

SELEUCID NOTES

KENT J. RIGSBY

Duke University

I. Zeus Olympius

Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–163 B.C.) enjoys a reputation as a devotee of Zeus Olympius. In proof of his attitude scholars have adduced substantial evidence—thus the imposition of this cult at Jerusalem, Antiochus' project to complete the Olympieum at Athens, the introduction of the image of Zeus in the coinage of the kingdom. The explanation of this devotion, however, has occasioned no little debate.¹ An earlier generation of scholars saw in Antiochus a zealous champion of hellenism who used the cult of Zeus Olympius as a rallying-point against "orientalism," spreading the cult even to the exclusion of other worship. This view, derived from the portrait of Antiochus in *Maccabees*, drew an incisive critique from E. J. Bickerman, who rejected as senseless the image of a cultural missionary: such behavior was inconsistent with Greek religious attitudes and with clear evidence showing that the king and his subjects honored other gods, some of them even oriental; in fact the cults revealed on the coins are diverse and this testimony inconclusive, and at Jerusalem Yahwe lord of the heavens was merely given a natural and obvious Greek epithet that does not reflect any broader royal policy.²

¹ For bibliography see O. Mørholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen 1966) 13–14 [cited hereafter by author's name alone].

² *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (Berlin 1937) 36–48, 92–96; *Institutions des Séleucides* (Paris 1938) 232–33. The notion that Antiochus "identified" himself with Zeus Olympius has been disproved by Mørholm 130–31 and needs no further comment.

Responding to Bickerman's skepticism, Henri Seyrig insisted on the evidence of the coins, on which the introduction of Zeus is sudden and wide-spread, so as to suggest a royal policy of patronage. This policy was consistent with the king's "cosmopolitanism"; and Syrians, who all worshipped a sky-god under some name, could easily see him in the figure of Zeus Olympius, and the kingdom was thereby endowed with a unifying common cult.³ This knowledgeable and judicious view of Antiochus' "Jovian policy" is widely accepted,⁴ albeit sometimes with caution. L. Robert, admitting the king's devotion as undeniable, praised Seyrig's formulation but refused to "probe the heart" of Antiochus.⁵ Mørkholm expressed certain reservations: the king's benefactions to Greece were mainly political in motivation, and the mints do not introduce Zeus simultaneously or universally, so that a systematic policy might be doubted (113 ff.). Nevertheless Mørkholm granted a "personal philhellene attitude, originating in a genuine admiration of Greek culture" (62); the king had a "personal preference for Zeus Olympius, but showed no missionary zeal" (133), Zeus being "the greatest pan-hellenic god" (127). Indeed Bickerman had himself admitted the personal attachment of Antiochus and his descendants to Zeus Olympius.⁶

These more modest estimates of Antiochus and his alleged *Kulturkampf* reflect the force of Bickerman's arguments, which remain compelling. Conscious "philhellenism" we should expect in some barbarian, but not in a Greco-Macedonian aristocrat.⁷ We may doubt too that ancient cult was used in the service of an abstraction like "hellenism." I would suggest, however, that Seyrig's explanation is also inadequate. Surely no monarch coolly studied his subjects to determine the most popular cult, then decided which Greek god was most similar and accordingly introduced his worship on a wide scale, sometimes drastically altering local practice as among the Jews. In

³ *Syria* 20 (1939) 296–300 [*Antiquités syriennes* III, 27–31]. The idea was not new but had usually been subordinate to that of hellenization: see for example E. T. Newell, "The Seleucid Mint at Antioch," *American Journal of Numismatics* 51 (1917/18) 23.

⁴ See in particular M. Rostovtzeff in *Mélanges syriens offerts à R. Dussaud* (Paris 1939) 294–95, cf. *SEHWW* 704: not Greek against oriental but an officially sponsored synthesis.

⁵ *La Déesse de Castabala* (Paris 1964) 97–98.

⁶ *Institutions* (above, note 2) 217.

⁷ For a somewhat similar case see J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* (1953) 152, p. 45. On the limitations of our ethnic model of Hellenistic history see Cl. Preaux, *CE* 40 (1965) 129–39.

ancient civic religion would diverse peoples be in any useful sense more unified (or indeed more hellenized) by calling their particular favorite gods by a common name?⁸ This is not what happened at Jerusalem. The interpretation owes more to the scholarly notions of “syncretism” and the tendency to monotheism than to the daily realities of ancient cult.

If Zeus Olympius was not a symbol or tool of either hellenism or syncretism, what precisely did the god mean to Antiochus? An answer may be sought in the earliest explicit evidence for the cult in Seleucid lands, two inscriptions from Seleuceia at the mouth of the Orontes. One contains rosters of the civic priests of two successive years: the two lists vary somewhat, but at the head of each is the priest of Zeus Olympius and Zeus Koryphaios, then the priest of Apollo of Daphne, then that of the previous kings, then that of the living king Seleucus IV (187–175), then a *skeptrophoros*, then *keraunophoroi*, after which the stone breaks off.⁹ Despite the royal flavor of these cults, the primacy of Zeus and the presence of *keraunophoroi* (who must belong to Zeus) are consistent with what we know independently of the civic religion of Seleuceia. The Orontes river was created when Zeus destroyed the monster Typhon with his lightning, an event commemorated by the Hellenistic name of the river, Typhon (Str. 16.2.7). Seleucus Nicator was said, after founding Seleuceia, to have held a festival in honor of Zeus Keraunios; to Zeus he prayed later to reveal the site of his second city Antioch.¹⁰ The god of Seleuceia is seen on the coins as Zeus holding a Victory holding the lightning, or more often simply as an enthroned or winged lightning bolt.¹¹ Scholars usually call this god Zeus Keraunios, an obvious epithet that was used also in antiquity, but not, in our

⁸ One might rather expect Ouranios as the more obvious rendering for Baal-Shamin or Yahwe. And as Robert has made clear (above, note 5), Zeus appears on Antiochus’ coins outside Syria, at a city whose chief divinity was female.

⁹ *OGIS* 245; *IGL Syrie* III, 1184. Similar rosters have been found at three other Seleucid cities (C. Hopkins, *MUB* 37 [1961] 237 ff. for bibliography), but all are later than the Seleuceian and are too fragmentary to reveal the order or selection of cults. The best preserved, from Scythopolis, seems to mention Zeus Olympius; his presence is presumably a result of the policy of Antiochus IV, but his place in the list is unknown.

¹⁰ Malalas 199 Bonn. In 123 B.C. the Seleuceians closed their gates against Alexander Zabinas upon learning that he had pillaged a shrine of Zeus at Antioch: Diod. 34/5.28.1; Just. 39.2.5–6.

¹¹ See Seyrig (above, note 3), who suggested that the cult was aniconic, using the *fulmen*.

evidence, before Roman Imperial times,¹² when rhetorical ornament becomes common in divine titles. The priestly list reveals that the official name of the lightning god of Hellenistic Seleuceia was Zeus Olympius.

