

PAROS, ALLARIA AND THE CRETAN KOINON

A severely mutilated inscription from Paros, cursorily discussed by the late Professor Anastasios Orlandos at the Third International Cretological Conference of Rethymnon in September of 1971, is an intriguing historical document of special interest to Hellenistic historians and to Cretologists in particular.

The present discussion of this Parian document is prompted by the fact that its discoverer, Professor Orlandos, has not undertaken an exhaustive investigation of its historical implications relative to Crete and her relations with Paros and the Aegean Islands in general: Orlandos has merely suggested some sensible, although speculative, interpretations of its contents which, nevertheless, cannot fail to impress us, when we consider the fact that he was not commenting on a subject of his own academic expertise and interests.

But let us examine the inscription¹:

Ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Ἐπιάνναξ Ἐπιάννακτος εἶπεν ὑπὲρ ὧν
προεγράψαντο οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅπως Τιμησιφῶν Ἐπιάννακτος, ὁ πρεσβεύσας
εἰς Κρήτην τρίς περὶ τῆς τῶν δανείων ἀποδόσεως, ὧν ὠφείλειν ἡ πόλις,
ἐπαινεθῆ καὶ τιμηθῆ καὶ στεφανωθῆ καθ' ὅ,τι ἂν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ
5 δόξῃ. Ἐπειδὴ Τιμησιφῶν Ἐπιάννακτος ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὧν καὶ πατροπα-
ράδοτον διὰ προγόνων παραλαβὼν τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὖνοιαν διὰ παντὸς
τοῦ βίου ταύτην αὔξων διατετέλεκεν καὶ λέγων καὶ πράττων ἐν παντὶ
καιρῷ τὰ συμφέροντα τῇ πόλει, διακείμενός τε εὐσεβῶς μὲν πρὸς τοὺς
θεοὺς, φιλ[ο]στόργως δὲ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα, φιλαγάθως δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πο-
λίτας, ἐν τε ταῖς ἐπιμελείαις καὶ λειτουργίαις καὶ ἱερωσύναις καὶ ἀρχαῖς
10 ταῖς ἐπισημοτάταις ὑγιῶς ἀνέστραπται καὶ ὀσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ φι-
λαγάθως πρεσβεῖ[ας ἀναδεξάμενος ἐν τ]οῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς καὶ
περὶ τῶν μεγίστων τῇ πόλει συμφερόντων..... δια]τε[τ]έλεκεν.....
.....κ]ατηργάσατο πρὸς ἰε.... σ.....

1. A. K. Orlandos, Δάνειον τῆς Πάρου ἐκ Κρήτης κατὰ τοὺς Ἑλληνιστικούς χρό-
νους, *Πεπραγμένα τοῦ Γ' Διεθνoῦς Κρητολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου* I (Athens 1973) 199-205.

- 15π]ρὸς αὐτοὺς πρεσβείας ἀδιαλείπτως
οὔτε κ]ίνδυνον οὔτε δαπάνην οὔτε τὴν
 κακοπαθίαν οὐδαμῶς πρὸ-ῆ ὑφ]ορώμενος τὴν δὲ περὶ τὰ κοινὰ φιλο-
 τιμίαν].....οι πᾶσαν εἰσφερόμενος προσκαρτε-
 20 ρίαν].....τῆς πόλεως εὐνοία καὶ πατρωνεί-
 α].....ἀεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιος γινόμε-
 νος].....οντων κατεπράξατο καὶ τὰς καθωσιωμέ-
 νας].....ους, ἔσπευσεν διαφυλαχθῆναι βεβαίους
καὶ πλό[α]ς ἀναδεξάμενος [ὕ]περοηγ
τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας
 25γικὸν οιο.....

The Parian psephism honors Timesiphon, the son of Epianax, member of an illustrious Parian family, for his faithful and distinguished services to the city. Among his benevolent activities the document first mentions his three embassies to Crete for the repayment of loans owed by the Parians. In fact, these Cretan missions provide the justification for the honors bestowed on Timesiphon for, in spite of the fragmented state of the inscription, references to them are made throughout the text and their importance to the city is clearly stated:

- v. 2: ὁ πρεσβεύσας εἰς Κρήτην τρεῖς περὶ τῆς τῶν δανείων ἀποδόσεως...
 v. 11f: πρεσβείας ἀναδεξάμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς καὶ περὶ
 τῶν μεγίστων τῆ πόλει συμφερόντων.....
 v. 15: πρὸς αὐτοὺς πρεσβείας ἀδιαλείπτως, etc.

Orlandos rightly interprets the document as revealing more than one Cretan loan to Paros and concludes that the three visits of Timesiphon to Crete imply either that the loans were paid in installments or that repeated negotiations between the Cretans and the Parians took place. Moreover, Orlandos draws our attention to the fact that the Parian psephism specifies neither the nature of the loan, *i.e.* whether it was monetary or not, nor the identity of the Cretan creditor or creditors. Subsequently, he proceeds to name the small city-state of Allaria as the benefactor of the Parians after summarily dismissing the Cretan Federation or *Koïnon*, Cnossus, private individuals, or Cretan temples¹.

This interpretation, based solely on the existence of a treaty of ἰσοπολιτεία between Paros and Allaria², is hastily drawn and does not take

1. *Ibid.*, 202-4.

2. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 2B.

into consideration other important aspects of Cretan history which point to a different conclusion. It is for this reason that a more detailed examination of the problem of the Cretan loan to Paros and of Cretan relations with Paros in general, is needed.

The Cretan city-state of Allaria is not well-known to historians and archaeologists. Even its exact geographic location is not firmly established. While it is generally believed to have been situated in West Crete¹, some scholars place it at the western extremity of the island, while others theorize it was located somewhere between Aptera and Eleutherna², on the coast of Rethymnon at Σταυρωμένος Μυλοποτάμου³ or in the region of the ancient Pantomatrion⁴.

