

the cheapest liturgy<sup>21</sup>) or a dedication of *phialai* by those who had performed it. The superintendent of the *eutaxia* was paid 30 *dr.* according to the law.<sup>22</sup> At the celebration of the Amphiareia at Oropos in 329/28 that sum was distributed to the festival commissioners,<sup>23</sup> which suggests that the *eutaxia* must have denoted a festival event, perhaps performed there or replaced by one of the games.<sup>24</sup> These included gymnastic, equestrian and *apobatic*<sup>25</sup> races, only the last of which required hoplite participation. In any event, if the relief NM 2958 is related to the liturgy at all, it might indicate that the *eutaxia* had something to do with a hoplite contest. The period 317/308 in which the festival liturgies were replaced by the *agonothesia* would provide a *terminus ante quem* for the relief.<sup>26</sup> Eutaxia is certainly in the right company, for the middle figure frequently appears on Athenian record reliefs of the fourth century as the Demos of Athens,<sup>27</sup> sometimes crowning a citizen<sup>28</sup> or a hoplite in the venerable presence of Athena.<sup>29</sup> On the relief NM 2946 (PLATE XXII c) the scene of Demos crowning a hoplite is almost identical with what is going on next to Eutaxia. Perhaps a similar scene was represented on the fragmentary NM 2954 (PLATE XXII d) where Demos is now missing.<sup>30</sup> The pattern suggests that the same scene is enacted on NM 2958, with Eutaxia pointing to the victor, her tablet presumably containing the names of the winning tribe and its team. The tripod in the background seems to me to be the prize rather than a topographical indication. Athena must have stood on the missing part of the relief.

The stance of Eutaxia and the middle Nymph of the Eukles relief is constructed along the same lines

<sup>21</sup> J. K. Davies, *loc. cit.*

<sup>22</sup> SIC<sup>3</sup> 298, ll. 41–5.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*; BSA 1 (1955), 34 f. (Lewis); JHS lxxxvii (1967), 39 (Davies). Reinmuth, *op. cit.*, 71, mistakenly interprets the lines 41–5 as implying that the 30 *dr.* were voted for the supervisor of the games. For the celebration of the Amphiareia see *Hermes* lvii (1922), 80 f. (E. Preuner).

<sup>24</sup> That *eutaxia*, though an abstract noun, was referred to a cavalry race on the analogy of *euandria* had been suggested in Daremberg-Saglio III 758.

<sup>25</sup> SIC<sup>3</sup> 298, ll. 16–18. For *apobasis* see RE I 2814 (Reisch); *Boll. d'arte*, xxxi (1938), 348 (Rizzo); *Hesperia* iv (1935), 379–81; H. A. Thompson-R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens* (1972), 121, pl. 166a; Démosthène, *Discours d'apparat*, ed. R. Clavaud, Belles Lettres (1974), 135–7.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. W. S. Ferguson, *Hell. Athens* (1911), 42 f.; Süsserrott, *op. cit.*, 120 n. 36; *Hesperia* xii (1943), 159 f. (Dow and Travis); AJA xlvi (1944), 239 n. 16 (Ferguson); J. K. Davies, *op. cit.*, XIX; S. Lauffer in *Hell. Poleis*, ed. E. C. Welskopf, I (1974), 155 f.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. the reliefs in Athens: NM 1482, Süsserrott, *op. cit.*, 67 f., pl. 9, 4; NM 2811, Süsserrott, *op. cit.*, 64 f., pl. 9, 3; NM 2946, Svoronos, *op. cit.*, 657, pl. 190; NM 2985, Süsserrott, *op. cit.*, 86, pl. 5, 4.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. NM 2811.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. NM 1482, 2811, 2946; 2954, Svoronos, *op. cit.*, 658, pl. 192; Akropolis Museum 3367 + 2542 with Athena, Nike and a hoplite, Walter, *op. cit.*, no. 55.