The god was connected (not confused) with Zeus Koryphaios, to the degree of having a common priest. This epithet derives from Mt Koryphe into which Seleuceia backs on the north side of the Orontes.¹³ Presumably the temple of Zeus Koryphaios stood up on the mountain while that of Zeus Olympius was within the city proper; perhaps the two were connected because they were thought to represent different episodes of the god's story at Seleuceia.¹⁴ Doubtless there was on Mt Koryphe a Baal, ancient and immovable, to whom the Greeks could only give the place-name as epithet, from which place they perhaps thought him to have saved the world from Typhon.¹⁵ Down in the Greek city, as its patron, Zeus was fully classical in title, Zeus Olympius.

The other major text from Hellenistic Seleuceia is a decree of 186 B.C. granting citizenship to a "friend" of king Seleucus; the city enrolls the honorand in the deme Olympieus and the tribe Laodikis.¹⁶ Olympieus surely must be that deme in which stood the temple of Zeus Olympius—probably the most honorific deme of which to be a member and thus fit for an associate of the king.

These inscriptions prove that the lightning god who held Seleuceia was called Zeus Olympius and that his primacy there cannot be credited to Antiochus IV, for it is older. In all likelihood this primacy goes back to the foundation of the city. Holleaux reasonably surmised

¹² *IGL Syrie* III, 1185 and 1210; *BMC Galatia* etc. 275, no. 46. Commentators have introduced confusion, I believe, by assuming Keraunios an old and official title (hence Seyrig expressed surprise that the roster does not include the patron god of the city) and speaking of the "identification" of cults (cf. *IGL Syrie* III, p. 648). The Hellenistic inscription shows rather that the god's epithet in the city did not reflect his chief attribute, the *fulmen*. So also the Baal whom official Hellenistic usage called Zeus of Baetocaece is found with a host of descriptive epithets in Roman times, including Ouranios and Keraunios (*IGL Syrie* VII, 4027, 2028.40, 4041).

¹³ Polyb. 5.59.4.

¹⁴ Compare at late Hellenistic Pergamum the shared priestess of Athena Polias in the city and Athena Nicephorus in the countryside: E. Ohlmutz, *Die Kulte und Heiligtümer der Götter in Pergamon* (Giessen 1940) 32 ff.

¹⁵ So across the river Baal Zaphon, the weather god of the Ugaritic texts, seems to have become Zeus Kasios: O. Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon* (Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums 1: Halle 1932) 23 ff., who may well be right to refer the Typhon story to this place and cult; cf. C. F. A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica* II (Paris 1949) 121–30.

¹⁶ *IGL Syrie* III, 1183, where the editors repeat the tentative observation of Holleaux that the name may derive from a cult title, a festival, or a toponym.

that the Laodice after whom the civic tribe was named was the wife of Seleucus Nicator; and before Antiochus IV it is only Nicator whose coins are dominated by Zeus, whom Antiochus I soon replaced with the image of Apollo of Daphne.¹⁷ If this is so, then the root of Nicator's interest in the cult would best be sought in Macedonian precedents—Archelaus' introduction of a cult of Zeus Olympius at Dium, whose festival was enlarged by Philip and by Alexander.¹⁸

Therefore, when Antiochus IV undertook to increase the honors of Zeus Olympius in his kingdom, which was foremost in his mind, the Elian god or the patron of Seleuceia? For it is the assumption of the panhellenic god of the Olympic games in Greece that has led scholars to think that Antiochus used religion as a tool of cultural policy. To be sure, any Greek at the name of Zeus Olympius will have thought soon or late of the cult in Elis.¹⁹ Our question, however, concerns the specific logic of a policy.

Seleuceia was the first city founded by Seleucus Nicator after the battle of Ipsus, older than Antioch, named for himself, seat of the first royal mint, site of his grave—in brief his capital.²⁰ The rise of Antioch would come in the next generation; but the symbolic importance of Seleuceia to the dynasty never ceased. In the third century the city was held for a generation by the Ptolemies; in 219 Antiochus III was prevailed on to make its recapture the first goal of his western campaigns, on the grounds that Seleuceia was the ancestress (*archêgetis*) and practically the hearth of the dynasty.²¹ As late as 109 B.C. a Seleucid king could still refer to Seleuceia simply as his fatherland, *patris*.²²

Therefore I would suggest that Antiochus Epiphanes' ostentatious devotion to Zeus Olympius reflects the fact that this was the patron of his native place and first city of his dynasty, truly the god of his fathers. If this is so, we can the more comfortably reject any scheme of hellenization or syncretism. His attitude would seem thus more

¹⁷ E. T. Newell, *Coinage of the Western Seleucid Mints* (ANS Numismatic Studies 4: New York 1941) 379–85.

¹⁸ Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.1; Diod. 17.16.3; D. Pantermale, *Ancient Macedonia II* (Thessalonica 1977) 341–42. For the festival see most recently J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* (1978) 232. Cf. Alexander at Sardes (Arr. 1.17.5).

¹⁹ Antiochus IV himself probably made a donation to the Elian Zeus: Paus. 5.12.4, with O. Mörkholm, *Studies in the Coinage of Antiochus IV* (Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 40.3: 1963) 23–24.

²⁰ This was first recognized by E. Honigmann, *RE* 2 (1921) 1185–86; followed by G. A. Downey, *A History of Antioch* (Princeton 1961) 56–59.

²¹ Polyb. 5.58.4, reporting the speech of the king's Seleuceian doctor.

²² Welles, *Royal Corres.* no. 71.15, with Downey (above, note 20) 59, note 25.

narrowly political: for him Zeus Olympius was not an emblem of Hellenic culture or a convenient alternative to Baal-Shamin; to the extent that a god might serve as an emblem, here was an emblem of Seleucidness. Antiochus was raised and educated in Rome. If his attitude toward and use of Zeus Olympius were indebted to any foreign god, surely this will have been no oriental but Jupiter Capitolinus,²³ whose temples on their raised *capitolia*²⁴ were to be seen in every colony of Rome, sanctioning Roman rule. However this may be, Antiochus' devotion seems intended to invoke the origins of his dynasty and its first patron—a gesture appropriate to this ambitious ruler.

II. Nysa-Scythopolis

In Greco-Roman times Beth-Shan by the river Jordan passed under two names, Scythopolis and Nysa. Literary sources from their earliest mention of the city—Polybius and the Septuagint—call it Scythopolis.²⁵ But the coins, of Roman Imperial date, show *Νυσαιέων* ὁ καὶ *Σκυθοπολιτῶν* or various abbreviations, most often *Νυσ Σκυ*.²⁶ The name Nysa occurs in literary sources only as a curiosity to be explained. So Pliny the Elder, commenting on both names, derives Nysa from the nurse of Dionysus: “*Scythopolis* (previously Nysa, Liber Pater having buried his nurse there), from the Scythians settled there.”²⁷ Malalas (177) dimly reveals a different version: Orestes and Pylades having rescued Iphigeneia from the Scythians, the three wandered Asia until they came to Tricomia in Palestine, whose inhabitants so marveled at Iphigeneia that, building a great temple to Artemis, they asked Iphigeneia to sacrifice there a maiden. This she

²³ The king built a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus at Antioch: Livy 41.20.9. For his other Roman affectations see Mørkholm 39, who elsewhere, without elaborating, has called Jupiter Capitolinus the “Roman equivalent” of Zeus Olympius (above, note 19: 59); compare the analogy in Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW* 434.

