

JAAP-JAN FLINTERMAN

PANNUCOME REVISITED  
LINES 11–13 OF THE LAODICE INSCRIPTION AGAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 181 (2012) 79–87

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



PANNUCOME REVISITED  
LINES 11–13 OF THE LAODICE INSCRIPTION AGAIN<sup>1</sup>

For the status of native peasants in Hellenistic Asia Minor, the so-called Laodice inscription is a piece of evidence as contested as it is essential. The central document of this dossier is a letter of Antiochus II to Metrophanes, the governor of Hellespontine Phrygia or a financial official, informing the addressee of the sale to the king's (former?) wife Laodice of a village, the land belonging to it, and the people (λαοί) living there.<sup>2</sup> I quote the lines 17–30 of the inscription as edited by Albert Rehm and Richard Harder, retaining for practical reasons the line numbering (1–14) of the edition by C. Bradford Welles, which is more often used by historians than the numbering in *IDidyma*, and omitting the detailed description of the boundaries of the estate in the lines 3–7. The translation that follows reflects my own position in the controversies surrounding the interpretation of the document in general and of ll. 11–13 in particular.

(...) βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος Μητροφάνει χαίρειν· πεπ[ρά]-  
καμεν Λαοδίκῃ Πάννου κώμην καὶ τὴν βᾶριν καὶ τὴν προσο[ύ]-  
σαν χώραν τῇ κώμῃ (...  
...  
5 ...  
...  
...) καὶ εἴ τινες (εἰς τὴν χά[ρα]ν ταύτην ἐμ[πί]-  
πτουσιν τόποι καὶ τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας αὐτό[θι λ]αοὺς πα-]  
νοικίους σὺν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν πᾶσιν καὶ σὺν ταῖς [τοῦ ἐ]-  
10 νάτου καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ ἔτους προσόδοις, ἀρ[γυ]-  
ρίου ταλάντων τριάκοντα, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες ἐ-  
[κ] τῆς κώμης ταύτης ὄντες λαοὶ μετεληλύθασιν εἰς ἄλλου-  
ς τόπους· ἐφ' ὧν οὐθέν ἀποτελεῖ εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν καὶ κυρία ἔ[σ]-  
ται προσφερομένη πρὸς πόλιν, ἣν ἂν βούληται·

(...) King Antiochus to Metrophanes, greetings. We have sold to Laodice Pannucome and the man-  
sion<sup>3</sup> and the land belonging to the village, (...) and also any settlements on the land, and the λαοί  
living there<sup>4</sup> with their households and with all their belongings and with the revenues of the 59th  
year, for 30 talents of silver, and likewise any λαοί from that village who have moved to other  
places, on the condition that she pays nothing to the royal treasury and will have the right to attach  
the land to a city of her choice.

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Professor Hammerstaedt of the ZPE's editorial board for his penetrating comments on a previous version of this article, providing food for thought and resulting in a couple of revisions. It is also a pleasure to acknowledge the help and advice unstintingly given by several colleagues of the Department of Archaeology, Classics and Near Eastern Studies of the VU University. Paula Rose and Rutger Allan answered on short notice questions of an amateur philologist. Bert van der Spek generously shared his wide-ranging knowledge of Seleucid history and played the devil's advocate with gusto. Gerard Boter repeatedly saved me from error and made suggestions that enabled me considerably to strengthen my argument. Any remaining mistakes and weaknesses are my responsibility only. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

<sup>2</sup> *IDidyma* 492, ll. 17–51 = RC no. 18. That Metrophanes was a financial official rather than a provincial governor is maintained by Aperghis 2004, 290–292. As for Laodice's marital status, it used to be assumed that Antiochus II divorced her when, at the end of the Second Syrian War (253 BCE), he married the Ptolemaic princess Berenice, and that the sale dealt with in the royal letter was in fact a divorce settlement, see e.g. Welles 1934, 97. But the idea that Antiochus II, when marrying Berenice, repudiated Laodice has been challenged by Martínez-Sève 2003, 693–700. Neither issue is of consequence to the problem dealt with in this article.

<sup>3</sup> On the meaning of βᾶρις see Schuler 1998, 71–73, esp. 72: “Hinsichtlich der βᾶρις von Pannu Kome ist eine Entscheidung zwischen den Alternativen Herrenhaus und Festung nicht möglich.”

<sup>4</sup> I think that in line 8 Rehm's αὐτό[θι] is to be preferred to the αὐτο[ίς] of Welles and earlier editors.

