

Citizenship in the Cities of Hellenistic Asia Minor

An Honors Thesis for the Department of History

Benjamin S. Auerbach

Advisor: Prof. David Proctor

Readers: Prof. Steven Hirsch; Prof. Bruce Hitchner

Tufts University, 2021.

Acknowledgements:

Prof. Proctor: I really appreciate your engagement with this project, even if it is not on a topic familiar to you. You have always provided guidance and encouragement throughout this entire process but simultaneously allowed me to develop this project independently and organically. I will always admire your dedication to your students.

Prof. Hitchner and Prof. Hirsch: You have both taught me how to engage ancient history—the sources, the mindset, the wonder of it all. Prof. Hitchner, thank you for setting me on the path towards defining this progress when we first met two Novembers ago. You've always provided exciting feedback and a clarifying perspective. Prof. Hirsch, you have taught me to study ancient history in an amazing range of thematic frameworks—oligarchy, interaction of peoples, and institutions. You also always have a good question to ask me.

Thank you all for sparking my interest in ancient history and helping me to study something that I love.

Contents

Citizenship in the Cities of Hellenistic Asia Minor.....	0
Introduction	3
Citizenship and the World of the Hellenistic <i>Polis</i>	14
Miletos, Smyrna, and Teos: <i>Sympoliteia</i>	28
<i>Isopoliteia</i> : Miletos and Potential Citizenship	53
Ilion- Royal Officials and Land Ownership	84
Conclusion	109
Bibliography:.....	113
Appendix	118

Introduction

Now the word *politeia* (citizenship) is defined also as "having a share of the rights in a State," as we say the Megarians voted Alexander the *politeia*; and when he made fun of their eagerness, they told him that up to that time they had conferred citizenship upon Heracles only and now upon himself. Then Alexander was astonished and accepted the gift, thinking that its rarity gave it value. (Plutarch, *On Monarchy, Democracy, and Oligarchy* 826)

Alexander the Great inaugurated the Hellenistic Period, but he did not remain close to Megara on the Greek mainland for long. The Hellenistic World was volatile and hosted a wide variety of states. The Hellenistic Kingdoms revered the Greeks and their way of governing themselves, but still ruled as glorified warlords. In this environment, the institutions of the *poleis* of Asia Minor were under pressure to build military, economic, and diplomatic guarantees of security and to placate the newly influential class of states and individuals of the period. The *poleis* remained citizen-states. Citizenship in the Hellenistic Period was malleable and reflected geopolitical realities. But as before, the institution of citizenship remained a potent marker of self-identity and civic pride that, whenever possible, was regulated within the bounds of tradition and civic ideology.

Methodology:

This investigation synthesizes scholarship on Greek citizenship with epigraphical evidence from the Hellenistic period in select Greek *poleis* of western Asia Minor in an effort to explore the uses, perceptions, and bounds of citizenship in that environment. The result is a snapshot of the institution of

citizenship in these cities, but it applies more broadly to the region. As background for the cases presented, a first chapter surveys the literature on Greek citizenship as it developed from the Archaic and Classical period, and a theoretical and historical context for understanding Greek citizenship. This section will also provide an idea of what notions of citizenship were rooted in, what it meant to be a citizen, and how individuals without citizenship status fit into the state, drawing on modern scholarship.

The case studies for this investigation consist of three thematically arranged sections concerning citizenship in the Hellenistic *poleis* of Asia Minor from the early third to the early second century BCE. That approximate century corresponds to the influence of the Seleukid Empire over much of Asia Minor. Unless otherwise stated, all dates are BCE. The first two sections will handle collective grants of citizenship. One will explore the institution of *isopoliteia*, or potential citizenship, and the other will explore *sympoliteia*, or a shared or merged citizenship. The last section will transition to individual grants of citizenship and the connection between citizenship and royal officials. Common themes that united these three sections are the importance of kinship, Greekness, and collective outlook to justifying adaptations of citizenship. Also common to the use of citizenship is a willingness to blur civic distinctions and privileges for geopolitical reasons, while maintaining self-identity and the fundamental value of citizenship in the *polis*.

Thousands of inscriptions documenting civic decrees, personal honors, and diplomatic correspondence have survived from Hellenistic Asia Minor. Many of them have been published, and a significant subset of this corpus exists in English translation. Abundant evidence is also available from the Greek mainland and Crete, but that evidence lies outside the scope of this investigation. In the interest of consistency and simplicity, this investigation keeps its evidence bound to the regions of Karia in the Southwest, Ionia on the Western Aegean Coast, and the Troad in the Northwest. In Ionia, the paper presents evidence from Smyrna, Teos, and Miletos. In Karia, it focuses Amyzon, but Mylasa, Olymos, and Pidasas arise as they relate to other cities. In the Troad, the included case is from Ilion, the city on the site of Homeric Troy. Each *polis* is introduced with a concise historical background, after which inscriptions relating to citizenship with analysis of their meaning and usage are provided.

The first chapter introduces Hellenistic Asia Minor and provides a framework for discussing citizenship in the Hellenistic Period. It presents the ideology of citizenship and connected themes. It lastly defines the key institutions of *sympoliteia* and *isopoliteia*. Three thematically-separated chapters follow. The first of these, and the second chapter, discusses the institution of *sympoliteia*, the merging of citizenship between multiple city-states. It finds that *sympoliteia* was a delicate process that set local independence and self-identity against regional and imperial geopolitical concerns. The third chapter discusses the institution of *isopoliteia*, the right of potential citizenship. It suggests that *isopoliteia* found its

mostly diplomatic value in the pride that the granting city-state held in its citizenship. The fourth chapter discusses individual grants of citizenship and the connection between citizenship and landownership. This chapter has a particular emphasis on these themes as they relate to officials of the Hellenistic Kingdoms. First: a survey of the literature concerning the Hellenistic World and its notion of citizenship.

A Literature Review

Scholars since Aristotle have studied the issue of the Greek *polis* and its component institutions and historians have studied the history of the Greek world since the beginning of the Classical Age. The Hellenistic Period, situated after the golden age of the Classical city-state, has traditionally been painted as an era of autocratic warlords and degrading institutions ended by the grand unification of the Mediterranean by Rome. The traditional view held that the independence of the Greek city state ended either at the Battle of Chaeronea when Philip II forced the cities of Greece into the Macedonian-led Hellenic League or with the conquests of Alexander the Great.¹ No modern scholar would end the city-state at Chaeronea, but nonetheless the *poleis* of the Hellenistic Period are traditionally neglected. The traditional approach to the civic institutions of antiquity centered on the classical *polis*, republican Rome, and the Roman Empire. For an English-speaking scholar of Greek civic culture and institutions, abundant material is

¹ See Harland, 2006 for discussion of this tradition.

available on classical Athens and the Greek East of the Roman Empire with little in between.

One such example is the work of Moses Finley. His argument that the economy of the Greco-Roman world was a function of the status of individuals and a civic ideology is one useful to this investigation. In his monumental work, *The Ancient Economy*, Finley describes a notion of citizenship that developed and solidified from the Archaic period to the Classical age, but he sees its next development with the coming of Rome.² Finley's work is now somewhat outdated, and institutional history of the Hellenistic Age has been reinvigorated since the Mid-Twentieth Century. An abundance of epigraphic material and new methods of constructing history arose since then. Rome and the Classical world are impossible to completely escape in a discussion of Hellenistic Asia-Minor, but focusing on the Hellenistic *polis* is more possible than ever.

It is important to note that this work focuses largely on sources that were written in or translated into English.³ Prominent French and German scholars, though, have made great contributions to the study of Hellenistic institutions. German scholars such as Wilhelm Dittenberger performed much of the early compilation of Greek inscriptions, particularly those of Asia-Minor, in the Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries.⁴ Whether writing in German or Latin, their translations and commentaries of a vast array of inscriptions is unavailable to

² See Muller, 2014 for concise discussion of Finley's idea and others in that tradition; Finley, *The Ancient Economy*, 1973.

³ Read: I don't know German and my French isn't very good.

⁴ See W.Dittenberger, "Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum" (Syll), W.Dittenberger, "Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae" (O.G.I.S), "INSCRIPTIONES GRAECAE."(I.G.) Dittenberger's commentaries are in Latin, as are those in I.G. When referring to inscriptions of this period and region, these three abbreviations are quite common references.

this investigation in their original form. Likewise, much of the epigraphically-based scholarship on the institutions of the Hellenistic *polis* derives from a French tradition, of which only select works are available to this investigation.⁵

Fortunately, many inscriptions have been repackaged and translated into English, as has some of the scholarly work of the more recent French and German epigraphists.⁶ While not complete, the quantity of inscriptions available in English offers a reasonably comprehensive sample of how the cities of Asia Minor treated the institution of citizenship.

G.G. Aperghis' book *The Seleukid Royal Economy* is a vital contribution to an understanding of Seleukid power over subject and allied cities.⁷ It is also especially useful for understanding status in the Hellenistic Period. And John D. Grainger's herculean *Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer* is of great value concerning the people and places of Seleukid Asia Minor.⁸ Hansen and Nielsen's *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* is invaluable for understanding the geography and history of the numerous *poleis* that arise in this investigation. Other notable scholars of Hellenistic history and cities include Rolf Strootman, Andrew Erskine, R. Malcolm Errington, and Richard Billows.⁹ Frank Walbank,

⁵ I engaged with Gauthier's work, since it very directly relates to the cases of Teos and Smyrna. Gauthier, Philippe, 1985 and Gauthier, Philippe *Symbola: les étrangers et la justice dans les cites grecques*, 1972. See Muller, 2014 for scholarship available in English, but others of French and German traditions include Peter Herрман, Francis Prost.

⁶ Muller, 2014, see above.

⁷ Aperghis, *The Seleukid Royal Economy*, 2004.

⁸ Grainger, *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*, 1997.

⁹ Strootman, "Kings and Cities in the Hellenistic Age", 2011; Erskine, *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, 2005; Errington, *A History of the Hellenistic World*, 2008; Billows, "Cities", 2008.

Michael Austin, and Peter Derow fit the same category, and their work interpreting and compiling ancient sources is particularly valuable.¹⁰

Studying the Hellenistic Period through literary sources can be difficult outside of a Roman-centric narrative. In Asia Minor, an abundance of epigraphy fills the gap. Inscriptions document institutions and societal practices particularly well. There are a few significant names in the field of Hellenistic epigraphy.

Relevant to Asia Minor is the work of French scholars Louis and Jeanne Robert (typically abbreviated L. and J.) and Philippe Gauthier.¹¹ Louis Robert coined the idea that “the Greek city did not die at Chaeronea” and his and Jeanne Robert’s work is vital for its compilation and commentary of inscriptions in Asia Minor.¹²

Gauthier’s study *Les Cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs* and several other essays analyze civic institutions in the Hellenistic Polis. His work concerning the institution of *euergetism*, royal officials, the interaction of king and city, and of course, citizenship, is particularly useful to this investigation.¹³ His work from the 1970s and 1980s frames much of the modern discussion on the Hellenistic *polis* and its institutions and interactions. The model of close case studies of epigraphical evidence from Hellenistic *poleis* that Gauthier uses is one this investigation hopes to emulate.

¹⁰ Austin *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, 2006; Walbank, *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World*, 2002; Bagnall and Derow, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, 2004.

¹¹ See Gauthier above, and numerous works by L. and J. Robert, *Documents d'Asie mineure* (1987), *Villes d'Asie Mineure. Études de géographie ancienne*.(1962), “Les honneurs de l'officier Séleucide Larichos à Priène.” In: *Journal des savants*.(1980) to name a few.

¹² Muller, “(De)constructing Polietia”, 2014; Robert, 1969 p. 13.

¹³ Gauthier, 1985. Others: Gauthier, 1972, for example.

John Ma employs a similar model of using inscriptions to study governing systems, albeit focused on the Hellenistic monarchies as well as the Hellenistic *polis*. Specifically, his research on inter-*polis* violence—“Fighting *Poleis* of the Hellenistic World” —and Hellenistic kingship highlights the complex balance of power between larger states and local communities, particularly in Asia Minor.¹⁴ He paints a Hellenistic Western Asia Minor in which ancient rivalries between largely independent *poleis* communities blend with power struggles between the great Hellenistic dynasties. Perhaps most influential is Ma’s comprehensive monograph *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, which closely examines the case of Seleukid activity in Asia Minor during the reign of Antiochus the Great around the turn of the third century.¹⁵ Ma utilizes the abundant Hellenistic epigraphical evidence from Western Asia Minor to investigate not only Seleukid administration of subject *poleis*, but also the actions of the Asian city-states as they navigated a world of vacillating influences and uncertain status. Ma frames grants of status from these *poleis* in the context of cities currying favor from Seleukid royals and their officials.

Sara Saba’s work *Isopoliteia in Hellenistic Times*, is the first work exclusively concerning *isopoliteia* since Gawantika’s book written in the 1970s. It presents the institution as one with a primarily diplomatic purpose of strengthening the relations between cities. Per this view, a usual grant of *isopoliteia* in Asia Minor was a symbolic gesture between cities rather than a potential amendment to the citizenship of a *polis*. It is also invaluable for

¹⁴ Kingship: Ma, 2003.; Ma, "Fighting Poleis of the Hellenistic world", 2000; Ma, "Kings", 2003;

¹⁵ Ma, *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 1999.

understanding the individual cases of *isopoliteia* that this investigation visits. This investigation largely accepts Saba's diplomatic framework for *isopoliteia* but problematizes it at times.

Smaller studies of *polis* institutions also prove useful: Kyle Fingerson's *Persian Katoikoi in Hellenistic Smyrna*, and Sheila Agler's *Keeping the Peace in Ionia: Kings and Poleis*.¹⁶ Henning Börm's *Stasis in Post-Classical Greece*, Christel Muller's *(De)constructing Politeia*, Gary Reger's *Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor*, Andrew Lintott's *Citizenship*.¹⁷ Reger analyzes the practice of *Sympoliteia* in the region as one deeply shaped by the monarchies, while Muller provides an excellent analysis of the variable and blurry meaning of Hellenistic citizenship and Lintott delivers a more theoretical analysis of citizenship in the classical and Hellenistic ages.

The works discussed above reveal an evolving understanding of the utility of citizenship for the Hellenistic *poleis*. It is an understanding that is derived from classical notions of community membership, but it is also frequently connected to the peculiarities of the Hellenistic period. There does not exist a comprehensive study of citizenship in the Hellenistic *polis*, and there is certainly not one specific to Asia Minor. This investigation builds upon the existing literature to provide examples and analysis of how *poleis* under the unique political circumstances of that region and time used the institution of citizenship.

¹⁶ Fingerson, "Persian Katoikoi in Hellenistic Smyrna", 2007; Agler, "Keeping the Peace in Ionia: Kings and Poleis", 1997.

¹⁷ Reger, "Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor", 2004; Muller, 2014; Börm, *The Polis in the Hellenistic World*, 2018; Lintott, "Citizenship", 2009.

Lastly, the weight of Rome often pulls at Hellenistic history. Readers must learn to make observations about the Hellenistic East, even when it is framed by the arrival of the intruders from the West. For the narrative of the Hellenistic Period, especially, Roman-centric sources are invaluable. As the region of Asia-Minor was a frequent neighborhood for Hellenistic kings to assert influence, the cities were often the pawns and sometimes instigators of great-power conflict. Erich Gruen's two-volume work *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* is essential to an understanding of the diplomacy and state-level history from the mid-late third century.¹⁸ Its goal is to evaluate Rome's ascension in the Eastern Mediterranean, but it is set in a Hellenistic world and follows Hellenistic actors. His argument about the rise of Rome hinges partly on the high degree of independent action that Hellenistic kingdoms and cities enjoyed well into the second century.

Arthur Eckstein, following in Gruen's tradition, focuses his study *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean* in the years 230 to 188.¹⁹ Eckstein's argument for Hellenistic state-level anarchy includes a wide coverage of the events, Roman-centric and otherwise, that culminated in Roman unipolarity after 188. Gruen and Eckstein are able to more fully ground their narratives and arguments in the ancient literary sources—primarily Livy and Polybius, whose own histories centered on the rise of Rome. Many other sources available that have Roman-centric framings to

¹⁸ Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, 1984.

¹⁹ Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 2008. See Eckstein, *Mediterranean Anarchy*, 2006 for a broader study of interstate relations in the ancient Mediterranean before the rise of Rome.

varying degrees are useful in their adjacency to Hellenistic themes and often, they provide openings to exploring Hellenistic topics. However, this investigation endeavors to study Hellenistic actors independent of Rome whenever possible. As Gruen and Eckstein argue, until well into the second century, Rome was just one actor among many on the Hellenistic stage.

Citizenship and the World of the Hellenistic *Polis*

The Poleis of Hellenistic Asia Minor

The coastal cities of western Asia Minor have a storied history that rivals the cities of the Greek mainland. The Greeks of the region of Ionia traced their origins into the Greek Dark Age and their cities prospered during the Archaic Period as a wealthy link between the Greek Aegean and wider Near East. During the later Archaic Period, the coastal *poleis* experienced Lydian, then Achaemenid Persian, influence and eventually conquest. Both kingdoms exerted influence in western Asia Minor from the city of Sardis, some miles inland from the Aegean coast. Persian control in coastal Asia Minor was sometimes strong and sometimes nonexistent. The coalition of Greeks that resisted Persia and expelled the Persians from Ionia would eventually become the Athenian-led Delian League. Athens would eventually incorporate most Ionian cities, along with many Karian, Aeolian, and Hellespontine cities (the Troad), into its imperial system of alliance. By the Fourth Century, western Asia Minor was under a firmer Persian control as Delian power waned.

The campaigns of the Macedonian King Alexander III (The Great) inaugurated the Hellenistic Period in Asia Minor. Upon his invasion of Asia, Alexander first campaigned in the northwest of Asia Minor: in the Troad he defeated a Persian army at the Granicus River in the Spring of 334. He later laid siege to the cities of Miletos and Halicarnassus and captured several other Ionian and Karian cities before continuing East. The Macedonian conqueror encountered some resistance from the Asian Greeks who, evidently, had some allegiance to the

Persian Empire. Alexander did not bring Hellenism to the *poleis* of western Asia Minor—again, these *poleis* enjoyed prestige as ancient Greek cities—but he did inaugurate the system of Hellenistic royal states. The Macedonian successors of Alexander replaced the Achaemenid Persian dynasty as the supreme royal authority in the Near East. The Hellenistic kings retained many Persian and Near Eastern traditions, but like Alexander, they held a powerful reverence for the Greeks and their cities, political institutions, and culture. The Persian kings famously asked subject cities to offer ‘earth and water’ as a symbolic token of their total submission to the Great King, who knew no equal.²⁰ Alexander and his successors, instead, viewed themselves as benefactors and protectors of Greek independence and democracy.²¹ They spoke in terms of alliances with the Greek city-states.

Upon Alexander’s death in 323, the *Diadochi* (successors of Alexander) hotly contested coastal Asia Minor. The wars of the successors are convoluted, but straightforwardly Antigonos I *Monophthalmos* (one-eyed), the founder of the Antigonid Dynasty that would later rule Hellenistic Macedon, controlled most of Asia Minor until his death at the Battle of Ipsos in 301. For some twenty years, another *Diadoch*, Lysimachos, would control the territory. Finally in 281, an aged Seleukos I defeated Lysimachos in Lydia at the Battle of Corupedium. Though he was murdered almost immediately by a rogue Ptolemaic prince, Seleukos’ victory

²⁰ Thomas R. Martin, *An Overview of Classical Greek History from Mycenae to Alexander* 8.1.2

²¹ I should not oversimplify here—there are instances of the Seleukids acting as benefactors of non-Greek cities, and instances of the Persians engaging in alliances with Greek *poleis*, but the reverence for Hellenism and the Greek cities, in particular, was potent for Alexander the Macedonian Seleukid Kings.

at Corupedium established an enduring Seleukid presence in Asia Minor, from the Taurus Mountains to the Aegean.

Seleukos I Nikator, “the Victor,” like the other successors, was a Macedonian and a general of Alexander the Great. Upon the death of Alexander, Seleukos received Babylon. With the help of Ptolemy I, the *diadoch* in Egypt, Seleukos expanded his control over Babylon and lands to the East. By 281, as a result of the battles mentioned above, he had expanded his authority as far West as the Aegean coast of Asia Minor. With a few exceptions, Seleukos I had recovered Alexander’s land Empire in Asia. On that basis, the Seleukid dynasty held a credible claim as the successors of Alexander, and as the successors of the Achaemenid Persian Empire.

Like Alexander, Seleukos was a Macedonian who revered Greek language and culture. His wife, Apama, was a Sogdian, and the royal family would adopt certain Iranian traditions, but the Seleukids saw themselves as one with the Greeks.²² They primarily governed their Empire from two capitals, founded by Seleukos and named for himself and his family. Seleukia on the Tigris displaced Babylon as the royal capital in Mesopotamia. Antioch on the Orontes in coastal North Syria became the Seleukid western capital. These marked the core domains of the Seleukid Empire, North Syria and Mesopotamia.

Asia Minor was simultaneously a Seleukid peripheral territory and its gateway to the Greek Aegean. Seleukid power in Asia Minor would not be unchallenged—the smaller kingdoms of Pergamon and Bithynia were proclaimed

²² Sogdia is a mountainous region in Central Asia. Like the Persians, the inhabitants’ culture was Iranian.

in the West and Northwest; Pontus and Cappadocia in the center and North by the mid-Third Century. Amid the six Syrian Wars fought between the Seleukids and Ptolemaic Egypt, the Ptolemies for some time wrested away control of parts of the Southwest, including Karia. Towards the end of the Third Century, ambitious Macedonian kings campaigned in the Southwest and West. The island Republic of Rhodes also maintained a small territory in Karia throughout the period, known as the Rhodian *Peraia*. Seleukid authority would wane and reform, seeing heights under Antiochos I, Antiochos II, and Seleukos II from 281 to the mid-century, and under Antiochos III from around 220 to his defeat by Rome in 190/89. In 188, the Treaty of Apamea, between Rome and Antiochos III, banished the Seleukid kings from Asia west of the Taurus Mountains. They would not return to Asia Minor. The Romans proclaimed the Greeks of Asia Minor free from Seleukid oppression, but the reality under Seleukid influence was much more complicated.

The Greek cities under Seleukid influence in Asia Minor had a long and storied history. The Greek core of western Asia Minor was centered on Ionia, with Aeolis to the North and Doric settlements to the South, but by the Classical Period, peripheral areas to the North, South, and Southeast were also Hellenizing. By the end of the Classical Period, the cities of Karia, Mysia, and the Troad largely governed themselves as *poleis* like the Ionians and mainland Greeks. Accordingly, their local languages and practices become displaced by those of the Greeks. There was always a population of non-Greek agricultural serfs who retained indigenous languages and traditions and populated the rural areas of western Asia Minor. However, the abundant epigraphical evidence from these

cities that is used in this investigation is all in Greek. And the citizen-population of these cities was comprised of Greek speakers who considered the Greek *poleis* of the west as peers.

The cities under consideration were Greek, and they were democracies. In his campaigns, Alexander favored democracies over oligarchies and his successors would continue this preference. Most cities probably were not radical democracies, in the style of fifth century Athens, but the citizens assembly was usually sovereign with popularly elected magistrates.²³ The word *demokratia* continued to hold a meaning that contrasted it with oligarchy and tyranny, and it held a potent normative meaning as a popular and free form of government that was to be maintained “at any price.”²⁴ For the cities themselves and for the philhellenic Hellenistic monarchs, upholding democracy in the Greek cities was a tantamount goal in rhetoric and in practice. In the early Hellenistic Period, this form of democracy was ascendant and its fundamental basis was citizenship, an institution that had already developed for centuries in the Greek world.

Origins of Greek Citizenship

The issue of citizenship in the ancient world is pulled between two poles, geographically and in time. One is the Classical Greek *politeia* on the Athenian model and the other is the Roman *civitas*. This investigation centers on the Greek cities of Western Asia Minor, polities with civic structures originating squarely in the Classical *polis*. Even as the Roman Republic began to exert power east of the

²³ Ma, 1999 p. 150; Weimer, *Hellenistic Cities*, p. 57.

²⁴ Muller, *Oligarchy and the Hellenistic City*, p. 34.

Adriatic, no significant convergence of Greek and Roman political institutions would develop at least until the later Hellenistic Period.²⁵ Thus, as this project's scope is in and around the third century, the Greek notion of *politeia* anchors this investigation. Whereas the Roman notion of *civitas* tended to denote civil rights, the Greek *politeia* reflected both civil rights and a function in the civic community. The word *politeia* does not only translate to citizenship, but reflects the norms, procedures, and structures of the political system of the *polis*.

Josine Blok writes: "In the 430s BCE, a new abstract noun emerged, *politeia* (Hdt. 9.34). It refers to the written rules and unwritten conventions shaping a society, in particular its system of political authority. "The Greeks conceived the *polis* and its *politeia* as an organic whole, because over the years a *politeia* created the distinctive sociocultural climate of a *polis*."²⁶ In this framing, the *polis* was a collective of its *oikoi* (households) along with the property of those individuals, the state, and the gods.²⁷ Men and women were citizens of the *polis*, though with different rights and roles.²⁸ Only adult men could participate in the assembly or councils, for example.

Aristotle stated: "A citizen pure and simple is defined by nothing else so much as by the right to participate (*metechein*) in judicial functions (*krisis*) and in office (*arche*)."²⁹ In other words, Aristotle defined citizenship in a Greek *polis* in terms of function. The central role of a citizen was the "dual participation" in the

²⁵ Gruen, 1984 for the interaction of Hellenistic and Roman institutions, with a particular focus on diplomacy. The Romans would adopt some Hellenistic diplomatic practices, but civic institutions did not converge.

²⁶ Blok, "Citizenship, the Citizen Body, the Assemblies", p. 163.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 164.

²⁸ Ibid, 166.

²⁹ Arist. *Politics* 3.1275

courts and in the *arche*, the function of office that includes participation in the assembly, council, and magistracies of the *polis*.³⁰ These are political rights associated with participation in the political institutions of the polis, rather than civil or economic rights. Again, this serves as a contrast to the Roman concept of citizenship, *civitas*, which was more closely associated with civil rights.

There were civil rights associated with the Greek *politeia*, though. There was a fairly clear set of rights that citizens held in the Hellenistic *polis*. They included the right to own a house and land (*enktesis ges kai oikias*), the right to import and export (*eisagoge* and *exagoge*), grazing rights (*epinomia*), and the right to marry other citizens (*epigamia*). This list is not comprehensive, but these rights are fundamental to the concept of the *politeia* across city-states. The right of land-ownership is a principal concern of this investigation. If the *polis* was made up of the households and property of its citizens, land-ownership in the territory of a city-state would be the exclusive domain of citizens.³¹ Aperghis writes that for the *polis* and its *chora* (land), “a long tradition made it the absolute property of its citizens.”³² Muller, on the other hand, finds that cities could grant many of the “fragments” that constituted citizenship without formally granting *politeia*.³³ Muller does not reach a definitive conclusion about exactly what rights a citizen always had or what rights were always the domain of citizens, instead

³⁰ Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, 540

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Aperghis, 2004, p. 88

³³ This is one of the main points of Miller, *Deconstructing Politeia*

finding that the meaning of *politeia* in Hellenistic epigraphical sources was inconsistent and often ambiguous.³⁴

Though more prominent in the Archaic and Classical Periods, there was also a fundamental military dimension to citizenship in the Hellenistic Period. It is theorized that some of the more democratic elements of the Greek *polis* developed as a result of the Greek style of warfare—the middle-class hoplites demanded representation, as did the rowers of Classical Athens.³⁵ Hellenistic *poleis* fought one another and maintained citizen militias as they had in earlier periods.³⁶ The grand armies of the kingdoms dominated events at a high level, but locally, these cities still relied on their citizens for military force. The institution of the *ephebia* was fully developed by the Hellenistic Period and trained citizens to be soldiers.³⁷ Consequently, there was an incentive for cities to enlarge their citizen populations in the interest of defense.

Membership in the *polis* was also holy and steeped in tradition. Blok writes that at the core of the heritage of *polis* membership was a “covenant with the gods.”³⁸ Her words on this heritage are worth including:³⁹

Mythical narratives about the origins of the *polis* created the identity of the present population as the legitimate heirs of the ancestors and legitimized real descent as a condition of polis membership in the present, expressed in the *ethnikon*... descent thus became the criterion of belonging to a polis and its subgroups.

³⁴ Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, 549.

³⁵ Victor Davis Hanson’s *The Western Way of War*, 1989 offers the classic theory for this idea; and Hanson, *The Other Greeks*, 1995.

³⁶ See John Ma, “Fighting Poleis of the Hellenistic World. In Van Wees, Hans (Ed), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*. London: Classical Press of Wales, 2000.

³⁷ Wiemer *Hellenistic Cities*, 61.

³⁸ Blok, 165.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

She adds that “Fundamental revisions of the polis body... were again cast in terms of descent.”⁴⁰ Kinship and Greekness were central to a notion of citizenship. Fundamentally, citizenship was a hereditary thing, and any alterations of a citizen body needed to reflect a kinship relation. Most citizens of a *polis* would have been born into their citizenship, and qualified by having one or both native parents, depending on the city.⁴¹ Granting citizenship to a foreigner was akin to adopting them into a common heritage.⁴² When circumstance demanded the expansion of the citizen body, invoking shared kinship between peoples could appeal to the hereditary nature of citizenship. In some cases, cities could reference a colonial relationship, where the people of a colony were supposedly descended from the people of a mother city. Particular to Asia Minor, many cities on the Aegean coast claimed shared kinship with the cities of Crete, with references to mythological heroes and the thalassocracy of the legendary King Minos.⁴³ Colonial relationships often delved into mytho-history, but when no colonial relationship existed, cities could just as easily reference a shared kinship through mythological heroes or simply the gods. Kinship and citizenship and the relationship of kinship and diplomacy often worked in tandem, as shared kinship justified warm diplomatic relations and shared (potential) citizenship.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ See Pericles’ citizenship law from Classical Athens, which documents this typical requirement.

⁴² Blok, p. 166.

⁴³ Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*, 1999 p. 60.