²⁴ The only surely identified temple of Zeus Olympius in Seleucid lands, that at Gerasa, stands on a partly artificial hill overlooking the southern gate and the agora: C. Kraeling, *Gerasa of the Decapolis* (New Haven 1938) 17–19. The case of Dura-Europus remains unclear; see C. B. Welles in *Excavations at Dura-Europus, Preliminary Report* 9.3 (New Haven 1952) 45; YCS 14 (1955) 138–44; *P. Dura* p. 131.

²⁵ Polyb. 5.70.4; LXX *Judges* 1.27 Βαιθσάν ἥ ἐστὶ Σκυθῶν πόλις; so too other non-local texts such as milestones (*CIL* III, 1415521; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* [1946/7] 215) and victory lists (Moretti, *I. agonist. gr.* 72.42, 85.20).

²⁶ A. Spijkerman, *Coins of the Decapolis* (Jerusalem 1978) 186–209.

²⁷ *HN* 5.74; the equation is also known to Stephanus of Byzantium, s. v. Σκυθόπολις.

does, and renames the city for the sacrificed girl, Nyssa. The three Greeks then raise a monument to the divinized victim, inscribing it "Receive the refugees from Scythia, goddess Nyssa." Although Malalas does not in fact use the name Scythopolis, the story seems to reflect an attempt to account for the two names of the city. The coins, which reflect the official version, confirm Pliny rather than Malalas, not surprisingly: on them we see a nurse and a divine child and Bacchic accoutrements, certainly Nysa and the infant Dionysus.²⁸

Thus sources of Roman date make explicit the Dionysiac burden of the name Nysa. Debate has arisen rather about "Scythopolis." Most scholars accept Pliny and, invoking Herodotus 1.105, posit at Hellenistic Beth-Shan either the survival or the memory of a settlement of Scythians. Tcherikover thought both of these explanations intrinsically improbable and would trace the name rather to some learned myth fabricated under Ptolemaic rule in the third century B.C.²⁹ So the origin of the name by which the world knew the city remains obscure. But the name Nysa presents a difficulty that has not been recognized. Tcherikover saw this name too originating in Ptolemaic rule, because Dionysus was an *archêgetês* of the Ptolemies.³⁰ This rationale is oddly complex and indirect, and it is unparalleled. Dynasties normally used dynastic names when renaming cities, and the Ptolemies otherwise made little of Dionysus outside the court and nothing of his nurse. One wonders too why they should have given the place two names. What in fact was the relation of these names?

The older of the two, despite the testimony of Pliny, must be Scythopolis. It is not uncommon for the literary sources to fix upon the first Greek name and ignore later innovations. In any case, the coins reveal the official usage, wherein the order of names is invariably Nysa-Scythopolis. So too Σελευκείς Ἀβιληνοί and Πομπηεῖς Γαδαρεῖς, variously abbreviated on their coins; compare Ἀντιοχεῖς οἱ ἐν Πτολεμαίδι (Seleucid Acco) or Καισαριεῖς Πανιάδος; or more fully Ἀντιοχεῖς οἱ πρὸς τῷ Χρυσορόα οἱ πρότερον Γερασσηνοί³¹ or (farther afield) Πτολεμαεῖς οἱ πρότερον

²⁸ The fullest treatment is by H. Seyrig, *Syria* 39 (1962) 207–11 [*Ant. Syr.* VI, 115–19].

²⁹ *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen* (Leipzig 1927) 71–72; for subsequent bibliography see B. Lifshitz, *ANRW* II.8 (1978) 262–68.

³⁰ H. Tiersch, *NAKG* 1932, 63–64, denied this and sought rather to trace the local cult of Dionysus to a pre-Greek origin in the Canaanite Mekal, seeing both as "vegetation gods." See instead H. O. Thompson, *Mekal the God of Beth-Shan* (Leiden 1970).

³¹ For inscriptions see Kraeling (above, note 24) 600; so too in abbreviation those coins that give the legal ethnic. Others show instead the ancient toponym alone in the

καλούμενοι Λεβέδιοι (*I. Magnesia* 53.79). When both names are used, precedence regularly goes to the newer—to the one that is legally, if not popularly, current.

Accordingly Scythopolis, whatever its explanation, was the original Greek name, bestowed at some time between the conquest of Alexander and its first appearance in literature of the second century B.C.; “Nysa” was subsequent, though older than Pliny. But if the name Nysa was an innovation of later Hellenism, what then becomes of the Dionysiac origin alleged in Roman times? We must doubt that the name of the city was changed on the strength of some discovery of a local connection with the god’s nurse. Rather the myth will have been invented subsequent to the change, to explain the name at some later date.³² What was its true origin?

The obvious explanation of “Nysa” is that it is dynastic, like the name-changes cited above and most others in antiquity. Its source is to be sought in politics, not myth. Legends placed Nysa the birthplace of Dionysus in various lands from Boeotia to India,³³ but few historical cities bore the name, and we should resist the ancient mythographers’ tendency to tie these as well to Dionysus. The origin and cults of Cappadocian Nysa we do not know.³⁴ Carian Nysa, however, gave first honor to Pluto and Kore, not Dionysus, and in fact Stephanus of Byzantium attributes its name to Nysa wife of the king Antiochus whose parents were Seleucus and Antiochis and whose sister was Laodice. The king is usually reckoned Antiochus I, who is not known to have had a wife Nysa.³⁵ But Stephanus’ confusion is more intricate than the relationship of the lady Nysa, for the genealogy as a whole corresponds to no segment of the Seleucid dynasty, and there is reason to think that Carian Nysa was founded nearer the end of the

religious acclamation “Artemis is the *tychê* of Gerasa,” “Ἀρτεμις τύχη Γεράσων,” an example of the popular vitality of the original name: Spijkerman (above, note 26) 156–67.

³² The classic instance of myth responding to civic history is Magnesia on the Maeander: Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften* V 1, 78–99. No doubt Dionysus was worshipped at Hellenistic Beth-Shan, but it is not certain that his was the primary cult; the coins and other Imperial evidence reveal other gods (cf. Lifshitz [above, note 29] 273–76). The great temple on the site, of Roman date, is of unknown ownership (A. Rowe, *Topography and History of Beth-Shan* [Philadelphia 1930] 44); Tiersch’s argument (above, note 30) 52–76 that a Hellenistic sculpted head found nearby represents a cult-statue of “Dionysus-Zeus Olympius-Antiochus IV” has been rightly dismissed by Mörkholm (above, note 19) 63.

