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Some Aspects of the Seleucid Empire: the Greek Inscriptions from Failaka, in the Arabian Gulf

The material presented in this article was found on the small island – measuring some 11.5 km. by 5 km. – now known as Failaka, which lies about 13 km. off the coast of Kuwait, at the northern end of the Arabian Gulf. The first Greek find from Failaka was an early hellenistic inscription (no.1) which was found by chance in the 1930’s, during ploughing on a low hill called locally Tell Khazneh («The Hoard»), in the south-west corner of the island. This find was important and exciting support for the Greek historical tradition of Greek exploration of the coast and offshore islands of the Gulf initiated by Alexander the Great.

From 1958 to 1963 a Danish archaeological team devoted five campaigns to the excavation of a mound (F 5) and a block of buildings (F 4), a short way south of Tell Khazneh. Preliminary reports of the excavation and finds have been published in Kuml, the journal of the Archaeological Society of Jutland (Kuml 1958, 172–200; 1962, 153–207; 1979, 219–236). Of the volumes of the final publication of the Danish excavations those on the terracotta figurines and the hellenistic pottery were published in 1982 and 1983 (n.22); further volumes on the hellenistic material, and on the prehistoric finds, are in progress (for the latter see P. KAERUM, Failaka/Dilmun I.1: The stamp and cylinder seals, Aarhus 1983). These excavations discovered a small fortified settlement, with two Greek temples, at F 5, and a complex of extra-mural buildings, including a terracotta workshop, at F 4; their discoveries are of almost inestimable value for the history of the eastern hellenistic world, since very few hellenistic sites have been chosen for controlled excavations. The Greek dedicatory inscription (no.2) and the Seleucid text (no.3) were discovered at F 5 in 1959, in the course of the Danish excavations.

In 1983 a joint French and Kuwaiti archaeological team, under the direction of Dr. J.-F. SALLÉS, held excavations on the island, in the same area, and found a new hellenistic sanctuary (B 6), extra muros, by the present coastline. This team also cleaned, and in 1984 conducted excavations, at Tell Khazneh, the findspot of the first inscription, where in 1976 an Italian team, from the University of Venice, had dug trenches and found material dating from the fifth century BC to the hellenistic period. The results of these excavations were presented by Dr. SALLÉS in papers at the Seminar for Arabian Studies in London in 1983 (now published in Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies 14, 1984, pp. 9–25), and in Cambridge in July
1984 (see n. 2). The final report of the excavation of B 6, Fouilles Françaises à Failaka 1983, edited by J.-F. Salles (Collection Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient, Lyon) is now published (1984). We are extremely grateful to Dr. Salles for generous and valuable discussion of the new finds.

The site at Tell Khazneh is another sanctuary site; it provides an important missing link in the history of the island because, unlike the other sanctuaries at F 5 and B 6, it was occupied in the Neo-Babylonian and/or Achaemenid period, thus confirming the historical tradition of a pre-Greek sanctuary on the island (see below, p. 31). During the hellenistic period the sanctuary continued in occupation until approximately the end of the second century BC; it was, therefore, in existence for the first of the two main phases into which occupation of F 5 is at present divided (from the early or middle third century to about the end of the second century BC). Both Tell Khazneh and F 5 were reoccupied in or around the first century BC. The original building of the sanctuaries at B 6 and the settlement F 5 are thought by Salles to be approximately contemporary; but B 6 may have been abandoned earlier than F 5, perhaps in the middle of the second century, since no find from it needs to be dated later than the reign of Antiochus IV. Thus for at least a century (and perhaps more) within the third to second centuries BC, as many as three hellenistic sanctuary sites, and one secular complex of buildings (F 4) existed on the island. All these sites are small; but there is no reason to believe that they represent the sum total of sites of this period on the island. No hellenistic cemetery has yet been found or excavated on Failaka.

The task of identifying and sorting out relationships between the sanctuaries and the communities attached to them will be a complex matter, and cannot be completed until all the hellenistic sites have been fully published. Our article will, we hope, contribute to this task by republishing, besides the dedicatory inscriptions (nos. 1 and 2) the single most important Greek inscription from Failaka, the long and difficult Seleucid dossier (no. 3). Our collaboration arises from a happy coincidence: C. Rouché’s opportunity to study the inscriptions from Failaka during several year’s residence in Kuwait, and S. M. Sherwin-White’s independent preparation of a study on the Seleucid empire in the east. We are most grateful to the Ministry of Information in Kuwait and to the authorities at the Kuwait National Museum – in particular, to Mr. Jawad Al Najjar, and Mr. Imran Abd – for their courteous and friendly co-operation.
Fouilles Françaises à Failaka: Maison de l'Orient, Lyre.
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Plate 1
IKAROS: THE GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

1. Dedication by Soteles and soldiers

A limestone block, broken below and above. The lower part of the original left side and right side are preserved. H. 0.45; W. 0.40–0.41; Th. 0.20. Letters: 0.018.

The inscription was found in the 1930's on Failaka, during ploughing at a site called Tell Khazneh, north of the mound called Sa'id which is the site of the hellenistic settlement F 5. This site was explored by the Italian expedition in 1976, and excavated by the French and Kuwaiti expedition in 1984; the finds so far show that this too was a pre-Islamic site. The inscription is now in the Kuwait National Museum. Plate 1.


\[\text{Σωτέλσθης} \]
\[\text{ Ἀθηναίος (or Ἀθηναῖος)} \]
\[\text{καὶ ὁ στρατιῶτα} \]
\[\text{ Δι Σωτέρι} \]
\[\text{ Ποσειδῶνι} \]
\[\text{ Ἀρτέμιδι} \]
\[\text{Σωτέρι} \]

*Translation:*
Soteles/the son of Athenaios (or Soteles/Athenaios, or Soteles/the Athenian) and the soldiers/to Zeus Soter, Poseidon, Artemis/Soteira.

*Script*
The inscription is not well cut. The size and shape of individual letters varies and alignment is irregular. The poor and unprofessional character of the lettering

---

1. For the find see M. Tod, o.c. 112, citing Freya Stark, who was told about the find on a visit to Failaka, and forwarded to Tod a photograph of the stone. For a description of the site see F. Stark, Baghdad Sketches (London 1937) 205; for the location see Albrechtsen, Kuml 1958, 185. Freya Stark's visit to Failaka was in March 1937, as is indicated by a letter written afterwards from Kuwait, and dated to March 20, about the island: F. Stark, Letters vol. III (London 1976) 76–78.


---

makes the inscription difficult to date: for example, the sprawling structure list after 445 BC, the pre-Islamic BC date. Alpha A(s) is a polygonal intersecting at one point, so therefore affords only the addition of the fourth character.

*Epigraphic commentary*

1. Σωτέλσθης is an abbreviation.
2. Ἀθηναίος is suggested by personal name without personal name previously being recognized. There is room to supply a dedication by an Attalid ἀντίτοιχος ἥρμηνους / κατάθεσης / Ἀθηναῖος / Ἀρτέμιδι / Σωτέρι.

---

3. Cf. Tod, ib. : "I can only suggest that the latter part of the fourth, or the ending sigma at fifth century Athens (Toronto 1978) 36 and 39.

4. E.g. OGIS 229. 103ff. (Eumenes I of Pergamon); S tranx, 'Recherches sur les Armes de la Grèce' (1968) 222, pl. 36b). So on old Greek cities – including I.3. στρατιῶτα is the name of a soldier, not a patronymic or στρατοφέους / Σωτέρι.

5. See Launey, 'Recherches sur les Armes de la Grèce' (1968) 222, pl. 36b). So on old Greek cities – including I.3. στρατιῶτα is the name of a soldier, not a patronymic or στρατοφέους / Σωτέρι.

6. See Launey, 'Recherches sur les Armes de la Grèce' (1968) 222, pl. 36b). So on old Greek cities – including I.3. στρατιῶτα is the name of a soldier, not a patronymic or στρατοφέους / Σωτέρι.
makes the inscription difficult to date, as Tod pointed out (o. c. 113). While, for example, the sprawling sigma of line 1 would not be out of place in an Athenian tribute list after 445 BC, the neater sigma of line 4 would fit a fourth or early third century BC date. Alpha alone seems to have a consistent shape, with right hand diagonal intersecting at or near the end of the crossbar. The criterion of letter forms therefore affords only the most general date for this particular stone, between, approximately, the fourth century and the early third century BC.\(^3\)

Epigraphic commentary

1. Σοτέλα[τής] is an alternative possibility, as Tod noted.

2. Ἀθηναῖος(ιος) is suggested in Bull. Ep. 1967.651. It is difficult to decide between reading the patronymic or the ethnic. In hellenistic dedications offered jointly by military commander and military units the commander is often designated simply by personal name without patronymic or ethnic. A third possibility which has not previously been recognised is that the names of two military leaders are given. There is room to supply καὶ, or we can assume asyndeton, as for example, in the dedication by an Attalid garrison from Aegina: Σατυρίνος Καλλίμαχος / καὶ άλλοι όπ' αοτοὺς ἡγήμονες / καὶ στρατεύται (Eph. Arch. [1913] 92–2, pl. 8; R. E. ALLEN, ABSA 66 [1971] 1–12, pl. 2: reign of Attalus I); compare the early hellenistic dedication from Samothrace of Philip III and Alexander IV of Macedon: βασιλεύς/ας Φιλίππου / Ἀλέξανδρος/ς θεοῦ μετ' θ'ελοις (J. R. McCREDIE, Hesperia 37 [1968] 222, pl. 66b). Soldiers and colonists in the hellenistic east came from many old Greek cities — including, of course, Athens.\(^5\)

3. στρατεύται is the reading preferred by all editors; other possibilities include στρατεύταις or στρατεύταινοι, cf. Tod 112 n. 1. Στρατευτοί is probably to be rejected, with Tod, in favour of the well paralleled joint dedication by military commander and group of soldiers. There is one problem to this solution, which was not noted by previous commentators; there is only room for approximately four letters in the remaining space in this line. This indicates that the longer

\(^3\) Cf. Tod, ib., «I can only say that the writing gives me the impression of belonging to the latter part of the fourth, or the opening years of the third century.» For the shape of four-bar sigma at fifth century Athens see M. WALBANK, Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century BC (Toronto 1978) 36 and 39.

\(^4\) e.g. OGIS 229, 103 ff. (c. 246 BC); SEG 7.4 (III/II BC; Susa); OGIS 266,19 ff. (reign of Eunenes III of Pergamum); SB 1104 (reign of Ptolemy II). For a useful conspectus see M. LAUNAY, Recherches sur les Armées hellénistiques II (Paris 1950) 1005–1018.

alternatives should be rejected in favour of στυλ των [ιωναγ]i, the shortest of the likely terms. We must then assume that the (amateurish) cutter, underestimating the amount of space needed, crowded together the last letters of the line. He would have had to fit only six letters into the space of four, of which two were iotas, and therefore comparatively easy to accommodate.

ll. 4–9: The dedication is made, in a standard form, jointly to three gods. Zeus, the chief Greek god, is here given the familiar title soter, «saviour». Poseidon, the god of the sea, is an obvious deity to honour after a voyage. Artemis, the third deity, is most probably chosen because on Ikaros, as Arrian relates (Anabasis 7.20.3–4) there was a sanctuary sacred to a goddess whom the Greeks identified with the Greek goddess Artemis. The inclusion of the epithets soter (for Zeus) and soteira (for Artemis) might indicate that the dedication celebrated the safe arrival of the dedicators (as Tod suggested, 112); but it is notable that these two epithets continued to be used of two deities at the settlement F 5 (see text 3, ll.10 and 22, and historical commentary, p. 32).

Historical Commentary

The dedication could derive either from some Greek military expedition in the Arabian Gulf, or from a garrison on the island. These are the two interpretations which the content and the form of the dedication suggest.

1. Military expeditions in the Arabian Gulf.

Military expeditions under Greek commanders in the Arabian Gulf, calling at Ikaros, are rare in recorded history. It is therefore not surprising that scholars have tentatively connected the dedication with Alexander the Great. Two different episodes have been cited.

M. N. Tod (c. 113) was inclined to link the occasion with Nearchus’ expedition (325–324) from the lower Indus to the head of the Arabian Gulf, observing in particular the sacrifices offered for the safety of the fleet by Alexander to Zeus Soter and Poseidon, and by Nearchus for his escape from danger to Zeus Soter (among other deities). But Nearchus’ expedition should be ruled out, because the westernmost point which he reached at the head of the Gulf, coasting up from Carmania, was Babylonian Diridotis, where the coast, after turning west, met the mouth of the Euphrates (Arrian, Indica 41.6; cf Strabo 16.3.2).

The expeditions sent by Alexander to explore the Arabian coast of the Gulf are more promising. Alexander dispatched three small expeditions in the winter of 324/3, as a preliminary to a major expedition under preparation in Babylon. The first expedition consists of those who sailed as far as Telos and Ikaros (Arrian, Anab. 6.9.32). Soli were later sent, each down the Arabian coast. Arrian, who is following the coast and offshore island identified as Phoenicia. Since Arrian relates the choice of incense and spices trade with Phoenician cities, it is likely that the mouth of the Euphrates and the surrounding islands were the same.