Moreover, it appears that Allaria was not one of the important city-states of the area. Before the second century B.C. West Crete was dominated by Polyrrhenia, Phalasarna, Aptera and Cydonia, but by the second century B.C. the latter, enriched by its commerce of the fourth and third centuries, had supplanted the influence of the other city-states⁵ and become one of the leading powers of the island, along with Cnossus and Gortyn⁶. Consequently, Allaria's historic record in Hellenistic Crete is hardly discernible. In fact, a letter from a Ptolemaic navarch dated c. 260 B.C.⁷ concerning relations between Allaria and Thera and the exchange of prisoners captured by Allarian pirates is the first mention of the city in the extant epigraphic sources which provide the bulk of our information on ancient Crete, especially in Hellenistic times.

Allaria, then, undertakes piratical ventures in the early third century B.C. when the Cretans, following the decline of Tyrrhenian piracy, became increasingly involved in this activity⁸. A few decades later in 217

1. R. F. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete* (London 1955) 148.

2. M. Guarducci, commentary on *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 1 p. 3.

3. Paul Faure, La Crète aux cent villes, in *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 13 (1959) 195.

4. E. Kirsten, s.v. Pantomatrion in *RE* XVIII, 3. For the topography of this area see the recent study of Stylianos Alexiou, Nouvelle identification de villes Crétoises, in Onofrio Carruba, ed., *Studia Mediterranea* I (Pavia 1979) 5-16.

5. H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe* (Paris 1968) 265; Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 149.

6. Strabo X, 476: πόλεις δ' εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ Κρήτῃ πλείους μὲν, μέγιστα δὲ καὶ ἐπιφανέσταται τρεῖς, Κνωσσὸς Γόρτυνα Κυδωνία.

7. *IG* XII, 3, 328=*SIG*², 921, 15f: συναπε[στέλαμεν πρέσβεις εἰς] τὴν Ἀλλάριαν. Also H. A. Ormerod, *Piracy in the Ancient World* (Liverpool - London, 1924) 131 and M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i., p. 1.

8. Ormerod, *Piracy*, 130 and n. 3; Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 244.

B.C. Κνωπίας of Allaria, an officer in the service of the Egyptian king Ptolemy IV Philopator commanded the three thousand Cretan mercenary force at Raphia¹. In the closing years of the third century B.C. Allaria and Teos in Asia Minor reached an agreement granting *asylia* rights² and in the early second century a treaty of *ἀσυλία* and *ἰσοπολιτεία* with Paros was negotiated³.

It has been proposed that Allaria adopted a pro-Ptolemaic policy⁴ since the Fourth Syrian War (221-217 B.C.). However, in the closing year of the War of 205-201 B.C. between Crete and Rhodes⁵ instigated by Philip V of Macedon, when many Cretan city-states deserted the Macedonian cause, Allaria, along with Axos, Sybrita, Lato, Istron and the Arcadians, remained pro-Macedonian⁶. Allaria was one of the signatory powers in the treaty of 183 B.C. between Eumenes II of Pergamon and thirty Cretan city-states which represented, most likely, the entire membership of the Cretan *Koinon*⁷. Besides a casual mention of some Allarians in a Magnesian inscription of the early second century⁸, nothing more is known of ancient Allaria. Yet, this meagre information, overlooked by Orlandos, reveals certain aspects of life in Allaria which, if carefully scrutinized and interpreted, lead us to the conclusion that this small Cretan city-state was not the benefactor of the Parians.

1. Polybius 5, 63, 12 and 65, 7; H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec*, 190 and 197 n. 1; M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, p. 1.

2. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 1.

3. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 2B.

4. H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec*, 255 n. 3. This is based primarily on Κνωπίας' participation at the battle of Raphia mentioned by Polybius (5, 63, 12 and 65, 7).

5. Polybius, 13, 4; M. Segre, «Κρητικός πόλεμος» *RF* 11, (1933) 365f.; M. Holleaux, *Études d'histoire hellénistique. Sur la «guerre crétoise»* (Κρητικός πόλεμος), *RÉG* 30 (1917) 88f; 33 (1920) 223f; R. Herzog, Κρητικός Πόλεμος, *Klio* 2 (1902) 316; M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941) 607; also *SIG*³, 567; 568; 569.

6. M. Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon* (New York, 1931) 66-7; M. Holleaux, *Études d'histoire hellénistique. Remarques sur les décrets des villes de Crète relatifs à l'ἀσυλία de Teos*, *Klio* 13 (1913) 137.

7. *SIG*³, 627. Willetts assumes that Eumenes' objective was to facilitate the recruitment of Cretan mercenaries on the island. See *Aristocratic Society*, 238; G. T. Griffith, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge 1935) 176. For the Cretan mercenaries of the Hellenistic Age see also S. Spyridakis, Cretans and Neocretans, *CJ* 72 (1977) 299f.

8. O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin, 1930) 21.

Allaria is definitely a city-state of secondary importance even in the narrow context of West Crete, an area which lies outside of the main currents of Cretan history in the center of the island, where Cnossus and Gortyn perennially contended for Cretan hegemony. This obscurity and relative anonymity alone make it difficult for us to accept the suggestion of Orlandos that Allaria was the destination of the Parian ambassador Timesiphon in Crete. The successive loans indicated in the Parian inscription, and the repeated negotiations of Timesiphon, imply that the Cretan succor was considerable¹. Thus, could Allaria alone have provided it? And if Allaria was the creditor, shouldn't its name, which was little known even in Crete, be mentioned in the Parian psephism? Besides, to accept the possibility that a remote, outside people such as the Parians identified Crete the *ἐκατόμπολις* with Allaria would be absurd.

Another interesting aspect of Allaria's history revealed in the sources is her involvement in piracy which, along with mercenary service overseas, constituted two of the island's plagues but also main industries in antiquity². Both were motivated by economic necessity resulting from overpopulation, endemic intercity-state rivalries and limited space and resources³.