⁴⁴ See Jones, 1999.

In a similar way, the notion of being a peer in a world of Greek *poleis* was also an essential qualifier of citizenship. The Greek communities of the Hellenistic Period saw themselves as connected through kinship relations, but this often acted more as a justification for expansions of citizenship rather than a tangible qualifier. Whether explicit or implicit, membership in the world of the *poleis* was often essential. Exceptions exist, for example where Smyrna grants *politeia* to a group of Persian military settlers, but they are far from the norm.⁴⁵ When a city grants citizenship to an individual, a Greek *ethnikon*, or ethnic demonym, is almost always given that places individuals into this system. At other times Greekness is more explicitly required. Aside from a degree of ancient prejudice, there is a logic to accepting into citizenship the citizens of other *poleis*, which often shared political institutions and an ideology of civic pride.⁴⁶ There is a helpful framework here known as “peer polities”. It is an international relations theory whereby politically similar states interact with one another on an ideologically level playing field.⁴⁷ This notion of Greekness fits with the idea of the *poleis* of the Hellenistic World acted as “peer polities.” This framework is helpful for understanding diplomatic uses of citizenship.

Collective Grants

The use of collective grants of citizenship status reached its height in the Hellenistic Period. Muller uses the term politography for the mass-registration of

⁴⁵ I.Smyrn. 573, explored in Chapter 2

⁴⁶ Ma, 1999, p. 208. Menestratos is “a citizen and the son of a citizen.” This idea is visited in Chapter 4.

⁴⁷ See Ma, John. “Peer Polity Interactions in the Hellenistic Age,” 2003.

new citizens.⁴⁸ Two forms of collective citizenship grants, *isopoliteia* and *sympoliteia* are highly relevant to this investigation. Muller offers clear definitions for *isopoliteia* and *sympoliteia*: “*Isopoliteia* was the reciprocal or unilateral granting of citizenship by a Greek community to all the members of another community through a decree or a treaty. *Sympoliteia* was the merging of one or more civic bodies, which led to the creation of a shared citizenship.”⁴⁹ As collective forms of citizenship, these grants are agreed, or decreed, between states, or in rarer cases between states and some other group of individuals. Both institutions, in their Hellenistic forms, are treated in modern scholarship. However, there remain major questions about the varying nature of their use and impact.

Isopoliteia is the more difficult institution to understand for modern scholars. *Isopoliteia* agreements are between *poleis*, granted from one community of citizens to another. Sara Saba, who has composed the most recent work devoted to *isopoliteia*, employs the term “potential citizenship” when describing the institution, using both terms interchangeably. She also sees *isopoliteia* as a primarily diplomatic tool, and as more of a means towards warming relations rather than an end in itself. In that way it is a supplemental, and somewhat symbolic, element of treaties, used to reinforce peace or other Hellenistic diplomatic institutions such as *asylia*, a term for territorial inviolability sought by numerous Hellenistic *poleis*.

⁴⁸ Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, p. 548.

⁴⁹ Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, p. 536 (in footnote).

Agreements of *isopoliteia*, though, could be quite specific in their procedures for enactment and usually included grants that could be disconnected from pure citizenship. It seems implausible that grants of potential citizenship were only symbolic in nature, and many scholars take the stipulations of an *isopoliteia* at face value. At one extreme, a literal reading from modern eyes of certain *isopoliteia* grants could suggest the existence of dual citizenship and free movement for those granted potential citizenship.⁵⁰ A middle ground seems fair. Cities could grant actual citizenship to individuals from *poleis* who held *isopoliteia* status, but they could do the same for other individuals too. It is helpful to consider the status as “potential citizen,” rather than “citizen,” for an individual granted *isopoliteia*. A grant of potential citizenship probably helped recipient individuals receive citizenship, but potential citizens had to activate their citizenship on an individual basis by enrolling in the citizen rolls. Other grants that were connected to *isopoliteia*, for example import-export rights and perhaps sometimes land ownership rights, could plausibly have also been used without becoming an enrolled citizen.⁵¹

One should be wary of any notion of dual citizenship between *poleis*. Granted, individuals could simultaneously enjoy citizenship in a *polis* and in a Federal League. In some cases, individuals could also enjoy a sort of *quasi*-dual citizenship, holding some of the component rights or privileges of citizens in a

⁵⁰ See, for example, J.K. Davies, “The Polis Transformed and Revitalized” in *The Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. VII, p. 309, who speaks of potential dual citizenship and more permeable boundaries between *poleis*.

⁵¹ On the possibility of granting rights that made up citizenship, see Müller, Christel. “(De)Constructing Politeia...”, 2014.

polis that was not their home.⁵² But *isopoliteia* probably did not open the door to individuals acting as citizens of multiple cities simultaneously in the early Hellenistic Period. A citizen of one *polis* could hold potential citizenship in another, but he could probably not activate his potential citizenship and remain a citizen in his city of origin. Picard states that a practice of multiple citizenship would “assume a complete severing of all ties with the former country.”⁵³ Development of multiple citizenship in federal leagues and constituent *poleis* may have “laid the groundwork” for later developments that look more like dual citizenship in peer *poleis*, but even Muller, who is somewhat skeptical of scholars’ rejection of the possibility of dual citizenship in the Hellenistic Period, does not claim it could have existed in the early Hellenistic Period, which forms the scope of this investigation.⁵⁴

Whereas cities used *isopoliteia* as a diplomatic tool with a basis in citizenship, *sympoliteia* usually had territorial and geopolitical concerns and effects for the parties involved. It is a more direct form of “politography.”⁵⁵ The term overlaps with *synoikismos*, the joining of adjacent settlements or the resettlement of nearby people. An act of *sympoliteia* can be an act of *synoekismos*, but a treaty of *sympoliteia* emphasizes the political arrangements and common citizenship of a union. Synoecism is attested in the Classical Period, as

⁵² Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*.

⁵³ Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, p. 543 cites Olivier Picard, “De la citoyenneté classique à la citoyenneté d’époque romaine : essai de conclusion,” in *Patrie d’origine et patries électives. Les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d’époque romaine*, ed. Anna Heller and Anne-Valerie Pont (Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2012), p. 341.

⁵⁴ Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, p. 543.

⁵⁵ Again, the term Muller uses for large-scale citizenship grants Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*, p. 548.

neighboring *poleis* joined together, sometimes creating a unified urban center as well.

In the Hellenistic Period, though, the *poleis* used the institution in two predominant ways. On the mainland, the Achaeans and Aetolians expanded their federal leagues through treaties of *sympoliteia* with new member cities.⁵⁶ The political institutions of the federal leagues and the existence of a federal citizenship is greatly interesting, but outside the scope of this investigation. In Asia Minor, through the institution of *sympoliteia* or *synoikismos*, the great cities of coastal Asia Minor subsumed many of the tiny *poleis* that inhabited the coast and river valleys.⁵⁷ Sometimes the kings initiated *sympoliteia*, but usually it was the city-states acting in their local interests. A treaty of *sympoliteia* created a shared citizenship, usually with a senior partner absorbing a lesser group into its citizenship and annexing its territory. Expanding a city's population and territory is largely motivated by geopolitical factors, but treaties of *sympoliteia* must consider deeply the issue of citizenship in the reformed *poleis* that they create. Each instance of *sympoliteia* reflects unique local circumstances, but this investigation will begin by exploring cases in Miletos, Smyrna, and Teos.

⁵⁶ The Aetolians used *isopoliteia* as well to grant their Federal citizenship to foreigners, but this was not the same process as the *sympoliteia* used to actually expand the League.

⁵⁷ Reger, 145 quoting Robert and Robert, 1976 p. 174-5.

Miletos, Smyrna, and Teos: *Sympoliteia*

[Thales of Miletos] advised that the Ionians have one place of deliberation, and that it be in Teos (for that was the center of Ionia), and that the other cities be considered no more than demes. (Hdt. 1.170.3)

When the Persian General Harpagus set out to conquer the Ionian Greeks in the 540s, Thales of Miletos had the idea to unify the Ionian cities into one state with common institutions. This process was not identical to the *sympoliteiai* of the Hellenistic Period, but the Greeks of the region had been familiar with the idea of political consolidation in the face of a changing geopolitical environment since the Archaic Period.

The cities of Ionia boasted legendary pasts and a Greekness as strong and ancient as the settlements of the Greek mainland. Miletos, Smyrna, and Teos are three settlements that sit on the Aegean coast of Asia Minor and boast prestigious Ionian pedigrees. Archaic and Classical Miletos, the “Ornament of Ionia,” was responsible for the foundation of countless colonies across the Black Sea region. Smyrna claimed the epic poet Homer as its most famous resident, who supposedly inhabited the city in its Archaic past. These cities all played prominent roles in the Ionian revolt against the Achaemenid Persian Empire at the beginning of the fifth century. During the Hellenistic Period, these cities maintained their existence as independently acting Greek *poleis*, albeit under the influence of the Antigonid, Ptolemaic, and Seleukid kings. These kingdoms often contested supremacy in the lands of western Asia Minor during the third century. In navigating this volatile international environment, one tool these cities used to maintain power and security was the control of their citizenship, particularly through collective grants

of citizenship. Miletos and Smyrna serve as model cases for agreements of locally-initiated *sympoliteia*. Teos provides a special case where *sympoliteia* was decreed from above.

Teos and Lebedos were neighboring Ionian cities. In that late third century, the successor King Antigonos I controlled the region of Ionia and attempted to join the two cities in *sympoliteia*. The act is best known from two letters of King Antigonos to the Teians, found inscribed at Teos. The inscriptions date between 306 and 302, slightly outside the scope of this investigation. Nonetheless, the event described in the text serves as an example that contrasts with the other instances of *sympoliteia* explored below. In the case of Teos and Lebedos, King Antigonos commanded the cities to join. Ultimately the *sympoliteia* failed after a coalition of other successors defeated Antigonos at Ipsos in 301. Without Antigonid authority, the cities were left a choice, and chose to maintain their separate citizenships. Selections of two of the letters follow:

*Inscription 1: Teos and Lebedos*⁵⁸

We thought it best that a building lot [be given] to each of the L[ebedians] among you equal to that which he leaves behind in Lebedos. Until the new houses are built, houses [are to be furnished to all] the Lebedians without charge: if the present city remains, one-[third of the] existing houses; if it is necessary to tear down the present city, half of the existing houses [are to be left], and of these one-third are to be given [to the Lebedians] and you are to have two-thirds; if a certain part of the city is torn down and the remaining houses [are enough] to receive both you and the Lebedians, [the] third part of these] are to be given to the Leb[edians]; . . .

As to the proxenoi of the city of Lebedos or those benefactors who possess [citizenship] or some other grant or honor from the Lebedians, (we thought it

⁵⁸ Derow, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest*, Source No. 7. Greek text of each inscription is included in the Appendix, matched by inscription number.

right) [that they have the same among] you, and that their names be inscribed within a year in the place where your *proxenoi* [and benefactors are] inscribed.

... ..

This makes clear that Antigonos intended Teos and Lebedos to merge politically. Additionally, it seems that many of the Lebedians were supposed to move to Teos, given the provisions for building housing in Teos and leaving dwellings behind in Lebedos.

King Antigonos to the *boule* and the *demos* of the Teans, greeting. When we [before studied] how the synoecism might be completed most quickly, we did not see from what source the [necessary] money would come [for you] to be able [to give immediately] to the Lebedians the value of their houses, because the amount arising from the revenues comes in over a [rather long] period of time. [When we received] your envoys and those from the Lebedians and asked [them if they had any] expedient to suggest to us, and they said they had none except taxation, examining [their proposals] we find that only your wealthiest citizens have always advanced the property taxes. [It seems good to us, then] that there should be six hundred (designated as) wealthy, [and that these] should advance money in proportion to their property, so that there may be [for the Lebedians] one-fourth of the compensation available at once, and that repayment be made to these men first, after an interval [of a year] from the revenues [of the city] all of them being appropriated for this purpose.⁵⁹ ...

In comparison to other relevant inscriptions, the details of these letters do not give a great deal of information about citizenship. This documents geopolitical landscaping by the Macedonian warlord Antigonos. There are aspects of great interest to law, economy, and settlement patterns, but the main effect is straightforward. The Lebedian *polis* is to vanish and become a part of Teos. Likely, Antigonos forced the Lebedians to leave their city and move to Teos.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/classics/bagnall/3995/readings/b-d2-1b.htm>

⁶⁰ Ibid.

For them, the *sympoliteia* does not preserve self-identity or citizenship in their *polis*.

There is no known instance of the Seleukids being so heavy handed in forcing the merging and resettlement of Greek city-states. Cases in the third century were more successful than the *sympoliteia* of Teos and Lebedos. The institution still usually had pressing geopolitical purposes for its use. However, when *sympoliteia* was by the initiative of the *poleis*, rather than that of the king, the merging cities could be more mindful of self-identity and local civic institutions like citizenship. The example of Teos and Lebedos serves as a contrast for the third century examples that follow. The first sees Smyrna absorb a nearby city and a group of military settlers.

Smyrna, Magnesia, and the *Katoikoi*

The dossier of three Smyrnaean inscriptions that follows presents a Hellenistic grant of citizenship that contrasts deeply with grants of *isopoliteia* and directly involves the Seleukid King Seleukos II. The context of this inscription is vital to understanding this mass grant of citizenship. The treaty follows the Third Syrian War, fought between the Seleukid and Ptolemaic kingdoms in the 240s. Seleukid royal involvement in the series of events described in this inscription is clear. The text invokes the name of Seleukos and his alliance with Smyrna numerous times. Evidently, Smyrna stayed loyal to the victorious Seleukos II, who allowed or encouraged Smyrna to absorb into itself the citizens of Magnesia-on-Sipylus, which had remained loyal to Ptolemy III. This is an instance of

sympoliteia, or the merging of citizenship between *poleis*, but other individuals are also involved. In this case of *sympoliteia*, two parties of the agreement are *poleis*, but the citizenship grant also involves a group of individuals who were citizens of neither city beforehand. For Seleukos, this act rewarded an ally and reinforced his influence in Western Asia Minor. The fortress and garrison at Old Magnesia and the allegiance of the military settlers may have been a particularly enticing prize for the King.

The following series of inscriptions is split into three sections:

*Inscription 2: Smyrna and Magnesia (Sip)*⁶¹

A:

...Whereas previously, at the time when King Seleucus crossed over into Seleukis, when many and great perils beset our city and territory, the *demos* maintained its good-will and friendship toward him, not terrified at the attack of the enemy nor caring about the destruction of its property, but reckoning everything to be secondary to standing by its policy and to supporting his state to the best of its ability, as has been its way from the beginning; wherefore King Seleucus too, being disposed piously toward the gods and lovingly toward his parents, being magnanimous and knowing how to return gratitude to those who benefit him, honored our city, both on account of the good-will of the *demos* and the zeal which it evinced for his state and on account of the fact that his father the god Antiochus and the mother of his father the goddess Stratonike are established among us and honored with substantial honors by the people in common and by each of the citizens individually, and he confirmed for the *demos* its autonomy and democracy, and he wrote to the kings and the dynasts and the cities and the leagues, asking that the temple of Aphrodite Stratonikis be (recognized as) inviolable and our city (as) sacred and inviolable...
(Continued below...)

This section is all praise and honors for King Seleukos. It does not contain any details about the logistics of the coming *sympoliteia*, but it provides critical framing. Seleukos is ascendant and any actions taken by the Smyrnaeans is

⁶¹ Found at <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/classics/bagnall/3995/readings/b-d2-1c.htm>

supervised, if not guided, by his wishes. The King's confirmation "for the demos and its autonomy and democracy" essentially validates his control over the city, and his assistance with the Temple of *Aphrodite Stratonikis* demonstrates that Smyrna was in Seleukos' favor.⁶²

Smyrna's absorption of Magnesia was, at least in part, directed from above by the Seleukid king. Reger distinguishes *sympoliteia* instances that were the product of local initiative from those related to royal initiative, seeing the former as more amenable to both parties, while royal direction tended to create agreements that were forceful and unstable.⁶³ As John Ma states, in some instances, "the expressions 'synoikism,' 'sympoliteia' should not obscure the violence of the process."⁶⁴ On the other hand, in their work L. and J. Robert stress the preservation of local identity in many *sympoliteia* agreements that they encounter.⁶⁵ The language of this Smyrnaean decree is not the explicit language of violence, but local identity is not preserved. The impact of Seleukid and Smyrnaean force is understood. The Seleukid incentives to hold the fortress of Old Magnesia, reward its ally, and attract military settlers to its side after the Third Syrian War are clear enough. The implications for Smyrna and Magnesia of a forceful combining of citizenship are more relevant to this investigation.

B.

On the following terms the Smyrnaeans (on the one side) and (on the other) the *katoikoi* in Magnesia, both the cavalry and the infantry in the city, and [those] in open camp and the other inhabitants concluded the (treaty of) friendship, and the Smyrnaeans gave citizenship to the *katoikoi* in Magnesia, the cavalry and

⁶² On the theory of Seleukid control over subject cities in Asia Minor, see Ma, 1999 Ch. 3.

⁶³ Reger, *Sympoliteia*.

⁶⁴ Ma, *Fighting Poleis in the Hellenistic World*

⁶⁵ Reger, *Sympoliteia*.

infantry in the city, and to those in open camp and to the (others who] live in the city, on the condition that those in Magnesia preserve with all zeal for all time for King Seleucus the alliance and good-will toward the affairs of King Seleucus, and that they return to King Seleucus as much as they have received from King Seleucus, after guarding (it) to the extent of their ability. They shall be citizens with the Smyrnaeans according to the laws of the city, without faction and reckoning the same as enemy and friend as the Smyrnaeans. Those in Magnesia shall swear to the Smyrnaeans and the Smyrnaeans to those in Magnesia, each of them the oath written below in the agreement. When the oaths have been carried out, let all the accusations that arose in the course of the war be done away with, and let it not be possible for either side to bring accusations about what happened during the war either through a court case or in any other way at all; otherwise, let every accusation brought be invalid. Citizenship in Smyrna, on equal terms and the same as for the other citizens, is to be given to the *katoikoi* in Magnesia, the cavalry and infantry in the city, and to those in open camp. Citizenship is likewise to be given to the others [who] live in Magnesia, as many as may be free and Greeks.

Here the Smyrnaeans agree to extend their citizenship to the Magnesians and the military settlers in Magnesia. This section specifies who is to receive citizenship in Smyrna and requests peace among the newly formed citizen body. Since the *katoikoi* in Magnesia are listed separately from the cavalry and infantry of the city and the other free Greeks in Magnesia, it seems likely that the *katoikoi* were not citizens of Magnesia. It is also notable that for those others who live in Magnesia, the qualifier for them receiving Smyrnaean citizenship is not Magnesian citizenship, but being free and Greek. Magnesian citizens would already meet this requirement, but this could also include any foreigners in the city, as long as they were originally Greeks. This may align with the geopolitical motives of the treaty for Smyrna, a city attempting to increase its citizen body in an unconventional way. Still, though, the requirement of Greekness is prominent.

Prodecure:

Let those who are secretaries of the (military) divisions deliver to the *demos* the registers of the cavalry and infantry in Magnesia, both those in the city and those in open camp, and (let) the men appointed by the *katoikoi* in Magnesia (deliver to

the demos) the list of the other inhabitants. When the secretaries provide the registers and the appointed men the list of the other inhabitants, let the *exetastai* have them swear on oath at the *metron* over freshly sacrificed victims, [the] secretaries that they have from the best motive brought the list of the *katoikoi* really with them, cavalry and infantry, [both those] drawn up [in the city and those in] open camp; the men who bring the list of the [other inhabitants, that they have from the best motive brought the list of those who] live in Magnesia and who are really free and Greeks. Let [the] *exetastai* hand over the [lists] that have been brought to the record-keeper of the boule and the demos, and let him deposit (them) in the public archive. Let the *exetastai* assign all the names that have been brought to tribes by lot and enter them in the allotment-lists, and let those entered in the allotment-lists share in everything in which the other citizens share. Let the enrolled citizens use the laws of the Smyrnaeans in contract and injury cases involving Smyrnaeans, even in Magnesia. And let them accept also in Magnesia the coin of the city as legal. And let those in Magnesia receive the magistrate whom the demos may send to have control of the keys and to be in charge of the protection of the city and to preserve the city for King Seleucus. ...

Here is a specific procedure for deciding who is to become a Smyrnaean and general instructions on how they will be integrated into the synoecized *polis*. The process whereby the representatives of the *katoikoi* provide a list of eligible individuals acts to audit the individuals who will be joining in Smyrnaean citizenship. While again, this does not specify that all must be former Magnesians, it does demonstrate that Smyrna was not content to expand its citizenship to anybody. The procedure whereby those named individuals are entered into tribes by lot and the granting to the new citizens of a “share in everything in which the other citizens share” served to guarantee the equality of the new citizens to the original Smyrnaeans. The random tribe-allotment even suggests an elimination of Magnesian identity within the *polis*—other cases, shown below, do preserve local identity in political institutions. Within this arrangement, it does not appear that any sort of Magnesian citizenship remained after the *sympoliteia*. Though, clearly, people remained in Magnesia.

Magnesian Oath

The *katoikoi* of Magnesia, both the cavalry and the infantry in the city, and those in open camp, and the others who are being enrolled in the state are to swear the following oath: “I swear by Zeus, Ge, Helios, Ares, Athena Areia and the Tauropolos, and the Sipyrene Mother, and Apollo in Pandoi, and all the other gods and goddesses, and the fortune of King Seleucus: I shall abide by the agreements which I conclude with the Smyrnaeans for all time; and I shall preserve the alliance and good-will toward King Seleucus and the city of the Smyrnaeans; and I shall preserve what I have received from King Seleucus to the extent of my ability and shall return (it) to King Seleucus; and I shall transgress nothing of what is in the agreement, nor shall I change for the worse the things written in it, in any way or on any pretext whatsoever; and I shall be a citizen, with concord and without faction, according to the laws of the Smyrnaeans and the decrees of the *demos*, and I shall join in preserving the autonomy and the democracy, and the other things which have been granted to the Smyrnaeans by King Seleucus, with all zeal and at all times, and I shall not wrong any one of them, nor shall I allow another (to do so), to the extent of my ability; and if I perceive anyone plotting against the city, or the territories of the city, or seeking to subvert the democracy or the isonomia, I shall reveal (this) to the *demos* of the Smyrnaeans and shall go to its aid, contending with all zeal, and shall not desert it, to the extent of my ability. May it be well for me if I abide by this oath, but if I break it may there be ruin for myself and for the family sprung from me.”

Smyrnaean Oath

The Smyrnaeans are to swear to those from Magnesia the following oath: “I swear by Zeus, Ge, Helios, Ares, Athena Areia, and the Tauropolos, and the Sipyrene Mother, and Aphrodite Stratonikis, and all the other gods and goddesses: I shall abide for all time by the treaty which we have concluded with the *katoikoi* [in] Magnesia, the cavalry and infantry in the city, and those in open camp and the others who are being enrolled in the state, transgressing nothing of what is in the agreement nor changing for the worse the things written in it, by no device and on no pretext whatsoever. And I shall bear good-will both toward King Seleucus and toward the *katoikoi* in Magnesia, those in the city and those in open camp, and (toward) the others who live [in] Magnesia, as many as are free and Greeks, and I shall make them all citizens, (them) and their descendants, on equal terms and the same as for the other citizens, and assigning them by lot to tribes I shall enter them in the one each may draw by lot, and I shall not wrong any one of them nor shall I allow another (to do so), to the extent of my ability. And if I perceive anyone plotting against them or their descendants or their property, I shall reveal this as quickly as I can, and shall lend support with zeal. And I shall give them the right to share in the magistracies and the other public affairs of the city in which also the other citizens share. May it be well for me if I abide by this oath, but if I do not may there be ruin for myself and the family sprung from me.”...

The oaths that the Smyrnaeans and Magnesians swore reinforced civic cohesion and allegiance to King Seleukos. In each section of this inscription, the connection between allegiance to Seleukos and being a good citizen of Smyrna is

strong and striking. Here, in the form of an oath for all parties to the treaty, the words describe how a citizen of Smyrna, post-treaty, ought to act. For both groups, the alliance with the King is named first. It is at least as important as the words seeking domestic peace and unity. The strong influence of Seleukos distorts the qualifiers for good citizenship. This is a powerful reminder of the geopolitical motivations for this treaty, but it should not remove attention from the details provided about a new Smyrnaean citizenship.

Ignoring Seleukos, the provisions about citizenship show a concern for internal unity and concord among the new citizen body. This also suggests concerns about a Magnesians desire to preserve self-identity within the *polis*. The requests for the Magnesians to act without faction, not subvert the democracy, and adhere to the laws as a Smyrnaean may reflect a worry that the Magnesians would misbehave within Smyrna. From the unequal circumstances of this treaty, one can already propose that the Magnesians were not fully content with joining Smyrna. A desire to maintain a self-identity, or even to regain independence, may have been strong. Self-identity and local citizenship are not the same, but here it is clear that Smyrna saw the unity of its citizens, legally and in identity, as essential.

In contrast to more diplomatic agreements of *isopoliteia*, this *sympoliteia* served as a more tangible instance of geopolitical landscaping by the Smyrnaeans. While the *katoikoi* at Magnesia apparently sent ambassadors, for the Magnesians the only advantage of this *sympoliteia* seems to be that it concluded a war in which Magnesia had backed the losing side. Citizens of a *polis* granted *isopoliteia*

may voluntarily apply for citizenship in the granting city, but the Magnesians and the *katioikoi* seem to be enrolled as citizens of Smyrna by force of this treaty, assuming they cooperate. Furthermore, this decree seemingly dismantles the independent *polis* of Magnesia and the independence of its component institutions. In Magnesia, Smyrnaean law is to be followed, a common coinage is to be accepted, and a Smyrnaean magistrate is to govern. With its enactment, Magnesian citizenship ceased to be the primary allegiance of the inhabitants of that settlement, if it continued to exist at all.

Magnesian enrollment into the Smyrnaean citizen-body is conditional on allegiance to King Seleukos. Further, an alliance with Seleukos is central to the oath that all Magnesians must swear. This allegiance does not seem to be voluntary, like the grant of citizenship itself. Citizenship is “given” by Smyrna, but the gift could not be rejected. There is not an alternative presented to swearing allegiance to Seleukos or to becoming a Smyrnaean citizen. Any notion that the Magnesians could remain politically independent conflicts directly with the Smyrnaean official sent to govern the new territory.

Along with Seleukos, Smyrna was the triumphant party to this treaty. Nonetheless, the absorption of the Magnesians conditional on an alliance with Seleukos represents a form of royal intrusion into the institution of citizenship, an institution that was traditionally tightly controlled by the *polis*. Several instances of royally initiated *sympoliteia* do exist, which are well treated in Gary Reger’s work on *sympoliteia*. However, the royal initiative in these instances tend more towards administrative restructuring in the royal interest rather than matters

dealing more specifically with *polis* citizenship. In the cases of *sympoliteia* between Teos and Lebedos decreed by Antigonos I or the consolidation of the cities of the Troad by Lysimachos, there existed some desire to form stronger urban centers which could strengthen royal power and influence in the region.⁶⁶ This case presents a mix of local and royal initiative. Seleukos is rewarding and strengthening an allied city by allowing it to coax a smaller, troublesome city into *sympoliteia*. The case of Teos and Lebedos is more akin to geopolitical landscaping by a strong king. Nonetheless, Seleukos' presence is abundantly clear from the inscription and Smyrna probably could not have done this without that presence. Under the influence or direction of the Seleukid king, Smyrnaean citizenship is dramatically expanded, even to non-Greeks, and Magnesians citizenship may cease to exist.

It is possible to consider such changes of citizenship as merely the institutional reaction of Smyrna to the military victories of Seleukos II. Other provisions may suggest greater royal influence in the area. Particularly, the stipulations involving which individuals are to be granted citizenship raise questions. It is not only the free, Greek Magnesians. Rather, it is the *katoikoi*, military settlers who had resided in Magnesia, including a group of Persians. As stated, the separation from the free Magnesians suggests the *katoikoi* did not hold Magnesians citizenship before the treaty, and the Persians holding citizenship seems even less likely. Combined with the requirement of dual allegiance, to Smyrna and to King Seleukos, this grant is atypical.

⁶⁶ Reger, 145; 155.

The atypical nature may reflect Seleukid influence—perhaps Seleukos II saw a particular incentive in placating these military settlers and Persians through a reward of citizenship. With a desire to maintain his footing in the region following the Third Syrian War, the allegiance of these soldiers to him and their integration into the civic institutions of an allied city strengthened the Seleukid position on the Empire’s western frontier. But this does not explain exactly why Smyrna offered citizenship. It seems possible that the Smyrnaeans could have gained the allegiance of the *katoikoi* without granting them full political rights. After all, they were not Magnesian citizens in the first place. As is also demonstrated by a Milesian grant of citizenship to Cretan settlers, though, it seems that obtaining citizenship was an attractive reward for military settlers, and perhaps it was even more forceful when requesting a shift of allegiance to Seleukos and to Smyrna. Further, granting citizenship established the military settlers as a permanent presence that would strengthen the king and the city in the long term. Citizenship tied these settlers to their new home city, to its defense, and quite explicitly to the interests of its Seleukid ally. That Smyrna allowed this expansion of its prized citizenship is a tangible result of Hellenistic international politics.

A last section of this treaty provides even more detailed terms for the *Katoikoi* and a group of Persians granted citizenship alongside them. It follows:

C. The *Katoikoi* in Particular

... in order that they might maintain the alliance and good-will of King Seleucus; reckoning it to be necessary for the city to take over also the place Old Magnesia and to make a guardpost with it, in order that, with this taken over as well, all the important affairs might remain (solid) for King Seleucus, they (the *demos*) sent to those living in the place and called upon them to choose friendship toward King

Seleucus and to hand over the keys to the magistrate sent by the *demos* and to accept the guard-force which will join with them in maintaining the place for King Seleucus, promising that, if they do these things, they will have from the city all the kindnesses and noble things; ...