It is in this context that Alexander’s expedition is to be seen, the first of three major expeditions that are described in the first book of Arrian’s Anabasis (325–324)

6 For Alexander see Arrian, Anabasis 6.19.5 and Indica 36.3; for Nearchus, Indica 36.9.
7 F. Stark, Baghdad Sketches, 197–198.
8 Arrian, Anabasis 7.19.3–20, Indica 43.8; Strabo 16.11.2.

9 See H. Berke, Das Alchetron, nos. 162 (Archias), 80 (Andra), 100 (Eudemos), 104 (Syndon), 404 (Anydae, or Amsdor), and 511 (Archias, or Orphus).
10 Arrian, Anabasis 7.20; Lost Histories of Alexander, 117.
11 Nearchus’ expedition was sent via Ras Masandam (C. Roueche, in forthcoming Festschrift for Beazley, p. 129) to the Persian Gulf, 324–323. For a detailed account see F. Salles, Le Golfe entre le monde ancien et le monde musulman, p. 172, 1983, 97–108, for a recent study.
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The shortest of the likely military expeditions in the Arabian Gulf, calling at Ikaros, Laussan and Thasos (Anabasis 7.20.3-4) in the winter of 326-325 B.C., was planned, but not carried out, because thesafe arrival of the expedition was jeopardised by an underestimate of the length of time required to cross the narrow strait between Arabia and the Red Sea (the Arabian Gulf). The expedition was designed to bring Alexander closer to the region of the Euphrates, from which he intended to explore the country further. The expedition consisted of a single triakonters commanded by Archias of Pella, who sailed as far as Telos (the Bahrein islands), and told Alexander about both Telos and Ikaros (Arrian, Anabasis 7.20.3-6). Androstenioi of Thasos and Hieron of Soli were later sent, each with a single triakonters, to push the exploration further down the Arabian coast (Anabasis 7.20.7-8). Alexander’s aim, as described in Arrian, who is following the contemporary Aristobulus, was to colonise the Arabian coast and offshore islands, which Alexander thought could be as prosperous as Phoenicia. Since Alexander was attracted by the prosperity of the Arabian incense and spice trade (Anabasis 7.20.2), it is likely that his colonies, like the Phoenician cities, were intended to exploit and control this trade as outlets for it.11

It is in this context of colonisation that Arrian names two islands «near» the mouth of the Euphrates, knowledge of which was brought back to Alexander by his explorers. The first, «not far from the outleff of the Euphrates», was the island which, as Aristobulus says, Alexander then ordered to be named Ikaros after the Aegean island (Anabasis 7.20.3-5); the identification of Ikaros with Failaka was confirmed by the discovery of a corpse of 9.20.4 Alexander’s reliance on the commanders of these expeditions for his information about these islands; Alexander clearly did not know Ikaros or Telos from autopsy. Arrian returns briefly to Alexander’s Arabian expeditions in the Indica (43.8): «Those whom Alexander sent from Babylon in order that sailing as far as possible on the right coast of the Red Sea (the Arabian Gulf) they might reconnoitre the country on this side, these men inspected certain islands lying there, and also doubtless put in at the mainland of Arabia». These expeditions appear in the sources as pioneering voyages of exploration, and as the prelude to the programme of conquest and colonisation which Alexander planned, but did not live to carry out.

9 See H. Berve, Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage (Munich 1926) nos. 162 (Archias), 86 (Androstenioi), 382 (Hieron).
11 Nearcirus’ expedition had discovered the Arabian trade in (Indian) cinnamon and its import via Ras Masandam (Cape Maceta) to Babylonia (Indica 32.6-7) and the expeditions of Alexander investigated the Arabian trade in myrrh, frankincense and other spices, accumulating information on the sources of these latter which Theophrastus used (e.g. De causis plant. 9.4.9, 10). In general see W. Müller, RE Suppl. 15 s.v. Weintrab, cols. 700 ff., esp. 720 ff.; N. Groom, Frankincense and Myrrh. A Study of the Arabian Incense Trade (London 1981) esp. chs. 4, 6-8. On the role of the Gerrhaeans as intermediaries in the trade and as main suppliers of Mesopotamia see Strabo 16.3 (766) from Aristobulus (and 768), and Arrian, Indica 41.7 with 32.7. For a good survey of the trade with the Indus valley and with Arabia see J.-F. Salles, Le Golfe entre le proche et extrême orient à l’époque hellénistique, in the forthcoming Festschrift for Beatrice de Cardi.
12 e.g. at Gerrha, or its port? See N. Groom, «Gerrha, a «lost» Arabian city», ATAL 6 (3), 1983, 97-108, for a recent discussion of the location of Gerrha.
There is, however, no support in the sources for identifying any of Alexander's Arabian expeditions as the occasion for the original foundation of the early hellenistic Greek settlement on Failaka. There is also no basis for the identification of Ikaros with the unnamed city founded by Alexander (Anabasis 7.21) after sailing from Babylon down the Pollacopas canal "to the lakes as in the direction of Arabia" (ib. 21.7). Firstly, Arrian ends Alexander's voyage "at the lakes", and has Alexander sailing back from "the marshes" to Babylon after the foundation of the city; there is no suggestion that Alexander has left Babylonia for the Arabian Gulf. Furthermore, the settlement at Ikaros was not a polis (see below on text 3, p. 31).

In summary, a military unit from any one of Alexander's Arabian expeditions could have called at Ikaros and made the dedication, but there is no support in the literary sources for dating the installation of a colony there to this time.

Two other occasions of Greek naval activity in the Arabian Gulf are known, of which the most familiar is the expedition of Antiochus III against Arabian Gerrha in 205 BC (Polybius 13.9.4–5). Antiochus' fleet had to pass Failaka on its way to Gerrha, and the king put in at Telos before sailing back to the head of the Gulf, and thence to Seleucia (presumably Seleucia-Tigris, not Seleucia-Eulaeos, at Su-sa). The other episode is undated. Pliny relates that Numenius, a Seleucid satrap of Mesene in southern Babylonia, won a double victory by land against Persian cavalry and at sea off the Arabian coast (in the Gulf of Ormuz) opposite Carmania (NH 6.152). The date of this is uncertain. The only clues are Pliny's naming of the king appointing Numenius to his office as Antiochus, the existence of Mesene as a separate satrapy, and its control by the Seleucids. The date of the creation of Mesene — in Seleucid terminology, «the districts of the Red Sea» — as a satrapy separate from Babylonia is uncertain; the terminus ante quem is 222 BC (Polybius 5.46.7). The area remained Seleucid until the revolt of Hyspaosines in or after c. 140 BC. Numenius could in fact date to the reign of any Seleucid king named Antiochus (from Antioch's combat resistance from Mesene the reinforcement or Taok/Tawwaj near Persis, where at Pasargad- to c. 280 BC, has been identified in 281 BC. After this in the Gulf may be implied the mouth of the Tigris. Gulf, if Pliny's attribution of the dedication is explained as a confusion.

The attested Greek expeditioners' explorers and the dedication of Antiochus III. It could do so one of the early excavations on the shores of the Gulf have now shown.

2. A garrison

The form of this dedication that comprises dedications n. 4. The Seleucid occupation of the area was

13 OGIS 233 (c. 205 BC) n. 11 identified Antiochus-Persis. The city of Taok-Tawwaj was nearby; Arrian, Indica 39.3, 5 miles from Bushir, has been 1981, 69–70. In a paper del. University on 7 December A. D. H. Bivar offered as a suggestion that Seleucid centre, such as Taok-Taw-raz and Persepolis (cf. Salles, polis, and Istakhr.


16 Cf. Polybius, 5.48.13. This is the first reference to the «Districts of Red Sea» as a separate satrapy; see H. Bengston, Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit II (Munich 1944) 17, 151. It is not safe to use OGIS 54 (reign of Ptolemy III). 22 ff. as a terminus post quem, since the omission of this area from the propagandistic list of Ptolemy's (ephemeral and perhaps largely apocryphal) conquests (as far as Bactria) could be explained by the fact that it was not subdued rather than by the assumption that it did not yet exist as a separate satrapy. The list is anyhow not complete; cf. II.28–24.

17 See Le Rider, Suse 370 n. 3.
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definition of the early hell-
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Antiochus (from Antiochus I, 280–261, to Antiochus IV, 175–164) who had to combat resistance from Persians. Antiochus I, for example, who personally organised the reinforcement of the Seleucid colony at Antioch-Persis (perhaps Bushir, or Taōke/Tawwaj near Bushir) seems to have faced at his accession unrest in Persis, where at Pasargadae the destruction level in the Achaemenid citadel, dated to c. 280 BC, has been associated with disturbances following the death of Seleucus I in 281 BC. After Antiochus III — mentioned above — Antiochus IV's interest in the Gulf may be implied by his possible refoundation of Antioch Charax near the mouth of the Tigris. He is not otherwise known to have been active in the Gulf, if Pliny's attribution to Antiochus IV of an Arabian expedition is correctly explained as a confusion with the expedition of Antiochus III.

The attested Greek expeditions in the Gulf, therefore, comprise those of Alexander's explorers and the military expeditions of Numinus the satrap and Antiochus III. The dedication, however, is almost certainly earlier than the period of Antiochus III. It could derive from a military expedition of either one of Alexander's explorers or one of the early Seleucid kings (or their officers) whose colonising activities on the shores of the inner Arabian Gulf (e.g. at Antioch-Persis, and, as the excavations have now shown, at Ikaros) make an early Seleucid date a valid option.

2. A garrison
The form of this dedication parallels that of a well-attested category of inscriptions that comprises dedications by hellenistic garrisons and their troops (see above, n. 4). The Seleucid occupation of Ikaros is dated relatively early in the Seleucid pe-

18 OGIS 233 (c. 205 BC). 14 ff. W. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India (1952) 270 n. 11 identified Antioch-Persis with Bushir, where no Seleucid period site has yet been identified. The city of Taōke was inland on the river Granis, and had a royal Achaemenid palace nearby; Arrian, Indica 39.3. An Achaemenid palace excavated near the town of Borazjan, 20 miles from Bushir, has been identified with the latter; cf. Salles, Proc.Sem.Arab. Studies 11 (1981), 69–70. In a paper delivered at the School of Oriental and African Studies of London University on 7 December 1982, entitled 'Hellenistic Cities on the Iranian Plateau', Dr. A. D. H. Bivar offered as a suggestion the location of Antioch-Persis at Taōke. It would certainly be in line with Seleucid policy to install a colony at a former Achaemenid administrative centre, such as Taōke. Taōke was on the main route from Bushir (and the Gulf) inland to Shīraz and Persepolis (cf. Salles, Lc. 70). Other possibilities would include a location near Persepolis, and Istakh.
19 D. Stronach, Pasargadae (Oxford 1978) 155–156. Commentators are normally split between Antiochus IV and Antiochus III: see the lists of Bengtson (o. c. n. 16) 156 n. 1, Le Rider, Suse 303 n. 5, and Mørkhøl (o. c. n. 15) 169 n. 14.
20 Plin. NH 6.138–139, with the discussion of Mørkhøl, o. c. 167 ff. as to the identity of the founder (Antiochus quintus); see Le Rider, Suse 309–311.
21 NH 6.147, 'nunc a Charace dicemus oram Epiphanis primum exquisitam', where Pliny is wrong to make Antiochus IV the first. Mørkhøl, o. c. 168–169, tries to save Pliny's credit by assuming that Pliny was only wrong to make Epiphanes' expedition the first. It is also possible to assume that he simply had the wrong king.
period (in the time of the progonoi of the Seleucid king of text 3). The earliest phase of the settlement F 5 appears to be dated to around, or a little before, the middle of the third century BC, on the basis of the archaeological finds.22 The first phase of the newly discovered hellenistic sanctuary excavated by the French expedition under Dr. J.-F. Salles on the coast nearby (B 6) appears to be approximately contemporary.23 The most probable interpretation of this dedication, therefore, is perhaps that it derives from a Seleucid garrison stationed on Ikaros in the first phase of Seleucid occupation.

This is the only direct reference for the presence of Seleucid troops on Ikaros. For indirect evidence for such a presence at the end of the third century, see below, the historical commentary on text 3 (pp. 35–36).

2. Dedication by the inhabitants

A small rectangular altar, found in the campaign of 1959 in Temple A of the hellenistic settlement F 5. The original upper right hand corner is not preserved; original edges are preserved at the top (on the top left hand side), at the upper left side and the lower left side. H. (max): 0.26; Th. 0.09; W. 0.20; letters 0.01–0.022. The inscription is now in the Kuwait National Museum. Plate 2.

First published by K. Jeppesen, Kuml (1960) 186 (fig. 26), cf. 187, 193; cf. F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, Klio 46 (1965) 274. The stone was re-examined by CR in the Kuwait Museum, and the text revised by SSW from a squeeze made in February 1983 by courtesy of the Kuwait Museum authorities.

\[
\text{το[ις δεοις] \protect\vspace{1ex}} \\
\text{οἱ ἐξ Ἰκαροῦ} \protect\vspace{1ex} \\
\text{ηδρύσοντα[το] \protect\vspace{1ex}} \\
\text{τὸν βωμ[ον]} \\
\text{vacat}
\]

Translation:
To [the Gods] / those from Ika[ros] / dedicated / the altar.

