
PART I

THE BACKGROUND IN THE MIDDLE EAST

CHAPTER I

THE SELEUCID SETTLEMENT

THE Seleucids, whatever from time to time they held or did not hold in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, were Alexander's heirs in Asia. He had not greatly modified the Persian empire which he had conquered: he might separate the three powers in the satrapies—civil, military, and financial—but they remained the huge Persian satrapies, though they might be governed by men of a different nationality. The Seleucid empire in its turn was still, in outward shape, very much the empire of Persia under different rulers; the great satrapies still remained, their military nature emphasised by the governor of a satrapy being no longer called satrap but *strategos*, 'general'. But something was done to tighten up the reins of satrapal government, for in all the lands east of the Euphrates the Seleucids had a more complete system of internal subdivision; it was a threefold division¹—satrapy, eparchy, hyparchy—corresponding roughly to the threefold division in Ptolemaic Egypt of nome, topos, village, the nome, like the satrapy, being under a *strategos* or general. This threefold administrative division in each of the two empires must, one supposes, have had a common origin, but what it was is unknown. As the smallest administrative unit was in Egypt the village and in the Seleucid East the hyparchy—a district which would comprise a number

Note. There is a good modern account of the Seleucid empire by M. Rostovtzeff in *CAH* VII Ch. v (1928), but the subject has now to be studied in special works; the excavations at Doura, Susa, and Seleuceia are important. The relevant bibliographies in *CAH* VII and VIII cover much of the ground. In this introductory sketch I am not always putting notes to well-known matters where touched on.

¹ For all that follows about the eparchies see Tarn, *SP Stud.* §iv. Cf. M. Rostovtzeff in *Yale Class. Stud.* II p. 48 n. 1.

of villages—the organisation of the Seleucid East was of necessity much looser than that of Egypt; the hyparchy, however, for purposes of land registration, was again subdivided into fortified posts called *stathmoi*¹—originally post stations on the main roads, the Seleucids having taken over the Persian postal system—each *stathmos* being the centre of a subdivision comprising so many villages.

The important thing in the Seleucid administrative division was the eparchy, of which each satrapy included a certain number; Appian's 72 Seleucid satrapies mean eparchies, for he is using the terminology of a later day, though it does not follow that the number 72 is correct. So far as is known at present, the eparchy was a Seleucid innovation. It *may* have been Achaemenid, for *a priori* the common source of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid subdivision should have been Persian, but the actual evidence is very dubious,² and the Alexander-historians know nothing about eparchies; they do very occasionally use an eparchy name, but that again is probably only the common case of late writers using the accustomed nomenclature of a later day. When the Seleucid empire broke up, it was the eparchy, not the satrapy, which survived; the Seleucid administration was imitated over a large part of Asia, and it was imitated on the basis of the eparchy. In the Seleucid Succession states, like Bactria, Parthia, Elymais, the eparchies became the satrapies, *i.e.* the primary administrative divisions, of the new kingdoms, while states which were not properly Succession states but were copying Seleucid (or, what comes to the same thing, Parthian) organisation gave their satrapies eparchy names; so universal was the practice that it was followed even by little states like Adiabene and Characene, which had themselves only been Seleucid eparchies. One reason for the emergence by the first century B.C. of the eparchy as the general unit of the organisation of a new Asia was that it had often been a natural division,

¹ The evidence for the *stathmoi* is from the Parthian period, notably Isidore and *Avroman* Pg. 1 (E. H. Minns, *JHS* xxxv, 1915, p. 22); but Strabo xv, 723 (see p. 55 n. 1) may show that they were Seleucid.

² Tarn, *SP Stud.* p. 32; add that in Darius' Behistun inscription, 38–9, Margus, *i.e.* Margiane, is under the satrap of Bactria. The question of subordinate governors of provinces under Persian satraps has since been discussed by O. Leuze, *Die Satrapienteilung in Syrien* 1935 pp. 163–5, for Syria and Babylonia, who decides that no conclusion is possible. It has, however, been suggested to me that the -ηνη termination in the East might have some connection with the Assyrian -anu; should that ever be substantiated, the connection could only be *via* Persia. The existence of old Greek city-names in -ηνη would not affect the (possible) adoption of the form in the East under other influences and for other purposes.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00941-6 - The Greeks in Bactria and India