One of the issues under discussion is the interpretation of the lines 11–13.<sup>5</sup> Welles read the phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες ἐ[κ] τῆς κώμης τούτης ὄντες λαοὶ μετεληλύθασιν εἰς ἄλλους τόπους as indicating that λαοὶ who had moved to other places were included in the sale, translating: “so also any of the folk of this village who have moved away into other places”. Pierre Briant, on the other hand, in a contribution to the *Colloque 1971 sur l’esclavage*, denied that the phrase should be understood as including in the sale λαοὶ who had moved away. The view presented by Briant in the early 1970’s amounted to a denial of the idea that the λαοὶ mentioned in the letter of Antiochus II were sold at all: “Ce qui paraît certain, c’est en tout cas que *les laoi sont ni donnés ni vendus*.”<sup>6</sup> This denial was bound up with Briant’s conviction that the *revenues* of the estate – rather than the village itself, the land belonging to it, and the people living there – were the object of the transaction between the king and Laodice: “Ce que (...) vend le roi, ce ne sont ni les terres ni les paysans: ce sont les revenus.”<sup>7</sup> Of course, this view of the nature of the transaction reported in the Laodice inscription left no room for the idea that λαοὶ who had moved to other places were included in the sale of Pannucome. Accordingly, Briant suggested that the lines 11–13 should be understood as meaning that the tribute payable by the village would remain the same and that Laodice could expect a ‘rente fixe’, “même si certains de ceux qui appartiennent au village se sont installés dans d’autres *topoi*”.<sup>8</sup>

Briant’s interpretation of the Laodice inscription did not remain unchallenged. Both G. E. M. de Ste. Croix and R. J. van der Spek argued that Briant’s understanding of the purpose of the royal letter was contradicted by its very wording.<sup>9</sup> As for the translation of the lines 11–13, Heinz Kreissig pointed out that Briant’s suggestion foundered on the parallelism with the lines 7–8 (καὶ εἴ τινες ἐ[κ] τὴν χώ[ρα]ν τούτην ἐμπ[ι]πτουσιν τόποι).<sup>10</sup> The present author, in a short note published in the *ZPE*, adduced a parallel for the phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες from a fictional πρόσταγμα in the so-called *Letter of Aristeeas* (§ 22). In this passage, the phrase indisputably serves to enlarge the scope of an action by adding an extra object to the verb. This parallel is, in other words, solid philological proof that the phrase means exactly what Welles and critics of Briant have assumed it did mean: λαοὶ who had moved away were included in the transaction implied in the verb (πεπράκαμεν). I also pointed out that the parallelism between the lines 7–9 and 11–13 of the Laodice inscription, noticed by Kreissig and adduced by him as an argument against Briant’s interpretation of the lines 11–13, was confirmed by the fact that in § 26 of the *Letter of Aristeeas* καὶ εἴ τινες was used to refer back to ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες in § 22.<sup>11</sup> The matter seemed settled as far as the philological interpretation of the document was concerned. In 1998 a monograph by Christof Schuler on *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien* was published. It contained a balanced discussion of the position of λαοὶ.<sup>12</sup> Schuler maintained that λαοὶ could not be treated as alienable commodities by the owner of an estate and that they may even, to a limited extent, have enjoyed freedom of movement.<sup>13</sup> But that did not detract, he argued, from the fact that the λαοὶ of Pannucome were included in the sale: “Laodike erhielt das Land *und* eventuell darauf befindliche Siedlungen, dazu die dort lebenden λαοὶ *und ebenso* diejenigen, die aus der Gemarkung von Pannu Kome weggezogen waren.”<sup>14</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Papazoglou 1997, 40: “Particulièrement délicate est l’interprétation des ll. 11–13.”

<sup>6</sup> Briant 1973, 105 (the italics are Briant’s).

<sup>7</sup> Briant 1973, 104; cf. Briant 1973, 105: “Ce que vend ou donne le roi, ce n’est ni la terre ni les paysans: c’est le produit de la première que permet le travail des seconds.”

<sup>8</sup> Briant 1973, 106.

<sup>9</sup> De Ste. Croix 1981, 152 with 566 n. 26: “But unless we are to pretend, gratuitously, that the Greek does not *mean* what it *says*, we must admit that the village itself was certainly conveyed to Laodice; and this gives no ground for denying that its peasants also passed to the ex-queen, as our document indeed specifically *says*” (italics in the original). Van der Spek 1986, 157: “[D]e teksten spreken duidelijke taal: (...) πεπράκαμεν Λαοδικῆ Πάννου κώμην καὶ τῆμ βᾶριν καὶ τὴν προσοῦσαν χώραν τῆι κώμηι.”

<sup>10</sup> Kreissig 1978, 96.

<sup>11</sup> Flinterman 1987.

<sup>12</sup> Schuler 1998, 180–190.

<sup>13</sup> Schuler 1998, 182–184.

<sup>14</sup> Schuler 1998, 182 (the italics are Schuler’s).

Schuler's discussion could well have been the near-final word about the matter.<sup>15</sup> The authors of two books, however, which by now must have the status of standard bibliography on the subject, espouse the same old misunderstanding. Clearly, there is a danger that a mistaken view will acquire the status of received truth. My aim in returning to the lines 11–13 of the Laodice inscription has been to avert that danger. The resulting article is only to a very limited degree a contribution to discussions about the status of native peasants in Asia Minor. I will not deal with matters of terminology, viz. whether λαοί can be defined as serfs. Neither will I go into the question whether λαοί were bound to their village or to the soil. What I will demonstrate is that the λαοί mentioned in the lines 11–13 of the Laodice inscription were included in the sale of Pannucome. What will also transpire is a point of method. It is an historian's job to interrogate his witnesses critically, if necessary harshly. Leading questions are not out of bounds. If he thinks the resulting evidence unsatisfactory, he can always argue that it is of little value, for example because the situation documented in it is untypical. Under no circumstance, however, one should deny one's crown witness the privilege of speaking for himself, treating him as a ventriloquist's dummy.

