ-  
 θαι Τηίοις διότι τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ αὐτοὶ σεβόμεθα καὶ δίδο-  
 10 ται τῷ θεῷ [παρ' ἁ]μῶν τὰν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰν χώραν ἀνιέμεν  
 ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον. ἡμεν δὲ  
 καὶ [πάνσι τ]οῖς ἐν Τέφ ἀσφάλειαν καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ  
 [θάλασσαν] ἐ[ς] τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον. ἔρρωσθε.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Teos. II.4-5. Ἀπολλοδό[δο]τω[ι], Guarducci; Ἀπολλοδό[τω]ι, Rigsby.  
 “12: [παροίκοις τ]οῖς Cauer.” – Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 299.

### 13 – Kydonia to the Teians – 201 BCE

= IC 2 x 2 = Rigsby *Asyilia* 139 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 13

Κυδωνιατᾶν.

Κυδωνιατᾶν ἡ πόλις καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες Τηίων τῇ βουλ[ῃ]  
 καὶ τῷ δάμῳ χαίρειν. ἐπειδὴ [Τή]οι φίλοι καὶ συγγενεῖς  
 ὑπάρχοντες διὰ προγόνων τῇ πόλει ψάφισμα καὶ πρεσ-  
 5 βευτὰς ἀπεστάλκαντι Ἀπολλόδοτον καὶ Κωλώταν, οἱ  
 ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὰν ἐκκλησίαν τό τε ψάφισμ<α> ἀπέδω-  
 καν καὶ αὐτοὶ διελέγην ἀκολούθως τοῖς γεγραμμένοις  
 τὰν ἐκτενεστάταν σπουδὰν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ποιόμε-  
 νοι περὶ τῷ γενέσθαι τὰν καθιάρωσιν τῷ Διονύσῳ τᾶς  
 10 τε πόλιος καὶ τᾶς χώρας τᾶς Τηίων καὶ τὰν ἀσυλίαν, ἔτι  
 δὲ καὶ ἄλλα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς ἔνδοξα καὶ τίμια εἰς  
 τὸν θεὸν ψαφισαμένοις καὶ αὐτὸς συναύξεν καὶ αἰεὶ τι-  
 νος ἀγαθῷ παραιτίος γενέσθαι τῷ δάμῳ καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα  
 ποιήσαντες ἀκόλουθα πράξομεν τῇ τε [?συγγενείᾳ καὶ τῇ]  
 15 ποτὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ τὰ μέγιστα χαριζόμεθα τῷ  
 δάμῳ· ἀποκρίνασθαι Τηίοις φίλοις καὶ οἰκεῖ[οις] ἐῷσιν δι-  
 ὅτι τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ αὐτοὶ σεβόμεθα καὶ τὸν Τηίω[ν] δᾶμον]  
 συγγενέα ὄντα ἀσπαζόμεθα καὶ ἐπαινῶμεν δ[ι]ό[τι κα]-  
 λῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως καὶ καταξίως τῷ[ι] θεῷ[ι] προεστάκαντι·  
 20 ἔνεκα ὧν καὶ παρ' ἁμῶν τὰ καλὰ καὶ τίμια δίδοται τῷ θεῷ  
 καὶ Τηίων τὰν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰν χώραν ἀνιέμεν ἱερὰν καὶ  
 ἄσυλον νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅλλον χρόνον πάντα, καὶ πει[ρα]-  
 σόμεθα αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθῷ παραιτίοι γίνεσθαι τῷ δάμῳ  
 καὶ κοινᾷ καὶ ἰδίᾳ. εἰ κα[ί] τινες ἄγωντι Τηίος ἢ τὸς κατοικόν-  
 25 τας παρ' αὐτοῖς, οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἄλλος ὁ λῶν Κυδωνια-  
 τᾶν ἢ Τηίων ἀφελόμενοι καὶ διδόντες τοῖς ἀδικη-  
 μένοις κύριοι ἔστωσαν. ἔρρωσθε.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Teos. I.15. χαριζόμεθα τῷ, Guarducci; χαριζόμεθα τῷ, Rigsby. II.15-  
 16. οἰκεῖ[οις] ἐῷσιν δι[ό]τι, G; οἰκεῖ[οις] οὖσιν δι[ό]τι, R. I.17. τὸν Τηίω[ν] δᾶμον, G; τὸν Τηίων δᾶμον, R. I.24.  
 κα[ί], R; καί, G. “2 APXONTOS Le Bas: ΚΟΣΜΟΙ Chishull (but Sherard’s copy ends with KAI). 15-17: the  
 line ends are reported by Kennedy Bailie (16-17: ΟΥΣΙΝ | ΔΙΟΤΙ) but not Le Bas; 16 οἰκε[ί]οις ὑπάρχουσιν]  
 Blass, οἰκεῖ[οις] ἐῷσιν δι]- Guarducci. 20: ENEKEN Kennedy Bailie. 21: ΧΩΠΑΝΑΥΤΩΝΕΜΕΝ Kennedy  
 Bailie. 24., 25 Cauer: καί and ὅλων Waddington.” – Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 301.

**14 – Hierapytna to the Teians – 201 BCE**= IC 3 iii 2 = Rigsby *Asyilia* 144 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 14

- Letter [τάν τε καθιέρωσιν τῶι Διονύσῳ τᾶς τε πόλιος]  
καὶ τᾶς χώρας [ὑμῶν δίδομεν καὶ ἐφ’ ὅσον κα δυ]-  
νατὸν ἦι οὐκ ἐπιτ<ρ>άψομεν οὐδενὶ ἀδικεῖν ἐν τᾷ  
ὑμῶι χώρῃ, τάν τε [φι]λίαν ἄρμωστὰν ἐῶσαν δι-  
ακαθεξίόμεν <ν>ὺν τε καὶ εἰς τὸ<ν> λοιπὸν χρόνον  
5 πάντα. εἰ δέ τι[νές κα] τῶν ὀρμωμένων ἐξ Ἰα[ρα]-  
πύτνας [ἀδικήσωντί τι]να Τηίων ἢ κο[ι]γᾶι ἢ ἰδί-  
αι ἐξέ[στω] τῶι παραγεν[ομένῳ] [Τηίων] ἐπιλα-  
βέσθαι καὶ [τῶν σωμάτων] καὶ χ[ρημάτων, εἴ τίς]  
κα ἄγῃ· οἱ δ[ὲ] κόσμοι οἱ τ[ό]κ’ ἀεὶ [κοσμίοντες ἐπα]-  
10 ναγκαζόντων ἀποδιδόμεν τὸς ἔχοντας [ἄζάμιοι]  
έόντες καὶ ἀνυπόδικοι πάσας ζαμίας. **ἔρρωσθε.**

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Teos. 2. ἐπιτ<ρ>άψομεν, Rigsby; ἐπιτ[ρ]άψομεν, Guarducci. 1.3. τε, R; τε, G. 1.4. <ν>ὺν, R; [ν]ὺν, G. τό<ν>, R; τό[ν], G. 1.5. τῶν, R; τῶν, G. 6. κο[ι]γᾶι, R; κο[ι]γᾶι, G. 1.7. ἐξέ[στω], R; ἐξέ[στω], G. [παραγεν]ομένῳ, R; [παραγεν]ομένῳ, G. 1.8. χ[ρημάτων], G; <χ>ρ[ημάτων], R. 1.9. [κοσμίοντες], G; κ[οσμίοντες], R. “2 NIBO, 3 TANTA, 5 ΔΩΝ, 7 ΜΕΝΟΔ, 9 fin. AEN Naber.” – Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 306.

**15 – The Thebans to Polyrrenia – end 3<sup>rd</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE**= IC 2 xxiii 1 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 15**Θηβαίων.**

- Letter [οἱ] **Θηβαίων πολέμαρχοι καὶ οἱ σύνεδροι** Π[ολυ]-  
[ρη]νίων τοῖς κόσμοις κ[α]ὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρ[ειν].  
[τοῦ] παρ’ ἡμῖν ψηφίσματος τοῖς ἀποστα[λεῖ]-  
5 Decree [σι] π[α]ρ’ ὑμῶν ὑπογεγράφαμεν ὑμῖν τὸ <ἀντίγραφον>· ἄ[ρχ]-  
[οντο]ς Θεοζότου, μηνὸς Πανάμου, ἔδ[ο]-  
[ξεν τ]ῶι συνεδρῶι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ· κτλ.

Date: PHI. Inscribed at Polyrrenia.

**16 – Axos (Crete) to the Aitolians – c.200-170BCE**= IC 2 v 19, cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 622, B = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 16

- A. Decree [στραταγέοντος τῶν Αἰτωλῶν τοῦ δεῖνος *ethnicum*, γραμμα]-  
[τεύοντος δ]ὲ βουλᾶς κτλ.

...

- B. Letter **Φαξίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Αἰτωλῶν** συνέδροις] καὶ τῶι στρα-  
ταγῶι καὶ τῶι ἱππάρχῃ χαίρειν. γινώ[σκε]τε Ἐράτωνα πολί-  
ταν ἄμὸν ἰόντα, ἐκπλεύσαντα δὲ ἐπὶ στ[ρ]ατ[ε]ίαν εἰς Κύπρον  
καὶ λαβόντα γυναῖκα τεκνοποιήσασθαι υἱ[ο]ὺς δύο, Ἐπικλῆν  
5 καὶ Εὐαγόραν. συνέβα δὲ ἀποθανόντος τῷ Ἐράτῳ ἐν τᾷ  
Κύπρῳ, αἰχμαλώτως γενέσθαι τὸν πε[ρ]ὶ τὸν Ἐπικλῆν καὶ  
τὰ μαιτέρᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ προαθῆμεν τὸν Ἐπικλῆν εἰς Ἄμφισσαν·  
καταβαλὼν δὲ τὰ λύτρα ὁ Ἐπικλῆς οἴκε[ι] π[α]ρ’ ὑμῖν ἐν Ἀμφίσσῃ,



- πολίτας ἰὼν ἄμὸς αὐτός τε καὶ τ]ὰ τέκ[να αὐ]τῷ Ἐρασ[ιφῶ]ν [καὶ]  
 10 Τιμῶναξ καὶ θυγάτηρ Μελίτα. [καλῶς οὖν π]οιη<σ>εῖτε φροντίδ-  
 δοντες ὅπαι εἴ τις κα ἀδικῇ α[ὐτῶς, κω]λύηται ὑφ' ὑμῶν [καὶ κοι]-  
 νᾷ καὶ ἰδία, ἃ δὲ κοινοπολι[τείας] ἀἰδία ὑπάρχει ἀν[αγραφά].

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

**17 – An unknown polis (Knidos?) or poleis to Bargylia – early 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE**  
 = Rigsby *Asyilia* 174 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 17

- Letter [ - - - - - ἄρχον]τες Βαργυλιατῶν τῇ πόλι [χαίρειν·]  
 [ - - - - - ἀπε]στάλακαμες πῶθ ὑμὲ το[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ΕΜΕΩΝ ἀρχιθέωρον Δαμάτ[ριον - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] Δαμοκράτη Ἀσσυτέλε<σ>, [ - - - ]  
 5 [ - - - - - ] Σ αὐτοῖς ἐντολὰς πρεσβε[υ - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ικας καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀσυλίας[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ] καὶ περὶ τῶν τιμῶν καὶ τα[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - τοῦ] ἀγῶνος ὁ<ν> ἀποκατέστα[σεν ἃ πόλις?]  
 [ - - - - - τ]ῶν λοιπῶν Ἑλλάνων [ - - - - - ]  
 10 [ - - - - - τοῦ]τους φιλοτίμως καὶ κ[αλῶς ? - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - πό]λιος ἀξίως καὶ τῆς θεο[ῦ - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ν πὸτ ἄμε ΡΟΙΝΟ.ΕΣΓΑΥ[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ι περὶ τούτων ἐπιμέλε[ιαν - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ατα τῶν θεαροδόχων [ - - - - - ]  
 15 [ - - - - - ἀ]ναγράφωντι ἐν στ[άλαι λιθίνοι·]  
 [ - - - - - πάντα τὰ τ]ίμια ἃ καὶ τοῖς πρ[οξένοις - - - ]  
 ἔρρωσθε.

Date: Ceccarelli. Probably inscribed at Bargylia. Letter: “1: ἃ πόλις καὶ οἱ ἄρχον]τες Boeckh. 2-3: [ἐπειδὴ τό τε ψάφισμα ὃ ἀπε]στάλακαμες πῶθ ὑμὲ το[ῦτο φιλοφρόνως ἐδέξασθε καὶ τὸν παρ’ ἃ]μῶν Boeckh, πῶθ ὑμὲ τό[ν τε παραγι]νόμενον παρὰ τῆς πόλιος] Graindor. 4-5: [οὓς ἀ]πεστάλακαμεν ποθ’ ὑμέ, δόντ]ες and πρεσβ[ευσομένοις Boeckh. (ΠΡΕΣΒ[Ρ] Ροσοκε), [ - - - καθὰ ἐδώκαμ]ες and πρεσβε[υομένους Graindor. 8: ΟΤΕΑΠΟ; end Boeckh. 10 Boeckh. 12: [ὑπεδέξασθε, ὡς ἀπάγγελ]ιαν πὸτ ἄμε οἱ [πρ]εσβ[ε]υ[ταί Boeckh. 13: δέδοκται τῇ πόλ]ι? and ἐπιμέλε[ιαν ποιήσασθαι τοὺς Boeckh. 14: με]τὰ Boeckh. 15 Boeckh. 16: [δόμεν δὲ καὶ αὐτοῖς (κτλ.) Boeckh.” – Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 356. The letter is not a cover letter for the following decree, see Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 334–5.

**18 – The Delphians to Magnesia on the Maeander – 194/3 BCE (letter)**  
 (on the same monument as 19) = McCabe *Magnesia* 119, cf. *I.Magnesia* 91b = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 18 – (Decree: McCabe *Magnesia* 11, cf. *I.Magnesia* 91a)

Decree παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀμφικτιόνων· κτλ.