... with good fortune, be it resolved that they are to be citizens and to have all the same things the other citizens have, and that they are to have, free from the tithe, their allotments, the two which the god and savior Antiochus, granted them and about which Alexander has written; and if the territory, which the *katoikoi* who were previously in Magnesia hold, is joined to our city, they are to have the three allotments as a gift and are to keep their present freedom from taxes; and as many of them as are without allotments, (resolved) for a cavalryman's allotment to be given them from the (lands) located by the place; and Timon and the infantry under Timon, who have been assigned from the phalanx to the guard-force of the place, are to have citizenship and the same freedom from taxes [which] also the others have, and they are to be in the place; and Omanes, and the Persians under Omanes, and those sent from Smyrna to guard the place—Menekles and those under him—are to have citizenship and the other kindnesses which have been decreed also for the others from Magnesia, and the *demos* is to take thought as to how the drink and food allowances, and as many other things as used to be given to them from the royal treasury, may be given to them from the royal treasury

The first clauses of this section emphasize the loyalty of the *katoikoi*, in particular, to King Seleukos. The middle of this section discusses land-related privileges of the *katoikoi*. Vitaly, it reveals that the land of the *katoikoi* could be “joined to our city.” Presumably, these military settlers held land outside of Magnesian territory. Perhaps they worked nearby plots of Seleukid royal land, since they served the Seleukid king.⁶⁷ If they had occupied Magnesian land, it would make little sense to separately discuss the *prospect* of joining their plots to Smyrna; the annexation of Magnesian territory was a certainty in the *sympoliteia*. Holding Magnesian land would have also probably made the *katoikoi* Magnesian citizens, which does not seem to be the case. As discussed above, the property of citizens, the cults, and the state formed the territory of the *polis*. Upon becoming citizens of Smyrna, though, the land of the *katoikoi* became property of citizens,

⁶⁷ See Aperghis, 2004, Ch. 6.

and became outlying territory joined to Smyrna. Later in this investigation, a related question appears concerning a Seleukid grant of land to a royal official that is joined to Ilion.

The last notable aspect of this section is a peculiarity: the inclusion of a group of Persians in the citizenship grant. It is unique and runs contrary to frequent references of Greekness as a qualifier for citizenship in a Greek *polis*. Even in the second section of this inscription, there is a requirement for new Smyrnaean citizens to be “free and Greek.” These Persians are an explicit exception. These Persians, under a man named Omanes, are probably also military settlers, like the other *katoikoi* granted citizenship. They are a remnant of the legacy of the Achaemenid Persian Empire, which controlled the Near-East before Alexander’s conquests. Fingerson, in his article on the issue, states: “Omanes and the Persians... reflect an earlier Achaemenid practice that was adopted by Alexander and his successors and suggests that the Greco-Macedonian sources of manpower had been exhausted by the middle of the 3rd century.”⁶⁸

Persian elites and soldiers remained in the former Persian satrapies and Iranian influence remained potent even in the Seleukid court.⁶⁹ Even in Asia Minor, where Greek influence was strongest, kingdoms arose that were heavily influenced by Persian culture and royal tradition—Pontus, Armenia, and Cappadocia.⁷⁰ They may attest to a shortage of Greco-Macedonian soldiers in

⁶⁸ Fingerson, *Persian Katoikoi*, p. 120.

⁶⁹ See Seleukos I’s wife Apama, for example.

⁷⁰ Fingerson, *Persian Katoikoi*.

Asia, on whom the Seleukid kings traditionally relied.⁷¹ If there was going to be a violation of a Greekness requirement for citizenship, at least there was the consolation that the grantees were Persians, who also enjoyed prestige and privilege in the Hellenistic Near-East. Nonetheless, these Persians likely had little exposure to the political life of a Greek *polis* and integrating them into the civic institutions of Smyrna probably posed a considerable difficulty. The offer of citizenship to the Persians contradicts Classical and Hellenistic tradition. It was possible only with the involvement of the Seleukid king that is abundantly evident in this dossier of inscriptions. The Smyrnaeans remained in the good graces of Seleukos II and absorbed the territory of an entire other *polis*, but in return they accepted an alteration to tradition and to their identity of citizens of a *polis*.

The issue of granting citizenship to military settlers is not unique to Smyrna, though the grant within a *sympoliteia* decree is exceptional. Epigraphical evidence also documents a grant of citizenship from Miletos to a group of Cretans who are presumably military settlers. This investigation visits that grant in a later section, but the city of Miletos also engaged in several agreements of *sympoliteia*.

Miletos and Pidasia

Miletos and the other Ionian cities were within the reach of several Hellenistic dynasts. After the settlement following the Battle of Corupedium in 281, the city, along with much of western Asia Minor, fell under the sway of the Ptolemies.⁷² In 283/2 Antiochus I *Soter* was named *Stephanephoros*, the

⁷¹ Fingerson, *Persian Katoikoi*.

⁷² Errington, 134

eponymous magistrate of the city, in gratitude for ending the oppression of Lysimachos in the city.⁷³ By the 260s, during the Chremonidean War, a series of inscriptions documents correspondence between Miletos and King Ptolemy II.⁷⁴ Its citizens were required to swear an oath of adherence to this alliance and the city was granted privileges by the Ptolemaic king.⁷⁵ By the early 250s, though, Antiochos II Theos reasserted Seleukid influence in the city as he expelled the tyrant Timarchos from the city after the tyrant aided a Ptolemaic rebel.⁷⁶ Around 246, Seleukos II granted the city numerous privileges and likely declared the city free, citing its goodwill for his father Antiochos II and the dynasty's reverence for the Oracle of Apollo at Didyma within its territory.⁷⁷ The city had developed a warm relationship with the Seleukids by the late Third Century, but little is known of Seleukid involvement in Miletos after Seleukos II abandoned Asia Minor to Antiochos Hierax during a Seleukid civil war.⁷⁸ This period of the 230's to the 180's gives us an exceptional wealth of inscriptions concerning Milesian citizenship and diplomatic activity. The great-power warfare of the period involved fighting in Ionia, but Miletos was not known to be heavily involved.⁷⁹ The city seems to have conducted an independent foreign policy that used its

⁷³ Errington, 134; Milet I 3.122-128 <http://www.attalus.org/docs/sig1/s322.html#B>

⁷⁴ Derow 21, *Milet* I 3 139

⁷⁵ *Ibid*

⁷⁶ Antiochos II apparently gained his epithet "Theos" from the Milesians for this deed. See Appian *Syr.* 13.65; Justin, *Epitome of Pompeius Trogus* Prog. XXBI; *OGIS* 226 <http://www.attalus.org/docs/ogis/s226.html>

⁷⁷ Errington 133; *OGIS* 227 / Didyma 22 <http://www.attalus.org/docs/rc/s22.html>

⁷⁸ Errington 134-5

⁷⁹ See Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, pp. 152-4 for the potential for Antigonid and Ptolemaic influence in Miletos in the late third century.

citizenship as one powerful tool, among many, to strengthen its power and alliances.

Hellenistic Miletos expanded its power physically and diplomatically through the use of collective citizenship grants. Diplomatically, the Milesians enacted numerous *isopoliteia* agreements and territorially the Milesians expanded the bounds of their *polis* with the institution of *sympoliteia*. It makes sense to consider the motivations and practical impact of *sympoliteia* in a geopolitical sense. The absorption of one *polis* into another involves power, military, demographic, and diplomatic. Nonetheless, it is possible to discover details about citizenship from the stipulations and local administration of a *sympoliteia* agreement. Inscriptions and literary references reveal several *sympoliteiai* involving Miletos as a senior partner, including one with the town of Pidasas.

Pidasas was located close to Miletos, though Pidasas was traditionally a Karian settlement. About twenty miles to the Southeast, Pidasas was a minor *polis* in a volatile region where Miletos was one of the strongest local actors. Scholars have dated the *sympoliteia* agreement between Miletos and Pidasas to the years 188-186. This dating straddles the later edge of the scope of this investigation. In 190/89, an allied army under the Roman Consul Lucius Cornelius Scipio and Pergamene King Eumenes II had decisively defeated Antiochos III at the Battle of Magnesia. This pushed the Seleukid king out of Asia Minor, leaving a power vacuum that the Roman allies would only partly fill. If anything, it was Rhodian authority in Karia that the Pidasasians feared.⁸⁰ Nonetheless, Seleukid authority had

⁸⁰ Jeremy LaBuff, *Polis Expansion...* p. 99. Rhodes was allowed to expand its authority over much of Karia after acting as an ally of Rome and Pergamon in the war with Antiochos.

been banished from Asia Minor before, and the basic assumptions of the Eastern Mediterranean environment were not yet dramatically different from the Third Century.⁸¹ A climate of uncertainty, though, may have prompted the Pidaseans to seek protection from Miletos.

Selections from the agreement follow:

*Inscription 3: Miletos and Pidasa*⁸²

With good fortune. When Pasikles was stephanephoros, in the month of Anthesterion, the Milesians and Pidaseans agreed to and arranged the following... [*Milesian officials are named*]

The Pidaseans shall be [Milesian](#) citizens, as well as their children and any of their wives who are Pidaseans by birth or citizens of another [Greek](#) polis.

The men chosen by the Milesians shall produce a list of names in the council-hall, and those who are named in the list shall have a share in the sacred rites and offices and other things in which the rest of the Milesians have a share. (... continued below)

This stipulates the admission of the Pidaseans into the Milesian citizen body on an equal footing as the Milesians. One learns that some Pidaseans men were married to non-Pidasean women. One also learns that Greekness was a condition for the wives of Pidasean citizens for admission into Milesian citizenship. Membership in the world of Greek *poleis* seems to be a common condition for individual grants of citizenship, often simply denoted with a Greek ethnic, but in this case the requirement is expressed explicitly. The grant of a “share in the sacred rites and offices...” is similar to what is granted in an *isopoliteia* agreement, but in a *sympoliteia* agreement these rights and privileges

⁸¹ For more information on the interstate environment of the Second Century Mediterranean, see Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East*, 2008 or Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, 1984. Eckstein places the critical point in the rise of Rome in the East towards the year 170 upon its defeat of the Antigonid King Perseus.

⁸² I.Milet 3.149; translation at http://www.attalus.org/docs/other/inscr_107.html

are actualized, rather than potential. What is conspicuously absent from this section is an assignment of the Pidaseans to Milesian tribes, suggesting that the Pidasean *demos* survived within the *sympoliteia*.⁸³ This is a significant concession for the Pidaseans, since it preserves a community of Pidasean citizens and some degree of self-identity. The inscription continues:

...The Milesians shall send to Pidasa a citizen chosen by lot as commander and garrison soldiers, as many as seem to be sufficient, and they shall make sure that the walls are maintained and remain in the land, and shall take care of the defense of the city, as they deem beneficial. (... continued below)

This implies that the settlement at Pidasa is to remain occupied, if under the protection of a Milesian garrison. The garrison and its Milesian commander demonstrate full Milesian control of Pidasa and its former territory.

Of the exports which are produced in the territory of the Pidaseans, the olive oil shall be exempt from the taxes that the Milesians enforce ... and when the aforementioned time has passed, the Pidaseans shall pay the same taxes in Miletos, just as the rest of the Milesians do. (... continued below)

The people of Miletos shall give dwellings for up to 390 beds to the Pidaseans who have resided and have remained until now in Pidasa or its territory.

It may seem logical to assume that this means individuals would not remain in Pidasa, but other provisions of the agreement make clear that some Pidaseans did remain. An alternative reading is that this was another Milesian concession to the Pidaseans: those Pidaseans who wanted to live in Miletos after the *sympoliteia* would be housed.⁸⁴ Others would remain in Pidasa.

The Pidaseans shall tend their existing property ... and when the aforementioned time has passed, they shall pay the same taxes as the Milesians do. ...

The Pidaseans who will be enrolled shall be free from liturgies for ten years, starting from the year when Philides is stephanephoros.

⁸³ Jeremy LaBuff, *Polis Expansion...* p. 99.

⁸⁴ This is the view of Jeremy LaBuff, *Polis Expansion...* p. 100.

...

It shall be permitted for those Pidaseans, who will be enrolled in the citizenship and who possess land in the territory of Euromos, to transport from the existing wine harvest in their private property up to 1000 *metrētai*, from the month of Poseideon during the year when Philides is *stephanephoros*, paying as tax a *chalkous* for all time, after those who possess land in the territory of Euromos have been recorded in the archive of the council.

The Milesians shall build a road passable for carts that leads from the territory of Pidasa to Ioniapolis.

The Pidaseans who have been enrolled previously shall have a share in the same things as all Pidaseans, except for the exemption from liturgies. (... continued below)

This implies that there were some Pidaseans who had already received Milesian citizenship. One can speculate whether these are migrants or individuals who have been granted citizenship as an honor, but the removal of the liturgy exemption for these individuals suggests migrants—there would be little reason to cancel the exemption if they had not become established Milesian citizens. The building of a road to the port of Ioniapolis is another indication that some of the Pidaseans meant to remain in their city. It would be worthless to build the road if the Pidaseans were going to abandon their settlement.

The other things set down in the decree, which was written about what is fitting for the *sympoliteia*, shall be valid and they shall be fulfilled, just as has been agreed on when the Pidaseans offered us their city, its territory, and the public revenue from them.

The *stephanephoros* with the sacred herald shall administer an oath to the envoys of the Pidaseans who have come, and to the *prytaneis* and the men chosen for the protection of the city and the appointed councillors, using the following oath: "I will forever abide by what has been agreed on and recorded, and I will not transgress it by any device or contrivance nor will I tolerate anyone who does transgress the arrangement, and if I learn that someone else has chosen to transgress the agreements, I will not tolerate him as far as is in my power, but I will expose him to the council and the people. This is the truth, by Hestia Boulaia

and the other gods. And may I prosper if I should uphold my oath, but if I should break my oath, may I be destroyed, together with my property."

The other Pidaseans who are resident and are of age shall also swear this same oath in Pidasas, swearing in addition by the gods who inhabit their city.

Whoever does not abide by the things set down in this arrangement shall be deemed unjust to the gods by whom they have sworn; and those not abiding by the arrangement shall pay a fine of thirty talents to those who do abide by it.

For the purposes of this investigation, the relevant issue in this agreement is the status and identity of the Pidaseans within their new *sympoliteia*. It seems that, in return for agreeing to be effectively absorbed into Miletos peacefully, the Pidaseans have drawn numerous concessions that preserve their identity and some independent status as Pidaseans. The question of Pidasean citizenship within the *sympoliteia* demonstrates how that institution was malleable but also highly valuable and connected to civic pride. Forming a separate group within the Milesian *demos*, the Pidaseans must have enjoyed some sub-citizenship within the Milesian *poleis* after the *sympoliteia*. An immediately available comparison would be the Federal Leagues, in which individuals could enjoy citizenship in their own *polis* and a separate federal citizenship that gave rights in other federal cities, but the Milesian *polis* was not a federal league and Pidasas was no longer a self-governing *polis*.

Perhaps, a more apt comparison would be the local deme councils in the Classical Athenian *polis*, in which local subdivisions of Attica governed themselves within the larger city-state. Nonetheless, the result is a separate identity and different sort of citizenship for the Pidaseans within a larger Miletos. This type of arrangement is not guaranteed—in the more one-sided case of Smyrna and Magnesia discussed above, the treaty merely places the new citizens

into Smyrnaean tribes by lot. Pidasas was not powerless before Milesian authority, so it could preserve some of its autonomy on more equal terms.

Miletos and Myus

In a rare case, a literary source presents an instance of *sympoliteia*, one between Miletos and Myus. The event dates to the Third Century. Like Miletos, Myus was an Ionian *polis*. The Roman-era geographer Strabo mentions the political union in passing in Book 14 of his *Geography*.⁸⁵ He reports that Miletos incorporated Myus into itself on account of Myus' sparse population.⁸⁶ This quick reference does not reveal anything remarkable about *sympoliteia* in Hellenistic times, and the agreed-upon details of the merger have not survived. Whether because of the silting of the Meander River delta or in a general move towards consolidation in larger settlements, it must have made sense for both the Milesians and Myesians to join Myus to the larger Milesian *polis*. For the institution of citizenship, this *sympoliteia* is interesting because epigraphical evidence for Myesian identity within the synoecized Milesian *polis* is available.

The inscription of interest documents the Myesians honoring an individual named Apollonios Metrophanes, a Milesian official. The Myesians honor Apollonios for dedicating silver to the temple of Apollo Terminus.⁸⁷ A Milesian officials-list shows that Apollodoros son of Metrophanes was *stephanephoros*, the city's eponymous archon, in 212/11.⁸⁸ The Myesian

⁸⁵ Strabo, *Geography* 14.10

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Mack, 2015 p. 22; Syll 332.

⁸⁸ Syll. 332 <http://www.attalus.org/docs/sig1/s322.html>

inscription in question is dated to the same time. It honors Apollodoros, a Milesian (presumably not a Myesian Milesian) without an ethnic. This is abnormal for a city honoring a foreigner—in the vast number of honorary inscriptions that survive from the Hellenistic Period a foreigner is always named with his *ethnikon*. Omitting the ethnic is conspicuous and it implies that Apollodoros is a citizen of the honoring community.⁸⁹ Because of the *sympoliteia* between Miletos and Myus, Apollodoros is not exactly a foreigner. The terms of his honor in Myus, though, are not typical of an honor for a member of the local community.⁹⁰ In Gary Reger’s words: “as a Milesian, he is at once a fellow-citizen and a foreigner.”⁹¹

There are several other instances where ethnic demonyms are conspicuously absent for honored individuals in *poleis* that have executed a *sympoliteia*. In Karia, there was a *sympoliteia* enacted between the cities of Mylasa and Olymos, where Mylasa essentially absorbed Olymos.⁹² Some of the relevant inscriptions are unpublished, but Reger reports that decrees from the Olymean *demos* after its mid-Third Century *sympoliteia* with Mylasa begin to report the Mylasean eponymous archon at their beginning.⁹³ He also reports that the Olymean tribes were subsumed into Mylasean *syngeneiai*, a Mylasean civic subdivision of citizens.⁹⁴ The most striking feature of this *sympoliteia*, however, is the persistence of an Olymean citizenship. Three Olymean decrees exist from the

⁸⁹ Mack, 2015 p. 222.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Reger, 166-167. See also Mack, 2015 p. 222.

⁹² Reger, 165.

⁹³ Ibid; Reger cites I.Mylasa 861 as an example.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

period after the *sympoliteia* that grant citizenship to individuals whose names are given, as in the case of Miletos and Myus, without an ethnic.⁹⁵ One inscription references individuals “who have become Olymeans,” indicating that the Olymean *demos* granted its citizenship somewhat regularly after the *sympoliteia*.⁹⁶ The Olymean citizens assembly (*ekklesia*) continued to meet and Olymos continued to administer its temples.⁹⁷ The citizens of the absorbed city continued to maintain a separate identity.

The issue of self-identity is so relevant to cases of *sympoliteia* because they oversaw the mass registration of new citizens in an already existing *polis*. *Sympoliteia* was a tool that operated under extraordinary circumstances—wars or royal directives for example—and made fundamental revisions to the structure of a *polis*. Extraordinary circumstances and fundamental changes sometimes demanded that *poleis* break with traditions related to citizenship. The institution of *isopoliteia*, another form of collective citizenship grant, did not always necessitate fundamental change to the citizen body, and often reflected the more traditional nature of citizenship. The city of Miletos also used the institution of *isopoliteia* extensively, along with *sympoliteia*.

⁹⁵ *I.Mylasa 876* is one example.

⁹⁶ Reger, 167.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

Isopoliteia: Miletos and Potential Citizenship

Miletos

Numerous Hellenistic inscriptions from the Ionian city of Miletos concerning its *isopoliteia* with other *poleis* of Asia Minor and the Aegean are particularly interesting to this investigation. This investigation will examine treaties with the cities of Kios, Seleukia-Tralles, and a group of Cretan military settlers, but others do exist. As explored above, Miletos used collective grants of citizenship extensively in the Hellenistic Period. Acts of *sympoliteia* merged the citizen bodies of other *poleis* into Miletos, while the acts of *isopoliteia* presented below offer citizenship to groups of individuals on a potential basis. Several Milesian inscriptions will follow in chronological order, dating from the second half of the third century and early second century.

A treaty of *isopoliteia* between Miletos and Kios is the earliest of this series. Kios was a Greek city in the region of Bithynia, located on the shores of the Propontis 200 miles to the North and East of Miletos. Archaic Miletos apparently founded Kios as a colony, making it one of the many *poleis* that called Miletos its ‘Mother City.’⁹⁸ The inscription of *isopoliteia* is dated to 228 and concerns Kian religious offerings and offers extension of Milesian citizenship to those Kians who wished to gain it. A translated selection from the inscription follows:

⁹⁸ This colonization is mentioned in the inscription below.

*Inscription 4: Miletos and Kios*⁹⁹

As they proposed: since the Kians, who are colonists of our city and have maintained their friendship towards our people, have sent the *hieropoioi* Nikandros and Philippides bearing a decree, in which they describe the wars that have oppressed their territory and the expenses arising from these wars, they ask to be relieved from donating the *phialae*, which they still owe to the god, as many as possible ... and have explained the marks of kinship and the privileges given in Kios both publicly to the city of Miletos and privately to those Milesians who come there ...

For the future, the people think that the offerings to the gods should remain as agreed by our ancestors. Citizenship shall be given to the Kians, as the *hieropoioi* mentioned, so that the people may be seen even more to retain their kinship with the Kians and to act in accordance with the policy of their ancestors. The *prytaneis* shall take care that the privileges agreed by the people should be granted to those Kians who choose to share in our citizenship; and the *prytaneis* shall allot them to tribes, if the Kians testify in a decree that they are their citizens. The people request that the Kians, recalling these privileges given to them, should retain their piety towards the god and should enhance their kinship with us even more, in accordance with the policy of their ancestors. For in that way they will be even more sure to receive every kindness from the people, and in no way will they be left lacking what is advantageous to them, just as happened in previous times.

...

A kinship connection is vital to the close connection between the Milesians and Kians. This connection provides justification for *isopoliteia* and warm diplomatic relations between the communities. At least symbolically, it allows Miletos to offer its citizenship to another city. Collective citizenship grants often note preexisting kinship connections, as also shown between Miletos and Crete or Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles.¹⁰⁰ Before the *isopoliteia* grant is introduced, the text emphasizes that, to the Milesians the Kians are “colonists of

⁹⁹ I.Milet 3.141, translation from http://www.attalus.org/docs/other/inscr_108.html

¹⁰⁰ This investigation visits both instances.

our city.”¹⁰¹ More directly relevant to citizenship, the Milesians state that the grant will allow them to “retain their kinship with the Kians and to act in accordance with the policy of their ancestors.” Later, the decree states that the *isopoliteia* grant will “enhance” the kinship connection “even more.” This is an ideological justification for an extension of citizenship. As citizenship was given to the children of citizens, the Milesians may extend this idea to admit into their citizenship the ancestors of the Milesians who colonized Kios in the Archaic past.

While the citizens of the Greek *poleis* rarely retained administrative authority over colonies founded by their ancestors, the connection of kinship could remain strong enough to ideologically qualify a colony for *isopoliteia* with its mother-city. When no colonial relationship existed, references to Myth could substitute, but the colonial relationship made it easier. There is no conclusive evidence that colonies *always* held the right of potential citizenship in the mother-city. If they did, there would be little sense in explicitly granting *isopoliteia*.¹⁰² Additionally, such an institutionalized international (potential) citizenship regime would be quite out of place in the Hellenistic Period outside of the Federal Leagues. Nonetheless, a kinship connection could provide a potent ideological justification for a citizenship grant, even when geopolitical dynamics were more often the practical motivator of events.

¹⁰¹ On obligations of the Kians to their mother-city of Miletus, see the rest of this inscription concerning the Kian request to skip sending an offering of a silver bowl to the Sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma due to the wars referenced earlier. See A.Chaniotis, "War in the Hellenistic World", p 122 for a discussion of this.

¹⁰² Thank you to Professor Hirsch for this extremely logical thought.

At a surface level this inscription documents a unilateral decree of *isopoliteia* by the Milesians for Kios, though Sara Saba argues that for the Kians, the principal purpose of their diplomatic mission was relief from a religious financial burden associated with the *phialae*, a donation sent to the temple of Apollo in Didyma, a Panhellenic sanctuary controlled by Miletos.¹⁰³ In this view, the grant of potential citizenship is subordinate to the request for remission of the *phialae*.¹⁰⁴ Regardless of whether the grant was truly subordinate, the diplomatic nature of the inscribed agreement is clear enough. Saba describes the clause granting Milesian citizenship, in particular, as a “concession that would compensate for any unsuccessful results of a mission by establishing an even stronger tie between communities.”¹⁰⁵ Indeed, the Milesians do not relieve the Kians of their *phialae* obligation. It must “remain as agreed by our ancestors.” Accordingly, the grant of *isopoliteia* does serve this purpose as compensation in the form of a positive diplomatic gesture. This does not diminish the significance of the grant of Milesian citizenship, but it does suggest that the primary intention of the cities was not to establish a system of immigration from Kios to Miletos. As an outcome of the Kian failure to extract the desired concession—relief from *phialae*—though, the Milesians do make it easier for Kians to inhabit Miletos.

The clause requiring that individual Kians who wished to become Milesian citizens obtain proof of their citizenship from Kios suggests that the *poleis* did intend to create a process for immigration. A Kian may apply only “if

¹⁰³ Saba 56-57

¹⁰⁴ Saba 57

¹⁰⁵ Saba 58

the Kians testify in a decree that they are their citizen.” This process is on a case-by-case basis, though, and it would require a serious effort on the part of a Kian if he or she hoped to emigrate. Gawantka has suggested that this provision existed in order to deter Kians from migrating to Miletos, since they would, in effect, need permission to emigrate from the body of Kian citizens.¹⁰⁶ The warm relations outlined in this inscription, however, do not suggest that the Kians would take much issue if one of their citizens wanted to immigrate to closely-allied Miletos. Either way, if the agreement made immigrating difficult for Kians, it was clearly still possible.

While it does not force or necessarily encourage Kians to become Milesians, there is a procedure described by which an individual Kian citizen may become a Milesian citizen if he pleases. It is not the case in the reverse—the grant is unilateral. A unilateral grant of *isopoliteia* is somewhat atypical, since usually two cities grant potential citizenship to each other.¹⁰⁷ The immediate explanation for the lack of reciprocation is the circumstance of the grant. *Isopoliteia* is a consolation for the primary Kian request. A Kian grant of *isopoliteia* to the Milesians does not serve a logical function within that dynamic. One could also speculate about the colonial relationship between Miletos and Kios—perhaps potential citizenship in the wealthy and powerful Miletos was more coveted than in the smaller colony. This seems unlikely, since many reciprocal *isopoliteia* agreements exist between cities of varying sizes.¹⁰⁸ Or perhaps as the mother city,

¹⁰⁶ Saba, 57; See Gawantka 1975, p. 159, n. 148

¹⁰⁷ See Saba or later cases of *isopoliteia* in this section.

¹⁰⁸ Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles, for example.

the Milesians already enjoyed privileges in Kios. While the decree does provide details, the ambassadors reportedly mentioned “the marks of kinship and the privileges given in Kios both publicly to the city of Miletos and privately to those Milesians who come there.”

Given this diplomatic context, what did a grant of potential citizenship do for a Kian in Miletos? From a surface-level read of a translated *isopoliteia* decree, the institution may seem to grant Milesian citizenship to all Kians without strings attached. Such a reading even suggests the possibility of dual citizenship between *poleis*. From the inscription one can gather, at least, that the grant was only on a case-by-case basis. It is very important to note the potentiality of *isopoliteia*. For good reason, Saba calls the institution “potential citizenship.” Potential citizenship is the only status shared by this grant. A Kian granted potential citizenship by this decree holds a status as a potential citizen in Miletos, but he is not a citizen of Miletos until he decides to actualize his potential citizenship. This is the view of Saba. And in this view, to actualize potential citizenship would have required that the individual perform whatever actions a naturalized immigrant had to perform normally, probably including the revocation of one’s old citizenship.

Of course, if actualized, Milesian citizenship offered immigrants a wide array of rights and privileges. Exemption from Milesian taxes, the right to own land in Milesian territory, the right to own a house in Miletos, and the right to participate in its government are typically reserved for citizens. The procedures by which Kios must confirm the citizenship of any Kians who desire Milesian

citizenship, and by which the Milesian *prytaneis* allots those individuals a Milesian tribe suggests that there was an expectation that some Kians would act upon this grant. Perhaps amid a period of instability and violence in the region surrounding Kios, the option to migrate to Miletos was particularly valuable.¹⁰⁹ Nonetheless, promoting a large outflow of citizens from their city would be nonsensical for the Kians. This was a time when Kios needed to strengthen itself, and promoting outmigration would do the opposite. Further, the purpose of the original Kian embassy was not to seek immigration rights. In this way, *isopoliteia* was a diplomatic tool that both parties probably did not view as a means to regulate immigration.

Nonetheless, the combination of the procedures outlined and this understanding of the motives behind the grant of *isopoliteia* demonstrates the value that Miletos and Kios held in regulating their citizen-bodies. It is regulated on both sides—Kios authorizes the legitimacy of one of its citizens and Miletos still accepts and processes new immigrants on a case-by-case basis. The decree is not an open immigration policy, but it derives its diplomatic value in the pride, symbolic and otherwise, of citizenship. Even citizenship, in its potential form, was a potent symbolic reward for Kios.

Miletos and the Cretan Settlers

¹⁰⁹ By the end of the Century the city would actually be sacked by Philip V and eventually handed to Prusias of Bithynia, so their fears were not unfounded. Prusias would rename the city after himself—Prusias by the Sea.

