

NICHOLAS P. MILNER

A Hellenistic Treaty from Boubon

An article by H. Ali EKINCI, Director of Burdur Museum (EKINCI 1994: 333–343, at 343, pl. 7, 339, fig. 3), published a photograph and drawing of a fragmentary limestone block inscribed with what was deemed to be a Roman funerary text of imperial date. The block was found in the ruins of a presumably Roman public building, incorporating Doric spolia, about 40 m. south of the theatre at Boubon. It is now in the museum collection.

The editors of *L'Année Épigraphique* (AE 1995: 1536) judged, on the contrary, that it was a treaty text from the end of the second century BC. They pointed out the mention of three cities (line 9), and of Boubon's neighbour, Oinoanda (line 2), and suggested that it was a fragment of the foundation-treaty of the tetrapolis headed by Kibyra, which Strabo (13.4.17, 631) reports, probably after Artemidorus of Ephesus, whose floruit is c. 100 BC (LARSEN 1945: 76, 80). The parties' agreement to respect Roman dogmata (line 8) evoked parallels with the convention between Aphrodisias/Plarasa, Kibyra, and Tabai (REYNOLDS 1982: 6 no. 1, IK 60 Kibyra I.2), tentatively dated by REYNOLDS to c. 120 BC.

The object of this paper is to present full readings obtained from photographs and a squeeze kindly supplied by Thomas CORSTEN, to propose supplements, and to discuss briefly the date and significance of the find.

DESCRIPTION

A roughly oval block of limestone, broken all round, back not described; the front face having traces of 10 lines of text. Height c. 12 cm., width c. 24 cm. Letter height tapering, lines 2–7 c. 1.0 cm. (omicron 0.8 cm.); line 8 c. 0.9 cm. (omicron 0.7 cm.); lines 9–10 c. 0.8 cm. (omicron 0.6 cm.). Letters unevenly spaced horizontally, slightly apicated, alpha with broken crossbar (but some rounded or straight), omega arcuated with horizontal out-turned feet, pi with right vertical hasta slightly shorter than the left, sigma four-barred with top and bottom hastae horizontal, epsilon rectangular. Interlinear spacing c. 0.2 cm., traces of guidelines marking the interlinear spaces. Taf. 21, Abb. 52, 53.

Text

“-----

[- - - - -]Σ[. .]Ο[- - - - -]

[- - - - - πρὸς Οἰνοά[νδοις - - - - -]

[- - - c.8 - - εὐσε]βοῦντες τοῖς κ[αιροῖς βοιηθήσομεν, ἀγω]-

4 [νιζόμενοι καὶ] λόγῳ καὶ ἔργοις καὶ ὄπλ[οις, σπουδῆς καὶ]

[φιλοτιμίας μ]ηθὲν ἐλλίποντες κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἡμῶν]

[αὐτῶν, διατηρο]ῦντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους το[ὺς κοι]-

[νοὺς σωτήρας] καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοίαν τε καὶ συμμα[χίαν],

8 [μηθὲν ὑπεναντ]ίον πράσσοντες τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμ[ασιν].”

[ὁμοῦνται δ' αἱ διαλ]λασ[σό]μεναι τρεῖς πόλεις δι' ἐντόμ[ων]

[νεοκαύτων - - c.7 - - τοὺς ὄρκο]υς τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον]

[τρόπον κ.τ.λ.]

TRANSLATION AND PARTIAL RECONSTRUCTION

“[We swear... by Zeus (? for example) ... that if we perceive that anyone plots against/attacks... the Boubonians, the Balbourans, or the Termessians at] Oinoanda, [or their territories(?), then...] as god-fearing men we will to come to [their] aid in [the time of peril, striving] by word, and deeds, and with arms, abating none of our zeal and spirit, to the best of our ability, preserving the treaty of goodwill and alliance with the Romans, the Common Saviours and Benefactors, doing nothing contrary to their decrees.” [The] three cities being reconciled [will also swear the oaths] over [new-burnt...] victims, in the [manner] written below...

MORPHOLOGY

λόγῳ (line 4), with no iota adscript; cf. GIGNAC 1976: 183. The loss of iota adscript in -ωι was usually shown in spelling in the first and second centuries AD, but was already frequent in Attic inscriptions, for example, from 200–100 BC onwards. There is extensive evidence for the elimination of the ω-diphthong in second century BC Ptolemaic papyri.