- ...  
 Letter [οἱ ἄρχοντες Δ]ελφῶν καὶ ἃ πόλις Μαγνήτων τῇ [βουλᾷ καὶ τῷ δάμωι]  
 (accomp- [χαίρειν· γ]ινώσκετε Σωσικλῇ τὸν παρ’ ὑμῶν [ἀποσταλέντα ἱερο]-  
 anying [μνάμονα τάν] τε θυσίαν τεθυκότα πλήρη πρόβατα τ[έλεια τριετῇ]  
 5 [τριάκοντα] καὶ τρία καταξίως τοῦ τε θεοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν, καὶ τὰν ἐνδαμίαν]  
 Decree) [ποιησάμεν]ον μετὰ πάσας εὐσεβείας καὶ τὰν ἀναστ[ροφὰν παρ’]  
 [ἀμῖν ὡς ἀρμ]όζον ἦν τοῖς ἐπὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐξαποστελλο[μένοις, καὶ ἀμὲς ἐ]-

[κρίναμες] ὑμῖν γράψαι περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Date: Ceccarelli. PHI dates the span of the monument at 195/193 BCE. Inscribed at Magnesia. l.8. Ceccarelli has ἔ[ρρωσθε], which is nowhere found in McCabe's edn.

## 19 – The *Strategos* of the Aitolians to the *boule* and *demos* of Magnesia on the Maeander – 195/4 BCE or 194/3 BCE

(on the same monument as 18) = McCabe *Magnesia* 120, cf. *IMagnesia*. 91d, and *IG ix* 1<sup>2</sup> 187, ll.13-21 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 19 – (Decree: *IG ix* 1<sup>2</sup> 187, ll.1-12, cf. McCabe *Magnesia* 9, and *I.Magnesia* 91c)

	[π]αρά τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Αἰ[τωλῶν.]
Decree	[στρατ]αγέοντος Θόα Τριχονίου τὸ δεύτερον, Θερμικ[οῖς, ἱππαρχέ]- [οντος] Νικάνδρου Τριχονίου, ν γραμματευόντων τοῖς [Αἰτωλοῖς - - - ] [ . . . Ὑ]παταίου, Μικκυλίωνος Φυσκέος· κτλ. ...
Letter	[Δικα]ίαρχος Μαγν[ή]των τῇ βουλῇ καὶ δάμοι χαίρειν· [Σωσικλῆς ὁ] [ἀπο]σταλεῖς παρ' ὑμῶν ἱερομνάμων τῇ τε ἐνδαμῖαι κέ[χρηται?] [κα]λῶς? καὶ εὐσχημόνως καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας συν[ετέλεσεν] 5 [τοῖς θε]οῖς ὡς ποθῆκον ἦν τὰ τε κατὰ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Πυθίων [εὖ ἔπε]- [τέλεσε]ν καὶ τῶν ἀγωνοθετῶν καὶ τῶν συνιερομναμόνων κ[αλῶς ἔπε]- [μελήθη], ὅθεν καὶ οἱ σύνεδροι ἐτίμασαν αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Ἀμφικτ[ίονες, καὶ ἀ]- [μὲς ἐκρί]νομες ὑμῖν γράψαι περὶ αὐτοῦ· εὖ οὖν ποιήσετε [τ]όν [τ' ἔπαινον] [Σωσικλείου]ς καὶ τὰς δεδομένας αὐτῷ τιμὰς εὐνόως ἀποδεξά[μενοι· ἔρρω]- 10 [σθε].

Date 1: McCabe (PHI). 2: Ceccarelli. PHI dates the span of the monument at 195/193 BCE. Inscribed at Magnesia. Decree: ll.2-3. ἱππαρχέ[οντο]ς Νικάνδρου Τριχονίου, Klaffenbach; ἱππαρχέ[οντος], McCabe. l.6 διατελέοντ<ι>, Klaffenbach; διατελέοντι, McCabe. ll.11. [παρὰ] τοῦ ἔθνεος, Klaffenbach; [παρὰ] τοῦ ἔθνεος, McCabe. McCabe does not give the same points of *vacat* as Klaffenbach. Letter: ll.3-4 κέ[χρηται? | κα]λῶς? McCabe; κ[ε]χρημένος ἐστὶ κα]λῶς, Klaffenbach. l.4. εὐσχημόνως ν καί, Klaffenbach. ll.5-6 [εὖ ἔπε]τέλεσε]ν, McCabe; [μετὰ τῶν] | [ . c.4 . ]ων, Klaffenbach. ll. 6-7. κ[αλῶς ἔπε]μελήθη McCabe; κ[αλῶς διώ]κησεν·, Klaffenbach. l.7. Ἀμφικτ[ίονες, Klaffenbach. ll.7-8. εὖ οὖν ποιήσετε [τ]όν [τ' ἔπαινον | Σωσικλείου]ς, McCabe; εὖ οὖν ποιήσετε [τ]όν [τε ἄνδρα] | [ . . 7-8 . . ], Klaffenbach. ll.9-10. [ἔρρω]σθε.] *vac.*, Klaffenbach.

## 20 – The arkhons, *synhedroi*, and *koinon* of the Epeirotai to the Rhodian commander of the Nesiotaian league – c.200 (192?) BCE

= *SEG* 37, 709; *SEG* 40, 690 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 20

A. Letter	Ἀπειρωτᾶν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ σύνεδροι καὶ τὸ κοινὸν Ο. . . . . APX- οι χαίρειν· Χάροψ ὁ ἀποσταλεῖς ἀρχιθεωρὸς [ὑφ' ἁμῶν ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις τὰς] [κ]ατὰ τὰς νάσους πάσας καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς [ - 10 - ] Πτολεμαῖον [τ]ὰν πρεσβεῖαν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἀπελο[γίζετο καὶ τὰν τῆς πόλεως πρὸς] 5 [ἀ]μᾶς ἂν ἔχουσα τυγχάνει εὖνοϊαν κα[ὶ] ca. 26 ] [.]σαισθε πολυωρίαν καὶ περὶ Ἀ[λ]εξ(ι)μάχου ΛΕΚΑΠ [ ca. 18 ] ----- ----- -----
-----------	---

10 -----  
 -----  
 -----

[. . .]υς, καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα δὲ τῶν Νάων [ ca. 31 ]

*vacat*

B. Decree [Ἐπὶ Φι]λίππου. . . .ΠΑΙΟΥΕΠΙ

15 [. . . . .]ου ΣΙΜΑΚΟΥ ΚΕΡΟΠΑΤ

[. . . . . π]όλεις τὰς κατὰ τὰς νάσους πάσας [καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς, ca. 10 ]

[καὶ Πτο]λεμαῖον

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Tenos. “in L. 7 ed. pr. reads ποτὶ ταῖ νάσῳ ταῖ ὑμαῖ (= Tenos), in L. 8 ἀποδέχομεθα οὖν, in LL. 9/10 [ὑπογεγράφα]μες δὲ ὑμῖν τὸ ψήφισμα | B. decree concerning the results of the embassy of Charops | 14. possibly Φι]λίππου [Ἰ]πποπ[α]ίου, Cabanes, *BE* (1988) no. 795 (the same suggestion in the article in *Nikephoros*) | 15. Σιμάκου Κεροπατ[- (= ethnikon), Cabanes, *ibidem*.” – *SEG* online.

## 21 – The Khyretai in Perrhaebia to Olosson – 190 BCE

= *Archaiologike Ephemeris* (1917) 304, cf. Rhodes w. Lewis, 166 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 21

Letter [Χυρετιέων] οἱ τ]αγο[ὶ κ]α[ὶ ἡ π]όλις, Ὀλοσσο[νί]-  
 [ων τοῖς ταγ]οῖς κα[ὶ] τῇ πόλει χα[ίρ]ειν· ἀπεστ[άλ]-  
 [καμε]ν π[ρ]ὸς ὑμᾶς πρεσ[β]ευ[τά]ς, Ἀντίσκ[ω]ν[α]  
 [Μελ]ανθίου, [Ἀ]λέξανδ[ρ]ο[ν Μ]ονί[μ]ου, Ἀσκληπ[ι]ά[δ]η[ν]  
 5 [Λεω]νίδου, το[ὺς] ἀποδώσοντ[α]ς ὑ[μῖ]ν, ἃς [τὸ ψ]ήφισ[μα ἔ]-  
 [χει τ]ιμ[ά]ς Ἐπίνω Σ[ω]π[ά]τρ[ου], [τ]ῷ ὑμετέ[ρ]ῳ π[ο]λ[ί]τῃ[ι],  
 α[ὐ]τῷ τ[ε] καὶ ἐκγ[ό]νοις, καὶ πα[ρ]ακαλέσοντας πε[ρὶ] ὧν  
 [ἔ]χουσιν [τ]ὰς ἐντολ[ά]ς· ὑ[μ]εῖς οἱ ἄν[θρω]ποι καλῶς ποιή[σε]τε τοὺς  
 τε [πρ]ε[σβ]ευτὰς ἀποδε[ξ]άμενοι φιλοφρόνως [κ]α[ὶ]  
 10 [κα]τ[α]κ[ο]λ[ο]υθήσαντες τοῖς π[α]ρακαλ[ο]υμέ[ν]οις ὑφ’ α[ὐ]-  
 Decree [τ]ῷ[ν]. Ἐρρωσθ[ε]. [Στρ]α[τ]ηγ[ο]ῦ[ν]τος Θ[α]υμ[ί]ου [τ]οῦ Κ[ύ]φο[υ]  
 [Ὀλ]οσσ[ονί]-  
 ο[υ], ἰε[ρ]έ[ω]ς δὲ τοῦ Ἀσκλη[η]πιοῦ ἐν Χ[υ]ρε[τί]αις Ἀλεξάνδρ[ου] τοῦ  
 [Μ]ο[νί]μου· [τ]αγευόντων Φι[λί]π[που] τοῦ [Βουλ]ίω[ν]ος, Ἀ[ρ]χίπ[ου]-  
 [π]ο[υ] τοῦ [Δι]οδ[ώ]ρου, Πολυ[ξέ]ν[ου] τοῦ Λυσ[ι]μάχ[ου]· [μ]ηνδ[ό]ς  
 15 [Ἀρτε]μ[ι]σί[ου] τετράδι· ἐκ[λη]σ[ί]ας οἱ[ὗ]σ[ης] ἐν νόμῳ, ἐν ἡ[μῖν]  
 [καὶ, τὰ ἀρ]χοσ[τά]σια συντ[ε]λεῖ[τε]· [πρ]ο[σ]τα[το]ύντο[ς] τῆς ἐκ[λη]-  
 [σί]ας Φι[λί]π[που] τοῦ [Β]ο[υ]λίω[ν]ος· συμπαρόντων καὶ [τ]ῶν ἐξ[ε]-  
 [τ]α[σ]τῶν Κλέων[ος] τοῦ Λυσ[ι]μάχ[ου], Ἀ[ρ]μοδίου τοῦ Λεω-  
 [νί]δου· μνε[ί]αν ποησαμέ[ν]ου Ἀντίσκ[ω]νο[ς] τοῦ Μελανθίου,  
 20 ὁμο[γ]νωμο[ν]οῦ[ν]των ἀ[π]άντων τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ μηδενὸς  
 ἀν[τε]ίπ[αν]τος· ἐ[π]ε[ι]δὴ Ἐπίνος Σ[ω]π[ά]τρ[ου] Ὀ[λ]οσσ[ονί]ος,  
 ἀν[η]ρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, ἀπὸ τῆς π[ρ]ώτης ἡλικίας [ε]ῖ-  
 [ν]ου[ς] ὑ[π]ά[ρ]χων δι[α]τελεῖ τῇ πόλ[ι]τι ἡμῶν, ἀ[εὶ] τ[ιν]ος  
 25 ἀ[γ]αθοῦ π[α]ραίτιος γινόμενος ἐν παντὶ κα[ὶ] ὡ[ς]  
 [καὶ] [το]ὺς ἐντυγχ[ά]νον[τα]ς τῷ πολιτῷ ἡμῶν [κοι]-  
 [ν]ῇ καὶ καθ’ ἰδίαν ἀποδ[έ]χε[τα]ί [τ’] εἰ καὶ ξενίξει μεγα-  
 λομερῶς, σπουδῆς καὶ φιλο[τ]ιμίας οὐθὲν ἐνλεί-  
 πων, εἰσ[φ]ερόμε[ν]ος τῇ π[α]σ[αν] οὐσί[αν] πρὸς [τ]ὸ μ[η]-  
 [δ]ὲ τῶν ἐντυγχ[ά]νομε[ν]ων ἀπαρνηθ[ή]σεσθαι, εἰ μὴ]

- 30 κα[ῖ] ἐν τα[ῖ]ς κοιναῖς ἀ[ρχ]αῖς, ἅς [ἐσ]τιν [ἀ]ν[ειλ]ηφώς, μη[θέ]-  
να σ[πο]υδὴν τυγχ[άν]ει ὑ[πὲρ τ]ῆ[ς] πόλε[ως] ἡμῶν πε[πο]-  
ημέ[ν]ος· ἵνα δὲ κα[ῖ] ἡ πόλις [ἡ Χ]υ[ρ]ετιέων φ[αί]νηται το[ῖ]ς  
αὐ[τῆ]ς εὐεργέταις τ[ὰ]ς καταξίας χάρι[τας ἀπ]ονέ[μ]ουσ[α,]  
ἔδοξ[ε] τῇ πόλ[ι]ε[ι] τῇ Χυ[ρ]ετιέων ἐπα[ι]νέσαι τε Ἐπῖνο[ν]  
35 ἐ[πὶ τῇ κ]αλοκαγαθί[αι κ]αὶ ε[ὐ]νοίαι, ἣν ἔ[χ]ων [δ]ι[α]τελεῖ  
π[ρὸς τὴν π]όλιν ἡμῶν, κα[ῖ] [δ]ε[δ]όσθαι α[ὐ]τ[ῶ]ι τε καὶ ἐκγ[ό]-  
νοις [π]ροξεν[ί]αν, πολιτεί[αν], ἔ[γκ]τησιν, ἀ[σφ]άλ[ει]α[ν,]  
[ἀ]συλί[α]ν καὶ πο[λ]έμου κ[αὶ εἰρ]ήνης [καὶ τᾶλ]λ[α] τί[μ]ι[α]  
[καὶ] φι[λ]άνθ[ρ]ωπα, [ὅ]σα κ[αὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις [πρ]οξ[έν]οις κ[αὶ] [εὐ]-  
40 [εργ]έταις τῆς Χυ[ρ]ετιέων πόλε[ως] ὑπ[άρ]χει.— Π[ρ]ονοη-  
[θῆ]να[ι] δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν[άρχ]ους τ[α]γ[οὺς καὶ] [τ]αμίας ἀναγ-  
[ράψαι τόδε τὸ ψήφισ]μα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῇ ἐν Χυρετίαις  
-----

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Olosson?