1. See in Orlandos' edition of the inscription :

- v. 2: ὁ πρεσβεύσας εἰς
 3: Κρήτην τρίς περι τῆς τῶν δανείων ἀποδόσεως, ὧν ὀφείλεν ἡ πόλις
 v. 11: πρεσβεῖ
 12: [ας ἀναδεξάμενος ἐν τ]οῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς καὶ περι τῶν μεγίστων
 13: τῆ πόλει συμφερόντων
 v. 15: π[ρὸς αὐτοὺς πρεσβείας ἀδιαλείπτως etc.

2. For Cretan piracy see especially Ormerod, *Piracy*, 144 f; Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 241f; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 201f. Most scholars consider that geographical conditions were mainly responsible for the rise of piracy in Crete. M. Cary, however, rejects this view and explains: «geographic factors count for much in history, but personality is an even greater force». See *The Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History* (Oxford, 1949) 97f.

3. Unlike the rest of Greece and especially Sparta the citizen population of Crete remained stable or even increased in the Hellenistic Age. See Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 246; H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec*, 330 n. 1; J.D.S. Pendlebury, *The Archaeology of Crete* (London, 1939) 354. Yet, the highest figure for the free population of Crete of one million proposed by Marinatos is highly exaggerated. See S. Marinatos, Note sur la population du Dréros, *BCH* 60 (1936), 283f. and Van Effenterre's refutation in «A propos du Serment des Drériens», *BCH* 61 (1937), 331. Cf. also M. Guarducci, Intorno al giuramento dei Drerii, *Epigraphica* 1 (1939) 95 n. 3, and S. Spyridakis, «Aristotle on Cretan *πολυτεχνία*», *Historia* 28 (1979) 380f.

The specific mention of Allarians as representatives of Cretan piracy in 260 B.C. indicates that this small city-state was prominent in the Cretan piratical ventures of the third century B.C. Although Allarian pirates are not mentioned in other sources, Allaria remained on the Macedonian side at the end of the Cretan War against Rhodes (201 B.C.), when a group of Cretan cities headed by Cnossus and including Cydonia, Rhaukos and Polyrrhenia, had abandoned the Macedonian cause¹. This Cretan War against Rhodes, inspired by Philip V of Macedon who made use of the Cretan pirates to implement his Aegean schemes of naval supremacy, was characterized by raids of individual Cretan city-states² and although Allaria's involvement is not documented in the scanty records of the conflict, her persistent support of Macedonian policies against Rhodes suggests a continuous advocacy of piracy.

The undisputed involvement of Allaria in piracy is quite significant. For it is widely known that the Aegean islands were the main targets of Aetolian and Cretan raiders³ in the second half of the third century following the withdrawal of Egypt and the dissolution of the Island League, before Rhodes took effective counter-measures to curb piracy. Rhodes' diplomatic activities in Crete resulted in the signing of a treaty of symmachy with Hierapytna⁴, an important piratical state, and with Lato⁵, the military occupation of Olus⁶ and the re-establishment of friendly relations with Cnossus⁷. As a result of Rhodes' successful di-

1. Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon*, 66-7.

2. Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon*, 65. In fact, Hierapytna appears as the only active combatant in the extant sources, raiding as far as Calymnos and Cos, two islands in the Rhodian sphere of influence (*SIG*³, 567). Hierapytna's involvement in piracy is generally recognized. See e.g. Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 785.

3. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 245; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 222-3.

4. *Inscriptions Creticae* III, iii, 3A; for the date of this treaty see A. Cardinali, *RF* 35 (1907) n.9; M. Holleaux, *REG* 33 (12920) 235 n. 1, and *SIG*³, 581. Cf. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 237 and H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec*, 225-26.

5. *Inscriptiones Creticae*, I, xvi, 35.

6. Van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec*, 231; A. K. Orlandos, Νέον τεμάχιον τῆς συνθήκης Ὀλουσίων καὶ Ῥοδίων, *Κρητικὰ Χρονικά* 15-16 (1961-2) 230-240 and S. Spyridakis, «Rhodes and Olus», in S. M. Burstein and L. A. Okin, editors, *Panhellenica: Essays in Ancient History and Historiography in Honor of Truesdell S. Brown* (Lawrence Kansas, 1980) 119-128.

7. Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon*, 66-7; Cnossus had dispatched a force of 150 men to Rhodes to fight Demetrios Poliorcetes (305 B.C.) and the good relations between the two cities continued after the withdrawal of Philip V of Mace-

plomacy in Crete and the Aegean, piracy declined in the early second century B.C. and Crete was impoverished, as we may gather from the scarcity of Cretan coins for this period¹. Again, the possibility of extensive loans to Paros in these years of economic decline in Crete by a small piratical city-state, such as Allaria, is not likely. Even without this logical inference of the impoverishment of Allaria, along with the other Cretan city-states, in the early second century B.C., the remaining epigraphic evidence also points to poor economic conditions in the city. The service of *Κνωπίας* in the Ptolemaic army at Raphia and the presence of Allarians at Magnesia, in the early second century, may be interpreted as results of the economic ills of the city which seems to have contributed its share to the Cretan diaspora of the Hellenistic Age. For the Cretans, those superpatriots of antiquity², whose attachment to their native island was proverbial³, would not venture overseas as mercenaries or in self-imposed exile, unless forced by economic necessity.

All of our extant sources, however limited, point to the fact, then, that Allaria was in no position to play the role of creditor or benefactor in the Hellenistic World!

Interestingly enough, the pro-piratical policies of Allaria through the Cretan War and the opening years of the second century B.C., when

don from the island's politics. In the Rhodo-Hierapytnian treaty of 201-200 B.C. the Rhodians stated clearly that they will not ally themselves with Hierapytna in the latter's war with Cnossus. See *SIG*³, 581 v. 74f., and Diodorus 20, 88, 9.

1. Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 785.

2. The characterization was made by Montesquieu, who attributes to this patriotism the fact that the Cretans were the last of the Hellenic peoples to be conquered by the Romans (*Esprit des Lois*, IV, 6).