William Woodthorpe Tarn

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE SELEUCID SETTLEMENT

3

dictated by the lie of the ground, while the great satrapies were not; examples are the Bactrian satrapy, which had included northern Sogdiana and Merv, countries not geographically connected with Bactria, and the varying arrangements for the government of the hill land and the plain land which had both been included in the Persian satrapy of Arachosia (App. 9). The eparchies naturally varied greatly in size, as do English and Scotch counties, and it is possible that the eparchies of a satrapy did not always account for the whole of its geographical content; Ptolemy, who is careful over eparchy names, gives tribes in some satrapies as well as eparchies, and though one cannot press this, seeing that he so often mixes up items from different periods, still we do hear of unconquered hill peoples, like the Elymaeans of Susis, and the great satrapies may have included territory which was informally a sort of native reserve, the general of the satrapy being responsible for keeping the hill tribes in check. This may be why the Seleucid *strategos* retained his military status while his Ptolemaic counterpart became a civil official.

The great satrapies almost always bore names ending in *-ia*, Persis being the only exception, unless Susis be reckoned; the eparchies most often bore names ending in *-ηνη* or, after iota, *-ανη* (*-ιανη*). Two other forms do also occur among the primary administrative divisions of the Succession states, names (very occasionally) in *ια* and some in *-ιτις*, which may be old eparchy forms; a third form in *-υαια* is merely a variant of *-ηνη* when preceded by upsilon, the two being used indiscriminately, as Parthyaia—Parthyene, Gordyaia—Gordyene.¹ The eparchy names had many sources; they might be taken from a city name, as Gabiene, Rhagiane; from a tribal name, as Paraitakene; or from some district name whose origin is lost, as Margiane from Margus (these are probably the majority); in Armenia some fanciful names are found, like Xerxene, Cambysene. And though other forms might sometimes occur, it was the *-ηνη* (or *-ιανη*) form which was the typical one and which spread all over Asia; and it is this form which has enabled the identification of a number of the Greek satrapies in India (Chap. vi). To make that identification valid, it is of course not

¹ Parthyaia and Parthyene indiscriminately in Strabo and Josephus. Gordyene always in Plutarch; both forms in Strabo, but usually Gordyaia. So even in personal names: the astronomer Naburiannu is *Ναβουριανός* in Strabo xvi, 739, but *Ναβουριων* (acc.) in a Babylonian text written in Greek: W. S. Schileico, *Arch. f. Orientforschung* v, 1928, p. 11.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00941-6 - The Greeks in Bactria and India

William Woodthorpe Tarn

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4

THE SELEUCID SETTLEMENT

enough to show that the majority of eparchies had names in *-ηνη* or *-ιανη*; it must also be shown that these names, in Greek writers, regularly meant either Seleucid eparchies or the primary administrative divisions of a Seleucid Succession state or of a state copying the Seleucid organisation; this is done in Appendix 2, the one or two exceptions being negligible among the mass of names extant; in fact, looking at the Greek dislike of technical terms, the result is rather notable. It must be emphasised that in speaking of the eparchy organisation I am speaking only of the lands east of the Euphrates (see on this App. 2), though the countries between the Euphrates and the Halys copied it.

The Seleucid empire was nothing organic, in the sense that the Roman state, up to a point, was organic. The latter resembled a vertebrate animal; it expanded outwards from a solid core, the city of Rome. The Seleucid empire resembled rather a crustacean, not growing from any solid core but encased in an outer shell; the empire was a framework which covered a multitude of peoples and languages and cities. What there really was to the empire, officially, was a king, an army, and a bureaucracy—the governing and taxing officials in the several satrapies. It had no imperial citizenship, as the Roman empire had; it hardly even had a unified state worship, for each satrapy had its own cult of the deified kings. Even before the final dissolution, any satrapy could easily set up for itself, as Bactria did for good and Media spasmodically, without endangering the life of the rest; and in the general break-up even eparchies, like Osrhoene, Adiabene, Mesene, easily became little kingdoms, because the governor of an eparchy, just as much as the governor of a satrapy, had an organisation ready to his hand, even to a *basileion* or palace residence,¹ while the Greek cities or settlements in his territory were only separate units and not parts of a whole. What actually held the empire together was the personality of the quasi-divine monarch, for the army was his and the officials were in his hand; how this might work out will be seen when we come to Antiochus Epiphanes. It had one advantage; the king—commander-in-chief, head of every service, the fount of law—stood high above the clash of nationalities or creeds; he could hold the balance level, for he had the power, and in particular he could if he chose hold it level