Script
The letters are of uneven size, and not well cut. Notable letter shapes include small omicron placed high or midway in the line, as is characteristic of hands of the third

---
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Plate 2
century BC, especially the first half,\textsuperscript{24} and sigma with sloping top and bottom strokes, not the horizontal strokes which had become common by the second century BC. In general appearance, unpolished workmanship and specific letter shapes the hand is not greatly different from that of the Seleucid inscription, text 3 (see further below). Both inscriptions are likely to be of approximately the same period.

**Epigraphic commentary**

l.1: TO [... ed.pr. As is clear from the photograph, both ll.1 and 4 are inset one letter space. The symmetrical arrangement of the text suggests that the dedication began with l.1.

l.2. Ἱς Ἱφήγου ed.pr. The vertical of the iota is clear on the squeeze. The following letter is kappa, not nu; the vertical and side strokes of kappa are clearly visible on the squeeze. Traces of the following letter are visible too. There is no sign of the horizontal bottom stroke of delta which the reading Ἱφήγου requires; traces of the crossbar of alpha can, however, be seen, giving the reading Ἰκάρου, the name of the island. Any direct connection with veterans of the Indian campaign of Alexander\textsuperscript{25} or of Antiochus III\textsuperscript{26} vanishes from the text.

**Historical commentary**

The designation adopted by the group from Ikaros which dedicated the altar is relevant to the question of the status and character of the hellenistic settlement. The οἱ ἐξ formula (with the expressions οἱ ἐν and οἱ πασὶ) is used to describe communities of Macedonian (or other) military colonists in hellenistic Asia Minor;\textsuperscript{27} for example οἱ ἐξ Λουδίνης Μακεδονῶν named in their dedication from Doidye in Lydia for King Eumenes II of Pergamum (160 BC)\textsuperscript{28} and οἱ ἐξ Κ[ο]βελύλης Μ[ακεδόνων] named in a dedication from Kebelye near to Kastolos.\textsuperscript{29} The significant difference at Ikaros is the absence of the ethnic Μακεδονῶν and of any other ethnic. This omission is consistent with the designation οἱ ἐν Ἰκάρῳ ὀικησταὶ used by the Seleucid official Anaxarchos in his letter to the community (text 3 l.1); neither there, nor in Ikadion’s letter (text 3 ll. 7 ff.) is there any indication that the Seleucid officials are addressing a «military» colony, Macedonian or otherwise.

\textsuperscript{24} On small omicron see Welles, RC pp. li-lii; L. Robert, JA 1958, 9 with n. 4.

\textsuperscript{25} So Jeppe, Kunl 1960, 187, 193.

\textsuperscript{26} G. Cohen, The Seleucid Colonies (Historia Einzelschr. 30, 1978) 43.

\textsuperscript{27} For a basic conspectus of evidence see Bickerman, Institutions des Seleucides (Paris 1938) 80 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{28} OGIS 314; for the date see L. Robert, Villes d’Asie Mineure (Paris 1962) 257 n. 4.

\textsuperscript{29} J. Keil and A. von Premerstein, Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien (Denkschr. Akad. Wien 54.2, 1911) 116 no. 223 (163 BC); cf. L. Robert, o.c. 36.

\textsuperscript{30} See, exempli gratia, T. 24, 27–28, 30–33, 37–42; Recueil no. 1228.

\textsuperscript{31} For the use of the definitive J. Marçal, Recueil des sigles IG VII.1831; base signed by Durbach, Choix no. 135; SEG. 2

\textsuperscript{32} Exempli gratia, R. H. Durbach, Choix no. 135; SEG. 2

\textsuperscript{33} Dr. J.-F. Salles, Procussions of the Athenian Agora: the deities to whom the altars were dedicated. A rectangular stele (H. 1.18 m) with a socket (H. 0.08 m) or 8 metres to the east was found in situ, against the wall, although it lay face down; 240 metres to the north, against the wall, it had the appearance of a large, rectangular stone, but a large part of the inscription was lost. Further details are given by F. Altheim and R. Stierlin, comments on J. and L. R. Robins, The Hellenistic Period, and by K. Jeppe, The Hellenistic Period.
Dedications «to the Gods» without further specification are common in the Hellenistic period, although the omission of the definite article seems more usual than its inclusion. The formula used for the consecration of altars can be compared with other inscribed Hellenistic altars from the old Greek cities. The dedicants' practice is similar to that of contemporaries in the cities of Greece and Asia Minor. Several other small altars, one with traces of a Greek inscription, have been discovered in the recent French excavations.

3. Letters from Anaxarchos and Ikadion

A rectangular stele (H. 1.16, W. average 0.615) of varying thickness (average 0.16) with a socket below, intended for insertion in a supporting base. The stone is a rough limestone, incorporating a considerable quantity of coraline particles; as a result, the original surface was not completely smooth, and had occasional protrusions and holes.

The inscription was found in 1959 by the Danish excavators, fallen face down, 7 or 8 metres to the east of Temple A; the base on which it originally stood was found in situ, against the facade of the temple. The stone was broken, and although it lay face down, much of the face had been worn away — apparently by sand. The Danish excavators did an excellent job in restoring the fragments of the stone, but a large part of the text is irretrievably lost. The inscription is now on display in the Kuwait National Museum. Plate 3.

The text was originally published by K. Jeppesen, Kuml (1960) 174–198 (hereafter ed.pr.), whence SEG 20.411, with some suggested emendations (hereafter SEG). It was apparently seen again, and was published with some revisions by F. Altheim and R. Stiehl, Klio 46 (1965) 273–81 (hereafter A–S); on this see the comments of J. and L. Robert, Bull. Ep. 1967.651, incorporating further observations by K. Jeppesen. The text here is based on examination of the stone on several occasions.

---

30 See, exempli gratia, Tituli Camirenses, ASAA NS 27–9, 1949–1951, nos. 9–12, 13–21, 24, 27–28, 30–33, 37–42; Durrrbach, Choix d'inscriptions de Delos, nos. 38,69; Michel, Recueil no. 1228.

31 For use of the definite article see, exempli gratia, IG XII (9) 925 (III/II BC; Chalcis); J. Marcade, Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs II (Paris 1957) no. 116 (Leuctra; also IG VII 1831; base signed by Praxiteles? !).

32 Exempli gratia, R. Herzog, Kioische Forschungen und Funde (Leipzig 1899), no. 217; Durrrbach, Choix no. 135; Michel, Recueil no. 1228.

33 Dr. J. E. Salles, Proc. Sem. Arab. Studies 14, 1984, 9, describes the altars, both of Greek and non-Greek type, found side by side at the entrance to the cella, and dating to the second (main) phase of the sanctuary. One of the former was inscribed in red paint with the names of the deities to whom the altar belonged.
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Ikadion to Anaxarchos. Greetings. / The king is concerned about the island of Ikaros / because his progenoi also consecrated land / (10) and decided to move the temple of the Saviour Goddess. / And they wrote to the officials in charge of / administration (instructing them) to move it. / But they, either, [perhaps] because they were prevented / or indeed for some [other] reason / (15) did not move it. But we, when the king wrote to us, / moved it [at prompty], and / we established [...] an agon, both / sporting and [cultural,] wishing to carry out / the policy of the king / (20) and of his progenoi. As to the people / settled in the island – both the neokoroi and / the others [...] around [...] of the Saviour God, / and those [...] when the island [...] they were included in the settlement [...] they should not / (25) encroach on this [...] in any way / but are to leave alone [...]. So let it be your concern / [to ensure that] men obtain their rights / and are not wronged [by anyone] / or moved. [And if] some of these wish / (30) to [...] acquire property on the island, designate land / [...] when they have cultivated and planted (it) / [they will own] as a hereditary possession. Let / [them also have] freedom from taxation just as the progenoi / [of the king] granted them / (35) [for whatever goods] they export to the island; but / [...] the region of Arabia do not allow / [...] anyone to export corn or something else. If / [...] of what is due / [...] sales, in order that / (40) they should not fall / [...] ill-health / [...] therefore / to inscribe this letter and / to set it up in the temple / [Year] 109, Artemision 17. Farewell.

Script
The condition of the stone creates considerable difficulties in reading what remains; and these are aggravated by the nature of the script itself, which is remarkably irregular. The margin at the left side is fairly straight, at an average width of 0.04; but on the right some lines extend to the very edge of the stone, while others stop several letter-spaces down to an omicron of often very difficult to a
The number of letters in an age of 30–32. Of those beyond doubt, 1.8 has 27, 19, 32; l. 11, 33; the rest 36 letters. Some of these at an appropriate point there are also considered because of the irregularity cut, with a narrow, curved line at the top. In spite of the upper lines tend to slope down.

As a result of these unusual and other examples of third as, for example, Antioch III's edict from Nehaw [1949] 5ff., pl. 1-4. Pa state of the original sur to work; another factor is the text for the inscription in a similar style used for the text.

The shapes of many short middle bar and bar the exceptionally the three short and long side strokes vertical. Sigma occurs in the lower stroke horizontally, with the vertical stroke and is never sunk to the right as the height is higher than on the vertical. It is side-stroke «shallow» (or «early») and is never sunk to the right as the height is higher than on the vertical.
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stop several letter-spaces short of it. The letters vary in height from about 0.015 down to an omicron of 0.007; but they vary more strikingly in width, so that it is often very difficult to assess how many letters should be restored in a given space. The number of letters in each line, therefore, varies considerably, around an average of 30–32. Of those few lines which are complete, or whose restoration is beyond doubt, l. 8 has 27 letters; l. 15, 29 letters; l. 7 and 12, 30; l. 20, 31; ll. 9 and 19, 32; l. 11, 33; the restoration of ll. 1, which seems almost certain, gives a line of 36 letters. Some of these irregularities result from the cutter’s wish to break the text at an appropriate point (thus he fitted Anaxarchos’ opening phrase into l. 1); but there are also considerable variations in the spaces between the letters, often because of the irregularities in the surface of the stone. The letters are fairly deeply cut, with a narrow, curved trench; there is a tendency for vertical lines to bifurcate at the top. In spite of the use of lightly incised guide-lines, traces of which are visible, lines tend to slope downwards (sometimes quite sharply) at the right hand side.

As a result of these tendencies, this inscription looks crude by comparison with other examples of third and early second century Seleucid edicts and letters, such as, for example, Antiochus I’s letter to Erythrae (RC 15; OGIS 223) or Antiochus III’s edict from Nehavend (ancient Laodicea in Media: L. ROBERT, Hellenica 7 [1949] 5ff., pl. 1–4). Part of the reason, as has been suggested, must have been the state of the original surface of the stone, which will have been extremely difficult to work; another factor may be that there was no experienced mason available to inscribe the text for the inhabitants of Ikaros. But more important than this is the lapidary style used for the inscription (see below). The shapes of many letters vary capriciously. Thus, epsilon occurs with both a short middle bar and with one equal in length to the top and bottom horizontals; additionally the three bars often slope instead of being parallel. Kappa has both short and long side strokes which do not always intersect at the same point on the vertical. Sigma occurs mostly with sloping upper and lower strokes, but also with the lower stroke horizontal. Rho, which is tall, is found with a small and a large «eye». The shape of chi varies too, sometimes a small letter positioned high up in the line, sometimes the size of other letters. Several letters have a consistent shape, if not size and orientation. Alpha has a straight, not «broken», cross-bar. Delta, remarkably, is supported on an upright, passim. Mu is always wide, with sloping – not vertical – side-strokes, but varies in height. Nu, often sloping, regularly has a «shallow» (or «early») form, in which the right hasta rises above the left vertical, and is never sunk to the base line. Omega and omicron are regularly small and positioned high in the line. Several letters have several quite different forms: theta, which is larger than omicron, occurs with a dot in the centre and with a cross-bar, both vertical (l. 5) and horizontal. The form of pi varies: it occurs both as a tall letter with a long horizontal and short right hasta (sometimes curved) and also, especially towards the end of the text (ll. 36ff.) as a small letter with right hasta of almost the same length as the left vertical.
The particular forms of several of these letters are consonant with a date in the third century BC, from between approximately the first quarter to before the last quarter of the century, being well paralleled now in the Seleucid empire by, e.g.,

the Greek versions of edicts of Asoka from Kandahar, the Seleucid milestone from Pasargadae, the manumission from Hycania of the reign of Antiochus I, and the recently discovered Greek inscription from the British excavations at Old Kandahar. Small omicron and omega «suspended» in the line, and shallow nu, are among the characteristic features of the scripts of these texts; they are earlier forms than the large omicrons and omegas, and the deep nus of the later third and second centuries (see Welles, RC, II–III).

Several letters of this text, however, do show later forms than occur in this sample of inscriptions: for example, theta with cross-bar, and the form of pi in which the second haste is nearly as long as the first. Both forms develop in the second half of the third century (cf. Welles, RC Il). Among their earliest dated attestations are their occurrence in the copy of the edict of Antiochus III concerning the dynastic cult of Laodike found near Carian Eriza, of 193 BC, and the Seleucid dossier on the holdings of the strategos Ptolemy from Tell el-Fîrîr near Beth-Shean (Scythopolis), inscribed in 195 BC. These forms, therefore, suggest a date later rather than earlier in the third century.

