

Teos. Granting of land to the artists of Dionysos

Description: Blue marble stele (h: 0.22 m w: 0.46 m); broken on upper side, on the right and on the left

Layout: the writing is left to right

Letters: Ionic letters

Origin: Teos, temple of Dionysos

Dating: late 3rd century - early 2nd century BC

Findspot: a Turkish cemetery near Sivrihissar (western Turkey)

Current location: Sivrihissar, archeological museum (?)

Reference edition: Demangel, Laumonier 1922, 312-319 (ed. pr.); ll. 2-3 according to Robert, *Ét.anat.*, 39-44

Other editions: SEG 2 580; H.W. Pleket, *Epigraphica* 37; Pickard-Cambridge 1968², 314; Bringmann, von Steuben 1995, no. 262; B. Le Guen, *Technites* 39; S. Aneziri, *Techniten* D2; Meier 2012, no. 51 (ll. 5-18)

Photographs: Demangel, Laumonier 1922 (squeeze)

Translations: Csapo, Slater 1996, 246-247 (in English); B. Le Guen, *Technites* 39 (in French)

Bibliography: Cardinali 1906, 78-102; Holleaux 1924, 24-27; Ruge 1934, cols. 560-564; Jones 1971², 55-56 and n. 40; Pickard-Cambridge 1968², 279-321; Herrmann 1965, 101-104 and passim; Rigsby, *Asyria*, 279-292; Csapo, Slater 1996, 239-242, 246-247; Ma 2004, 63-73, 260-265; Schuler 2005, 387-403; Migeotte 2006a, 77-97; Migeotte 2006b, 379-394; Rhodes 2007, 349-362; Rubinstein 2009, 115-143

[- - -]..[- - -]

[τὸν] ἱερέα τοῦ Διονύσου ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίοις καὶ [τὸν]

[πρ]ύτανιν ἐν τῷ πρυτανείῳ καὶ τὸν ἱεροκήρυκα [ἐν]

[τ]αῖς ἐκκλησίαις γίνεσθαι τὰγαθὰ καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῷ[ν πε-]

5 [ρὶ τ]ὸν Δίονυσον τεχνιτῶν· ἀγοράσαι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ κ[τῆ]-

[μα] ἔγγεον ἐν τῇ πόλει ἢ τῇ χώρῃ ἀπὸ δρα(χμῶν) ϞX

[καὶ] προσαγορεύεσθαι τὸ ἀγορασθὲν κτῆμα ἱερὸν ὃ ἀν[έθη]-

[κε] ὁ δῆμος τῷ κοινῷ τῶν περὶ τὸν Δίονυσον τ[ε-]

[χ]νιτῶν, ὃν ἀτελὲς ὦν ἡ πόλις ἐπιβάλλει τελῶν· ἀ[πο-]

10 δεῖξαι δὲ καὶ ἄνδρας δύο οἵτινες κτηματωνήσου[σιν]

[ἐ]π' ἀναφορᾷ τῇ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον· ἵνα δὲ τὸ ἀργύριον[ν]

[ὑπ]άρχηι εἰς τὴν κτηματωνίαν, τοὺς ταμίαις τοὺς [ἐ-]

[ν]εσθηκότας δοῦναι τοῖς ἀποδειχθησομένοις δρα(χμᾶς)

[X]XX ἐκ τοῦ μετενηνεγμένου ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ὀ[χυ-]

15 [ρ]ώσεως ὃ δέδοται εἰς τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ σίτου· τὸ δὲ ὑπ[ο-]

[λι]πὲς δρα(χμᾶς) XXX δότωσαν οἱ εἰσιόντες ταμίαι ἐκ τ[ῶν]

[πρ]ώτων δοθησομένων αὐτοῖς ἐγ βασιλικοῦ εἰς τ[ὴν]

[τῇ]ς πόλεως διοίκησιν· δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐπο-