The following inscription documents a grant of citizenship to a group of Cretan military settlers by Miletos in the 220s. The document either dates to 229/228 or 223/222, a time of Seleukid revival in western Asia Minor. The grant makes references to diplomacy between Miletos and the Cretans, but the origins of this particular group are unknown. It is difficult to place this decree into the category of *isopoliteia* or *sympoliteia*, since its scope is somewhat unique. A selection follows:

*Inscription 5: Miletos and Cretan Settlers*¹¹⁰

[since] familiarity and kinship exists between us and the Cretans, [starting from the god], and there is also a treaty with them, which the people has maintained from the time of our fathers, ... as was fitting for those who took the beginning of their kinship [from the] god, ... it determined also in accordance with what was really advantageous [to each party] and following . . . (continued below)

In the opening words of this inscription are references to the relationship between Miletos and Crete. These references demonstrate a kinship relationship and hint at the role the grant of citizenship plays on a diplomatic plane. As with the grant of *isopoliteia* to Kios, kinship is integral to qualifying the Cretans for a grant of citizenship. For the Cretans, the notion of kinship with the Milesians originates in the mythological past. It is “starting from the god,” but “maintained in the time of our fathers.” Diplomatically, the relationship is difficult to parse. Also as in other *isopoliteia* agreements, there is reference to treaties in the past, at least providing some diplomatic framing for the grant of citizenship. It is unclear which Cretan state this treaty refers to, though. Perhaps it is the city of origin of

¹¹⁰ http://www.attalus.org/docs/other/inscr_182.html I.Milet 3.37

these settlers, or perhaps it is the Cretan *koinon*.¹¹¹ It is difficult to find diplomatic purpose in this decree, but it follows the framework of *isopoliteia* in placing a grant of citizenship in the context of warm diplomatic relations.

. . . therefore so that the people [may meet the needs of those who wish to take citizenship] with the Milesians . . . received [a response of the god] in agreement with its plans, with [good] fortune it is decreed by the Milesians that to those who have sent messages [about] citizenship, whose names have been sealed up . . . [in accordance with the] previous decree, there shall be granted a share in [citizenship at Miletos, and in the sacred rites] and the magistracies and all the other rights which [are shared by the other Milesians; and in order that] all this may be arranged with the . . . favour of the gods, the prophet and the treasurer in attendance at the temple shall perform a [sacrifice] to Apollo Didymeus, and the *stephanephoros* shall perform a sacrifice to Apollo Delphinios, and the priests and the *prytaneis* and those chosen for the defense of the city shall perform sacrifices to Hestia Boulaia and to Zeus Boulaios, praying that the distribution of citizenship may contribute to the safety and concord of all the Milesians; and so that what has been decreed may remain fixed for all time, after [the distribution] it shall not be permitted for anyone who has received a share in citizenship [to go to law against any of the] citizens [about any matter], but [they shall remain] on familiar and [friendly] terms [with the citizens and] the magistrates, and [they shall abide] by the decrees of the people . . . (continued below)

This section reveals more about the inspiration for the grant of citizenship, demonstrates the civic ritual surrounding a grant of citizenship, and hints at concerns the Milesians had about expanding their citizen body. The civic ritual is most clear. Milesian officials performs sacrifices to attain the “favour of the gods” for the grant of citizenship. This demonstrates the sanctity of citizenship within the close connection between civic institutions and religion. The reference to a group of individuals who sent messages to the Milesians about citizenship reveals that part of the initiative came from the Cretan settlers. Their names of those who

¹¹¹ For a treatment of Hellenistic Crete, see Chaniotis, Angelos. 1996. *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

wanted citizenship are “sealed up.” This makes clear that one party is the Milesians, and the other party is a group of individuals, not in the form of a *polis*. Despite the presence of a diplomatic framing, the involvement of a group of individuals, rather than another *polis*, differentiates this grant from instances of *isopoliteia*.

The request for “concord” among citizens and the prohibition for these new citizens to go to court against other Milesians reveals some of the Milesian concerns with admitting a group of new citizens into their citizen body. The inscription does not state what the time limit on this provision was, if there was one. This is a distinction that makes the naturalized Cretans second class citizens in Miletos, even though they are explicitly granted a share in Milesian citizenship on par with the other Milesians in the same decree. It may reflect a Milesian concern that the Cretans would go to court against the Milesians for past slights (before the Cretans became citizens), or it may reflect a desire to limit the political rights of a group whose loyalty to Miletos was yet unproven. In decrees of *sympoliteia*, there were often provisions concerning the identity of newly-absorbed citizens. Here, one sees a similar concern over regulating a group of newly admitted citizens within the wider citizen body. It is not a concern that *isopoliteia* agreements typically address.

The *prytaneis* shall also allot [them] to the tribes that the people indicates . . . they shall be able to obtain official posts in defense of the city and as commander of the guard after the passage of twenty years; they shall remain free from official duties {*liturgies*} for five years from the [year] after the year when Protagoras was *stephanephoros*, and [also] the assessors shall conduct the sale of the contract to collect the harbour dues, on condition that the buyers [of the contract

will exempt] from taxation any of those [enrolled as] citizens who import anything

The nature of this decree is local and practical rather than diplomatic and ideological. This is an instance where citizenship grant was used outside of an institutionalized diplomatic tool like *isopoliteia* or *sympoliteia*. The parties to this decree are the Milesian *polis* and a group of individuals, rather than two *poleis*. The Cretans are almost certainly mercenaries, and this is a procedure to integrate a large number of them safely and effectively into the Milesian citizen body for demographic and military reasons.¹¹² Temporarily ignoring the problem of classifying this grant into an institutionalized tool, it is worth asking what the function of citizenship was for the Cretans granted it and for the Milesians granting it.

First, why was citizenship an appropriate reward? This is a simpler question; Citizenship offered these Cretans a means to participate in Milesian government and prosper in its society. The grant does not explicitly list the rights that constituted Milesian citizenship, but they would include the right to own land and a house, the right to conduct trade, and the right to participate in the assembly, courts, sacred rituals, and magistracies. By the Hellenistic Period, some of the economic rights could have been granted on an individual basis to foreigners without citizenship, but the participation in government was something unique to citizens.¹¹³ With two exceptions, the Cretans would not be second-class

¹¹² see A. Chaniotis, "War in the Hellenistic World", p. 105 (Google Books) for the number of mercenaries.

¹¹³ On the granting of economic rights separately from citizenship, see Muller, *Deconstructing Politeia*.

citizens in Miletos, but more or less equal to native Milesians in rights and participation. In return, Miletos' increased manpower presumably strengthened its defense and local influence amid the period of instability and violence of the later third century. The Cretans are exempted from harbor dues and other economic rights are granted to them with their citizenship grant, most importantly the right to own land in the territory of the *polis*.

Considering that cities sometimes did grant economic privileges to foreigners without granting citizenship, it is curious that the Milesians chose to give these Cretans full, participatory, citizenship rather than the status of resident alien with economic rights. A few explanations seem plausible. First, perhaps the right of land ownership was too fundamental to citizenship to grant it to foreigners, without integrating them into the citizen body. The *polis* was supposed to be composed of the households of its citizens, including their land and property, so it would be a problem to have a large group of individuals owning *polis* land who were not citizens. Second is the question of participation. Property rights would have given the Cretans a stake in the success of the Milesian state and participation in the courts, assembly, and magistracies gave them a stake in the running of that state. The Milesians may have seen this as a way to build trust, goodwill, and patriotism among the new citizens, and the Cretans may have demanded it as a condition for settling in Milesian territory. This is a testament to the value citizenship held as a draw to the Cretans, and as a tool for the Milesians to strengthen their city.

It is also worth further discussing the exact political status of those Cretans granted Milesian citizenship. While the document emphasizes that they were to receive equal citizenship in Miletos, there are a few notable restrictions placed upon their political activities. Already mentioned was the prohibition of the new citizens using the courts against fellow citizens. The other restrictions concerned eligibility for military positions in the city, positions which the newly enfranchised Cretans were not allowed to hold for twenty years. These restrictions contradict the notion that citizenship in the Hellenistic *polis* was always a precisely delimited institution—in this case there are rights held by native Milesians not held by naturalized immigrants. There was not full equality.

Limiting service in military offices was a disconnect from a fundamental aspect of membership in the Hellenistic *polis*. Hellenistic city-states maintained citizen-militias for defense, even as Hellenistic kingdoms dominated the broader international stage.¹¹⁴ Hellenistic cities probably did not limit their defense to citizens—clearly mercenaries were active as well and the armies of the kingdoms also provided security—but it was a role of the citizen to serve. The restrictions on military office-holding limit the role certain citizens could play in military matters. It seems there was some doubt in the trustworthiness of the newly enfranchised Cretan settlers, and it resulted in an alteration of fundamental rights and responsibilities of citizenship: office holding and defense, alongside the restriction in the courts. Another explanation may be the Milesians giving the new citizens time to become better integrated into the culture and traditions of the

¹¹⁴ See Ma, *Fighting Poleis* for a discussion of Hellenistic militias.

community. This explanation still connects to self-identity of the Cretans within the *polis* and trust among the citizen body. The military restriction was marginal and temporary, but it is nonetheless notable.

Other statements in the decree emphasize the importance of trust within the citizen-body. The new citizens were to always remain on “familiar and [friendly] terms [with the citizens and] the magistrates” and to always abide by the decrees of the people. A Milesian citizen was trusted to act in a certain way towards the interest of the city. These statements imply a citizen body that was meant to look out for its fellow citizens collectively and act in harmony with common goals. This parallels Weimer’s statement that in the Hellenistic city, “Being a citizen is equated with participation in the decision-making process in the general assembly and in the law courts, with service and devotion to the public good, and with obedience to the laws and decrees passed by the assembly of the people.”¹¹⁵

In a broader sense, this grant of citizenship and the special provisions restricting office formed an instance of an unorthodox use of the institution of citizenship. As with the *sympoliteia* between Smyrna, Magnesia, and the military settlers, an unorthodox use of citizenship demonstrates how the *polis* treated the institution when faced with the circumstances of the Hellenistic period. For this grant there are parallels in *sympoliteia* and in *isopoliteia*. Likewise, the Milesians chose an unorthodox way to cautiously expand the citizenship of their *polis* as a means to bolster their defenses against the Hellenistic states operating in western

¹¹⁵ Weimer, *Hellenistic Cities*. p. 57-58.

Asia Minor. Both adapt the institution of citizenship in innovative ways in response to external pressures. Nonetheless, the Milesians still justify this grant of citizenship in traditional terms.

Without disputing the Milesian belief in a shared kinship with the Cretans, the presence of this reasoning as an introduction to the grant of citizenship suggests that the Milesians felt a need to provide a traditionally valid reason to give Cretan mercenaries citizenship. Military and demographic necessity were not adequate. Present in most decrees of *isopoliteia*, a notion of shared kinship apparently was a valid reason. The kinship shared between Miletos and the Cretans is even more dubious than the distant but direct connection between Miletos and its colony of Kios—there is no specification even of the Cretan city or cities from which these mercenaries came.¹¹⁶ The notion of kinship is a remnant of diplomatic nicety found in other grants of citizenship. The Milesians must have felt it necessary to include this, even in an atypical non-diplomatic grant of citizenship to a body of mercenaries. Even if temporal concerns dictated the more liberal granting of citizenship, what some scholars may call a degradation of the institution, the idea of expanding citizenship to unrelated individuals may have remained taboo for the Greeks outside of a few special cases.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ By the third century the word “Cretan” was sometimes even used as a label for archers regardless of origin, although it does appear that the inscription is referencing the islanders here given the reference to shared kinship. See Fingerson, *Persian Katoikoi*, p. 119

¹¹⁷ For a broad view on changes in city-state institutions, see J.K. Davies, “The Polis Transformed and Revitalized” in *The Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. VII.

Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles

The following inscription documents an instance of *isopoliteia* between Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles dated to 218/17. Seleukia-Tralles was a *polis* located on the border of Karia and Ionia. Xenophon report that it was in Karia, and Diodorus Siculus reports it was Ionian.¹¹⁸ Nonetheless, it was not far from Miletos. Originally named Tralles, the Seleukid King Antiochos I renamed the city Seleukia, after his father.¹¹⁹ During the later third century, the city probably reverted to calling itself Tralles, but the history of the *polis* in the third century is poorly understood.¹²⁰ A selection follows:

*Inscription 6: Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles*¹²¹

A (Milesian Decree):

... [to explain] in detail [the good attitude] that they have towards the populace [of Miletos, and because they wish] also to honour Apollo Didymeus, to whom they trace [the origin] of their kinship with our city, [they have] voted [to send] *theoroi* ...

So that the *demos* shows that it sees with favor those who have behaved piously toward the god and with benevolence toward the city and that it grants them what is of value to it, it was decreed by the Milesians that the Seleukeians be praised for their attitude and that they be put under the care of the *boule* and the *demos*, and also that we accept the honors that have been decreed by them with benevolence. (17) (Also, it was decreed that) citizenship shall be granted to the Seleukeians who live in their homeland and city Seleukeia up to the year of the *stephanephoros* Epikrates and the month Taureon. If some have been granted citizenship by decision of the *demos*, but do not live in the city of the Seleukeians, or in case citizenship is granted to anyone after this (deadline), they shall also have our citizenship after they have inhabited Seleukeia as homeland

¹¹⁸ *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, p. 1135; Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.19; Diod. 14.36.2. Tralles was not one of the 12 cities of the Classical Ionian League and the *Inventory* groups the city into Karia. It was supposedly an Argive colony and its location on the border of Karia and Ionia gave it a particularly strong connection to the Hellenic world.

¹¹⁹ Saba, *Isopoliteia*, p. 60 cites Ma, 2002 ch. 2

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* The city was certainly called Tralles again after 188, when the Romans drove Antiochos III from Asia Minor.

¹²¹ Saba, *Isopoliteia*, p. 60

and city for ten years starting from (the time of) their enrollment in the citizen body. (continued below...)

Like the two above decrees of Miletos granting citizenship to Cretan settlers and potential citizenship to the Kians, this inscription uses kinship to justify a grant of citizenship. As in other decrees of *isopoliteia*, a declaration of common kinship between the two signatories precedes the grant of potential citizenship. Other decrees reference kinship relationships between a mother-city and its colony, particularly with Miletos, but this inscription references shared kinship originating with the god Apollo Didymeus. Regardless of whether the Milesians and Seleukians believed their ancestry with the god was literal, a notion of common kinship through a divine being is more far-fetched than an invocation of the ties of colonization or semi-mythical migration.¹²² All three could be fictional, but the different attempts to form kinship connections are notable.

This first section also hits at grants of citizenship by decree in Seleukia outside of this grant of *isopoliteia*. The inscription requires that individuals granted citizenship in Seleukia-Tralles “by a decree of the people” have lived in Seleukia “as their fatherland” for ten years if they are to qualify for potential Milesian citizenship. It is no surprise that citizenship was sometimes granted by decree in Hellenistic *poleis*—countless inscriptions describing this phenomenon exist.¹²³ The difficulty regarding these individual grants is understanding what they meant for the grantee if he did not immigrate to the granting city.

¹²² See Miletus and Kians

¹²³ To cite a few from Miletos: Milet VI,3 1055; Milet I 3, 32a; Milet I 3, 39

The inscription makes clear that some individuals granted Seleukian citizenship did not live in Seleukia. There is an implication that individuals could continue to live in another community but enjoy some form of honorary (potential?) citizenship in Seleukia-Tralles. This is one instance where it would be easy to declare the existence of dual citizenship between *poleis*. Some scholars are adamant that a notion of dual citizenship may have been “inconceivable” to the Greeks.¹²⁴ This seems the same problem as with understanding a grant of *isopoliteia*: *isopoliteia* was really a grant of potential citizenship. Perhaps the grants of citizenship to individuals who lived in foreign cities were also potential. They held the right to *politeia* in Seleukia, but they were not acting citizens until they chose to actualize that right and become enrolled in the citizen body.¹²⁵ In other words, being granted the right to citizenship was not the same as becoming a citizen.

But evidently, Miletos saw those who had moved and held Seleukia-Tralles “as their fatherland” for ten years as holding the legitimate form of citizenship, one which qualified them for isopolity. This seems a more concrete problem of trust and citizenship that arises in several of the cases in this investigation.¹²⁶ Perhaps new immigrants to Seleukia-Tralles could not be trusted to be as friendly to the Milesians without integrating into the Seleukian citizen-body. It is also possible that this provision closed a loophole that would have

¹²⁴ Saba, 16; See O. Picard 2012, p. 342 on dual citizenship

¹²⁵ From this inscription “enrollment in the citizen body” is a clear marker of actualizing a citizenship grant. This would involve being allotted to a tribe and phratry.

¹²⁶ Such as the case of Cretans naturalized into Milesian citizenship not being able to hold military office for ten years.

allowed an individual to migrate to Miletos by migrating first to Seleukia-Tralles as an intermediary. Both possibilities could be true.

(The Milesian decree continues...)

Those who decide to live with us as citizens and (24) partake in (our) sacred (practices) and magistracies and all the rest, in which take part all other Milesians, shall register at the seat of the *boule* every year before the 20th of the month Anthesterion (by declaring) their fathers' name and the tribe to which they belong. (27) The secretary shall report to the next assembly after the registration; the *prytaneis* shall distribute them by lot in the tribes, which the *demos* shall indicate. Those who join the citizen body shall partake in everything else immediately but be assigned to the guard and command of the guard only ten years after their first allocation (to the tribes). If anybody lives as citizen against this decree, he shall be liable to prosecution by the *molpoi* and with the procedures that discipline matters concerning foreigners according to the laws. (...)

Above is the actual grant of potential citizenship. It is clear that the grant is potential. The Seleukians who “decide to live with us as citizens” may choose to activate the grant before the council at a specific time of year. The grant of potential citizenship retains its force indefinitely after this agreement of *isopoliteia*. This helps further differentiate potential citizenship, or citizenship in its *isopolitical* form, from actual granted citizenship. This decree is a one-time grant of *isopolitical* citizenship, which allows the Seleukians to approach the Milesian *boule* if they choose to activate active citizenship.

From the grant, it is also notable that the Seleukians requesting citizenship must declare their father's name and *Seleukian* tribe membership. Including the father's name is common in civic inscriptions and probably served a more functional than ideological purpose, but it does highlight the importance of kinship and descent to the institution of citizenship. The requirement to declare

the Seleukian tribe is more puzzling. Greek *poleis* often had the same, or similar, sets of tribes. It is quite likely that Ionian Miletos and close by Seleukia-Tralles had the same set of tribes, but this seems inconsequential, since the new citizens are assigned to Milesian tribes by lot.¹²⁷ Perhaps providing a Seleukian tribe demonstrates the applying citizen's membership in a common system of citizenship, or perhaps it provides further verification of the applicant's identity.

The last part of this section describes two restrictions placed upon the new citizens. First is a restriction on military service quite like the one placed upon the Cretans discussed above. New citizens may not serve in or command the guard for ten years. Like the corresponding restrictions on Cretans, this demonstrates an issue of trust in having non-native citizens serve in military roles. The other restriction sees any individual who "lives as citizen against this decree" prosecuted as a foreigner. It is not stated explicitly what it would mean to "live as citizen against this decree." One can imagine that fraudulently meeting the criteria to become a Milesian citizen would suffice. Perhaps acting in a way contrary to the Milesian interest would, as well. Regardless, this is a demonstration of the importance the Milesians held in regulating their citizen body carefully. If an individual became a citizen illegitimately, the Milesians would revoke any rights they had been granted as citizen and punish them harshly. If the actions classified as "against this decree" were defined more broadly, this could provide the Milesians a further mechanism to maintain authority and civic concord.

B (Seleukeian decree),

¹²⁷ Given more time, it would be helpful to verify the similarity between Milesian and Seleukian tribes with epigraphical evidence.

To good fortune; it has been decreed by the *boule* and the *demos* to praise the Milesians for their benevolence and conduct which they have in regard to the people. Citizenship rights on equal footing shall be granted and they shall partake in everything in which other citizens do. Anyone of the Milesians who wants to live as citizen in Seleukeia shall be registered by the *strategoï* and the secretary of the *demos*. They shall register the applicant in the tribe to which he wants to belong. They shall also have *proedria* in all festivals and access to the *boule* and *demos* first after the sacred matters. The current elected *strategoï* shall take care of the *demos* of the Milesians and provide for those who come to our city, so that they always find the best possible conditions. Theoroi shall be sent to Miletos to join in performing a sacrifice to Apollo Didymeus, the founder of our kinship, at whatever times the Milesians perform a sacrifice. (...)

The Seleukian decree is shorter and looser than the grant offered by Miletos. The nature of the grant is the same—this decree grants potential citizenship in Seleukia-Tralles to the Milesians, which they may activate when they wish. In Seleukia-Tralles, though, there seems to be less care involved with regulating the citizen body. Any Milesians who wish to join in Seleukian citizenship are allowed to choose the tribe to which they wish to belong. For Seleukians joining Miletos, the secretary selects the tribe by lot. There are no restrictions placed upon former Milesians for military service or in the law courts. The grant is straightforward and open.

This probably reflects the circumstance of the grant and the context of the two cities. In the correspondence between the two cities, Miletos is the senior partner and Seleukia-Tralles the junior, even though the grant was reciprocal. Miletos was a famed and locally powerful Ionian city. Seleukia-Tralles, though it had considerable Hellenic history, was a relative backwater. The citizenship of Miletos, therefore, was something more valuable to foreigners. Seleukia-Tralles was small and there was little reason to restrict access to its citizenship past the

normal requirements, such as being Greek.¹²⁸ It is probably not that the Seleukians did not care who became a citizen of their city, while the Milesians did, but Milesian citizenship was more coveted, so it made more sense to regulate entry into it strictly.

According to Saba, this *isopoliteia* between Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles is representative of a diplomatic and reciprocal use of *isopoliteia*. It bears a great deal of similarity to the case of Miletos and Kios, and some similarity to the unclassified case between Miletos and the Cretan settlers. The next case presented is even more difficult to classify in nature and in effect than the case of the Cretan settlers. It involves Teos and three cities in Seleukid Syria.

Teos and the Syrian Cities

The Ionian *polis* of Teos was introduced above in the context of its failed late fourth century *sympoliteia* with the city of Lebedos. The following inscription dates to around 203, about a century later. The *polis* was part of the Ionian *dodekapolis*, the twelve cities of the Ionian League, alongside Miletos and Smyrna. During the initial Persian invasion of Asia Minor in the 540s, some Teians fled to found the colony of Abdera in Thrace, which remained in some sort of political union with Teos through the Classical Period.¹²⁹ In the fifth century, Teos participated in the Ionian Revolt and later joined the Delian League.¹³⁰ An

¹²⁸ These requirements were probably inherent.

¹²⁹ *Inventory* 1101; Hdt. 1.168.

¹³⁰ The Ionian Revolt saw the cities of Ionia revolt from the Persian King in 499. The Athenian burning of the Persian regional capital of Sardis during this revolt supposedly drove King Darius to plan his infamous invasion of Greece. The Delian League was Athens' de facto empire that rose out of its defense of Greece during the Persian Wars.

Athenian ally, the city was sacked by the Spartan Admiral Kallikratidas late in the Peloponnesian War.¹³¹ Teos probably returned to Persian influence early in the fourth century.¹³² Following the campaigns of Alexander, the city saw Antigonid control and eventually fell under Seleukid influence, which waned and returned by the late third century under Antiochos III. From the Archaic Period to this point, Teos had found itself deeply involved with events of the Aegean. It could certainly boast of its history as an independent Greek *polis*. This is the context of a quite unique grant of *isopoliteia* that was decreed by the Teians around the turn of the third century.

An inscription¹³³ from ca. 203 documents a Teian offer of potential citizenship to the people of three “eponymous” cities in northern Syria, the administrative core of the Seleukid Kingdom. In the first sections of the decree, the Teians give honors to Antiochos III and his wife Laodike and incorporate the couple into the civic and religious rituals of the city. The section included below decrees the Teian *intention* to grant potential citizenship to the Syrian cities. It follows:

*Inscription 7: Teos and the Syrian Cities*¹³⁴

... and since, in addition to the honours given to the king by the city, it is a fine thing and fitting with the goodwill of the king and his friends towards the people and our eager character towards the king and his friends, to put in common, so to speak, with the cities named after the ancestors of the king the favours which were given and those which will be given by the king to the people, so that, after a grant of our citizenship to them, they should be the readier to benefactions and show eagerness in all matters, just as it is a fine thing to do with one's own

¹³¹ *Inventory*, 1101; Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.15

¹³² *Inventory*, 1101; Diod.14.84.3: The city was induced to secede from the Spartan alliance by the Persian Satrap Pharnabazus.

¹³³ Ma *Antiochos*, No. 18 *Second Decree of the Teians for Antiochos III and Laodike III*

¹³⁴ Translation found in Ma, 1999 as inscr. No. 18

fatherland, and so that we should renew our pre-existing friendship with them,— with good fortune, (it seemed good to have the *strategoï* and the *timouchoi* propose at the next election that citizenship be granted to the people of the Antiocheians by Daphne and the people of the Seleukeians in Pieria and the people of the Laodikeians by the sea...

and in order that King Antiochos and his sister, Queen Laodike, should know of the gratitude of the people, to appoint three ambassadors who should go to them and hand over this decree, and after bringing greetings from the people, and after rejoicing that they be in good health and in the situation which they wish and which we pray the gods for them to be in, and after informing them of the honours decreed and after telling them...

Some more general information about this inscription is warranted.

Critical are the identities and status of these three cities “named after the ancestors of the king.” First, it would be foolish to use this grant of citizenship as a model for Hellenistic grants of *isopoliteia*. Its circumstances are quite unique—no other grant like it exists. Like any grant of *isopoliteia*, though, the grant is directed towards the collective people of the receiving city, even as the language classifies the cities as corporate bodies of citizens.

Next, the three cities “eponymous”, more commonly called Antioch on the Orontes, Seleukia Pieria, and Laodikeia by the Sea, formed the urban core of Seleukid North Syria.¹³⁵ Antioch on the Orontes served as a sort of dual capital of the Seleukid Empire, along with Seleukia on the Tigris. Seleukia Pieria served as the port for nearby Antioch, and Laodikeia was another important Seleukid port on the Syrian coast, located to the south. The cities were founded by earlier Seleukid kings and named for Antiochos I, Seleukos I, and his mother Laodike.

¹³⁵ Along with Apameia on the Orontes, these formed an area called the Syrian Tetropolis. One can only speculate on why Apameia is excluded, but Saba and Hermann suggest Apameia, named for Seleukus I’s Persian bride, did not hold the same status as the other three, which were named for Macedonians. Saba, 225; Hermann, 1965 p. 84. Apameia may have also served a more military function than the other cities.

One can presume that many officials serving the Seleukid kings, as well as their *philoï*, resided in these Syrian cities.¹³⁶ Gauthier traces several *philoï* of Antiochos III to the cities.¹³⁷ The cities each had some number of Greco-Macedonian inhabitants and some degree of Greek architecture and governmental institutions.¹³⁸ However, Aperghis writes that “one should probably not refer to the new foundations as *Greek* cities.”¹³⁹ He reports that the actual citizen population of these cities was relatively small, likely below ten thousand, and that the general population of these cities was made up of non-Greeks.¹⁴⁰ Additionally, despite being some of the more prominent Hellenistic cities, the Seleukid foundations had no Hellenic history before the late Fourth Century. Most importantly, these cities did not conduct their own foreign policies, symbolically or actually. Greeks were certainly a dominant political and culturally, but these were not independent *poleis* in the sense of Teos, Ilion, Smyrna, or Miletos.

It is also important to note that this inscription decrees the Teians *intention* to grant citizenship to the Syrians. It is not known for certain whether the Teians actually implemented the grant of *isopoliteia*, but this lack of certainty must not completely discount the fairly clear instruction of the Teians to their officials to enact a grant after the next elections in the city. Nonetheless, this inscription

¹³⁶ On the *philoï* and the Seleukid court under Antiochos III, see Rolf Strootman. "Hellenistic Court Society: The Seleukid Imperial Court Under Antiochos the Great, 223-187 BCE" In *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires: A Global Perspective*, 63-89. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.

¹³⁷ See Gauthier, 1985 p. 173 provides examples of *philoï* close to Antiochos III who were from these cities.

¹³⁸ On the cities, see for example Rolf Strootman, “Kings and cities in the Hellenistic Age.” In Alston, Richard & van Nijf, Onno M. *Political Culture in the Greek City After the Classical Age*. Walpole: Peeters, 2011.

¹³⁹ Aperghis, 2004, pp. 92-93.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

presents the intention and the reasoning behind it, but not the details concerning how the Teians would implement the grant. This information is available in other instances of *isopoliteia*.

Given these premises, the primary question for this investigation is what a grant of citizenship to the Seleukid foundations in Syria meant for citizenship in Teos. Why would, and how could, a Greek *polis* extend its citizenship to cities that may not have been fully autonomous?¹⁴¹ Hermann, Gauthier, and Ma take the following view for why the Teians offered the grant: that the grant served as an honor for Antiochos III and royal officials (the *philoï*).¹⁴² Teos was under Seleukid influence for much of the Third Century. It stood to suffer at the hands of Seleukid demands or prosper from the beneficence of the Syrian royals and, vitally, their friends and officials. Whether a tangible privilege or symbolic honor, a grant of Teian citizenship demonstrated goodwill and deference toward the King and his officials. For Antiochos III, the grant honored his capital city and its neighbors, named for his family. For his *philoï* residing in northern Syria, the grant honored them and their cities, quite explicitly to make them “readier to benefactions.”

One can, however, argue that the purpose of the grant of citizenship was primarily a diplomatic honor for the Seleukid king in return for favorable treatment, without consideration of the king’s *philoï*. Saba hypothesizes that in return for Antiochos granting *asylia* to Teos, the Teians responded with

¹⁴¹ I must qualify ‘comparable political institutions,’ since some Greek city institutions did exist in the Seleukid foundations of Syria and in the rest of the Empire. However, the fundamental source of power in the Seleukid royal-named cities was not in these institutions, but in the monarchy.

¹⁴² Saba, *Isopoliteia*, p. 225; she cites Hermann, 1965 p. 79-84; Gauthier, 1985 pp. 169-175.

concession of an “equally important” diplomatic tool, *isopoliteia*.¹⁴³ To support this hypothesis, Saba documents several instances from Teos where a grant of *isopoliteia* occurs alongside another *polis*’ concession of *asylia*.¹⁴⁴ If this is the purpose of the grant, it would mean that, in effect, the Seleukid eponymous cities could serve as representatives for the King in diplomatic exchanges with autonomous Greek city-states. To the Teians, a diplomatic concession to the citizens of those cities could be potent enough to serve as a diplomatic concession to King Antiochos. Despite dealing with the monarchical Seleukid Empire, the Teians acted within a paradigm of diplomacy in which relations were between city-states made up of citizens.