<sup>30</sup> NM 2946, see n. 27; NM 2954, see n. 29.

as that of the Marathon Boy,<sup>31</sup> and I suspect they should all be referred to a similar source of inspiration. Fuchs has suggested that the standing Nymph of the Eukles relief as well as the Hygieia of the Asklepios reliefs derived from a statue of the 320s.<sup>32</sup> It seems to me, however, that the variations of the type indicate the existence of several statuary if not pictorial prototypes adaptable to various purposes, which make their appearance already in the 330s.<sup>33</sup> The Ashmolean torso, being a genuine Attic work roughly contemporary with the Marathon Boy, is good evidence for this hypothesis. Its sadly mutilated condition can only allow us to speculate about the position of the right arm which was presumably outstretched. This is a dramatic gesture, more suitable for male characters,<sup>34</sup> meaningless in the Nymphs if taken in isolation, and artificial in Eutaxia where it looks borrowed and recalls the gesture of Demokratia crowning Demos on the relief from the decree against tyranny of 337/6.<sup>35</sup> It is rather unlikely that our fragment originally represented Eutaxia. It looks more like part of a group, possibly a Nymph combined with one seated on her right and another leaning on her left shoulder;<sup>36</sup> or a Muse airing a musical instrument in the company of her sisters;<sup>37</sup> or perhaps Hygieia leaning on a votive pillar in the presence of Asklepios seated.

OLGA PALAGIA

*St Hugh's College, Oxford*

<sup>31</sup> Athens National Museum bronze 15118. Height 1.30 m. Commonly dated toward the end of the third and the beginning of the last quarter of the fourth century. Fuchs, *Skulpt. Griech.*, fig. 106.

<sup>32</sup> *AM* lxxvii (1962), 248 n. 33.

<sup>33</sup> One version appears on the Apulian pelike in the British Museum F. 309.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the Sisyphos I at Delphi, *Ant. Plastik* vii (1968), 39–40, pls. 30–2 (Dohrn).

<sup>35</sup> Agora I 6524. *Hesperia* xxi (1952), 355–9, pls. 89–90 (Meritt); *Hesperia* xxxi (1962), 238 (Raubitschek); Hausmann, *op. cit.*, 42–4, figs. 21–2; K. Schefold, *Class. Greece* (transl. 1967), 188, fig. 56; Thompson-Wycherley, *op. cit.*, 102, pl. 53a; K. Zimmermann in *Hell. Poleis* III, 1258, fig. 38.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. NM 4466.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. the Mantinea base, slab NM 217, Rizzo, *Prass.* (1932), pl. 132.

### A Coan Domain in Cyprus

Coan possession of *chora* in Cyprus is attested, in the Imperial period, by a dedication in honour of a Roman governor of Cyprus, who had retrieved for the Coans their land.<sup>1</sup> The text of the inscription

<sup>1</sup> I should like to thank Mr P. M. Fraser and Dr H. W. Pleket for helpful criticism at various stages. I use the following abbreviations in addition to the usual ones:

PH = Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, Oxford, 1891.

HG = R. Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*, Berl. Abh., 1928.

was first made known by R. Herzog in 1928, and was later published, without commentary, by G. Patriarca in 1932.<sup>2</sup> It is one of a number of documents in which Roman authority is exercised in settlement of a *controversia agrorum* in Greek provincial cities.<sup>3</sup> It merits further attention because of the startling revelation of Coan ownership of land in Cyprus. For convenience the text is reproduced here:

[ὁ δᾶμος ἐτίμαε]  
 Ἀῶλον Δίδιον Πρόστομον ἀνθύπατον  
 Κύπρου, ἀντιλαβόμενον τὰς ἱερᾶς καὶ  
 δαμοσίας ἀμῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ χώρας καὶ πρ[ο]  
 νο(α)θέντα τῶν τὰς πόλιος δικαίων  
 ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας  
 τὰς εἰς αὐτόν.<sup>4</sup>