## 22 – Amphissa to Skarphaea – 200-150BCE

= IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 3, 750 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 22

- [ἀγαθ]ᾶ τύχαι.  
5 Letter [Ἀμφισσέ]ων [οἱ ἄρ]χοντες καὶ ἡ πόλις Σκαρφέων τοῖς ἀρχόντ[οις]  
[καὶ τῶ βουλῇ] καὶ ταῖ πόλει χαίρειν· τῶν δεδομένων τιμίων ὑπὸ  
[τᾶς] πόλ[ι]ο[ς] ἡμῶν Μηνοφάντ[ω]ι Ἀρτεμιδώρου Μακεδόνι Ὑρκανίω  
[τὸ ἀ]ντί[γ]ραφον ἐξαπεστάλκαμεν ποτὶ τὰν ὑμετέραν πόλιν,  
Decree [καθάπερ] καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Μηνόφαντος ἀμὲ παρεκάλεσε. μηνὸς Ἀμ[ῶ]-  
10 [νο]ς [ἔ]κτα ἐπ’ εἰκάδι. κτλ.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Amphissa. Preceded by fragmentary, unrelated document.

## 23 –The *prytanis* and *demos* of Byllis (Illyria) to Sparta – early 2<sup>nd</sup> cent.

= IG v i 28 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 23

- Βυλλιόνων ὁ πρότα-  
[νις κ<αῖ> ὁ] δῆμος [Λακεδα]ι-  
μ[ονίω]ν δῆμοι χαίρειν· [ἀπ]-  
[εστάλκ]αμε<ν> τιμίων τῶ[ν]  
5 π[αρ] ἡμῶν ἀντίγραφον  
[ - - - - ] ΛΡΗΣΜΝ [γε]-  
γρά[φ]αμε[ν] [πε]ρ[ὶ] τ[—]Ε  
[ - - - - - ]  
Ε[ - - - ] Ο[ - - - ] Ε[ - ] Τ[ - ]  
10 ΝΟ[ - - - - - ]

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Sparta.

**24** – The *kosmoi* and *polis* of Allaria (Crete) to the *boule* and *demos* of Paros – early 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= IC 2 i 2 B = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 24

- A. [ - - - - - ] αε [ - - - - - ]  
 Parian [ - - - - - ] ανα [ - - - - - ]  
 Decree [ - - - - - ] δὲ καὶ τὰ γρά[μματα]  
 [τὰ τῶν παραγενομένων] ὅει ἐξ Ἀλλαρίας [τοὺς ἄρ]-  
 5 [χοντ]ας [ἐν τῷ δ]ημοσίῳ μετὰ τοῦ γραμματ[έως.]  
 [ἐξ]αποστείλαι δὲ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς περὶ Ἄ[γα]-  
 θιν τοῦδε τοῦ ψηφίσματος τὸ ἀντίγραφον σφραγι-  
 σαμένους τεῖ δημοσίαι σφραγίδι ὅπως παρακο-  
 λουθῶσιν Ἀλλαριῶται τὰ ἐψηφισμένα περὶ τούτων.  
 10 *vacat*  
 B. Letter Ἀλλαριωτᾶν οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Παρίων τῇ βουλῇ  
 καὶ τῷ δάμῳ χαίρεμ. παραγενομένων τῶν πρεσβευ-  
 τᾶν ποτ’ ἡμέ, Φάνιός τε καὶ Δόρκω, οὓς ἀπεστείλατε  
 πρεσβεύοντας περὶ τῷ σὺλῳ ποθ’ ἡμέ, καὶ ἀνανε-  
 5 ωσαμένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ πρεσβείᾳ κατὰ τὸ ψάφισμα  
 τὸ παρ’ ὑμῶν τάν τε φιλίαν καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν τὴν ὑ-  
 πάρχουσαν ταῖς πόλεσι ποτ’ ἀλλάλας διαφυλάτ-  
 τεν, ἐπὶ κόσμων τῶν περὶ Φιλόμβροτον τὸν Εὐθυ-  
 μάχῳ, ἀγαθὰ τύχαι δεδόχθαι Ἀλλαριωτᾶν  
 10 τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τῇ πόλει· ἐπαινέσαι μὲν τὸν  
 δᾶμον τῶν Παρίων διότι διαφυλάττει τὴν φιλίαν  
 καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡμῶν, κατὰ  
 ταῦτά δὲ ὑπάρχειν καὶ Παρίοις τὴν φιλίαν καὶ τὴν εὐ-  
 νοίαν παρὰ Ἀλλαριωτᾶν, ὅπως φαινόμεθα τὰ ὅμοι-  
 15 α τοῖς προαιρουμένοις ἡμέ<ς> συντελόντε<ς>. εἴμεν δὲ  
 Ἀλλαριώταις καὶ Παρίοις ἰσοπολιτείαν, μετέχω-  
 σιν τῷ τε Ἀλλαριώτῃ ἐμ Πάρῳ καὶ θείνῳ καὶ ἀν-  
 θρωπίνῳ, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τῷ Παρίῳ ἐν Ἀλλα-  
 ρίᾳ μετέχωσι καὶ θείνῳ καὶ ἀνθρωπίνῳ. ἐὰν <δὲ>  
 20 συνδοκεῖ ταῦτα τῷ δάμῳ τῷ Παρίῳ, ἀναγρα-  
 ψάντων αἱ πόλεις ἀμφοτέραι ἐς στάλαν λιθίναν  
 καὶ ἀνθέντων Πάριοι μὲν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Δάματρος,  
 Ἀλλαριῶται δὲ ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τῷ {ι} Ἀπόλλωνος. ταῦ-  
 τα δὲ εἶναι ἐφ’ ὑγιείᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν πόλεων  
 25 ἀμφοτερῶν. ἐὰν δέ τι φαίνεται ὑμε<ῖ>ν προσθεῖναι  
 ἢ ἀφέλαι, εὐχαριστῶμες. *vacat* ἔρρωσθε.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Allaria.

**25** – The Metropolitai(?) to the magistrates and *polis* of Hypata – c.180-c.140 BCE?\*

= IG ix 2, 11 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 25

- Letter [ . . . . . οἱ τ]αγοὶ καὶ ἡ π[ό]λις  
 [Ἵ]παταίων τοῖς ἄρ[χ]ουσι καὶ τ[ῇ] πό-

- [λει χαίρειν. τῶ]ν δεδομένων τι-  
 μίων ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν  
 5 **Γλαύκῳ Εὐδώρῳ** τῶι ὑμετέ-  
 ρῳ πολεΐτῃ ἀπεστάλακαμεν  
 ἡμε[ῖς τὸ] ἀντίγραφον, ἵνα εἰ-  
 Decree [δῆτ]ε· στρατηγοῦντος  
 Ἀλεξίππου τοῦ Ἰπ<π>ολόχο[υ]  
 10 [Λαρι]σα[ίου] μηνὸς Ἀφρῑου δε[υ]-  
 [τέρ]αι, ἐ[κκλ]ησίας ἐννόμ[ου,] κτλ.

\*I have inferred this date from 160-159BCE on PHI Online and “**182-181** (*IG* ix) or 160-159 (Corrigenda) or **179-146** BC. (Wilhelm)” in Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Hypata.

**26 – Aptera (Crete) to the Teians – post c.170BCE**  
 = *IC* 2 iii 2 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 26

- Ἀπτεραίων.  
 Ἀπτεραίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Τη-  
 ῖων τῶι βῳλῶι καὶ τῶι δάμῳι χαίρειν.  
 παραγενόμενοι οἱ παρ’ ὑμέων πρεγγευ-  
 5 ταὶ Ἡρόδοτος Μηνοδότῳ, Μενεκλῆς  
 Διονυσίῳ τό τε ψάφισμα ἀπέδω-  
 καν ἐν ᾧ ἐγράψατε ψάφισμα ἀνανεώσασθαι  
 τάν τε συγγένειαν καὶ τὰν προῦ-  
 πάρχωσαν φιλίαν τὰ τε δεδομένα  
 10 τίμια ὑπὸ τᾶς ἀμᾶς πόλεως ἐν τοῖς  
 πρότερον χρόνοις καὶ τὰν καθιέρωσιν  
 τᾶς πόλιος καὶ τᾶς χώρας τῶι Διονύ-  
 σῳ, παρεκαλεῖτε δὲ καὶ ἀναγράψαι  
 τὸ πρότερον δόγμα ἐν ὁποίῳ κα κρί-  
 15 νωμεν ἱερῶι· **διελέγη<σ>αν <δὲ> καὶ οἱ παρ’ ὑ-**  
**μῶν πρεγγευταὶ ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν**  
**τῶι ψαφίσματι**, ἀποφαίνοντες τάν  
 τε πόλιν εὐσεβῶς διακειμέναν  
 πρὸς πάντας τὸς θεός, μάλιστα δὲ  
 20 πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον ὄντ<α> ἀρχαγέταν  
 τᾶς πόλεως, ᾧ καὶ καθιερωσθαι συν-  
 βέβακε τάν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰν χώραν,  
 ὑπέρ τε τῶν λοιπῶν πᾶσαν σπου-  
 δὰν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ποτάγοντες δι-  
 25 ελέγην· διὸ καὶ δεδόχθαι ἀποκρίνασθαι  
 τῶι δάμῳι τῶι Ἀπτεραίων Τηίοις  
 οὔσιν συγγενέσι καὶ φίλοις διό-  
 τι ἐν τε τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις τυγ-  
 χάνομεν εὐσεβῶς διακείμενοι πο-  
 30 τὶ πάντας τὸς θεός θ’ ἡμῶν [μάλιστα δὲ]  
 καὶ τὸν Διόνυσον δι’ ὃν καὶ πρότερον τάν  
 τε ἀσυλίαν ὑμῖν ἐδώκαμεν καὶ καθι-  
 ερώσαμεν τὰν χώραν καὶ τὰν πόλιν,  
 τετηρηκότες δὲ τὰ προδεδομένα ὑ-

- 35 μῖν φιλάνθρωπα μέχρι τοῦ νῦν **πειρά-**  
**ξομεν καὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον**  
**διαφυλάσσειν** ἀν<α>νεωσάμενοι ἃ  
 παρακαλεῖτε διὰ τοῦ ψαφίσματος καὶ  
 οὐκ ἀδικέομεν Τηῖος συγγενέας  
 40 καὶ φίλος ὑπάρχοντας οὔτε πολέμου  
 οὔτ' εἰράνας, καθότι οὔτε πρότερον,  
 πειράξομεν δὲ καὶ ἐάν τινες ἀδικῶν-  
 τι Τηῖος ἢ κατὰ κοινὸν ἢ κατ' ἰδίαν ἢ κα-  
 τὰ γὰρ ἢ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἐόντας ἰα-  
 45 ρὸς καὶ ἀσύ<λ>ος, βοασθεῖν αὐτοῖς καθότι  
 ἂν ὦμεν δυνατοί. καὶ ἐάν τινες ὀρμι-  
 ὄμενοι ἐξ Ἀπτέρας ἀδικήσωντι Τη-  
 ῖος, εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐνόχος τῷ τῆς ἱερο-  
 συλίας νόμῳ. ἀγγραψάτωσαν δὲ καὶ  
 50 Τήιοι τὰν ἀνανέωσιν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν  
 τῷ Διονύσῳ, ὅπως φανερὰ ἦ<ι> πᾶσι τοῖς  
 Ἑλλησι ἢ τῶν Ἀπτεραίων εὐσέβεια  
 πρὸς πάντας τὸς θεός. ἀναγραφῶμεν  
 δὲ καὶ ἀμὲν τό τε πρότερον δόγμα  
 55 καὶ τὰν ἀνανέωσιν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ  
 τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἀπτέρας. ἐκαλέσα-  
 μεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια τοὺς πρεγγευτάς  
 [ἐπὶ τ]ὰν κοινὰν ἐ[στίαν]. **ἔρρωσθε.**

Date: PHI. 170BCE? Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Teos.

**27** – The Athenian *strategoí* to the *epimeletes* of Delos – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE  
 = *I.Délos* iv, 1510 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **27**

- Letter **οἱ στρατηγοὶ Χαρμίδει ἐπιμελη-**  
**τεῖ Δήλου χαίρειν·** γενομένων  
 πλειόνων λόγων ἐν τεῖ βουλευῇ  
 περὶ τοῦ δόγματος οὗ ἦνεγκεν  
 5 ἐκ Ῥώμης Δημήτριος Ῥηλαι-  
 εὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ τὸ Σαραπι-  
 εῖον, ἔδοξεν μὴ κωλύειν αὐ-  
 τὸν ἀνοίγειν καὶ θεραπεύειν  
 τὸ ἱερὸν καθάπερ καὶ πρότε-  
 10 ρον· γράψαι δὲ καὶ πρὸς σε πε-  
 ρὶ τούτων ἵνα εἰδῆς· ὑποτε-  
 τάχαμεν δέ σοι καὶ τοῦ ἐνε-  
 χθέντος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δόγματος  
 τὸ ἀντίγραφον.  
 15 Κόιντος Μινύκιος Κοίντου  
 Roman υἱὸς στρατηγὸς τεῖ συγκλή-  
 Decree τῶι συνεβουλεύσατο ἐν κο-  
 (SC) μετίῳ εἰδυιοῖς ἐντερκ<α>λα-  
 [ρ]ίοις· κτλ.

Date: PHI. post 164 BCE Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delos.

## 28 – The Spartans to Amphisso – mid-2nd cen. BCE

= SEG 52, 541, cf. Rousset 2002a, 83-90 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 28

Letter Ἀγαθαὶ τύχαι·  
**Λακεδαιμονίων γραμματοφύλ<α>ξ Πόλλις Ἐπιστράτου**  
**ὁ ἐπὶ Ὀβρίμου Ἀμφισσέων ἄρχουσι καὶ τῷ πόλι χαίρειν·**  
 τῶν ὄντων παρ’ ἡμῶν γραμμάτων ἐν τῷ δαμοσίῳ ὑπο-  
 5 Doc. γέγραφα ὑμῖν τὸ ἀντίγραφον· κτλ.