Meaning of the Grant

Even less so than in typical instances of *isopoliteia*, the Teian decree does not seem to anticipate large-scale immigration from the Syrian cities to Teos. It presents no details on how the Syrians would win citizenship, although this inscription only declares the Teian intention to grant *isopoliteia*. Nonetheless, the symbolic and honorific use of Teian citizenship is meaningful. It is difficult to understand what reason the Teians had to implicate their own citizenship if dealing exclusively with the king, even if the king was the primary beneficiary of the honors. Relative to Teos, then, the status of the inhabitants of the Syrian cities is a relevant question to ask. John Ma writes that the recipients of the decree

¹⁴³ Saba, 226.

¹⁴⁴ Saba, pp. 227-232.

became “quasi-citizens with a sense of obligation towards Teos.”¹⁴⁵ This seems plausible. As with other cases of *isopoliteia* and outside of the federal leagues, this could not create some sort of dual citizenship between Teos and the distant Syrian cities. The Antiochenes, Seleukians, and Laodikeians were not going to become Teians as well, and therefore become likely to provide benefactions truly as if they were citizens of Teos.

Additionally, the Greeks and Macedonians of the Seleukid Syrian foundations could not have conceivably acted for their cities as independent entities. The great Hellenistic cities—Alexandria and Antioch—were known for their rowdy populaces as well as for their roles as centers of Greek culture and thought, but they remained the seats of monarchical regimes. *Isopoliteia* was a diplomatic tool and accordingly references to the Antiochenes, for example, referred to them as a corporate political body. Gauthier does not believe that the royal capital had any sort of independent authority to deliver benefactions to a Teos.¹⁴⁶ The eponymous cities’ foreign policy was entirely in the hands of the king. Gauthier finds this Teian supposition that it could expect benefactions from the initiative of these cities “une incroyable malconnaissance des réalités du royaume seleucide” (‘an incredible ignorance of the realities of the Seleukid Kingdom’).¹⁴⁷

Another idea that is relevant here is the concept of “peer polities.” As theorized by John Ma, the Hellenistic *poleis* tended to interact with one another

¹⁴⁵ Ma, 1999, 210

¹⁴⁶ Gauthier, 1985. p. 170

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

on an ideological level and decentralized playing field, as peers.¹⁴⁸ This world view not only meant the operation of diplomacy without international hierarchy, but also the acceptance of other actors as ideological equals. This has implications for the interaction of long-established Greek *poleis* with newcomers to the *polis* system, and it has implications for the interaction between independent *poleis* and larger, imperial states. Both are relevant in the case of Teos and the eponymous Syrian cities and both have interesting implications for citizenship.

Regarding interaction between long-established *poleis*, such as Teos, and newcomers to that political system, the case is straightforward and reflects something of a liberalization of a symbolic notion of Teian citizenship. The region of north Syria had no Hellenic settlement before the campaigns of Alexander. Afterwards, the Seleukid foundations would have been inhabited by Greeks and Macedonians but also by Persians and native Syrians.¹⁴⁹ Ma gives the example of Delphic recognition of *asylia* for the Karian city of Alabanda, and here is the example of Teos and these Syrian cities as another example of Greeks operating under the paradigm of peer polities with different sorts of polities. And as stated above, a city under direct Seleukid control was a different sort of political actor from the long-established and theoretically independent *poleis* of Western Asia Minor. Granting potential citizenship to the inhabitants of such a city demonstrates how under the circumstances of the Hellenistic Near East, a peer polity paradigm could extend the bounds of an institution like citizenship in order to meet diplomatic goals, using familiar diplomatic tools.

¹⁴⁸ John Ma, *Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age*, pp. 24 and 25.

¹⁴⁹ Can just assume this but try to cite something

It is difficult to disentangle issues relating to citizenship from larger, more controversial issues relating to ethnicity and diplomacy in this unique case of *isopoliteia*. Though it may be symbolic and seemingly unrelated to the international politics of the Seleukid Empire, citizenship is the tool chosen by Teos. Honoring the citizens of Seleukid eponymous cities could both honor the royal family and make the inhabitants of those cities “quasi-citizens” of Teos in some loose, symbolic way. In their capacity as Seleukid actors, when applicable, perhaps those individuals would have some enhanced benevolence toward Teos.¹⁵⁰ Either way, a citizenship grant meant something of significance to Antiochos, to the residents of his capital region, or to both. This is a demonstration of how, in the Hellenistic Period, members of different political systems could be brought into the diplomatic system of the *poleis* that remained powerful in Asia Minor by engaging outsiders in civic institutions like citizenship. A parallel exists to the Smyrnaean grant of citizenship to a group of Persian *katioikoi* in the interest of greater military strength. The institution of citizenship was malleable and Hellenistic Greeks inventively crafted ways to adapt the institution to novel interstate circumstances.

Malleability and innovation did not, however, mean that the institution of citizenship became degraded or meaningless. A grant of potential citizenship meant something to Antiochos and to the eponymous cities, but clearly it also meant something important to Teos. Citizenship was a diplomatic prize, and it was only so because as an institution, citizenship *in Teos* remained valuable. The

¹⁵⁰ Perhaps find evidence that some Seleukid officials were from these cities

Teians granted citizenship as a symbolic gesture, but in the city-states citizenship was still the fundamental basis of government. It conferred a broad range of economic rights and privileges and more importantly, it conferred the political privileges that allowed the *poleis* of Asia Minor to continue their prized but shaky political independence. In Seleukid Asia, a realm inhabited by countless peoples but culturally and politically dominated by Greco-Macedonian power, the institution of citizenship in a Greek *polis* must have enjoyed great prestige outside of the Greek homeland. A grant rooted in domestic pride and foreign prestige enhanced, not degraded, the value of citizenship in the *polis*. In its collective form and in its individual form, citizenship was a valuable tool in the hands of the cities of western Asia Minor. The next chapter visits the individual form of citizenship grant.

Ilion and Amyzon- Royal Officials and Land Ownership

Honorific decrees are abundantly common from Hellenistic Asia Minor. Decrees honoring royal officials for benefactions or other good deeds are an ample subgenre of this inscription type.¹⁵¹ Notable examples of such decrees are found in Amyzon, Ilion, Sardis, Apollonia under Salbake, and Teos. This section will investigate a set of three Amyzonian decrees, all likely dated to the years 201/200.

Amyzon was a *polis* located in western Karia, a region of southwest Asia Minor. Close by, to the West, were the coastal cities of Ionia, and to the East was the rugged Anatolian interior. Like the Troad, the region of Karia was largely Hellenized by the mid-Hellenistic Period. During the mid-fifth century, the cities of Karia were members of the Athenian Alliance and by the wars of Alexander's successors the region was strongly connected to the Greek Aegean. The 'Greekness' of the Karians is variable in geography and in time, but by the turn of the third century the Karian cities governed themselves as *poleis* and their Karian language had been on its way to extinction for two centuries.¹⁵² The ethnic identity of the Karians is important to keep in mind when considering their adoption of conventionally Greek institutions. Compared to the Ionian Greeks, who enjoyed prestige as a Greek cultural center, the Seleukids may have had less respect for the traditions and institutions of the Karian cities. But in the grand stage of the Hellenistic world, the Karians were extremely closely associated with

¹⁵¹ Ma *Antiochos* 206; J. and L. Robert 1983: 194

¹⁵² Carless Unwin, 2017, p. 2; Errington p. 136.

the Greeks. The Hellenistic kingdoms treated the Karian cities as such when operating in the region.

The campaign of King Antiochos III in western Asia is vital context to this set of inscriptions as well. Amyzon in the Third Century was subject to the Seleukid, Ptolemaic, and Antigonid kingdoms at different times. In the decades immediately preceding the dating of these decrees, c. 201/200, the allegiance of the Karian cities is extremely difficult to pin down. Amyzon could have remained under the control of a Ptolemaic-turned-Antigonid governor named Olympichos, or the Ptolemies could have reasserted their authority in the region. Just as likely, some of the Karian cities may have become independent of the kingdoms, or been brought under a lighter Rhodian influence.¹⁵³ Nonetheless, the evidence is clear that Zeuxis, Antiochos' chief representative in Asia Minor, reconquered Amyzon and surrounding cities in 203.¹⁵⁴ Inscribed language of benefactions and mutual good feelings should not overshadow the fact that Antiochos' commander brought Amyzon back into the Seleukid dominion by force.

Many of the Karian cities also belonged to a loose federal structure known as the Chrysaorian League, headquartered in the town of Chrysaorium.¹⁵⁵ The scope and institutions of the League, like those of other lesser-known federal leagues, are not well understood. The League will feature in one of the following inscriptions, and its nebulous existence seems to have been relevant to the Amyzonians and the Seleukid officials operating in Karia.

¹⁵³ Ma, 1999 p. 69, 70.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid; Ma, J. T., P. S. Derow, and A. R. Meadows. "'RC" 38 (Amyzon) Reconsidered." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 109 (1995): 71-80. is also helpful for chronology.

¹⁵⁵ Ma, 1999, p. 175.

The three inscriptions included below may all date to the same season of 201/200. The first, a decree for Menestratos of Phokaia, has a more certain dating to November or December of 201, while the origins of the others are less solid.¹⁵⁶ The inscriptions involve the granting of civic or economic rights and privileges to Seleukid royal officials. The first:

*Inscription 8: Amyzon for Menestratos of Phokaia:*¹⁵⁷

When Antiochos the Great and [Antiochos the son] were kings, in the hundred and twelfth [year], in the month of Apellai[os, in the high-priesthood of Nikan[or] and in the tenure of . . . as priest of Zeus Kretagenetas and Diktynna, and within the city in the tenure of the god as *stephanephoros* for the second time and in the tenure of Iason son of Balagros as priest of [the kings]; it seemed good to the people; proposal of the *prytaneis*; since Menestratos, son of Agathokles, of Phokaia, appointed *epistates* over the Artemision, has given many demonstrations of his excellence in favour of all the interests of the people, by writing to Zeuxis, the official in charge of affairs, concerning the goodwill which the people continuously has towards the kings and towards Zeuxis, and by writing to Nikomedes and to Chionis, the official appointed over Alinda, to give likewise testimony of the goodwill of the people; he zealously took care of our movable property that was held in Alinda, so that we should recover it; he also takes full care concerning the remainder of our citizens, who reside in the autonomous (cities), and summons them to the repeopleing (*synoecism*) of the Artemision, and is kind towards those of the citizens who meet him on their own;--so that the people be seen to return gratitude to those among men who are worthy of it;--with good fortune, let it seem good to the people of the Amyzonians:--to let Menestratos be praised for the disposition which he has towards the people; to let him be a benefactor of the people; to give him citizenship, the right to landownership, and participation, to full extent, in the rites, the offices, and all the other things in which the Amyzonians participate; to extend the same privilege to him and his descendants; to send to him a share of the public sacrifices, as is done for the (other benefactors)...

Here, one Menestratos of Phokaia is awarded several rights and privileges for his overseeing of a Temple of Artemis and his gracious treatment towards the

¹⁵⁶ Ma, 1999 p. 207

¹⁵⁷ Ma, 1999 no 10; Robert, 1983: 151-4, no. 15- Decree of the Amyzonians for Menestratos of Phokaia, the Epistates of the Artemision (c. Nov-Dec 201)

Amyzonians. The identity of Menestratos and his position in Amyzon is important here. He is *epistates*, governor or overseer, of the Artemision at Amyzon.¹⁵⁸

Plainly, Menestratos, apparently of the Ionian city of Phokaia, is not an Amyzonian. Menestratos, then, seems to be a local Seleukid official, managing a temple located in Amyzon but under some broader Seleukid jurisdiction.

Menestratos seems to have had access to more powerful officials in the Seleukid imperial system--it seems that he acted as an advocate for the Amyzonians in his dealings with Zeuxis, Antiochos III' deputy and chief representative in Asia Minor.¹⁵⁹ Menestratos writes to Zeuxis and to peer Seleukid officials in other Karian cities about the goodwill of the Amyzonians towards the King, but also towards Zeuxis himself.

His more concrete deeds seem to involve advocacy for the Amyzonians within the region of Karia outside of Amyzon. They hint at a few ideas of the Amyzonian notion of citizenship within their community and region. More obvious is the emphasis on the people, or citizens, of Amyzon. The "people" and the citizens are emphasized. Menestratos is "kind towards those of the citizens who meet him on their own." This is unsurprising, since this decree originates from the collective Amyzonian citizen body. The object of good treatment towards the *polis* of Amyzon is good treatment towards the Amyzonian citizenry. Less clear is what this means non-rhetorically. The decree mentions taking care of property in Alinda, another Karian city, and taking "full care of the remainder of our citizens who reside in the autonomous (cities)."

¹⁵⁸ Grainger, *Gazetteer*, p. 464

¹⁵⁹ Grainger, *Gazetteer*, p. 122-123.

The meaning of “autonomous (cities)” is not immediately clear. The Greek, “ἡμῶν πολιτῶν τῶν κατοικούντων τὰς αὐτονομούς,” means “our citizens who inhabit the self-governing (cities)”, or “autonomous (cities).” Ma supposes that these individuals in the autonomous cities were refugees from Antiochos’ campaign in the area c. 203.¹⁶⁰ A broader meaning could simply denote the multitude of independent *poleis* of Western Asia Minor. A narrower meaning could be the cities of the Chrysaorian League, the *koinon* of Karian cities.¹⁶¹ It does seem that, within this League, citizens held the right to inhabit other member cities.¹⁶² One can draw from this that the citizens of Amyzon could reside in certain other cities, maintaining an identity as Amyzonians and still enjoying certain rights or protections as Amyzonian citizens. Interestingly, the protection of Amyzonian citizenship is also provided by the local Seleukid officials appointed to Karia. Menestratos “takes care” of the Amyzonians in the other cities. The deeds for which the Amyzonians reward Menestratos offer some idea of how the Amyzonians view their collective citizen-body, a citizen-body that they then invite Menestratos to join.

Menestratos is first named a “benefactor,” or *euergetes* in the terminology of Hellenistic civic honors. Cities may have separated their foreign benefactors from domestic ones, so one should first consider the grants of the Amyzonians to Menestratos of rights and privileges shared by citizens. The broadest grant is citizenship. Below that, and typically included under the rights of active citizens,

¹⁶⁰ Ma, 1999 p 144.

¹⁶¹ Ma, 1999 seems to suggest the “autonomous” cities would include Myus and Alabanda. These are Chrysaorian cities, pointing to the latter definition. p. 144.

¹⁶² See L. and J. Robert on institutions of the Chrysaorian League.

are the right of land-ownership, participation in civic institutions and offices, and the same for his descendants. What is absent from this inscription is an assignment of Menestratos to a *deme* or *phratry*, which is often present in other individual and collective citizenship grants. It does seem plausible that such an assignment could have been found after the inscription cuts off. Nonetheless, these rights and privileges, if activated, constitute some of the most fundamental aspects of citizenship: property ownership, participation, and entry of descendants into the Amyzonian *demos* as if part of its *ethnikon*.

Regarding the Amyzonian *ethnikon*, there is a broad relevance of the identity of Menestratos discussed above. Menestratos is introduced as “Menestratos, son of Agathokles, of Phokaia”: a Greek and the son of a Greek; “a citizen and the son of a citizen.”¹⁶³ This places Menestratos into the community of peer *poleis* with people of a similar political disposition and a (perceived) similar ethnic identity. Within the Seleukid space, this practice is one unique to the Greek city-states. Ma reports that “in royal administration, individuals are called by name, with no patronymic or *ethnikon*, as abstract and interchangeable conveyors of executors of orders...”¹⁶⁴ The Greeks could see these origin-less royal officials as ‘flatterers’, or simply servants of the king.¹⁶⁵ Menestratos, conversely, is portrayed as, in Ma’s words, “an individual who happened to have been appointed to a position by king Antiochos.”¹⁶⁶ This, in addition to the Amyzonian praise for his virtue and good treatment of their local citizen-community, qualifies

¹⁶³ Ma, 1999 p. 208

¹⁶⁴ Ma, 1999 p. 207; He also cites J. and L. Robert 1983: 114-15 on the topic.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, 208.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, 208.

Menestratos for a citizenship grant. And since Menestratos' status as the son of a citizen (of some city) serves to qualify Menestratos to interface with the Amyzonians as an equal, Menestratos' descendants are welcomed into the Amyzonian civic community.

Menestratos' qualifications demonstrate the importance of descent and Greekness for citizenship, with its relation to kinship and of common political values among Greeks. While there are exceptional instances of non-Greek foreigners being invited into the civic communities of the *polis*, the Greek-populated administrative apparatus of the Hellenistic kingdoms made such grants ideologically easier.¹⁶⁷ This is not to say that the Seleukids exclusively employed Greek administrators in their Empire—locals administered the Seleukid state throughout its satrapies alongside Greeks.¹⁶⁸ Nonetheless, Greeks certainly held a privileged and outsized status in Seleukid administration, especially in their own territory. This allowed the special dynamic discussed above, whereby imperial administrators may become, symbolically or literally, local citizens.

Now that Menestratos' qualification for what he is granted is established, it is worth discussing what his grant did for Amyzon and what his grant did for him. For Amyzon, the grant expresses thanks and attempts to socialize Menestratos into a community of citizens who patriotically value the prosperity of Amyzon and its citizens. The grant probably did not immediately transform Menestratos the Phokaian Seleukid administrator into a tax paying, assembly-

¹⁶⁷ The instance where Persians are granted citizenship by Smyrna occurs under royal direction *and* after a destructive war.

¹⁶⁸ On Seleukid administration, see Aperghis, 2004.

going, landowning Amyzonian. If he chose to activate his grant and enroll as an Amyzonian citizen, though, he probably could. Whether described as potential or unactivated, Menestratos' offer of citizenship makes the Amyzonians his compatriots, at least in a symbolic sense. In this way, to socialize a royal official as citizen is to attempt to attract favorable action on the part of the official in his capacity as a royal administrator, as a member of a well-connected class within a royal system, and as an otherwise wealthy and influential individual.

A last issue at hand with this inscription is the addition of Menestratos' name to the city's list of benefactors. The title *euergetes*, or benefactor, was widely granted by Hellenistic *poleis* to individuals who had done some good for the city, often giving money or performing some other good service. These individuals were usually, if not always, foreigners. There is a relevant interplay between the title *euergetes* and citizenship in Amyzon. Amyzon had a history of rewarding the title to royal officials—it named as *euergetes* one Margos, a Ptolemaic governor of Karia more than half a century before.¹⁶⁹ Menestratos was a foreigner, but he was also granted citizenship in the same decree that also calls him a benefactor of the people (ευεργετην του δημου).

Further, the Amyzonians grant Menestratos several privileges “as is done for the (other benefactors)”. This clause, καθοτι και τοις [αλλοις ευεργεταις], associated with those same privileges, is one used when honoring *citizen* benefactors in Amyzon (this is *not* the same as the title *euergetes*, which was granted to foreigners).¹⁷⁰ Here, there are honorific practices in conflict with one

¹⁶⁹ J. and L. Robert 1985: no. 3

¹⁷⁰ Ma, 1999 p. 207 referencing inscription No. 14 in the same work.

another. The apparent contradiction of Menestratos, originally a foreigner, receiving honorific privileges usually reserved for citizens reveals an interesting blurring of the dynamic between citizen and foreigner in the *polis*. Menestratos, a Greek but a foreigner, receives honorific privileges usually reserved for citizens. But he receives these privileges only *after* a grant of Amyzonian citizenship. On the one hand, the Amyzonians are honoring an official of an imperial power that so recently conquered their city by force. It seems logical that any independent-minded *polis*, to some extent, resented the need to flatter an imperial official. On the other hand, the Amyzonians use Menestratos' grant of citizenship to protect privileges traditionally reserved for citizens. They still abstain from handing to a foreigner these rights, and they only grant them to Menestratos once he has received a grant of citizenship, even if the grant was largely symbolic.

Another inscription from Amyzon documents an honorific decree for an official named Nikomedes:

*Inscription 9: Amyzon for Nikomedes*¹⁷¹

(let it seem good to the people) . . . and to grant him participation) [in all the other things] in which the Amyzonians as well [participate] among the cities of the Chrysaorians; to elect men who will go to Nikomedes and hand over the decree to him, and, after greeting him on the part of the people, invite him to always try to be responsible for some good for the people since he is a benefactor; to write up this decree at the most conspicuous location of the temple of Artemis; to have the *prostate* take care of the writing up, so that it be clear to all that the people, when it has received a benefaction, returns worthy tokens of gratitude to those who do good to the people . . .

This inscription was carved on a different side of the same block of stone as the one for Menestratos. At issue in this decree are citizenship, federal

¹⁷¹ Translation from Ma, 1999 inscr. No. 11

institutions, and benefaction. It grants privileges to one Nikomedes in the Chrysaorian League, another Seleukid official who seems to be a colleague of Menestratos. Ma suggests that Nikomedes was a Seleukid financial official with jurisdiction over an area of several cities.¹⁷² Grainger supposes that this Nikomedes was the same Nikomedes of Kos who had served Antiochos III in his eastern campaign as a cavalry commander.¹⁷³ If Grainger's connection is correct, it would confirm that Nikomedes is a native Greek—Kos is a Greek island located near coastal Karia. Greekness remained a requisite quality for participation in civic institutions.

Text is missing before Nikomedes is granted participation in the cities of the Chrysaorians. It seems likely that Nikomedes would have been granted rights and privileges similar to those the city granted to Menestratos, but one can only speculate without the whole inscription. He apparently was a “benefactor,” or *euergetes*, of the city, which would only suggest that he was not a citizen at the time of the grant. Accordingly, it is not known whether Nikomedes is granted citizenship in Amyzon, but the inscription does show that the Amyzonians grant him some sort of federal citizenship in the Chrysaorian cities. This would grant him certain privileges within many of the Karian cities, though these rights and institutions are not well understood.¹⁷⁴ It is worth discussing the oddities of this Chrysaorian League, since they leave questions about its federal citizenship.

¹⁷² Ma, 1999 p. 207.

¹⁷³ Grainger, *Gazetteer*, p. 109.

¹⁷⁴ Ma, 1999 p. 175. Cites J. and L. Robert, 1983 on the finances of the League.

The League is a little-understood federal structure. It apparently had an assembly and financial institutions that met at Chrysaorium, and citizens of member cities held rights in the other cities of the League.¹⁷⁵ This *koinon* was looser than the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues of the Greek mainland. Perhaps an appropriate parallel would be the also little-understood *koinon* of Athena Ilias in the Troad. What is remarkable about the Chrysaorian *koinon* is that its cities were divided between the dominions of multiple Hellenistic states. Amyzon and nearby cities were loyal to Antiochos' Seleukid Empire, while some of the cities to the South were subject to the Rhodians.¹⁷⁶

This dynamic is fascinating on its own, but for present purposes it demonstrates the layering of institutional structures that was possible in the Hellenistic Age. An institution of common citizenship in a federal league could exist under the Rhodian and the Seleukid dominion. This demonstrates how disconnected imperial administration was from the civic structures of the Greek *poleis*—no idea of Seleukid citizenship existed, but a *koinon* could operate with shared citizenship in and outside of the Seleukid space. The institutions acted independent of Seleukid or Rhodian power and probably did not fall under the scope of imperial practice. Like citizenship within the *poleis*, Greeks could use these independent institutions to pursue goals within the Seleukid imperial system, but it remained on local terms.

Citizenship Grants and Land in Ilios

¹⁷⁵ Ma, 1999 p. 175

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

The previous two inscriptions originated in Amyzon, in Karia. The following two are from Ilion, in the Troad. Like the Amyzonian decrees, the first is an individual citizenship grant for a friend of a Seleukid king. The last inscription involves a land grant to a different friend of a Seleukid king. The focus is the connection between grants of citizenship and the right of land ownership in the Hellenistic *polis*.

The first of these was found in Ilion and is typically dated to 275-268. Some scholars date the inscription to the reign of Antiochos III around the turn of the Second Century, but a consensus exists around King Antiochos I and around the year 270.¹⁷⁷ The surrounding region straddling the straits leading to the Black Sea, the Troad, was firmly under Seleukid control by the 270s. At that time, Ilion was a Hellenized *polis* located on the site of Homeric Troy. A loose federation, a *koinon*, of cities in the Troad seems to have existed from the beginning of the Third Century called the *koinon* of Athena Ilios.¹⁷⁸ Knowledge of this *koinon* is similarly murky to knowledge of the Chrysaorian League. In the 270s, during their invasion of Asia Minor, the Galatians sacked Ilion, though the city survived the sack and continued its political existence.¹⁷⁹ Somehow, Antiochos was wounded in battle, and the physician Metrodoros healed him. If the battle was local, Antiochos may have been fighting the Galatians, but Antiochos could have easily received the wound fighting the Ptolemies in Syria. Little is known of the

¹⁷⁷ Bagnall and Derow, 2004, *The Hellenistic Period Historical Sources in Translation* No. 79 Commentary (p. 138)

¹⁷⁸ On the *koinon*, see Ellis-Evans, Aneurin “The Koinon of Athena Ilios and its Coinage,” in *American Journal of Numismatics*, Vol. 28 (2016) pp. 105-158; Lefèvre, F. and Pillot, W. 2015. “La confédération d’Athéna Ilios: administration et pratiques financières.” REG 128.1: 1–27

¹⁷⁹ Strabo 13.1.27

physician Metrodoros, but he is a Greek, from the Athenian colony of Amphipolis located some miles upriver from the Aegean coast of Thrace. The inscription follows:

*Inscription 10: Ilion for Metrodoros the Physician*¹⁸⁰

Whereas King Antiochus has sent to us (to say) that, having been wounded in the neck in the battle, he was safely healed by Metrodoros the physician, (and whereas) Meleager the *strategos*, thinking of what is in the interest of the city, has also sent (to us) about him, be it resolved by the *boule* and the *demoi* to praise Metrodoros son of Timokles, of Amphipolis, for his virtue and his goodwill towards the Kings Antiochus and Seleucus and towards the *demoi*, and for him to be (declared) *proxenos* and benefactor of the city; and for there to be granted to him citizenship and the right of owning land and the right to approach the *boule* and the *demoi* first after the sacred matters; and to permit him to [enter into] whatever tribe and *phratry* he may wish ...

This is a grant of citizenship to an individual. Many such grants exist in the cities of Hellenistic Greece and Asia Minor, so many that the practice appears routine and uninteresting. Often the reasoning for individual grants of citizenship is unknown, but when not involving immigration, grants often reference benefactions, or in some cases, royal service. This is one of those cases, in which a court physician is rewarded for his good work.

Metrodoros' good work was not for the city of Ilion or its people, at least not directly. Antiochos I Soter was, indeed, a savior to the cities of Asia Minor. His defeat of the invading Gauls in the 270's ended their plunder of the region, and Metrodoros' healing of Antiochos, thus, saved the city's protector, and its overlord. Perhaps that is enough to prompt the Ilions to grant Metrodoros citizenship and his further honors. It is worth asking whether this grant was on the

¹⁸⁰ Translation from <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/classics/bagnall/3995/readings/b-d2-3.htm>

sole initiative of the Ilians or whether it was prompted or asked for by the Seleukid *strategos* Meleager. Perhaps the exact terms of the grant of citizenship were not demanded by the governor, but his “thinking what is in the interest of the city” and his message to the Ilians about the deeds of Metrodoros’ strongly suggests royal initiative. Would the Seleukid governor suggest citizenship for Metrodoros’ and why would the physician be pleased by such a grant?

As a Greek with origins in the North Aegean, it seems plausible that Metrodoros could actually use the rights and privileges granted to him by the Ilians. If the rights granted to Metrodoros were intended to be tangible, meaning if Metrodoros intended to acquire land in the *polis* or participate in its government, the prize could be quite valuable. Perhaps the governor Meleager suggested the grant to the Ilians so that Metrodoros could become established there. But other than being under Seleukid influence following Antiochos I’s campaigns, there is no known reason for Ilios, in particular, to grant citizenship to Metrodoros. Perhaps other cities in the region made similar grants that do not survive. That would follow from a more symbolic and honorific nature for this grant of citizenship, but it does not mean that Metrodoros did not receive other privileges in the community, potential or otherwise. This grant is clear that Metrodoros is being honored for his service. This means that citizenship was a tool that the *poleis* used to maintain favor with the Seleukid royal house through honoring officials in the Empire’s court.¹⁸¹ In that way the audience of this decree is Antiochos and his friends.

¹⁸¹ I hesitate to call citizenship a tool that the Seleukid Empire could use, since the initiative is almost always with the *polis*, though sometimes we can assume royal influence.

One can assume the symbolism and honor in the grant and even assume a royal audience, but the political and economic rights detailed in the grant do suggest the *possibility* of tangible actions. One can even suppose that multiple *poleis* in the Seleukid orbit made similar grants and offered tangible privileges. It is similar to cases of *isopoliteia* granting *potential* citizenship to a group, where an individual from one city can choose to move to the other and own property or participate in government. It seems logical to read this grant in a similar way. The Ilians grant Metrodoros rights that, should he decide to move to Ilion, he may enjoy. Per the inscription, Metrodoros is not even enrolled in a tribe or phratry yet, he is only told that he may enroll in one if he desires. A similar grant could exist in other cities, but presumably Metrodoros would only accept the grant in one city.¹⁸² Doing so would create another dual-citizenship problem. In short, this grant does not see the man enter the body of active Ilian citizens, but he may if he wishes. The other rights—to own land and to approach the *boule* and *demos*—may have also only been activated in the city if Metrodoros chose. The relationship between land ownership and citizenship may have changed in the Hellenistic Period.

Land Ownership and Grants

Land ownership and the right to approach civic institutions with priority are the two fundamental rights that the Ilians explicitly offer Metrodoros. Land ownership was fundamentally woven into the concept of citizenship in the *polis*.

¹⁸² There is no indication that dual citizenship was possible in the Hellenistic *polis*. Ma, 1999 p. 210; Gruen, *Hellenistic Poleis*, 1993.