3. It is widely known that although multitudes of Cretans served abroad in the Hellenistic Age, few of them remained permanently in foreign lands, e.g. the *Κρηῆτες τῆς ἐπιγονῆς* in Egypt, the colonists of *Κρητόπολις* in Pisidia and a few others. See *SEG* XIX, 830 v. 10. In fact, the Cretans had shown little interest in colonizing ventures even in the epoch making years of Greek expansionism of the pre-classical period. With the exception of the joint Creto-Rhodian colonization of Lindii, on the «Gold Stream» of Gela at the end of the eighth century B.C. (Thucydides, 6, 4), Crete was not a participant in Greek colonialism. Tradition, however, indicates several instances of Cretan colonization from Tarrha in the Caucasus to Biannos in Gaul. These may be echoes of colonial undertakings in Minoan times and cannot be related to the Hellenistic Age. See *Πεπραγμένα τοῦ Β' Διεθνoῦς Κρητολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου* II (Athens 1968) 55-56 for these early Cretan «colonies». Civil strife, however, often led to exile in Hellenistic times.

Rhodian diplomacy and naval police action temporarily pacified the Aegean, may well explain the two Allarian treaties with Teos and Paros, whose exact chronologies are a matter of controversy but fall roughly into the closing years of the third and the very early part of the second century respectively. For in spite of endemic warfare and constant antagonisms in the Hellenistic Age a surprising abundance of testimony exists which indicates an increasing humanity in the code of war of the Greeks of this age¹. Conventions for the ransom of prisoners were commonly entered between various city-states and larger powers at this time and a considerable number of individual cities received guarantees of immunity from plunder by right of war or commercial reprisals (*ἀσφάλεια καὶ ἀσουλία*)². Crete was no exception to this rule. In fact, because of her attachment to mercenary activities and especially to piracy, which was viewed as a means of livelihood by the Cretans³, and often led to raiding expeditions which took the form of warfare⁴, many cities on the coast of Asia Minor and the Aegean islands sought protection through treaties with various Cretan city-states and even with the Cretan Federation or *Koinon*. A convention for the ransom of prisoners between Miletus and several Cretan city-states is well-known to historians⁵. Equally known and important is the Cretan *Koinon's* declaration of Anaphe and its territory as inviolable (*ἄσυλοι*)⁶.

Similarly, individual city-states in Crete often granted *ἀσουλία* and *ἰσοπολιτεία* rights to various island states in the Aegean as well. The

1. M. Cary, *A History of the Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C.* (London, 1951) 242-3. Cf. however, Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 201-2.

2. See W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford, 1913) 209-10 and Cary, *A History of the Greek World*, 242.

3. Piracy as a means of livelihood is discussed even by Aristotle (*Politics*, 1256): οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ θήρας ζῶσι, καὶ θήρας ἕτεροι ἐτέρας, οἷον οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ ληστείας.

4. See e.g. the Calymnian decree in honor of Lysander, the son of Phoenix, and Hierapytna's attack on the islands during the Cretan War against Rhodes in *SIG*³, 567.

5. *Inscriptiones Creticae* I, viii, 6; xxiii, 1 and 4, 161. See also A. Rehm, *Milet*, 3, 140. This Milesian inscription contains a treaty between Miletus and three groups of Cretan city-states headed by Cnossus, Gortyn and Phaestus regarding the liberation of prisoners captured by Cretan and Milesian pirates. Since Cnossus is allied with the largest number of Cretan city-states, it may well be the strongest power on the island at this time (260-240 B.C.). See Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 117 and n. 1 and especially Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon*, 59-60.

6. *IG* XII, 3, 254; *IC* IV, 194; Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW*, 199.

evidence is abundant and constantly increasing as excavations in Crete and the Aegean islands continue. As examples of these extensive contacts and of the growing body of new epigraphic records relating to them, we may cite the recently unearthed and edited inscriptions of a treaty of *ισοπολιτεία* between Phaestus and Tenos¹ and an alliance between Polyrrhenia and Melos².

Teos negotiated a treaty of friendship not only with Allaria (201 B.C.) but with various other Cretan city-states³ at the time of the Cretan War which involved Cretan raids on the islands and the coastal cities of Asia Minor by the pro-Macedonian Cretan powers, including Allaria. Thus, the motives of Teos in actively seeking extensive alliances with the Cretan city-states may not be hard to perceive. It is important to note that the treaty with Allaria was endorsed by Perdikkas, the envoy of King Philip V, who may well have expressed the official Macedonian policy of protecting Teos from the hostility of the Cretans. The specific provisions of the treaty, furthermore, make clear what were the main concerns of the Teians (*IC* II, i,1) v. 28:

ἐὰν τέ τινες ἄγωσιν Τηίως ἢ τὸς κατοικόν-
 τας παρ' αὐτοῖς, οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἄλλος ὁ βωλόμενος
 30 Ἀλλαριωτῶν ἢ Τηίων, ἀφελόμενοι καὶ ἀποδι-
 δόντες τοῖς ἀδικημένοις κύριοι ἔστων.

In the light of this *a priori* evidence and of the nature of most Cretan relations with the Aegean islands, the treaty between Paros and Allaria should be considered from a similar perspective. The inscription clearly refers to rights of *asylia* negotiated by Parian ambassadors in Allaria⁴ and is rightly dated by the leading epigraphers Hiller von Gärtingen⁵ and M. Guarducci⁶ before the year 197 B.C. when the Rhodian navy freed Cythnus and Paros from the Macedonians⁷. The treaty, the-

1. *SEG* XXV, 1006.

2. *SEG* XXV, 1030.

3. See *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 1, and *ibid.* I, v, 52 with Guarducci's commentary for the other Cretan city-states.

4. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 2B:

1. Ἀλλαριωτῶν οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἅ πῶλις Παρίων τᾶι βουλαῖ

2. καὶ τῶι δάμωι χαίρεμ. παραγενομένων τῶν πρεσβευ-

3. τᾶν ποτ' ἀμέ, Φάνός τε καὶ Δόρκω, οὓς ἀπεστείλατε

4. πρεσβεύοντας περὶ τῶσῶλω ποθ' ἀμέ... etc.