The first of the two books referred to in the above paragraph is a monograph published in 1997 by Fanoula Papazoglou, *Laoi et paroikoi*.<sup>16</sup> In her discussion of the Laodice inscription, Papazoglou enunciated her preference for Briant's interpretation.<sup>17</sup> More specifically, she argued that inclusion in the sale of λαοί who had moved away, would have required specification of the number of λαοί sold, and that Briant's translation did better justice to the adverb ὁμοίως: "En effet, il ne faut pas passer outre l'adverbe ὁμοίως qui introduit la proposition discutée."<sup>18</sup> Astoundingly, she referred to my 1987 *Miszelle* as support for Briant's reading of the lines 11–13<sup>19</sup> – in spite of the fact that I had quite unequivocally sided with Briant's critics. The second book is a monograph by Makis Aperghis, published in 2004, *The Seleukid Royal Economy*. Aperghis considers Papazoglou's treatment of the status of λαοί "both comprehensive and thoroughly convincing". He deems it, therefore, unnecessary to enter into an analysis of the problem.<sup>20</sup> This does not stop him from repeating the by now thoroughly familiar refrain: "Land grants involving *laoi* are *not* to be interpreted as showing the transfer of ownership of populations, but of the revenue derived from these as part

<sup>15</sup> On two points, however, I would hesitate to follow Schuler. He suggests (p. 183) that the λαοί enjoyed "persönliche Freiheit". It seems to me that for people included in the sale of a village personal freedom must have been a tenuous possession. Moreover, I doubt whether his translation of ἀργυρίου τάλάντων τριάκοντα (ll. 10–11) as 'im Wert von 30 Talenten' (p. 181 n. 100) reflects a correct understanding of the phrase, which I would take as a specification of the price of the estate rather than of its revenues. One argument for this interpretation (which is, to the best of my knowledge, almost universally shared) can be found in ll. 19–23, where Metrophanes is told that payment will take place in three instalments; the γαζοφυλάκιον mentioned in l. 20 apparently comes under the addressee. It would make little sense to inform an official about the number of instalments if he had not been notified of the total sum to be paid. Metrophanes must, therefore, have been informed about the price of the estate, and the obvious place to look for this piece of information is the royal letter. The only sum mentioned in the letter is ἀργυρίου τάλάντων τριάκοντα in ll. 10–11 which, therefore, should be the price. The revenues of the estate in the 59th year, on the other hand, were an unknown quantity at the time of the sale; as has been correctly pointed out by Rehm 1958, 294, the provision that the revenues of the 59th year will go to Laodice implies "dass die πρόσοδοι noch nicht greifbar sind". Moreover, the inclusion in the sale of the revenues of the current year does away with any need to mention an assessment of these revenues in the agreement. So while there is a clear necessity to mention the price of the estate, it would be quite surprising to find the revenues specified. As for the anomalous position of the statement of the price, in the middle of a listing of the objects of the sale, see Welles 1934, 100, quoted in n. 34 below.

<sup>16</sup> Note that Papazoglou and Schuler were apparently unaware of each other's work: Schuler's 1998 monograph is an 'überarbeitete Fassung' of a 1996 doctoral dissertation that Papazoglou is sure to have missed in Beograd, and Schuler in his turn is hardly to blame for not taking notice of a book published in 1997 in Beograd while preparing his own 1996 dissertation for publication in 1998.

<sup>17</sup> Papazoglou 1997, 35–41, esp. 40.

<sup>18</sup> Papazoglou 1997, 40. For discussion of Papazoglou's arguments see below, text at nn. 35–36.

<sup>19</sup> Papazoglou 1997, 40 n. 82: "Critiqué par Kreissig (1978), p. 96, la traduction [i.e. Briant's translation] de la tournure ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινας etc. à la l. 11 est appuyée par Flinterman, *ZPE* 70, 1987, p. 172, par une parallèle dans le prostagma fictif de Ptolémée Philadelphie cité dans la lettre de Aristéas."

<sup>20</sup> Aperghis 2004, 111. Aperghis seems to have missed Corsaro 2001, a review article on Papazoglou's book, criticizing on p. 30 the idea "che le popolazioni indigene siano rimaste in una sorte di immutabile condizione di 'dipendenza collettiva' di carattere fiscale". Corsaro 2001, 27 follows among others Welles 1934, 97 in seeing in *RC* 18, ll. 11–13 evidence for the ἰδίον concept.

of their tributary obligation.”<sup>21</sup> Apparently not wholly insensitive, however, to the challenge posed to this reconstruction of the situation underlying the Laodice inscription by the lines 11–13, he proceeds to solve the problems involved by combining a clumsy translation of ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες etc. with a misleading paraphrase of the preceding lines:

“The phrase in the Laodike dossier which refers to the revenue the ex-queen would receive from her land grant is followed by (...): ‘and it will be the same if some people from this village had moved to other places’ (...). Thus some villagers had apparently departed from the village since the time when its tributary obligation as a collective unit had been set, but the tribute, which was now to be Laodike’s revenue, was to remain unchanged.”<sup>22</sup>

Aperghis’ discussion calls for several observations.