Under a typical understanding of citizenship and except in the radical democracies, land-owning citizens constituted the decision-making bodies of a *polis* and only citizens of a *polis* could own land within its borders.¹⁸³ As introduced in an earlier section, Aperghis writes that for the *polis* and its *chora* (land), “a long tradition made it the absolute property of its citizens.”¹⁸⁴ Meanwhile, Hellenistic dynasts ruled over the Asian *poleis*, just as the Achaemenid Persians had. Much of Asia Minor was, in theory, owned by Hellenistic kings as ‘spear won’ territory, though in practice a patchwork of royal land, tributary land, and free cities existed throughout Hellenistic Asia Minor.¹⁸⁵ Despite the booming trade of the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean, agriculture continued to dominate the ancient economy, and in such a system ownership and exploitation of land was largely synonymous with wealth. For these reasons, royal grants of land in territory containing *poleis* poses an interesting problem for citizenship in the Hellenistic period.

The ownership of property by individuals differed from the kings’ property rights. The Seleukid kings were able to break the Classical tradition of property ownership being the sole prerogative of citizens, though one could argue that the kings, and the kings only, acted above the institution of citizenship in the Hellenistic *polis*. On the topic, John Ma writes that “some cities in the Hellenistic period lost the monopoly of authority over property rights within their urban

¹⁸³ See Finley *Ancient Economy* for a classical treatment. As for the radical democracies, we know that landless individuals could certainly participate in the Classical Athenian Democracy, but the Hellenistic democracies did not usually follow this model. The converse of this is more important to this investigation—the idea that only citizens could own land—and it did remain in the radical democracies.

¹⁸⁴ Aperghis, 2004, p. 88

¹⁸⁵ Ibid, pp. 88-89.

centre--to the advantage of the king, the political master.”¹⁸⁶ Inscriptions show that the Seleukid King Antiochos III owned porticos in Sardis and properties in various other cities.¹⁸⁷ The Seleukid dynast and usurper Achaios the Elder also owned private estates in Asia Minor, but his position both as a Seleukid prince and usurper attempting to establish an independent power base makes his status closer to a Seleukid king than an official or private individual.¹⁸⁸

A dossier of inscriptions found at Ilion forms the primary set of evidence for this issue. They document a gift of land by the Seleukid King Antiochos I to one Aristodikides of Assos.¹⁸⁹ The first follows:

Inscription 11: Antiochos I, Ilion, and Aristodikides

RC. 10

King Antiochos to Meleager, greeting. We have given to Aristodikides of Assos two thousand *plethra* of cultivable land to join to the city of the Ilions or the Skepsians. Do you therefore give orders to convey to Aristodikides from the land adjacent to that of Gergis or Skepsis, wherever you think best, the two thousand *plethra* of land, and to add them to the boundaries of the (land) of the Ilions or the Skepsians. Farewell.

11

King Antiochos to Meleager, greeting. Aristodikides of Assos has come to us, asking us to give him in the Hellespontine satrapy Petra, which formerly Meleager held, and of the land of Petra fifteen hundred *plethra* suitable for cultivation, and two thousand other *plethra* of cultivable land from that adjacent to the lot previously given to him. And we have given him both Petra, unless it has been given previously to someone else, and two thousand *plethra* of cultivable land besides, because he as our friend has furnished us his services with all good-will and enthusiasm. Do you therefore having made an investigation, if this Petra has not already been given to someone else, convey it with its land to Aristodikides, and from the crown land adjacent to the land

¹⁸⁶ Ma, p. 156.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Included English text found at <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/classics/bagnall/3995/readings/b-d2-1c.htm>

formerly given to Aristodikides give orders for the surveying and conveyance to him of two thousand *plethra*, and that he be permitted to join (his holding) to any of the cities he wishes in our country and alliance. If the crown peasants of the region in which Petra lies wish to live in Petra for protection, we have ordered Aristodikides to allow them to live (there). Farewell.

12

King Antiochus to Meleager, greeting. Aristodikides has come to us, saying that, because it had been assigned to Athenaios the commander of the naval base, he has not even yet received the place Petra and the land belonging to it which we previously wrote giving it to him, and he has asked that there be conveyed to him instead of the land of Petra the same number of *plethra* elsewhere, and that there be granted to him two thousand *plethra* besides, which he may join to any of the cities in our alliance he wishes, just as we wrote before. Seeing therefore that he is well-disposed and enthusiastic in our interest we are anxious to favor the man highly, and we have given our consent in this matter also. He says that his grant of the land of Petra was fifteen hundred *plethra*. Do you therefore give orders to survey and to convey to Aristodikides of cultivable land both the twenty-five hundred *plethra* and, instead of the land belonging to Petra, fifteen hundred other *plethra* suitable for cultivation from the crown land adjacent to that originally given him by us. (Give orders) also to permit Aristodikides to join the land to any of the cities in our alliance he wishes, just as we wrote in our earlier letter. Farewell.

(The dossier continues below...)

This inscription offers a rich view of Seleukid power and administrative practice in the lands of western Asia Minor. The fact of a gift of land by a Hellenistic king to a friend is not surprising and its motivations are not of particular interest to this investigation. The treatment of land in this dossier is of great interest to this investigation in its implications on citizenship in Ilion. While the Greeks and Romans viewed Ilion as the site of Troy, the Hellenistic city governed itself as a Greek *polis*, seemingly no different from any other *poleis* in

Asia Minor.¹⁹⁰ As with its grant of citizenship to Metrodoros treated above, one should treat it similarly to other Greek cities and assume it handled citizenship in a similar way.

Two citizenship-related questions raised by this dossier concern Seleukid intervention into the status of individuals in the *polis* and the actual status of an individual granted land in a *polis*. The case of Metrodoros above already demonstrates that some Seleukid intervention into the status of individuals in the *poleis* of Asia Minor occurred, though the exact extent of Seleukid pressure is not known. These questions are interconnected, since the status of an individual granted land in the city depends on the royal authority to dictate status in that city.

The core issue at hand is that Antiochus I made a gift of royal land to Aristodikides and required that the land be joined to a *polis*. Given the nature of land ownership in the *polis*, this either forces Aristodikides into citizenship or poses a challenge to the connection between land ownership and citizenship in the Hellenistic period. From the inscription, it is clear that the land granted to Aristodikides must become part of a *polis*. According to Aperghis, this is no surprise, since land in the Seleukid realm was always either royal land, direct property of the king, or attached to some city.¹⁹¹ If the land was to belong to Aristodikides, as a private individual, it had to be attached to a city. This does not necessarily mean that the land had to be physically connected to the established borders of the *polis*—it seems that outlying plots of land owned by citizens of a

¹⁹⁰ On Hellenistic Ilion, see Charles Brian Rose. “Ilion in the Early Hellenistic Period.” Chapter. In *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*, 158–95. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

¹⁹¹ Aperghis, 2004, p. 88.

polis were still part of the city's territory. Even when a citizen of a *polis* acquired land, it could become part of the *polis*, as it was owned by one of its citizens. In this situation, though, a presumed non-citizen obtains land and attaches it to a *polis*. At least by the understanding above, this inherently admitted Aristodikides into the body of land-owning citizens in Iliion. To consider this from the Ilian perspective, perhaps the Ilians were happy to allow a distinguished friend of the king into their citizen body and expand their tax base with the addition of his land. The cities of Asia Minor were undoubtedly vying for land to expand their borders.¹⁹² However, it does not seem that the choice to add this land was in the hands of the Ilians.

One aspect of the inscription that is particularly striking is a choice that Mealeagros gave to Aristodikides. The grantee may choose the *polis* to which he will join his granted land. The initial parcel of land to be gifted, in Hellestpontine Petra, was already occupied. Aristodikides is then given the option to join the alternate land found for him to *either* Iliion or Skepsis. The possible locations of this land are all in the vicinity of the Hellespont, but otherwise the decision of which land to offer Aristodikides is arbitrary and unrelated to the identity of the man. If not for an administrative mix-up, he could have acquired a wholly separate tract of land and attached it to a different city-state. Through this awkward and arbitrary mechanism, royal initiative and personal choice results in Aristodikides of Assos owning land controlled by Iliion. If attaching land to a *polis* did grant the owner citizenship, this freedom to choose based on the whims of

¹⁹² Ibid, p. 101

royal officials would represent a direct intrusion into the constitution of the citizen-body of the city-states of Asia Minor. Aperghis states that because owning city land was an exclusive right of its citizens, “when Aristodikides eventually decided upon the city, he would effectively become one of its citizens.”¹⁹³ On the privileges Ilios would grant Aristodikides, Derow states that they “will have included citizenship.”¹⁹⁴ In this view, Aristodikides is able to make himself a citizen of a nominally independent *polis* essentially by his own choice under the authority of King Seleukos. Once he chose, Ilios was faced with a new large landowner who was, at least previously, a foreigner.

13

Meleager to the boule and the demos of the Ilians, greeting. Aristodikides of Assos has given us letters from King Antiochus, the copies of which we have written for you below. He has also himself come to us, saying that although many others address themselves to him and confer on him crowns—a fact which we ourselves know because certain embassies have come to us from the cities—he wishes, both because of the sanctuary and because of the good-will he entertains toward you, to join to your city the land given him by King Antiochus. What he thinks should be granted him by the city, then, he himself will make clear. You would do well to vote all his privileges and to inscribe the terms of the grant which he will make on a stele and to place it in the sanctuary, so that the grant may remain securely yours for all time. Farewell.

Aristodikides’ is to be given a choice of privileges within his chosen *polis*: “What he thinks should be granted him by the city, then, he himself will make clear.” The Seleukid official Meleager does not make an explicit demand that the Ilians grant these privileges, but his declaration that they would “do well to vote” them makes his demand known. What sort of grants would Aristodikides desire

¹⁹³ Aperghis, 2004, p. 101

from the Ilians? Likely these privileges would include exemptions from taxation, religious rites, and whatever other honors a *polis* would see fit for a friend of the king. The grant of citizenship to the physician Metrodoros may serve as an example of what such a grant would entail. It offers citizenship, land-ownership, and political rights.

One can only speculate about any right to hold office or special access to the assembly and courts of Iliion, but it is logical to imagine the Ilians may have granted some form of citizenship to Aristododikides. There was a clear connection between citizenship and owning land within a city, but the rights to participate in the assembly as a landed citizen, serve on courts, and participate in civic rituals would be the most basic of rights which Aristododikides could request if he really did receive citizenship. As the owner of a vast, newly incorporated tract of Ilian land, he also acquired a vested interest in the politics of the city. Access to the governing institutions of the *polis* would serve his interest if he wanted his land to be secure and prosperous. At face value, it may seem overly speculative to assume that a royal grant of land resulted in Iliion adding the grantee to its citizen rolls, but given the tight and well-established connection between land ownership and citizenship, it is difficult to imagine otherwise. If this practice was widespread, it would represent a fundamental, if consented, intrusion into the cities' control of status, if not citizenship.

In Asia Minor, several other instances of royal land grants attached to *poleis* do exist. This same set of inscriptions reveals that a naval commander Athenaios was granted the village land initially chosen for Aristododikides. The

evidence does not reveal to which *polis* Athenaios joined his granted land, but a similar process was likely. Another set of inscriptions documents a transfer of land from King Antiochos II to his former wife Laodike, who must then attach it to a city. That transfer may pose an interesting problem for gender and citizenship, though Laodike is herself a former Seleukid queen and may transcend traditional restrictions.¹⁹⁵ Gauthier explores a grant of land by a Seleukid king of the Third Century to a Seleukid officer named Larichos that becomes attached to Priene.¹⁹⁶ This instance provides geographical breadth—even the thoroughly Hellenic cities of Ionia were subject to grants becoming attached to their territory. Other cases probably existed where documentation has not survived. The practice seems to have been fairly common.¹⁹⁷

If this practice was not exceptional, it suggests that there was a small class of rewarded royal officials who gained privileged civic status or citizenship in the Greek cities of western Asia Minor. Perhaps it was only a few grantees in any one city, if any. But if the above logic is correct, it was possible for individuals to gain citizenship as a direct result of Seleukid actions. Again, it would be misleading to consider the attaching of this land and the potential granting of citizenship to these individuals unwelcome by these *poleis*—on the contrary, these cities probably coveted any expansion of territory. Accordingly, this is not some sort of corruption or degradation of control of the institution of citizenship by the

¹⁹⁵ RC no. 18; Austin inscr. no. 173; Aperghis, 2004 p. 102. The gender issue would concern the rights of women, who technically were citizens but held few rights.

¹⁹⁶ Gauthier Philippe. Les honneurs de l'officier Séleucide Larichos à Priène. In: Journal des savants, 1980, n° pp. 35-50; The King is likely Seleukos I or Antiochos I

¹⁹⁷ Aperghis, 2004 - that the practice was common for Seleukid Kings

Hellenistic *poleis*. It is more plausible that navigating the geopolitics of the Hellenistic period forced cities to exercise their political institutions in unconventional ways that reflected novel diplomatic conditions.

In the Hellenistic Period, the relevant novel conditions were the Greekness of royal officials and the system of ‘alliances’ that constituted the Seleukid sphere among the *poleis* of Asia. Many, though not all, Seleukid officials were Greeks or Macedonians. Though Greeks did play some role in the administration of the Achaemenid Persian Empire, under the Seleukid kingdom Greeks and Macedonians filled the role formerly held by ethnic Persians. The aforementioned Aristodikides of Assos or Larichos, another ethnic Greek, serve as examples.¹⁹⁸ Among the Greek cities of Asia Minor, with their long and prestigious histories connected to the Greek world, this meant that some Seleukid officials were more or less compatible with the institutions of the *poleis*. Of course, their ethnicity qualified them for citizenship more than if they were Persian, though by the Hellenistic period such ethnic concerns may have become more blurred.¹⁹⁹ Perhaps more important was a familiarity with the institutions of the *polis*. An official with origins in one *polis* could more easily engage with the civic institutions of another *polis*. Variation certainly existed between political structures among the *poleis*, but one can presume that the basic component institutions of the city-state of Assos were similar to those at Ilion. Aristodikides of Assos knew how to be a citizen of a *polis*, and perhaps it would seem natural to, for example, attach him and his granted land to that of a Hellespontine Greek

¹⁹⁸ See Grainger, *Gazetteer*. Larichos was the son of Laomedon of Mytilene, a Satrap of Syria.

¹⁹⁹ See Smyrnaean grant of *politeia* to Persian *katoikoi*

city-state. Perhaps this is a liberalization of citizenship in the cities, but it remains within a traditional framework.

Similarly, the system of alliances that constituted the power of Hellenistic kingdoms in regions settled with Greek *poleis* presented a complex dynamic for the cities of Asia Minor when attempting to interface with the monarchical, but symbolically Macedonian, polity that was the Seleukid Empire. Earlier things were different: “What men are you, and where dwell you, who desire alliance with the Persians?” stated the Achaemenid Satrap in Sardis upon an Athenian request for an alliance.²⁰⁰ An earlier iteration of the Persian Empire and a farther away city, yes, but the delivering of Earth and Water to the Persian King was unlike the alliance system of the Hellenistic states. For the Macedonian Seleukids, Greeks and their cities were prized and their allegiance was hotly contested. Meanwhile, Greek city states often involved the issue of citizenship in their diplomatic relations. As visited in other parts of this investigation, an offer of potential citizenship could help cement alliances between *poleis*, and other forms of citizenship grants were part of the diplomatic arsenal of the Hellenistic cities. The relationship between Ilion and the Seleukids is described in the same terms of such an alliance. On the orders of Antiochos, Aristodikides is allowed to attach his land to any city “in our alliance.” Under this sort of alliance, a deal can exist where a royal official is awarded a gift of land and an allied city, Ilion, is allowed to expand its territory but must implicitly extend its citizenship.

²⁰⁰ Hdt. 5.73

Conclusion

This investigation examined the institution of citizenship in the *poleis* of western Asia Minor through three lenses. It explored mass grants of citizenship in two forms, *sympoliteia* and *isopoliteia*, geopolitical and potential. It then examined royal land grants and individual grants of citizenship to royal officials. Both forms of collective grant and the discoveries related to land ownership and individual grants of citizenship reflect political aspects of the Hellenistic Period. *Sympoliteia* often saw direct royal involvement and offered the city state an institutional ability to strengthen itself by making fundamental changes to its citizen-body. *Isopoliteia* allowed *poleis* to build alliances and engage in diplomacy on a level playing field through the potential offering of the status of citizen. Individual grants of citizenship reveal attempts to socialize and flatter royal officials and royal grants of land demonstrate instances where royal fiat intruded into the institution of citizenship. These reveal the extent of the political independence of the Hellenistic *polis* and its civic institutions, but they are still based on the value that individuals and cities in the Hellenistic Near East placed upon citizenship in a Greek city state.

This investigation has shown that citizenship in the early Hellenistic Period was a changing institution, despite its enduring value as an institution connected to traditional values of Greekness, property, and kinship. Cities used citizenship in novel ways, but it remained the fundamental basis of government and self-identity. Change in the use of citizenship does not reflect a degradation of the institution, at least not in the part of the Hellenistic Period covered by this

investigation. Rather, in the century of Seleukid influence over western Asia Minor, the institution of citizenship proved to be adaptable and meaningful enough to play a significant role in the diplomacy and geopolitics of the city-states and kingdoms. Hopefully, this investigation has shown that the topic of citizenship in the Hellenistic Period is worth further study.

The body of inscriptions from Hellenistic Asia Minor that relate to citizenship, civic ritual, benefactors, and civic honors is abundant. A great deal also exists from the city-states of Sicily, Crete, and mainland Greece. Crete, in particular, is a source of many cases of *isopoliteia*. Better studied, the Federal Leagues of the Greek mainland pose questions about multiple citizenship and the adaptability of the institutions of the *polis* to the Hellenistic geopolitical environment. In Asia Minor, only a selection of these inscriptions is available in English translation.²⁰¹ A more comprehensive investigation of this topic should consider the broader body of evidence available.

A few themes related to citizenship in the Hellenistic *polis* are also worth exploring more thoroughly. The connection of citizenship to civic ritual and the proliferation of royal cults deserve attention. The extent of royal access to the institution of the *polis* also deserves study—the right of kings and their officials to access the council, assembly, courts, and cults of cities under their influence seems to present a problem for citizenship. Given the broad body of evidence

²⁰¹ The Federal Leagues are well studied—see A. Rizakis “La double citoyenneté dans le cadre des koina grecs: l'exemple du koinon achéen” in Anna Heller / Anne-Valérie Pont (Bearb.): *Patrie d'origine et patries électives*, Pessac : Ausonius, 2012.

available, studying these topics would readily add to the understanding of citizenship in the Hellenistic period reached in this investigation.

Citizenship in the Hellenistic Period after the Treaty of Apamea (c. 188) also proves quite worthy of exploration. In some ways, the *poleis* of the later Hellenistic Period play more smoothly into a narrative of institutional decline, even as the power of the Seleukids, Antigonids, and Ptolemies waned in Asia Minor. The smaller kingdoms and states that gobbled up former Seleukid territory and operated under Roman unipolarity did not always treat the city-states under their sway in the same way as the successor kingdoms.²⁰² The Attalid kings of Pergamon, in particular, engaged subject cities with benefactions in an exceptional way. Perhaps their interaction with citizenship in the second century differed from the Seleukids of the third.

Of course, the entrance of the Roman Republic, a non-monarchical but still imperial polity with its own notion of citizenship, into the politics of Asia Minor poses its own questions. “Freedom of the Greeks” was a potent idea for the Romans as it had been for the Hellenistic Kingdoms, and the institutions of the *polis* would continue to develop under Roman hegemony.²⁰³ Into the late Hellenistic and early Roman Imperial Periods, it is much easier to detect changes in the use of citizenship, especially when viewed in the context of oligarchizing and the development of a provincial elite. By the early Empire, for example, it is

²⁰² See Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* for details on the smaller kingdoms and states; Eckstein, *Rome Enters the Greek East* for an understanding of the rise of Roman unipolarity in the first half of the second century.

²⁰³ See Sviatoslav Dmitriev, *The Greek slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*, 2012.

possible to find examples of elites holding magistracies in multiple cities, indicating the existence of multiple citizenship.²⁰⁴

The Greek cities of Hellenistic Asia Minor remained citizen-states. They governed themselves with peoples' assemblies, civic magistracies, and citizen courts. The world in which they operated brought challenges to the city-states, and the institution of citizenship was malleable enough to adapt as a diplomatic and geopolitical tool that helped the cities survive and maintain independence. Cities referenced tradition sometimes and broke with it at other times, but the value of the uses of citizenship discussed in this investigation always was based in the value of citizenship in the *polis*.

²⁰⁴ See Denise Reitzenstein, *Elite und Mehrfachbürgerrechte im lykischen Bund*; Anna Heller, *Stratégies de carrière et stratégies de distinction : la double citoyenneté dans le Péloponnèse d'époque impériale*; Gabrielle Frija, *Les citoyennetés multiples chez les notables locaux : l'exemple des prêtres du culte impérial civique* in Heller, Anna. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*, 2012

Bibliography:

Ancient & Primary Sources:

Aristotle, *Politics*.

Appian Mac.

Dio Cassius, Roman History.

Herodotus, *Histories*

Plutarch, *Lives*.

Plutarch, *On Monarchy, Democracy, and Oligarchy*.

Polybius, *The Rise of the Roman Republic*.

Livy, *Rome and the Mediterranean*. (Books 30-45)

Strabo, *Geographica*.

Collections:

Attalus.org

Austin, Michael, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest:*

A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation. 2nd ed. New York:

Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Bagnall, Roger and Derow, Peter, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in*

Translation. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Secondary Sources / Historiography:

Alston, Richard & van Nijf, Onno M. *Political Culture in the Greek City After the Classical Age*. Walpole: Peeters, 2011.

- Harter-Uibopuu, Kaja. "Money for the Polis: Public Administration of Private Donations in Hellenistic Greece."
- Strootman, Rolf. "Kings and cities in the Hellenistic Age."
- Zuiderhoek, "Oligarchs and benefactors. Elite demography and euergetism in the Greek east of the Roman Empire."

Aperghis, G. G. (Gerassimos George). *The Seleukid Royal Economy : The Finances and Financial Administration of the Seleukid Empire*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Blok, Josine H. "Becoming Citizens. Some Notes on the Semantics of "Citizen" in Archaic Greece and Classical Athens", In *Klio* 87, 1 (2005): 7-40
- Blok, Josine. "Citizenship, the Citizen Body, and its Assemblies." In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, 161-175. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013.
- Börm, Henning, and Nino Luraghi. *The Polis in the Hellenistic World*. Franz Steiner Verlag, 2018.
- Dmitriev, Sviatoslav. 2011. *The Greek slogan of freedom and early Roman politics in Greece*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dmitriev, Sviatoslav. 2005. *City government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eckstein, Arthur. *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*, 2006.
- Eckstein, Arthur. *Rome Enters the Greek East*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Errington, R. Malcolm. *A History of the Hellenistic World, 323-30 BC*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Erskine, Andrew. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Malden, Blackwell Publishing, 2005:
- Austin, Michel, "The Seleukids and Asia."
 - Scholten, Joseph B., "Macedon and the Mainland, 280-221."
 - Kosmentatou, Elizabeth, "The Attalids of Pergamon."
 - Ma, John, "Kings."
 - Billows, Richard, "Cities."
- Finley, Moses. *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Fingerson, Kyle R. "PERSIAN KATOIKOI IN HELLENISTIC SMYRNA." *Ancient Society* 37 (2007): 107-20.
- Gauthier, Philippe. *Les Cités Grecques et Leurs Bienfaiteurs (IVe-Ier s. Av. J.-C.)*, 1985.

- Gauthier, Philippe. Les honneurs de l'officier Séleucide Larichos à Priène. In: *Journal des savants*, 1980, pp. 35-50.
- Gauthier, Philippe. *Symbola: les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*. Nancy: Université de Nancy, 1972.
- Gruen, Erich. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. 2 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Gruen, Erich. "The Polis in the Hellenistic World," In Rosen R. & Ferrell J., *Nomodeiktēs: Greek studies in honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994. p 339-354.
- Grainger, John D, *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*, Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Harland, Philip A. "The Declining Polis: Religious Rivalries in Ancient Civic Context." In *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*, 30. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2006.
- Habicht. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Habicht, Christian. 2006. *The Hellenistic monarchies: selected papers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman, and Thomas Heine Nielsen. *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hugh Elton and Gary Reger (ed. *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, 1997 <https://books.openedition.org/ausonius/1127>.
- Agler, Sheila L. "Keeping the Peace in Ionia: Kings and Poleis."
 - Billows, Richard. "Rebirth of a Region: Ionia in the Early Hellenistic Period."
- Jones, Christopher P. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999
- Kallet-Marx. *Hegemony to Empire*, University of California Press, 1996.
- Lintott, Andrew. "Citizenship." In *A Companion to Ancient History*, A. Erskine (Ed.), 2009.
- Ma, John. *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

- Ma, John, "Fighting Poleis of the Hellenistic World. In Van Wees, Hans (Ed),
War and Violence in Ancient Greece. London: Classical Press of Wales,
2000.
- Ma, John. "Peer Polity Interactions in the Hellenistic Age" In *Past & Present*, No.
180, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ma, J. T., P. S. Derow, and A. R. Meadows. "'RC" 38 (Amyzon) Reconsidered."
Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik 109 (1995): 71-80.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20189633>.
- Müller, Christel. "(De)Constructing Politeia: Reflections on Citizenship and the
Bestowal of Privileges upon Foreigners in Hellenistic Democracies *." *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales: English Edition* 69, no. 3 (September
2014): 533–54. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2398568200000881>.
- Reger, Gary. "Sympoliteiai in Hellenistic Asia Minor". In Colvin, Stephen, *The
Greco-Roman East*, Volume XXXI. Yale Dept. of Classics.
Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Rizakis, Athanase, "La double citoyenneté dans le cadre des koina grecs:
l'exemple du koinon achéen" in Anna Heller / Anne-Valérie Pont (Bearb.):
Patrie d'origine et patries électives, Pessac: Ausonius, 2012.
- Rose, Charles Brian. "Ilion in the Early Hellenistic Period." Chapter. In *The
Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*, 158–95. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 2013.
- Scafuro, Adele C. "Keeping Record, Making Public: The Epigraphy of
Government." In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, 400-416.
John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013.
- Shipley, D. Graham J. *The Early Hellenistic Peloponnese: Politics, Economies,
and Networks 338–197 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2018. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139034012>.
- Strootman, Rolf. "Hellenistic Court Society: The Seleukid Imperial Court Under
Antiochos the Great, 223-187 BCE" In *Royal Courts in Dynastic States
and Empires: A Global Perspective*, edited by Duindam Jeroen, Artan
Tulay, and Kunt Metin, 63-89. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.

Walbank, Frank W. *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: Essays and Reflections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich. "Hellenistic Cities." In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, 54–69. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2013.

Appendix

This section includes the Greek text of the inscriptions used in the investigation. Selections of English translations are included in the text of this project. This appendix section includes the inscriptions in their entirety, unless otherwise noted. Each inscription has a number and short title associated with it, so that they may be matched with those in the text of this investigation. The Greek text is largely sourced from <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/>, which compiles epigraphical texts from a variety of textual collections.