It is normal in hellenistic Greek epigraphy to differentiate between the «monumental» and «cursive» (or «documentary») styles, which co-existed. The latter was influenced by the style used for writing on papyri and comparable material. It seems clear that text 3 is not cut in the «monumental» style. In so far as it is possible to detect the signs of a particular lapidary style the influence in text 3 comes from the «documentary» – or «cursive». The «cursive» style was also used for the inscription of the two important sets of Seleucid documents from the very early second century cited above: the copy of the edict of Antiochus III (with hypomnema) from Eriza, and the dossier of correspondence between Antiochus III, Seleucid of-

34 L. Robert, JA 1958, 7–18 (plate 4); D. Schlumberger, CRAI 1964, 126–140 (plate facing 140) with the commentary of L. Robert at 134–140.


37 P. M. Fraser, Afghan Studies 2, 1979, 9–21 (plates 20–21).

38 M. Holleaux, BCH 54, 1930, 245–62, esp. 246–49 (plates XII–XIII). Holleaux aptly compared the cursive characteristics of the inscription from Tenos, IG XII 5, 872 (O. Kern, Inscr. Graecae, 1913, pl. 35), dating from the second half of the third century, or early second century; cf. Holleaux, o.c. 247 n.6.

39 Edito princeps; Y. H. Landau, IEJ 16, 1966, 54–70 (plate 7), with description (and a table) of the letter forms at 55–56; the text has been re-edited by Th. Fischer, ZPE 33, 1977, 131–138; see also, for bibliography, Taylor, o.c. below (n. 46).

40 Cf. L. Robert, o.c. n. 34, 8–9.
ficials, and Ptolemy the strategos from Tell el-Firr.\textsuperscript{41} M. Holleaux began his description of the lettering of the former as follows: «L’écriture, comme le fait voir cette image, est NEGligée, irrégulière, et si inégalement espacée, que le nombre des lettres varie à la ligne de 27 à 39. Elle ne flatte guère l’œil. Mais elle a le grand intérêt de rappeler par son tracé rapide et systématiquement simplifié, qui exclut toute orneman\textsuperscript{2}tation (l’absence complète d’apices est notable), l’écriture des papyrus grecs.»\textsuperscript{42} This apt description could easily be transferred to the Ikaros inscription, text 3, so similar are the remarkable features of the two hands. The absence of apices – as in text 3 – is in fact characteristic of this lapidary style. The influence of the «cursive» style on our text can also be seen in the tendency of the second vertical of eta and (sometimes) of pi to curve, and the distinctive shallow form of nu (mentioned above) all characteristics of the Eriza and the Tel el-Firr inscriptions. Although omicron and omega develop in size over time, and the side-strokes of mu become parallel in «monumental» texts (Welles, RC ii–iii), the particular forms that these letters have in text 3 are found in inscriptions of the second century cut in «cursive» style; they are thus well paralleled e.g. in the text from Eriza, and in Seleucid muniments from Seleucia-Eulaeus (Susa).\textsuperscript{43}

To summarise: the lettering of text 3 is consonant with a date in the latter part of the third or the early second century BC. It is fully compatible with the date resulting from the proposed reading (l. 43) of the Seleucid era date 109 (204 BC, month of Artemision). As to the quality of the script, any surprise at the unlovely appearance of this Seleucid document may be partly accounted for by the character of the stone, which made inscribing it hard. The most important factor, however, is perhaps the style: not the beautiful monumental lettering in which the Greek version of Asoka’s bilingual edict, or the copy of the edict of Antiochus III at Nehavend, were decoratively inscribed, but the less attractive «documentary» style in which individual letter shapes often varied considerably, as the Seleucid inscriptions from near Eriza and from Tell el-Firr well show. In this respect the Seleucid inscription from Ikaros is not an isolated phenomenon, nor necessarily «provincial»; it belongs to the gradually growing group of Seleucid documents from far-flung corners of the empire which attest the homogeneity of the different lapidary styles in the colonial Greek world of the hellenistic period.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{41} See nn. 38–39. The lettering of the monolingual Greek text from Old Kandahar (CRAI 1964, 126–40; n. 34 above), which contained much of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th edict of Asoka, was influenced by «papyrus» hands; see the remarks of L. Robert, CRAI 1964, 135, with the photo facing 140. \(\pi\) is small, with left and right haste of equal length; \(\theta\) is dotted throughout.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{42} o.c. n. 38, 246.

\textsuperscript{43} Cf. Cumont, CRAI 1931, 279–285 no. 1 (with facsimile), whence SEG 7.17 (183 BC); and Idem, Mém. de la Mission arch. de Perse 20, 1928, 81–84 (pl. IV.3), whence SEG 7.2 (177/6 BC). S. M. Sherwin-White is grateful to Dr. B. Lecknam, Conservateur of inscriptions in the Department of Oriental Antiquities, for facilitating access to the hellenistic Greek inscriptions from Susa in the Louvre museum.

\textsuperscript{44} Cf. L. Robert, JA 1958, 11–12, and CRAI 1964, 135–136.
Epigraphic commentary

1.1: Αναζορείζεται: the O was only read, very tentatively, by us. ed.pr. gives [AA, where we read, cautiously, [AA]: the spacing of the uprights would permit the restoration, on which we agree. The result is an opening phrase of the standard form. For contemporary use of the term oiketai collectively, to describe the (free) inhabitants of Magnesia-Sipylos (Greek and non-Greek) as distinct from the Seleucid military katoikoi, see OGIS 229.35, 47 and 48 (Seleucus II); for the implications for the situation on Ilaros, see historical commentary.

1.3: ἔντον ὡς ὁ ἄτομος; ἘΦΩΝ ed.pr.; we read a preceding upright which could be T.

For the resultant phrase compare e.g. an official letter of c. 275: ἐπιστολές... ὁν ταύτης ὑπογράφωμεν (OGIS 221; RC 13, 3–4), which suggests this restoration: but a passive construction – ὑπογράφοντες – is equally likely. For the passive, see the structure of the covering letters accompanying the instructions for the worship of Laodice, of 193 (L. Robert, Hell. VII, 5–29; CRAI [1967], 281–96).

1.4: ὡς ὁ... ἔντον suggests a temporal clause, and plausibly that suggested by ed.pr., ὡς ὁ... ἔντον τάχιστα λαμβάνεται; for the construction, citing a close parallel from a third century papyrus, P.Cair.Zen. 241.1, see LSJ s.v. ὡς, A.d.

ἔπιστολαν: the stone has a δέλτα in place of λαμβάνη.

1.5: ἕναν γράφων: ἕπιστολαν ed.pr.; ἕναν γράφων: ἕπιστολαν SEG. The most common formula, εἰς στήλην, is too long for the available space; we prefer εἰς στήλην.

At the end of the line, ed.pr. reports ...ἈΠΙ...(ΛΕΙ)ΤΕ, and restores ὡς [ὁ] λειπετε, which is not otherwise attested in such a context. There is a break in the stone before ΕΤΕ; the letter written across the break appears to us to be a large θeta, with a vertical as well as a horizontal bar. The preceding letter is certainly K, and we agree that the letter before that is E, giving θετετε. While the most common term used for the «setting up» of inscribed documents is ἀνάγραφεται, ἀναγράφεται is also sometimes used in this sense; thus in a Canaan law of 200 BC: τὸ γράφομαι τὸ δικαίωσαι ἐπὶ λείκουμα ἐκτεινόμενο πάνω (Syll. 1023.63; similarly 921.120, fourth century Attica; 339.3, early third century Rhodes; etc.). The letter before this word is triangular, and there are traces of the lower edge of a delta, although alpha or lambda cannot be completely ruled out. The simplest interpretation seems to be that this is δ', either as a connective particle or as the final element of a demonstrative pronoun (τηνδε). The triangular letter is preceded by two uprights, which could be interpreted as an N; before those a trace can be seen, which may well be the second vertical, with a characteristic curve, of an eta, giving ΗΝ. We would suggest reading τηνδε οτως των την δ'... as referring back to the stele: «inscribe the letter on a stele, and set this up»; the construction is not standard, but might well have been influenced by the terms in which Ikadion gave his instructions about the display of his letter: in II.41–2 the spacing suggests to us the restoration την επιστολήν των την ἀναγράφασαν την κτ.

1.6. The year date must be supplied from I.43. Since the month is the same as that
nonth, l{k][w] ev pr. ed.pr.

The uprights would potentially refer to the
inhabitants of Ikaros, forwarding Ikadion's letter, with instructions for its display. The scribe left a gap between this and the text of Ikadion's letter.

L.7: Compare Antiochus II: oi ημέτεροι πρόγονοι εσπευσον άεί ποτε περι
cótoς; OGIS 223 (RC 15) 1.23; Erythrae.

L.9: προγόνως may mean no more than «father» (see the conspectus of evidence assembled by Welles, RC pp. 81–2); or it may be a stereotyped term for the «ancestors» of the Seleucid dynasty, perhaps including both the Achaemenids and the Argeads (see Rostovzeff, «Progonoi», JHS 55, 1935, 56–66. See historical commentary p. 39.

At the end of this line the stone is unbroken, but the surface has been rubbed away, leaving only faint traces of the word which stood there. The first letter is either a rather splayed triangular letter, or the first part of a mu. The traces in the next space may not be significant – there is perhaps the mark of an upright. The next space seems definitely to contain an upright, perhaps with the bowl of a rho. The following trace, if significant, could be of an omicron. There is a further space, with apparently insignificant traces, and then a final sigma. Ed.pr. reports similar traces, including the final sigma (although SEG prints nu), without attempting a restoration; after a subsequent revision of the stone Jeppeesen proposed to read ὁνόλον (see Bull. Ep. 1967.651). A–S proposed [βωμοῦ]τις.

In our view, the word which can be accommodated to most – although perhaps still not all – the traces visible on the stone is [θ]γρο[θ]νες, «fields», and so «land». Compare the consecration (or re-consecration), of ἄγροι at Xanthos by Antiochus III's viceroy, Zeuxis (OGIS 235 of c. 203, with the restoration and commentary of J. and L. Robert, Fouilles d'Amyzon I [Paris 1983] 93–96 no. 1). The sense then is that the king's progonoi consecrated a site in preparation for the installation of the hieron. Compare the expression γάν ιερόνα (Syll. 3 145.15, Delphic Amphioclyny in 382/79 BC) and the hellenistic use of the cognate καθευρόο for the consecration of a polis and chora in establishing the asyla of a place (thus Syll. 3 590.8–9, from Mileus, late third/early second century BC; P. Herrmann, Anadolu 9, 1964, 29–159 at 34, II. 15–16 [Antiochus III at Ticos] and 37, II. 29–30) and for the dedication of land – chora – for a sanctuary: H. Waldmann, Die Kompagnischen Kultureformen unter König Mithradates I Kalliakis und seinem Sohne Antiochos I, Leiden 1973, 87 l. 165 and 103 l. 94 (Antiochus I of Commagene). L.10: The stone has ΘΠΩΤΕΙΡΑΣ. Ed. pr. does not report the second T, but we see traces.

ε[θ]γουλο[θ]νες: we have been unable to see the sigma reported in ed. pr.

L.11. For the use of metagenes compare Syll. 2 587.6: τον τε νιου της Αθηνας ἐργο-
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of Ikadion's letter dated 17 Artemision, the date here must be ten days later, [27] Artemision (so ed.pr.).