(i) The interpretation given in the last sentence of the above quotation is the same as Briant’s: the tribute payable by the village will remain the same and Laodice may expect the same revenue, “même si certains de ceux qui appartiennent au village se sont installés dans d’autres *topoi*”.<sup>23</sup>

(ii) A quick glance at the relevant lines as quoted above will suffice to perceive that the passage quoted by Aperghis (ll. 11–13) is preceded not by one, but by two phrases, the first (ll. 9–10) referring to the revenues of the 59th year, the second (ll. 10–11) to the price to be paid by Laodice. Why are the revenues mentioned? Is it in order to fix their size? Apparently not: the size of the revenues is not specified. What is specified is that the revenues *of the 59th year* (irrespective of their size) will go to Laodice. The obvious aim of this specification is to fix the point in time in which the estate will be conveyed to the buyer.<sup>24</sup>

(iii) Aperghis’ translation of ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ., ‘and it will be the same if some etc.’, assumes that ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ can be read as an apodosis, ‘and (it will be) the same’, to which εἴ τινες κτλ. is the protasis. In my view, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ should be understood as an adverbial phrase (‘similarly’, ‘likewise’) and εἴ τινες as introducing an object clause. In order to demonstrate that this is how ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ. should be understood, I will discuss the occurrences of the phrase in Greek texts from the period between the fifth century BCE and the fifth century CE. A *TLG* search results in three hits. The Packard Humanities Institute’s *Searchable Greek Inscriptions* gives two more hits, one of these being the lines under discussion from the Laodice inscription. Before examining these four parallel passages, let us have a closer look at the collocations εἴ τινες and ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ.

From a brief reconnaissance it becomes apparent that in Greek prose εἴ τινες is regularly used as an alternative to the indefinite relative pronoun οἵτινες. The inquisitive reader can consult the *TLG* for himself; here three examples, admittedly striking but not exceptional, must suffice to illustrate the point.<sup>25</sup> The first one is Thucydides’ description of the very beginning of the Sicilian expedition:

αὐτοὶ δ’ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ εἴ τινες τῶν ξυμμαχῶν παρήσαν ἐς τὸν Πειραιᾶ καταβάντες ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ῥητῇ ἅμα ἔφ’ ἐπλήρουν τὰς ναῦς ὡς ἀναξόμενοι.

<sup>21</sup> Aperghis 2004, 112 (italics in the original).

<sup>22</sup> Aperghis 2004, 112. I have seen the following reviews of Aperghis’ monograph: *AC* 75, 2006, 532–534 (Migeotte); *CB* 82, 2006, 138–140 (Keenan); *CR* 57, 2007, 454–456 (Brodersen); *Latomus* 66, 2007, 759–761 (Tuplin); *RH* 130, 2006, 141–143 (Graslin); *Sehepunkte* 5, 2005, <http://www.sehepunkte.de/2005/07/7266.html> (Mittag); *Hermathena* 182, 2007, 182–188 (Ma); *HZ* 285, 2007, 158–160 (Mehl). None of these reviews discusses Aperghis’ view that in cases such as these no transfer of ownership of populations was involved.

<sup>23</sup> See above, text at n. 8.

<sup>24</sup> Kreissig 1978, 95; De Ste. Croix 1981, 566 n. 26; cf. Schuler 1998, 181: “[B]ei Verkäufen von Agrarland müssen sich alter und neuer Eigentümer über eine ausstehende Ernte einigen.”

<sup>25</sup> For an additional parallel see Kühner–Gerth II, 1904, 190–191, referring to [Dem.], *Or.* 47.63 τὰ ὑπόλοιπα σκεύη, εἴ τινα τῆ προτεραιᾶ ἐν τῷ πύργῳ ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔτυχεν ἔξω ὄντα. Kühner–Gerth refer to this Demosthenic passage in order to illustrate the interchangeability of εἴ τις οὐ and ὅστις οὐ. It will be evident from the passages adduced that the interchangeability does not depend on the negation.

But the Athenians themselves and any of their allies who were at Athens at the time went down to Piraeus at dawn on the day appointed and manned the ships for putting out to sea.<sup>26</sup>

Our second example is from Philo's *De specialibus legibus*. It is part of a disquisition on the unwritten rules the Law imposes on people who earn a living by commerce:

διὸ προστάττει τοῖς καπήλοις καὶ ἐμπόροις καὶ εἴ τινες ἄλλοι τὴν τοιαύτην προαίρεσιν ἐπανήρηνται τοῦ βίου ζυγὰ δίκαια καὶ σταθμῖα καὶ μέτρα παρασκευάζεσθαι, ...

And therefore he commands tradesmen, merchants and any other persons who have taken up such a line of life to provide themselves with just scales and weights and measures, ...<sup>27</sup>

The third and final example is from the grim story of Caracalla's massacre among the Alexandrians:

..., ὅφ' ἐνὶ δὲ σημείῳ προσπεσόντες πανταχόθεν οἱ στρατιῶται τὴν ἐν μέσῳ πᾶσαν νεολαίαν, καὶ εἴ τινες ἄλλως παρήσαν, παντὶ τρόπῳ φόνων ἀναιροῦσιν, ὀπλισμένοι τε ἀόπλους καὶ πανταχόθεν περιειληφότες.