- [χῆ]ν ἔτη πέντε ἀπὸ μηνὸς Λευκαθεῶνος καὶ πρυτ[άνε-]
 20 [ως] Μητροδώρου· ὅπως δὲ καὶ τὰ δόξαντα τῶι δήμ[ωι]
 [πά]ντες εἰδῶσιν, ἀναγράψαι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς [στή-]
 [λη]ν λιθίνην καὶ τὸν στέφανον καὶ ἀναθεῖναι παρὰ
 [τὸ]ν νεῶ τοῦ Διονύσου· ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν παρ[α-]
 [στά]δα τοῦ θεάτρου τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε καὶ τὸν στέφαν[ον].
 25 [τῆ]ς δὲ ἀναγραφῆς τῶν στεφάνων {} καὶ ψηφίσματ[ος]
 [καὶ τ]ῆς στήλης τὴν κατασκευὴν τὴν ἔγδοσιν π[ο-]
 [εἰσθ]ωσαν οἱ ἐνεστηκότες ταμίαι καὶ τὸ ἀνάλωμ[α]
 [δότ]ωσαν οἱ ἐνεστηκότες ταμίαι· τοὺς δὲ πρεσβ[ευ-]
 [τάς] τοὺς ἀποδεδειγμένους ἀποδοῦναι τὸ ψήφι[σ-]
 30 [μα τόδ]ε τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίταις καὶ ἐπ[αι-]
 [νέσαι α]ὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ εὐνοίᾳ ἣν ἔχοντες διατε-
 [λοῦσι] περὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Τηίων. ἀπεδείχθη-
 [σαν κτ]ηματονήσοντες (vac.)
 [. 6.] Σ' Ἐπιτιμίδου (vac.) Θερσίων Φάνου.

Apparatus criticus: I. 1: [εὔχεσθαι] Robert. I. 3: [καὶ τὸν ἱε]ροκήρυκα Robert : [εὔξασθαι δὲ τοὺς δ]ύο κήρυκα[s] Demangel and Laumonier (the restoration is too long). II. 6-7: ἀν[έθη|κε] Crönert apud SEG : ἀν[ατίθη|σι] Demangel and Laumonier, maybe too long : ἀν[έδει|ξε] Roussel (BE, 1924, no. 353). I. 28: ΠΒΕΣΒ[- - -] stone.

Translation:

[- - - resolved] that the priest of Dionysos at the Dionysiac festival and the prytanis in the prytanic office and the sacred herald at the assemblies pray for prosperity also for the Association of the Artists of Dionysos (i.e. as well as for the city); to buy for them a parcel of land in the city or territory to the value of six thousand drachmas, and to proclaim as sacred the land bought, which the people have dedicated to the Association of the Artists of Dionysos, as being free of the taxes that the city imposes; to appoint two men, to buy property for referral to the people; in order that the money be available for the purchase, the treasurers in office are to give to the men to be appointed three thousand drachmas from the amount transferred from the fortification account, which was given for the payment of corn; let the incoming treasurers pay out the remaining three thousand drachmas from the first payments to be made to <the technitai> from the royal treasure for city administration; a stay of repayment is also to be granted to them for five years beginning in the month Leukatheon and the prytany of Metrodorus.

In order that all may be aware of the decrees of the people, this resolution and the <award of the> crown is to be engraved on a stone slab and set up by the temple of Dionysos. Also there is to be engraved on the side wall of the theater entrance this decree and <the award of> the crown. Let the treasurers in office make payment for the inscription of the crowns and decrees and the erecting of the slab; the delegates who have been appointed are to hand over this decree to the Artists of Dionysos and commend them for the goodwill, which they continue to display toward the people of Teos.

(These people) were appointed to purchase land: [- - -], son of Epitimides; Thersion, son of Phanes.

(Csapo and Slater, with modifications)

Commentary:

This inscription concerns the granting of sacred land to the technitai of Dionysos in Teos and furnishes some details about the land purchase. We can compare *OGIS* 213, a Milesian decree which assigns to Antioch I the location where he will build the stoa promised to the city, specifying that the tamias will purchase that location (see especially II. 16-20: probably, information about the fund for the purchase was furnished at the incomplete II. 20-21); *I. Magnesia* 53, II. 68-71 (decree from Klazomenai), where ξένια for theoroi who attend the festival of Artemis Leukophryene are financed by the tamias with the fund for the dioikesis (τῆς δὲ ἀποστολῆς / τῶν ξενίων ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοὺς στρατηγούς / καὶ τοὺς πολέμαρχας καὶ τὸν ταμίαν, τὸ δὲ ἀνά|λωμα δοῦναι τὸν ταμίαν ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως). In the present inscription, the citizens charged to buy the land are distinguished from the tamiai, who are charged only to provide the money from several funds. In the Hellenistic Age, together with