³³ See O. Stein and A. Herrmann, *RE* 17 (1937) 1640–61.

³⁴ W. Ruge, *RE* 17 (1937) 1662.

³⁵ W. Ruge, *RE* 17 (1937) 1631–40. Tcherikover (above, note 29) 27, rejecting Stephanus, justified a Dionysiac origin of the name Nysa by calling Dionysus a fellow chthonian divinity with Pluto and Kore.

third century B.C. than the time of Antiochus I.³⁶ But whatever may have been Stephanus' errors of chronology and genealogy, I suggest that he is unlikely to be wrong about the rationale of the civic name, as being dynastic. The Ptolemaic house did not use the name Nysa; for Nysa-Scythopolis we must accordingly look to the Seleucids and therefore to a date after 200 B.C. when this area was conquered by Antiochus III.

An inscription on Delos reveals that in the archonship of Tychandros or just before, Nysa daughter of a king Antiochus was wed to Pharnaces I of Pontus.³⁷ Durrbach and others thought this date to be 172/1 and the girl therefore a daughter of Antiochus III (died 187) or rather of his eldest son and co-regent Antiochus (died 193). But Roussel in 1916 argued and Dow in 1935 confirmed that Tychandros' year was 160/159, and Mørkholm has drawn the necessary conclusion that, born about 174, she must be daughter to Antiochus IV³⁸—probably his eldest, born near the beginning of his reign. Admittedly there may have been an unattested Seleucid princess named Nysa in the preceding generation, after whom a city acquired in 200 B.C. might be named. But it may for now be suggested that Nysa-Scythopolis owed its new name to the known girl and was therefore a refoundation of Antiochus IV.

Antiochus has been thought a founder of many cities, in part from a too-ready extension of his portrait in *Maccabees*; Mørkholm (115–18) applied to his alleged foundations a judicious caution and convincingly removed several cities from the list. But many remain valid, and I suggest that Nysa-Scythopolis be added to that list. Beth-Shan is one of the few sites attested by explicit (non-numismatic) evidence to have had a cult of Zeus Olympius.³⁹ Gerasa is another, and this city is usually thought to owe its name Antioch to Antiochus IV. Samaria anticipated royal intrusion by founding its own cult of Zeus.⁴⁰ The

³⁶ *IG* XI.4, 1235, with Ruge (above, note 35) 1634.

³⁷ *OGIS* 771; *IG* XI.4, 1056; Durrbach, *Choix* no. 73. A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford 1971²) 250, without argument suggested the possibility that the civic name was secondary and derived from this girl; dismissed by Lifshitz (above, note 29) 265.

³⁸ P. Roussel, *Délos colonie athénienne* (Paris 1916) 355–57; S. Dow, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 91; Mørkholm 54. From the second century on the name is common in the royal houses of Pontus, Bithynia, and Cappadocia, which intermarried—in all probability the Cappadocian civic name was dynastic (Jones [above, note 37] 181).

³⁹ Rowe (above, note 32) 45 [*SEG* 8.33]; Hopkins (above, note 9).

⁴⁰ Jos. *AJ* 12.257–64, II *Macc.* 6.2; if true, this story speaks against the restoration of Zeus Olympius in the priestly roster found at Samaria (G. H. Reisner et al., *Harvard Excavations at Samaria I* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1924] 250 [*SEG* 8.96]).

case of Jerusalem is well known. Palestine, conquered in 200 and in part rebellious after 170, evidently was the object of his systematic attention.

III. The Brother Peoples

A number of bronze coins of the mid-second century B.C. have as their only legend ἀδελφῶν δῆμων, “of the brother peoples,” in place of a civic ethnic.⁴¹ Their attribution was first made by D. Masson in 1763,⁴² on the strength of their Syrian fabric and of Strabo 16.2.4: the finest part of Syria, the Seleukis, is also called the Tetrapolis because of its four great cities Antioch, Seleuceia, Apamea, and Laodicea, which were called “sisters of one another on account of their unanimity” (ἀλλήλων ἀδελφαὶ διὰ τὴν ὁμόνοιαν). It became conventional thereafter to speak of the coins as struck for these four cities, whether the actual mint was at the capital Antioch or, as MacDonald deduced from the monograms, at Seleuceia.

Then in 1949 Henri Seyrig remarked that in his researches in Syria he had seen examples of these coins only at Antioch and Seleuceia.⁴³ Being bronze, the coins will not naturally have circulated beyond the territories of the cities that gave them legal currency, and it followed that the brother peoples included only Antioch and Seleuceia. From this fact Alfred Bellinger concluded that the coins reveal a league between these two cities, which implied “a power of concerted action highly detrimental to the royal authority.”⁴⁴ On this Glanville Downey has enlarged: “It is plain that the two cities, alarmed by the insecurity of their position in the midst of the intrigue and misrule which had prevailed since the death of Antiochus IV, felt it necessary to seek some basis for common protection that should be independent of the weak and untrustworthy royal administration.”⁴⁵

⁴¹ *BMC Galatia* etc. 151–52; G. MacDonald, *Hunterian Collection* III, 141–42; *SNG Copenhagen* 36.394–97; *SNG Great Britain* 4.5923–24.

⁴² In N. F. Haym, *Thesauri Britannici* (Vienna 1763) 65–68, deducing also that the dates are Seleucid era and commenting on the Zeus of Seleuceia and the Apollo of Antioch.

⁴³ In A. R. Bellinger, “The End of the Seleucids,” *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 38 (1949) 60, note 6.

⁴⁴ Bellinger (above, note 43) 60, cf. 62, note 17.

⁴⁵ Downey (above, note 20) 121; of its short duration, “Evidently the resources of the cities were too weak, and the external pressures were too great, for this attempt at solidarity to succeed.” The phrase “monetary league” had long been used to describe the coins—e.g. Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 846—but applied to the four cities.

Propounded by scholars of such excellence and authority, this interpretation of the coins is likely to become standard. Nevertheless, I believe that it is mistaken.

The more restricted attribution of the coins is surely correct. They show either Zeus on the obverse with a lightning bolt on the reverse—the god of Seleuceia; or Apollo on the obverse and a tripod on the reverse—Apollo of Daphne, the god of Antioch. Or the obverse has two busts, bearded males shoulder to shoulder—evidently the brother peoples, and as Downey remarked, they are two, never four; the reverse shows either Zeus or a city *tychê*. Accordingly Seyrig's experience in the field, compelling in itself, seems confirmed by the iconography: the brother peoples were the Antiochenes and Seleuceians, and no others.

Students of the late Hellenistic kingdoms understandably look for evidences of decline and fall; it is convenient when history makes sense.⁴⁶ But two features of the brother peoples coins suggest that they cannot have been issued by an alliance formed against the advantage of the Seleucid state and marking for us a stage in its disintegration.

The first feature is their chronology. All issues but one are dated, and they derive from three Seleucid years, 164, 165, 166–149/8, 148/7, 147/6 B.C.: clearly the coins constitute a single and coherent sequence.⁴⁷ But it has not been noticed that this sequence is part of an equally coherent larger sequence, and the predecessors and successors of the brother peoples coins will help explain their character.