The date of the restitution requires discussion. The inscription is inscribed in ornate lettering typical of the early Imperial period. The Coans' recovery of their land must postdate 22 B.C., the year in which Augustus allocated Cyprus as a senatorial province under the government of a proconsul.<sup>5</sup> A date in the late first century B.C., or in the first century A.D. is therefore probable. There is at present no further evidence about Aulus Didius Postumus to help place his career within this chronological context. But the rareness of the *nomen* Didius and that of its combination with the *praenomen* Aulus suggests the strong possibility that Aulus Didius was related, perhaps as son, to Aulus Didius Gallus, who led an active senatorial career under the Emperor Claudius and held, among other positions, the legateship of Moesia in c. A.D. 46, and the legateship of Britain from A.D. 52 to 58.<sup>6</sup> Relationship with Gallus would place Postumus' governorship of Cyprus, and the recovery by Cos of its territory, in the approximate vicinity of Claudius' reign.

There is as yet no evidence of where in Cyprus the Coan domain was, or of its extent. From its description as ἡ ἱερὰ καὶ ἡ δαμοσία χώρα it clearly included a *temenos*.<sup>7</sup> Nothing more is known. The

loss of the territory must have been due to appropriation by private individuals<sup>8</sup> and not confiscation by Rome, since the proconsul of Cyprus did not have the authority to reverse any *senatus consultum* (or Imperial edict) which might have revoked Coan rights to property in Cyprus, and restore the Coan territory.

In geographic terms Cyprus is a surprise as the home of Coan *chora*. The most natural location for Coan land, outside the island of Cos, was the mainland of Asia Minor—in particular Caria. Why Cyprus? There is no evidence of any sort in the fourth century B.C., or in the Hellenistic period, of official contact between Cos and Cyprus,<sup>9</sup> a fact requiring explanation if the Coans had acquired territory directly from a city (or king) in Cyprus, in the period before Cyprus came under Ptolemaic control in 295 B.C., after which it continued as part of the Ptolemaic empire until the Roman annexation, in 58 B.C. An alternative is that the *chora* was a gift of one of the Ptolemies.<sup>10</sup> Close links with the Ptolemaic kingdom in the Hellenistic period make Cos an eligible candidate as a beneficiary.<sup>11</sup> If the *chora* was a Ptolemaic award, the grant would fall within the period of Egyptian control of Cyprus (295–58 B.C.). Friendship between the Ptolemies and the Coan state continued in the second century B.C., so that a date in the third century for the grant of land is not an automatic choice.<sup>12</sup> But political ties with Egypt were strongest in the third century before Cos turned, with the decline of Ptolemaic

public land see M. I. Finley, *Land and Credit in Ancient Athens* (New Brunswick 1951) 285–6 n. 45.

<sup>8</sup> For cases of private appropriation of sacred land see L. Robert, *Sanctuaire de Sinuri* (Paris 1945) 35 no. 11, 6–10, and (in Crete) P. Ducrey, *op. cit.* 848.

<sup>9</sup> There is little evidence of casual contact between Cos and Cyprus. For a study of foreign settlement in Cyprus, in the Hellenistic period, based on the incidence of ethnics in inscriptions, see I. Michaelidori-Nicolaou, *Kypriakai Spoudai* xxxi (1967) 15–36. No Coan is attested. There is no sign of, for example, the settlement in Cyprus of a Coan cleruchy. As for the evidence of settlement from Cyprus in Cos see the funerary inscriptions of Imperial date (*PH* 182; 247). No Coan coins have as yet been found in Cyprus. Coan wine was exported to the East as finds of Coan amphora handles in many sites of the near East (including Cyprus) and in Alexandria attest. Much of this trade, which went via Cyprus, was no doubt of indirect character.

<sup>10</sup> R. Herzog, *HG* p. 45; M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 2nd ed. 1953), III, 1375.

<sup>11</sup> See P. M. Fraser, *BSA Alex.* xl (1953) 61 n. 3, for a summary of the evidence of Ptolemaic relations with Cos in the third century B.C.

<sup>12</sup> See *HG* 9 (*PH* 43; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1028; Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969) no. 165) A, 12–14, a Coan procession for a King Ptolemy whose identification as Ptolemy VI Philometor follows from the date of the calendar (156–145 B.C.: cf. R. Herzog, *HG* p. 27); *PH* 73 (*OGIS* 141); ? *PH* 8 (cf. M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* II (Paris (1950) 855); Appian, *Mithrid.*, 23, 115–17 (cf. Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii, 13, 1; xiv, 7, 2).