5. *IG* XII, 5, 1.

6. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, i, 2 (Commentary, p. 5).

7. B. Niese, *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeroneia* II, (Gotha 1893) 635 for the events of this period.

refore, was in effect during the years when the pro-Macedonian Cretan raiders would be expected to spare Paros, an island under Macedonian protection. This consideration would also explain the grant of *ἰσοπολιτεία* between Allaria and Paros, two island city-states in the Macedonian camp.

Orlandos dates the Parian psephism honoring Timesiphon after the year 194 and speculates that the reason for the Parian loan was provided by the *λοιμὸς* of 188 B.C.¹ which, according to a Tenian inscription, afflicted *ἅπαντας τοὺς νησιώτας* without naming the Parians, whom Orlandos rightly includes among the victims. Subsequently, Orlandos assumes that the treaty between Paros and Allaria was concluded c. 192 B.C., the Allarian loan(s) to Paros was given c. 188 B.C. and its repayment took place a few years later².

The chronologies proposed by Orlandos are definitely conjectural, but the effects of the plague of 188 may well be the reason for the Cretan loan to Paros. For it is a well-documented fact that the Hellenistic city-states displayed a surprising degree of compassion and social consciousness in dealing with catastrophic events afflicting their fellow Greeks in other areas. In spite of political considerations which often motivated Greek philanthropy, it is a fact that aid was given and suffering was often alleviated. The most notable example of this altruism was provided during the famine of 330-326 B.C. which had affected most of Greece³. This economic blight is attributed by Tarn to a failure of harvests⁴, but Westermann felt that «the problem was one of price inflation, bad distribution and profiteering» and not an actual shortage of grain⁵. Nevertheless, Cyrene supplied *σῖτος* (wheat)⁶ to various needy

1. *IG* XII, 5, 824.

2. Orlandos dates the Parian treaty with Allaria between 194 and 166 B.C., following O. Rubensohn's arguments in *RE* XVIII, 4 *s.v.* Paros. His subsequent chronology is based on this assumption. See *Δάνειον τῆς Πάρου ἐκ Κρήτης*, 203-5.

3. *SEG*, IC, 2; M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* II (Oxford, 1948), p. 273.

4. W. W. Tarn, *CAH* VI, 448f.

5. W. L. Westermann, New Historical Documents in Greek and Roman History, *American Historical Review* XXXV (1929), 17f.

6. It is widely believed that wheat was the main grain produced in Cyrene. Thus, *σῖτος* here denotes wheat and not any other cereals. This view is expressed by Wilamowitz and adopted by Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 273f., who cites A. Jardé, *Les céréales dans l'antiquité grecque* for the various meanings of *σῖτος*.

city-states of Greece, including Argos, Athens, Larissa, Megara, Rhodes, Tenos, Thera and several Cretan city-states, *i.e.* Cnossus, Gortyn, Cydonia, Hyrtakina and Elyros¹.

The general climate of good-will in the Hellenistic world was also expressed in the attempts of various city-states to mediate conflicts between third parties. Paros itself had acted in that capacity, when it dispatched to Mylasa a certain Akrisios, the son of Jason, to serve as *δικαστής*². It is for this reason that the Cretan loan to Paros in times of dire need should not surprise us. But the identification of the Cretan benefactor of Paros with Allaria is not justified by the extant evidence and the mere fact that a treaty between the two cities had been negotiated in the closing years of the Cretan War or shortly thereafter, when Macedon would naturally restrain her Cretan allies such as Allaria from attacking their Aegean possessions. The manifest poverty of Crete at the time of the Aegean *λοιμός*, furthermore, makes it difficult for us to believe that a small, impoverished piratical city-state such as Allaria could give successive loans to Paros (and perhaps to other Aegean islanders afflicted) and alleviate their plight. Moreover, if we accept Orlandos' date for the Cretan loan to Paros following the disastrous plague of 188, which seems quite logical, we have more reason to dismiss Allaria as the Cretan creditor of the Parians, when we consider the magnitude of their economic problem, Allaria's insignificance as a political and economic power and her traditional attachment to piracy.

All of the existing evidence points to the fact that a much wider Cretan participation in the loan is involved. For if we reject Allaria we must likewise reject the possibility that another Cretan city-state, Cretan individuals or temples came to the succor of the Parians.

Evidence of individuals lending money to cities also exists. Even the Cretans, whom the rabid Cretophobe Polybius had characterized as greedy and avaricious³, had often acted nobly and generously at ti-

1. For the Cretan recipients see *SEG IX*, 2, v. 27, 31, 33, 49, 54, 59. Cnossus received 10.900 medimni of wheat, Cydonia 10.000, Gortyn 10.000, Hyrtakina 5.000 and Elyros 3.000. There were a total of 51 consignments to 41 communities, individuals and tribes. Cnossus received two instalments of wheat: the first amounted to 10.000 medimni and the second was a mere 900 medimni.

2. *IG XII*, 5, 350; J. Martha, *Inscription métrique de Paros*, *BCH VI* (1882) 245-9; Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 207.

3. The anti-Cretan bias of Polybius may be understood when we consider that the Cretans had some dealings with the archenemies of his Achaean compatriots, the Aetolians (see *e.g.* *SIG*³, 535 and Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW*, 199), and with the despised

mes of need. The actions of Eumaridas of Cydonia, who not only became instrumental in the ransoming of Athenian slaves in Crete but also contributed a considerable sum of money for the transportation of those freed Athenians to their home city, are heart-warming even today. In the archonship of Heliodorus (229/8 B.C.) the Athenians, in fact, honored Eumaridas for his philanthropy¹:

πολλάς καὶ μεγάλας χρείας παρέσχετο
 τῶι δήμῳ καὶ προεισήνεγκε χρήματα
 ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων εἰς τὰ εἴκοσι τάλαντα
 τὰ συμφωνηθέντα ὑπὲρ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων
 ἐδάνεισε δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀλοῦσιν εἰς ἐφόδια.