From the 120's B.C. a growing number of cities won such autonomy that allowed them their own coinages in silver and bronze. Until that time there had been only two episodes in Seleucid history wherein cities on a wide scale were for a time permitted by the king a municipal bronze coinage which may be termed pseudo-autonomous. These episodes reflect royal policy, not collapse. The first occurred under Antiochus IV in the years following 170 B.C. when some two dozen cities in the western half of the kingdom struck bronze under their own names.⁴⁸ The second, involving far fewer mints, occurred under

⁴⁶ For a similar caution see Mørkholm 129–30.

⁴⁷ The exception *SNG Great Britain* 4.5922 of year $\xi\rho$ (160 = 153/2 B.C.) is only apparent; the photograph shows that the coin is effaced where a first digit would be, and the monograms show that this is the same die as *BMC Galatia* etc. 152, no. 5, of $\epsilon\xi\rho$. The undated issue is that with *tychê*, but MacDonald gives no further reason than lack of a date to think this issue separate from the others.

⁴⁸ Mørkholm 124–30 and in *Congresso internazionale di numismatica II Atti* (Rome 1965) 63–67.

Alexander Balas (150–145), when Antioch, Seleuceia, Apamea, Laodicea, and Cyrrhus in northern Syria are found issuing municipal bronze.⁴⁹ These coins have the king's portrait on the obverse, and on the reverse some local type and the name of the city in place of that of the king. All dated issues of this local bronze (preceding the years in question) stem from the Seleucid years 162, 163, 164–151/0, 150/49, 149/8 B.C. On the other side, toward the end of Alexander's reign, we find only one of these mints in operation, that of Seleuceia: here two issues are known, one dated to Seleucid 166 (147/6 B.C.), the other undated.⁵⁰ Compared with the several municipal coinages of earlier in Alexander's reign, these later issues of Seleuceia seem of a more privileged manner, showing Zeus rather than the king on the obverse, with the reverses as before—that is, all reference to the king is gone.

The brother peoples coins fall rigorously between these two groups of municipal issues under Alexander: the municipal issues cease when the brother peoples coins begin, and these stop in the year the municipal coins of Seleuceia begin again. I suggest that these usages were mutually exclusive: that the brother peoples coins succeeded the earlier municipal bronze in 149/8, to be then succeeded by the sole mint at Seleuceia in 147/6. The sequence is so tight that we should perhaps reckon the undated coins of the second stage of the mint at Seleuceia as subsequent to those dated 147/6.

These bronze coinages must be considered as a whole. They are coterminous with the years of Alexander Balas, and they constitute the history of local coinage rights during his reign. Seen in this perspective, the coins reveal that Alexander began his reign in 150 permitting, as had his father, municipal mints at a number of important cities, restricted the right of civic bronze to the brother peoples Antioch and Seleuceia two years later, and finally to Seleuceia alone in 147/6. As one part of this sequence, the brother peoples coins cannot represent a new and independent status extorted by two powerful cities allied now against a feeble monarch. To the contrary, they would appear to show one stage in the king's restricting of a particular privilege, that of municipal coinage.

The second objection to any such alliance must concern substance. In the years that Antioch and Seleuceia enjoyed the use of the brother peoples coins, both continued under Seleucid rule, as we know from literary testimony and from the presence of royal mints at

⁴⁹ Babelon, *Rois de Syrie* 115–19, 127; *BMC Seleucid Kings* 56–57.

⁵⁰ *BMC Galatia* etc. 269–70.

both cities.⁵¹ In these circumstances it is not obvious by what resources or to what end the two can have formed an alliance which answered to some failing in royal control or protection, without such a gesture constituting rebellion against the king.

Moreover, Greek cities that formed an alliance were called allies, not brothers. The phrase is unique here among coins and rare in the documents, but its meaning is readily found. The *locus classicus* is the letter in I *Maccabees* purportedly from Areus I of Sparta to Onias I high-priest of Jerusalem: it has been discovered in ancient writings that Spartans and Jews are brothers, being alike descended from Abraham.⁵² In Hellenistic times colony and mother-city called themselves brothers, descended as they were from common ancestors.⁵³ Finally, a Hellenistic decree of Histiaea on Euboea reveals that this city and Sinope in Paphlagonia reckoned themselves brother peoples.⁵⁴ Sinope honored as its founder Autolycus of Thessalian Tricca, who had sailed with Heracles against the Amazons but was left behind in Paphlagonia.⁵⁵ To the ancients it was obvious that Euboean Histiaea, which faces on the gulf of Pagasae, was related to the Thessalian district Hestiaeotis, whose chief city was Tricca. One account was that the Perrhaebi, who held Hestiaeotis, settled the Euboean city.⁵⁶ I should suggest that the brotherhood of Sinope and Histiaea reflects the same legend, tracing their common origin to Autolycus of Tricca and his eastward voyage.

If Strabo's statement on the Tetrapolis is pertinent to these coins, then he will have mistaken not only the number of cities but also the reason for their brotherhood, seeming to associate their *homonoia* with the fact that they were all foundations of Seleucus Nicator. Naturally Nicator founded more cities than these.⁵⁷ If this is the logic

⁵¹ Newell (above, note 3) 47–50; Babelon, *Rois de Syrie* 113, no. 884, is a royal tetradrachm struck at Seleuceia in 147/6.

⁵² 12.19 ff. *ὅτι εἰσὶν ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐκ γένους Ἀβραάμ*. Cf. 14.20 ff. *ἀδελφοῖς χαίρειν*.

⁵³ The evidence is collected by L. Robert, *BCH* 59 (1935) 498 [*Opera Min. Sel.* I. 311].

⁵⁴ *IG* XII.9, 1186.22 [τοῖς Σινωπεῖ[υ]σιν ἐκ παλαιοῦ φίλοις καὶ ἀδελφοῖς [οὔσιν---].

⁵⁵ Ap. Rhod. 2.955–58; Plut. *Luc.* 23.3–6; Str. 12.3.11.

⁵⁶ Ps.-Scymnus 578 (*GGM* I, 219). A different version (Str. 9.5.17) held that Perrhaebi raided northern Euboea and carried off some of the inhabitants to Thessaly—that is, that the Euboean toponym was the older.