Lines 1–6 therefore present a standard covering letter from Anaxarchus to the
habitants of Ikaros, forwarding Ikadion's letter, with instructions for its display. The scribe left a gap between this and the text of Ikadion's letter.

| 1.7 | Compare Antiochus II: οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρὸγονοι ἐσπευσοῦν αεί ποτε περὶ κότης; OGIS 223 (RC 15) 1.23; Erythrae. |
| 1.9 | προγόνως may mean no more than «father» (see the conspectus of evidence assembled by Welles, RC pp. 81–2); or it may be a stereotyped term for the «ancestors» of the Seleucid dynasty, perhaps including both the Achaemenids and the Argeads (see Rostovzeff, «Progonoi», JHS 55, 1935, 56–66. See historical commentary p. 39. |
| 1.10 | The stone has θπωτειρας. Ed. pr. does not report the second T, but we see traces. |
| 1.11 | For the use of metagenes compare Syll. 2 587.6: τὸν τε νιου τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐργολαβήτερας μεταγαγέναι καὶ οἴκοδομήσαν ... καὶ τὸν βωμὸμεταγαγέναι κατεσκεύασαν, a reference to moving the temple of Athena inside the walls of Pepare- |
thus when the city was being rebuilt in c. 196. Compare, more generally, Syll.3
588.51 (snythekai of Miletus and Magnesia, of c. 196). For the repetitive use of  
κατ' - the so-called «κατ' style» - see the article of L. ROBERT, JA 1958, 12.
I.11–12. Compare Antiochus III, writing to Magnesia in c. 205: γεγραφαμεν δε 
kαι τοις επι των πραγματων τετεγμενως, RC 31 (OGIS 233) 25–26. The implication 
of the next sentences is that these were Ikadion’s predecessors in office; see 
historical commentary p. 29.
I.13. After EIT there is a break in the stone, with room for about four letters. Ed.pr 
restores ειτ’ [οδιν δια; but there seems no need for the connective force of οδιν, 
and we prefer the slight sense of irony conveyed by δια. This first explanation is 
perhaps that advanced by the officials.
I.14. There is, again, a break after EIT, and a worn area further on. Between the 
two, ed.pr reports HNA, followed by traces of a possible further H, with the 
consequent restoration ειτι [ετι] ινθι [πο] τοτων. To us, the traces in the central space 
appear to be ιΝΑ, followed by a 3–4 letter space in which nothing definite can 
be determined. The next letter seems to us more like a gamma than a tau. We 
therefore restore ειτι [ετι δια τ μυ’ αίλλην] γονιν αιτιαν. Γονιν, with the force of «bringing 
forward a reason which, while not absolutely conclusive, is the most probable 
explanation of a previous statement» (SMYTH, Greek Grammar, 1956, para. 2830) 
provides just the right tone.
I.15. The emphatic position of ημιν, at the beginning of the sentence, suggests that 
Ikadion is concerned to stress the contrast between his conduct and that of his 
predecessor(s): «But, when the king wrote to us ...».
I.16. After the final sigma of βασιλεος, ed.pr reports sigma, and restores σ[πουδή] 
We are not convinced that we can see the sigma, but we find the restoration 
convincing.
I.17. Before άγανα ed.pr reports ΕΣ, whence SEG suggest έπάναγακ]ες. We can 
only determine the sigma with difficulty, and nothing certain before it.
I.18. After κατ', there are traces of one more letter, followed by an area in which 
nothing can be read. Ed.pr interprets the traces as epsilon, and restores: (i)ε[ρετς 
κατε]εξεμεν γ. We read the surviving traces as μου, and have restored μουειοκόν, 
as a very likely description of the contest which Ikadion established. For the classes 
of agong set out in this order, compare Syll.3 390.21 (c. 280 BC); for the wider 
issues, see historical commentary, p. 38.
After the gap, ed.pr reports [ΔΑΜΕΝ]; we see ΥΛΟ, then traces of Μ, ΕΝ, and, 
less certainly, ΩΓ. Before Υ the letter cannot be read, but the traces in the preceding 
space would accommodate Β; we therefore restore μουειοκόν εξεργασε[ν]εν: for the sense of «administer» see WELLES, RC p. 333.
I1.19–20. For αργας, a standard term in hellenistic documents for «policy», see 
WELLES, RC p. 310; for the thought here compare e.g. Antiochus I: τοιτο ποιον 
The first section of Ikadion’s letter has taken the form standard in such docu-
ments, of setting out the main points to be followed, and are to follow (see WELLES 
with regulating the statute or the possibility of punctuality). The 
phrase βοηθήσασθαι ... or: «contrast, which Ikadion seems 
also about the inhabitants of Ikadion and his predecessor(s) and his of 
II.20–26. These lines providing a key has been said, we consider 
introducing the section of the next recognisable open 
spaces where we should look for 
mands which are to make 
the current situation; the 
structions of the king(s) 
in an impersonal construc 
I.22. After ἀλλον, it is properly 
an upsilon; and then an 
the corner of a delta. Ed. 
as βουλ[εται] ποιει [καθε]κερος, 
This might give ουκ, int 
preceding clause; that is 
within the available space 
governing ουκ. Alternatively 
ending with ἀλλον, and 
ουκ [...
After the delta/sigma νθι 
what seems fairly clearly 
space for 2–3 letters, the 
have not found these tr 
supply a description (such 
as accusative plural, to ago 
followed by the main ver 
the traces.
more generally, Syll. 3

For the repetitive use of συνάναγκας, see p. 333.

The remainder of the letter is concerned with regulating the status and rights of the inhabitants of the island. We considered the possibility of punctuating after μουσικόν, in l. 18, and assuming a new sentence, with the sense «Wishing to carry out the policy of the king and his ancestors also about the inhabitants, etc., we did so and so». But this produces a rather cumbersome sentence, and one with apparently no connective. We prefer to take the phrase βοηγολομενοι ... αὐτός with the preceding sentence, as reinforcing the contrast, which Ikadion seems eager to point out, between the lax behaviour of his predecessor(s) and his own ready compliance with royal policy.

ll. 20–26. These lines present the most intractable problems of this difficult text. As has been said, we consider that a new sentence begins in l. 20, with και περὶ τῶν, introducing the section of the letter (ll. 20–41) concerned with the inhabitants. The next recognisable opening of a sentence is ἐπιμελέκτως οὖν, at the end of l. 26. Between these two sentences, it is not clear whether there is one or two sentences, nor where we should look for the main verb(s). These might be the first of the commands which are to make up the second part of the text; one possibility is that the infinitives in ll. 23–25 should be taken as imperatives. But the use of οὖν, in l. 27, with the first recognisable command perhaps suggests that the commands begin at that point. If this is right, then in ll. 20–26 we should be looking for a description of the current situation; the verb(s) might be in the third person, describing the instructions of the king(s); in the first person plural, describing action by Ikadion; or in an impersonal construction.

l. 22. After άλλων, it is possible to see traces of a circular letter; then, fairly clearly, an ὑπίλοιον; and then an angle which might be either the upper angle of a σίγμα or the corner of a δελτα. Ed.pr. reports οΥΣ, proposing ςηθοῖας ..., developed by SEG as ςηθοῖας ὑπίλοιον ἐπὶ [βου]μῇ Σωτήρος. We find the reference to sacrifices rather difficult to incorporate, and consider the circular letter more likely to be omicron. This might give ςηθ, introducing a relative clause describing the «others» of the preceding clause; that is an attractive construction, but it requires us to locate within the available spaces, both a main verb and a verb within the relative clause, governing ςηθ. Alternatively, we can take the description of the island residents as ending with άλλων, and assume that the main clause begins here, with ςηθ Σ..., or αιδιόν ...

After the δελτασίγμα we see 2 or 3 spaces, followed by a circular letter, and then what seems fairly clearly to be a ςί; this was not seen previously. It is followed by space for 2–3 letters, the last one consisting, or ending, in a vertical (so ed.pr.). We have not found these traces easy to interpret. If this is a relative clause, we cannot supply a description (such as κάτω γού), which we considered) since it is not in the accusative plural, to agree with ςηθ. It would be convenient to assume a negative, followed by the main verb; but we have been unable to find a likely term which fits the traces.
In the last part of the sentence, ἐπί, which is fairly clear, is followed by a hole in the stone, where 2 or perhaps 3, letters might have stood; this is followed by ΟΥ Σωτήρος. Ἐπί is most easily taken as an indication of location, to be followed by the name of a place – Βοιων (as suggested by SEG), νῆσος ηπί (as suggested by SEG), or another appropriate term; but it seems surprising that the Soter, mentioned for the first time here, appears without a definite article (in contrast, for example, with the Soteira, in l.10). This might be explained if the preceding word was θέος: compare, for example, the reference to the god at Baetocaceae in a letter originally probably of the late second or early first century: τῆς ἐνεργείας θεοῦ Διὸς Βαετοκάτης, RC 70 (OGIS 262).4. For discussion of the date see K.J.Rigby, TAPA 110 (1980) 233–61 at 248–54.

l.23. Of the first letter only an upright can be seen, of the fourth only an upper horizontal. It is probably safest to restore καὶ τοῦξ (ed. pr.), καὶ τοῦτος or καὶ τοῦτο. A–S proposed τοῦξ ἢκε ἀνάφωκτον [ἐκ] τῆς νῆσου, but this cannot be fitted with the surviving traces.

The rest of this line seems most probably to have been occupied by a genitive absolute construction describing the island, qualified by a participle – perhaps just οὔσις, with an epithet such as ἀετας (as suggested by SEG, τοῦξ οὐκέτα ἀετας] οὔσις). Other possibilities might be ἐριμάς, or σῶν (compare Seleucus I to Miletus: τῆς πόλεως διάμετρος σῶν, RC 5 (OGIS 214).11, 288/7 BC.

l.24. σωκάσθησθαι [.]. Ed.pr. reported σωκάσθησθαί[n]..., which led SEG to suggest τοῦξ οὐκέτας ιέρας] οὔσις τῆς νῆσου σωκάσθησθαί [ἐκ] τοῦ ἐντός; A–S restore σωκάσθησθαί[n]... ἡμίπ τὸ τέμπνυς τοῦτο. We consider that the surviving traces of the letters, and the spacing, make the infinitive certain. After the alpha there is a space which could accommodate one letter, and then an upright, almost certainly an iota, previously unread. It is probably easiest to take the space as a fault in the surface, and the iota as the last letter of the verb.

For the use of the noun συνοικίσκοις, and the verb συνοικίσθησιν to denote the repeopling and reconstruction of a place – not political unification – see J. and L.Robert, Amyzon I no. 15, 15–16 (Amyzon, 201 BC) and 189 (decreet of Xanthos, referring to the restoration of the rights of Kyтин in Doris; 209–208 BC, cf. ib. 162 n.31)

After this we see a definite sigma, which was not reported previously, followed by a probable upright. This is another possible location for a main verb, and an obvious choice would be συν[νε]ταίρις εἰς συ[νε]τάρις ἑπάμεν. If, however, we could locate a verb in l.22, or if we take these infinitives as imperatives, we could end the phrase concerned with the original inhabitants after συνοικίσθησιν. The words which follow could then belong to a new sentence, in ll.24–26, concerned with orders given to newer inhabitants, or soldiers, not to encroach on the rights of residents (see historical commentary, p.35). This would give good sense. But it remains very difficult, firstly, to make good sense of ΟΣ after the lacuna; and, secondly, to determine the sense of τοῦτο, which apparently describes what this group must not encroach upon, which it can refer – unlike a noun, immediately preceding.

At the end of the line: we faint trace of the sigma, verb, in the sense of 'set Labraunda: μὴ ἐπιτρέποντος τῶν ἑπιμελητων εὐθύς τῶν μὴ καθήκων Crampa on the Labraud.

l.25. After proposed μὴ δεκακοντα: traces of letters, but are l.26. Ed.pr. reads ἀλλ' ἐν μεθηματι. We find the sentence with ἀλλ' ἐν μεθηματι[,]... we be the sense of this pass 

We have been unable to best to punctuate before command addressed to κάθοι/κάνοντος ἐντο. In II.26–27. After ἐπιμελέσας ἐνάντι Σ... Since of, περικλέερες to be the last word, σφνοικίσκοισι φιλίκοις; A space with no letter visible believe that these are not σφν, followed by a horizon.

l.27. In the second part 

We can see all general instruction that met the classical and hellenists of Polybius VI, of 16 ὡς τον προνοιόσιν ὑπος τον des Ordonnances des P. 

l.28. Before ὡς τον προνοιόσιν αποστάλματι εἰς τινας] ἐναντιοὶ; A-letter broader than ἔνα.
phrase such as μηδ’ ὅφεινο] ἔννοιαν[ or — making better use of the available space — μηδ’ ὅποι μηδαίνοις[. For such a formulation, which is quite common, compare e.g. the letter of Ziaelas to the Coans of c. 240: πάνωσι σπουδήν ποιείς τάς ἔννοιας μηδ’ ὅφεινο ἔννοιαν ὅποι, RC 25 (Syll. 3 456).43–44; cf. also Syll. 3 346.55.

The very general requirement that men should not be unjustly treated is coupled with the specific admonition, that they should not be moved — μεταγέντας, the verb already used of moving the shrine of the Soteira in ll. 11, 12, 15 and 16; see historical commentary p. 35.

l. 29. Before τινὲς we read Ν (with ed.pr.), preceded by some traces which we cannot resolve. It is clearly necessary to start a new sentence here; A–S proposed καὶ εἷς [τινὲς], but we prefer καὶ εἷς [τινὲς].

l. 30. At the beginning of the line ed.pr. reports ΕΣ, followed by a lacuna of some 8 or 9 letters, and then νῦν before EN, and proposes ΕΣ [ὑπερακεν τῇν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ] χώραν. After ΕΣ we see a definite upright; thereafter the surface is very rough, but, after a space of 5 or 6 letters, we see traces of a circular letter, followed by a triangular shape and then an upright. This suggests a passive or a middle infinitive; and a very probable restoration is ἐξερήσασθεν την Νήσον. For the use of this term in documents concerned with the appropriation of land compare e.g. SB 7657 (= 8033) of 165–158: οὐχ ὑπομένει ἕξυσαμόζην τάς λοιπὰς ὀρούρας [κλίματα] παρά τῷ καθή- κουν μαζόζην; cf. also P. Hibeh 198.220, and LSJ s. v.

ll. 30–31. At the end of l. 30 ed.pr. reports ΠΑΡΑΑΔΕΙΣ, and proposes παράδειξος/ [ος μεθ’] ήτοι [ος]. J. and L. Robert pointed out, however (Bull. Ep. 1967.651), that such a restoration assumed an irregular syllabic division of the word; moreover they suggested that there was no clear trace of the final σιγμα in l. 30. We have found no trace of such a letter; and there can be no real doubt about the restoration proposed by J. and L. Robert, παράδειξιος [γινόμενος], supplying a term found in other Hellenistic documents with the sense «assign, convey» (see Welles, RC p. 352).


l. 31. J. and L. Robert punctuated after νήσου, in l. 30, to make χώραν the object of παράδειξος. Our restoration of ἐξερήσασθεν [ἡτοι] requires χώραν as its object; we must therefore supply an object for παράδειξος in the lacuna at the beginning of l. 31. Before ἐξερήσασθεν, ed.pr. reports ...[ΩΤ[].Σ], and restores μεθ’ ήτοι [ος]. We see the traces which could be read as σιγμα, but are not convinced that they are significant; we can determine nothing before that. We therefore restore παράδειξιος [γινόμενος], which gives exactly the right number of letters to fill the lacuna.