the progressive centralization of the city administration, the same magistrates were often charged to administer both public and religious expenses (Migeotte 2006b, *passim*: see for instance *OGIS* 267, ll. 5-6: the strategoi appointed by Eumenes I for the city of Pergamum administer [τάς τε κοινὰς τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς προσόδους]; there were constant money transfers between public funds and religious ones (on these transfers see *infra*, commentary to ll. 16-18). In this context, we can understand why in this inscription the granting of sacred land to the *technitai* of Dionysos (a sacred association) is financed with funds for the city administration; compare *I. Magnesia* 98, ll. 63-67, where the *psephisma* about the feast and the sacrifice of a bull for Zeus will be financed by *oikonomoí* ἐκ τῶν πόρων ὧν ἔχουσιν εἰς πόλεως διοίκησιν] and be posited εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Διὸς εἰς τὴν παραστάδα (compare the present inscription, ll. 23-24: the *psephisma* and the (award of the) *stephanos* will be inscribed εἰς τὴν παρ[α]στάδα τοῦ θεάτρου). See *infra*, commentary to ll. 16-18.

Some graphic data (in particular the pi with short stroke) suggest a period between the 3rd and the 2nd century (Holleaux 1924, 25-26 n. 5). There are at least two references to Teos' dependence on a Hellenistic king. The first one is at ll. 8-9: the *technitai* are exempted «from the tributes imposed by the city». This formula of limitation is typical in inscriptions from cities and communities which depend on someone else (see Jones 1971, 55-56; Rubinstein 2009, 115 and n. 1): cf. *IG* II² 1185; *IG* V 2 510 (*IPark* 36r), ll. 2-4; *CIG* 2673b (*I. Iasos* 36r), ll. 2-4; 2677a (*I. Iasos* 45), ll. 8-11. The second one is a reference to some contributions from a royal treasure for city administration (ll. 16-18): the future participle reveals that these contributions were regular (Holleaux 1924, 25 n. 2). Therefore, the present inscription should be dated to a period of dependence on the Attalids. The kingdom of Pergamum dominated Teos during three periods (228-223, 218-201, 188-133). That Teos was included in the first conquest of Asia minor by Attalus I (228 BC) is certain from Polyb. 5.77.6: in 218, Attalus I reconquers Asia minor during Achaeus' expedition against Selgae; Teos and Colophon restore the «former pacts» with him (Cardinali 1906, 93-95; Herrmann 1965, 102, with further bibliography; contra Walbank 1957-1979, *ad loc.*, with not convincing objections). A third period of dependence began when, with Apamea peace, Eumenes received the tributes from those cities that had already paid tributes to Attalus (Polyb. 21.24.8; Liv. 37.55.6: see Cardinali 1906, 73-74, 81-88). That Teos paid tributes to Attalus is proved also by honorific inscription in Teos to Antioch III and Laodice (ll. 19-20, 33-34: see Herrmann 1965, 101-104). This inscription is dated between 205/4 and 202/1 (Herrmann 1965, 95-97). The privileges given by Antioch to Teos prove that the present document cannot be dated to the period of dependence on Philip V of Macedon and Antioch III (201-188).

The *technitai* mentioned in the inscription are surely the *κοινόν* of Ionia and Hellespont: they are cited for the first time in *Syll.*³ 507, a honorific decree to this *κοινόν* by the Aetolians and the Delphian Amphictiony (227 BC). According to Strabo 14.1.29, the *κοινόν* took up residence in Teos, before it moved first to Ephesus, then to Lebedus for some contrasts with Teos (see Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 294; Aneziri, *Techniten*, 81; cf. *I. Pergamon* 163 = Aneziri, *Techniten* D12). The donation attested in this inscription is probably to be connected with the settling of *technitai* in Teos (Aneziri, *Techniten*, 179; cf. Rigsby, *Asylia*, 287). A consequence of this settling can be individuated in two honorific decree to Teos by the Aetolians and the Amphictiony (*Syll.*³ 564, *F. Delphes* III.2 134 a-b), where Teos receives the *ἀσυλία* and all other honours «like the Artists of Dionysos», *scil. οἱ τεχνῖται οἱ ἐπ' Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου*: the text is integrated according to copies from the temple of Dionysos in Teos, probably the same temple cited in the present inscription. The Delphian decree should be dated before 201 BC (see Colin in *F. Delphes* III.2, 135-136; cf. Herrmann 1965, 93-94); consequently, this inscription could be dated to the period of dependence on Attalus I, probably the second one (218-201).