<sup>2</sup> R. Herzog, *HG* p. 45; cf. G. Patriarca, *Bull. Com. Rom.* lx (1932) *Appendice*, *Bull. del Museo dell' Impero Romano* iii (1933) 6 no. 3 (*A. Ep.* 1934, 23 no. 86). The inscription at present stands in the Coan Asclepieion.

<sup>3</sup> See P. Ducrey, *BCH* xciii (1969) 346–52, for comparative material from Crete.

<sup>4</sup> For parallels of (civ)αντιλαβόμενοι + gen. see e.g. L. Robert, *Coll. Froehner* (Paris 1936) 93. For instances of the phrase τὰ δίκαια τῆς πολέως see *idem*, *R.Ph.* xxxii (1958) 29–30.

<sup>5</sup> Dio Cassius, liv 4, 1. On Augustus' re-annexation of Cyprus after it had been granted, by Caesar, to Arsinoe and Ptolemy the Younger and by Antony to Cleopatra, see O. Vessberg and A. Westholm, *Swedish Cyprus Expedition* IV 3 (Lund 1956) 237–9; A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the East Roman Provinces* (Oxford 1971) 369.

<sup>6</sup> *PIR* (2) III no. 70 (Aulus Didius Gallus); *PIR* (2) III no. 72 (Aulus Didius Postumus).

<sup>7</sup> The unnecessary repetition of the article in this phrase suggests that the land was technically of two different kinds. On the two categories of sacred and

power in the second century, to Rome.<sup>13</sup> The third century is the most likely time for a Ptolemaic gift to Cos.

It is debatable whether the grant of distant pieces of territory was characteristic of Ptolemaic policy. The location of, for example, the grants of land which Ptolemy II Philadelphus made to his friend and ally Miletus, in 279 B.C.,<sup>14</sup> and to the independent city of Byzantium, is uncertain. The land awarded by Philadelphus to Byzantium is known, from Dionysius of Byzantium, to have been *ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας*, on the Asiatic mainland.<sup>15</sup> But its position is not attested beyond this general indication.<sup>16</sup> The location of the land granted to Miletus is also not certain. The general assumption that it was formerly royal land (not that of a neighbouring *polis*), is acceptable but adds no information on its whereabouts.<sup>17</sup> In view

<sup>13</sup> It is worth noting here the evidence of Coans who served as Ptolemaic officials in Cyprus. It has been tentatively suggested that Lochus, the general of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (145–116 B.C.) and sometime governor of Cyprus (*cf.* T. B. Mitford, *Op. Ath.* i (1953) 159–63; *BSA* lvi (1961) 28–9, nos. 75, 76), may have been Coan: *cf.* P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* II (Oxford 1972) 150–1 n. 121. Lochus' ethnic is not attested, but the name is not common. P. M. Fraser cited V. Grace, *Excavations at Nessana* I (London 1962) 121, who pointed out that the name Lochus occurs frequently on Coan handles. Reference was also made to Coan coins which bear the name (*PH* pp. 314–15, nos. 154, 163). To this collection of material may be added the name's occurrence in the Coan list of new members of the gymnasium: *cf.* G. Pugliese Carratelli, *apud Synteleia: Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz* II (Naples 1964) 816–19, lines 30–1, *Νυνφόδοτος Δόχου* (reign of Claudius). For Aristus, son of Timodemus, the Coan *ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως* of Carpasia, see T. B. Mitford, *Op. Ath.* i (1953) 154. It is conceivable that the Coan estate in Cyprus may have derived from a Ptolemaic gift to a Coan official. This hypothesis, however, entails a series of unsubstantiated assumptions and should probably be dismissed; only if the Ptolemaic *dorea* was not revocable but was granted on terms of absolute ownership (*cf.* e.g. the Seleucid grants of *OGIS* 221, 225) does the beneficiary gain the right of free disposal of his domain, and only if he (or one of his descendants) chose to dispose of it not to his family but to the Coan *polis*, could the Coans have secured tenure of their Cypriot land from such a source.