¹ *Βασιλειον* of Gabiene at Gabae, Strabo xv, 728; of Parthyene at Susia-Tōs, Artemidorus in Steph. s.v. *Υαία*; of Hyrcania (the Parthian not the Seleucid province) at Tambrax, Polyb. x, 31. These may suffice.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00941-6 - The Greeks in Bactria and India

William Woodthorpe Tarn

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE SELEUCID SETTLEMENT

5

between the Greek and the Asiatic. But it was not precisely of a level balance that the Seleucid kings were thinking.

Such was the theoretical outline of the monarchy; and it was very well understood by the two capable men, Seleucus and his son the first Antiochus, who made of the empire what it was to be. They knew the weakness of their position over against their vast and strange inheritance, and set to work to remedy it in their own way, by filling Asia with Greek settlements. I see no reason to believe that they had any deliberate intention of hellenising Asia; their object was not to spread Greek culture or turn Asiatics into Greeks, but to make of their unwieldy empire a strong state. Certainly they were hard-working, conscientious men who meant to govern as well as they could according to their lights; but their lights were the commonplace Greek lights of Plato and Aristotle—the barbarian was a person who was to be kept in his place and ruled by Greeks, though the Seleucid kings added *well* ruled. Alexander had gone far beyond that, and we shall hear something later about his ideas and their consequences, but to Seleucus a strong state meant the support of his own people: on them the state must be founded. The Seleucids did get the support of their own people; the dynasty was popular, and the abiding loyalty of the Graeco-Macedonian settlers to the person of the reigning Seleucid became notorious (Chap. v).

The Greek settlement of Asia was one of the most amazing works which the ancient world ever saw, for it was not the natural result of an overspill of population, as had been the early Greek colonisation of the shores of the Mediterranean; it was undertaken deliberately, and though there *was* an overspill it was the kings who used and directed it. The Seleucid idea was to give to the framework of their empire substance and strength by filling it out with Greeks; Greeks were to supply its lack of living tissue. Indeed it is conceivable that the early kings dreamt of a day when the empire should no longer be a framework at all but should have become a complex of contiguous and quasi-autonomous city states, the whole under a quasi-divine king who managed policy and saw to security. This is the period we want to know about, the period from 312 to 262 B.C. when Seleucus and his son were settling Asia; and we hardly know anything. Some light has been thrown upon the Middle East in recent years by excavations, but the light has all fallen upon later times, usually the Parthian period; the first half of the third century is still almost a blank, and we have to deduce what happened as best we can.

The basis of the Seleucid settlement was the military colony and not the Greek city, the *polis*.¹ The first two kings did not, as one used to be told, fill Asia with Greek cities directly; it was largely done indirectly. This was what enabled it to be done at all, for only the king could found a *polis*, and there is a limit to the work one man can do, especially under a system where delegation of power is imperfectly understood. Greek tradition remembered that Seleucus was a hard worker;² but even the foundation of a single *polis* meant for the king hard work.³ He had to find land for the city, build the wall, supply food, seed-corn, cattle and tools to give the people a start, remit taxation until the city had found its feet, and decide personally innumerable housing, economic and social questions; give a constitution and get political life started; and settle the city law. As to the last, he probably ordered the adoption of some well-known Greek city code, with any modifications required to suit local circumstances; but doubtless a city colonised for the king by some old Greek city, as it kept the gods of its mother-city,⁴ kept its code also. For while the king also had to find settlers, we should undoubtedly see, if we had the complete story, that in this he was greatly helped by the old Greek cities of Ionia. What is known is that Magnesia on the Maeander colonised Antioch towards Pisidia⁵ and Antioch in Persis⁶ for the Seleucids, that Miletus when under the rule of Ptolemy II colonised for him Ampelone in Arabia,⁷ and that the Greek populations of Susa and Uruk-Orchoi must have come from Ephesus, for the city-goddess of Susa, Artemis-Nanaia (p. 29), annexed the bee of Artemis of Ephesus for her own symbol, as did Artemis-Ishtar at Uruk.⁸

The military colony⁹ goes back to Alexander. Traditionally he founded 70 'cities'; but comparatively few can be identified, and the

¹ It was the great merit of Tschirikower's book (pp. 121 *sqq.*) to bring this out, though he hardly went far enough. No reliance of course can be placed on the use of the word *polis* in many writers. Isidore (the Parthian survey) is always accurate, and Strabo usually so; I would not care to commit myself further.