The only trace of a letter l. 33. Before ἀντέλαια ed.pr. proposes [ὅτι αὐτοὶ καὶ] ἀντέλαια; we have followed l. 34. The supplement to θέλει for the space. Ed.pr. suggested an awkward construction, but we have been unable to find traces before the νῦν of l. 35. At the end of the l. 35 to εἰς [τῇ]ν νήσον. We read the remainder of the line, ed.pr., Παράδειξιος, PP, very faint. Ed.pr., suppli- ian. The turn of phrase and terminology.

The text here is, how is possible that we should not think Ikadion has returned to another...

l. 37. Ed.pr. supplies μη[δε] κατάλειπε τὴν λέξιν, and have we there on the assumptions dis- cussed...

At the end of the line, as we think we can see traces...
The only trace of a letter which we can see before εἰς is an upright; we therefore follow J. and L. Robert in reading φωτεύ/στάντες ἡλιοφαινόμενον.

I.33. Before άττλεως ed.pr. reports no trace, and supplies [ή άνωλα καὶ ή] SEG proposes [δέ αὐτοῖς καὶ]. We see a faint trace, which might be a crossbar, before άττλεως; we have followed J. and L. Robert in supplying [δέ αὐτοῖς καὶ ή].

I.34. The supplement to this line easy to make, but is unsatisfactorily short for the space. Ed.pr. supplied oi after πρόγονοι, which helps a little, but makes an awkward construction. At the end of the line, αὐτοῖς would make good sense; but we have been unable to detect any trace of the final sigma on the stone.

I.35. At the end of the lacuna ed.pr. reports ...[εἰς ἐπιστήσαι]ν θεσον, and proposes [πάσι τοῖς εἰς τὴν ψηφον]. We are not convinced that we can determine any significant traces before the nu of την, but there is an outline which might be an epsilon some 4/5 letters before it. We have adopted the restoration suggested by SEG, [δοσον-περ] εἰς τὴν ψηφον.

The purpose of this command seems to be to keep the community on Ikaros economically viable by exempting them from taxes payable on supplies exported from the Seleucid empire into the island. This would necessitate the following prohibition – if our interpretation of I.35–37 is correct – on the export of goods out of this subsidised economy, perhaps to non-Seleucid territory.

I.35–36. Restoration here must be very tentative; but εἰς I.35 indicates that we are dealing with an expression of location or direction. It is therefore tempting to read, with ed.pr., 'Αριστιάνπα θεσον in I.36, although the traces of the surviving alpha are very faint. Ed.pr. supplies [την άνω' αὐτοῖς 'Αρίστιαν] θεσον; A–S, [την ἀντίκειρο 'Αρίστιαν]. The turn of phrase which we have proposed is a commonplace in hellenistic terminology.

The text here is, however, so fragmentary that there can be little certainty; and it is possible that we should restore διὰ ή κατὰ μήνα; if so, we must assume that Ikaros has returned to the topic of attacks by one group of inhabitants against another.

I.37. Ed.pr. supplies μη/δέ κατὰ μήνα ἡξανθισθαι] ἄλλα μηθεν; SEG suggested μη/δέ κατὰ μήνα ἡξανθισθαι. The prohibition seems to us to require a personal object, and we have therefore supplied μη/δειν. For the rest, our restoration is based on the assumptions discussed above, and is very tentative.

At the end of the line, ed.pr. reports Ε, followed by a space, and restores εἰς[ι]; we think we can see traces of the iota.

I.38. Ed.pr. reads ... τοῖς ἐμπιστευόμενοι; SEG suggested [μη κατὰ πρόστασιμα τοῖς. The surface here is very worn; but we read τοῖς ἐμπιστευόμενοι. Ἐπιπέλλατο can have the sense 'belong to', and this could be another prohibition against invading the property of others, expressed in similar terms to the letter of Seleucus II at Labraunda, cited at I.24. But the verb can also mean 'fall to, be due to' (LSJ s. v. II.6); it is used of an allotment of corn in the Samian corn-law of the second century BC (Syll. 976.70 and 80). If, therefore, this passage is still concerned with the
regulation of supplies to the island, the sense could be "If [there is an interruption of some kind to] the allotted (supplies)".

1.39. If ll. 37–38 were taken up with a conditional clause, the lacuna in this line must contain the main verb of this sentence, before the subordinate clause introduced by ίνα. The first legible traces in this line are ...ΜΑΙΑΙ; and the easiest interpretation seems to be to see this as the end of a word concerned with selling, -πολιτα. Ed.pr. suggests ... τη μνοπολιτα; we would prefer a nominative plural, with the sense "let there be sales of such-and-such a kind". The most suitable term here would be one for the sale of food; αιτασαμεναι is not otherwise attested, but it would give good sense.

1.40. Ed.pr. supplies [τις τοις ειρημενας αι]πολιτας. While the passage must remain very uncertain, we are inclined to take ἐμπιστευει in its well-attested sense of "fall into difficulties" (LSJ s.v. 4.b), those difficulties perhaps being specified by a word such as ἀρροσ实践经验s; such an interpretation would seem to be relevant if we are right in interpreting these lines as concerned with food supplies.

1.41. Ed.pr. restores [λαβεται και θ' ενθοπε]ουν. We consider it most likely that ΟΥΝ should be read as αον, preceded by a word of command, such as συνταξον; for a similar construction, compare the dossier of c. 200, from Tell el-Ferr (cited at note 39), I.1: συνταξον άναγραφαντας ἐν στήλαις ΛΩ[ήνας ... τά]ς ἐπιστολῆς ἀνάθησιν ἐν ταῖς ὀπαρχοσεσίς ... τοι κύριαι; cf. also Cl.Rh. IX, 190.

Neither συνταξον, nor any other likely term, is sufficient to fill the lacuna here. We must therefore assume that it was preceded by the last word of the preceding sentence – a word of about 4/6 letters, very probably an adverb, qualifying ἐμπιστευει.

1.42. Before άναγραφαντας there is room for 4–6 letters. Ed.pr. proposes στήλης, but this is an unparalleled construction; an alternative possibility is τοτης, perhaps reflected in the terms of Anaxarchos' letter (see above, on 1.4).

1.43. The bad condition of the stone is particularly frustrating at this point, since this line apparently contains the year date, which is lost in line 6; it is followed by the day of the month, 17 Artemision, ten days earlier than the date of Seleucid's covering note (1.6). This indicates that no great distance separates Ikadion and Anaxarchos; compare the time-lags in the publication of the decrees honouring Laodike (L. Robert, Hell. VII, 15–17).

After the lacuna, ed.pr. reports traces of a triangular letter, followed by a circular letter and then a square corner, proposing a sentence ending in Α, followed by a date, ΟΤ'. A-S proposed εν τοι ερωτ ἐνταξον [Σωτήρος ἡ δευτ ἔλ]ηου, which is too long. J. and L. Robert (Bull. Ep. 1967.651) suggested that, while the most probable restoration would be a year date, in the Seleucid style – that is, with the lower numbers first – an alternative possibility might be εν τοι ερωτ [της Άρτημις], which would fit the lacuna. The construction which we are assuming, however, requires a verb for setting up the inscription – ἀναπληρον (the standard term) or ἐκθεται (the less common term, used by Anaxarchos in 1.5) – in the first part of this line, where there (which is certain). After a particular letter is more likely it is uncertain, but can (the photograph) as πονοι. This would give the date implications, see histori letter can be determined be the upper part of a τθετα to be a separate longer prudent to assume a br the date.

Historical commentary

The two documents rec the inhabitants of Ikar Seleucid public relation term progonoi was use Antiochus I, to refer to the "a unfortunately not possible for the sanctuary on Ik atmospheric king on the th what is known of Antiochus.

The position of Ikadion specified. He is apparent

45 Compare the letter of Antiochus III following the of his progonoi with regards 29–159 at 34, II.14–15: deci J. and L. Robert, A
of this line, where there is space for some 9–11 letters before the circular letter (which is certain). After puzzling over the traces, we have concluded that the circular letter is more likely to be a *theta*, with a dot, than an *omicron*. The letter after it is uncertain, but can convincingly be read on the stone and squeeze (less so on the photograph) as *rho*, a letter which varies in size and shape in this document. This would give the date *η*′, 109, of the Seleucid era – that is, 203/2 BC.; for the implications, see historical commentary. What we are less sure of is whether any letter can be determined before the numerals. We do see (with *ed.pr.*) what could be the upper part of a triangular letter; but it appears to us to be too close to the *theta* to be a separate letter. The surface is extremely pitted, and we feel it most prudent to assume a brief *vacat* here between the last word of the sentence and the date.

**Historical commentary**

The two documents recorded on this *stele* are a letter from a Seleucid official, Ikadion, to his subordinate, Anaxarchos, and a covering letter from Anaxarchos to the inhabitants of Ikaros. Ikadion’s letter sets out the policy of a Seleucid king for the inhabitants of the island. Our reading of line 43 gives the date as Artemision in year 109 of the Seleucid era – that is, April/May of 203 BC. The king must therefore be identified as Antiochus III (222–187). This dating is supported by the lettering (see above, p. 18) and is entirely consistent with the content of the documents.

The king’s policy for Ikaros (l. 9) is justified in terms of his adhesion to that of his *progonoi*, and is explained solely in terms of their intervention in, patronage of and plans for the religious life of the island (l. 9–11, cf. 19–20, 33–34). This theme of dynastic loyalty combined with royal piety and religious patronage is typical of Seleucid public relations, and is particularly well attested of Antiochus III.45 The term *progonoi* was used already in the time of the second Seleucid king, Antiochus I, to refer to the ‘ancestors’ of the ruling house (OGIS 222.18; cf. n. 45). It is unfortunately not possible to identify the reign (or reigns) in which the royal plans for the sanctuary on Ikaros had not been implemented. Now, however, there is an energetic king on the throne pressing his officials to action, a scenario fitting well what is known of Antiochus III as a historical figure.

The position of Ikadion in the Seleucid bureaucracy and administration is not specified. He is apparently a high-ranking Seleucid official belonging to the rather

---

45 Compare the letter of Seleucus II to Miletus (OGIS 227; RC 22; Ins.Didyma 493); for Antiochus III following the policy of his *progonoi* see e. g. Welles, RC 42; and for piety as a motive, RC 32 (Ins.Magn. 19; OGIS 232): Antiochus, son of Antiochus III, abiding by his father’s policy and referring to his piety; RC 44 (OGIS 244, 25 ff.): *ευσεβεία* of Antiochus III and of his *progonoi* with regard to the cults at Syrian Daphne; P. Herrmann, Anadolu 9 (1965) 29–159 at 34, II.14–15: decree of Teos honouring Antiochus III. See also the valuable discussion of J. and L. Robert, Amyzon 140, 180–181.
vague category oĩ ἐπὶ τῶν προγεμάτων τεταγμένων (l. 11–12), «those in charge of affairs», and so at the head of some section of the Seleucid administration. This formula is not used in Seleucid terminology to describe any one specific position. One department of Seleucid bureaucratic administration which would be involved in the issues discussed here is that of the dioiketai and their subordinates (the oikonomoi) whose direct responsibility to the king, and independence of the governor has recently been illuminated, in the case of Seleucid Palestine, by the Seleucid dossier from Tell el-Firr. As important officials regionally deployed, in direct communication with the king, and as officials responsible for economic matters (including supplies as well as fiscal administration) they would have been concerned in the administration of Ikaros, especially with regard to taxation. Since, however, the dioiketai are referred to in documents by their title, instead of the formula used here, it seems unlikely that Ikadion should be identified as one. This formula is used of Zeuxis as viceroy of Antiochus III in Asia Minor, as well as being applied collectively to royal officials who are responsible to the king for affairs in the satrapies. Ikadion is therefore very likely to have been the governor of the satrapy to which Ikaros was attached. Which one was at present unknown. The most likely is perhaps Babylonia, more specifically the satrapy of «The Districts of the Red Sea» after its creation (by 222 BC; see above, p. 8 and n. 16). Less likely, but possible, is the satrapy of Susiana. Jeppesen was inclined to identify Ikadion with the homonym named by Jerome (comm. in Dan. XI.6) as a supporter of Laodike and her son Seleucus II in the dynastic struggle of c. 246 against Berenice, the second wife of Antiochus II, after the death of the latter; our dating for this text must rule that out.

