

MYLASA IN 261 BC

... die bekanntlich viel zu kleine Zahl genau datierter Zeugnisse aus der Regierungszeit des Antiochos I. ... , bei denen, wie W. Otto einst bemerkt hat, “selbst die kleinsten Angaben” von großem Wert für die Erkenntnis der noch immer weithin dunklen, zum Teil nur hypothetisch rekonstruierten Geschichte der 70er und 60er Jahre des 3. Jahrhunderts sein können (M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 5, 1975, 61–62)

Among a number of new inscriptions published in *Epigraphica Anatolica* 40 by Wolfgang Blümel is the following, inscribed on a marble block built into the enclosure wall of the Firuz Bey (Kurşunlu) mosque in modern Milas.¹ It was originally labelled a ‘Pachturkunde’ because of its similarity to the documents in the land-lease dossiers from Mylasa and Olymos,² although strictly speaking the text documents an acquisition of properties by the *oikonomos* of the *phyle* of the Otörkondeis for the *phyle*’s god, Zeus, and is therefore an act of sale (Kaufurkunde). Perhaps for this reason it was not included in Isabelle Pernin’s *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne - corpus épigraphique et étude* (2014), although the acquisition (for the benefit of a god) was one of the steps in the procedure that, in the bulk of the land-lease dossiers, led to the final act of *misthōsis*, the leasing out of the land acquired. This document could, but need not, have been part of such a larger dossier.³

Insert photo here (with acknowledgement of the photographer: A. Kızıl)

Greyish-white marble block. h. 0.42 m; w. 0.62 m; d. unknown; letters 0.12–0.15 cm. Ed. W. Blümel, *EA* 40 (2007) 41/42 no. 1 with photo and commentary (*SEG* 57, 1101, where the second τ in πεντηκοστοῦ is omitted in l. 2). Blümel, van Bremen, Carbon, *Guide to Inscriptions in Milas* (2014) 23/24, no. 12 with photo and translation.

[traces of the lower parts of letters]
ἐνὸς καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀριστέου
τοῦ Ἰατροκλέους, μηνὸς Πανήμου προτέρα· ἐπρία-
4 το Πολίτης Πρωτέου οἰκονόμος τῆς Ὀτωρκονδέ-
ων φυλῆς τῶι Διὶ τῶι Ὀτωρκοκονδέων παρὰ Ἀριστέου
τοῦ Ἐκαταίου οἰκίας δύο κατὰ πόλιν ἐν τῶι τεμένει
τῶι τοῦ Διὸς Ὀτωρκονδέων σὺν τῶ προσόντι αὐλιδί-
8 ωι καὶ οἰκοπέδωι, σὺν εἰσόδωι καὶ ἐξόδωι, αἷς γείτονες
Διονύσιος Ἰατροκλέους, Γλαῦκος Μενίππου, Πρωτέας
Τιμοκλέους καὶ τὰ ἐργαστήρια τὰ Διὸς Ὀτωρκονδέων·
ἄλλας οἰκίας τέσσαρας ἐν τῶι αὐτῶι τεμένει καὶ

* For discussion and advice I am grateful to L. Criscuolo, R. Parker, D. Rousset, F. Rumscheid and I. Savalli-Lestrade. This article could not have been written, during lockdown, without the help of Rowena Morisson.

¹ ‘Neue Inschriften aus Karien’, *EA* 40 (2007) 41–48, at pp. 41–42, no. 1.

² *I.Mylasa* I and II, s.v. with Blümel, *EA* 47 (2014) 73–106 at nos. 202–231; I. Pernin, *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne - corpus épigraphique et étude* (2014). New texts and dating: W. Blümel, *EA* 51 (2018) 1–18; R. van Bremen, *EA* 51 (2018) 19–37, and Chr. Marek. E. Zingg, *Die Versinschrift des Hyssaldomos und die Inschriften von Uzunyuva (Milas/Mylasa)*. *Asia Minor Studien* Bd. 9 (= *I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva*) 157–174 with nos. 13–19.

³ On the sequence of documents see *I.Mylasa* vol. I, pp. 74–76, Pernin, *Baux*, pp. 422–430; *Milas Guide*, p. 2, and *I.Mylasa Uzunyuva*, pp. 157–161.

- 12 τὸ προσὸν ἀλίδιον, σὺν εἰσόδοι καὶ ἐξόδοι, αἶς γεί-
 τονες Πρωτέας Τιμοκλέους, Γλαῦκος Μενίππου,
 Διονύσιος Κωστεω, Πόλλις Πολυκρίτου, ἀργυρί[ο]υ Ἄλ[ε]-
 [ξα]νδρέου δραχμῶν πεντακοσίων εἴκοσι· βεβαιωταὶ
 16 [κ]ατὰ τὸν νόμον Γλαῦκος Μεν[ίπ]που, Ἱεροκλῆς Ἀπολλω-
 [νί]ου· μάρτυρες δικασταὶ Ἀριστεάς Μενίππου, Ὑβρέας
 Μελεάγρου, Μενίσκος Μέλανος, Ἱεροκλῆς Ἀπολλωνίου
 [traces of the upper parts of letters]

Translation

2 [- - -] of the fifty-first. In the year of the *stephanephoros* Aristeas son of Iatrokles, on the first (day) of the month Panemos.