² Plut. *Mor.* 790 A. Somewhat similar sentiments were attributed, doubtless with truth, to Gonatas (Stob. *Flor.* 7, 20; 49, 20) and Doson (Justin xxviii, 3, 13).

³ Ditt.³ 344 gives the best idea of the work which fell on a king. See also Holleaux, *BCH* XLVIII, 1924, p. 1 on *SEG* II, 663; Rostovtzeff, *CAH* VII pp. 178 *sqq.*; *Sardis* VII, i, no. 2 (1932).

⁵ Strabo XII, 577.

⁷ Tarn, *JEA* xv, 1929, p. 21 on Pliny VI, 159.

⁸ On the bee see Allotte de la Fuye, *MDP* xxv, 1934, pp. 9 *sq.*

⁹ Oertel, *Katoikoi* in *PW*; Tschirikower *loc. cit.*; Rostovtzeff, *CAH* VII p. 180; and the excellent account in Griffith pp. 147 *sqq.*

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00941-6 - The Greeks in Bactria and India
 William Woodthorpe Tarn

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE SELEUCID SETTLEMENT

7

number, right or wrong, includes his military colonies; the same is true of many of the 'cities' attributed to Seleucus.¹ The first Antigonos continued Alexander's system, as did the early Seleucids, and it is only rarely that we know under which king any particular colony was founded. The places called Alexandropolis, for example, must be military colonies which claimed to go back to Alexander;² Doura and Orrhoë are recorded to have been founded under Antigonos I;³ but the majority probably belonged to the Seleucid settlement. A military colony was settled either with time-expired troops, sometimes mercenaries, or with men able and willing to serve; normally, though by no means always, it was located at or beside a native village, and was usually, it seems, perhaps always, founded by the provincial governor on the king's order, as some of the names show (p. 11); the king had to provide the land and money required, but he could and did delegate the actual work to a subordinate, whereas a subordinate could not found a *polis*. Each settler received a *cleros*, an allotment of land which carried with it the obligation to serve in the army when called upon; hence the name cleruch, one who had a *cleros*, the regular name in the Hellenistic period for a settler in a military colony.⁴ The succession law of Doura⁵ shows that the allotments there were at the start grouped

¹ App. *Syr.* 57.

² No evidence; but Alexander could not, without reason, have altered his regular name (Alexandria) in just two or three cases.

³ Doura (Isidore 1) was founded by Nicanor, who was the well-known general of the upper satrapies under Antigonos I (Tarn, *CAH* VI p. 430, and independently Tscherikower p. 88), though most writers still persist in calling him an official of Seleucus, no such Nicanor being known. The same Nicanor (Pliny VI, 117) founded Orrhoë, later Antioch-Edessa called Arabis (*ib.*); this Antioch Arabis is not Nisibis, as Tscherikower thought p. 89, for Pliny had previously given Nisibis (VI, 42), and the Orrhoei (*v.l.* Orroei and see VI, 129) extended to Orrhoë. There is no Greek authority for the name Ὀρρόη, but it follows from the Syriac form Ōrhāi, which ultimately came back and on which see A. R. Bellinger and C. B. Welles, *Yale Class. Stud.* v, 1935, p. 96 n. 8.

⁴ The Hellenistic use of *cleros* is to be distinguished from the classical use (Lenschau, κλήροι in PW), in which *cleros* refers to the division of the city land of a new city among the citizens and has nothing to do with military service. This *may* have still obtained in those new Hellenistic cities which were founded directly as *poleis*, if the Emperor Julian's reference to 10,000 κλήροι at Antioch on the Orontes, cited by Cumont, *JRS* xxiv, 1934, p. 188, be not a piece of archaism.