Date: SEG, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Amphisso. “2. ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΟΦΥΛΟΞ, lapis; this is the earliest attestation of this office and of the archive (L. 4: τὸ δαμόσιον), ed.pr.” – SEG online.

## 29 – The arkhons and polis of Eretria to the boule and demos of Kos – mid-2nd cen. BCE

= SEG 49, 1116, cf. IG xii 4, 1 169 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 29

Letter [Ἀρίστου?] τοῦ Ἀρίστου Φιλόφρονος τοῦ Τιμάρχου  
 [τοῦ Δαμ]οκλεῦς Παρμενίσκου τοῦ Τιμίδα  
*crown crown crown*  
 [Ἐρετριέω]ν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ πόλις Κώϊων τῇ  
 [βουλῇ καὶ] τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν· τῶν ἐψηφισμέ-  
 5 [νων ὑφ’ ἡμ]ῶν τιμῶν τῷ τε δήμῳ ὑμῶν καὶ  
 [τοῖς ἀποσ]ταλείσι δικασταῖς ἀπεστάλκα-  
 [μεν ὑμῖν ἀν]τίγραφον σφραγισάμενοι τῇ δημο-  
 [σίᾳ σφραγί]δι ἵνα παρακολουθῆτε· ἔρρωσθε·  
*vacat*  
 10 [ἐπειδὴ πεμ]ψάντων ἡμῶν ψήφισμα καὶ δικ<α>σ-  
 Decree [ταγωγὸς κ]αὶ πρεσβευτὰς πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τὸν  
 [Κώϊων Δημή]τριον Εὐκλήμονος, κτλ.

Date: SEG (c.150 BCE), Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Kos. “The restorations of He. were corrected from the squeeze in Berlin and the parallels provided by SEG 41 330, ed.pr. [...] 3. [Λαρισαίω]ν, He.; [...] 5. [παρ’ ἡ]μῖν, He. | 9. ΔΙΚΑΣ, on the stone | 11-12. Κλεο[νίκου], He.” – SEG online.

## 30 – Korkyra to the Ambrakiotai – mid 2nd cen. BCE

= SEG 47, 604, cf. IG ix 1<sup>2</sup> 4, 796B, and SEG 49, 591bis = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 30

B [Κ]ρίμα τὸ γινόμενον περὶ χώρας Ἀμβρακιώταις καὶ Ἀθαμᾶσι·  
 Letter **Κορκυραίων οἱ ἄρχοντες - - - Ἀμβρακιωτᾶν τοῖς ἄρχουσι - 16 - χαί]-**  
**ρειν· Σάτυρος ΑΝΔ[. . .]Α[- - - - - ἀποσταλέντες]**  
**παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν καὶ [- - - - - ]**  
 5 **μενον τὸ γενόμενον ὑμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς Ἀθαμᾶσι- - - - - καὶ]**  
**διελέγησαν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ὑφ’ ὑμ[ῶν - - - - - γι]-**  
 νώσκετε οὖν ἡμῶν τοὺς τε πρεσβευ[τάς - - - - - ]  
 των ἀνδρας πέντε τοὺς ἐπιπο[ρευθησομένους- - - - - ]



καὶ διακουσσομένους ἐπὶ τοῦ τ[όπου- - - - -]  
 10 δὲ οἱ αἰρημένοι τῷ ἔκται καθῶ[ς- - - - -]  
 οὖν ἐπάγοντες αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰν [χώραν - - - - - τῶν ἀποστα]-  
 λέντων ἀρχόντων ποθ' ὑμεῖς ἐχόντ[ων?- - - - -]  
 ἂ κρίσις ὑμῖν τελεσθήσεται ἐν Κ[ορκύραι - - - - - ἀπο]-  
 σταλέντες καὶ ὑμέσ· ὁπότεροι δ[ὲ - - - - - τοὺς]  
 15 παρ' ἀμῶν ἄρχοντας ἢ μὴ παρ[- - - - - γι]-  
 νώσκετε ὅτι κατὰ τοὺς παρ[αγενομένους?] Ἀθαμάνων περὶ [- 21 -]  
 Document? Ἀμβρακιωτῶν περὶ Ἀγασίσ[τρατον - - - - -] καταβάντων τῷ περὶ [- 12 -]  
 να καθ' ὅμ φαντι συνόριον εἶμεν? - - -] κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. c.175-160 B.C. (post 167 B.C.?) *SEG*. Inscribed at Kerkyra. This text is accompanied by the letter of the Roman Publius Cornelius Blasio with appended senatus consultum. The text of *SEG* 47, 604 on *SEG* Online exhibits an important error: what appears on *SEG* Online to be lines 12-15 are actually lines 5-8, which have somehow been moved from between original lines 4 and 9 to between original lines 14 and 15. Sherk has the correct reading which I have reproduced as *ORRLIG* 9. The numbers in square brackets indicate the number of dashes in the edn. “B 1. restored by Ho. | 2. οἱ ἄρχοντες - - - τοῖς ἄρχουσι, Ho.; οἱ ἄρχοντες - - - Ἀμβρακιωτῶν τοῖς ἄρχουσι, ed.pr. [in fine, e.g. [Ἀμβρακιωτῶν τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ], Chaniotis] | 3. Ἀνδ[. . .]ος, possibly Ἀνδ[ρίσκ]ος, ed.pr.; ἈΝΔ[. . .]Α, R. [...]| 5. in fine, [καί], Chaniotis] | 6. in fine, ἀκολούθως τοῖς ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἐντελλομένοις or γεγραμμένοις, ed.pr. | 7-8. ...καθῶ[ς], R. | 13. restored by Ho. (but Κ[ορκύραι])”. – *SEG* online.

### 31 – The arkhons of Elatea to the Delphians – c.150-130 BCE

= *Fouilles de Delphes* III 2: 120 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 32

Letter Ἐ[λατέων οἱ ἄρχ]οντες Δελ[φῶν] [το]ῖς ἀρχό[ντ]οις καὶ  
 τῷ πόλει χαίρειν. γινώσκετε τὰν ποτεσφραγισμ[έ]-  
 ναν τῷ ἐπιστολίῳ ἀπελευθερίαν, ἀναγεγραμμένα[ν]  
 ἐν τῷ παρ' ἀμὲ ἱερῷ τ<ῶ> ἐν Ἀσκλαπιείῳ. ὑμεῖς οὖν εὖ ποι[ή]-  
 5 σετε, φροντίζαντες ὅπως καὶ παρ' ὑμὲ ἀναγραφῇ ἂ αὐ-  
 τὰ ἀπελευθέρωσις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος  
 τοῦ Πυθίου.  
 Manu- ἄρχοντος Νικάνδρου, μηνὸς ἔκτου, ἐν ἐννόμ[ωι]  
 mission ἐκκλησίαι, γραμματεῦντος τῶν συνέδρων  
 10 Ἐπικράτεος τοῦ Νέωνος, κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. ‘undated’ PHI. Inscribed at Delphi.

### 32 – The *synhedroi* of Sikyon to the arkhons of Argos – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED

(on the same monument as *ORRLIG* 15, 33, 34) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.76 (A. v. a) =  
 Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 33

(A. v. a) Σικυωνίων σύνεδροι / Ἀργείων  
 τοῖς ἄρχουσι χαίρειν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. The texts of the Unpublished Dossier from Argos are as they appear in Rhodes, P.J., with Lewis, D.M., *Decrees of the Greek States*, (Oxford, 1997). In order to compile an immense set of data, the texts in *DGS* are abbreviated (I provide the abbreviations below). Unfortunately, in the case of this Argos Dossier, these letters are still unpublished and no other transcription is available, even to the author. I

would like to thank Emeritus Professor Peter J. Rhodes for being so kind as to discuss these texts with me and for his efforts to locate them in publication. Ceccarelli in *AGLW* (2013) still referred to them as ‘unpublished’. Even in abbreviated form, we can still ascertain address formulae, so these letters are still useful to this study.

Abbreviations and other relevant information from the DGS Catalogue ‘Introduction’: “An oblique stroke (/) is used as a punctuation mark to separate items within a document; occasionally double oblique strokes (//) are used to indicate a major break.” – Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.65. Δ = ὁ δεῖνα (article given when needed to make case clear); person’s name. M = indication of month. ΔΔ = unspecified number of names. “...dotted letters are normally not indicated; uncertainties are discussed where necessary.” – Rhodes with Lewis, *DGS*, 66.

### 33 – A *grammateus* of Sikyon to the *damiorgoi* of Argos – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED

(on the same monument as 32, *ORRLIG* 15, 34) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.76 (A. vi. a) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 34

(A. vi. a) Δ Σικωνίων γραμματεὺς  
συνέδρων / Ἀργείων δαμιοργοῖς  
χαίρειν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. For Abbreviations of this and other *DGS* texts, see notes to *IOLPHK* 32.

### 34 – The *damiorgoi* of Karynia to the *synhedroi* and arkhons of Argos – post 146 BCE – UNPUBLISHED

(on the same monument as 32, *ORRLIG* 15, 33) = Rhodes with Lewis *DGS* p.76 (A. vi. b) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 35

(A. vi. b) Καρυνέων δαμιοργοὶ οἱ ἰν  
δεύτερον ἔτος / Σικωνίων [τοῖς]  
[ᾗ]χουσι καὶ συνέδροις χαίρειν

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Argos. For Abbreviations of this and other *DGS* texts, see notes to *IOLPHK* 32.

### 35 – The arkhons and *polis* of Delphi to the Athenians – post mid 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 2: 94 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 36

[οἱ ᾗ]ρχοντες Δελφῶν καὶ ἡ πόλις Ἀθη[να]ίων τᾷ βο[υλᾷ καὶ τῷ] δάμῳ  
χαίρειν.

[Δε]ινοκράτης, Διοκλῆς, Πραξικλῆς, οἱ παρ’ ὑμ[ῶ]ν παραγενόμενοι ποθ’ ἅμῃ  
πρεσβευταί, τὸ

τε ψάφισμα ἀπέδωκαν ἡμῖν, καὶ, ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὰν ἐκκλησίαν,  
διελέγησαν ἀκο-

λούθως τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατακεχωρισμέν[ο]ις, ὁμοίως δέ, καὶ ἐν τὰ πράγματα  
ἐμβάν-

5 τες ἐφ’ ᾗ παραγεγόνεισαν, τὰν πᾶσαν ἐπι[μ]έλειαν καὶ ποτικαρτέρησιν καὶ  
παράκλη-

σιν ἐποιήσαντο ἕνεκεν τοῦ λύσιν λαβεῖν αὐτά, σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν  
ἐνλείποντες· ἐπαινέῖμεν οὖν ὑμὲ ἐπὶ τῷ[ι] πρότερόν τε πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας

ἀπο-

δείξεις πεποιῆσθαι τᾶς τε ποτὶ τὸν θεὸν [ε]ὐσεβείας καὶ τᾶς π[ο]τὶ τὰν πόλ[ι]ν  
ἁμῶν

- εὐνοίας, καὶ νῦν διότι, ἀκούσαντες τὸν πε[ρ]ιεστακότα ἀμῖν καιρόν, ψάφισμά  
 τε καὶ  
 10 πρεσβευτὰς ἀπεστείλατε ἄνδρας καλοὺς κ[αὶ] ἀγαθοὺς, οἵτινες τάν τε  
 ἀναστροφὰν καὶ  
 τὰν παρεπιδαμίαν ἐποιήσαντο ἀξίως με[ν] ὑμῶ]ν τῶν ἐξαποστειλάντων αὐτούς,  
 ἀξίως  
 δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀμετέρας πόλιος· δεδόχθαι ο[ὖν] τῇ π[ό]λει στεφανῶσαι τὸν δᾶμον  
 τῶν Ἀθη-  
 ναίων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ στεφάνῳ, ᾧ πάτρι[όν] ἐστι Δελφοῖς, δεδόσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς  
 πρεσ-  
 βευταῖς παρὰ τῆς πόλιος προξενί[αν, προμαντ]εῖαν, προδικίαν, ἀσυλίαν,  
 ἀτέλειαν,  
 15 προεδρίαν ἐμ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγώνοις ο[ἷς] ἡ πόλις τί]θητι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τίμια ὅσα  
 καὶ τοῖς  
 ἄλλοις προξένοις καὶ εὐεργέται[ς] τῆς πόλιος] ὑπάρχει· ἐκαλέσαμεν δὲ τοὺς  
 πρεσ-  
 βευτὰς καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια ἐν τῷ πρυτανεῖον ἐπὶ τὰν] κοινὰν τῆς πόλιος ἐστίαν.

Date: Ceccarelli. ‘undated’ PHI. Inscribed at Delphi.

**36 – The magistrates of the Gortynioi to the magistrates of the Itanioi –  
 112/111 BCE (dossier inscribed) c.145 BCE? (letters sent)**

(on the same monument as **37**) = *IC* 3 iv 9, ll.115-121, cf. *I. Magnesia* **105** = Ceccarelli *AGLW*  
 ‘App.3’ **37**

- Decree ... [ . . . . . ] τε ἡ  
 ἐπιστολ[ῇ] καὶ ἀνεγράφη, γε]-  
 115 [νομένης] ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς ἀντιλογίας, ἐκρίναμεν δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς ἀ[ντίγραφον]  
 καταχωρίσαι [τὸ ὑπογεγραμμένον].  
 Letter [Γ]ορτυνίων οἱ κόρμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις Ἰτανίων τοῖς κόρμοις καὶ [τ]ῇ πόλ[ι]  
**χαίρεν· πεπεισμένοι** ὑπ’ ἀνδρός τινος]  
 [ὃς δεδ]ήλωκεν ὅτι οἱ Πραῖσιοι οἰκονομούνται περὶ τῆς Λεύκας ὥς  
 [ἐπιστ]ρατίας γενομ[ένας, κρατῆσαι αὐ]-  
 [τῆς, τάδε] ἐκρίναμεν ὑμῖν ἐπιμελίως ἀποστεῖλαι· ὑμὲν ἄν καλῶς ποιή[σαιτε  
 τ . ]ς ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ [ - - - ]  
 [ . ]επ[ . ]σιν θέμ<ε>νοι παρορῶντέ<ς τε> εἰ χρεῖαν ἔχετε ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ[ν]  
 ἐ[πιταδεῖω]ν· γεγράφαμεν οὖν ὑμῖν, οὐκ ὄν]-  
 120 των τούτων φίλων τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ αὐτοῖς ὑμῖν, [δι]ὰ [πα]ντὸς  
 ἐ[πιμε]λούμενοι κ[αὶ] βω[λό]μενοι ἀεὶ - - ]  
 [ . ]ε[ . ]αι τῷ τε βασιλεῖ καὶ τοῖς τῷ βασιλέως φίλοις.