3 Polites son of Prōteas, *oikonomos* of the *phyle* of the Otōrkondeis, has bought for Zeus of the Otōrkondeis from Aristeas son of Hekataios two dwellings in the city in the precinct of Zeus of the Otōrkondeis with the adjoining small courtyard and the plot for building, with (right of) entry and exit, whose neighbours are Dionysios son of Iatrokles, Glaukos son of Menippos, Prōteas son of Timokles, and the workshops of Zeus of the Otōrkondeis;

11 further four dwellings in the same precinct and the adjoining small courtyard with (right of) entry and exit, whose neighbours are Prōteas son of Timokles, Glaukos son of Menippos, Dionysios son of Kōstes, Pollis son of Polykritos, at the price of 520 Alexander-drachmai;

15 guarantors according to the law were Glaukos son of Menippos, Hierokles son of Apollōnios;

17 witnessing-judges were Aristeas son of Menippos, Hybreas son of Meleagros, Meniskos son of Melas, Hierokles son of Apollōnios [---]

The text is interesting for several reasons, to some of which I shall return below. My concern is first of all with its date, for, on letter forms and procedural aspects, this is among the earliest of the Mylasan property transaction inscriptions. Blümel initially dated it to the second century BC, but the recent publication, by Chr. Marek and E. Zingg, of a large number of new Mylasan inscriptions resulting from the Uzun Yuva excavations between 2010 and 2016, and my own subsequent redating of the Olymos land leases,⁴ has allowed us to move it to an earlier group of texts, alongside *I.Mylasa* 201, and *I. Mylasa Uzun Yuva* 13, 16 and 17, all of which share features that are different from the procedures and formulas in the bulk of the land-lease dossiers.⁵

Our inscription has a dating formula by *stephanephoros*, month and day in ll. 2–3. This is preceded, in l. 2 by a numeral in the genitive, ἐνὸς καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ, ‘fifty-first’, which was left unresolved in the original edition. As part of a revision of all property-related inscriptions of the Mylasa-Olymos region for a volume in preparation by Wolfgang Blümel and myself, we returned to this problematic line, and Blümel suggested that the numeral could be part of a dating formula. If so, only the Seleukid era comes into question. The first day of the 51st year, in the Syro-

⁴ Above, n. 2. On the dates see below, XXX.

⁵ *I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva* 16 and 17 are fragments of sale or lease contracts. 17 is linked to 16 by way of Θεόμνηστος Ὑβρέους priest of Delian Apollo, who features as a guarantor (βεβαιωτής) in 17 and in an unclear role in 16. The name also occurs in *I.Mylasa* 706.4 (a fragment). Neither inscription is specifically concerned with the acquisition of land for a god or with the leasing out of the property of a god.

Macedonian calendar (the first of the month Dios) fell on September 26, 262 BC.⁶ The first (?) day (προτέρα) of Panemos (the ninth month), fell on June 17, 261 BC; the final day (if προτέρα is to be thus understood)⁷ on July 16. Both post-date the death of Antiochos I, on June 2nd of 261 BC.⁸ A careful re-reading of the photograph confirmed our conjecture, for the first line contains the names of two Seleukid kings, Antiochos (I) and his son Antiochos:

BA]ΣΙΑ[E]YON[T]ΩΝΑΝ[T]ΙΟΧΟΥΚΑΙΑΝΤΙΟΧ[- - -]

The beginning of the inscription can now be restored (its 43 letters fall just within the range of between 37 and 43 letters per line in the rest of the text) as follows:

[Βασ]ιλ[ε]υόν[τ]ων Ἀν[τ]ιόχου καὶ Ἀντιόχ[ου τοῦ υἱοῦ ἔτους]
ἐνὸς καὶ πεντηκοστοῦ ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἀριστέου
τοῦ Ἰατροκλέους, μηνὸς Πανήμιου προτέραι . . . κτλ.

Mylasa was therefore under Seleukid control in 261 BC, and presumably some years before that date. This runs counter to what has been near-unanimously assumed, namely that the city did not become Seleukid until *c.* 259 BC at the earliest, when, during the first stages of the second Syrian War (*c.* 261 BC–254 BC), the revolt, in Ephesos, of Ptolemy ‘the Son’⁹ allowed Antiochos II to make inroads into Ptolemaic possessions in central and western Karia.¹⁰ The presumed ‘Karian campaign’ of Antiochos II, during which Alabanda is said to have been renamed ‘Antiocheia’, Stratonikeia founded, Alinda, Mylasa and Bargylia ‘taken’,¹¹ has as its only variant in the recent historiography the view of Chr. Habicht and Ph. Gauthier,¹² that it was not

⁶ See, most conveniently, the Babylonian Calendar Converter, based on R.A. Parker and W.H. Dubberstein’s *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-A.D. 75* (3rd ed. 1971) which shows simultaneously the Babylonian and Macedonian year:

https://webpace.science.uu.nl/~gent0113/babylon/babycal_converter.htm

⁷ On the meaning ‘first day of the month’ and on the various other possibilities for προτέρα see the discussion of Crampa of an identical dating formula in *I. Labraunda* 9.2; discussion at p. 69.

⁸ We do not know where Antiochos died so have no way of estimating how long it would have taken for the news to reach Mylasa.

⁹ W. Huss ‘Ptolemaios der Sohn’, *ZPE* 121(1998) 229–250 for all references and earlier discussions, cf. the additional page in *ZPE* 149 (2004) 232 for discussions post 1998; with reference to the Milesian context see especially A. Bencivenni, ‘Il giuramento civico di Mileto, il figlio di Tolemeo II e il potere del linguaggio in I. Milet I 3, 139’, in: M. Mari & J. Thornton (eds.), *Parole in movimento. Linguaggio politico e linguaggio storiografico nel mondo ellenistico. SE 27* (2013) 299–315 and, differently, L. Criscuolo, *Anc. Soc.* 47 (2017) 1–18, especially 8–11.

