



**GED 05.04.307**

## Unknown

<b>ID:</b>	GED 05.04.307	<b>Chronology:</b>	About 203 BC 201 BC	<b>Greek designation/s:</b>	preigeutas
<b>Name:</b>	Unknown	<b>Place of Origin:</b>	Eastern Mediterranean islands Crete Rhaukos	<b>Role/s:</b>	envoy
<b>Patronymic:</b>					
<b>Ethnic/demotic:</b>	Rhaukios (Ραύκιος)				
<b>Authors:</b>	Leon Battista Borsano				
<b>Last modified:</b>					
<b>DOI:</b>					

## General info

### Inscriptions

LBW 63

### Keywords

Cretan war, Seleucid domain, international protection, royal power projection

## Missions List

### Teos to Rhaukos, 203-201 BC

#### Mission date

203 BC 201 BC

#### Greek Designation

preigeutas

#### Patron

Antiochus III (Seleucid king)

#### Recipient

Rhaukos

#### Sender

Teos

#### Envoy/Colleagues

GED 06.04.289 Apollodotos, GED 05.03.084 Hagesandros, GED 06.04.812 Kolotes, GED 05.04.307 Unknown



## Keywords

Cretan war, international protection, royal power projection, Seleucid domain

---

## Commentary

This anonymous envoy, together with other colleagues, spoke in the assembly at Rhaukos in favour of the Teians and their call for *asylia*, after the Teian envoys and the envoy dispatched by Antiochus III. Although Cishull (followed e.g. by Rigsby 1996, 300) believed that these ambassadors still corresponded to the two envoys of Teos, what Le bas read is correct. At this point in the text (LBW 63, l. 10) 'our' envoys, i.e. from Rhaukos itself, are certainly mentioned.

This intervention in the assembly, however, seems strange or at least needs an explanation. Holleaux (), following Waddington, thought that some envoys from Rhaukos stopped by Teos at an earlier time, on a mission probably addressed to Seleucid power. And in fact we know today that Antiochus III was physically present near Teos for a certain time in 204 (). Rigsby found implausible this reconstruction, because apparently Rhaukos would be too "little" for such a mission and there would be no parallels in the other decrees about Teian *asylia*. I find it implausible for another reason: in the Hellenistic period, envoys are neither permanent nor fixed. It would be bizarre if Rhaukos recalled a previous embassy without any contextualisation. But this is the case: so it is likely that such contextualisation was not necessary, because these envoys were still in office, i.e. they had just returned from some other mission, during which they had been able to test the moral qualities of the Teians. This explanation can easily fit into the broader framework of the Cretan war, where we know that royal envoys were working precisely for a peace. It is indeed not difficult to think that the various warring *poleis* were sending their delegations to allies and enemies to participate in negotiations. It is therefore possible that the envoys of Rhaukos met the envoys of Teos and perhaps also the royal agent Agesandros in another city, e.g. Eleutherna or Lappa, and based their intervention on this earlier meeting. I thank C. Crowther for providing a photograph of this text.