..., while from every side the soldiers at a single signal fell upon all the encircled young men and any who were there for other reasons. They wiped them out with every kind of slaughter, armed soldiers against defenceless men who were totally surrounded.<sup>28</sup>

In passing we may note that the last example deserves our special attention, because here καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ. quite obviously serves to add an object to ἀναιροῦσιν. The passage offers, in other words, a full parallel to ll. 7–8 of the Laodice inscription: καὶ εἴ τινες (εἰς τὴν χά[ρα]ν ταύτην ἐμ[πί]πτουσιν τόποι, which serve to add an object to πεπ[ρά]καμεν in ll. 1–2.

As for ὁμοίως δὲ καί, the translation 'similarly' or 'likewise' seems to do justice to the collocation. As is the case with the English equivalents, the extent of the similarity implied varies with the context. There may be a clear analogy between what is introduced by the collocation on the one hand and what precedes on the other. But ὁμοίως δὲ καί may also simply serve to introduce the umpteenth item in an enumeration, and the similarity of an item thus introduced with what precedes does not need to go further than what justified its listing in the first place. Examples will be provided by the four occurrences of the phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες in Greek texts from the period between the fifth century BCE and the fifth century CE to which we now turn.

Our first example can be found in a treaty of ἰσοπολιτεία between Miletus and Heraclea by Latmus from the early second century BCE (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 633). The treaty opens for citizens of Miletus the possibility of full incorporation into the citizen body of Heraclea and vice versa, detailing the formalities of registration in both cases (ll. 43–57). Heracleans, however, who lived neither in Heraclea nor in Miletus at the date of commencement of the treaty, cannot register as citizens of Miletus until they will have lived for a period of five years either in their native city or in Miletus. The same rule applies to Milesians who at the same point in time lived neither in their native city nor in Heraclea:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες Μιλησίων μὴ οἰκήκασιν μήτε ἐν τῇ ἐαυτῶν πατρίδι μήτε ἐν Ἡρακλείαι ἕως τοῦ προειρημένου χρόνου, μὴ εἶναι προσγραφῆναι τούτοις ἐν Ἡρακλείαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρότερον οἰκήσωσιν ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἢ ἐν Ἡρακλείαι ἕτη πέντε.

Similarly, if any Milesians have lived neither in their own country nor in Heraclea until the point in time mentioned earlier, they are not allowed to register in Heraclea until they will have lived for five years in Miletus or Heraclea.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Th. 6.30.1. Translation: R. Warner (Penguin Classics).

<sup>27</sup> Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 4.194. Translation: F. H. Colson (Loeb Classical Library), slightly adapted.

<sup>28</sup> Hdn. 4.9.6. Translation: C. R. Whittaker (Loeb Classical Library).

<sup>29</sup> *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 633, ll. 60–63; cf. Gawantka 1975, 72.

The protasis can be understood as part of the apodosis, both as a dative that can be substituted for *τούτοις* and that depends on *μὴ (ἐξ)εἶναι* and as the accusative subject of *προσγραφήναι*. The relation of the protasis to the apodosis can be elucidated by translating *εἴ τινες* as *οἵτινες*, thus transforming the protasis into a restrictive relative clause:

Similarly, any Milesians who have lived neither in their own country nor in Heraclea until the point in time mentioned earlier are not allowed to register in Heraclea until they will have lived for five years in Miletus or Heraclea.

The second translation finds its justification in the use, documented above, of the collocation *εἴ τινες* as an alternative to the indefinite relative pronoun *οἵτινες*. As for *ὁμοίως δὲ καί*, the extent of the similarity implied in it seems to be quite large in this case: there is a very precise equivalence between the treatment of Heracleans who lived neither in their home town nor in its new partner city at the time of the commencement of the treaty, on the one hand, and of Milesians finding themselves in the same situation on the other. Our next example will show that such an equivalence is a possibility rather than a necessary implication of the use of *ὁμοίως δὲ καί*.

For our second example we move from the Hellenistic period to Late Antiquity. It is a letter from the bishops who had participated in the Council of Ephesus of 431 CE to colleagues who had been unable to attend. The orthodox shepherds list their decisions about punitive measures to be taken against the supporters of the pernicious doctrines of Nestorius and Celestius. Metropolitans are to be deprived of their authority and may even be deposed from their rank as bishop; bishops are to be deprived of their priesthood and deposed from their rank; clerics are to be deposed; wrongdoers condemned on previous occasions, who have been rehabilitated by Nestorius and his cronies, are to remain deposed.

Ὅμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες βουλευθεῖεν τὰ περὶ ἐκάστου πεπραγμένα ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ οἰοιδίποτε τρόπῳ παρασαλεύειν, ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ὥρισεν, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοὶ εἶεν, τοῦ οἰκείου παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμοῦ· εἰ δὲ λαϊκοί, ἀκοινωνήτους ὑπάρχειν.