Yet, the extant sources do not permit us to assume that Cretan individuals were involved in the Parian loan. Besides, the magnitude of the loan as implied in the psephism of Paros, argues against private contributions. More important perhaps is the consideration that individual creditors and benefactors delight as much in having their deeds recorded as in collecting the money owed them: philanthropists such as Eumaridas are invariably honored by the recipients of their favors and their names are immortalized in psephisms of gratitude.

Another possible source of the loan, however, should be sought

tyrant of Sparta Nabis (Polybios, 13, 8; Livy 34, 37; Ormerod, *Piracy*, 148). In spite of Polybius' comments there is plenty of evidence supporting the view that the Cretans were no different from their Greek kinsmen. The hospitality of the Cretans not only contrasted with the *ξενηλασία* of the Spartans, but constitutes a unique phenomenon in the history of the Hellenic peoples, as E. Caillemet noted. See his article «Cretensium Republica» in Daremberg-Saglio's, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*. Ephoros' account of the treatment of slaves in Cydonia (Ephoros *apud* Athenaios 6, 263f; *FGrH*, 70f 29 [Text]) and eulogies of Cretans, such as the following from Sparta:

Χαῖρε
 ('Ρ)ιανὲ Κ(ρ)ῆς 'Ολεῶν δ(ς) ἐν
 χαρίτεσσι τέ-
 λειος ὕμνεϊ-
 5 ται πᾶσιν,
 πᾶσι φίλος γαρ ἔφου

further refute the evil reputation Polybius attributes to the Cretans. The epigram of Rhianos is in A. Wilhelm, *Griechische Epigramme aus Kreta*, 72; also in *IG V*, 1, 725 and W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* I, 1397 p. 416.

1. *SIG³ IV*, 535. For similar services rendered to the Athenian people see an Athenian decree in honor of another Cydonian, Eurylochos, in *IG 111*, 395.

in the various Cretan temples. Paros, on another occasion¹, had borrowed from the temple of Delian Apollo and there is no good reason to doubt the possibility of a similar loan from the Cretan temples. The most famous of these were prosperous. The Temple of Zeus Dictaeus in the Eteocretan region of the island had public lands and a treasury². A first century B.C. document from the Temple of Dictynna in West Crete contains the remains of a record of its accounts which appear to be considerable³. Moreover, Philostratos has written that the wealth of the Dictynnaeum was guarded by dogs of unmatched ferocity—another indication of a rich treasury⁴. In Roman imperial times and especially during the reign of Hadrian the sacred money of the Temple of Dictynna was even used to finance public works⁵. A second century B.C. psephism of Lebena also refers to the money deposited in the treasury of the famous Temple of Asklepios Lebenaeus⁶.

The apparent prosperity of the leading Cretan temples is one of the reasons why the Cretan city-states often fought for their control. The Temple of Dictynna appears repeatedly in the territorial disputes between Cydonia and Polyrrhenia and its possessor is usually identified as the leading power in the western part of the island⁷. Similarly,

1. *IG XII*, 2, 1635 cited by Orlandos, *Δάνειον τῆς Πάρου ἐκ Κρήτης*, 203 and n.3.

2. *Inscriptiones Creticae* III, iv, 9 v. 81f.

3. *IC II*, xi, 3, v. 40f.

4. Philostratos, *Life of Apollonius*, 8, 30: Φυλακὴ δὲ τῶ ἱερῶ κυνῶν ἐπιτέτακται φρουροὶ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ πλούτου, καὶ ἀξιοῦσιν αὐτοὺς οἱ Κρηῖτες μήτε τῶν ἄρκτων μήτε τῶν ὄδ' ἀγρίων λείπεσθαι.

5. *Inscriptiones Creticae* I, xi, 6:

Imp. Caesar Divi
Tr]ajani Parth[ici] fil.
D]ivi Nervae ne[ros]
Tra]janus Hadrianus [Aug.
pont. max. trib. pot. --
cos. III p.p. proc.
pecunia sacra deae
Dictynnae fieri iu[ssit].

6. *Inscriptiones Creticae* I, xvii, 6 v. 11f:

καὶ τῶν ἀπο[τι-
θεμένων χρημάτων
ἐς τὸν θησαυρὸν...

7. The Temple of Dictynna was contested by Cydonia and Polyrrhenia. When Cydonia acquired the undisputed hegemony of West Crete in the second century, the Temple was again under its control. See Guarducci's comments, *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, p. 129 and R. F. Willetts, *Cretan Cults and Festivals* (London, 1962), 192.

in East Crete Praisos, Itanos and Hierapytna fought for the honor and financial profit of controlling the ancient Eteocretan Temple of Zeus Dictaeus¹. This dependence upon the dominant powers of their region deprived the Cretan temples of independent action and as a consequence any financial transactions on their part must be seen in the context of the foreign policies of the city-states that controlled them. Since the Temple of Dictynna was under Cydonian control in the second century B.C. we must seek Cydonian links with Paros at this time in order to suggest that the treasures of this temple were possibly used to relieve the Parians of their financial burdens. These are, unfortunately, non-existent. Similarly, it is futile even to theorize on the possibility of aid to Paros by other Cretan temples, such as that of the Eteocretan Zeus Dictaeus.

In addition to the treaty with Allaria, the Parian presence in other parts of Crete is also manifested in various epigraphic documents. Thus, we encounter a Parian, Μνησίθεος in Chersonesos², Parian ἀγαλματοποιοὶ in Arcades³, a Parian? man in Polyrrhenia where Parian marble is also mentioned⁴, another Parian artist, Ἀθήναιος Διονυσίου in Gortyn⁵ and finally in an inscription from Elyros we may have yet another reference to a Parian⁶. These inscriptions, however, date from the third to the first century B.C. and do not suggest a close Parian relationship with any of the leading Cretan city-states such as Cnossus, Gortyn or Cydonia in the early second century B.C., which could have possibly provided economic aid, through loans, to Paros. On the contrary, the Parian presence throughout the island, from Chersonesos in the east to Elyros in the west, is indicative of individual rather than official state contacts between the Parians and the Cretans.