ἐλλίποντες (line 5); cf. GIGNAC 1976: 189, 191 n.2, 325, n.2, on the interchange ει/ι in demotic spellings to represent the phoneme /i/ (long or short) in Asiatic koine from the third/second century BC onwards.

συνμα[χίαν] (line 7), with nu dissimilated from mu, was an etymological spelling, which did not correspond to the contemporary pronunciation. It is very common for example in Egyptian papyri from the second century BC, becoming the norm, even, in the Roman period; cf. GIGNAC 1976: 166, 168 n.1, 170.

πράσοντες (line 8), with simplification of the double sibilant; cf. GIGNAC 1976: 154, 158–9. With the adoption of a stress-accent, koine ceased to distinguish double sibilants from single in pronunciation, leading to variation in spelling, though the original was never ousted as the correct form.

COMMENTARY

Line 1: Only traces of two letters are preserved from this line.

Line 2: The political name of Boubon's neighbour, Oinoanda, was οἱ Τερμησσεῖς οἱ πρὸς Οἰνοάνδοις (see COULTON 1982). There follow several phrases proclaiming the commitment and zeal of the speakers. In lines 3–5, these are more colourfully phrased than is normally found in the stipulation clauses of a treaty, which are written in drier, legal language, but the more colourful language occurs naturally in the oaths sworn to treaties (see below), or in honorific decrees praising the honorand, which latter is not the point here. The phrase κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἡμῶν αὐτῶν], however, is found both in oaths and stipulation clauses.

Boubon's neighbour, Kibyra, will be the only city capable of giving the oath in lines 1–8. For, so far as we know, only Kibyra had a treaty with Rome and only the Kibyrates could swear to preserve it. The fragmentary text, then, implicitly refers to this city. Because “the cities being reconciled”, according to line 9, were three in number, and as line 9 appears to introduce a new sentence, there were perhaps three cities in addition to Kibyra. It makes sense that Oinoanda and Balboura should have made a threesome with Boubon, being reconciled or bonded to Kibyra in the treaty. In the tetrapolis, Strabo tells us, Kibyra was the dominant party, with two votes, as compared to one each for the other three cities. Therefore, the reference to Oinoanda in line 2 is likely to have accompanied Balboura and Boubon, as beneficiaries of the military and political obligations being sworn to in lines 1–8.

Of course, if another city such as Boubon or Oinoanda also had a treaty with the Romans, other possibilities arise for the threesome, with only these two named cities being fixed parties.

The oath, if that is what it is, will have included an invocation to the gods, probably others as well as Zeus, likely to have been named at the start of the oath. Compare the oath of Plarasa/Aphrodisias, Kibyra and Tabai, second century BC (IK 60 Kibyra I.2), which appears to have been sworn Διὶ Φιλίῳ καὶ Ὁμονοίᾳ κα[ὶ] θεᾷ Ῥώμῃ, or the oath of Smyrna to Magnesia on Sipylos, post 243 BC (SCHMITT 1969: 167 line 70), ὀμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἄρη, Ἀθηνᾶν Ἀρείαν καὶ τὴν Ταυροπόλον καὶ τὴν Μητέρα τὴν Σιπυληνὴν καὶ Ἀφροδίτην Στρατονικίδα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς πάντα καὶ πάσας.

Lines 3–8: The hypothesis that the treaty text contains an oath in oratio recta chimes with the syntax, where there is a series of nominative plural present participles, the negatives are μή, μηθέν, etc., as in a sentence governed by a verb of swearing, and the participial phrases are superlative expressions of personal endeavour, rather than limitations or conditions, so that the translations of the negative, “unless ..., if not ...” are inappropriate to the context. The nominative phrases cannot depend on an imperatival infinitive, such as is common in decrees, since in that case the subject is accusative. They may be the subject of a third person imperative verb, as is common in the stipulation clauses of a treaty, but the highly coloured language is less likely in such a context. The missing main verb, then, will most probably be future indicative, and the appropriate expression is suggested by one of the oaths from the treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos (line 68): βοιηθήσω ἀγωνιζόμενος μετὰ πάσης φιλοτιμίας. Indeed, since our treaty is concerned with military assistance, the earlier lines may have run similarly to *ibid.* line 67: καὶ ἐάν τινα αισθάνωμαι ἐπιβουλεύοντα τῆι πόλει ἢ τοῖς χωρίοις τοῖς τῆς πόλεως..., with the substitution of the names of the three cities aforementioned.