⁵ B. Haussoullier, *Rev. hist. du droit français et étranger* 1923 p. 515; P. Koschaker, *Sav. Z.* XLVI, 1926, p. 297 (belongs to the first days of the colony before families were well established); D. Pappulias, Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν 28 Nov. 1929, given by L. Wenger, *Arch. f. Pap.* x, 1932, p. 131.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00941-6 - The Greeks in Bactria and India

William Woodthorpe Tarn

Excerpt

[More information](#)

together into larger units; it cannot be said whether this system was general or not, but the name given in that law to these larger units, *hekas*,¹ has not occurred elsewhere. The reason for this arrangement is unknown, but it had nothing to do with the one-time system of land-ownership by the *genos* (the clan, or family in the widest sense), for at first the *genos* did not exist at Doura;² it might conceivably point to some system of collective farming under a head man. The same law shows that from the beginning the *cleros* could, on failure of the male line, pass to and be held by a woman; doubtless in that case she had to provide a man for the army. This elasticity in the law of inheritance, and the *hekas* (if it existed at other places), differentiated the Seleucid *cleros* in the third century B.C. from the better-known Ptolemaic *cleros*, and may have been one reason, though not the principal one, why the cleruch system was so much more successful in Asia than in Egypt.³

The purpose of the military colony was primarily defence; there was a chain of seven across Asia Minor to prevent the Galatians attacking Ionia;⁴ those in Bactria-Sogdiana, started by Alexander, were to safeguard the frontier against the nomads (Chap. III); those in Media were to bridle the hill tribes;⁵ but those in normally quiet districts like northern Syria served the double purpose of settling Macedonians and Greeks in Asia and constituting an army reserve. Naturally they were walled. At some places in Asia Minor, and presumably everywhere, the military colony called itself a *koinon*,⁶ that useful word which did duty for almost any form of association from a League to a dining club; a village in old Greece might also call itself a *koinon*,⁷ and by analogy a military colony might be referred to as a village.⁸ The elected officials therefore of a military colony, like those of any private *koinon*, must have tended to copy city officials so far as might be, and it had some

¹ A *hekas* is also mentioned in *Doura Pg.* 1; Fr. Cumont, *Fouilles* pp. 287 sqq.

² This follows from Koschaker *op. cit.* p. 300; see further p. 37.

³ See Griffith pp. 162–3 on the fact and the reason.

⁴ Names in Tarn, *Hell. Civ.*² p. 134.

⁵ Polyb. x, 27, 3.

⁶ *BCH* 1887 p. 466 n. 32, [Οἱ π]ερὶ Θυάτειρ[α Μ]ακέδονες; *OGIS* 290, [Οἱ περὶ Νά]κρασον Μακέδονες; οἱ περὶ is a usual expression indicating a *koinon*. L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure* 1935 p. 75, would restore *Α]κρασον for Νά]κρασον in *OGIS* 290, but this does not affect it as evidence for a *koinon*. For examples of a *katoikia* being called a *koinon* see Oertel, *Katoikoi* in *PW* col. 10.

⁷ *SEG* III, 12.

⁸ Steph. *s.v.* Σύνναδα: Docimeum a κώμη. Many instances in Oertel, *Katoikoi* in *PW* col. 8.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-00941-6 - The Greeks in Bactria and India
 William Woodthorpe Tarn
 Excerpt
[More information](#)

THE SELEUCID SETTLEMENT

9

power of managing its internal affairs. It was a planned foundation and had something which may be called a written charter;¹ perhaps a stereotyped form existed. In the Mediterranean countries the great majority, if not all, of the settlers were no doubt Greeks or Macedonians, but east of the Euphrates this element tended to become thinner. There were cases in which Greeks, if there were any at all, can only have been a small minority, as at Avroman in Kurdistan, where the settlers named in the parchments are all Asiatics;² Mysia in the Parthian satrapy³ and Pterion in Media⁴ must have been primarily settled with Anatolian mercenaries, Mysians and Cappadocians of Pteria; Thracian colonies are recorded east of the Tigris,⁵ and we shall meet a colony of Pisidian mercenaries in India (p. 250); but probably Greek was always the *official* language, as it still was in the first century B.C. at Avroman.