Yet, a decree of proxenia from Aptera relating to a certain Parian, Polycles, the son of Amphichares, deserves closer attention:⁷

1. For the conflicts in the Eteocretan region of Crete involving the Temple of Zeus Dictaeus at Palaikastro see S. Spyridakis, *Ptolemaic Itanos and Hellenistic Crete* (Berkeley, 1970).

2. *Inscriptiones Creticae* I, vii, 3.

3. *Inscriptiones Creticae* I, v, 6.

4. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, xxiii, 31 and 20.

5. *Inscriptiones Creticae* IV, 343.

6. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, xiii, IB; Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 150.

7. *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, iii, 10A.

Ἔδοξε [τᾷ β]ωλᾷ καὶ τῷ δάμωι· Φείδων
 Ἀρχέτω εἶπε· ἐπειδὴ Πολυκλῆς
 Ἀμφιχάρη Πάριος εὐνόως διακείμενος
 ποθ' ἄλαν μὲν τὰν Κρήταν, μάλιστα δὲ πο-
 5 τὶ τὰν ἄμᾶν πόλιν, καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν καὶ κ[ατ'] ἰδίαν
 τ]οῖς ἐν[τυ]νχάνωσιν τῶν πολιτᾶν καθυπερξεν.
 -----] τω[.φι]λοτιμο [-----] δεδόχθαι
 τᾷ βω]λᾷ καὶ τῷ δ[άμωι-----s
].η καὶ ἤμεν πρόξενον-----etc.

The decree reveals another aspect of Parian relations with Crete which may well be the key to our understanding of the nature of the Cretan loan to Paros:

εὐνόως διακείμενος,
 ποθ' ἄλαν μὲν τὰν Κρήταν, μάλιστα δὲ πο-
 τὶ τὰν ἄμᾶν πόλιν....

The relations of a Parian citizen with Aptaera, which may be seen in the context of other Parian contacts with Cretan city-states such as Allaria and Chersonesos, are not as significant as the feelings of Polycles ποθ' ἄλαν μὲν τὰν Κρήταν which the document indicates. The astute epigrapher M. Guarducci rightly identifies in this passage a reference not to the island itself but to the Cretan *Koinon* or Federation,¹ and R.F. Willetts, the leading British Cretologist, concurs². Thus, we have at least some documented evidence of Parian attitudes towards the Cretan *Koinon*, although we cannot determine whether Polycles acted as an individual or as a Parian official. Yet, the εὐνοια of Polycles towards the Cretan *Koinon* encourages us to suspect that friendly, even warm relations between Paros and the Cretan Federation existed. This evidence, if taken into consideration, makes the problem of the Parian embassies of Timesiphon to Crete less puzzling. For if friendly relations between Paros and the Cretan *Koinon* in fact existed, as the decree of Aptaera tempts us to assume, then the wider Cretan effort to assist the Parians, could be attributed to it. The Cretan loan was given ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς during the plague of 188 B.C. and was repaid a few years later, as Orlandos reasons. Evidence exists that the Cretan

1. See M. Guarducci's commentary in *Inscriptiones Creticae* II, iii, 10A, p. 27f.

2. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 228 and n. 1.

Koinon functioned at that time and played some role in the wider politics of the Aegean world. The treaty of 183 B.C. between Eumenes of Pergamon and the member states of the Cretan *Koinon*, including Allaria, is an undisputed proof of this fact¹. Why, then, not consider the possibility that the Cretan *Koinon* is the creditor of Paros?

The decree of Aptaera, however, is important for other reasons as well. While scholars generally insist that only a few standard stylistic formulae and terms such as πάντες Κρηταιεῖς, κοινὸν τῶν Κρητῶν (Κρηταιέων) or something similar reveal the existence of the Cretan Federation in the sources², we have proof here that the simple use of the name Κρήτη as an entity, can be identified with it. Obviously, it is absurd to search for Polybian phraseologies in the local epigraphic documents of Crete and Paros. Indications of collective Cretan action should be the main criterion for identifying the Cretan *Koinon*. In fact, additional material supporting this contention is not lacking.

Among the numerous Delian inscriptions of the period following the Attic colonization of that sacred island which have been edited by P. Roussel in the third volume of the *Inscriptions de Délos*, we find a number of documents recording votive offerings given to Delian temples by donors from many parts of the ancient world. Inscription no. 1442 enumerates, among other gifts, προσώπια ἃ ἀνέθηκεν Κρήτη³. Roussel does not comment on this offering, in spite of the fact that the use of the name Κρήτη is peculiar. The donor Κρήτη cannot be a female individual, since Κρήτη is not normally used as a feminine name in antiquity. Besides, in cases of offerings by individual believers, the patronymic, husband's or master's name and (or) the city of origin of the donor are invariably given⁴. Thus, the masks of the Delian temple

1. *SIG³*, 627; Van der Mijsbrugghe, *The Cretan Koinon*, 27f.

2. M. Muttelsee and M. van der Mijsbrugghe compiled a list of eleven inscriptions dealing with the Cretan *Koinon* before the Roman conquest of the island and H. van Effenterre added two more. See Muttelsee's *Zur Verfassungsgeschichte Kretas im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Diss. Hamburg, 1925) 41-2; Van der Mijsbrugghe, *Cretan Koinon*, 14-15; H. van Effenterre, *La Crète et le monde grec*, 128-9. Willetts has accepted their conclusions and furnished his readers with a similar list, including the two documents added by Van Effenterre. See *Aristocratic Society*, 222-9. The Κρητῶν κοινὸν of the Roman period should be identified with the Cretan «Concilium provinciae» according to Van der Mijsbrugghe, *Cretan Koinon*, 16.

3. *Inscriptions de Délos* III, 1442A, v. 66. See also S. Spyridakis, A Delian Inscription and the Cretan *Koinon*, *Hermes* 98 (1970) 254f.