[εὐσε]βοῦντες. The bottom loop of beta is visible on the squeeze, and looks too tight for theta or omicron. The theta in line 5 below, at least, is set higher in the line as well. Should the supplement be right, the meaning will have reference to the piety (to the gods) of the oath-takers, “discharging our duty reverently, god-fearing.” An object does not seem to be necessary, though such expressions as τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς are possible. [εὐσε]βοῦντες does not appear to be paralleled in a treaty or oath, but reference to abiding by the oaths and not abandoning one’s allies does occur naturally in such contexts after the statement of the conditions for immediate military assistance stipulated by the treaty, and may be relevant to this interpretation. Otherwise one might attempt to restore [βοιη]θοῦντες and seek another main verb, but this stumbles against the difficulty that this is precisely the main verb in other treaty texts, and does not appear as a participle.

τοῖς κ[αιροῖς βοιηθήσομεν]. Of the kappa, the vertical hasta is clear on the squeeze, but there is only the faintest suggestion of a lower diagonal hasta joining it. Cf. Syll.³ 495.37 (Olbia, third century BC): βοιηθῆσαι τοῖς καιροῖς.

Line 4. [καὶ] λόγῳ καὶ ἔργοις καὶ ὄπλ[οις]. The phrase is a variant of the common pair, καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ. The variant may be influenced by phrases used in treaties with Rome, for example Syll.³ 693.8 (Methymna, c. 129 BC): μήτε ὄπλοις μήτε χρήμασιν μήτε ναυσὶν βοιηθείτωσαν, SEG 35 (1985) 823.26–28 (Maroneia, c. 167 BC): μήτε αὐτοὺς σίτωι μήτε ὄπλοις μήτε ναυσὶν μήτε χρήμασιν χορηγείτωσαν, and the new text published by SCHULER in the present volume.

Lines 4–6. [σπουδῆς καὶ | φιλοτιμίας μ]ηθὲν ἐλλίποντες κατὰ δύνα[μιν τὴν ἡμῶν | αὐτῶν]. Compare the oath to the treaty of Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos (lines 68–69: βοιηθήσω ἀγωνιζόμενος μετὰ πάσης φιλοτιμίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ; the letter of Eumenes II to the Ionians, Smyrna 167 BC (OGIS 763.44): οὐδέποτ’ ἐλλείποντες κατὰ γε τὴν ἐμὴν δύναμιν; and several examples of σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐλλείποντες/ων, e.g., Syll.³ 614.25 (Delphi 180 BC), 748.5 (Gytheum 71 BC), 569.13 (Kos c. 204 BC), 1107.15 (Kos c. 200 BC), DEROW 1991: 261–2 (A) 39–40 (Pharos c. 218 BC), SCHMITT 1969: III 321 no. 552.25–26 (Olus, Crete, c. 200 BC), or φιλοτιμίας καὶ σπουδῆς οὐθὲν ἐλλε[ί]πτων, Syll.³ 691.15 (Salamis, Attica 130 BC).

Lines 6–7. [διατηρο]ῦντες καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τ[οὺς κοι]νοὺς σωτήρας] καὶ εὐεργέτας εὐνοιάν τε καὶ συμμα[χίαν]. Compare Syll.³ 630 (Delphi 182 BC): διατηροῦντες τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τοὺς κοινούς [εὐεργέτας φιλία]ν, REYNOLDS 1982: 11 no. 2.4 (Aphrodisias 88 BC): πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ὄντας σωτήρας καὶ εὐεργέτας, and IK 28 Iasos 152 (mid-second century BC): [ὑπὸ Ῥωμ]αίων τῶν κοινῶν [εὐ]ε[ρ]γ[ε]τῶν [κ]α[ί] σωτήρων. On this unofficial title of the Romans, bestowed on them by the Greeks in their political discourses with one another, FERRARY 1988: 124–32 observes that it became frequent only after the battle of Pydna, 168 BC, continued until the late first century BC, and expressed the Greek interpretation of their new dependency on Rome in terms of their recognition of Roman hegemony in return for benefits from the universal benefactor, in parallel to Roman state clientela. ERSKINE 1994: 84–87 finds that it alludes also to the Roman policy of “liberation” of the Greeks, first proclaimed at the Isthmian Games by T. Quinctius Flaminius in 196 BC (Polyb. 18.46.15). This suggests that in our inscription, the phraseology is to be taken closely with line 8, and