<sup>14</sup> *Cf.* A. Rehm, *Milet* 1 (3) 123, 38.

<sup>15</sup> Dion. Byz. 41 (ed. Güngerich), *μικρὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ νεὸς Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου· τοῦτων ἐτίμασαν ἴσα θεῶ Βυζάντιοι, μεγαλοφροσύνης τ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τιμῆς τῆς περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀπολαύσαντες· καὶ γὰρ χώραν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας δωρεῖται καὶ κίτρον πολλὰς μυριάδας καὶ βέλη καὶ χρήματα.*

<sup>16</sup> For Byzantine territory in 'Mysia' in the reign of Prusias I (c. 230–182 B.C.) see Polybius iv 52. For epigraphic evidence from the Gulf of Nicomedia of the Byzantians' possessions in Bithynia see L. Robert, *Hellenica* vii (Paris 1949) 30–44. On Byzantine territory at Dascylium see Strabo xii 576. It is uncertain what, if any, of this territory is to be identified with the gift of Philadelphus.

<sup>17</sup> *Cf.* C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (Yale 1934) 74 (with bibliography).

both of Ptolemaic possession of coastal and inland cities in Caria in the third and early second century B.C., and the geographic proximity of Cos, we might expect the Coans to have been given land in Caria and not in Cyprus. It was after all neighbouring Calymnos which was incorporated by the Coans, under Ptolemaic patronage, at the end of the third century.<sup>18</sup>

By contrast, the award to states of distant territory, made to suit the convenience of the donor rather than the beneficiary, is a well attested feature of Roman rule both in the Republic and in the Imperial period. Certain unidentified Italian towns owned land in Cilicia, as a letter of Cicero, dated to 51 B.C., attests.<sup>19</sup> Octavian granted Capua territory in Crete, at Cnossus, which it still possessed in the reign of Domitian.<sup>20</sup> Cyzicus and Stratoniceia were also among Greek states which were rewarded by Rome with land for past services.<sup>21</sup>

It is clear that Coan territory in Cyprus may in fact have derived from a grant by Rome; on the basis of the comparative material there is a slight presumption in favour of identifying Rome as the benefactor. The *terminus post quem* would be the Roman annexation of 58 B.C. and the *terminus ante quem* the *restitutio agrorum* which occurred, perhaps, in Claudius' region. It is idle to speculate when in this long period the Coans are likely to have acquired this gift, or for what services.

S. M. SHERWIN-WHITE

*Hertford College, Oxford*

<sup>18</sup> R. Herzog, *Riv. Fil. NS* xx (1942) 5, no. 2 (M. Segre, *ASAA NS* vi–vii (1944–5) XII (Plate II); H. H. Schmitt, *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums* III (Munich 1969) no. 545).

<sup>19</sup> *Ad Fam.* viii 9, 4.

<sup>20</sup> *Cf.* P. Ducrey, *BCH* xciii (1969) 846–52, for the literary and epigraphic evidence (including new material) of Campanian territory at Cnossus.

<sup>21</sup> For the awards, which were made after the First Mithridatic War, see *OGIS* 441 (Stratoniceia); Strabo, xii 576 (Cyzicus). On Roman gifts of territory to Greek states *cf.* T. R. S. Broughton, *apud* T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV (Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1938) 798–9. The Coan land is assumed, without discussion, to have resulted from a Roman gift.

### The Title of Prometheus Desmotes

All I hope to do in this note is to reinforce Lesky's protest against 'the attitude of mind shown by many modern scholars, who refuse to admit that there is a *Prometheus* problem at all, and pass over in silence so many arguments which deserve the most careful attention'.<sup>1</sup> One reason why the majority of scholars are so sanguine about the peculiarities of *Prometheus Desmotes* is that they take it for granted that the surviving play was the first of a trilogy, and that the remainder of the trilogy would somehow or

<sup>1</sup> *History of Greek Literature* English tr. (London 1966) 255; German 3rd edn. (Bern 1971) 294.