Similarly, if any persons should wish in any way to upset the decisions in each point taken in the holy synod of Ephesus, the holy synod has decided that if they are bishops or clerics they should be completely deprived of their own rank and if they are laity they should be excommunicated.<sup>30</sup>

The protasis furnishes the accusative subject of the infinitives *ἀποπίπτειν* and *ὑπάρχειν* in the apodosis. This relation can be brought out in a translation by rendering *εἴ τινες* as *οἵτινες*, thus transforming the protasis into a restrictive relative clause:

Similarly, the holy synod of Ephesus has decided that any persons who should wish in any way to upset the decisions in each point taken in the holy synod should be deprived of their own rank if they are bishops or clerics and should be excommunicated if they are laity.

As with the previous example, the second translation finds its justification in the well attested use of the collocation *εἴ τινες* as an alternative to the indefinite relative pronoun *οἵτινες*. Further confirmation that it is legitimate to substitute a relative for a conditional construction is in this case provided by the context. Our sentence is the last one in a series of five. The first three of these rulings are constructed in the same way as the last one: a protasis followed by an apodosis. But the penultimate sentence shows a telling variation: instead of the conditional clause *εἰ δὲ τινες κτλ.* we find a relative clause introduced by *ὅσοι*. As for *ὁμοίως δὲ καί*, on a maximizing interpretation one could perhaps read the phrase as suggestive of the consistency that characterizes the council's rulings: similar trespassers are similarly disciplined. Still, its main function seems to be that of introducing a final addition to a series of sentences.

The third parallel passage is part of Xenophon's description of the Athenian preparations for the naval battle at the Arginusae islands. The Athenians arrived at Samos with 110 ships.

<sup>30</sup> ACO 1.1.3, p. 28. Translation: N. P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, London, Washington DC 1990, slightly adapted.



..., κάκειθεν Σαμίας ναῦς ἔλαβον δέκα· ἤθροισαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλας πλείους ἢ τριάκοντα παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων, εἰσβαίνειν ἀναγκάσαντες ἅπαντας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες αὐτοῖς ἔτυχον ἔξω οὖσαι. ἐγένοντο δὲ αἱ πᾶσαι πλείους ἢ πενήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν.

..., and from there [they] added ten Samian ships to the fleet; they also collected more than thirty from the other allies, compelling everyone to embark, and likewise any ships they happened to have abroad. They amounted in all to more than 150.<sup>31</sup>

Obviously, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες here serves to add an object to the verb ἤθροισαν, ‘they collected (...) likewise any ships they happened to have abroad’. The words ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ pick up the sentence, which has been interrupted by εἰσβαίνειν ἀναγκάσαντες ἅπαντας, and introduce a third category that was at the time added to the Athenian fleet: Σαμίας ναῦς (...) δέκα· (...) καὶ ἄλλας πλείους ἢ τριάκοντα παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων (...) ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες αὐτοῖς ἔτυχον ἔξω οὖσαι. What this passage illustrates very well is the indefinite quality and quantity indicated by the words εἴ τινες. The number of ships the Athenians had abroad at the time could not be specified beforehand; it was not even absolutely certain (though highly probable) that there were any Athenian ships abroad. In fact, Xenophon is still uncertain about the number of ships thus added to the Athenian fleet: he remains vague about the total number of ships collected by the Athenians (‘more than 150’), and this vagueness is at least partly due to his uncertainty about the number of ships abroad the Athenians managed to assemble.

The fourth and last parallel passage is part of the fictional πρόσταγμα of Ptolemy II Philadelphus that can be found in the so-called *Letter of Aristeeas* (§ 22):<sup>32</sup>

‘Ὅσοι τῶν συνεστρατευμένων τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς κατὰ Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην τόπους ἐπελθόντες τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώραν ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο σωμάτων Ἰουδαϊκῶν καὶ ταῦτα διακεκομίσασιν εἰς τε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν ἢ καὶ πεπράκασιν ἑτέροις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτά εἰσιν εἰσηγμένοι τῶν τοιούτων, ἀπολύειν παραχρῆμα τοὺς ἔχοντας, κομιζομένους αὐτίκα ἑκάστου σώματος δραχμὰς εἴκοσι κτλ.

Those who while participating in the campaign of our father in Syria and Phoenicia have joined in the invasion of the country of the Jews and have taken into captivity Jewish persons and have transported these to the city and the country or have sold them to others, likewise any such persons who were here before or have been imported afterwards, all those who possess them should set them free immediately, receiving right away compensation of twenty drachmas for each person.

Here, I cannot but repeat the gist of what I wrote 25 years ago.<sup>33</sup> The king orders the release of the Jews enslaved during the campaign of Ptolemaeus Soter in Syria and Phoenicia; he also orders the release of the Jews enslaved before and afterwards. The phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτά εἰσιν εἰσηγμένοι τῶν τοιούτων adds an object to ἀπολύειν and thus serves to widen the scope of the royal order to liberate Jewish slaves by including those enslaved before and after Soter’s campaign. According to the author of the *Letter to Aristeeas* (§ 26), it was Philadelphus himself who added the crucial phrase to the concept submitted to him: καὶ εἴ τινες προῆσαν ἢ καὶ μετὰ εἰσιν εἰσηγμένοι τῶν τοιούτων. The fact that the added phrase is referred to in § 26 as καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ. rather than as ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ. (as in § 22) demonstrates that both phrases can be put to similar use, viz. to add an(other) object to a verb in the apodosis.