¹⁰ John Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (2nd ed. 2002) 39–42. R.S. Bagnall, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt* (1976) 93: ‘It may be that Ptolemaic control was terminated as early as 259’. J. Crampa, *I. Labraunda* I, pp. 1, 35, 80, 83, suggested more generally the beginning of the reign of Antiochos II. Cf. also Le Rider *BCH* 114 (1990) 543–551, with numismatic arguments, modified in *BCH* 120 (1996) 775–777. Along the same lines: T. Boulay and A.-V. Pont, *Chalkêtôr en Carie* (2014) 37–38.

¹¹ So, tentatively but suggestively, Ma, *Antiochos III*, 42, followed confidently by A. Meadows ‘Stratonikeia in Caria: the Hellenistic City and its Coinage’ *NC* 162, 79–134, at 116.

¹² Chr. Habicht, review of J. Crampa, *I. Labraunda* I, *Gnomon* 44 (1972) 162–170, at 169, with n. 1 on the foundation of Stratonikeia; Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1994, 528 (Kildara); 1996, 397 (Kildara); see also *id.*, *REG* 112 (1999) 1–36, at 29–31 (Kolophon and Mylasa – discussed below, n. 57) and *BE* 1995, 523 (on Euromos): ‘il semble désormais établi que dans les années 260 la région de Mylasa dépendait des Lagides, sous l’autorité de “Ptolemée le fils” et de Sôphrôn, ce dernier étant peut-être στρατηγός ἐπὶ Καρίας’. This last discussion refers to the so-called ‘Funktionärsbrief’ written by a Ptolemaic official to the city of Euromos (M. Errington, *EA* 21 (1993), 20, No. 3 (*SEG* 43, 705). Gauthier’s ingenious

until the mid-240s, with the liberation of Mylasa by Seleukos II (246 BC)¹³, that the region became Seleukid again, having been under Ptolemaic control since the 270s. Both versions of events have now been overturned by the new reading of our text.

I. Mylasa in the 260s

In trying to work out the timeline of Seleukid presence in western Karia (by which I mean broadly the area indicated on the map (Fig. XX) with a few relevant outliers to the north and east: Amyzon, Alabanda, Hyllarima, Xystis and Bargasa) and in the Mylasa region more specifically we run into unresolved and much-discussed problems surrounding the unclear shifts of power between Ptolemies and Seleukids. That both Mylasa and Labraunda had come under Ptolemaic control in the early 270s is not in dispute. An inscription from the territory of the future Stratonikeia, dated to Panemos, ninth year of Philadelphos (April/May 277 BC) shows Ptolemaic presence in the Marsyas valley immediately to Mylasa's east.¹⁴ A decree from Amyzon for the Ptolemaic *strategos* Margos is dated to Hyperberetaios of the same year (July/ August 277).¹⁵ At Iasos, Ptolemaic presence is attested already under Ptolemy I, and an anonymous Ptolemaic *Funktionärsbrief* from Euromos may date to the 270s or early 260s.¹⁶ For Herakleia under Latmos M. Wörrle has made a persuasive case for Ptolemaic control under Ptolemy II.¹⁷

The last document directly attesting Ptolemaic control in Mylasa is *I. Labraunda* 43, a decree of the Chrysaoric League in honour of the Ptolemaic *oikonomos*, Apollonios.¹⁸ It is dated to the 16th day of Daisios, year 19 of Ptolemy

correction to II. 5–6 turned γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ Πτολεμαῖοι τῷ βα[σιλεῖ] into γεγράφαμεν δὲ καὶ Πτολεμαῖοι τῷ βα[σιλέως υἱῷ] thus making Ptolemy 'the Son' (active according to G. in the 260s) the recipient of the letter. Its author could then have been Sōphrōn. P. Herrmann (*EA* 27 [1996], 55–56), with W. Blümel (*ibid.*, 61–62), showed that the restoration was impossible for reasons of space. The Ptolemaic context of the letter remains unchallenged (mention of Theodotos, the *dioiketes*, reference to *philanthrōpa*, letter forms of the early third century) but we cannot date it to the 260s. It probably predates that decade. Theodotos cannot have been *dioiketes* in the years that Apollōnios (from year 24 of Philadelphos) or his predecessor Satyros (down to year 23 of Ptolemy Philadelphos) were active: see below n. 28.

¹³ On the date see A. Bencivenni, *Progetti di riforme costituzionali nelle epigrafi greche dei secoli IV–II a.C.* (2003) 258–280 with the schedule on p. 281; for the city's liberation by Seleukos II see *I. Labraunda* 3.7–8 and the new *I. Labraunda* 134.13–14 (S. Isager, L. Karlsson, 'A new Inscription from Labraunda: Honorary decree for Olympichos (Labraunda no. 134 and 49)', *EA* 41 (2008) 39–52 (*SEG* 2008, 2020).

¹⁴ In the Harpasos valley, further east still, Ptolemaic presence is attested in the mid 270s in a decree of the Mogōreis (Xystis) in honour of the Ptolemaic *strategos* Moschiōn (A. Bresson and R. Descat, forthcoming). H. Malay and M. Riel have recently published a dedication by a Ptolemaic garrison ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου, probably from Bargasa and dated most likely to the 270s (*I. Nordkarien* 555). In the same city, a *phyle* Ptolemais is recorded in a decree dated to shortly after 129 BC (*I. Nordkarien* 551).

¹⁵ J. and L. Robert, *Amyzon* 3. His title may have been στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Καρίας.

¹⁶ Above, n. 12, and see most recently van Bremen, 'Labraunda and the Ptolemies', *SE* 31 (2018) 223–259 with all references. The surviving part of an honorific decree from the Samian Heraion for Aristolaos son of Ameinias (*IG* XII 6 1, 120) begins [στ]ρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Καρίας κατεστη[κώς]. It was dated to between c. 270 and 259 by Chr. Habicht (*AM* 72, 1957, 152–274, no. 57, and 218–219, with n. 68), who called him 'der erste hellenistische Statthalter Kariens überhaupt, der ausdrücklich als solcher bezeichnet ist'. The eds. of *IG* give a more cautious date of c. 280–246 BC.