Date 1: PHI. 2: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Magnesia and Itanos. I have not included ll.1-106 to conserve space.

### 37 – The Hierapytnioi to the Itanioi – 112/111BCE (dossier inscribed) c.145 BCE? (letters sent)

(on the same monument as 36) = *IC* 3 iv 9, ll.125-130, cf. *I.Magnesia* 105 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 38

- 121 Doc. Ἱεραπύτνιοι δι' ἐξέτι τῆς ἀμφισβη[τ]ήσ[εως ἀντε]-  
[χόμεν]οι καὶ φάσκοντες τὴν νῆσον ἑαυτῶν εἶναι προγονικὴν ἀκλῆ[ . . . . . ]  
ιτης τῶν [ - - - - - ]  
[. . .]ς τε ἀρχούσης καὶ τῆς τῶν Στηλιτῶν φήσαντες πλοῖον εὐ[ . . . . . ]ν τὸμ  
πολεμ[ - - - - - ]  
[. . .]υκραι καταχθῆναι καὶ παρακαλοῦντες τὸς Ἱτανίους περὶ τούτων [ . . .  
μν]εῖαν τιν[ἀ - - - - - ]  
125 Letter [ . . . ] αὐτοὶ Ἱτανίοις τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολήν· **Ἱεραπυτνίων οἱ** [κόσμοι  
κ]**αὶ ἡ πόλις Ἱτανί**[ων τοῖς]  
[κόσ]μοις καὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν· βέλτιον ὑπελάβομεν γράφαι ὑμῖν ὅπως εἰ  
διὰ [τὸ σ]υμβεβηκὸς ὑ [ - - - ]  
[ . . . ] καὶ Πραισίων καταῖκται τὸ πλοῖον τὸ Κυδάνο<ρ>ος ἐκ τᾶς ὑμᾶς νάσω  
Λεύ[κας . . . ]ν ἀδικοῦν ἱ [ - - ]  
[ . . . ]σαιτε ἐπιστροφάν τινα ποησάμενοι περὶ τούτων ὅπως μηθὲν [ . . . . ]ν  
ἀδικήσητε [ - - - - - ]  
[ . . . ] ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς, εἴ τί κα συμβαίνει τινὶ ὑμῶν τοιοῦτο ἐν τᾷ ἀμ[ᾶ  
μηθεν] ἐπιτρέψομεν. [ἔρ-  
130 Doc. ρωσθ]ε. τίς οὖν ἂν ἐτι προσδέξαιτο τὴν ὑπὸ Ἱεραπυτνίων κατὰ Στηλιτῶν . . . .  
[ . ] καιρὸν [ - - - ] κτλ.

Date 1: PHI. 2: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Magnesia and Itanos. The numbers in square brackets are mine, and indicate the number of dashes or dots in the published edition.

### 38 – The *prytaneis* and ‘chosen’ members of the *phylake* of Miletos to the Eleans – c.138BCE

= *I.v. Olympia* 52, ll.29-40, cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 683 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 39

- κρίσις περὶ χώρας  
Μεσσανίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίο[ις].  
*vacat*
- col. I.3 πρεσβευτᾶν παραγενομένων παρὰ τᾶς πόλιος  
τῶμ Μεσσανίων Μηνοδώρου τοῦ Διονυσίου, κτλ.  
...
- vacat*
- Letter 30 **Μιλησίων οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ οἱ ἡρημένοι ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ**  
**Ἡλείων τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τοῖς συνέδροις χαίρειν**· παρα-  
γενομένωμ πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρεσβευτῶν παρὰ Μεσσηνίων  
**Μηνοδώρου τοῦ Διονυσίου, Φιλοίτου τοῦ Κρατίου**, καὶ  
παρακαλούντων δοῦναι αὐτοῖς ἀντίγραφον πρὸς ὑ-  
μᾶς τῆς γεγενημένης κρίσεως Μεσσηνίοις τε καὶ  
35 Λακεδαιμονίοις κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τῆς συγκλήτου, καὶ τῆς τε  
βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου συγχωρησάντων τὰ προδεδηλ<ω>μέ-  
να καὶ ἐπιταξάντων ἡμῖν δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν κρίσιν, ὑπο-  
[τ]άξαντες αὐτὴν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ἐδώκαμεν τοῖς πρεσβευ-

- 40 [τ]αῖς, ὅπως διακομίσωσιν αὐτὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐσφραγισμέ-  
 [νη]ν τῇ [δημ]οσίᾳ σφραγίδι.  
 col. II.41 ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου **Εἰρηνίου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδο[υ]**, μηνὸς  
 Document **Καλαμαιῶνος** δευτέραι, ὥς δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς [ἔγρα]ψε **Κόιν-**  
**τος Καλιπόρνιος Γαῖου υἱὸς** μηνὸς τετάρ[του καὶ δεκά]-  
 του καὶ ἡμέραι ἐνδεκάτη κατὰ σελήνην ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας τὸ  
 45 δόγμα ἐγένετο, ἐκκλησίᾳ συνήχθη κυρία ἐν [τῷ θεά]-  
 τρῳ ἐν τῇ προειρημένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καθότι Λακ[εδαιμόνι]-  
 οὶ καὶ Μεσσήνιοι συνωμολογήσαντο, καὶ ἀπ[ε]κληρώθη  
 κριτήριον ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ δήμου τὸ μέγιστον ἐκ τῶν  
 νόμων, κριταὶ ἑξακόσιοι, καὶ εἰσέχθη ἡ κρίσις κατὰ τε  
 50 τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ προειρημένο[υ] στρατηγοῦ καὶ  
 κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τῆς συ[γκ]λήτου Π[ - - ] ἐπ' ἀμφιλλο[γ]-  
 [ία]ι Ὁ [ - ] . [ - ] . [Λ]ακεδαι[μον]ί[οι]ς τε καὶ Μεσσηνίοις, ὅπό]-  
 τεροι ταύτην τὴν χώραν κατεῖχ[ον ὅτε Λεύκιος]  
 Μόμμιος ὑπάτος ἢ ἀνθύπατος [ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐπαρ]-  
 55 χεῖαι ἐγένετο, ὅπως οὗτοι οὕτ[ως κατέχωσιν - - - - ]  
 ηρηθή αὐτοῖς τὸ ὕδωρ πρὸς τὴν [ - - - - ] ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ  
 πρώτου λόγου ἑκατέροις μετρη[ταὶ Μιλήσιοι δεκα]-  
 πέντε, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου λόγου [μετρηταὶ Μιλήσιοι]  
 πέντε, καθότι καὶ αὐτοὶ εὐδόκησαν· [καὶ λ]εξάντων  
 60 πρὸς τὴν τήρησιν τοῦ ὕδατος παρὰ [μὲν Λ]ακεδαιμονί-  
 ων **Εὐδαμίδα τοῦ Εὐθυκλέος**, παρὰ δὲ Με[σ]σηνίων **Νίκ<ων>-**  
**ος τοῦ Νίκωνος**, καὶ ῥηθέντων τῶν λόγων [ὅ]φ' ἑκατέ-  
 ρων, ἐκρίθη κατεισχῆσθαι ἡ χώρα ὑπὸ Μεσσηνίων ὅτε  
 Λεύκιος Μόμμιος ὑπάτος ἢ ἀνθύπατος [ἐ]ν ἐκεί-  
 65 νῃ τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὅπως οὗτοι οὕτως  
 κατέχωσιν. τῶν ψήφων, αἷς ἔδοξεν κατεισχῆσθαι  
 ἡ χώρα ὑπὸ Μεσσηνίων καὶ ὅπως οὗτοι οὕτω[ς κα]-  
 τέχωσιν, πεντακόσιοι ὀγδοήκοντα τέσσα-  
 70 ρες· αἷς κατεισχῆσθαι ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίω[ν],  
 δεκαέξ.

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Olympia.

**39 – The koinon of the Amphiktionones to the Athenians – 134 or 130 BCE**  
 = *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1132, ll.40-51, cf. *CID* 4 115 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 42

Preceding θ[ε]οί.

Decree ἐκ τοῦ μητροῦίου· νυν ἐπὶ Ἰέ[ρ]ωνος ἄρχον-  
 τος ἐν Δελφοῖς· πυλαίας ἐαρινᾶς· κτλ.

...

Letter **τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτιό[νων Ἀθηναίων τε]**  
**βουλευῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν**· πρεσβευσάντων πρὸς ἡ-  
 μᾶς παρὰ τῶν τεχνιτῶν τῶν μετεχ[όντων τῆς παρ' ὑ]-  
 μῖν συ[ο]νόδου **Διονυσίου τοῦ Νύμφι[δος] τραγικοῦ ὑ]-**  
 45 **ποδιδασκάλου, Θυμοτέλου τοῦ Φιλο[κλέους] τραγικοῦ**  
**ποιητοῦ, Ἐλπινίκου τοῦ Ἐπικράτου** τραγικοῦ ὑποδιδασ]-  
 κάλου, **Φιλίωνος τοῦ Φιλομήλου** τραγικοῦ [ὑποδιδασκάλου],

**Ἀρίστωνος τοῦ Ζήνωνος** τραγικοῦ ὑποδι[δασκάλου καὶ]  
 ἦν ἔλαβον ἀπόκρισιν παρ' ἡμῶν οἰηθέντων[ν δεῖν πέμπειν]  
 50 καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὑπογεγράφαμεν ὑμῖν τοῦ γ[εγεννημένου]  
 ὑφ' ἡμῶν δόγματος τὸ ἀντίγραφον. *vacat*  
 Following ἄρχοντος ἐν Δελφοῖς Ἀριστίωνος τοῦ Ἀνα[ξανδρίδου μη]-  
 Decree νὸς Βουκατίου, Πυθίοις· κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Athens.

#### 40 – Tyre to Delphi – 125 BCE

= *SEG* 2, 330, cf. also Rigsby *Asyilia* pp.483-484 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 43

Θεός. Τύχ[ην ἀγαθήν]. | **Τύρου τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ ἀσύλου ἡ β[ουλῆ]**  
 [καὶ ὁ δῆμος Δελφῶν τῇ] | **βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τοῖς συγγε-**  
**ν[έσιν χαίρειν. Εἰ ἔρρωσθε, εἴη ἂν ὥς] | βουλόμεθα· καὶ**  
**αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑγιαί[ν]ομ[εν. Τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὑπάρχουσαν] || σύνκρᾶσιν**  
 5 **ἐπαύξειν καὶ ταῖς τ[ῶν βασιλέων εὐεργεσίαις μνημό]||συνον**  
**αἰώνιον ὑπάρξει, ἅμα δὲ [καὶ χρήσιμοι βουλόμενοι φαίνεσθαι**  
**καὶ ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς εἰς τ[ὴν πόλιν παρραγινόμενοις πρὸς τὸ] |**  
**καὶ μὴ ἀμετόχους εἶναι τοῦ κοιν[οῦ τε τῆς ἀσυλίας καὶ τοῦ]**  
**[νῦν] | ἐπιγενομένου φιλανθρώπου, ἐ[λευθερίας τυχόντες ἐπιμε]-**  
 10 **[λές] || ἐποιήσαμεν διασαφῆσαι [ - - - - - ]**

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi. "4. Αἰ προελόμενοι τὴν ἐς ὑμᾶς prop. Cr." – *SEG* online.

#### 41 – The *grammateus* of a Macedonian or Akhaian *polis* to Sparta – 123/121 BCE

= *IG* v i 30 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' 44

[Φε]νεατᾶν. *vacat*  
 [ὁ δεῖνα γρα]μματεὺς συνέ-  
 [δρων . . . . . ]ς ὁ τὸ πέμπτον καὶ εἰ-  
 [κοστὸν ἔτος Λ]ακεδαιμονίων ἐφόροις  
 5 [καὶ τῇ πόλει χα]ίρειν· τῶν ὄντων παρ' ἐ-  
 [μοὶ κειμένων ἐν] τῷ ἀρχεῖῳ ἐν βυβλίῳ  
 [ψηφισμάτων γ]έγραφα ὑμῖν τὸ ἀντί-  
 [γραφον· ἐπεὶ . . . ] κράτης Στεφά[νου]  
 [ - - - - - εὖ ποι]ῶν διατε[λεῖ - - - - ]  
 10 [ - - - - - ]

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Sparta.