Inscription 1: Teos Lebedos

Syll. 344; SEG 4 618²⁰⁵

Only a selection is included (lines 1-25 ;109-126)

[—]ντε πε[—]

[— ὅστις δ' ἄν] εἰς τὸ τὸ Πανιώνιον ἀποστέ[λληται, ὠϊό]μεθα δεῖν [πράττειν πάντα τὰ]

[κο]ινὰ τὸν ἴσον χρόνον, σκηνοῦν δὲ τοῦτον καὶ πανηγυράζειν μετὰ τῶν παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπεσταλμέ]-

νων καὶ καλεῖσθαι Τηϊόν. ὠϊόμεθα δὲ δεῖν καὶ οἰκόπεδον ἐκάστωι τῶν Λ[εβεδίων δοθῆναι]

παρ' ὑμῖν ἴσον ὧι ἂν καταλίπηι ἐν Λεβέδωι· ἕως δ' ἂν οἰκοδομήσωνται, [ιδίας? δοθῆναι]

[ο]ικίας τοῖς Λεβεδίοις ἀμισθί, ἐὰν μὲν διαμένηι ἢ ὑπάρχουσα πόλις τὸ τρίτον μέρος τῶν]

ὑπαρχουσῶν οἰκιῶν· ἐὰν δὲ δεῖ κατασκάπτειν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πόλιν [ὄλην,? καταλειφθῆναι]

[μὲ]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 ἰκαναὶ ὧσιν αἰ κατα]-

²⁰⁵ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/256448>

λειπόμεναι δέξασθαι καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ τοὺς Λεβεδίους, δοθῆναι τοῖς Λε[βεδίοις
 τούτων τὸ]
 [τρ]ίτον μέρος· ἐὰν δὲ αἱ καταλειπόμεναι μὴ ἰκαναὶ ᾧσι δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς [τε καὶ καὶ
 τοὺς Λεβεδίους, οἴ]]-
 [κί]ας καταλειφθῆναι τῶν μελλουσῶν κατασκάπτεσθαι τὰς ἰκανά[ς, ὅταν δὲ
 συντελεσθῶσιν]
 [ἰκ]αναὶ οἰκίαι ἐν τῇ κατασκευαζομένῃ πόλει, κατασκάψαι τὰς οἰκίας τὰ[ς
 καταλειφθείσας,?, ὅ]-
 [σαι] ἂν ἔξω πίπτωσι τῆς περιβαλλομένης πόλεως· οἰκοδομ[εῖσθαι δὲ τὰς οἰκίας
 τοὺς λα]-
 [βόν]τας τὰ οἰκόπεδα ἐ[ν] ἔτεσιν τρισίν, εἰ δὲ μὴ, δημόσια εἶναι τὰ [οἰκόπεδα.
 ωῖόμεθα δὲ]
 δεῖν καὶ τὰστέγας τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀποδοθῆναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις [ὅπως τάχιστα
 κατασκευά]-
 [ζω]νται αἱ οἰκίαι, [ἐν ἔτε]σιν τέσσαρσιν πρὸς μέρος ἐκάστου ἐνι[αυτοῦ. ωῖόμεθα]
 [δὲ] δεῖν καὶ τόπον ἀποδειχθῆναι τοῖς Λεβεδίοις οὗ θάψουσι το[ύς νεκρούς. ὅσα
 δὲ εἰς τόκους]
 [ὀ]φεί<λ>ει ἢ Λεβεδίων πόλις, ταῦτα διορθωθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κοιν[ῶν προσόδων
 κατ' ἐνιαυτόν,]
 [τὰ] δὲ δάνεια ταῦτα ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ὑμετέραν πόλιν, ὅπως οἱ Λεβ[έδιοι ὄφειλον,
 παραλαβεῖν].
 καὶ ὅσοι δὲ πρόξενοὶ εἰσι τῆς Λεβεδίων πόλεως ἢ εὐεργ[έται ἢ πολιτεῖ]-
 [αν] ἢ ἄλλην τινα δωρεὰν ἢ τιμὴν ἔχουσιν παρὰ τῶν Λεβεδίων τ[ὰ αὐτὰ ἔχειν καὶ
 παρ']
 [ὑ]μῖν καὶ ἀναγραφῆναι τούτους, ὅπου καὶ οἱ ὑμέτεροι πρόξεν<ο>ι [καὶ εὐεργέται
 εἰσὶν ἀνα]-
 [γε]γραμμένοι, ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ. τὰ δὲ ἐγκλήματα καὶ τὰ συμβόλαια [τὰ ὑπάρχοντα
 ἕκα]-
 [τέ]ροις αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτοὺς διαλυθῆναι ἢ διακριθῆναι κ[ατὰ τοὺς ἑκατέρων]

... Lines 109-126:

[Βασ]ιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος Τηϊῶν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν. ἡμεῖς τὸ
 [πρότερον σκοποῦντες δι' οὗ]
 [τρ]όπου τάχιστ' ἂν συντελεσθεῖ ὁ συνοικισμός, οὐκ ἐωρῶμεν τὰ [ἀναγκαῖα
 ὑμῖν]
 [χ]ρήματα πόθεν πορισθῆι, τοῦ ἔχειν Λεβεδίο[ι]ς τὰς τιμὰς τῶν οἰ[κιῶν ἐξ
 ἐτοίμου ἀποδι]-
 [δό]ναι, διὰ τὸ τὰ ἐκ τῶν προσόδων γινόμενα κατὰ χρόνους προσπορεύ[εσθαι
 ὑμῖν μακροτέρους· δεξάμε]-

νοι δὲ τοὺς τε παρ' ὑμῶν καὶ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν Λεβεδίων διαπυθνομένοι αὐτῶν εἴ
 τινα ἔχουσιν]
 [ἡ]μῖν πόρον εἰσηγεῖσθαι, ο[ὐ φ]αμένων ἔχειν ἔξω τῶν περὶ τὰ τέλη
 ἐπισ[κεψάμενοι τὰ εἰθισμένα]
 αὐτοῖς, εὐρίσκομεν ἀεὶ μ[όν]ον [πρ]οεισηνεγκεῖν ὑμῶν τοὺς εὐπορωτά[τους, ἡμῖν
 οὖν καλῶς δο]-
 [κ]εῖ ἔχειν, τοὺς μὲν γε εὐποροῦντας εἶναι ἑξακοσίους, προεισηνεγκεῖν [δὲ τὰ
 ἀναγκαῖα χρήματα]
 κατὰ τὰς οὐσίας, ὥστε γενέσθαι τὸ τέταρτον μέρος τῶν τιμῶν τάχιστα[α τοῖς
 Λεβεδίοις,]
 τὴν δὲ κομιδὴν γενέσθαι τοῖς προεμπορίσασιν πρώτοις ἐκ τῶν προσόδω[ν τοῦ
 ἑνιαυτοῦ τοῦ ἐ]-
 [ν]εστώτος πασῶν συντασσομένων τοὺς μὲν ἄξοντας τοὺς τιμήσοντα[ς τὰς οἰκίας
 καὶ τοὺς]
 [ἐκ]γραφομένους τοὺς νόμους ἐκ Κῶ αἰρεθῆναι εὐθὺς, ὅταν ἡ ἀποψηφισί[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]
 [τι]μητὰς ἀποσταλέντας ἄγειν τοὺς τιμητὰς ὡς ἂν ἐνδέχεται τάχιστα. ο[ἰ]όμεθα δὲ
 δεῖν ὅσον οὖ]-
 [π]ω ἐξαριθμηθῆναι τὰς παρ' ὑμῖν οἰκίας ἄς δεῖ Λεβεδίοις εἰς π[α]ροικίαν ἐν
 ἡμέραις]
 δεκάπεντε ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡ ἀπόκρισις ἀναγνωσθῆι, τοὺς δὲ ἐξαριθμήσοντα[ς τὰς
 οἰκίας καὶ δώ]-
 [σ]οντας τοῖς παροικιζομένοις αἰρεθῆναι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρ' ἐκάσ[της
 φυλῆς.]

Inscription 2: Smyrna and Magnesia (ad Sip.)

I.Smyrna 573.I + II.2 (p. 376)²⁰⁶

(names of ambassadors are omitted at beginning)

ἔδοξεν τῷ δήμῳ, στρατηγῶν γνώμη· ἐπειδὴ πρότερόν τε καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ὁ
 βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος ὑπερ-
 ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν Σελευκίδα, πολλῶν [κ]αὶ μεγάλων κινδύνων περιστάσεων τὴν
 πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν
 χώραν, διεφύλαξεν ὁ δῆμος τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐνοίαν τε καὶ φιλίαν, οὐ
 καταπλαγεῖς τὴν τῶν ἐναντίων ἔφοδον

²⁰⁶ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/254898>

οὐδὲ φροντίσας τῆς τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀ[π]ωλείας, ἀλλὰ πάντα δεύτερα
 ἠγησάμενος εἶναι πρὸς τὸ διαμεῖ-
 ναι ἐν τῇ αἰρέσει καὶ ἀντιλαβέσθαι τῶμ π[ρ]αγμάτων κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δύναμιν
 καθότι ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπέστη· διὸ
 καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος, εὐσεβῶς τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς διακείμενος καὶ
 φιλοστόργως τὰ πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς, μεγα-
 λόψυχος ὢν καὶ ἐπιστάμενος χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς ἑαυτὸν εὐεργετοῦσιν,
 ἐτίμησεν τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν διὰ
 τε τὴν τοῦ δήμου εὐνοίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ἣν ἐπεποίητο εἰς τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ
 διὰ τὸ τὸμ πατέ-
 ρα αὐτοῦ θεὸν Ἀντίοχον καὶ τὴν μητέρα τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς θεᾶν Στρατονίκην
 ἰδρῦσθαι παρ' ἡμῖν τιμωμέ-
 νους τιμαῖς ἀξιολόγοις καὶ κοινῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους καὶ ἰδία ὑφ' ἐκάστου τῶμ
 πολιτῶν καὶ ἐβεβαίωσεν τῷ δήμῳ τὴν αὐ-
 τνομίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν, ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ τοὺς δυνάστας
 καὶ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἀξι-
 ῶσας ἀποδέξασθαι τό τε ἱερὸν τῆς Στρατονικίδος Ἀφροδίτης ἄσυλον εἶναι καὶ
 τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον· νῦν τε ὑπερ-
 βεβληκότος τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν Σελευκίδα οἱ στρατη[γο]ὶ σπεύδοντες διαμένειν
 τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ πράγματα συμφερόντως διε-
 πέμψαντο πρὸς τοὺς ἐμ Μαγνησῖαι κατοίκους καὶ πρὸς[ς] τοὺς ὑπαίθρους ἰππεῖς
 καὶ στρατιώτας καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἐξ αὐτῶν
 ἓνα Διονύσιον τὸμ παρακαλέσοντα αὐτοὺς δια[φυ]λάσσειν τὴν φιλίαν καὶ
 συμμαχίαν βασιλεῖ Σελεύκῳ εἰς
 πάντα τὸν χρόνον, ἐπαγγελλόμενοι διατηρούντων αὐτῶν τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὸν
 αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ φίλον ἠγούμενων ὑπάρξειν αὐ-
 τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Σελεύκου πάντα τὰ φιλόφρονα καὶ
 καλῶς ἔχοντα καὶ ἀποδοθήσεσθαι χάρι-
 τας αὐτοῖς ἀξίας τῆς αἰρέσεως· οἱ δὲ ἐμ Μαγνησῖαι παρακληθέντες καὶ αὐτοὶ
 ὄντες πρόθυμοι πρὸς τὸ διαφυλάσσειν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὴν τε φι-
 λίαν καὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν καὶ διατηρεῖν αὐτῷ τὰ πράγματα, τὰ τ[ε] ἀξιωθέντα ὑπὸ
 τῶν στρατηγῶν φιλοτίμως ἀπεδέξαντο καὶ ἐπαγγέλ-
 λονται τὴν αὐτὴν ἔξειν αἴρεσιν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ εἰς πάντα τὰ τοῦ
 βασιλέως Σελεύκου συμφέροντα καὶ ἀπεστάλκασιν
 πρὸς ἡμᾶς πρεσβευτὰς ἐγ μὲν τῶν κατοίκων Ποτάμωνα καὶ [Ι]εροκλῆν, ἐγ δὲ τῶν
 ὑπαίθρων Δάμωνα καὶ Ἀπολλωνικέτην, τοὺς δ[ια]-
 λεξομένους τε ἡμῖν καὶ ἀνοίσοντας τὴν ὁμολογίαν καθ' ἣν ἀξι[ο]ῦσιν συνθέσθαι
 τὴν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς φιλίαν· ἐπαχθέντες δὲ καὶ ο[ἱ]
 πρεσβευταὶ ἐπὶ τὸν δῆμον συνλελαλήκασιν ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων ἀκολ[ού]θως τοῖς ἐν
 τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ γεγραμμένοις· ἀγαθὴ τύχη· δεδόχθα[ι]

τὴν τε φιλίαν συντίθεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐμ Μαγνησίαι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖ[ς] τοῦ βασιλέως
 Σελεύκου συμφέρουσιν, καὶ ἀποδείξει πρὸς αὐτοῦ[ς]
 πρεσβευτὰς τρεῖς, οἵτινες τὴν ὁμολογίαν τε ἥτις ἂν δόξῃ τῷ δήμῳ ἀνοίσουσιν
 αὐτοῖς καὶ περὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν αὐτῇ δι[α]-
 λεγῆσονται καὶ παρακαλέσουσιν αὐτοὺς δέχεσθαι τε καὶ συντελεῖν τὰ ἐν τῇ
 ὁμολογίᾳ γεγραμμένα, καὶ ἑάμπερ δέξωνται οἱ ἐμ
 Μαγνησίαι, ὀρκισάτωσαν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἀποδειχθησόμενοι πρεσβευταὶ τὸν ὄρκον τὸν
 ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ γεγραμμένον· προσδεξαμέν[ων]
 δὲ ταῦτα τῶν ἐμ Μαγνησίαι καὶ συνσφραγισαμένων τὴν ὁμολογίαν καὶ
 ὁμοσάντων καὶ ἐπανελθόντων τῶν πρεσβευτῶν συ[ντε]-
 λείσθω καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ γεγραμμένα, καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε
 ἀναγραφῆτω κατὰ τὸν νόμον· ἀναγραφῆτω δὲ κ[αὶ] εἰς]
 στήλας εἰς ἃς καὶ ἡ ὁμολογία ἀναγραφῆσεται· καλεσάτωσαν δὲ οἱ ἐπιμήνιοι τῆς
 βουλῆς καὶ τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς παραγεν[ομένους]
 ἐγ Μαγνησίας ἐπὶ ξενισμὸν εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον· τοῖς δὲ ἀποδειχθε[ῖ]σιμ
 πρεσβευταῖς δότω μεθόδιον Καλλῖνος ὁ ταμίας τὸ ἐκ τοῦ [νόμου]
 ἡμερῶν ὅσων ἂν ὁ δῆμος τάξῃ ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς πόλεως προσόδων· ἡμέρα[ι]
 ἐτάγησαμ πέντε, πρεσβευταὶ ἀπεδείχθησαν Φανόδημος Μικ[ίωνος?],
 Διονύσιος Διονυτᾶ, Παρμενίσκος Πυθέου.

Inscription 3: Miletos and Pidasa

I.Milet 3 149²⁰⁷

εἶναι Πιδασεῖς Μιλησίων πο-
 λίτας καὶ τέκνα καὶ γυναῖκας, ὅσαι ἂν ᾧσιν φύσει Πιδασίδες ἢ πόλεως Ἑλλη-
 νίδος πολίτιδες· παραδοῦναι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀναγρα-
 φὴν τοὺς αἰρεθέντας ὑπὸ Μιλησίων ἀνδρας καὶ μετεῖναι τοῖς ὀνόμασιν καὶ
 ἀνενεχθεῖσιν ἱερῶν καὶ ἀρχείων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ᾧν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς μέτε-
 στι Μιλησίοις· πέμπειν δὲ Μιλησίους εἰς Πίδασα τὸν λαχόντα τῶν πολιτῶν
 φρούραρχον καὶ φρουρούς, ὅσους ἂν ἱκανοὺς εἶναι φαίνεται, καὶ προνοεῖν, ὅπως
 τὰ τεῖχη ἐπισκευάζεται καὶ κατὰ χώραν μένη, καὶ τῆς φυλακῆς ἐπιμε-
 λείσθαι, καθότι ἂν κρίνωσι συμφέρειν. τῶν δὲ ἐκφορίων τῶν γινομένων[ν]
 ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ Πιδασέων τὸ μὲν ἔλαιον εἶναι ἐπιτελεῖς τῶν τελῶ-
 ν, ᾧν καὶ Μιλήσιοι τιθέασιν. τῶν δὲ ἄλλων τελῶν χαλκοῦν ἐφ' ἔτη πέν-
 τε ἄρχοντος στεφανηφόρου Φιλίδου, καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν ἰσταμένω[ν]

²⁰⁷ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/252167>

ἐν τῇ Πιδασίδι, ὅσα ἐστὶν Πιδασέων τῶν ἐμ Πιδάσοις κατοικούντων καὶ ζμηνῶν τὸ ἴσον [ἐ]φ' ἔτη τρία ἄρχοντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ στεφανηφόρου, διελθόντος δὲ τοῦ προειρημένου χρόνου τελεῖν εἰς Μίλητον Πιδασεῖς τὰ αὐτὰ τέλη, καθότι ἂν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Μιλήσιοι τελωνῶνται. δοῦναι δὲ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μιλησίων Πιδασεῦσιν τοῖς κατωικηκόσιν καὶ ἐνμεμενηκόσιν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν χρόνου ἐμ Πιδάσοις ἢ τῇ χώρῃ τῇ Πιδασέων οἰκ<ή>σεις εἰς κλινῶν λόγον τριακοσίων καὶ ἐνενήκοντα. νέμεσθαι δὲ Πιδασεῖς τὰς τε ὑπαρχούσας ἱεράς κτήσεις καὶ δημοσίας καὶ ἂν τινες ἄλλαι προσγίνωνται τοῖς θεοῖς ἢ τῷ δήμῳ πέντε μὲν ἔτη ἄρχοντος στεφανηφόρου Φιλίδου τελούντας τῶν ἐκφορίων χαλκοῦ[ν], διελθόντος δὲ τοῦ προειρημένου χρόνου τὰ ἴσα τέλη, ὅσα καὶ Μιλήσ[ιοι] φέρουσιν. τοῦ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὄρεσιν τοῖς περιορισμένοις γινομένο[υ] σίτου τελεῖν αὐτοῦς διελθόντων τῶν πέντε ἐτῶν ἑκατοστήν εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον. εἶναι δὲ Πιδασέων τοὺς προσγραφησομένους ἀτελεῖς λειτουργιῶν ἐφ' ἔτη δέκα ἄρχοντος στεφανηφόρου Φιλίδου. ἐγδικῆσαι δὲ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μιλησίων καὶ περὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς ἀποκαθεσταμένης αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν, ἐάν τις γίν[η]-ται διάκρισις. συγκεχωρηθῆσαι δὲ Πιδασέων τοῖς προσγραφησομένοις πρὸς τὸ πολίτευμα καὶ ἐνεκτημένοις ἐν τῇ Εὐρωμίδι εἰσάγειν ἀπὸ τοῦ γεινομένου οἰνικοῦ γενήματος ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις κτήσεσιν ἕως πλείστων μετρητῶν χιλίων ἀπὸ μηνὸς Ποσιδεῶνος τοῦ ἐπὶ Φιλίδου τελούσιν ἐλλιμένιον χαλκοῦν εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον ἀπογραψαμένων ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἀρχεῖον τῶν ἐνεκτημένων ἐν τῇ Εὐρωμίδι. κατασκευάσαι δὲ Μιλησίους ὁδὸν ἐκ τῆς Πιδασίδος ζυγίοις πορευτὴν εἰς Ἰωνίαν πόλιν. μετέχειν δὲ Πιδασέων καὶ τοὺς πεπολιτογραφημένους πρότερον τῶν αὐτῶν πᾶσ[ιν] Πιδασεῦσιν πλὴν {πλὴν} τῆς ἀτελείας τῶν λειτουργιῶν. ὑπάρχειν δ[ἐ] καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ κατακεχωρισμένα ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι τῷ γραφέντι περὶ τῶ[ν] ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν συμπολιτείαν κύρια καὶ συντελεῖσθαι αὐτά, καθό[τι] συγκεχώρηται προσφερομένων Πιδασέων πόλιν τε καὶ χώραν καὶ τὰ[ς] [ἐ]κ τούτων προσόδους. ὀρκισάτω δὲ ὁ στεφανηφόρος μετὰ τοῦ ἱεροκῆρυκος [τ]οῦς τε ἦκοντας ἐκ Πιδασέων πρεσβευτὰς καὶ τοὺς πρυτάνεις καὶ τοῦ[ς] εἰρημένους ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ τοὺς κεχειροτονημένους συνέδρους τὸν ὄρκον τόνδε· ἐμμενῶ τοῖς ὁμολογημένοις καὶ ἀναγεγραμμένοις [εἰς] τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον καὶ οὐ παραβήσομαι τέχνην οὐδεμιᾶ οὐδὲ μηχανῆν οὐδὲ ἄ[λλ]ω παραβαίνοντι τὴν συνθήκην ἐπιτρέψω, καὶ ἐὰν τινα ἄλλον πυν[θ]ά[ν]ωμαι αἰρούμενον παραβαίνειν τὰς ὁμολογίας, οὐκ ἐπιτρέψω κατὰ δύνάμιν τὴν ἐμήν, ἀλλὰ δηλώσω τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ. ταῦτα ἀληθῆ, νῆ τῆν Ἑστίαν τῆμ Βουλαίαν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς. καί μοι εὐορκοῦντι μὲν εὖ εἶη, εἰ δὲ ἐφιορκοίην, ἐξώλης εἶην καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τὰμά. ὁμόσαι δὲ ἐμ Πιδάσοις καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Πιδασεῖς τοὺς ὄντας

ἐπιδήμους καὶ ἐν ἡλικίαι ὑπάρχοντας τὸν αὐτὸν ὄρκον προσομνύοντας
καὶ τοὺς κατέχοντας αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν θεοῦς. ὁπότεροι δὲ ἂν μὴ ἐμμ<ε>ίνω-
σιν τοῖς ἐν τῆιδε τῆι συνθήκῃ κατακεχωρισμένοις, ἀδίκους τε εἶναι
αὐτοὺς τῶν θεῶν, οὓς ὁμωμόκασιν, καὶ ἀποτεῖσαι τοὺς μὴ ἐμμεΐναν-
τας τοῖς ἐμμεΐνασιν τάλαντα τριάκοντα.

Inscription 4: Miletos and Kios

I.Milet 3, 141²⁰⁸

γνώμη συνέδρων τῶν αἰρεθέντων, Εὐδώρου τοῦ
Σαμιάδου, Ἀντήνορος τοῦ Εὐανδρίδου, Αὐτοκράτου
τοῦ Ἠγήμονος, Σαμίου τοῦ Ἀνδρίου, Λαοδήμου τοῦ
Λαέρτου, Τιμοπόλιος τοῦ Ἡφαιστίου, Ποσειδωνίου τοῦ
Βοήθου, Λίχαντος τοῦ Ἑρμοφάντου, Διονυσίου τοῦ
Ποσειδωνίου, Πασικλείους τοῦ Βηβιλέως· εἶπαν· ἐπειδὴ
Κιανοὶ ἄποικοι ὄντες τῆς πόλεως καὶ διαφυλάσσον-
τες τῆμ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον φιλίαν ἀπέστειλαν ἱεροποι-
οὺς Νίκανδρον καὶ Φιλιππίδην ψήφισμα κομίζοντας,
ἐν ᾧ ἀπολογισάμενοι τοὺς πολέμους τοὺς κατασχόν-
τας αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν καὶ τὰς δαπάνας τὰς εἰς ταῦ-
τα γινομένας ἀξιοῦσιν εἰς τὰς φιάλας, ἃς προσοφείλου-
σιν τῷ θεῷ, ἀφεθῆναι, ὅσας ἂν δυνατὸν ᾖ, καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ
δὲ οἱ ἦκοντες παρὰ Κιανῶν περὶ τε τούτων διελέγησαν
ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι γεγραμμένοις καὶ ἐμφα-
νίσαντες τὰ οἰκεῖα καὶ φιλόφρονα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα κοινῇ τε
τῷ δήμῳ ἐν Κίῳ καὶ ἰδίαι τὰ γινόμενα τοῖς ἀφικνουμέ-
νοις Μιλησίων ἐμνήσθησαν περὶ πολιτείας, ὅπως ὑπάρχη<ι>
Κιανοῖς ἐν Μιλήτῳ, προσήκει δὲ τῷ δήμῳ κτίστην ὄντι
τῆς ἀποικίας καὶ τὴν εἰς τοὺς οἰκείους εὖνοιαν ἐμ παγ-
τὶ καιρῷ ἀποδεικνυμένῳ μὴ ἀφίστασθαι τοῦ συμφέροντος[ς],
ἀλλ' ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήσασθαι τῶν ἀποίκων τῆμ προσήκου-
σαν· ἐψηφίσθαι Μιλησίοις ἀποκρίνασθαι Κιανοῖς περὶ μὲν τῶμ [φι]-
αλῶν, ὧν ἀξιοῦσι τὴν ἄφεςιν γενέσθαι, διότι, εἰ μὲν μὴ συνέβαινε

καὶ αὐτοὺς τεθλιφθαι διὰ τοὺς πολέμους καὶ τὰς ἀφορίας τὰς
κατασχούσας τὴν χώραν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὴν ἄφε-
σιν ποιήσασθαι τὸν δῆμον τῶν γινομένων ἀπαρχῶν τῶ[ι θε]-
ῷ διὰ τὸ τὸν νόμον τὸμ περὶ τούτων ὑπάρχοντα κωλύειν, ἐ-

²⁰⁸ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/252140>

πει πᾶν τὸ δυνατὸν ἂν ἔ<π>ρα<ξ>εν εἰς τὸ συντελεσθῆναι Κιανοῖς
 τὰ περὶ τούτων ἀξιούμενα, νυνὶ δὲ ἐπιχωρεῖ αὐτοῖς ποιήσασ-
 [θ]αι τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῶν ὀφειλομένων φιαλῶν. ἐπειτὰν
 φαίνεται αὐτοῖς κατὰ καιρὸν εἶναι. περὶ μέντοι τῶν ἐφεξῆς
 οἶεται δεῖν ὁ δῆμος γίνεσθαι τὰς ἀπαρχὰς τῶι θεῶι κατὰ τὰ ὑπὸ
 [τῶ]μ προγόνων συγκείμενα. τὴν δὲ πολιτείαν δεδόσθαι Κιανοῖς,
 [κ]αθότι ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ ἱεροποιοί, ὅπως ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται ἐπὶ πλε[τ]-
 ὄν τὴν οἰκειότητα διατηρῶν καὶ ἀκόλουθα πράσσειν τῆι τῶμ προγό-
 νων αἰρέσει· ἴνα δὲ τοῖς προαιρουμένοις Κιανῶν μετέχειν τῆ[ς]
 πολιτείας γίνηται τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου δεδομένα, ἐπιμελεῖσθ[αι]
 τοὺς πρυτάνεις καὶ ἐπικληροῦν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς φυλάς, ἐὰν
 ἀπομαρτυρῶσιν αὐτοῖς Κιανοὶ μετὰ ψηφίσματος, ὅτι εἰσὶν
 αὐτῶμ πολῖται· παρακαλεῖ δὲ ὁ δῆμος Κιανούς μνημονεύου-
 τας τῶν γινομένων αὐτοῖς φιλανθρώπων τὴν τε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν
 εὐσέ[ι]βειαν {εὐσέβειαν} διατηρεῖν καὶ τὴν οἰκειότητα ἐπὶ πλεῖον αὔξειν ἐπα-
 κολουθοῦντας τῆι τῶμ προγόνων αἰρέσει. οὕτω γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ
 δήμου πολλῶι μᾶλλον ὑπάρξει αὐτοῖς πάντα τὰ φιλόφρονα
 [κ]αὶ ἐν οὐθενὶ λειφθήσονται τῶν συμφερόντων αὐτοῖς καθότι καὶ
 [ἐ]ν τῶι πρότερον χρόνῳ· τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι εἰς στήλην
 λιθίνην καὶ ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπόλλων[ο]ς τοῦ Δελφινί-
 ου· τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς τῆς στήλης καὶ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τοῦ ψη-
 φίσματος ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοὺς τειχοποιούς καὶ τὸν ἀρχιτέκτ[ο]-
 να· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰς ταῦτα δοῦναι τοὺς ἡρημένους ἐπὶ τῆ[ς]
 δημοσίας τραπέζης ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰ τειχο-
 ποϊκά· καλέσαι δὲ τοὺς ἱεροποιούς καὶ ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς τὸ πρυταν[εῖ]-
 ὄν. ἔδοξε τῶι δήμῳ εἰς λεύκωμα ἀναγράψαι τὸ ψήφισμα.