In tracking the occurrences of the phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες and in familiarizing ourselves with the collocations εἴ τινες and ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ we have moved from the Classical era to Late Antiquity and back again to the Hellenistic period. The time has come to recapitulate the main findings of our reconnaissance

<sup>31</sup> Xen., *Hell.* 1.6.25. Translation: Xenophon, *Hellenika* I–II.3.10. Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary by Peter Krentz, Oxford 1989, slightly adapted.

<sup>32</sup> On the πρόσταγμα in PER Inv. 24552 concerning σώματα λαϊκὰ ἐλεύθερα as “the actual model after which the forged *prostagma* of Pseudo-Aristeeas was freely fashioned” see Westermann 1938, 19–23.

<sup>33</sup> Flinterman 1987.

as far as they are relevant to the interpretation of ll. 11–13 of the Laodice inscription. This can be done under five headings. (1) Εἴ τινες and οἵτινες are interchangeable (Th. 6.30.1; Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 4.194; Hdn. 4.9.6). (2) Conditional clauses of the type εἴ τινες κτλ. can be used to add an extra object to a verb in the apodosis (Hdn. 4.9.6); this usage is exemplified by ll. 7–8 of the Laodice inscription. (3) The collocation ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ may indicate that there is a clear analogy between what is introduced by it and what precedes (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 633, ll. 57–63), but not necessarily so: it can also be used to link a new item to an already extended list (*ACO* 1.1.3, p. 28) or to make an addition resulting from an afterthought (*Letter of Aristeas* § 22). (4) In two of the four occurrences we have studied (Xen., *Hell.* 1.6.25; *Letter of Aristeas* § 22), the phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες is used to add an object to a verb in the apodosis. (5) The phrases καὶ εἴ τινες and ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες have a similar function (*Letter of Aristeas* § 22 and 26).

Combined these findings should suffice to convince even the most sceptical reader that the λαοὶ mentioned in ll. 11–13 of the Laodice inscription are included in the sale of their village and the land belonging to it. The passages from Xenophon's *Hellenica* and from the so-called *Letter of Aristeas* allow the conclusion that the phrase ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες in texts from the Classical and Hellenistic periods can be used to add an extra object to the verb of a sentence. The fact that in the *Letter of Aristeas* ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες is referred to as καὶ εἴ τινες is welcome confirmation that in the Laodice inscription ll. 7–8 (καὶ εἴ τινες (εἰς τὴν χώραν) ταύτην ἐμπίπτουσιν τόποι κτλ.) and 11–13 (ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες ἐ[κ] τῆς κώμης ταύτης ὄντες λαοὶ μετεληλύθασιν εἰς ἄλλους τόπους) have essentially the same function: they make explicit additions to the object of the sale specified in 2–3 (Πάννου κώμην καὶ τὴν βᾶριν καὶ τὴν προσο[ύ]σαν χώραν τῆι κώμῃ). In ll. 7–8 the phrase καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ. picks up the listing of the objects of the sale that has been interrupted by the description of the boundaries of the estate in ll. 3–7. The listing is then continued until l. 10, where the price is stated. In l. 11 the listing is picked up again with ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἴ τινες κτλ. In the *Letter of Aristeas*, the phrase introduced by ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ (§ 22) is explained by the author (§ 26) as a royal afterthought, and it is certainly tempting to surmise that something similar may have been the case with the addition of the horizontally mobile λαοὶ to Antiochus' letter.<sup>34</sup> Interpreting ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ as introducing another addition certainly does not amount to neglect of the adverb ὁμοίως, a danger cautioned for by Papazoglou.<sup>35</sup> Neither should much weight be attached to Papazoglou's objection that inclusion of λαοὶ who have moved away would have required specification of the number of λαοὶ sold. The deliberate choice for a collocation that may serve as an alternative to the indefinite relative pronoun sufficiently shows that such precision would have been out of the question. In fact, the whole dossier makes it abundantly clear that Laodice had bought “un'area con qualche incertezza nella definizione catastale e in quella censitaria della popolazione”.<sup>36</sup>

In sum, one can only maintain that “[l]and grants involving *laoi* are *not* to be interpreted as showing the transfer of ownership of populations”,<sup>37</sup> if one is prepared “to pretend, gratuitously, that the Greek