**42 – The *koinon* of the Amphiktionones to the Athenians – 117-116 or 112 BCE**  
 = *IG ii*<sup>2</sup> 1134, ll.77-103, cf. *CID* 4, 120 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **45**

- 77 [τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων Ἀθηναίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ] **δήμῳ χαίρειν**.  
 Μενε . . .  
 [ - - - - - ]ς Περγασῆθεν, Χαρι . . . .  
 [ - - - - - ]θε]ν, Πολύστρατος Θορί[κιος]  
 80 [ - - - - - ]γος Φλυεὺς ν οἱ παρ’ ὑμ[ῶν]  
 [παραγενόμενοι πρεσβευταὶ - - - - - ψήφ]ισμα ἐν ᾧ διεσαφῆ[σατε]  
 [ - - - - - ]υς ἐπὶ τὰς μετεχού[σ]α[ς . . . ]  
 [ - - - - - ]κα]ταλύσει μὲν τοῦ κοινοῦ . . .  
 [ - - - - - ]τῶν ἡ]γουμένων Ῥωμαίων βουλ . . .  
 85 [ - - - - - ]Ἀμ]φικτύοσιν κατὰ πόλιν ἀνα . . .  
 [ - - - - - ]ώμεθα προσελθόντες δὲ κ[αὶ . . ]  
 [ - - - - - ] ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι κατακεχωρι[σ]μ]-  
 [ἐν - - - - - ]ἐξ Ἰσθμοῦ καὶ Νεμέας τεχνίτας . .  
 [ - - - - - ]ν δοξάντων, ὅς καὶ παρανέγ[νωσ]-  
 90 [αν - - - - - ]συγ]κλήτου δόγματα καὶ τὰς Ῥω[μα]-  
 [ίων - - - - - ]κε]χρηματισμένα τῇ πρὸ ταύτης[ς]  
 [γεγονεῖαι μεθοπωρινῇ πυλαίᾳ? - - - - - ] παραγε[ν]ομ[έν]ων δὲ  
 πρεσβευ[τ]-  
 [ῶν - - - - - ]να [κατηγο]ριῶν, ὁμοίω[ς]  
 δὲ καὶ [ - - - - - ] τεχνιτῶ[ν]  
 95 καὶ ἐξαπε[σταλ]- - - - - ]κατη]γορία[ς ποιεῖσθ]αι ἐ-  
 τέρους πρέσβε[ις - - - - - ] δόντες μη[θὲν ὑπεναν]-  
 τίον τοῖς τε νόμοις καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Ἀμφικ]τυόνων· ἐκρίναμε[ν τὰ  
 κεχρημα]-  
 τισμένα ἐν τῇ μεθοπ[ωρινῇ πυλαίᾳ ἐπὶ] ἄρχοντος ἐν Δελφοῖς Ε[ὐκλείδου]  
 κύρια εἶναι καὶ βέβαια εἰς [τὸν ἅπαντα χρόν]ον καὶ μηθὲν ὑπεναντίον α[ὐτοῖς]  
 100 ἐπιχρηματίζειν ν δίκαιον ἡ[γεῖσθαι, καὶ] διαφυλάσσειν τὰς δεδομένας ὑφ’ [ἡ]-  
 μῶν τῷ δήμῳ τιμάς, ὁμοίως δὲ κα[ὶ τοῖς] παρ’ ὑμῖν τεχνίταις τὰ  
 ὑπάρχοντα [φι]-  
 λάνθρωπα περὶ τε τῆς ἀσυλίας καὶ ἀ[σφαλ]είας ν καὶ χρυσοφορίας ἔτι δὲ καὶ  
 τῆς συ[νερ]-  
 γασίας, ν θεωροῦντες καὶ τοὺς κοινού[ς ε]ὐεργέτας Ῥωμαίους ν ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς  
 γεγο-  
 νότας γνώμης.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Athens. l.100 of the edn. of *IG ii*<sup>2</sup> 1134 on PHI Online has η[γεῖσθαι], which I have changed to ἡ[γεῖσθαι]. This text is preceded by an earlier decree of the Athenians, ll.1-76. It is followed by two crowns in which is the following text: (col.I l.105) τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων | *in corona* τὸν δῆμον | τὸν Ἀθηναίων | (col.II l.105) τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων | *in corona* τὸ κοινὸν τῶν | τεχνιτῶν | τῶν | ἐν Ἀ[θήναις].

**43 – The *koinon* of the Amphiktionones inserted in an Athenian decree(?) – 117/116 BCE**  
 = *SEG* 26, 117 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **46**

- Decree? [ - - - ca. 12 - - ἐπὶ Μενοίτου ἄρχο]ντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος ν  
 [ - - - - - ca. 26 - - - - - ]άδης Ἀττάλου Βερεινικίδης

[ἐγγραμμάτευεν - - - - ca. 13 - - -] τετράδι ἰσταμένου τετάρτη  
 [τῆς πρυτανείας· βουλὴ ἐν βουλευτῇριώι· τῶν προέδρων ἐπειψήφι-  
 5 Letter [ζεν- - - ca. 14 - - καὶ συμπρό]εδροι vac. **τὸ κοιν**[ὸν τῶν Ἀμφι]-  
 [κτιόνων Ἀθηναίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ] **τῶι δήμῳ χαίρειν** [- - - -]

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Athens. “Fragment of a white marble stele found in the Agora Excavations (I 7156). Ed. pr. S.V. Tracy, *HESPERIA* 45 (1976) 287-288, no. 3 (ph.). B.D. Meritt, *HESPERIA* 46 (1977) 255, shows that there is no *vacat* in L. 3 after ἰσταμένου, as printed in Tracy’s text. | *Apparatus Criticus* 1. [ἐκ τοῦ Μητρώου] Tracy, - cf. IG, II<sup>2</sup>, 1132 LL. 1, 40.” – SEG online.

#### 44 – A *grammateus* of a *synhedrion* to the Karystans or the Euboians (?) – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= IG xii 9, 5 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 47

Letter [ - - ] **Ξε**[ν]ον γραμματεὺς συνεδ[ρίου - - - - -]  
 [ - - στρατη]γ[οῖ]ς **χαίρε**[ιν]. τῶν ὄντων π[αρ]’ - - ]  
 [ἡμῖν - - - ὑμ]εῖν [τὸ ἀ]ντίγραφον [πεπόμφαμεν]  
 20 [διὰ πρεσβευτοῦ - - ]η[ - τοῦ Πολ]υκράτου Φι-[ - - ]  
*Hypo-* [ - - - - ]ορ[ . . . ]ς [Ἐρετρ]ιέων γραμμ[ατέως - - ]  
*mnema* [ - - - ] Χαλκιδέων στρατηγὸς κα[ὶ - - - - - ] κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Karystos. This letter is preceded by a letter believed to be from a Roman magistrate (in the Roman corpus as *ORRLIG* 21). “*Athenis* in museo. Fragmentum tabulae marmoreae superne, a dextra et sinistra fractae inventum Carystii iuxta domum Georgii Deligeorgis ad litus maris, A. 0,52, l. 0,26, cr. 0,12. Litt. a. 0,08, saec. II a. Chr. Ed. Lolling *Ath. Mitt.* IV 1879, 226 VII. Exscripsi. *Ect.* [...] Litteras magistratus Romani ad Carystios sive ad Euboensium foedus datas esse Wilamowitz perspexit. Idem supplevit vs. 7.10—13. 18. 20.—8. 15. 17. 19. 23. 29 suppl. Hiller. Cum litteris mittebantur ὙΠΟΜΝΗΜΑ de rebus quibusdam, quod Carystii iubentur in tabulario publico deponere vs. 15 (cf. Dittenberger *OGIS* 453<sub>50</sub> ἔστιν δὲ ἀντίγραφα τῶν γεγονότων ὑμεῖν φιλανθρωπῶν τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα· ἃ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις τοῖς παρ’ ὑμεῖν γράμμασιν ἐντάξαι ; Joseph. Ant. XIV 319).” – Ziebarth, *IG* xii 9, 5, page 2.

#### 45 – The ephors and *polis* of Sparta to the *tagoi* and *demos* of Larissa – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= IG ix 2, 518 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 49

[Λ]ακεδαιμονίων ἔφο[ρ]οι κα[ὶ ἃ] πόλι[ς]  
 [Λ]αρισ[σ]α[ί]ων τοῖς ταγοῖς κα[ὶ] τῶι δ[ιά]-  
 [μῳ χαίρεν. ἃ] <π>εστάλακα<μ>εν π[ρὸ]θ’ ὑμῆ  
 [πρέσβεις Ἀρισ]τόγικον Εὐαμερίο[υ].  
 5 [ - - - - - ]ΙΟΣΛΡ[ - ]Δ[ - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ΟΙΚΗ[ - ]ΙΟΥΑΙ[ - ]  
 [ - - - - - ]ΩΝΤΙΓΩΜΛ[ - - - ]

Date: Ceccarelli. ‘undated’ PHI. Inscribed at Larisa.



**46 – An unknown polis to Sparta – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE**= IG v i, 8 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **50**

[ - - - - - εὐεργε]σίᾳ. vac.  
 [ - - - - - ων οἱ σ]τραταγοὶ καὶ ἡ πόλις Λακεδαι-  
 [μονίων ἐφόροις κ]αὶ τῇ πόλει χαίρειν· πόθοδον  
 [ποιησάμενων π]οτί τε τὰν βουλ[ᾶν καὶ τὰ]ν ἐκκλη-  
 5 [σίαν ἀμῶν - το]ῦ Λέοντος, Αἰσχυρίωνος τ[οῦ] Αἰσχυρ-  
 [νος τῶν ὑμετέρων] πολιτῶν, καὶ ἐνφανιζόντων πε-  
 [ρὶ - - τοῦ - - ]άρχου καὶ Ἱπποθραέος τοῦ Ἱπποθρα-  
 [έος - - - - - ]

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Sparta.

**47 – Hypata to the Amphiktionones – 146BCE. (inscribed 110 BCE?)**(on the same monument as **48**) = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1: 578 col. II, 14ff., cf. *CID* 4 121 and 122 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **51**

col. II.1 <θ>[εὸ]ς τ[ύ]χαν ἀγαθάν].  
 ἀναγ[ραφείσης τῆς γ]ενομένης κρι[σεως]  
 ἄλλ<ω>[ν πάντων]ν τ[ῶ]ν ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ κτλ.  
 ...  
 Letter Ὑπαταίω[ν] οἱ ἄρχοντ[ες - - - - - χαίρειν - - - - - δε]-  
 15 δωκέναι κριτήριον τ[οῖς] ἀμει]-  
 τέραν πόλιν περὶ τᾶ[ς] κρίσιος  
 [X]αλ[κ]ιδέων φαμέν[ων]  
 Π.Ο. . . ιαν ἀμέρας [ - τὰν ἰαρο]-  
 [μν]αμοσύναν το[ῖς] . . . . .  
 20 . ΥΧΛΝΕ . . μηνὶ κ[αθὼς] - - - - - ἄγοντι]  
 . ΛΙΤΛΙ . . . ΚΛ  
 . . Ν.ΤΩΝ . . ΣΤ  
 . . . . . Ι.Ο. . . ΛΙ  
 . . . . . ΡΑΣΤΟΙ  
 25 . . . . . ΑΙΣ

Date 1: PHI. 2: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi. The spacing of the words without dashes is the same as on PHI online.

**48 – Hypata to the Amphiktionones – 146BCE. (inscribed 110 BCE?)**(on the same monument as **47**) = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **52** = *CID* 4 121 and 122 = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1: 578 col. I, 9ff.

col.I.1 [ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνηματισμῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ πα]ρε[ρχομ]ένη πενταετηρίδι  
 συντελ[ου]μ[ένων]ν . . κτλ.  
 ...  
 10 Letter [ . . . . . τῷ κοινῷ τῶν] Ἀμφικτιόνων χαίρειν. ἐκομισάμεθά τε  
 ἐπιστολὰ[ν] ἐν ᾧ [δισσα]-  
 [φήσατε ἀμῖν πάντα καὶ παρεκαλέσ]ατε τὰν ἀμετέρ[α]ν πόλιν  
 κριτήριω[ν] φέρειν [περὶ] Ἑρετριέω[ν] κα[ὶ]

- [Καρυστίων ἀμφιλλεγόντων πάλιν πο]τὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶ[ν Χ]αλκιδέων π[ε]ρὶ τᾶς  
κρίσιος τᾶ[ς γενομ]ένα[ς]  
[ἀκολούθως τοῖς γεγραμμένοις] ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερομ[ναμ]ό[νων] τῶν συνελθόντων  
εἰς τὰν πυλα[ί]αν τὰν  
[ - - - - ἐπὶ - - - - ἄρχοντος ἐ]ν Δελφοῖς, πότ[ερων] κέκριται κατὰ τὸ  
βέ]λτιστ[ον ἢ δεῖ ἄ]κυ-  
15 [ρον τὴν κρίσιν γίνεσθαι ἐν ἀν]δρά[σ]ιν τριάκοντα ἐνὶ [κ]ληρωθ[εῖσιν] . ΞΑΓ  
[ὕπ]ο[ς] τ[ο]ῦ δάμου καὶ ὅτι λέγ[ουσ]ι γενέσθαι κρίσιν τὰν [π]αρά  
[τ]ὰ [δόγ]-  
[ματα] . . . . . ἐν [Δ]ελφοῖς, τοῦ Ἡ[ρ]αίου μηνός, καθὼς [Δ]ελφοὶ ἄγοντ[ι] . . . . .  
[ἐν Ὑ]πάτα Φίλ[ιπ]πον τὸν ἀστ[ρ]ολόγον ὃν ΕΛΕΚΕΤΕΟΥΠΑ . . . . .  
... α τ[ο]ύτων καὶ κεχειροτο[νημ]ένους α[ὕτο]ι ... ΛΡΙ  
20 ... [ἀ]πὸ δέκα δ[ύ]ο . . . . . EN.OΛIONT ... KN  
... ΤΙΣΦΑΓ  
[γέ]γραπτα[ι τ]ῶι ΧΑ—  
... ΕΩΣΣ  
.. ΑΙ.ΥΣΑΣΙ  
25 ... ΟΡ  
.. ΝΠΑΣΙΑΣΑΝ  
.. ΡΟΝΙΚΟΥΓΡΟΦΕΥ  
.. ΚΑΛΛΙΦΑΝΤΟΥ  
... ΥΜΛ. .Σ

Date 1: PHI. 2: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

#### 49 – The Delphians to the Athenians – 106-105 BCE

= *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1136 + add. pt.1.2 p.672 (PHI Online), cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 711K = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 54

- [Δελφῶν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ πόλις Ἀθηναίων τᾶι]  
[βουλᾶι καὶ τῶι δάμῳ χαιρεῖν. νν τοῦ γεγονότος]  
[ὕφ’ ἀμῶν δόγματος Χρύσιδι Νικήτου θυγατρὶ, τᾶι]  
[ὑμετέραι πολίτιδι, ὑπογεγράφαμες τῶι δεῖνι τοῦ δεῖνος]  
Letter [ . . c.7 . . Ἀθ]ηναίῳ τῶ[ι προ]ξένῳ τ[ὸ ἀντίγραφον]  
Decree [ὅπῳ]ς εἰδῆτε· νν **ἔρρωσθε**. νν ἐπειδὴ τοῦ δά[μου]  
τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ἀγαγόντος τὰν Πυθαῖδα τ[ῶι]  
[Α]πόλλωνι τῶι Πυθίῳ μεγαλομερῶς καὶ ἀ[ξί]-  
5 [ως] κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Athens.