Anaxarchos, as a subordinate of Ikadion, is identifiable as a Seleucid official in charge of one of the regional subdivisions into which the Seleucid satrapies were subdivided. The context is resident at Ikaros - for example, a noteworthy feature (l. 15) to denote to whom Antiochus I.2. Ikadion also administered the action that had been seized by a person singular to give one possible that this usage should be used by the Seleucid king in the Seleucid governance which they are passing on the authority which that officer the section responsible for.

The two documents on the status and character of the community emerges from the island through his of king's, as is implicit in his

Whatever type of society organised as a polis. The kind of the form of address Anaxarchos was given to the inhabitants of a city or some other representative, the same ἄναρχος do not possess the ἀρχή could be addressed (cf. the constraints of the settlement was not built as one of the life for any administrative office on the island.

We know that the pronoun, Anabasis 7.20.3–4), 25.76.4 for the hellenistic: 1.2

——


——

Jeppesen, A. K., Huitième Congrès International
of an official. This implies that one or more of the Seleucid satraps were subdivided. The content of the documents makes it appear unlikely that he was resident at Ikaros – for example as Seleucid governor (epistates) of the island.

A noteworthy feature of the text is Ikadion’s use of the plural pronoun ἡμῖν (l. 15) to denote to whom the king had written. The usage is paralleled by Anaxarchus in l. 2. Ikadion also uses the plural forms for the verbs (ll. 16–17) describing the action that had been taken. In contrast, he uses the imperative in the second person singular to give orders to Anaxarchus (l. 36, cf. 26–27, 30–31). It seems possible that this usage should be understood as analogous to the royal ‘we’ regularly used by the Seleucid kings in correspondence. There are several other instances where Seleucid governors use ‘we’ when referring to the king’s orders to them which they are passing on. In these cases ‘we’ perhaps stands collectively for the authority which that official and his group of subordinates represent in the state as the section responsible for carrying out the king’s policy.

The two documents contained in text 3 illuminate only indirectly the question of the status and character of the settlements on Ikaros. The subordinated character of the community emerges first in the fact that the king communicates his orders for the island through his officials. The people are subject, and the land (chora) is the king’s, as is implicit in his orders for its distribution (ll. 29 ff.; i.e., chora basilike).

Whatever type of social organisation the inhabitants belong to, they are not organised as a polis. The lack of civic structure emerges in several ways: firstly from the form of address Anaxarchus employs in his covering note, which is directed simply to the inhabitants collectively (l. 1) instead of to a board of magistrates and/or some other representative body such as a boule or assembly. Secondly, the oikeiai do not possess the hall-mark of a Greek polis – a city ethnic by which they could be addressed (cf. also text 2 and commentary). Thirdly, the physical constraints of the settlement F 5 at c. sixty metres square demonstrate that the place was not built as one of the new Seleucid poleis. There is, therefore, no evidence for any administrative organisation on Ikaros other than that of the cult (or cults) on the island.

We know that the pre-Greek community was centred round a sanctuary (Arrian, Anabasis 7.20.3–4), and the physical remains of F 5 suggest a similar arrangement for the hellenistic site. Furthermore, the only local officials to be mentioned

33 See BENGTSON, o. c. 12 ff.; on Babylonian regional subdivisions see S. M. SHERWIN-WHITE, JNES 42 (1983) 268.
36 Pace the remarks of G. COHEN (o. c. above, n. 26) 44.
in text 3 (and in the plural) are the neokoroi (l. 21), «temple-wardens», who, on the
analogy of the famous sanctuaries of Artemis at Sardis and Ephesus, as well as that
at Amyzon, were important administrators responsible for temple administration
as well as for the organisation of the cults in their care. They tend to be prominent
where a sanctuary functioned as the centre of the life of a place; and this very
probably continued to be the case in the hellenistic period on Ikaros.

The question of the original location of the hieron which was moved (l.10–16)
– presumably to F 5 – remains unclear. Certainly Alexander’s explorers learned of
a sanctuary and cult of a goddess («Artemis») on Ikaros in the pre-Greek period.
But was this, or the cult of Soter (l. 22) localised at the Achaemenid site at Tell
Khazneh, or yet somewhere else? One of the motives behind the move is likely to
have been protection; F 5 was fortified, if inadequately, by a circumference wall
of mud-brick resting upon a base of irregular blocks of rock. The unplanned and
irregular disposition of the houses filling the area around the two temples suggests
that the site functioned as a fortified settlement rather than as one of the
«true forts» characteristic of the hellenistic period, which were designed with regularly
laid out barracks to serve primarily as a military base for troops. Temple A was
oriented exactly on the east-west axis of the «square», evidently as an original
part of the plan. The main objective would appear to have been to provide for-
tified protection for a (new) sanctuary, and room for a community to dwell around
it.

The Seleucid kings’ policy of support for the religions – Greek and non-Greek –
of the peoples within their empire is becoming ever more fully documented. Their positive action provides the historical background for an assessment of the
cult patronage of text 3. There are, however, serious impediments to a more
detailed account, even beyond the uncertain state of much of this text. While it seems
likely that the hieron of the Soteria was moved to Temple A, since the inscription
stood in front of it, it does not necessarily follow that the temple had been built to
accommodate the cult of the goddess becoming synnaos.64

The cult of the Artemis of Ikaros, as well as that of Soter, as well as that of Soter
might be the Zeus of Ikaros.

The cult – or cults – of recognisably Greek in plan
reflects the building traditions of the Greek fashion – the re-orientation – of specifically
style of life for the Greeks, beautifully encapsulated off the Fertile Crescent, in
decision in which, it least explicitly. It is unlikely.

The ethnic composition or settlement(s) is potentially of cultural significance. Seleucid colonising policy is documented by literary and archaeological exploration of the time reveal more about the settlement which Alexander turnedwards into Seleucid colonial territory Ikaros also reflects.

62. See MATHIESEN (O.C. N. 39f. (Catalogue, Part 2, Greek 103–104).
63. See MATHIESEN (O.C. N. 39f. (Catalogue, Part 2, Greek 103–104).
64. On this phenomenon see cf. L. ROBERT, Amyzon, 110, 116, cf. 191 (with special reference to Amyzon).
65. Cf. A.W. LAWRENCE, Greek Aims in Fortification (Oxford 1979) 179, who describes the
site F 5 as the «weakest true fort yet discovered».
68. JEPPSEN, L. C. n. 55) 542.
69. See MATHIESEN (O.C. N. 39f. (Catalogue, Part 2, Greek 103–104).
accommodate the cult of the Soteira. It is entirely possible that the moved cult simply shared — in keeping with Greek practice — a temple with other deities, the goddess becoming sympauros. This may be suggested by text 2, from the area of Temple A, apparently dedicated «to the gods»; and, although ll.22 ff. of text 3 cannot be adequately restored, it appears that Ikadion is concerned with another cult, of Soter, as well as that of Soteira (l.10). It seems reasonable to equate the Soteira with the cult of «Artemis» mentioned by Arrian, and the Artemis Soteira of text 1; the Soter might be the Zeus Soter also invoked in text 1.

The cult — or cults — of Temple A (and B) were housed in a structure that is recognisably Greek in plan, architecture and decoration. At least one Iranian feature reflects the building tradition of the larger region, but the moved cult's new home, probably unlike the old, was basically Greek in physical appearance. The establishment of an agon, probably accompanied by cultural competitions as well as athletics, was an integral part of the royal policy with regard to the sanctuary (ll.16 ff.) and was therefore perhaps partially intended to celebrate — in normal Greek fashion — the re-organisation. The Seleucid kings' promotion — indeed imposition — of specifically Greek cultural traditions to create a recognisably Greek style of life for the Greek and hellenised inhabitants of their empire to share in is beautifully encapsulated in this image of a Greek agon celebrated on a small island off the Fertile Crescent, in the inner Arabian Gulf. The reaction of the inhabitants to a decision in which, it appears from text 3, they had no say is not recorded, at least explicitly. It is unlikely to have been all favourable (see below).

The ethnic composition of the population of Ikaros and of the Seleucid settlement(s) is potentially of considerable importance for the general understanding of Seleucid colonising policies. The occupation of the island in the Achaemenid period is documented by literary sources, but has not yet been much illuminated by archaeological exploration of the island. It is to be hoped that excavation will in time reveal more about the size and material character of the sanctuary-centred settlement which Alexander's explorers described, and which passed not long afterwards into Seleucid control. The presence of a non-Greek element on hellenistic Ikaros also is reflected in the material finds from the hellenistic sites, being inferable from the presence of artefacts of traditional Mesopotamian style (as well as objects imported from Mesopotamia and perhaps from Susiana), from a non-

65 See Jeppesen, l.c. (n.55) for the bell-shaped column bases of Persian design (pl.136.1). See also M. Collidge, Parthian Art (London 1977) 24, 67 (use of mud-brick in the fortifications); L. Hannestad, o.c. (n.59) p.61, on building techniques.
66 See n.2.
67 See Mathiesen (o.c. n.22) 15–16, 17 ff. (Catalogue, Part 1, Oriental Types, nos.1–70), 39 ff. (Catalogue, Part 2, Greek Types, nos.71–108); Hannestad (o.c. n.22) esp. 11, 79, 103–104.
Greek (perhaps North Arabian or Aramaic) graffiti, and perhaps too from the relative rarity of Greek objects at the settlement F 5 and at the new French site. The presence of Greeks is indicated above all by the inscriptions nos. 1 and 2. If the interpretation of text I is correct, the Seleucid settlement will have begun under the protection of a Seleucid garrison. Since the Seleucids drew upon non-Greek peoples within the empire as well as on Greeks for their colonial settlements, any colonists sent to Ikaros are likely to have included non-Greeks too, hellenised to varying degrees; cf. for example the Greek and Iranian military garrison at Magnesia-Sipylus, and Antiochus III's dispatch of Jews from Babylonia as colonists to Asia Minor.

Text 3 should not automatically be regarded as evidence for the hellenised (let alone hellenic) character of the inhabitants as a whole. Firstly, there is a danger in arguing from government documents put up for public display to either the public's knowledge of the language in which they were written, or to their literacy. «Government's ideas on what ought to be readable do not necessarily coincide with what the subjects can actually read.» Second, there is the question of the function behind the publication of Ikadion's letter — that is, the audiences for which public exhibition of the documents was intended. Ikadion's letter informed his Greek subordinate both of the implementation of (and reasons for) the king's plans regarding Ikaros, and passed on royal orders concerning the treatment, taxation and property rights of the inhabitants which was Anaxarchos' responsibility to implement. One function of publication was to provide proof, not so much to the local audience, but to Seleucid personnel of rights that they are to respect (e.g. to the dioiketes and oikonomos responsible for fiscal administration in the case of the taxation immunity and land grants, and to the Seleucid soldiers, or colonists, guilty of roughing up the inhabitants [II.24 ff.; see below], quite apart from Anaxarchos' own successors in office). This function of publication is well illustrated by another Seleucid document: the dossier of texts concerning the legal rights and ateleia from billeting of the villages near Scythopolis belonging to Ptolemy, Seleucid governor of Coele Syria and Phoenicia (see n.39). In response to a request for action the king (Antiochus III) ordered Ptolemy to have the documents inspected and placed on public display in his villages (as cited in the commentary on l.41, above). It is obvious from the dossier that the purpose was not to provide a stele for Ptolemy and the villagers to read, but to provide evidence for the numerous Seleucid authorities in the region, who were Greeks and Macedonians (the dioiketai

68 Salles, L.G. n.23, reported a non-Greek graffito, possibly Aramaic or North Arabian, inscribed on an altar.
69 Salles, ib., and Hannestad, a. c. (n.22) 104.
70 OGIS 229, exp. 100 ff.
71 Josephus, AJ 12.149
72 D. M. Lewis, JThS 19 (1969) 583–588 at 587 (review of J. N. Sevenzser, Do you know Greek? How much Greek could the first Jewish Christians have known?)

with subordinate oikon by in the future. One of the purposes was as a channel for Seleucid administration. The Seleucid officials are mainly Greek. This fact is not surprising given the hodos of the Seleucid kings in Egypt.

Lines 20–40 deal with rights to land, an issue not easy because of the peremptory nature of the decree of A.D.C. 11–14 of the edict of Il.20–26 is unambiguous. The king grants the rights of the (local) inhabitants (ëtav ...) belonging to a group whose name seems to be this group (tovtov in this text) and to the royal garrison. The lands (chôna) with hereditary rights to farm it. The colonists are permitted to cultivate the land for a small annual fee against similar mistreatment by the local inhabitants (e.g. Scythopolis) which pertain to a settlement (Il. 29–32) the cultivation of which is forbidden.