¹⁷ M. Wörrle, 'Inchriften von Herakleia am Latmos I: Antiochos III, Zeuxis und Herakleia', *Chiron* 18 (1988) 421–476, at 435–436.

¹⁸ In the article cited in n. 16 above, I argued that *I. Labraunda* 44, 45 and 51 are equally documents of the Ptolemaic period. On Apollōnios see further below XXX.

Philadelphos (10 May 267 BC).¹⁹ Six years later, by June 261 BC, Mylasa dated its documents by Seleukid reign. The obvious question is: when, during those years between 267 and 261 did Ptolemaic control cease?

These are very obscure years in the history of Karia and more generally of western Asia Minor. Relevant to our understanding of events in the 260s is first of all the identity of two royal officials, Ptolemy ‘the Son’ and Sōphrōn, both mentioned as predecessors in a letter written by the Seleukid *strategos* Olympichos to the Mylaseis in the 240s BC. A large number of ingenious but not always convincing scenarios have been proposed as to their identity and allegiance.²⁰ I paraphrase here briefly what I have recently written about the subject in an article on the Ptolemies and Labraunda, though I now end with a different conclusion.²¹ In *I.Labraunda* 3, a letter of the late 240s BC,²² Olympichos, *strategos* in the service of Seleukos II, refers to the Mylasan ambassadors having shown him ‘other documents, including those written by Sōphrōn to you and by Ptolemy the brother of king Ptolemy, as well as those measures taken by us at the time when king Seleukos wrote to us to liberate your city’ (3–7: ἐπέδειξαν δὲ ἡμεῖν οἱ παρε<σ>βευταὶ καὶ χρηματισ[[μο]ῦς ἄλλους τε καὶ τὰ παρὰ Σώφρονος γραφέντα πρὸς[[] [ὑμ]ᾶς καὶ Πτολεμ[α]ίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως Πτολε[[μ]αίου, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα οἰκονομηθέντα ὑφ’ ἡ[[μ]ῶν).

There is no need here to go into all the complexities of this Ptolemy’s identity. He is most likely, but not certainly, the same Ptolemy (‘the Son’) whose name appears alongside that of his father in all official documents between 268/7 and 259/8 BC, disappearing from Ptolemaic records towards the end of the year 259/8 BC.²³ For our purpose it is enough to acknowledge him as representing the Ptolemaic king in his communications with the Mylaseis. According to Chr. Habicht, his ‘Labraundan’ date must have been close to the end of this period, because Olympichos in his letter mentions Sōphrōn before Ptolemy, something the royal protocol would not have allowed unless a chronological sequence was specifically intended. Sōphrōn, according to Habicht, could therefore only have been a Ptolemaic official active *before* Ptolemy ‘the Son’, not (as others had argued) the Seleukid commander ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐφέσου of the same name, who, in the fateful year 246 BC, the start of the Laodikeian war, went over from the Seleukid to the Ptolemaic camp.²⁴

¹⁹ The date given by Crampa is June 10, 267 BC. E. Grzybek, *Du calendrier macédonien au calendrier ptolémaïque: problèmes de chronologie hellénistique* (1990) 184, dates the month of Daisios 267 to April 25–May 24. The 16th day would be May 10th.

²⁰ See in first place Chr. Habicht’s critical review of Crampa’s historical reconstruction, above, n.12. For a summary of the extensive literature concerning the identity of these two individuals see A. Bencivenni, *Progetti*, 260–261 (who prefers Habicht’s interpretation, as does Ph. Gauthier, see here n. 12). See also the discussion by A. Calapà of the Ephesian situation, *SE* 24 (2010) 198–199. For the different Ptolemies: ‘the Son’, ‘the Brother’ ‘of Ephesos’ and ‘Andromachou’ and their identities, the evidence is collected in W. Huss, ‘Ptolemaios der Sohn’ and discussed in M. D. Gyax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder des Königs Ptolemaios III. Euergetes, und Mylasa: Bemerkungen zu I. Labraunda Nr. 3’ *Chiron* 30 (2000) 353–366. Huss and others, among whom is most recently L. Criscuolo, ‘Ptolemy the Son, a pretended co-regency?’ *Anc. Soc.* 47 (2017) 1–18 assume an identity between the ‘Son’ and Ptolemy of Telmessos.

²¹ For the original passage, see my ‘Labraunda and the Ptolemies’ (above, n. 16) 251–254.

²² On the date see especially A. Bencivenni, *Progetti*, 260–270, 281–282, and *passim* for the wider context.

²³ The most recent and up to date evidence is cited in Criscuolo, ‘Ptolemy the Son’ 2–3. The earliest attestation is now. *P. Sorb* III 71. L. Criscuolo doubts – probably rightly – whether this was a genuine co-rulership.

²⁴ Followed by Ph. Gauthier, above, n. 12. On Sōphrōn, see the discussion in Gyax, ‘Ptolemaios, Bruder’ (above, n. 20) with all references.