the benefactions alluded to in the title were of the same kind as the freedom of the Lycians and Carians, and of Kaunos and Stratonikeia decreed by the Senate in 167–66 BC.

εὔνοιαν τε καὶ συνμα[χίαν]. Compare εὔνοιαν τε καὶ φιλίαν, oath to the treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos, line 37, διατηρήσω τὴν τε συμμαχίαν καὶ τὴν εὔνοιαν, *ibid.*, line 62; also [φ]υλασσόντ<ω>ν Τερμησσέων τε καὶ Ἀδα|[δέων τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους] συμμαχίαν καὶ εὔνοιαν, treaty between Termessos and Adada, second century BC, TAM III 2, 10–11.

Line 8. [μηθὲν ὑπεναντ]ίον πράσσοντες τοῖς ἐκείνων δόγμ[ασιν]. Compare the treaty between Pharnakes I of Pontos and Chersonnesos of 155 BC (LATYSHEV 1916: 1.402, redated BURSTEIN 1980: 1–12, cf. now HEINEN 2005: 31–54): τὴν τε πρὸς Ῥωμαίους φιλίαν διαφυλασσόντων καὶ μηδὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῖς πρασσόντων, the oath of Plarasa/Aphrodisias, Kibyra, and Tabai (IK 60 Kibyra I.2): [ὕ]πὲρ τοῦ μηθὲν ὑ<π>εναντίον | [π]ράξειν μήτε Ῥωμαίοις μή[τε] | αὐτοῖς, and a decree of the Amphictyons at Delphi (Syll.³ 692.61, ante 130 BC), which ends: εἶναι δὲ ταῦτα τοῖς ἐν Ἀθήναις τεχνίταις, ἐὰμ μή τι Ῥωμαίοις ὑπεναντίον ἦι. After the defeat of Macedon in 168 BC, many Greek foreign policy documents were drafted so as to fit in with whatever the Romans wanted. It remains debatable to what extent the policies were actually instigated by the Romans. δόγμ[ασιν] is the standard translation of *senatus consulta*, and occurs, for instance, in REYNOLDS 1982: doc. 8.1 referring to senatorial decrees of 39 BC; see also DREYER, ENGELMANN 2003: 23 and n. 25 with further references.

Line 9. [ὁμοῦνται δ' αἱ διαλ]λασ[σό]μεναι τρεῖς πόλεις. The subject changes at the start of the line to the “three cities” which, since Greeks did not naturally speak of “we cities”, but “we citizens”, appear to be third person plural. Therefore, the passage in *oratio recta* will have ended, and the subject of the next sentence, at least, is in the third person. The treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos provides parallels: in the dossier of the decrees and oaths together forming the treaty, lines 40–41 introduce an oath with the future indicative (ὁμοῦνται) and subject in the nominative, which provides a neat solution to the lacuna at the start of our line 8: [ὁμ]οῦνται δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐμ Μαγνησίαι Συμυρναίοις καὶ Συμυρναίοι τοῖς ἐμ Μαγνησίαι ἑκατέρω αὐτῶν τὸν ὄρκον τὸν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ ὑπογ[ε]γραμμένον. The three cities, then, were to swear the oath written below, lost from our fragment. The oath will have complemented and echoed that sworn by the Kibyrates, but will not have referred specifically to keeping the treaty with the Romans.