Inscription 5: Miletos and Cretan Settlers

I.Milet 3 37²⁰⁹

ἔδοξε τῶι δήμῳ· γνώμη ἐ[πι]στατῶν· Ἀντίπατρο[ς] ...?. εἶπεν· ἐπε[ιδὴ]
 πρὸς Κρήτας ὑπαρχούσης οἰκειότητος καὶ συγγενε[ίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ],
 συγκειμένης δὲ καὶ συμμαχίας, ἦν διὰ πατέρων ὁ δῆμο[ς κατὰ τὰ]
 διὰ τῶν ψηφισθέντων ὠρισμένα τετήρηκεν, ὡς προσ[ῆ]κον ἦν ἀπὸ [τοῦ
 θεοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς συ<γ>ενείας εἰλήφοσιν, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἔ[ργων ὁ δῆμο[ς]
 ἐκφανῆ {ι} καθιστὰς τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν κοινῆι τε πάντ[ων Κρητῶν]
 ἐποιεῖτο πρόνοιαν καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις τῆς ἀφ' αὐτοῦ βοηθείας ὑπ[ή]-
 κουε τοῖς ἀξιουμένοις διὰ τὸ κρίνειν κ[α]ὶ κατὰ τ[ὰ ἐκατέρους]
 οἰκείως συμφέροντα ἀκολουθῶν δὲ [κ]αὶ τ[—]

²⁰⁹ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/252160>

(Lines 10-29 missing)

[—][—] ὅπως οὖν σ[υναν]-
[τήσηι ὁ δῆμος τοῖς βουλομ[ένοις πολιτεύε]σθαι μετὰ Μιλησίων
[—][—]δ..Ἀπόλλων..5..
[.....c.15..... περι ὧν τὴν εὐνοίαν ἀπεφίνατο ἐ[πι τοῦ θεοῦ]
[τοῦ δευτέρου τοῦ μετ' Ἀθη|ναγ]όραν καὶ προσέλαβε σύμψηφον τὴν τοῦ
θεοῦ γνώμην, ἀγαθῆι τύ|χηι· ἐψηφίσθαι Μιλησίοις τοῖς μὲν διαπεμ-
[ψαμένοις περὶ τῆς πολί]τειας, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα κατασφραγισάμενοι
[....11..... κατὰ τὸ πρό]τερον ψήφισμα, δεδόσθαι μετουσίαν
[τῆς ἐμ Μιλήτωι πολιτείας καὶ| ιερ]ῶν καὶ ἀρχείων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὧν καὶ
Μιλησίοις μέτεστιν. ἵνα δὲ πά|ντα προσού]σης καὶ τῆς [.2-3.] τῶν θεῶν
[εὐμεν]είας τάσσηται, τὸμ προφ[ήτην κ]αὶ τὸν ταμίαν τὸν
πα[ρ]εδ[ρ]εῦοντα ἐν τῷ ιερῷ συντελέσ[σ]αι θυσί]αν τῷ Ἀπ[όλ]λωνι τῷ
Διδυμεῖ, τὸν δὲ στεφανηφόρον τῷ Δε[λ]φινίωι, τὸν [δ]ὲ ιερέα καὶ τοὺς
πρυτάνεις καὶ τοὺς ἡρημένους ἐπὶ τ[ῆ]ι φυλ[ακ]ῆι τῆι τε Ἐστίαι τῆι
Βουλαίαι καὶ τῷ Διὶ τῷ Βουλαίωι ἐπευχο|[μένου]ς τὴμ μετάδοσιν
τῆς πολιτείας ἐπὶ σωτηρία καὶ ὁμον[ο]ίαί πά]ντων Μιλησίων γε-
νέσθαι· [ὅπ]ως δὲ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα διαμ[είνη]ι τὸν ἀεὶ χρόν[ον], γε[νο]μέ-
νης [τῆς μεταδόσεως] μ[ὴ ἐξ]έστω τοῖς [μ]ετειληφόσι τῆς πολιτεί[α]ς
[δικάζεσθαι περὶ μηθενὸς μηθενὶ τῶμ |πολι]τ[ῶ]ν, ἀλλ' οἰκείους καὶ
φίλους ὑπάρχειν τοῖς τε πολίταις καὶ| τοῖς ἄρχουσιν, τοῖς δὲ δόγ-
μασιν τοῦ δήμου ἐμμένειν [—]

(Lines 50-59 Missing)

[—| ἀποτίνε]ιν τὸ τίμημα. ἐὰν δὲ ὁ διώκων μὴ μετ[αλάβ]ηι
[τὸ πέμπτο]ν μέρος] τ[ῶ]ν ψήφων, ἀποτεισάτω τὸ ἥμισυ το[ῦ τιμ]ή-
[ματος —|—] τὸ μὲν τῆς πόλεως, τὸ δὲ τοῦ ιδιώτου· τὴν δὲ
[προθεσμί]αν ἐντὸς τρι]ῶν εἶναι ἐνιαυτῶν. ἐπικληρωσάτωσαν δὲ
[αὐτοὺς οἱ πρ]υτάν[ε]ις καὶ ἐπὶ φυλάς, ἃς ἂν ὁ δῆμος ἀποδείξῃ
[.6... λαγχ]ῆ|ἀγέτ[ω]σαν δὲ φυλακὴν καὶ φρουραρχίαν ἐτῶν παρελ-
[θόντων εἴ]κοσι· λητουργιῶν δ' ἔστωσαν ἀτελεῖς ἔτη πέντε ἀπὸ
[ἐνιαυτοῦ τ]ῶ| μ[ε]τὰ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Πρωταγόρ[ου]· π[ρο]ηήσασθαι
[δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀνα]τ[άκτα]ς τὴν πρᾶσιν τοῦ ἐνλιμενίου, ἐφ' ὧτε οἱ πρι-
[άμενοι τῆ]ν ὄνην ἀ]τελ<εἶ>ς [ἀφήσουσ]ιν τοὺς εἰσάγοντάς τι τῶμ πολι]-
[τογραφηθέντων —]

(Lines 70-79 Missing)

[—][...7...]ς καὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις
[—][.6...] νομ[ί]ζωσιν ἐπιτηδει-
[. . εἶναι .5. . ὁ δὲ ὄρκος ἔστω· συμπολι]τεύσομαι τῷ δήμωι τῷ Μιλη-
[σίωι μεθ' ὁμονοίας καὶ συνδιατηρήσω] τὴν πόλιν] καὶ τὰ φρούρια, ἃ τε
[νῦν κατέχει ὁ δῆμος καὶ ὅσα ἂν ὑστε]ρον πρὸς α]ὐτὰ προσγίνηται,

ἀεὶ κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐμήν. ἐμμενῶ δὲ| και πᾶ]σι τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψηφίσμα-
[τι γεγραμμένοις και οὐ παραβήσομαι, ἀλλ' ἀγ]ωνιστῆς ὡς προσῆκον
[ὑπάρξω ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, και μοι εὐορ|κοῦν]τι γ[ί]νοιτο ἄμεινον, εἰ δὲ
[ἐφιορκοίην, ἐξώλης εἶην αὐτὸς και τὰμά·| ἀναγράψαι] δὲ τό τε ψηφισμα
τόδε και τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ὁμοσάντων εἰς| τὸ ἰε]ρὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος
τοῦ Δελφινίου11.....]το β[.....15..... τοῦς| δὲ τειχο]-
[ποιοὺς μετὰ τοῦ ἀ]ρχιτέκτονος μ[ισθῶσαι τὴν ἀναγρα|φήν. εἰς δὲ]
[τοῦτο ὑπηρε]τῆσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς δη[μοσίας τραπέζης ἐκ το]ῦ δοθέντος]
[εἰς τὰ τειχ]ποικιά. ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι εἰς [φυλακὴν και σωτη]ρίαν τῆς]
[πόλεως. εἰ]δοξε τῷ δήμῳ εἰς λεύκωμα ἀναγράψ[αι τὸ| ψηφισμα].

Inscription 6: Miletos and Seleukia-Tralles

(Two decrees) Milesian Decree:²¹⁰ I.Milet 3.143A; SEG 37.982

[.....c.20..... ἐμφανίζο]ντες π[ερὶ τῶν πρότερον ὑπαρ]-
[χόντων ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀμφοτέραις] πρὸς αὐτὰς φιλανθρ[ώπων, και]
[νῦν? Σελευκεῖς διὰ προγόνων ο]ϊκείως χρώμενοι τῷ δήμ[ῳ τῷ]
[Μιλησίων διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] συγγένειαν τετιμήκασι τὸν δη-
[μον και ἀπεστάλκασιν πρεσβε]υτὰς Μηνόδωρον Τιμέου, Ἀντιγένην
[.....c.18..... Πausa]νίου, Ἀριστ[έ]αν Πausανίου, Διονύσιον
[ἐμφανιοῦντας τὴν αἴρεσιν αὐτ]ῶν κατὰ μέρος, ἣν ἔχουσι πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος
[τὸ Μιλησίων, και βουλόμενοι] τιμᾶν και τὸν Ἀπόλλω τὸν Διδυμῆ, εἰς ὃν ἀναφέ-
[ρουσιν και τὴν ἀρχή]ν τῆς πρὸς τὴν πόλιν συγγενείας, ἐψηφισμένοι
[εἰσὶ πέμπειν θε]ωροῦς τοὺς συντελέσοντας καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος πομπὴν
[και θυσίαν και ἄ]λλας τιμὰς μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς και φιλοτιμίας·
[ὅπως οὖν] ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται συναντῶν προσηκόντως τοῖς προ-
[σηνηνεγ]μένοις πρὸς τε τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς και πρὸς τὴν πόλιν εὐ-
[νοϊκῶς κ]αὶ μεταδιδούς αὐτοῖς τῶμ παρ' αὐτῷ τιμίων, δεδόχθαι Μιλησίοις·
[ἐπη]ιν<ῆ>σθαι μὲν Σελευκεῖς αἰρέσεως ἔνεκεν και εἶναι ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ
[πα]ρὰ τῇ βουλῇ και τῷ δήμῳ, δέχεσθαι δὲ και τὰς ἐψηφισμένας
[ὑ]π' αὐτῶν τιμὰς μετ' εὐνοίας, δεδόσθαι δὲ και πολιτείαν Σελευκεῦσι
τοῖς νέμουσι πατρίδα και πόλιν Σελεύκειαν ἕως εἰς στεφανηφόρον
Ἐπικράτην και μῆνα Ταυρεῶνα· εἰ δὲ τινες κατὰ δόγμα τοῦ δήμου πολῖται
γεγένηται, μὴ ἔνεμον δὲ τὴν Σελευκεῖον πόλιν, ἢ ἐάν τισιν μετὰ ταῦτα
δοθῆι παρ' αὐτοῖς πολιτεία, ὑπάρχειν τούτοις και τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν πολιτείαν νεί-
μασι πρότερον πατρίδα και πόλιν Σελεύκειαν ἔτη δέκα ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς τὸ
πολίτευμα προσγραφῆς. ὅποσοι δ' ἂν αὐτῶν αἰρῶνται μεθ' ἡμῶν
συμπολιτεύεσ-
θαι και μετέχειν ἱερῶν και ἀρχείων και τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων, ὧν και τοῖς ἄλλοις

²¹⁰ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/252141>

μέτεστι Μιλησίοις, ποιείσθωσαν τὴν ἀπογραφὴν ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἀρχεῖον ἀν' ἑ-
 καστον ἔτος ἕως τῆς εἰκάδος τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος πατρόθεν κ[αί]
 ἦς ἀν ὧσι φυλῆς· ὁ δὲ γραμματεὺς εἰσαγγελλέτω εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ
 τὴν ἀπογραφὴν· οἱ δὲ πρυτάνεις ἐπικληρούτωσαν αὐτούς, ἐφ' ἃς ἀν ὁ δῆμος
 ἀποδείξει φυλάς· τοὺς δὲ προσιόντας πρὸς τὴν πολιτείαν τῶμ μὲν ἄλλων παρα-
 χρῆμα μετέχειν πάντων, φυλακὴν δὲ καὶ φρουραρχίαν συγκληροῦσθαι διελ-
 θόντων ἐτῶν δέκα ἀφ' ἐκάστης ἐπικληρώσεως· ἐὰν δὲ τις πολιτεύηται
 παρὰ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα, εἶναι αὐτὸν ὑπεύθυνον τῆι τε ἐμ μολποῖς ἐνστάσει καὶ
 τῆι δίκῃ τῆς ξενίας κατὰ τοὺς νόμους· ἵνα δὲ τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς δήμοις περὶ
 τῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς φιλανθρωπίας διαμνημονεύηται εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον, ἀναγρά-
 ψαι τὰ ψηφίσματα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος
 τοῦ Δελφινίου· τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς τῆς στήλης καὶ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῶν ψηφισμά-
 των ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοὺς τειχοποιοὺς μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος· εἰς δὲ ταῦτα ὑπη-
 ρετῆσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς δημοσίας τραπέζης ἀπὸ τῶν εἰς τὰ τειχοποϊκὰ ἐξειρημ[έ]-
 νων· ἵνα δὲ ἕκαστα γίνηται μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐμενείας, τὸμ μὲν προφήτη[ν]
 καὶ τὸν ταμίαν τὸν παρεδρεύοντα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ θυσίας καὶ προσόδους ἱερῶν ποι-
 ῆσασθαι τὰς νομιζόμενας τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Διδυμεῖ, τὸν δὲ στεφανηφόρον μετὰ
 τῶν προσεταίρων τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Δελφινίῳ, ἐπευχομένους συνενεγκεῖν τὰ [ἐ]-
 ψηφισμένα ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀμφοτέραις· τοὺς δὲ πρεσβευτὰς καλέσαι εἰς τὸ
 πρυτανεῖον,
 ἀποστεῖλαι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ξέγνια, τῆς [δὲ] ἀποστολῆς ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοὺς πρυ-
 τάνεις καὶ τοὺς ἡρημένους ἐπὶ τῆι φυλακῇ. vacat

Seleukian Decree:²¹¹

I.Milet 3.143B; SEG 37.982

ἔδοξε τῆι βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· βουλῆς γνώμη· ἐπειδὴ Μιλήσιοι φίλοι καὶ οἰκεῖοι
 ὑπάρχοντες διὰ προγόνων πρότερόν τε διετέλουν ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ πρόνοιαν
 ποιούμενοι καὶ κοινῇ παντὸς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σελευκέων καὶ καθ' ἰδίαν ἐκάσ-
 του τῶν ἀφικνουμένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα παραγενόμε-
 νος Πρύτανις ἀνήγγελλεν, διότι τὴν αὐτὴν αἴρεσιν ἔχοντες οὐθενὸς ἀφί[σ]-
 τανται τῶν τῆι πόλει συμφερόντων ἐμ πᾶσιν οἰκείως ἀποδεικνύμενοι τῆ[ν]
 αὐτῶν σπουδὴν· ὅπως οὖν ἐπὶ πλεόν αὔξηται τὰ προὑπάρχοντα φιλάνθρωπα
 καὶ οἰκεῖα ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀμφοτέραις καὶ φαίνηται τιμῶν ὁ δῆμος Μιλησίους
 ἀξίως ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν εὐνοίας· τύχη ἀγαθῇ· δεδόχθαι τῆι
 βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· ἐπὶ τῆι εὐνοίᾳ καὶ τῆι προαιρέσει,
 ἦν
 ἔχουσιν εἰς τὸν δῆμον· δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ πολιτείαν ἐφ' ἴσῃ καὶ ὁμοίᾳ καὶ
 μετέχειν αὐτοὺς ἀπάντων, ὧ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πολῖται μετέχουσιν, καὶ τὸμ βουλό-

²¹¹ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/252124>

μενον Μιλησίων πολιτεύεσθαι ἐν Σελευκε[ία] ἀπογράφεσθαι πρὸς τε τοὺς στρατηγούς καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου· τοὺς δὲ καταχωρίζειν εἰς φυλὴν τὸν ἀπογραψόμενον, εἰς ἣν ἂμ βούληται. ὑπάρχειν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ προεδρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν πᾶσιν καὶ ἔφοδον ἐπὶ τῆμ βουλῆν καὶ τὸν δήμον πρώτους μετὰ τὰ ἱερά. ποιεῖσθαι δ' ἐπιμέλειαν τοὺς ἀεὶ χειροτονουμένους στρατηγούς τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Μιλησίων καὶ προνοεῖν τῶν παραγινομένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ὅπως πάντων τυγγάνωσι τῶν καλῶς ἐχόντων. πέμπεσθαι δὲ καὶ θεωροὺς τοὺς [σ]υγτελέσοντας θυσίαν τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Διδυμεῖ τῶι ἀρχηγέτη τῆς οἰκει- [ότητο]ς, ἐν οἷς ἂν χρόνοις συντελῶσι Μιλήσιοι. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἐψηφισμένοις συν- [τελέσαι θυσία]ν τῶι Διὶ τῶι Λαρασίωι καὶ τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τοὺς ἱερομνήμονας κα[ι]

[τοὺς ..7-9... καὶ τοὺς ἱε]ροκ[ήρυκα]ς ἐπευχομένους συνενεγκεῖν ἀμφοτέραις [ταῖς πόλεσι τὰ ἐψηφισμένα καὶ εἶναι] ἐπὶ σωτηρία καὶ εὐτυχία· ἀνα- [γράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην] καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ [Διὸς τοῦ Λαρασίου· τῆς δὲ κατασκευῆς τῆς στήλης ἐπι]μεληθῆναι τους ἐ- [πι]c.20..... τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰς τὰς θυ]σίας καὶ τὴν κα- [τασκευὴν τῆς στήλης ὑπηρετῆσαι τοὺς ταμίασ?· τὸν δὲ πρ]εσβευ[τήν] [καλέσαι εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον—]

Inscription 7: Teos and the Syrian Cities

SEG XLI 1003, reproduced in Saba, *Isopoliteia*, p. 223.

This includes the second decree of the dossier, from lines 90-113.

... ἐπεὶ δὲ κ[α]-
 [λῶς ἔ]χον ἐστὶν ἅμα ταῖς ἄλλαις ταῖς δεδομέναις παρὰ τῆς πόλε-
 [ως τῶ β]ασιλεῖ τιμαῖς καὶ ἀκόλουθον τῆ τε τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῶν
 [φίλων] εὐνοία πρὸς τὸν δῆμον καὶ τῆ παρ' ἡμῶν πρὸς τε τὸν βασι-
 [λέα καὶ] τοὺς φίλους αὐ[τ]οῦ ἐκτενεῖαι καθάπερ εἰς κοινὸν τεθῆναι τὸ
 [τῶν ἐ]πωνύμων πόλεων τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως προγόνων τὰ δε[δο]-
 [μένα κ]αὶ δοθησόμενα παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀγαθὰ τῶι δήμωι (ἵνα) ψη[φισ]-
 [θείσης] αὐτοῖς πᾶσιν παρ' ἡμῖν τῆς πολιτείας καὶ ἐτοιμότεροι π[ρὸς]
 [τὰς εὐ]εργεσίας ὑπάρχωσι σπεύδοντες διὰ παντὸς, καθά[π]ερ
 [καλό]ν ἐστίν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἰδίας πατρίδος [κ]αὶ [τῆ]ν προϋπάρχουσαν τοῖς
 [...]οις πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀνανεωσόμεθα φιλιάν· τύχη ἀγαθῆ· τοῦ[ς] στρα-
 [τηγο]ὺς καὶ τοὺς τιμύχους εἰσενενγκεῖν εἰς τὰς ἐπιούσας ἀρχαι-
 [ρεσία]ς καθότι δοθήσεται πολιτέα τῶι δήμωι τῶ Ἀντιοχέων τῶμ
 [πρὸς] Δάφνη καὶ τῶι δήμωι τῶι Σελευκέων τῶν ἐμ Πιερία [κα]ὶ τῶι δή
 [μωι τ]ῶι Λαοδικέων τῶμ πρὸς θαλάσση· ἀναγράψαι δὲ [κ]αὶ τὸ ψή-
 [φισμα τ]ὸδε εἰς τὴν παραστάδα τοῦ νέω τοῦ Διονύσω κα[ὶ κ]αθιερω-

[σαι, τῆ]ς δὲ ἀναγραφῆς τοῦ ψηφίσματος ἐπιμεληθῆνα[ι τ]οὺς ἐνεσ-
 [τηκότ]ας τα[μί]ας· ἵνα δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος καὶ ἡ ἀ[δ]ελφὴ αὐτοῦ
 [βασί]λισσα [Λ]αοδίκη εἰδήσωσι τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τοῦ [δ]ήμου, ἀποδει-
 [ξαι π]ρεσβευτὰς τρεῖς ἤδη οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸ
 [μὲν ψ]ήφισμα τόδε ἀποδώσουσι καὶ ἀσπασάμεν[ο]ι ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου
 [καὶ] συνησθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὑγιαίνειν αὐτοὺς [καὶ] πράσσειν ὃν τρόπον
 [αὐτ]οὶ τε βούλονται καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχόμεθα καὶ ἐμφανίσαν-
 [τες] τὰς [τι]μὰς τὰς ἐψ[η]φισμ[έ]νας καὶ δ[η]λώσαντες αὐτοῖς [-]

Inscription 8: Amyzon for Menestratos of Phokaia

Ma, 1999 inscr. No. 10; Robert, *Amyzon* no. 15²¹²

[βασιλε]υόντων Ἀντιόχου Μεγάλου κ[αὶ Ἀντιόχου τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἔτους]
 [δω]δεκάτου καὶ ἑκατοστοῦ, μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίου[· ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως —]
 [..]ορος, τοῦ δὲ Διὸς τοῦ Κρηταγενέτα καὶ Δικτύννης [...c.11...., ὡς δὲ]
 [ὁ δ]ῆμος ἄγει ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου θεοῦ δευτέρου καὶ ἱερέως τ[ῶν βασι]-
 [λ]έων Ἰάσονος τοῦ Βαλά<γ>ρου· ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ· γνώμη πρυτάνε[ων·]
 [ἐ]πειδὴ Μενέστρατος Ἀγαθοκ<λ>εῖους Φωκαιεὺς κατασταθεὶς ἐπὶ
 τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου ἐπιστάτης ἀποδείξεις πολλὰς πεποίηται τῆς αὐτοῦ
 καλοκαγαθίας εἰς πάντα τὰ τῷ δήμῳ συμφέροντα γράφων πρὸ Ζεῦ-
 ξιν τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐνοίας ἣν ἔχων διατελεῖ
 εἰς τε τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ εἰς {ι} τὸν Ζεῦξιν, πολλάκι δὲ γράφων καὶ
 πρὸς Νικομήδην καὶ Χίονιν τὸν ἐπ' Ἀλίνδων τεταγμένον ὁμοίως
 ἐγμартυρῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐνοίας τῶν πολιτῶν· ἐσπούδασεν δὲ
 καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀποσκευῆς τῆς κατασχεθείσης ἡμῶν ἐν Ἀλίνδοις ὅπως
 κομισώμεθα· φροντίζει δὲ διὰ τέλους καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων ἡμῶν πολι-
 τῶν τῶν κατοικούντων τὰς αὐτονόμους προσκαλούμενος εἰς τὸν
 συνοικισμὸν τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου ἰδία τε τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τῶν πολι-
 τῶν συμπεριφερόμενος διατελεῖ· ἵνα οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται
 τοῖς ἀξίοις τῶν ἀνδρῶν χάριτας ἀποδιδούς· τύχη ἀγαθῆ· δεδό-
 χθαι Ἀμυζονέων τῷ δήμῳ· ἐπηνῆσθαι Μενέστρατον ἐπὶ τῇ αἰρέ-
 σει ἣ ἔχει εἰς τὸν δῆμον· εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ εὐεργέτην τοῦ δήμου·
 δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πολι{ρ}τεῖαν {²⁶πολιτείαν} ²⁶ καὶ ἔγκτησιν καὶ μετουσίαν
 ἰε-
 [ρ]ῶν καὶ ἀρχε<ι>ῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ὧν καὶ Ἀμυζονεῖς με-
 [τέ]χουσι πάντη· τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκγόνοις· πέμπε[σ]-
 [θαι δὲ] αὐτῷ καὶ γέρας ἀπὸ τῶν δημοτελῶν θυσιῶν καθότι καὶ τοῖς

Inscription 9: Amyzon for Nikomedes

²¹² <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/256811>

Ma 1999 no. 11; J. & L. Robert 1983: 192-3, no. 16²¹³

[—]

[— καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπ]άντων ὧν καὶ Ἀμ[υζο]-
[νεῖς μετέχουσιν ἐν] ταῖς Χρυσαιορέωμ πόλε[σιν·]
[ἐλέσθαι δὲ ἄνδρ]ας οἱ ἀφικόμενοι πρὸς Νικομήδη[ν]
[τὸ] ψήφισμα ἀποδώσουσιν καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι αὐτ[ὸν]
[πα]ρὰ τοῦ δήμου παρακαλέσουσιν ὄντα εὐεργέτην πει-
ρᾶσθαι ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιον γίνεσθαι τῷ δήμῳ·
ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε ψήφισμα ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τό-
πωι τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος· ἐπιμεληθῆναι δὲ τῆς ἀ-
ναγραφῆς τοὺς προστάτας ὅπως ἦι πᾶσι φανερόν
ὅτι ὁ δῆμος εὐεργετηθεὶς ἀποδιδῶι χάριτας ἀξία[ς]
τοῖς εὐεργετοῦσιν αὐτόν· τὸ δὲ ἀνήλωμα εἰς ταῦτα
δότην ὁ καθεσταμένος ταμίας ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν
προσόδων· ἠιρέθησαν Μυωνίδης Ἰεροκλείου, Μένιπ-
πος Νικασικλείου.

Inscription 10: Plion for Metrodoros the Physician

OGIS 220²¹⁴

ἐπειδὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος ἐ<φ>έσ-
ταλκεν, ὅτι τραυματίας γενόμενος
ἐν τῇ μάχῃ εἰς τὸν τράχηλον
θεραπευθ<εί>η ὑπὸ Μητροδώρου τοῦ
ιατροῦ ἀκινδύν<ω>ς, ἐφέσταλκεν <δὲ>
περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Μελέαγρος ὁ στρα-
τηγὸς προορώμενος τὸ τῆς πό-
λεως συμφέρον· δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ
καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· ἐπαινέσαι μὲν
Μητρόδωρον Τιμοκλέους Ἀμφι-
πολίτην ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ
εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς βασιλέας
Ἀντίοχον καὶ Σέλευκον καὶ τὸν
δῆμον· εἶναι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ πρόξε-
νον καὶ εὐεργέτην τῆς πόλεως·
δεδόσθαι δ' αὐτῷ καὶ πολιτείαν
καὶ <ἔγ>κτησιν καὶ ἔφοδον ἐπὶ τὴν

²¹³ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/256814?bookid=483&location=1682>

²¹⁴ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/287671>

βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον πρώτῳ<ι>
μετὰ τὰ ἱερά· ἐξεῖναι δ' αὐτῷ καὶ
εἰς φυλὴν καὶ φρατρίαν ἣν ἂν βού-
ληται εἰσελθεῖν — —]

Inscription 11: Inscriptio 11: Antiochos I, Pion, and Aristodikides
OGIS 221; Austin no. 164; RC 10-13²¹⁵
Greek only available for RC 10-12.

Μελέαγρος Ἰλιέων τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαί-
ρειν· ἀπέδωκεν ἡμῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης ὁ Ἄσσιος ἐπι-
στολὰς παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου, ὃν τάντιγρα-
φα ὑμῖν ὑπογεγράφαμεν· ἐνέτυχεν δ' ἡμῖν καὶ αὐ-
τὸς φάμενος, πολλῶν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐτέρων διαλε-
γομένων καὶ στέφανον διδόντων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ-
μεῖς παρακολουθοῦμεν διὰ τὸ καὶ πρεσβεῦσαι ἀ-
πὸ τῶν πόλεων τινὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, βούλεσθαι τὴν
χώραν τὴν δεδομένην αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀν-
τιόχου καὶ διὰ τὸ ἱερόν καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐνοι-
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 φιλόφρονα αὐτῷ καὶ καθ' ὅτι ἂν
συγχωρήσῃ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ποιησάμενοι καὶ στη-
λώσαντες καὶ θέντες εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἵνα μένη ὑμῖν
βεβαίως εἰς πάντα τὸν χρόνον τὰ συγχωρηθέντα·
ἔρρωσθε.

βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μελεά-
γρῳ χαίρειν· δεδώκαμεν Ἀριστοδικίδει τῷ Ἀσσίῳ
γῆς ἐργασίμου πλῆθρα δισχίλια προσενέγκασθαι
πρὸς τὴν Ἰλιέων πόλιν ἢ Σκηψίων· σὺ οὖν σύνταξον
παραδειξάμενος Ἀριστοδικίδει ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμορούσης τῆι
Γεργιθίῃ ἢ τῆι Σκηψίῃ, οὗ ἂν δοκιμάζῃς, τὰ δισχίλια
πλῆθρα τῆς γῆς, καὶ προσορίσαι εἰς τὴν Ἰλιέων ἢ τὴν
Σκηψίων· ἔρρωσο.

βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μελε-
άγρῳ χαίρειν· ἐνέτυχεν ἡμῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης ὁ
Ἄσσιος, ἀξιῶν δοῦναι αὐτῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῆι ἐφ' Ἑλλησ-
πόντου σατραπείῃ τὴν Πέτραν ἡμῶν πρότερον

²¹⁵ <https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/287716>

εἶχεν Μελέαγρος, καὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς Πετρίδος ἐργασίμου π<λ>έθρα χίλια πεντακόσια, καὶ ἄλλα γῆς πλέθρα δισχίλια ἐργασίμου ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμορούσης τῆι πρότερον δοθείσῃ αὐτῶι μερίδι· καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν τε Πέτραν δεδώκαμεν αὐτῶι, εἰ μὴ δέδοται ἄλλωι πρότερον, καὶ τὴν γῶραν τὴν πρὸς τῆι Πέτραι καὶ ἄλλα γῆς πλέθρα δισχίλια ἐργασίμου διὰ τὸ φίλον ὄντα ἡμέτερον παρεσχῆσθαι ἡμῖν τὰς καθ' αὐτὸν χρείας μετὰ πάσης εὐνοίας καὶ προθυμίας· σὺ οὖν ἐπισκεψάμενος, εἰ μὴ δέδοται ἄλλωι πρότερον αὕτη ἢ Πέτρα, παρὰδειξον αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτῆι γῶραν Ἀριστοδικίδῃ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς χώρας τῆς ὁμορούσης τῆι πρότερον δεδομένηι χώραι Ἀριστοδικίδῃ σύνταξον καταμετρήσαι καὶ παραδείξαι αὐτῶι πλέθρα δισχίλια, καὶ ἐᾶσαι αὐτὸν προσενέγκασθαι πρὸς ἣν ἂμ βούληται πόλιν τῶν ἐν τῆι χώραι τε καὶ συμμαχίαι· οἱ δὲ βασιλικοὶ λαοὶ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ τόπου ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἡ Πέτρα ἐὰμ βούλωνται οἰκεῖν ἐν τῆι Πέτραι ἀσφαλείας ἕνεκε, συντετάχαμεν Ἀριστοδικίδῃ {²⁶Ἀριστοδικίδῃ}²⁶ ἐὰν αὐτοὺς οἰκεῖν· ἔρρωσο βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μελεάγρῳ χαίρειν· ἐνέτυχεν ἡμῖν Ἀριστοδικίδης, φάμενος Πέτραν τὸ χωρίον καὶ τὴν γῶραν τὴν συγκύρουσαν, περὶ ἧς πρότερον ἐγράψαμεν διδόντες αὐτῶι, οὐδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν παρεληφέναι διὰ τὸ Ἀθηναίωι τῶι ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυστάθμου ἐπικεχωρῆσθαι, καὶ ἠξίωσεν ἀντὶ μὲν τῆς Πετρίτιδος χώρας παραδειχθῆναι αὐτῶι τὰ ἴσα πλέθρα, συγχωρηθῆναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πλέθρα δισχίλια, προσενέγκασθαι πρὸς ἣν ἂμ βούληται τῶμ πόλεων τῶν ἐν τῆι ἡμετέραι συμμαχίαι, καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον ἐγράψαμεν· ὁρῶντες οὖν αὐτὸν εὖνουν ὄντα καὶ πρόθυμον εἰς τὰ ἡμέτερα πράγματα βουλόμεθα πολυρεῖν τάνθρώπου, καὶ περὶ τούτων συγκεχωρήκαμεν· φησὶν δὲ εἶναι τῆς Πετρίτιδος χώρας τὰ συγχωρηθέντα αὐτῶι πλέθρα χίλια πεντακόσια· σύνταξον οὖν καταμετρήσαι Ἀριστοδικίδῃ καὶ παραδείξαι γῆς ἐργασίμου τὰ τε δισχίλια καὶ πεντακόσια πλέθρα καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν περὶ τὴν Πέτραν ἄλλα ἐργασίμου χίλια πεντακόσια ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς χώ-

ρας τῆς συνοριζούσης τῆι ἐν ἀρχῇ δοθείσῃ
αὐτῶι παρ' ἡμῶν· ἐᾶσαι δὲ καὶ προσενέγκασθαι
τῆγ χώραν Ἀριστοδικίδην πρὸς ἣν ἂν βούληται
πόλιν τῶν ἐν τῆι ἡμετέραι συμμαχίαι, καθά-
περ καὶ ἐν τῆι πρότερον ἐπιστολῆι ἐγράψαμε[ν]·
ἔρρωσο.