This interpretation has been countered by M. Domingo Gygax with the argument that Olympichos may well have referred first to an immediate *Seleukid* predecessor—namely Sōphrōn, the commander at Ephesos—and then to the latter’s own *Ptolemaic* predecessor, i.e. Ptolemy the Son/Brother; in other words, no such chronological restrictions need apply. I am now more inclined to accept that Sōphrōn may indeed be identical with the Seleukid commander at Ephesos²⁵, though without being able to speculate further on the exact nature of his authority or his political allegiance during the Laodikeian war. The ordonnances from Ptolemy ‘the Son’ to the Mylaseis can only have been issued before Mylasa became Seleukid and presumably after he became associated with his father in official documents.²⁶

While we cannot, on the present state of our knowledge, achieve a clear view of exactly how and when Ptolemaic control in the wider Mylasan region came to an end, it may be relevant to consider the position of the *oikonomos* Apollōnios, honoured by the Chrysaoric League in the decree of May 267 BC (*I.Labraunda* 43; above, p. XXX). I have argued elsewhere—and others have too—that he may be the same man as the future *dioiketes* of Ptolemy II.²⁷ The year in which Apollōnios became *dioiketes* was year 24 of Ptolemy Philadelphos, i.e. 262/1 BC of the Macedonian calendar.²⁸ The first reference to Apollōnios has been said to date from year 23, April/May 263 BC (*P.Cairo Zen.* 59671), but this is less than certain.²⁹ These dates throw perhaps a bit more light on the career of this important Ptolemaic official, but at best they give a *terminus ante quem* for the end of Ptolemaic control in the Mylasa region which broadly aligns with what we have learned from our inscription.

Our knowledge of Seleukid history in the 260s is equally full of gaps. The final decade of Antiochos I’s rule is hard to reconstruct, as has been often said, and although it is probably somewhat better documented than is usually asserted, a continuous narrative is still not possible.³⁰ Too much attention has perhaps been paid to the problems surrounding this king’s two co-regencies, in particular the transition from joint rule with Seleukos, the older son (first attested in January 279) and this son’s presumed assassination,³¹ to that with the future Antiochos II. The transition is thought to have happened in the course of 266, a date on which the Babylonian sources and almost all those from Asia Minor, agree. An inscription found on the site

²⁵ So also J. Kobes, *EA* 24 (1994) 1–6.

²⁶ Huss, ‘Ptolemaios der Sohn’ 229.

²⁷ ‘Labraunda and the Ptolemies’ 223, n.1.

²⁸ The evidence is set out in M. Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the third century B.C., a Study in Economic History* (1923) 16–17. *PSI* 324 of 29 May 261 BC ((ἔτους κε’, Ἀρτεμισίου ιβ’)) shows that Apollōnios was already *dioiketes* in (Macedonian) year 25 of Philadelphos (cf. *PSI* 325 of the same day). Parts of the Revenue Laws show that Satyros, not Apollōnios, was *dioiketes* in year 23. R. concludes that Apollōnios must have become *dioiketes* sometime in year 24.

²⁹ The description of *P.Cairo Zen.* 59671 as ‘an account of corn allowance concerning Apollonios’ household’ as well as its date, come from K. Vandorpe’s entry ‘Zenon son of Agreophon’ on the homepage of the Leuven Papyri (p. 3): <https://www.trismegistos.org/arch/archives/pdf/256.pdf>. G.F. Franko, ‘Sitometria in the Zenon Archive: Identifying Zenon’s Personal Documents’ *BSAP* 25 (1988) 13–98, at 23 and 29 is more sceptical about the nature of this fragment and even its date.

³⁰ E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* (1979 [2003]) 150–152. Cf. the quotation from M. Wörrle’s ‘Antiochos I, Achaïos der Ältere und die Galater. Eine neue Inschrift in Denizli’ at the beginning of this article, above, p. XXX.

³¹ Dismissed conclusively in G.F. Delmonte, ‘Antioco I Soter e i figli Seleuco e Antioco, un nuovo testo da Babilonia’ *Studi Classici e Orientali* 45 (1995) 433–444, usefully summarized in John R. Holton, ‘The Ideology of Seleukid Joint Kingship :The Case of Seleukos, Son of Antiochos I’, in K. Erickson (ed.) *War within the Family* (2018) 101–128. Delmonte discusses a Babylonian document of August 266 (BM 55437) in which both sons, Seleukos and Antiochos, appear in the dating formula alongside their father. By October, Seleukos’ name has disappeared (CT 49 115).

of the future Stratonikeia, honouring a man from Koliorga, one of the city's future demes,³² dated by the joint rule of Antiochos I and II, year 44, month of Lōios (between July 4th and 1st August 268 BC) puzzlingly does not fit this schema.³³

A further complication is the so-called 'battle of Sardes' (περὶ Σάρδεις) fought according to Strabo (13.4.2) between Eumenes I, who had succeeded Philetairos as ruler of Pergamon in 263, and Antiochos, with the former victorious.³⁴ Since we do not know when, between Eumenes' accession—dated only by year not by month and day—and Antiochos' death in early June 261, this alleged battle took place, we cannot give it a date and neither can we assess its impact on other developments.³⁵

Given that our perspective on the transition from Ptolemaic to Seleukid rule in Mylasa has now shifted, I propose, with this in mind, to look again at a number of cases from the wider region that are dated to the 260s or early 250s and whose interpretation may be in need of revision.

Hyllarima and Stratonikeia

First to be added into the equation is a text inscribed on the well-known Karian-Greek bilingual stele from Hyllarima, whose right fragment was published many years ago by A. Laumonier.³⁶ The stone's matching left fragment was found in 2004, allowing for the entire set of texts to be reviewed and republished with an extensive commentary.³⁷ One of the inscriptions on face A of this stele, which can now be read in its entirety (Laumonier's fragment only contained the final few letters of each line), is of interest to us. It is a list of priests of Apollo, dated by Antiochos and his son Antiochos to the 49th year of the Seleukid era, i.e. 264/3 BC, two years before the Mylasan inscription.³⁸

Hyllarima lies to the north-east of Stratonikeia, 'above' that city (πολίχιον Καρίας ὑπερθεν Στρατονικείας)³⁹, in between the valleys of the Marsyas and the Harpasos, linked to Stratonikeia by a direct road and in proximity to some of the communities that were to become its demes (see the map, Fig. XX). According to

³² *I.Stratonikeia* 1030. The honouring community is not known.