[αἱ διαλ]λασ[σό]μεναι τρεῖς πόλεις. There are traces of the upper parts of two triangular letters and what may be the top corner and upper middle hasta of sigma immediately before the second lacuna, which has space for two letters, and the damaged letter immediately after the second lacuna looks mu- or nu-shaped. The supplement is hard to avoid and suggests a conflict between the cities, or between them and Kibyra, which was ended by the treaty. Conflict between neighbouring cities was endemic in the ancient world, and often leagues were formed by the dominant city or group of cities to avoid or at least regulate such conflicts in the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

Lines 9–10. δι' ἐντόμ[ων | νεοκαύτων]. ἔντομα is a very rarely attested (Herodotean) word for victims, σφάγια, see CASABONA 1966: 227–29; the verb ἐντέμνω, however, was commonplace, and it seems possible that the banal-looking word ἔντομα is rare by accident of our sources. At any rate, the reading ἐντόμ[-] is certain, and a synonym of τόμια, σφάγια makes sense here. As CASABONA has pointed out, LSJ⁹ incorrectly distinguish ἔντομα as being special to sacrifice for the dead.

For the suggested supplement νεοκαύτων, compare the treaty between Smyrna and Magnesia on Sipylos, lines 48–49: ὀρκισάτωσαν [αὐ]τοὺς οἱ ἐξετασται ἐπὶ τοῦ μητρῴου ἱεροῖς νεοκαύτοι[ς], and the oath of Plarasa/Aphrodisias, Kibyra and Tabai (IK 60 Kibyra I.2.5–7): ποιησάμενοι καὶ ὄρκι[α] | καθ' ἱερῶν νεοκαύτων καὶ σφ[άγια]. For διὰ with instrumental genitive in reference to sacrifice, compare Plut. Num. 8: θυσίαι δι' ἀλφίτου καὶ σπονδῆς πεποημένα. Compare generally ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυγῆς σφασθῆντος ἱερείου ὠμόσαμεν καθ' ἱερῶν (Syll.³ 685.26–27, arbitration between Itanos and Hierapytna by Magnesian judges, 139 BC).

[τοὺς ὄρκο]υς. The surface of the stone is more damaged along the lower edge. The photograph suggests that the surface is destroyed before τὸν, but the squeeze suggests there the upper hastae of upsilon and then a hole bounded by the lines of a four-bar sigma. The expected reading [τὸν ὄρκον] τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον] may possibly be correct. Following the squeeze, however, one will explain [τοὺς ὄρκο]υς as plural because each of

the three cities will swear the (same) oath, different from the one above, which was specific to Kibyra as it referred to Kibyra's treaty with the Romans, but no doubt otherwise setting out similar obligations.

τὸν ὑπογεγ[ραμμένον | τρόπον] κ.τ.λ. An adverbial accusative, equivalent to τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, is conceivable, though not readily paralleled.

DATE AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

At least three of the four members of the Tetrapolis are embraced by the fragment: Boubon (the findspot), Oinoanda (line 2), and Kibyra (the only member known to have a treaty with the Romans). The fragment refers to “three cities” apparently after the oath sworn by the Kibyrates, so that one may infer that one of these three was the fourth member of the Tetrapolis, Balboura.

The letter-forms would support a date in the second or first centuries BC (see, generally, LARFELD 1902: 472–83). The morphology would support a date more easily in the first century BC. If, however, our inscription is the foundation-treaty of the Kibyritic tetrapolis, which was dissolved about 84 BC (Strabo 13.4.17, 631), and it was inscribed at the foundation, a date in the second century is likely, since there is reason to believe that the tetrapolis did not predate the independence of the Lycians from Rhodian control in 167 BC, and Strabo implies that it existed for a long time.

As suggested above, in the absence of any known treaty between Boubon and Rome, the reference in the text to the “goodwill and alliance” with the Romans will most likely be to that between Boubon's near neighbour, Kibyra, and Rome, of which the lower half survived to be recorded in an inscription found at Kibyra (IK 60 Kibyra I.1, OGIS 762); a notable feature is that it was to be set up on the base of the gilded statue of the goddess Roma, which they had (just) voted. This is dated to the second century BC, though precisely when is unclear.