However, John Ma has recently argued that the decrees of *asylia* conferred to Teos were consequent to the «consecration of Teos to Dionysos», to the *asylia* and to the exemption from tributes conferred to the city by Antioch III, as attested by the already-cited honorific decrees by Teos to Antioch and Laodice (*SEG* 41 1003, I, ll. 15-20). Ma is surely right when he thinks that the Cretan *asylia* decrees to Teos (Rigsby, *Asylia* 136-148) are consequent to the *asylia* conferred by Antioch (cf. Herrmann 1965, 134-136): Teos ambassadors to Crete were sustained by Hegesander of Rhodes, one of Antioch's ambassadors. Even Rome conferred *asylia* to Teos with the mediation of another of Antioch's ambassadors, Menippus (*Syll.*³ 601: letter from the praetor peregrinus M. Valerius Messalla). These documents are similar to Teos' decree for Antioch (see Ma 2004, 205-206 on the use of verb *ἀνέημι*). But in Aetolian and Delphian *asylia* decrees for Teos there is no mention of Antioch (a problem in Ma's reconstruction: Ma 2004, 206). We can find a solution if we distinguish these decrees from the Cretan and Roman ones: in Aetolian and Delphian inscriptions, the *asylia* is due to the presence of *technitai*, not to the royal honours, which are probably later (these decrees have not the same verbal coincidences with Teos decree about Antioch as the Cretan ones). In addition to this, Cretan and Roman decrees should probably to be dated to the beginning of the 2nd century (Messalla is praetor peregrinus in 193: see Liv. 34.54-55), while Aetolian and Delphian decrees should be dated to the end of the 3rd century (see *supra*).

- I. 3. *ἱεροκήρυξ* is a herald who makes announcements during festivals and religious ceremonies (cf. *Milet* I 3, *Delphinion* 145, ll. 36-40; *I. Pergamon* 246, *OGIS* 332, ll. 43-47; *SEG* 2 258, ll. 18-25; *Syll.*³ 577, ll. 37-41).

- ll. 8-9. The complete name of the *κοινόν* is οἱ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνῖται τῆς Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου: the use

of the short name has no significance here, because in Teos the identity of the *κοινόν* would be clear. In some Magnesia inscriptions regarding the *κοινόν* (*I. Magnesia* 89, 94, 98) we find only the short form of the name. It is even possible that the complete formula was used at the beginning of the present document, now lost: cf. *CIG* 3067 (Le Guen, *Technites* 45), ll. 1-2, 5-6: the Ionian technitai are here connected with *οἱ περὶ τὸν καθηγεμόνα Διόνυσον τεχνῖται*; the cult of Dionysos Kathegemon was bound with the Attalid dynasty (on Dionysos and the Attalids, see Musti 1986; the union of these two *κοινά* is probably to be dated to the reign of Eumenes II: see Pickard-Cambridge 1968, 292). There is the same alternation between the long name and the short name in Aneziri, *Techniten* D 13 (see Robert, *Ét. anat.*, 446 ff.). On the double name, see also Aneziri, *Techniten*, 71-80 (but it is not probable that it was the original name).

- I. 9. Rubinstein 2009, 115-116, distinguishes two types of *ateleia*, honorific and economic, bound to a particular activity (frequently conferred when there was a contract between the city and a person or a group). Some cases of honorary *ateleia* can even be considered as economic, conferred in order to make future financial contracts more accessible: analogously, in the present inscription the *ateleia* aims to strengthen the relationship between Teos and the *κοινόν*. Another type is the *ateleia* conferred to an entire group of citizens or another community: the *ateleia* conferred to *κοινά* such as the technitai are similar in some respects (among many examples, Rubinstein 2009, 132 n. 4, cites a decree concerning the Aetolian technitai *κοινόν*: *IG IX² 1 136*). Dionysiac *κοινά* were often looking for these types of honours in order to be protected during their journeys all around the Greek world (Csapo, Slater 1996, 240; cf. *Syll.*³ 460; 399).

- I. 11. In *Syll.*³ 578, ll. 21-23, another inscription from Teos, the expenses by the paidonomos and the gymnasiarchos have to be approved by the assembly (same formula: *ἐπ' ἀναφορᾷ τῇ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον*).