³³ I have no solution to offer for this apparent anomaly, but it ought to be pointed out that an inscription from Tabai equally dated to February 268 BC (44th year) and restored by L. Robert (*La Carie* II no. 3) βασιλευ[ό]ντων Ἀντ[ιόχου καὶ Σελεύκου,]τετά[ρτου] καὶ τεσσ[αρακοστοῦ ἔτους] μηνὸς [Δύσ]τ[ρ]ου could well instead be restored βασιλευ[ό]ντων Ἀντ[ιόχου καὶ Ἀντιόχου τοῦ υἱοῦ] since we do not know the line-length; and even though l. 4 starts with ΣΕΛΣ ? in the copy used by Robert, this could be a reference to Seleukos I. There is no certainty, since the well-known inscription from Denizli, published by M. Wörle, *Chiron* 5 (1975) 59–88 (*IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 1) is dated to Peritios of the 45th year (28 December 268 – 26 January 267) Βασιλευόντων Ἀντιόχου καὶ Σελεύκου.

³⁴ καὶ ἦν ἡδὴ δυνάστης τῶν κύκλω χωρίων, ὥστε καὶ περὶ Σάρδεις ἐνίκησε μάχη συμβαλὼν Ἀντιόχον τὸν Σελεύκου.

³⁵ I. Savalli-Lestrade, *REG* 105 (1992) 222: 'cette mystérieuse bataille de Sardes' sums it up well.

³⁶ A. Laumonier, *BCH* 58 (1934) 345–376, no. 39; *LSAM* 56.

³⁷ I.-J. Adiego, P. Debord, E. Varinlioglu, 'La stèle caro-grecque d'Hyllarima (Carie)', *REA* 107 (2005) 601–653 (with a description of the precise location of the new fragment on p. 602 with n. 4). See also P. Debord and E. Varinlioglu, *Hyllarima de Carie. État de la question* (2018) 36–48, nos. 1–12 (with photos 02–08) and now W. Blümel, *Inscriften aus Nordkarien* 451–461.

³⁸ *Hyllarima de Carie* no. 8; *I.Nordkarien* 457; *SEG* 55, 1113A. **No month or day are given. To be precise, the year ran from October 17 264 till October 5 263. The editors give no reason for their dating of this list to 263/2 BC.** Debord, ('Stèle caro-grecque' 637) thought that the (emphatic) dating by Seleukid kings of what was a new list strongly suggested that the region had been recently (re-)conquered by the Seleukid kings.

³⁹ Steph. Byz. *s.v.*

Pierre Debord the fate of both cities must always have been closely interwoven.⁴⁰ The evidence of the Hyllarima list of 264/3 BC may therefore be put alongside the pre- or proto-Stratonikeian inscription of July/August 268 BC. Together these two documents suggest continuity of Seleukid control throughout the 260s. Debord's conclusion was that Hyllarima and the region of (?the future) Stratonikeia had, during this time, 'remained loyal' to the Seleukid cause. Given how little we know about the actual attitude of local communities to those who controlled their territories, this is an over-interpretation, but in terms of chronology it seems the only plausible conclusion one can draw.

The Stratonikeian document has long created problems for those who prefer to attribute the foundation of Stratonikeia to Antiochos II, or even later.⁴¹ One solution to its unwelcome existence was to label it a 'pierre errante from eastern Karia' because such evidence of Seleukid presence in the region immediately to Mylasa's east, while Mylasa and Labraunda were still under Ptolemaic control, seemed not to fit the narrative.⁴² Since we now know that Mylasa had become Seleukid during the life-time of Antiochos I, there is even less reason to doubt the evidence it provides. We can therefore once again consider Antiochos I a plausible – perhaps the most plausible – candidate for the foundation of Stratonikeia, sometime between 268 and 261 BC.⁴³

The date of the Hyllarima priest list additionally raises the question of Ptolemaic-Seleukid transition precisely in 'eastern Karia' where Xystis and Bargasa, both in very close proximity to Hyllarima, may not have remained Ptolemaic much beyond the end of the 270s.⁴⁴

Alabanda

The renaming of Alabanda, further north in the Marsyas valley, to Antiocheia has also been more or less unanimously attributed to Antiochos II.⁴⁵ The possibility that it was already under Antiochos I that the city was renamed (and brought under Seleukid control) should however now be briefly discussed. The timing of the city's renaming depends on the date(s) of two inscriptions from Delphi and one from Delos, as L. Robert showed many years ago in a classic article.⁴⁶ In two Delphic proxeny decrees Artemidōros son of Menyllos has the ethnic Alabandeus. The inscriptions are dated by two successive archons who are however not (yet) securely placed in the Delphic

⁴⁰ 'Stèle caro-grecque' 637; *Hyllarima de Carie* 121–124.

⁴¹ A. Meadows, 'Stratonikeia', 116: 'The date of this foundation [i.e. Stratonikeia] is unclear, but is certainly no earlier than the reign of Antiochos II (261–246), and conceivably was the work of Seleucus II (246–226/5): there is otherwise little evidence for Seleucid control of western Caria before the reign of this last monarch'.