It was doubtless as a supporter of the Seleucids, that Kibyra was made to pay the Romans a huge war indemnity, 100 talents and 10,000 medimnoi of wheat, in the aftermath of the battle of Magnesia, which occurred at the end of 190 BC – a disaster for Antiochus the Great and his Asiatic allies. After extremely frosty dealings between Cn. Manlius Vulso, proconsul, at the head of a Roman army, and the tyrant of Kibyra, Moagetes, in 188 BC, as reported by Polybius (21.34) and by Livy (38.14), Kibyra was admitted into the *φιλία* – “friendship” – of Rome, not a treaty-relationship, but a form of clientela (BADIAN 1958: 4–7). It was presumably then handed over to the Attalids, along with the rest of Asia “on this side of the Taurus,” except Caria and Lycia (on the dispositions of territory, see MAGIE 1950: 958 n.75).

In the present state of the evidence, the extent of Attalid control of the region between Phrygia and Pamphylia is hard to gauge, but Kibyra's neighbour, Oinoanda, had architectural affinities with the Pergamene kingdom (MILNER 1998: 116). Oinoanda's considerable issue of silver didrachms, dated to the 180's BC, may have been designed to facilitate exchange with new cistophoric Attalid tetradrachms in the context of a wall-building programme (ASHTON 2005: 73–74). Kibyra's more distant eastern neighbour, Olbasa, at least, was in the kingdom of Attalos II in 159 BC (KEARSLEY 1994: 47).

During the Rhodian mandate over Lycia and Caria, from the treaty of Apameia in 188 BC to the end of the mandate by senatorial decree in 167, the Kibyrates appear to have become close to Rhodes, for Polybius tells us that the tyrant of Kibyra, Pankrates', sons were brought up in Polyaratos' house on Rhodes (Polyb. 30.9.14ff.). It seems therefore possible that, during this time, Kibyra became aligned more closely with Rhodes, than with Pergamon, and perhaps subject to Rhodes, if for example one envisages the sons as diplomatic hostages like Demetrius, second son of Philip V of Macedon, who was sent to Rome for this purpose at the age of 10 or 11 with some of his friends in 197 BC (Polyb. 18.39.5, 21.11.9). This relationship would have been severed in 167 BC, when Rhodes became *persona non grata* with Rome. Kibyra will not, it seems, have had an independent foreign policy, much less a treaty with Rome, before 167 BC, but what is clear is that it immediately began exerting its autonomy and projecting military power then. Accordingly, DEROW (1991: 270 n.27) dates the Rome-Kibyra treaty to this juncture.

The Kibyrates' co-operativeness in handing over the Rhodian renegade Polyaratos, who had fled to them for refuge from the Romans (Polyb. 30.9.12–19) may have earned them some credit. Rome's convergence

with Kibyra is suggested in the latter's battle with the Rhodians over the liberty of Kaunos, as becomes clear when the Senate declared Kaunos free in 166 BC, along with Stratonikeia (Polyb. 30.5.11–16, 30.21.3).

If, as seems likely, 166 BC was an opportunity for a new relationship with Rome, it was also an opportunity for the creation of a new political league with neighbouring cities, as part of a general expansion of influence taking advantage of the contraction of Rhodian power, following the switch in Roman support. It was with Roman goodwill that it could intervene in Kaunos against the Rhodians, and it was most likely only in this context that it could extend its territory in the words of Strabo "from Pisidia and the Milyas district as far as Lycia and the Rhodian Peraea", which expression must include the territories of the Tetrapolis cities. Strabo's emphasis on Kibyra's εὐνομία may reflect Roman approval of its expansive political and military arrangements.

Unless future δόγματα of the Senate are meant, the Roman decrees the new text refers to, against which nothing contrary was to be done, will on this dating be that freeing the Lycians and Carians south of the river Maeander from Rhodian control in 167, and that declaring Kaunos and Stratonikeia free from Rhodes in 166 (Polyb. 30.21.3, 30.9.14 ff.) in particular.

The movement will, then, describe a political expansion within constraints set by Rome. Kibyra could with Roman acquiescence form a federation with its neighbours, Boubon, Balboura and Oinoanda. How, if at all, this affected Oinoanda's ability to strike a treaty with the Lycian city of Tlos about the same time, remains to be seen when the treaty is published in full (see LE ROY 1996: 980). Certainly, it does not seem to have limited Oinoanda's ability to form a clientela-relationship with the Roman governor of Asia, Q. Mucius Scaevola, in or about 98 BC (EILERS, MILNER 1995: 87; the date of Scaevola's governorship now appears to be the early 90's, that is, a praetorian one, before his consulship in 95, see GORDON 2003: 225 n. 66).