4. *E.g.*, *Inscriptions de Délos* I, 313C, v. 10: - σκάψιον? Νικάν[δρου] Ἰτι-θουμ[νίου ἀνάθημα] —, II, 423 v. 185; II, 442.

document must be a gift of the people of Crete, a fact difficult to comprehend when we consider the existence of nearly fifty independent city-states on the island in the second century B.C.¹ Κρήτη, then, in the Delian inscription may be understood only if it is associated with the Cretan Federation of States, known as the *Koinon*².

In view of these facts, Timesiphon's missions εἰς Κρήτην may be interpreted as embassies to the Assembly of the *Koinon* and its Council, which consisted of delegates from the member states (σύεδροι)³. It should be noted that although the *Koinon* was often dominated by a leading Cretan power such as Cnossus or Gortyn, it was never identified with a specific city-state. In fact, it had no federal capital and met in various places on the island⁴. Thus, if Κρήτη in the Parian psephism represents the Cretan *Koinon*, we can understand why not a single Cretan city-state is named as the creditor of the Parians in their hour of economic peril.

The inscription of Delos sheds light on other aspects of the *Koinon* as well. The document reveals the fact that, in addition to granting rights

1. See the list of the Cretan city-states in M. Guarducci's *Inscriptiones Creticae* 4 vols. (Rome 1935-40). Their coins are collected in N. Svoronos' *Numismatique de la Crète ancienne* (Macon 1890). See also George Le Rider, *Monnaies crétoises de V^e au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.* (Paris, 1966).

2. The origin of the *Koinon* should be traced to the traditional συγκρητισμός of the Cretans, according to Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon*, 57. He bases this assumption mostly on Plutarch, *De frat. am.* (490) 19B: μιμούμενον αὐτὸ γοῦν τοῦτο τὸ Κρητῶν, οἱ πολλάκις στασιάζοντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ πολεμοῦντες, ἐξωθεν ἐπιόντων πολεμίων διελύοντο καὶ συνίσταντο· καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν ὁ καλούμενος ὑπ' αὐτῶν συγκρητισμός. Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 227 adopts the same view. The date of its establishment, however, is controversial. Two historic events are accepted by most scholars as indicators of its beginning: the unified action of Gortyn and Cnossus in 221 B.C., which brought about the subjugation of the entire island except Lyttos (Polybius, 4, 53, 4) and the year 217/6 B.C., when Crete was again unified under the προστασία of Philip V of Macedon (Polybius, 7, 2, 9). The first date is accepted among others by Van der Mijnsbrugge, *The Cretan Koinon*, 58 and the second by Guarducci (*RF* 66 (1938) 54, n. 4 and *Inscriptiones Creticae* I, p. 49). Van Effenterre, however, cites the Athenian decree in honor of Eumaridas of Cydonia, which is dated c. 229/8 by Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London, 1911) 209, and concludes: «la fondation du koinon peut en somme être rapportée au troisième quart du III^e siècle» (*La Crète et le monde grec*, 137).

3. A clear reference to these is seen in *Inscriptiones Creticae* IV, 197 = *IG* XII, 3, 254: «Ἐδοξ[ε] τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ τῶ[ι κοινῶ]ι τῶν Κρηταιέων (decree of the Synedroi and Assembly of the Cretans concerning the ἀσυλία of Anaphe in the second century B.C.).

4. See Willetts, *Aristocratic Society*, 228. He adopts the conclusions drawn by Van der Mijnsbrugge in *Cretan Koinon*.

of *asylia* and honors to foreigners, the loose Cretan Federation had also jurisdiction over religious matters. In fact, the Cretan gifts to Isis in Delos imply that a federal treasury existed, since the offerings must have been drawn from a common fund rather than the resources of a particular state. Or, at least, the *Koinon* could solicit funds from its member states in order to meet religious or other obligations. This in turn presupposes the service of federal Cretan magistrates who administered the funds of the *Koinon*, in spite of the fact that students of Cretan federalism have not been able to ascertain the presence of Cretan federal officials¹ other than the delegates from the member states, the *σύνεδροι*.

The existence of a Cretan federal fund, then, may be based on epigraphic evidence and should be considered as the most likely source of the Cretan loans to Paros. In addition to providing some suggestions for a more centralized and better organized Cretan Federation with a wider involvement in foreign affairs, especially in the Aegean, this interpretation offers a partially satisfying solution of the puzzle of the Cretan loans to Paros which is supported, or at least is not contradicted, by the meagre extant sources. Unfortunately, in dealing with the early history of Crete, we still have to invoke the old confession of Appian (Ill. 6): «I acknowledged, when writing about Crete, that I had not found what were the exact causes and pretexts of the wars, and invited those who could tell more to do so. I shall write down only what I myself learnt».

STYLIANOS V. SPYRIDAKIS

1. The decrees of the *Koinon* were issued by the *σύνεδροι* in conjunction with the Assembly and were dated by reference to the *πρωτόκοσμοι* of the leading states of Cnossus and Gortyn. See e.g. *Inscriptiones Creticae* IV, 197 (*ἀσυλία* of Anaphe decree):

Ἔδοξε τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ τῶ[ι
 κοινῶ]ι τῶν Κρηταίων, Κνω-
 σοῖ ἐν τῶι συνλόγῳ, κορμι-
 ὄντων ἐν Γόρτυνι μὲν ἐ-
 5 πὶ τῶ]ν Δυμάνων τῶν σὺν
]ίῳι τῶι Ἀλλοδάμῳ
 ὅκα τ]ὸ δευτερον, μῆδος
 Καρ]νήῳ τετράδι, Κνωσο[ῖ
 δὲ ἐ]πὶ τῶν Αἰθαλέων κο[ρ-
 10 μίοντ]ων τῶν σὺν Κυψέλω[ι
 τῶι]ρέτω, μῆδος Ἀγυή[ι-
 ῶ τετράδι· ἄσυλον ἤμεν [Ἀ-
 ναφαίῳ]ν τὰν πόλιν κα[ι
 τὰν χῶρ]αν etc.