<sup>34</sup> See Welles 1934, 100: “The additional point introduced by ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ is a typical contractual clause, but it is clearly out of place. It belongs to the description of the object of sale, but it stands, an after-thought, after the naming of the price.” Cf. Mileta 2008, 156: “Möglicherweise hat es bezüglich dieser Regelung längere Verhandlungen gegeben, da der den Verkauf anweisende Königsbrief (...) mehrfach überarbeitet scheint.” But I don't agree with Mileta when he continues: “Jedenfalls ist die Passage (...) die den eventuell abgewanderten λαοὶ gilt, ein Anakoluth.” Admittedly the prose of the royal chancellery has little literary merit, but the sentence is syntactically consistent. Melita fails to recognize that εἴ τινες (εἰς τὴν χώραν) ταύτην ἐμπίπτουσιν τόποι (ll. 7–8) and εἴ τινες ἐ[κ] τῆς κώμης ταύτης ὄντες λαοὶ μετεληλύθασιν εἰς ἄλλους τόπους (ll. 11–13) are object clauses. He takes καὶ τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας αὐτό[θι] λαοὺς πα[ν]νοικίους (ll. 8–9) as depending on the condition allegedly implied in εἴ τινες (εἰς τὴν χώραν) ταύτην ἐμπίπτουσιν τόποι (ll. 7–8) “und wenn in diesem Land irgendwelche Weiler enthalten sind, auch die dazugehörigen λαοὶ mit ihren gesamten Häusern”, and then looks in vain for a similar constituent after εἴ τινες ἐ[κ] τῆς κώμης ταύτης ὄντες λαοὶ μετεληλύθασιν εἰς ἄλλους τόπους. Incidentally, “dazugehörigen” seems to translate Welles' αὐτο[ί]ς rather than Rehm's αὐτό[θι] printed by Mileta.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. for this and the following argument of Papazoglou above, text at n. 18.

<sup>36</sup> Boffo 2001, 253. See also the observation by Kreissig 1978, 95: “Man weiß, wohl gemerkt, gar nicht, ob es solche Fälle gibt, setzt sie aber als möglich voraus.”

<sup>37</sup> Aperghis 2004, 112 (italics in the original).

does not *mean* what it *says*”.<sup>38</sup> Christian Mileta may have a point in challenging the view that the little evidence there is allows us “die gesamte Bevölkerung des königlichen Gebietes von Kleinasien als einen einheitlichen Stand von Leibeigenen der Monarchen zu betrachten, der die offizielle oder auch nur offiziöse Bezeichnung ‘λαοί’ trug”.<sup>39</sup> After all, historians are entitled to discard the little evidence they have. Personally I would be inclined to assume that a royal letter was not wholly irrelevant to the legal status and the social position of the people concerned – in Pannucome, but possibly also elsewhere in Asia Minor and in the Seleucid empire. But my intention in revisiting Pannucome was not to hypothesize on the ways in which the king’s statement reflected or affected the life of his subjects; my aim has been to ascertain the statement’s meaning. I hope that this meaning has now been established beyond reasonable doubt: in the sale of Pannucome both λαοί who were living there and λαοί who had been living there were included.

### Bibliography

- Aperghis, G. G. 2004. *The Seleukid Royal Economy*, Cambridge.
- Boffo, L. 2001. Lo statuto di terre, insediamenti e persone nell’Anatolia ellenistica. Documenti recenti e problemi antichi, *Dike* 4, 233–255.
- Briant, P. 1973. Remarques sur “laoi” et esclaves ruraux en Asie Mineure hellénistique, in: *Actes du colloque 1971 sur l’esclavage*, Paris, 93–133 (= P. Briant, *Rois, tributs et paysans. Études sur les formations tributaires du Moyen-Orient ancien*, Paris 1982, 95–135).
- Corsaro, M. 2001. Sovrani, cittadini, servi: aspetti sociali dell’Asia Minore, *MediterrAnt* 4, 17–40.
- Flinterman, J. J. 1987. Sur les lignes 11–13 de l’inscription de Laodice (RC 18), *ZPE* 70, 171–172.
- Gawantka, W. 1975. *Isopolitie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*, München.
- Kreissig, H. 1981. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Seleukidenreich*, Berlin.
- Kühner, R. – B. Gerth 1898 and 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, von R. Kühner. Zweiter Teil. Satzlehre, neu bearbeitet von B. Gerth*. 3rd ed. in 2 vols. Hannover and Leipzig.
- Martinez-Sève, L. 2003. Laodice, femme d’Antiochos II: du roman à la reconstruction historique, *REG* 116, 690–706.
- Mileta, Chr. 2008. *Der König und sein Land. Untersuchungen zur Herrschaft der hellenistischen Monarchen über das königliche Gebiet Kleinasiens und seine Bevölkerung*, Berlin.
- Papazoglou, F. 1997. *Laoi et paroikoi. Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique*, Beograd.
- Rehm, A. 1958. *Didyma II: Die Inschriften*. Hrsg. von Richard Harder, Berlin (= *IDidyma*).
- Schuler, Chr. 1998. *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*, München.
- De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1981. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, London.
- Van der Spek, R. J. 1986. *Grondbezit in het Seleucidische rijk*, Amsterdam.
- Welles, C.B. 1934. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, New Haven/London/Prague (= *RC*).
- Westermann, W. L. 1938. Enslaved Persons who are Free. Rainer Papyrus (PER) Inv. 24,552, *AJPh* 59, 1–30.

Jaap-Jan Flinterman, VU University, Faculty of Arts, Department of Archaeology, Classics and Near Eastern Studies, De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam  
j.j.flinterman@vu.nl

<sup>38</sup> The quotation is from De Ste. Croix’ discussion of the Laodice inscription (italics in the original), see above, n. 9.

<sup>39</sup> Mileta 2008, 111–126, esp. 123. Mileta does not deny that the λαοί mentioned in the Laodice inscription were among the objects of the sale (p. 122f. with n. 348).