⁵⁷ But for the unity of policy behind these foundations see H. Seyrig, *Syria* 47 (1970) 290–311, esp. 301–03 (and 309, note 3, for a caution on the relevance of Strabo). Compare also the restricted usage in the Teian decree published by P. Herrmann, *Anadolu* 9 (1965) 39–40 (lines 95–104), cf. 81–82: cities named for the *πρόγονοι* of

of the passage, whether it is original with Strabo or derived from his source Posidonius of Apamea, a parallel exists, but of Roman rather than Hellenistic date. In Pisidia the Roman colony Antioch, being a sister, honored the colony Lystra with a statue of *Homonoia*, and the colony Tavium honored her sister colony Antioch with another such statue.⁵⁸ Apparently they are sisters by virtue of being all colonial foundations of Augustus. Perhaps under Roman rule a looser usage emerged for the brotherhood of cities,⁵⁹ which has affected either Strabo's understanding of the relations of the Syrian cities, or indeed their own understanding. However this was, the Hellenistic evidence seems consistent: brotherhood rests on common ancestry. The phrase on the coins thus points not to political alliance but to legendary origins, to the well-attested effort of the new cities of the Hellenistic East to tie themselves to the old Greek world and its epic legends by means of fictitious genealogies—so the Lacedemonian Selgeans and dozens of other cases, which Professor Robert has studied.⁶⁰

To raise therefore the antiquarian question, who was the common ancestor of Antioch and Seleuceia? Owing to the late antique prominence of Antioch and its writers, we know much about its foundation legends. The oldest Greeks here were said to be descended from Triptolemus.⁶¹ Of Seleuceia nothing is reported. But Strabo, writing of the Antiochenes, says that they celebrated their festival of Triptolemus at his temple on Mt Casius by Seleuceia (16.2.5). As Strabo hints and later evidence proves, Mt Casius was on the territory of Seleuceia across the river, not of Antioch seventeen miles upcountry.⁶² If this had always been so, then the festival of Triptolemus must surely have been held jointly by the two cities. I would speculate therefore that Triptolemus was regarded as the common ancestor of the two, and that this is the burden of the coins. However this may be, the brother peoples coins serve to evoke an

Antiochus III include only Antioch, Seleuceia, and Laodicea.

⁵⁸ *IGR* III 302, *JRS* 2 (1912) 84, no. 3; cf. B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (Oxford 1967) 196–97; L. Robert, *Stud. Clas.* 16 (1974) 68–69. For a private monument to the *homonoia* of brothers, see R. Heberdey and E. Kalinka, *Denkschr. Wien* 45.1 (1897) 55, no. 80.

⁵⁹ For the brotherhood of Rome and the Aedui, acknowledged by the Senate, see Caes. *BG* 1.33.2, cf. Cic. *Att.* 1.19.2, *Fam.* 7.10.4, Tac. *Ann.* 11.25.2. I do not know what lies behind the claim of brotherhood by Ephesus, Cnidus, and Cos, attested in the Severan period: *Forschungen in Ephesos* II, no. 54–55. They did share a festival (55.11–12 *συνεορτά[σ]αντα*), and to worship the same gods was a proof of *συγγένεια* (Jos. *AJ* 12.125–26, cf. 257–60; cf. Isoc. 4.43).

⁶⁰ See most recently *BCH* 101 (1977) 96–132.

⁶¹ See Downey (above, note 20) 56 ff.; Robert (above, note 60) 107.

⁶² *BMC Galatia* etc. 272–77.

ancestral legend, and this evocation should not be taken to imply a contemporary and political alliance or any threat to the king; the tone is rather more like that of the coins of contemporary Smyrna with their portraits of Homer.⁶³

We can thus see the question imposed on us by the coins: Why now? In this stage in the history of local coinage rights under Alexander Balas, why did Antioch and Seleuceia put their bronze under this learned and indirect title rather than their own names as before? The sequence gives the appearance that these two cities, threatened like others in Syria with the end of their coinage, managed for a time to salvage the privilege in the name of their common ancestry. What was that to Alexander Balas?

Obviously no more than a circumstantial answer could be offered to such a question. In Seleucid eyes Antioch and Seleuceia were the premier cities of the kingdom. Antioch needs no comment. The role of Seleuceia, especially under Antioch IV, has been remarked above. Indeed the coins in question are only one item in the growing honor of Seleuceia in these years. The Seleuceian mint survives alone among the Syrian cities in 147/6, and these bronzes are of quite autonomous an appearance, representing Seleuceia's victory in the competition for royal favor. Several years later Seleuceia will be the first city in Syria, perhaps the first outside the Aegean, to be declared sacred and inviolable.⁶⁴

Alexander Balas, for his part, was a usurper, an illegitimate son of Antiochus IV; he seems to have lacked talent. At any rate, his broad grant of municipal mints is itself a repetition of a gesture of Antiochus. In his last year 146, threatened by a legitimate Seleucid, he issued tetradrachms with his own name but the portrait of his father.⁶⁵ Our only characterization of him—playing a joke on a philosopher—is in Athenaeus (212d), who remarks that he was good-humored and gentle and above all φιλόλογος ἐν ταῖς ὁμιλίαις—he loved learned conversation. I would guess that this king, like many other rulers with dubious claims and competence, ostentatiously

⁶³ *BMC Ionia* 244–47.

⁶⁴ I shall collect the evidence as part of a corpus on *asylia*. E. T. Newell in Welles, *Royal Correspondence* p. 292, note 3, is imprecise in implying that there was municipal silver in these years, and the chronology of the subsequent bronze is uncertain. Tyre obtained the titles in 141/0, Seleuceia by 139/8 at the latest.

⁶⁵ O. Mørkholm, *NC* 6.20 (1960) 25–30; compare Alexander's evocation of Antiochus IV to the Roman senate, Polyb. 33.18.7–9. On Alexander see U. Wilcken, *RE* 1 (1893) 1437–38; A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Séleucides* I (Paris 1913) 338–46; cf. Seyrig, *Ant. Syr.* III, 29 note 1, suggesting his good relations with Seleuceia.

cultivated emblems of legitimacy and tradition; that, when he sought in 148 to cancel the coinage rights that he had granted on his father's example, he was prevailed on to relent to the extent of allowing to Antioch and Seleuceia a municipal coinage, only under this display of their traditional relationship as brothers. Such, I should imagine, is the case they made to him, and it caught his fancy. At all events, the coins with their legend must be seen as a harmless affectation—not decline and fall, but doubtless still typical of the spirit of the age.

IV. Baetocaece

From the island of Aradus one surveys a section of the Phoenician coast along which its eastern wall, the chain of the Ansariya mountains, becomes less elevated and rugged than farther to the north, rising in stages marked by many streams and highland valleys. Nearly due east of the island and some twenty miles inland is one of these valleys, modern Husn Suleiman, where stand the spectacular remains of the temple of Zeus of Baetocaece.⁶⁶ The valley inclines decidedly to the south-west, toward its easiest gateway in the wadi that leads down to the coast. The traveler who would proceed instead to the cities of the Orontes valley must climb higher still to reach the spine of the mountains some four miles (as the crow flies) to the east; here at the watershed he will be about two miles west of ancient Raphaneaia on the eastern descent, seat of a Roman legion,⁶⁷ and over thirty difficult miles south of Apamea.