- II. 16-18. *πόροι εἰς τὴν πόλεως διοίκησιν* appear in order to finance honorific and religious expenses in *I. Magnesia* 89, ll. 84-86 (honorary decree for technitai); 94, ll. 10-11; 98, ll. 66-67; in an inscription from Colophon (Picard, Plassart 1913, 236-238), they furnish money for inscriptions *ἔκδοσις* (compare for instance, besides the Magnesia inscriptions, *IG XII 5 653*, ll. 61-63; 715, l. 9; 716, ll. 12-13; 717, ll. 11-12). The term *διοικήσεις* refers here to a fund for city administration, divided among several necessities. It reveals a certain degree of economic centralization. However, in most cases, evidence does not provide clear indications about the organization of these funds. A high degree of centralization, attested in decrees which organize the total administration of a city (*τὰ τῆς διοικήσεως ψηφίσματα*), is generally rare and contested (Schuler 2005, and Rhodes 2007, are skeptical about the effective centralization affected by these *nomoi* or *psephismata* about *διοikesis*; more emphasis on the centralization in Migeotte 2006b, 389 n. 51). In the present case, the centralization is attested rather in the transfer of some money from one fund to another: the first half of money necessary for the estate is taken from the fund *εἰς τὴν ὀχύρωσιν* formerly transferred to the fund for the payment of the corn.

At a first glance, these funds seem distinguished from the central fund *εἰς τὴν τῆς πόλεως διοίκησιν* (Schuler 2005, 401). Rhodes 2007, 361, provides a better interpretation: «the king provided a grant towards the routine expenditure of the state, and that may have been kept in a single treasury, whose name we do not know, but alternatively it may have been apportioned among various funds by some kind of *merismos* / *diataxis*». Compare Miletus' economic administration, with a high degree of centralization and special magistrates (*ἀνατάκται*) charged to the sharing of public expenses (*ἀνάταξις*); see Migeotte 2006a, 78-83; Migeotte 2006b, 382-383; on similar divisions in Athens and in the Hellenistic world, see again Rhodes 2007, 353-355, 358-359 (*μερισμός* in Athens: *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 48.1-2). In Miletus again we find a special fund for fortification (*I. Delphinion* 147, ll. 64-66), cited about another money transfer in order to finance the inscription: this transfer is here due to the assignment of the *κατασκευὴ τῆς στήλης* and *ἀναγραφὴ τοῦ ψηφίσματος* to the *τειχοποιοὶ μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος* (ll. 62-64; cf. *I. Delphinion* 145, ll. 82-83). Another money transfers is attested in *IG XII 5 1010*, ll. 5-8 (from Ios, 3rd century BC): the money for an honorific garland has to be furnished by *ὁ ἡγορακῶς τὸν σῖττον τὸν δημόσιον* from the money he has to give to the *agoranomos*.

In other cases, the existence of special funds besides the ones for general administration is surely attested: SEG 39 1243, col. V, ll. 52-53: *ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς καὶ τῆς διοικήσεως* (Colophon honorary decree; this protection fund is similar to the fortification one in Teos; an analogous protection fund is attested in *I. Kyme* 12, ll. 3-4).

Teos' fund for city administration (*διοikesis*) is cited even in the honorary decree for Antioch and Laodice (SEG 41 1003, ll. 19-21): the *tamias* assigns to the *prostatai* of the *symoriai* a part of the *διοikesis* according to a division plan (*τοὺς δὲ ταμίας τοὺς ἐκάστοτε γιν[ομένους] | διδόν[αι] τοῖς τῶν συμμοριῶν προστάταις τὸ ταγὲν ἐκ τ[ῆς] διοι[κ]ήσε[ως] κ.τ.λ.*). This passage concerns the expenses for sacrifices and feasts in honour of the king and the queen. Other attestations of Teos' *διοikesis* fund are SEG 4 601, ll. 15-16 (decree to confirm the *philia* with Tyrus: here it finances the *xenia* sent to Tyrus by Teos' *tamiai*); *I. Magnesia* 97, ll. 24-27 (it furnishes money for ambassadors' *epheodion*).

It is very interesting that the notion of *διοικήσεις* is connected with the royal contributions: the activity of benefactors, such as wealthy citizens with extraordinary administrative powers and, in Hellenistic times, kings,

improved the economic centralization; vice versa, the centralization increased the power of the élites and of individual men (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.2; see Schuler 2005, 390-391, 400-401; Migeotte 2006b, 385-387 and n. 31). In Pergamum too, Eumenes I, in order to reorganize the city administration, provided five strategoi, who were charged both to public and religious expenses (see supra, introductory note). On dioikesis, see in general the already cited Schuler 2005; Migeotte 2006a; Migeotte 2006b; Rhodes 2007. A survey of the inscriptions discussed in these four studies (some of which have been cited supra) is provided in SEG 55 1989.