#### 50 – Apparently excerpts from a letter, in Attic, from a *polis* arbitrating for Thronion and Skarphaea, inscribed in Delphi – end 2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE

= *Fouilles de Delphes* III 4: 38, 3, cf. *CID* 4 123-125 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 56

- Decree [κριτὰς ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἐγέ]νοντο σύμφωνοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ νενικηκότα[ς]  
[τοὺς Θροινέας καὶ εἰ]ληφότας ψήφους πεντήκοντα ἐννέα, τοὺς δὲ Σκ[αρ]-  
[φέας εἰληφότ]ας ψήφους [δ]ύο. [γ]εγράφαμεν οὖν ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε· ὑπογ[έ]-  
[γραπται δὲ] ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ἀντίγραφον τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς τῆς ἀποδοθείσης]  
5 [ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τῶ]ν ἐξαποσταλέντων πρεσβευτῶν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Θρο-

- [νιέων, ὁμο]ίως δὲ καὶ τῆς δοθείσης ἀντιγραφῆς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξαποσταλέντων[ν]  
[πρεσβευτῶν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Σκαρφέων. – ἀμφιλλέγει ἅ πόλεις τῶν  
Θρονιέων[ν]
- Letter- [περὶ τῆς ἱερομοναμοσύνας ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Σκαρφέων. “ἐπιβάλλει μοι τῆς  
exerpt τῶ[ν]
- 1? [Ἐπικν]αμι<δ>ίων Λοκρῶν ἀμφικτιονείας τὸ τρίτον μέρος, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ  
πρόβατα ἐ[ν]
- 10 [τὰς θυ]σίας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα πρότερον ἐν τοῖς Ἀμφικτίονας συ[μ]-  
[βέβλ]ημαι, καὶ καθ’ ὃ κέκριμαι πρότερον περὶ τούτων ἐν Ἀμφίσσαι κατὰ τὸ[ν]  
[ἀμ]φικτιονικὸν νόμον· καὶ δεῖ κρατεῖν ἐμὲ καὶ κυριεύειν τοῦ ἐμὶν ἐπιβά[λ]-  
[λ]οντος μέρος, καὶ τὸν ἱερομνάμονα καθίστασθαι παρ’ ἐμὲ καὶ πέμπε-  
σθαι ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ, ἐπεὶ κα ἐμὶν καθήκη ἡ ἱερομοναμοσύνα. τὸ δέ, πόλι Σκαρφέ-  
15 ων, ἀντιποιεῖσαι κακοπραγμόνως κατασοφίζομένα, καὶ ἐξειδιάξεσθαι[ι θε]-  
λεις ἀδίκως τὸ ἐμὶν ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς ἱερομοναμοσύνας.” – ἡ πόλις τῶ[ν]
- Letter- Σ[κ]αρφέων ἀντ[ε]γ[ρ]άψατο ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Θρονιέων[ν]. “μὴ δεῖν εἶμεν τὸ  
exerpt τρι[τον]
- 2? μέρος τῆς ἱερομοναμοσύνας Θρονιέων, ἀλλ’ εἶμεν κοινὰν τὰν ἱερομοναμοσύν[αν]  
Λοκρῶν τῶν [Ἐ]πικναμιδίων κατὰ τε τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰς γερονείας περὶ το[ύ]-  
20 των κρίσεις παρὰ τε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Ἀμφικτίοσιν, καὶ δεῖν τὸν ἱερομνά[μο]-  
να καθίστασθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Λοκρῶν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἀπὸ τ[ᾶ]ς ἀρχ[ᾶς]  
διωικημένοις καὶ τῶ[ι ὑ]πὸ Ῥωμαίων κειμένωι γραπτῶι.”

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

## 51 – The *strategoí* of Lampsakos to the magistrates of Thasos – first third of the 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE

= *I.Lampsakos*, no.7 = Dunant-Pouilloux *Thasos* II, 171 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 57

- Λαμψακηνῶν
- Letter **Λαμψακηνῶν στρατηγοὶ Θασίων ἄρχουσι**  
**χαίρειν· εἰ ἔρωσθε (sic), τὸ δέον ἂν εἴη, καὶ ἡμεῖς**  
**δὲ ὑγιαίνομεν.** Τῶν γεγονότων
- 5 φιλανθρώπων παρ’ ἡμῖν τῶι πολίτῃ ὑμῶν  
**Διονυσοδώρῳ Πεμπίδου**  
ἐξαπεστάλκαμεν τὰ ἀντίγραφα  
ὑποτάξαντες ὑπὸ τὴν ἐπιστολήν.
- Decree 1 Πρυτανεύοντος Πριάπου Ἐπιφανοῦς,  
10 ψηφίσματα ἐκ βουλῆς· κτλ.  
...
- Decree 2 ὥς ἂν τῶι δήμῳ δόξῃ. Πρυτανευούσης  
Ἀφροδίτης Ἐπιφανοῦς, ψηφίσματα  
ἐκ βουλῆς· Ἀπατουριῶνος· ἔδοξεν  
30 τῶι δήμῳ· κτλ.

Date: Frisch. Inscribed at Thasos. Letter: “2 ἄρχουσι Tréheux (am Foto bestätigt (‘confirmed in the photo’)); ἄρχουσιν Dunant-Pouilloux. ... 8 ἐπιστοᾶν de Stein (‘ΕΠΙΣΤΟΑΗΝ on the stone’).” – Frisch, *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*, 51–52, my translations.

**52 – Letter (?) of the Rhodians to the Thasians – first third of the 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE**  
 = Dunant-Pouilloux *Thasos* II 172 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 58

Letter? [ *noms propres* ? οἱ ? πρεσ]-  
 [βευτ]αὶ ποτὶ Λεύκιον Αὐρήλιον στρα[ταγόν]  
 [ἀνθύ]πατον Ῥωμαίων παραγενόμενο[ι παρ']  
 [ἀμῖν] ἐνεφάνιζον ὅτι Διονυσόδ[ωρος]  
 5 [Πεμ]πίδου ὁ ὑμέτερος μὲν πολίτ[α]ς, εἰλη]-  
 [φῶς] δὲ καὶ παρ' ἀμῖν προξενίαν, τ[ᾶς]  
 [ἀσφα]λείας αὐτῶν προενόησε *uac.* [καὶ]  
 [τᾶς κα]ταστάσ<α>σ<ε>ως ποτὶ τὸν στ[ραταγόν].  
 [ὁμοίω]ς δὲ ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποιήσατο κ[αὶ τᾶς]  
 10 [ἀνακ]ομιδᾶς αὐτῶν τᾶς εἰς Ἀμφίπ[ολιν]  
 [καὶ ἐν] τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι ἐν οἷς αὐτοῦ χ[ρ]εΐαν  
 [εἶχον] ἐποιεῖτο τὰν ἐκτενεστά(τα)ν πρ[όνοι]-  
 [αν· φιλι]κῶς οὖν αὐτοῦ ποτιφερομένο[υ ποτὶ]  
 [τοῦς] ἐκπεμπομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ δά[μου],  
 15 [θέλο]μεν καὶ ὑμῖν διαμαρτυρῆσαι [τὰν τοῦ]  
 [ἀνδρ]ὸς καλοκάγαθίαν, ὑπογεγράφα[μεν]  
 [δὲ κ]αὶ τοῦ ψαφίσματος, καθ' ὃ δέδω[καν ἅ βου]-  
 [λὰ καὶ] ὁ δᾶμος τὰν προξενίαν, τὸ ἀ[ντίγραφον]  
 [ῖνα κ]αὶ ἐν τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν δαμοσίοις ὑπάρχῃ]  
 20 [ταῦτα τ]ὰ δεδομένα ὑπὸ τοῦ δάμου ΠΙ - - - -  
 Decree [ἐπὶ ἱερ]έως Θερσάνδρου, Ἀριστοκλεῦ[ς τοῦ]  
 - - - κρᾶτευσ γραμματεύοντος βου[λᾷ],  
 [πρυταν]ίων τῶν σὺν Ἀριστοβούλῳ τῷ Δ - - - ,  
 [καθ' ὅθ]εσίαν δὲ Μικύθου· κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Thasos. Dunant-Pouilloux have reproduced the shapes of letter fragments in their *apparatus*, which I have represented with dots since I could not reproduce them in this document. “N. C. La première et la dernière ligne ne conservent plus que quelques traces de lettres peu distinctes et incertaines (*Apparatus Criticus* (Critical Notes). The first and last lines do not have more than some traces of letters which are indistinct and uncertain’ – CJH); 1.1 : [ca 10 l.] . . . . [ca 11 l.] . . [ca 6 l.]; 1.30 : [ca 8 l.] Υ·Ι . . ΟΣ . . . ΔΟΝ . ΑΓ [ca 10 l.]; 1.8 : ΤΑΣΤΑΣΑΣΕΩΣ; L.12 : ΕΚΤΕΝΕΣΤΑΝ.” – C. Dunant and J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l’histoire et les cultes de Thasos*, II (Paris, 1958), 27, my translation.

**53 – Strategoi and a boule of an unknown polis to Tegea(?) – 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE**  
 = IG v 2, 21, cf. *IPArk* 6 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 60

[ - - - - ]έων στρατηγοὶ ναὶ ἡ [βουλὴ Τεγεατῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ]  
 [τῷ δήμῳ χ]αίρειν. τῶν ἐψηφισμένων - - - - -  
 [ . . αἰτοῦ]σι δικαστ[ήριον - - - - -]

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Tegea.

**54 – The Delphians to the Dionysiac *tekhnitai* of Athens – 98/97 BCE**  
 = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 2:48 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ 61

Letter **Δελφῶν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ πόλις τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόν[υσον τεχνίταις  
 χ]αίρει[ν· τὰς δοθείσας ὑφ’ ἁμῶν]  
 ἀποκρίσιος ὑπογεγράφαμες ὑμῖν τὸ ἀντίγραφον, ὅ[πως εἰδῆτε. - - - - ]  
 ἔ[ρρωσθε].**

Decree ἐπειδὴ οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυτον τεχνῖται οἱ ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ ὁ ἐπι[μελητὰς] αὐτῶν  
 Ἀλέξαν[δρος Ἀ]ρίστωνος, κτλ.

Date: Ceccarelli. 97 BCE PHI. Inscribed at Delphi.

**55 – The Gephyraioi to Delphi – 37-36 BCE**

(on the same monument as 56) = *SEG* 30, 85 1.6-14, cf. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1096 = Ceccarelli *AGLW*  
 ‘App.3’ 62

Θεο[ί]  
 Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ. Ἐπὶ Θεοπείθου ἄ[ρχοντος, τοῦ δὲ γέ]-  
 νους τοῦ Γεφυραίων Φιλων[ίδου ἄρχοντος Παι]-  
 [α]νιέως ν Σκιροφοριῶνος ν [- - - - - - - - - -]  
 5 Letter [Ἐπιστολὴ παρὰ τοῦ γένους πρὸς Δελφούς]  
 [Γεφυραίων τὸ γένος Δελφῶν τῇ πόλει χαίρειν. ν Φι]-  
 [λίας ἀπ]εστὰ[λκαμεν παλαιᾶς εἰς ἀνανέωσιν Θεόφιλον]  
 Διοδώρου Ἀλαιοῦ [καὶ Παμμένην Ζήνωνος Μαραθώνιον]  
 καλλιερήσοντας [καὶ ἐπερωτήσοντας τὸ μαντεῖον]  
 10 καθὼς ἐστὶν τῷ γέ[νει πάτριον ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βουζύγου]  
 καὶ ἱερέως Διὸς ἐμ Πα[λλαδίῳ Διοτίμου τοῦ Διοδώρου]  
 Ἀλαιοῦ ν ὑμεῖς οὖν καλῶς [ποιήσετε ἀποδεξάμενοι αὐ]-  
 τοὺς καὶ εἰσαγαγόντες εἰς τ[ὸ χρηστήριον καὶ τοῦ δο]-  
 θέντος χρησμοῦ διαπεμφ[άμε]νοι τῷ γέ[νει ἀντίγραφον]

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Athens.

**56 – The Delphians to the Gephyraioi – 37-36 BCE**

(on the same monument as 55) = *SEG* 30, 85 1.16-27, cf. *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1096 = Ceccarelli *AGLW*  
 ‘App.3’ 63

Ἐπιστολὴ παρὰ Δελφῶ[ν πρ]ὸς τὸ γένος [ ]  
 16 **Δελφῶν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ <ἀ> π[ό]λις τῷ γένει τῷ Γ[εφυραίων]  
 χαίρειν** ν Γινώσκετε τοὺς [ἀπ]εσταλ<μ>ένους ὑφ’ ὑ[μῶν ἐπὶ]  
 τὰν μαντεῖαν καὶ <ἐ>περώτας[ιν ὑ]πὲρ τοῦ Βουζύγου κ[α]ὶ ἱ[ε]ρέως]  
 [Δ]ιὸς ἐμ Παλλαδίῳ Διοτ[ίμου] τοῦ Διοδώρου Ἀλαιοῦ [Θε]-  
 20 [όφιλ]ον Διοδώρου Ἀλ[αίου] Παμμένην Ζήνωνος Μα[ρα]-  
 [θώνιον ἀπ]οδε[δωκότας ἀμ]εῖν τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν πεμφθέντ[α]  
 [γράμματα περὶ τὰς μαντεῖας καὶ ἀνανεωμένους τὰν]  
 [ὑπάρχουσας ποτὶ τε τὰν] πόλιν ἁμῶν καὶ τὸν θεὸν οἱ-  
 [κειότατα τῶν Γεφυραίων] καὶ κεκαλλιερηκότας καὶ

25 [ἐπερωτακότας τὸ ἔδος? ἄ]γιον· τὰν οὖν ἐπερώτασιν  
[καὶ τὸν χρησμόν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπε]στάλμεθα π[ο]θ' ὑμὲ  
[σφραγισάμενοι τῇ δαμοσίᾳ σφρα]γεῖδι *vacat*  
[- - - - -]

Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Athens. The text above is that of *SEG* Online. Aside from their respective restorations, the major divergences between what this edn. and Kirckner in *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> give as present on the stone are as follows. ll.15-16. ἐπιστολὴ παρὰ Δελφῶ[ν πρ]ὸς τὸ γένος· [οἱ αἰρεθέντε]ς ἔγχρονοι ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ [ἱερεῖ]ς τῷ γένει τῷ — — — . ll.17-18. γινώσκετε τοὺς [— — — ἀφ]εσταλμένους ὑφ' ὑ[μῶν κα]τὰ μαντεῖαν, Kirchner. l.19. [Δ]ιὸς *SEG*; [Διὸς] τοῦ, Kirchner. l.21. [ἀπ]ὸ δὲ [δωκότας ἀμ]εῖν, *SEG*; . . . ]ωλε . . . c.12 . . . σιν, Kirchner. l.25. [ἄ]γιον, *SEG*; μαντ]εῖον, Kirchner. l.26. [πο]θ', Kirchner.