While other dates for the formation of the Tetrapolis may well have been possible between 167 and 84 BC, the start of this period offers senatorial decrees suitable for the references in the new inscription, and reasons for a strongly pro-Roman policy in Kibyra. The confidence they felt may have been multi-lateral. The alliance with their western neighbours, Tabai and Plarasa/Aphrodisias, of which Tabai was certainly freed from Rhodian control by Rome's volte-face, may also date to this period (ERRINGTON 1987: 97–118). That relationship too seems to trade on Roman approval and Roman popularity, having the cult of the goddess Roma on prominent display. Rome may well have been interested in the military potential of these alliances. The size of the Tetrapolis' forces was noted by Strabo as 30,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry (Strabo 13.4.17, 631). But evidence of direct Roman involvement remains elusive.

WILHELM 1912: 6 suggested that the Tetrapolis was only founded after the end of Attalid power in 133 BC. Certainly, the Pergamenes were active in the area to the east, as has recently been demonstrated by a new inscription from Olbasa, mentioned above. Yet the absence of Pergamon from the history of the Tetrapolis may not be significant. Any need for Kibyra to defer to the Attalids may have been superseded first by the relationship with Rhodes, and then the Roman treaty, if it is datable in the context of the Roman guarantees of freedom for states formerly subject to Rhodes in 167–166.

It is true, too, that possible decrees of the Senate might have been invoked by our treaty in connexion with the foundation of the province of Asia, and the Romans might have been involved in the settlement of wars between members of the Tetrapolis and the Lycian League listed by the second century BC Araxa decree in honour of their statesman, Orthagoras (SEG 18.570). The Araxa decree also makes no reference to the Attalids, while it does refer to embassies to and from the Romans, and by implication refers to the Tetrapolis in lines 11–13: ἀποσταλείς | τε πρεσβευτῆς δις κατὰ Μοαγέτου καὶ Βουβωνέω[v] | πρὸς Κιβυράτα[ς ὕ]πὲρ τῶν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον. The Araxians complained to the Kibyrates about Boubon, in virtue of some ostensible authority over them. The same thing then occurred when the Lycian League complained to the Kibyrates about Moagetes (lines 19–21).

These events, which resulted in accusations against the Kibyrates before the Lycian League, war between Lycian-supported Araxa and Kibyra, short-lived revolutions by tyrants in Tlos and Xanthos (presumably pro-Kibyrate), and war between the "Termessians", presumably Oinoanda (so LARSEN 1956: 162) (supported by the Tetrapolis?), and the Lycian League, are all undated, and they might extend after 133. ERRINGTON 1987: 114–118 dates them between the 160's and the 120's, whereas ZIMMERMANN 1993: 147–48 has argued that they are between 189 and 167 BC. ROUSSET 2006: 115–116 concluded that these events straddle 167 BC.

The tale of dynastic feuding between members of the family of the tyrant of Boubon, Molkestes/Molketes/Mokeltes (the MSS readings vary, and may or may not be a corruption of Moagetes), recorded by Diodorus Siculus 33.5a and dated between 155 and 139 BC (Errington 1987: 116), does not help to date the Tetrapolis, which is not mentioned.