Two main points emerge regarding the rights of the inhabitants. First, the cultivation of the land by the inhabitants is forbidden against similar mistreatment (Josephus, AJ 12.151, n. 20) by the Seleucid authorities (Cf. the inscriptions c

73 Landau, a. c. 39, 585.
74 Cf. the prophetic renunciation cited above.
75 Compare the Seleucid decree of Pharaoh Necho II, ed. 61–63 no. 46. with B.
76 Cohen, a. c. 26, 68.
78 Cf. the inscriptions c
with subordinate oikonomoi and the military commanders in the district)\textsuperscript{73} to abide by in the future. One very important function of the publication of these documents was as a channel of communication between different branches of the Seleucid administration. The intercourse is within the government, at a level where officials are mainly Greek speaking, not between the government and its subjects. This fact is not surprising, since it is becoming increasingly clear that the bureaucracy of the Seleucid kingdom was as complex and developed as that of Ptolemaic Egypt.\textsuperscript{74}

Lines 20–40 deal with the present situation on Ikaros. Reconstruction is not easy because of the poorly preserved state of the inscription. The following is a tentative appraisal of what seems to be going on. Although the exact supplementing of II.20–26 is uncertain, it appears that Ikadion is concerned to protect the rights of the (local) inhabitants (cf. μὴ προσπορεύεσθαι ... τρόποι μηδενί ἄλλο βαν ...) belonging to the population settled on the island (συνοικίσθημα). It seems to be this group which is to be protected (l.25, end – I.29, beginning) by ensuring that they attain their <rights>, and by their protection against injustice or removal (expropriation, expulsion, or even being carried off as slaves).\textsuperscript{75} Members of this <group> (τούτων in I.29, i.e. presumably the anthropoi of I.28, who would appear to be the παρία group of I.20) are to be granted an allotment of island land (chora) with hereditary leasehold – as attested in other Seleucid colonies – if they want to farm it. The condition, which is characteristic of emphyteuteic leases, of the lessee cultivating the land, is made explicit.\textsuperscript{76} This requirement (and probably the hereditary tenure) seems to have applied generally to Seleucid colonial allotments in this period, also being used, for example, by Antiochus III in his arrangement for the settlement of Babylonian colonists in Phrygia.\textsuperscript{77}

Two main points emerge. Firstly, a section of people on Ikaros have suffered in the ways prohibited in II.24–26, and 26–28. There are several Seleucid rulings against similar mistreatment of local populations (e.g. by Seleucid soldiers at Carian Amyzon, at the sanctuary of Labraunda, and in the villages of Ptolemy near Scythopolis) which point to a similar situation on Ikaros.\textsuperscript{78} The second issue (II.29–32) is the cultivation of the island chorai. Two main interpretations are possible: a) the policy of making land grants and leaseholds to the local population has

\textsuperscript{73} Landau, o. c. n.39, 58–59, II.1–3, 12 ff.
\textsuperscript{74} Cf. the prophetic remark of Welles, RC p. 102; see Taylor, o. c. n. 46, 147 ff., 170–171.
\textsuperscript{75} Compare the Seleucid edict (probably of the reign of Antiochus III and from Zeuxis) curbing at the king's order the misbehaviour of the army at Labraunda: Crampa, Labraunda III.2, 61–63 no. 46, with Bull. Ep. 1970.553; Amyzon 138–142, no. 10 (Antiochus III at Amyzon).
\textsuperscript{76} Cohen, o. c. n. 26, 68–69.
\textsuperscript{77} Josephus, AJ 12.151, compared by Cohen l. c., with the condition of land tenure on Ikaros attested in text 3.
\textsuperscript{78} Cf. the inscriptions cited in n. 75.
not been implemented properly in the past, and is now to be put fully into operation. This could refer to a distinction (and now conflict) between Seleucid colonists who had been granted land, and local inhabitants, whose livelihood, apart from tending the cult(s), will have come from fishing, and any trade that the island's position as a staging point and watering place created. Or, b), the plan to promote the cultivation of the island by landgrants is new, or – if ancestral – is being implemented now for the first time. There seems no way to decide between these two hypotheses.

In considering the king's policy in land allotment, it is worth noting the contrast drawn in the accounts of Alexander's explorers between cultivated Telos and Ikaros.\(^ \text{79} \) Ikaros was thickly wooded (perhaps with low scrub, but possibly – in contrast to today – with real trees) which suggests that there was little or no cultivation on the island in the pre-Selucid period. The island is cultivable, being comparatively well provisioned with fresh water, since -by some whim of geology,- the water table is less than 2 metres below the ground surface, and catches the rare winter rainfall, which can easily be tapped by wells. Bibby also noted reports that corn had been grown on the island until recently.\(^ \text{81} \) It is possible that an increase to the population of Ikaros had meant that the island's delicately balanced ecology could not support it adequately. The king's policy, in encouraging the cultivation of land on the island, was perhaps aimed at catering for a larger population.

The other main issue – the oppression of members of the population – might be a long-standing problem; but it is perhaps more likely, in the light of other Seleucid inscriptions, to be a recent development, linked either with the move of the sanctuary or, more probably, with the influx of a new group. This could be new colonists (hence the promotion of agriculture) sent to reinforce the Seleucid hold on Ikaros, and/or a more temporary influx of soldiers connected with the military operations that Antiochus' Arabian policy had engendered in 205 BC.

Another mechanism used to promote the future success of the settlement is the grant of ateleia (I.23–35) which takes the form of a reaffirmation of immunity conceded by the king's progonoi. The exact nature (and limit) of the ateleia is made clear in 1.35 as being immunity on goods exported to the island. This is most likely a reference to the customs dues imposed by the Seleucids on the movement of goods in the Seleucid empire, grants of immunity from which are attested both as rewards to friendly foreign powers and to places within the kingdom.\(^ \text{82} \) We know

---

\(^{79}\) See Arrian, Anabasis 7.20.3–4; for description of Telos see Anabasis 7.20.6, and Theophrastus, HP. 4.7.8.


\(^{82}\) See, e.g., the tax exemptions granted to the Rhodians trading in the Seleucid empire by Seleucus II (Polybius 5.89.8, cf. 21.45.17) and Antiochus III's grant to the Jewish ethnos of tax exemption on imports of materials needed for rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem: Josephus, AJ 12.141; Bickerman, Institutions Séleucides, 115–116.
be put fully into operation between Seleucid colonists and the locals whose livelihood, apart from any trade that the locals may have entered into, or, if "ancestral" - is not always the best way to decide between traditions.

It is worth noting the contrast between cultivated Telos and Ikadion's Telos, but possibly - in considering the fact that there was little or no cultivation in the island and is cultivable, being primarily an island dependent on some whim of geology for its surface, and catches the imagination. Buzy also noted reports of small craft and sailing. It is possible that an island's delicately balanced economy depends on encouraging the cultivable, searching for a larger population. The island's population - might be calculated on the light of other Seleucid inscriptions or in the move of the sanctuaries, would be new colonists from Seleucid land on Ikadros, with military operations and role.

The absence of the settlement is the necessary affirmation of immunity (or at least a limit) of the ateleia is made from the island. This is most likely the result of raids on the movement of Jewish colonists which are attested both as part of the kingdom. We know from the coins of Seleucia-Tigris and from artefacts found at F 5 that the inhabitants had contact with Babylonia and the cities there; they would have had to import many basic materials and supplies. The grant of ateleia, which would have facilitated this, was also perhaps intended to reinforce by economic inducements attachment to the Seleucids.

Line 33 shows that the ateleia should not be regarded as a new privilege, designed to meet new circumstances, but as one granted in the past, perhaps at the beginning of Seleucid rule on Ikadros. There was apparently no time limit on the immunity such as is often attested in grants of ateleia, especially in the case of royal attempts to revive a place after war, or establish or restore a colony. There is no reason, however, to conceive of the island as a tax-haven! The islanders are likely to have been subject to other Seleucid crown taxes since there is no reference to grants of immunity from them. And those who became cleruchs of royal land, under the terms of II.29–32, became liable to a set of regular taxes. The ban in the last lines (II. 35 ff.) and its precise objective (I. 39) is too fragmentary for anything to be reconstructed securely; but it is possible that the effective subsidy of imports to Ikadros entitled a ban on their re-export from the island – see the tentative restoration of II.35-37, with the commentary.

Ikadros' letter seems clearly to attest a reorganisation of the Seleucid settlement on Ikadros on the king's initiative, although essential details remain problematic. What is also of interest is that there was no physical segregation of the population in the settlement F 5, as the archaeological discoveries importantly demonstrate. The mingled cultural traditions of this comparatively small helle-
nistic settlement are well reflected in the material finds.\(^9\) This discovery provides an interesting counter example to a current view of the relationship between Greeks and non-Greeks in areas under Macedonian rule as one of juxtaposition and segregation.\(^10\) This model is too simple to apply in toto to the settlements of the Seleucid empire, where such variables as manpower, function and place combined to produce different patterns.\(^11\) It is worth noting also that royal policy in this text observed no distinction juridically as regards the rights of inhabitants. It is true, however, that, as so often, the reality appears from II.26ff. not to have coincided with the aspirations of the government; but the Seleucid authorities do attempt to correct abuses. At the same time, the king's policy is to enhance the Greek veneer of religious and social life by the establishment of a characteristically Greek institution, the agon, and probably also in the provision of 'Greek' temples. The text documents both the central role of the king in the formation and the execution of Seleucid settlement policies, and the specifically Greek modes which he encouraged their realisation to take.

The king regarded his policy (at least officially) as the implementation of ancestral policy. This is not entirely to be dismissed as novelty in the guise of traditionalism. Both archaeology and our text I combine to suggest a Seleucid presence at Ikaros from the early third century. This evidence can legitimately be linked with Seleucus I's gift to the Miletian sanctuary at Didyma (dated 288/7 BC)\(^12\) of large amounts of frankincense, myrrh and Indian spices (cinnamon and costum - that is, Putchuk) which documents indirectly Seleucids' access to the precious trade in incense and other South Arabian products which, together with Indian trade arriving by sea in the Gulf were passed north via Telos and Gerrha.\(^13\) Such hints as these suggest that one purpose of Seleucid control of Ikaros was to enhance Seleucid power in the trading of the Gulf, especially with regard to the valuable spice and incense trade. Ancestral activity in the Gulf can thus be traced back as far as Seleucus I, founder of the dynasty.\(^14\)

Rostovtzeff has shown that Seleucus I, like his rivals, claimed a blood connc-

---

\(^12\) OGIS 214 (RC 5; Ins. Didyma 424) 49–51; cf. W. Gouw, JSEA 21 (1971) 70. Cf. also J. J. Miller, The spice trade of the Roman empire (Oxford 1969) 85, misdating OGIS 214 to the reign of Seleucus II.
\(^13\) Cf. Rostovtzeff, CAH VII, 175.
\(^14\) W. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilisation* (with G. T. Griffith, Cambridge 1952) 242. Cf. idem, JEA 15 (1929) 9–25 at 22, who rightly infers the good relations of Seleucus I with the Gerrhaeans. Their request to Antiochus III not to destroy their 'everlasting peace and freedom' (Polybius 13.9.4) indicates that they remained independent of Seleucus I.
This discovery provides new information about the relationship between Seleucid and Hellenistic peoples as one of juxtaposition and voluntary assimilation. This suggests a complex relationship, not limited to function and place competition. It also indicates that Seleucid authorities did attempt to enhance the Greek presence and influence to a characteristic degree. This can be seen in the construction of Greek temples. The Seleucid policy suggests a deliberate attempt to enhance the Greek presence and influence. It is possible to identify the Seleucid policy with the practice of the Seleucid empire in the late Hellenistic period. This is demonstrated by the Seleucid policy of expansion in the inner Arabian Gulf which the king had taken up.

90 Cf. ROSTOVZTEFF, JHS 55 (1935) 56–66 at 63–65, relying in primis on Libanius (XI.91) who refers to Seleucus' kinship with the Hecatae (ancestors of the Argeads) as a Temenid. See P. GOUKOWSKY, Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre, I (Nancy 1978) 125–131 for the evidence for Seleucus' conscious use of the myth of Alexander in his struggle for power and empire. GOUKOWSKY is mistaken in his statement (citing ROSTOVZTEFF, o.c.) that Alexander was not included among the Seleucid progonoi. ROSTOVZTEFF's argument was precisely the opposite. He believed that Alexander was included among the progonoi of the early Seleucids (cf. above); he thought that at some point, perhaps with the organisation of the centralised dynastic cult which he (rightly) attributed to Antiochus III, Alexander was excluded. His evidence for this supposed change was the (incomplete) list of priesthoods of royal cults of the Seleucid kings from Seleucia-Pieria, Samaria, and Seleucia-Tigris, in which Alexander does not feature. However, as BICKERMANN, Institutions Seleucides 236–246 and 256, subsequently pointed out, these are municipal cults, unrelated to the centralised dynastic cult of the Seleucid empire instituted by Antiochus III. GOUKOWSKY's remark, o.c. 131, on the absence of figures of Alexander in the Seleucid empire has to be modified in light of the publication (inter alia) of the Ikaros terracottas; see also the fine ivory makhaira sheath decorated with Alexander wearing a lion-scaul head-dress; B. A. LITVINSKYI and L. R. PCHIRITYAN, 'The Temple of the Oxus', JRAS 1981, 133–167, at 144, plate VIII.