The aim of every military colony was to become a full *polis*, which in the East meant a city, not necessarily of Greek nationality, but of Greek organisation and civic forms; there was a steady upward growth of the colony into the *polis*, and it was this which before the end of the second century B.C. had filled Asia with 'Greek' cities. It is difficult to define the minimum distinction between a military colony and a *polis*; the real matter was the greater autonomy of the latter. The wall was there in any case. It may I think be taken that, to constitute a place a *polis*, there would have to be, at the least, a Council, an Assembly, a division of the Greek population into tribes with consequent rotation of prytanies⁶ and the other phenomena of that division, an elected magistracy, and almost certainly a gymnasium (p. 17). How the change-over from military colony to *polis* took place is not known.⁷ There were cases where the king of set purpose enlarged some colony and formally made it a *polis*, but usually the settlement itself must have outgrown the *koinon* form and petitioned for the change: mere permission from the king probably sufficed, but was certainly needed (p. 31).

¹ *Avroman Pg. 1, ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ συγγραφῇ*; see E. H. Minns, *JHS* xxxv, 1915, p. 52; L. Mitteis, *Sav. Z.* xxxvi, 1915, p. 428.

² Minns *op. cit.* p. 45.

³ Ptol. vi, 5, 3.

⁴ Steph. *s.v.*

⁵ Diod. xix, 27, 5.

⁶ Common in Asia Minor. An identifiable case, from its name (p. 11), of a military colony which became a *polis* with prytanies is Themisionium, Michel 544.

⁷ On the very peculiar case of the colony at Magnesia-under-Sipylos, *OGIS* 229, see now Griffith pp. 154 sq. In the Roman period a place might be allowed to call itself a city as a favour; I know of no evidence that this is Hellenistic.

In Asia Minor there are supposed also to have been some Greek civil colonies;¹ there is not the material for detecting such forms in the East, and their existence there is not very probable. But civil colonies of another people are heard of. Where the Greek went the Phoenician trader followed, as he had followed Alexander to India: two important cities, Seleuceia and Antioch-Merv (p. 15), contained large bodies of 'Syrians', and their presence can be deduced at Susa (p. 29); doubtless there were 'Syrians' in every city important for commerce. But, quite apart from their presence in Greek cities, foundations of their own are recorded. Eddana on the Euphrates, south of Doura, is mentioned as a Phoenician colony;² another is given in Arabia;³ and they founded a Tyre, probably a small one, in India itself.⁴ There are names too which imply civil colonies of other Asiatic peoples, doubtless founded as trade settlements; such are Nisibis in Aria,⁵ which must have been settled from Antioch-Nisibis in Mesopotamia, and Elymaide (if the record can be trusted) in India,⁶ a colony from Elymais. As these two colonies took the native and not the Greek names of their places of origin, it is not likely that they were military colonies, though it is not impossible.

The military colony at first had no name but that of the native village where it was founded, and many kept their native names throughout, even when they became *poleis*, as for example Nacrassa, where this is proved by inscriptions;⁷ this was the case with the *poleis* with native names given by Isidore in eastern Iran. But if most of the settlers came from one place they often renamed the colony themselves after their mother-city; the numerous colonies or cities in northern Syria and elsewhere with Greek or Macedonian place-names had all named themselves.⁸ Every Greek or Macedonian place-name in Asia implies a

¹ Oertel, *Katoikoi* in PW cols. 7–8. The evidence is from Roman times, but some were presumably Hellenistic.

² Steph. s.v.

³ Ptol. vi, 7, 3, Φοινίκων κώμη.

⁴ Steph. s.v. Τύρος. Unfortunately no source is given, but it can hardly be a made-up name from Dionysius' *Bassarica*, for it does not occur in Nonnus; and Nonnus has so much to say about Tyre itself that had he found an Indian Tyre in the *Bassarica*, his regular source, he was almost bound to mention it.

⁵ Ptol. vi, 17, 7.

⁶ Peutinger Table (K. Miller, *Itineraria Romana* 1916 p. 787).

⁷ Before becoming a *polis*, *OGIS* 290 (see however p. 8, n. 6); after, *ib.* 268, which is Attalus II, not I, see Griffith p. 151 n. 4.

⁸ Tscherikower pp. 123 sqq.; to me conclusive. It must have been universal.