## 57 – The Spartan Ephors to the Delphians – 30-25BCE

(on the same monument as **58**, **Excl.T. 8**, **59**, **Excl.T. 9**) = *IG* v i 1566, cf. *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1:487b = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **64**

[ἐπὶ] ἄ[ρ]χοντος [Πο]λεμά<ρ>[χου].  
[Λ]ακεδαιμονίων ἔφοροι καὶ ἅ πόλ[ις] Δελφῶν τοῖς ἄρχουσι]  
[καὶ τῇ πό]λει χαίρειν· τοῦ γεγον[ό]τος ὑφ' ἁμῶν ψαφίσματος]  
[Διοδώρῳ]ι Δωροθέου τῷ ὑμετέρῳ[ι πολίται ἀπεστάλκα]-  
5 [μ]εν ὑμῖν τὸ ἀντίγραφον· ἐπεὶ Διό[δωρος Δωροθέου Δελφὸς]  
ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ εὐνόως [διακείμενος ποτὶ τὸν δᾶ]-  
μον ἁμῶν χρειᾶς τε παρείσχητα[ι πολλὰς καὶ κοινᾶι καὶ ἰδίαι]  
τοῖς ἐντετευχόσιν αὐτῷ τῶν ἁμ[ετέρων πολιτῶν σπουδᾶς]  
καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐλλείπων κα[ὶ] νῦν δὲ εὐφραμήθη]  
10 ὑπὸ πλειόνων τῶν ἁμετέρων π[ολιτῶν· ὅπως φανερόν πᾶσι γένηται]  
τὸν ἁμέτερον δᾶμον τοὺς καλο[ὺς κἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ἀποδέχεσθαι]  
καὶ ποιῶντας ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ τ[ὰ δίκαια . . . . . ]

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

## 58 – The *strategos* and *synhedroi* of the *koinon* of the Thessalians to Delphi – 30-25BCE

(on the same monument as **57**, **Excl.T. 8**, **59**, **Excl.T. 9**) = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1:488 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **65**

ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος [Πο]λεμάρχου].  
Ἀλέξιππος στρ[ατηγὸς τοῦ κοινοῦ τοῦ ἐν Θεσσαλ]ίαι καὶ οἱ  
σύνεδροι Δ<ε>[λφῶν τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῇ βουλῇ χ]αίρειν.  
προσδ[εομένου Διοδώρου τοῦ ὑμετέρου πολίτου τὴν] Θεωροδο-  
5 [κίαν - - - - - λελα]χέν[αι]  
[ - - - - - ] πρόξενον  
[ - - - - - ] τὸν πολί-  
[την ὑμέτεραν - - - - - ] οδίκαν  
[ - - - - - ἀπ]οδεχόμε-  
10 [νον - - - - - ] πρόξενον  
[ . . . καὶ πάντα ὅσα καὶ τοῖς καλοῖς κἀγαθοῖς ἀ]νδράσιν ἐν  
[Θεσσαλ]ίαι . . . . . ] ἀπιδίδο-  
[ται]. *vacat*

vacat

Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

**59** – The *doriarkheon* of the *koinon* of the Dorians to the arkhons and *polis* of Delphi – 30-25BCE(on the same monument as **57**, **58**, **Excl.T. 8**, **Excl.T. 9**) = *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 770B, cf. *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1:490 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **67**

	ἐπὶ [ἄρχοντος Πολεμάρχου.]
Letter	<b>Χαριγένης ὁ δωρι</b> [αρχέων τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Δωριέων] <b>ἐγ Ματροπόλεως</b> Δ[ελφῶν τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῶι] <b>πόλει χαίρειν.</b> τῶν δεδομένων τιμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ κοι-
5	νοῦ τῶν Δωριέων Διο[δώρῳ Δωροθέου τῷ ὑμετέρῳ] πολίται ἀπεστάλκαμε[ν ὑμῖν τὸ ψάφισμα ἀντιγε]-
Document	γραμμένον· δωριαρχέον[τος Χαριγένεος? τοῦ Ἀλέ]- ξωνος, γραμματεύοντο[ς τῆς βουλᾶς Καφι?]- σία τοῦ Εὐξιθέου Βοαίου, ἔ[δοξε ἐν ἀλίαι]
10	τοῖς Δωριέοις πάντοις δεδό[σθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κοι]- νοῦ τῶν Δωριέων Διοδώρῳ Δω[ροθέου Δελφῶι καὶ ἐκ]- γόνοις ἰσοπολιτε<ί>αν, ἐπινομίαν, [γᾶς καὶ οἰκίας ἔγκτη]- σιν, ἀσφάλειαν καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰ[ρᾶνας, καὶ τᾶλλα]
15	πάντα, ὅσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις προξέ[νοις δίδονται] παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Δωριέων. ἔγγ[υοι προξενίας·] Λαμπρίας Ξενύτα, Φοιβίδας Τιμο[ - - - - - ] Λαμπρία.

Date: Ceccarelli. ‘undated’ PHI. Inscribed at Delphi. Ceccarelli has accidentally listed *IG* v i 1566 as a concordance, which is correct for *FD* III 1:487b. 1.1. ἐπί, Bourguet; --ΣΛ, Dittenberger. 1.2. δωρι[αρχέων], Ditt.; Δωρια[ρχέων], Bourguet. 1.3. Δ[ελφῶν], Ditt.; Δ[ε]λ[φ]ῶ[ν], Bourguet. 1.4. χαίρειν, Ditt.; χαίρει, Bourguet (PHI Online). 1.5. τῶν δεδομένων τιμῶν, Ditt.; τῶν δεδομένων [τιμῶν], Bourguet. Διο[δώρῳ Δωροθέου], Ditt.; Διοδώρῳ Δωρο[θέου], Bourguet. 1.6. ἀπεστάλκαμε[ν ὑμῖν τὸ ψάφισμα], Ditt.; ἀπεστάλκαμε[ν ὑμῖν ἀντίγραφον], Bourguet. 1.7. δωριαρχέον[τος Χαριγένεος?], Ditt.; Δωριαρχέοντος Χ[αριγένεος], Bourguet. 1.8. γραμματεύοντο[ς τῆς βουλᾶς], Ditt.; γραμματεύοντος δὲ [τῆς βουλᾶς], Bourguet. 1.10. δεδό[σθαι], Ditt.; δεδόσ[θαι], Bourguet. 1.11. Δω[ροθέου], Bourguet; Δωρ[οθέου], Ditt. 1.16. Τιμο - - - - , Bourguet (PHI Online); Τιμο[κλέος, Ξενύτας?], Ditt.

## Auxiliary Letter

### The letter of Stephanos of Laodikea

This letter was listed by Ceccarelli in the section of Roman Republican letters in her ‘Appendix 3.’ Stephanos is clearly not a Roman; but he does not appear to be a monarch of any significance, nor does he disclose his status as the representative of any *polis*. Of this Stephanos, Reynolds writes “[he] appears as a man of local consequence, to whom the Plarasians and Aphrodisians sent an embassy, ... He was based in Laodicea (clearly on the Lycus) and presumably had an authority beyond Laodicean territory ... he had the power to arrest (l.7) which probably implies a formal appointment of some kind and the backing of some military force; but he gives no title” (Reynolds *AR* pp.99-100). He is the same Stephanos to whom Octavian gives an order in *ORRIG* 47 (= Reynolds *AR* 10). While I could not justify including this text as a Roman letter, and likewise could not include it as a letter of a Hellenistic *polis*, *koinon*, or kingdom, there is no reason for it not to be included as an auxiliary text.

**Aux.1** – Stephanos of Laodikea to the arkhons, *boule*, and *demos* of the Plarasians and Aphrodisians – post 38 BCE\*

= Reynolds *AR* 11 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ R57<sup>^</sup>

Plate X **Στέφανος Πλαρ(ασέων) Ἀφροδισιέων ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ χαίρειν.**  
**Προσελθόντων μοι ὑμετέρων πρεσβευτῶν ἐν Λαοδικῇ καὶ**  
**τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν ψηφίσματα ἀναδόντων,** ἐγὼ πᾶσαν σπουδὴν  
 εἰσηενκάμην καὶ ἐπιμελέστατα ἐξζητήσας παρὰ τε τῶν ἑ-  
 5 ξωθεν καὶ τῶν ἐμῶν ἀπέδωκα αὐτοῖς δούλους ὅσους ποτὲ ἐ-  
 πέγνωσαν καὶ ἐλευθέρους ὅσους ἔλεγον ἐπὶ Λαβιήνου πάντα(ς)  
 ὑμεῖν ἐνδεδεῖσθαι καὶ τούτους ὑμεῖν παρέδωκα ὅπως τὰς  
 καθηκούσας ὑμεῖν τιμωρίας ὑπόσχωσιν. *star* σὺν τούτοις καὶ  
 στέφανον χρυσοῦν ἀποδέδωκα τοῖς ὑμετέροις πρεσβευ-  
 10 ταῖς καὶ ἄρχουσιν ὃς ἦν ἀπενηνεγμένος ὑπὸ Πύθου τοῦ Οὐμανίου.

\*I have inferred this date from the date given for Reynolds *AR* 10, since there is no explicit mention of a date. Inscribed at Aphrodisias (Reynolds). ^Ceccarelli lists this text in the Roman section of her ‘Appendix 3’ despite the text not being Roman. “Inscribed in the lowest course of column 3 of the archive wall (inscribed area : 1.75 × 0.27). | Letters, second-third cent. A.D.: av. 0.018; ligatured NM, ME in l.2, MHN, TH in l.4, HN in l.6, ME in l.8, HN, NHN, ME in l.10; apices in ll.2, 5; the first Ω in l.2 cut over O; star-shaped stop in l.8. [...] l.6. ΠΑΝΤΑ *lapis*.” – Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, 99.



## List of Excluded Texts

The following texts are listed in Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'Appendix 3' as inscribed official letters of Hellenistic *poleis* and *koina*, but I have excluded them from my corpus for one or more of the three possible reasons listed in the preface to the Appendix. I have included such texts here for completeness and for the convenience of the marker.

**Excl.T. 1** – Letter (?) of the Pharians to the Parians (?) – (No date given)

= *SEG* 23, 489 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **31**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Inscribed at Pharos.

**Excl.T. 2** – The *strategos* (?) and *grammateus* (?) of the *synhedrion* of the Magnetans to Kleitor – 168-146BCE (sent) *c.*130 BCE (inscribed)

(on the same monument as **Excl.T. 3**) = *IG* v 2, 367, ll.1-6 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **40**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date 1: PHI 2: Ceccarelli ('prob. *c.*130 BCE').

Inscribed at Kleitor.

**Excl.T. 3** – The *strategoi* and *nomophylakes* of Demetrias to the *damiorgoi* and *demos* of Kleitor – 168-146BCE (sent) *c.*130 BCE (inscribed)

(on the same monument as **Excl.T. 2**) = *IG* v 2, 367, ll.24-29 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **41**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date 1: PHI 2: Ceccarelli ('prob. *c.*130 BCE').

Inscribed at Kleitor.

**Excl.T. 4** – An unknown *polis* to Demetrias (?) – 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= Wilhelm *Hermes* 40 (1909), pp.53-54 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **48**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Demetrias.

**Excl.T. 5** – An individual (Greek or Roman?) to Kyparissos (?) – 2<sup>nd</sup> or 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE

= *ORRLIG* **Excl.T. 4** = Sherk *RDGE* **46**, cf. *SEG* 11, 1025 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **53** and **R25bis**

Reason for exclusion: it is debated as to whether it is Greek or Roman, and therefore has been **excluded from both IOLHPK and ORRLIG corpora**. Date: Sherk, Ceccarelli. Found at Christianoi in Messenia (Sherk).

**Excl.T. 6** – An unknown *polis* to the Delphians (?) – end 2<sup>nd</sup> cen. BCE

= *Fouilles de Delphes* III 4: 33, cf. *SEG* 3, 381 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* 'App.3' **55**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

**Excl.T. 7** – A *polis* or a Roman proconsul to Sparta (?) – 1<sup>st</sup> cen. BCE

= *ORRLIG* **Excl.T. 6** = *IG v i, 9* = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **59** and **R31bis**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. It is also debated as to whether it is Greek or Roman, and therefore has been **excluded from both *IOLHPK* and *ORRLIG* corpora**. Date:

Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Sparta. “**Litterae vel Urbis cuiusdam vel proconsulis Romani**” (‘A letter either of a city or of a Roman proconsul’, my emphasis and translation) – Kolbe *IG v i, 9*

**Excl.T. 8** – An unidentified *polis* to the Delphians (?) – 30-25BCE

(on the same monument as **57, 58, 59, Excl.T. 9**) = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1:489 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **66**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date: PHI, Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

**Excl.T. 9** – An unidentified *polis* to the Delphians (?) – 30-25BCE

(on the same monument as **57, 58, Excl.T. 8, 59**) = *Fouilles de Delphes* III 1:495 = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **68**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. Date: Ceccarelli. Inscribed at Delphi.

**Excl.T. 10** – Referred to as: ‘Letter of an unidentified polis or

king/emperor/consul to Sparta, very fragmentary, **Sparta, date?**’ (Ceccarelli, p.378)

= *ORRLIG* **Excl.T. 19** = *SEG* 47, 355, cf. *IG v i, 10* = Ceccarelli *AGLW* ‘App.3’ **69**

Reason for exclusion: too fragmentary. It is also debated as to whether it is Greek or Roman, and therefore has been **excluded from both *IOLHPK* and *ORRLIG* corpora**. Inscribed at Sparta. “*IG V.1.10*. G.Shipley, in W.Cavanagh et al., edd., *op.cit.* (*SEG* 47 354) 215/216 no. 4 (ph.), presents the following new text after study of the stone. He favors as the author either **Augustus or another emperor**, or else his correspondent.” – *SEG* Online (my emphasis).