⁴² So e.g. Ma, *Antiochos III* p. 42 with n. 57; cf. p. 41 with n. 53: 'Rather than reconstruct an earlier inroad under Antiochos I, on the basis of *I.Stratonikeia* 1030....', with a further discussion on pp. 277–278. P. Debord, 'Essai sur la géographie historique de la région de Stratonicee', *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, 8 (1994) p. 107–121 at 107, and *idem*, *REA* 107 (2005) 637, accepts the evidence of 1030. In *EA* 45 (2013) 100, M. Ç. Şahin confirms that the stone came originally from Stratonikeia.

⁴³ For previous views on the date of foundation see van Bremen, 'The Demes and *Phylai* of Stratonikeia in Karia', *Chiron* (2000) 389–401 at 389, with n.1 for all references.

⁴⁴ Above, n. 14. This will be discussed in a forthcoming article by A. Bresson and R. Descat.

⁴⁵ G.M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (1995) 250 with the main references; Ma, *Antiochos III*, 42.

⁴⁶ L. Robert, 'Sur des inscriptions de Délos I: sur un proxène d'Antioche de Carie' *Études déliennes* (*BCH* Suppl. 1, 1973) 435–466 (*Choix d'écrits* [2007] 471–499).

archon list.⁴⁷ The first, *FD* III 3: 192 (*SGDI* 2699), in which Artemidōros features among a number of other *proxenoi*, is dated to the archonship of Aristiōn (either 267/6 or 266/5 or, on the low dating 262/1 or 261/0 BC).⁴⁸ The second (*SGDI* 2587) a proxeny decree for Artemidōros and his three brothers, is dated by Aristiōn's immediate successor Archelas and so has a date of either 266/5 or 265/4 on the high dating, or 261/0 or 260/59 on the low dating. *IG* XI 4, 600, from Delos, is an honorific decree for the same Artemidōros son of Menyllos, but here his ethnic is Antiocheus. The *rogator* of this decree, Menes son of Euelthōn, is known from a number of Delian documents; his activities have been dated to between 267–246 BC.⁴⁹ The decree for Artemidōros is given a date ‘dans les années 260–250’.⁵⁰ If we adhere to the lower dating for both Delphic archons, 262/1 or 261/2 for Aristion, 261/0 or 260/59 for Archelas, then it is clear that the city's renaming took place under, or on the instigation of, Antiochos II. If the higher date, then a renaming (and a take-over of the city) under Antiochos I should not be excluded—and the Delian decree does not contradict this.

It hardly needs saying that the fate of Alabanda was at all times closely connected to that of neighbouring Alinda, whose plain is easily reachable by way of the valley to Alabanda's north.

Bargylia

I next consider Bargylia, located south of the Gulf of Iasos on the western shore of a sheltered, narrow sea inlet. Unlike Hyllarima, Stratonikeia and Alabanda, Bargylia, as a coastal city and at no great distance from Ptolemaic Myndos and Halikarnassos, is in some ways the most surprising city to have become Seleukid. There seems however to be no doubt at all that this took place under Antiochos I. The most direct evidence is in the decree *I.Iasos* 608 in honour of a foreign judge from Teos sent to Bargylia at the behest of ‘the king’ (l. 3–4: καθότι ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐ[ἴ]γγρα[ψεν]). The honours conferred on the Teian judge are to be announced at Bargylia by the agonothete ἐν τῷ γυμνικῷ ἀ[γῶνι] || [τ]ῷ συντελουμένῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου βασιλε[ῖ] Ἀντιόχ[ω] Σωτήρι (20–22). And even if we cannot be absolutely certain that the king who ordered the sending of the judge (mentioned again in l. 18, 41 and 44) was Antiochos I Sōter rather than his son Antiochos II,⁵¹ the fact that the Bargylietai

⁴⁷ D. Knoepfler and F. Lefèvre, *BCH* 119 (1995) 137–159 and 161–208 respectively; F. Lefèvre *Topoi* 8/1 (1998) 173–185; *idem*, *CID* IV, 26–27, indicates the issues and the problems, though without (as I understand it) coming down on either side of the chronological divide.

⁴⁸ L. Robert, and after him G.M. Cohen, *Hellenistic Settlements* (249) still worked with an earlier dating of 275/4 BC for the proxeny decree under Archelas.

⁴⁹ L. Robert gave as his dates 267–240 BC (Choix d'écrits 472) but see the next n.

⁵⁰ For the dates see Cl. Vial, *Délos indépendante (314–167 avant J.-C.), étude d'une communauté civique et de ses institutions* (1984) 98 with n. 16, 134 with n. 44, 137, 261 (as herald in 250 BC), 350 (with all references).

⁵¹ Cf. M. Holleaux, *Études* III (1938) 35 (Antiochos Sōter); L. Robert, *OMS* 24–26; 1053 n. 5; Ph. Gauthier, *JS* 1994, 167; *idem*, *BE* 1998, 104; P. Fröhlich, *REA* 218, p. 359 (Antiochos I) and 360 (where Antiochos II is a typo, so P. F. *per ep.*). L. Capdetrey, *Le pouvoir séleucide* (2007) 299 attributes the sending of the Teian judge to Antiochos II (p. 436) but gives as date for the decree *I.Iasos* 608 (his no. 51) ‘vers 270–261’. Chr. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. *Zetemata* 14 (2nd ed. 1970) 103 with n. 2, thought that the decree must belong to the final years of Antiochos I, since Alexandros, brother of Laodike I, who was based in Sardes in the 240s and turned partisan of Antiochos Hierax in the Laodikeian war (Euseb. *Chron.* I, 251; Porph. F32.8 [*FgrHist* 260]), is mentioned in ll. 46–48: ἀναγγεῖλαι δὲ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ [καταλ]ελειμμένῳ ὑπὸ [τοῦ] [[β]ασιλέως. John Ma (*Antiochos III*, 42, n. 57) assumed, for the same reasons, that the decree belonged to the first years of Antiochos II. The exact dates of Alexandros' position at Sardis are simply not known. Capdetrey vacillates between his being in place as governor (or vice-roy: his title is identical to that of

celebrated an *agōn* in his honour is sufficient proof that the city's subject status went back to the earlier monarch.⁵² Whether the same fate befell Iasos, in alliance with the Ptolemaic kings since the time of Ptolemy I, is impossible to say. It is usually assumed that the alliance which secured that city a limited autonomy remained in place until around the middle of the third century but we do not have any direct evidence for this and the proximity of Seleukid Bargylia must have caused the Iasians at the very least some concern.⁵³