Beside the monumental entrance of the precinct of Zeus is inscribed a series of documents concerning the privileges of the temple, first copied in the eighteenth century and now given a definitive edition by Rey-Coquais.⁶⁸ Three episodes are revealed: an initial Seleucid grant; a "decree of the city sent to Augustus," enjoining civic magistrates from taxing or requisitioning goods sold at the festivals of Zeus; and the confirmation by Valerian and his colleagues of the traditional rights of the temple, which occasioned the inscribing of this archive. The first episode is of interest here. A king Antiochus instructs a functionary Euphemus to carry out the terms of the attached memorandum. In the memorandum the king, impressed

⁶⁶ See J.-P. Rey-Coquais, *Arados et sa pèrée* (Paris 1974) 61–64, 108–21, and pl. 6 and 12–19. For the situation compare the inscription of Eshmun'azar of Sidon, who "built a house for Eshmun, the Holy Prince, (at) the *Ydll* Spring in the mountain" (*ANET* 662).

⁶⁷ *IGL Syrie* IV, 1397–1401.

⁶⁸ *IGL Syrie* VII, 4028.

by the miracles of Zeus of Baetocaece, grants to the god ownership of the village of Baetocaece with its lands and resources, frees the biweekly festival from taxes, and declares the temple inviolable and the village exempt from requisition of lodging; violators will be prosecuted for impiety.

When did this benefaction take place? Palaeography is of course no guide, as the text is a late reinscription. The event was once generally assigned to the last years of the dynasty, the late second or early first century B.C., for it seemed to show a powerful native temple extorting privileges from an enfeebled monarchy. The Seleucids, it was thought, sought to limit the power of the oriental priestly authorities, and the failure of this policy was a mark and cause of the kingdom's decline.⁶⁹ But in 1951 Seyrig put the matter on a new basis. Arguing that the temple was on the mainland territory of Aradus, which must be author of the civic decree in the archive and toward which nature orients the site, and observing that the king treats the status of Baetocaece as dependent on his will, Seyrig concluded that the benefaction must date to a time when Aradus was a subject city of the Seleucids. But Aradus reckoned an era of liberty from 259 B.C. and was thereafter independent, but for a period from 170 to 138 that followed its reconquest by Antiochus IV. The unfavorable conditions of this latter epoch inclined Seyrig to attribute the benefaction to the earliest period of the dynasty, an act of Antiochus I (280–261) or possibly his son at the start of his reign.⁷⁰

The historical implications of this early date for such an act are not at once apparent. Although all other grants of inviolability in Syria-Palestine are late Hellenistic, Rey-Coquais has denied that they entailed a loss of royal sovereignty;⁷¹ on this question I shall comment elsewhere. But the arguments for a late date, as Seyrig saw, were not strong. In fact a royal decision c. 200 B.C. in favor of a native temple in its conflict with Apollonia in Caria has now shown that the Seleucids did not consistently favor cities over native temples before their declining years.⁷² In contrast to arguments from general probability, Seyrig's case for an early date of the Baetocaece memorandum has that lucidity and rigor that one expected of its author; one does not abandon it gladly. Nevertheless, there is a reason for doing so.

⁶⁹ See the summation by Welles, *Royal Correspondence* pp. 282–83.

⁷⁰ *Syria* 28 (1951) 191–221 [*Ant. Syr.* IV, 170–200]; *RN* 6.6 (1964) 9–50; Rey-Coquais (above, note 66) 156. Indeed the period of subjection in the second century, doubted by Rey-Coquais, was disproved by Mørkholm 123–24, so that only the earlier remains.

⁷¹ Rey-Coquais, *IGL Syrie* VII, p. 63.

⁷² L. and J. Robert, *La Carie* II, no. 166.

Antiochus carefully identifies the place at issue: "the village of Baetocaece which formerly was owned by Demetrius son of Demetrius son of Mnaseas in Tourgona of the satrapy around Apamea."

Seyrig explained that the lands and village "had previously belonged to Demetrius of Tourgona, and, for one reason or another, had reverted to the crown. Would it not be desirable to the people of Aradus to have them attributed to their temple, whose maintenance they should otherwise have to pay for themselves?"⁷³ Thus the act was a benefaction to Aradus, converting royal land to civic. Seyrig conceived the temple to have belonged to Aradus from the start, while the village in which it stood and the lands about were royal land assigned to an individual. I submit that this reading is needlessly contorted, implying an isolated piece of Aradian territory (the temple) in the midst of land of the king (the village and its environs). Surely rather one piece of property is in question—the temple, the village, and the lands around them: doubtless at least the valley of Husn Suleiman. The whole had been assigned to Demetrius; now it is given to the god.

Was this royal or civic land? In general in the Seleucid kingdom, did privately owned villages exist on the territories of cities? More than a point of law is at stake. If they did, then Svetsitskaya is right to conclude that the Hellenistic age saw a radically new kind of civic life,⁷⁴ in which demes—political villages serving to induct citizens into the *boulê*—coexisted with apolitical villages owned privately, sometimes by non-citizens, and populated by peasants bound to the soil. Rostovtzeff had thought that royal land assigned by the king to an individual had then to be attached to a civic territory; he admitted exceptions (individually assigned land that remained royal), of which Baetocaece was his example. Perhaps troubled by the anomaly of owned villages on city territories, he later guessed that in such a transfer of royal to civic land, any *basilikoi laoi* must have been granted some intelligible and traditional civic status, as *paroikoi* or *katoikoi*.⁷⁵

⁷³ *Ant. Syr.* IV, 179–80; cf. Rey-Coquais (above, note 66) 115. I am myself uncertain whether Tourgona is the locale of Demetrius or of Baetocaece.

⁷⁴ *VDI* 96 (1966) 44–53; 115 (1971) 3–16; in *Gesellschaft und Recht im griechisch-römischen Altertum* II (Berlin 1969) 227–50: I regret that I can follow her work (in Russian) only in summary.

⁷⁵ *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Leipzig/Berlin 1910) 248–78, esp. 249–51 for Baetocaece; *CAH* VII (1928) 183.

The evidence on owned villages is slight. Antiochus II sold his former wife Laodice a village with its land and people, stipulating that the property be free of royal taxes and that she may register it to the city of her choice; and she can, before or after associating the property with a city, sell the land to another.⁷⁶ It is not certain that the conversion to civic land is obligatory here and normal; in any case nothing is said of the subsequent status of the village and its inhabitants when on civic land—doubtless such a matter was not in the king's jurisdiction. Nor is it expressly said that she can sell them (as distinct from the land) after civic registration. At Seleucid Sardes Mnesimachus raised a loan from Artemis by assigning to her the enjoyment of the villages which the king had assigned him.⁷⁷ The transaction is a mortgage, or "sale subject to redemption," but the goddess, whose temple was on Sardian territory, does not now own the lands but rather enjoys their proceeds. Indeed, if Mnesimachus should default by virtue of the king's depriving Artemis (that is, Mnesimachus) of the lands, Mnesimachus must make good his obligation to the goddess with a monetary equivalent. It is not envisioned that Artemis (that is, in effect, Sardes) could by his default come to own these lands and villages: only cash is being transferred in these dealings, not land or persons. The land remains royal throughout. We are told that the Parthian royal family had a village given them by the Seleucid king, but this tells us nothing pertinent to civic life.⁷⁸ Other attested assignments of royal land to individuals are unprobing because they did not include villagers, so that the question of civic status of persons does not arise.⁷⁹

Thus only the case of Laodice shows that an owned village could pass onto civic territory, with unknown juridical results. Against this case speaks the silence of two other texts. One is the Seleucid inscription found west of Scythopolis in 1960.⁸⁰ The owner of some villages, Ptolemy the *stratêgos* of Coele-Syria, petitions Antiochus III to prohibit quartering of troops and other royal use of these villages which the crown had given him. Responses and enforcement are channeled through a number of royal agents, with no mention of a city and its powers of police and taxation. It seems certain that no

⁷⁶ Welles, *Royal Correspondence*, no. 18–20. For bibliography on the question of *laoi* see P. Briant, in *Annales litt. Besançon* 140 (1972) 93–133; M. Wörle, *Chiron* 5 (1975) 78–81.