βασιλικόν designates the royal contributions for city administration, distinguished from the πολιτικόν, the city treasure (*I.Mylasa* 201, ll. 8-9; *OGIS* 225, ll. 9-10, *RC* 18, ll. 13-14): from the future participle we can argue that these contributions were regular (cf. *OGIS* 229, 106-107, especially l. 7: τὰ ἅλλα ὅσα εἰώθει ἐκ βασιλικοῦ δίδοσθαι αὐτοῖς). Korragos' inscription (SEG 2 663, *I.Prusa* 1001) cites royal contributions εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ πόλεως διοίκησιν (Holleaux 1924, 25 n. 3). Korragos is honoured because he asked the king to furnish these contributions (we do not know the name of the city of this inscription). Complete epigraphic documentation on βασιλικόν in Holleaux 1924, 37-38.

- ll. 22-23. The most ancient temple of Dionysos in Teos was the one by Hermogenes (Vitr. 3.3.6-8; see also 4.3.1; 7, praef. 12). The temple was destroyed during a quake in 14 BC and reconstructed by Augustus; a second reconstruction is attested in the 2nd century AD, probably after another quake (see Uz 1988). The temple cited here is that of Hermogenes: Teos' excavations have not revealed the existence of former temples (Gros 1978, 694-695; contra Aneziri, *Techniten*, 178). The estate given to the κοινόν was surely distinguished from the temple ground: the estate had not been bought yet, so its location was indeterminate (l. 6: ἐν τῇ πόλει ἢ τῇ χώρῃ, cf. Aneziri, *Techniten*, 177).

- l. 26. The phrase structure is not very clear: it can be corrected with the genitive τῆς κατασκευῆς (cf. *Syll.*³ 694, l. 34, cited in SEG apparatus), but we can also interpret τὴν κατασκευὴν as an accusative of respect.

Bringmann, K. and H. von Steuben (1995), *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, Berlin

Cardinali, G. (1906), *Il Regno di Pergamo*, Roma

Csapo, E. and W.J. Slater (1996), *The context of ancient drama*, Oxford

Demangel, R. and A. Laumonier (1922), 'Inscriptions d'Ionie', *BCH* 46, 307-355

Gros, P. (1978), 'Le dossier vitruvien d'Hermogénès', *MEFRA* 98, 687-703

Herrmann, P. (1965), 'Antiochos der Grosse und Teos', *Anadolu* 9, 29-160

Holleaux, M. (1924), 'Inscription trouvée a Brousse', *BCH* 48, 1-57 (now in Holleaux, *Études*, II, Paris 1968, 73-125)

Jones, A.H.M. (1971²), *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford

Ma, J. (2004), *Antiochos III et les citées de l'Asie Mineure Occidentale*, Paris

Meier, L. (2012), *Die Finanzierung öffentlicher Bauten in der hellenistischen Polis*, Mainz

Migeotte, L. (2006a), 'La planification des dépenses publiques dans les cites hellénistiques', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici XIX*, Pisa-Roma, 77-97

Migeotte, L. (2006b), 'La haute administration des finances publiques et sacrées dans les cites hellenistiques', *Chiron* 36, 379-394

Musti, D. (1986), 'Il dionisismo degli Attalidi: antecedenti, modelli, sviluppi', in *L'association dionysiaque dans le sociétés anciennes*. Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'École française de Rome (Rome 24-5 mai 1984), Roma, 105-128

Picard, C. and A. Plassart (1913), 'Inscriptions d'Éolide et d'Ionie', *BCH* 37, 155-246

Pickard-Cambridge, A. (1968²), *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, Oxford

Schuler, C. (2005), 'Die διοίκησις im öffentlichen Finanzwesen der hellenistischen Poleis', *Chiron* 35, 387-403

Rhodes, P.J. (2007), 'διοίκησις', *Chiron* 37, 349-362

Ruge, W. (1934), s.v. 'Teos', *RE*, V.A1, cols. 560-564

Rubinstein, L. (2009), 'Ateleia grants and their enforcement in the classical and early hellenistic periods', in L. Mitchell and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in honour of P.J. Rhodes*, Swansea, 115-143

Uz, D.M. (1988), 'The Temple of Dionysos at Teos', in W. Hoepfner and E.-L. Schwandner (eds.), *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistische Architektur*, Mainz am Rhein, 51-61

Walbank, F.W. (1957-1979), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols., Oxford

Author: Stefano Fanucchi

Last update: March 2017