In the end, it is not possible to date the foundation of the Tetrapolis certainly, but our treaty fragment is consistent with what we know of the Tetrapolis, embraces at least three members of it, and may well be its foundation-document. If so, it appears to fit the same historical context as Kibyra's treaty with Rome, and its treaty with Plarasa/Aphrodisias and Tabai, and all three appear to depend on very friendly relations with Rome, which may not have continued through the wars with Araxa, and the Lycians. In the first century BC, at any rate, Rome intervened on the side of the Lycians in their endemic territorial struggle with their northern neighbours (MITCHELL 2005: 229–230). The weight of the evidence, wobbly as it is, can be said to support a date in the period 167–166 or shortly after, on a balance of probabilities, but does not prove it beyond reasonable doubt.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the kind permission of Hacı Ali EKINCI, Director, Burdur Museum, and the generous assistance of Thomas CORSTEN, who sent me photographs and a squeeze he had taken in Burdur. Earlier versions of the material in this article were delivered to the British Epigraphy Society in November 2000 and to Joyce REYNOLDS's Epigraphical Saturday in January 2005. I am grateful for suggestions made at these meetings, especially to Michael CRAWFORD, and also to Jim COULTON, Stephen MITCHELL, and Christof SCHULER, who commented on earlier drafts of this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ASHTON, R. H. J., 2005
 BADIAN, E., 1958
 BURSTEIN, S. M., 1980
 CASABONA, J., 1966
 COULTON, J. J., 1982
 DEROW, P., 1991
 DREYER, B., ENGELMANN, H., 2003
 EILERS, C., MILNER, N. P., 1995
 EKINCI, H. A., 1994
 ERRINGTON, R. M., 1987
 ERSKINE, A., 1994
 FERRARY, J.-L., 1988
 GIGNAC, F. T., 1976
 GORDON, R., 2003
 HEINEN, H., 2005
 KEARSLEY, R. A., 1994
 LARFELD, W., 1902
 LARSEN, J. A. O., 1945
 LARSEN, J. A. O., 1956
 LATYSHEV, B., 1916
 LE ROY, C., 1996
 MAGIE, D., 1950
- “The coinage of Oinoanda”, *The Numismatic Chronicle* 165: 65–84
Foreign Clientelae (264–70 BC) (Oxford)
 “The Aftermath of the Peace of Apamea”, *American Journal of Ancient History* 5: 1–12
Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec (Aix-en-Provence)
 “Termessians at Oenoanda”, *Anatolian Studies* 32: 115–31
 “Pharos and Rome”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 88: 261–70
Metropolis I (IK 63, Bonn)
 “Q. Mucius Scaevola and Oenoanda: a new inscription”, *Anatolian Studies* 45: 73–89
 “Boubon Kurtama Kazısı 1993”, *Müze Kurtama Kazıları Seminesi* 5: 333–43
 “Θεὰ Ῥώμη und römischer Einfluß südlich des Mäanders im 2. Jh. v. Chr.”, *Chiron* 17: 97–118
 “The Romans as Common Benefactors”, *Historia* 43: 70–87
Philhellénism et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate (BEFAR 271, Rome)
A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods I. Phonology (Milan)
 in collaboration with Joyce REYNOLDS, “Roman Inscriptions 1995–2000”, *Journal of Roman Studies* 93: 212–94
 “Die Anfänge der Beziehungen Roms zum nördlichen Schwarzmeerraum. Die Romfreundschaft der Chersonesiten (IOSPE I² 402)”, in Coşkun, A. (ed.), *Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat (Göttingen)*
 “The Milyas and the Attalids: a Decree of the city of Olbasa and a new Royal Letter of the second century BC”, *Anatolian Studies* 44: 47–57
Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik II (Leipzig)
 “Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism”, *Classical Philology* 45: 65–97
 “The Araxa Inscription and the Lycian Confederacy”, *Classical Philology* 51: 151–69
Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et Latinae I (2nd edition, Petrograd)
 “Une convention entre cités en Lycie du nord”, *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Comptes rendus* 1996, 961–80.
Roman Rule in Asia Minor (Princeton)

- MILNER, N. P., 1998 "A Hellenistic statue base in the Upper Agora at Oinoanda", *Anatolian Studies* 48: 113–16
- MITCHELL, S., 2005 "The treaty between Rome and Lycia of 46 BC (MS 2070)", in Pintaudi, R. (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Schøyen* (Papyrologica Florentina 25, Florence)
- REYNOLDS, J., 1982 *Aphrodisias and Rome* (Journal of Roman Studies Monograph 1, London)
- ROUSSET, D., 2006 "Épigraphie grecque et géographie historique du monde hellénique", *École Pratique des Hautes Études, Livret-Annuaire* 20 (2004–05 [2006]): 114–18
- SCHMITT, H. H., 1969 *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums III. Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.* (Munich)
- WILHELM, A., 1912 *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde II* (Vienna)
- ZIMMERMANN, M., 1993 "Kyaneai und seine Nachbarn. Zur Geschichte der zentrallykischen Poleis unter rhodischer Herrschaft", in BORCHHARDT, J., DOBESCH, G. (ed.), *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums I* (Öst. Ak. d. Wiss. Denkschr. Ph.-h. Kl. Bd. 231, Vienna): 143–48.