⁷⁷ *I. Sardis* 1.

⁷⁸ Philostr. *v. Apol.* 1.37.

⁷⁹ Welles, *Royal Corres.*, no. 10–13; *OGIS* 335.133 ff.

⁸⁰ Y. H. Landau, *IEJ* 16 (1966) 54–70, with *Bull. épigr.* (1970) 627, and the commentary of J. E. Taylor, *Seleucid Rule in Palestine* (Diss. Duke 1979) 108–68.

city-state had jurisdiction here, and that the villages were thus on royal land. The inscription was discovered on a tell some seven miles up the Jezreel valley from Scythopolis, where also Persian and Hellenistic remains were found. Evidently this site was one of Ptolemy's villages, and the territory of Scythopolis did not extend this far.

The import of the Baetocaece memorandum is the same. The taxes and requisitions from which the place is freed must be royal. There is no mention of civic taxes or civic authorities, nor a letter to Aradus announcing the gift to the temple, nor a civic decree in response. Seleucid interference in the territory of Carian Apollonia, a subject city, occasioned complicated negotiations between the city and the king. In contrast, at Baetocaece as in the Jezreel the king disposes of the matter of the village without let or hindrance of the Aradians or the least reference to them. Any correspondence with Aradus would have left documents in the possession of the temple, to be inscribed if the temple privileges were challenged. We have such a text from the time of Augustus. At the time of our Antiochus, both the privileges and their execution rest entirely with the king.

We must conclude that Husn Suleiman was royal land, not part of Aradian territory. It seems that owned villages were usually on royal land, conveyed to high friends and relatives of the dynasty who normally would take no part in civic life. The case of Laodice, whose relationship to the dynasty was ending, may not be typical. At any rate, on the death or disgrace of Demetrius, the king, rather than assign Husn Suleiman to another mortal, assigned it to the god. Aradus had no claim on the area and is not in question. But if this site was not Aradian before or after the benefaction to Zeus, then Seyrig's case for an early date collapses.

What then is the relation of this event to the civic decree in the archive? For Seyrig's proof that Baetocaece was Aradian in Roman times is compelling.⁸¹ But that the large *peraea* of Aradus was as old as the dawn of the Hellenistic period he deduced from an incident in Arrian: the son of the king of the Aradians, abandoning the Persian cause, delivered to Alexander Aradus, Marathus, Sigon, Mariamme, and all they controlled.⁸² But that such an area constituted the territory of Aradus is at variance with the royal ownership of

⁸¹ *Ant. Syr.* IV, 176–78, cf. 198, note 1; *RN* (1964) 28–46; see in general Rey-Coquais (above, note 66) 61–141.

⁸² *Arr. Anab.* 2.13.7–8; Rey-Coquais 98–99 even suggests an origin in the eighth century. Hellenistic use of the 'era of Aradus' (259 B.C.) by several mainland cities (Rey-Coquais 196–97) shows not that they were subjects or allies of Aradus but that we have misnamed the era, whose occasion is unknown.

Baetocaece and with the continuing existence of cities in the “*peraea*.”⁸³ Rather, the scene in Arrian must represent the power of a Phoenician king over his allies or subjects; it tells us nothing of the corporate property of the city-state Aradus. There is in fact some evidence that the mainland territory made gains at the very end of the Hellenistic period.⁸⁴ The liquidation of the Seleucid state by Pompey necessitated the disposal of royal lands. Most must have passed to the cities, at least in Phoenicia; and Aradus and its fleet were active in various Romans’ service in the first century B.C.⁸⁵ I should guess that the *peraea* of Roman Aradus was in substantial measure a creation of this period. At the time of the Seleucid memorandum, Aradian holdings were more limited, not extending to Baetocaece. If these suggestions are correct, the conflict between the city and the temple attested under Augustus reflects Aradian control that is relatively recent and perhaps based on a Roman decision.

If we are without Seyrig’s criterion for dating the Seleucid gift to Zeus, is there another? A grant of *asylia* in Phoenicia one might expect to be late; elements of the vocabulary seem late. But Seyrig was right to question the force of such arguments. Therefore another aspect of the text, long noticed, assumes greater weight. When in Seleucid history was there a satrapy of Apamea?⁸⁶

No sure answer is in hand. We have two pieces of evidence. On Delos in the time of a king Demetrius, a statue was dedicated by the “satrap in charge of the Seleukis.”⁸⁷ Palaeography allows no certain distinction between the three Seleucids of this name—dated 162–150, 139–126, 95–88; Wilhelm preferred the second. But Posidonius, writing in the 90’s, says that the Seleukis consists of four satrapies.⁸⁸ Caution is in order, for we cannot know how often such administrative divisions were changed. But the simple inference is that the satrapy of Seleukis was divided into four, one that of Apamea, at some date in the second half of the second century B.C., and that the Baetocaece memorandum was written later than this change.

⁸³ See Seyrig, *RN* (1964) 36–37, and Rey-Coquais 115 and 123–26, on the anomalous character of this alleged *peraea*.

⁸⁴ Rey-Coquais 119 and 131–37.

⁸⁵ Rey-Coquais 160–64.

⁸⁶ H. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit* II (Munich 1964²) 16, 42, 181. The point is dismissed by Rey-Coquais, *IGL Syrie* VII, p. 61.

⁸⁷ *I. Délos* 1544 *σατράπης* [ἐπὶ τῆς Σελευκίδος. The term occurs in two earlier Seleucid texts, but apparently only with a geographical rather than administrative sense: *I. Ilion* 32.4–5 (c. 280 B.C.), *Staatsverträge* III, 492.2 and 13 (c. 243).

⁸⁸ *FGrHist* 87 F 65; this element of Strabo 16.2.4, being anachronistic, necessarily derives from Posidonius. For bibliography on the passage see E. Frézouls, *ANRW* II.8 (1978) 168–73.

To sum up these considerations: nothing suggests an early Hellenistic date for the Seleucid benefaction to Zeus of Baetocaece; several arguments, no one of them very strong, combine to support the traditional assignment of this event to the late second or early first century.