Kildara

In *Epigraphica Anatolica* 20 (1992)⁵⁴ W. Blümel published four fragments of an inscription found at the ancient site of Kildara (Killara), modern Kuzyaka, to the south-west of Mylasa and some 10 km from the site of Bargylia on the coast.⁵⁵ The text is a letter written in 246 BC by the Ptolemaic minister Tlepolemos to the Kildareis in response to a decree that had been presented to him by their ambassadors together with gifts. The Kildareis, in sending an embassy to Tlepolemos, had made it clear to him that they had decided to embrace the cause of Ptolemy III, his sister Berenike and her child with Antiochos II (also called Antiochos and already called 'king'). 'Ἡμεῖς δὲ παρηκολουθη[κότ]εξ εὐνόως προσεληλυθόσι πρὸς τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολ[ε]μαιοῦ πράγματα (A/C 5–6): 'we, having heard that you have with good intentions gone over to the cause of king Ptolemy' are the words of Tlepolemos. From this Blümel (rightly, in my view) concluded that the Kildareis had until then been under Seleukid control but had changed sides at the outbreak of the 'Laodikeian war' in 246 BC at the death of Antiochos II, turning their back on the party of Laodike and

Zeuxis under Antiochos III) at Sardes at the end of Antiochos I's reign 'au plus tard' (p. 295) and his being given that role under Antiochos II (p. 272). For references see most conveniently *I. Tralleis und Nysa* I, at no. 25 (an honorific decree for an Alexandros). A. McAuley's 'a series of inscriptions from Sardes dated to between 261–244' in which Alexandros supposedly features as a 'Seleukid satrap with military and civil authority over the region' simply does not exist ('The House of Achaïos: reconstructing an early client dynasty of Seleukid Anatolia' in K. Erickson (ed.) *The Seleukid Empire 281–222 BC, War within the Family*, 37–58, at p. 48).

⁵² Coins from the time of Antiochos II with the cult image of Artemis Kindyas alongside a seated Apollo on the reverse should be attributed to Bargylia. Le Rider, 'Antiochos II à Mylasa', *BCH*, 114 (1990) 543–551, argued on the basis of these coins, attributed initially to Mylasa, that that city was Seleukid under Antiochos II. Correctly, as it turns out, but not on the evidence of the coins, which cannot be Mylasan. Cf. his 'Note additionnelle', *BCH* 120 (1996) 775–777. Houghton and Lorber, *Seleucid Coins A Comprehensive Guide: Part I* (2002) 195–196, also reject a Mylasan mint, but hang fire on Bargylia because of the difficulty in identifying the cult statue. On two recently auctioned coins (May 10 and June 28, 2017, both Classical Numismatic Group, Auction 105, lot 412, and Electronic Auction 400, lot 319) however, the Artemis Kindyas with her ribbons crossed over her chest is clearly identifiable. On the identification see especially F. Delrieux *RSN* 77 (1998) 41–52. To which of the Successors we should date the Bargylian Alexanders equally with the Kindyas statue on the reverse alongside a seated Zeus, is unclear. The modern attribution is either 'vers 280' or 'between 300 and 280'. H. Seyrig had initially argued for an early Seleukid date: 'Monnaies hellénistiques XI', *RN* 6.6 (1964) 7–8 (with Fig. 1). Our ignorance about Bargylian history before the 260s is near-total: van Bremen, *EA* 46 (2013) 21–22.

⁵³ So L. Migeotte: 'on peut supposer que les conditions de son alliance avec les Ptolémées sont restées à peu près stables jusqu'au milieu du IIIe siècle environ, époque où l'influence lagide a subi un recul dans la région' ('Iasos et les Lagides' in Fr. Duyrat et O. Picard (éd.), *L'exception égyptienne ?* (2005) 189–203, at 206.

⁵⁴ W. Blümel, 'Brief des Ptolemäischen Ministers Tlepolemos an die Stadt Kildara in Karien', *EA* 20, 1992, 127–33 (*SEG* 42, 994).

⁵⁵ In antiquity, Kildara was closer to, and had direct access to, the sea. See J. and L. Robert *Fouilles d'Amyzon* 181–186 for an evocative description of the location and the site's relation to Hydisos, Bargylia and Theangela.

Seleukos II.⁵⁶ But in a discussion of the text in the *Bulletin épigraphique* of 1994 (528) Ph. Gauthier saw in the expression rather a continuation of the Kildareis' adherence to the Ptolemaic cause: 'il me paraît probable que les Kildaréens (comme les Mylasiens et les Halicarnassiens) aient été, dès avant 246, dans la dépendance des Lagides'.⁵⁷

It now looks likely that the Kildareis, like their close neighbours the Mylaseis and the Bargylietai had become Seleukid in the 260s and that Blümel's initial reconstruction was right. Kildara presumably remained Seleukid until 246, when the city briefly rallied to the Ptolemaic cause as shown in the inscription, only to be 'liberated' soon after, by Seleukos II. This sequence of events (*if* it could be taken to apply equally to Mylasa) would have the merit of explaining why, in his letter to the Mylaseis, Olympichos referred to the king as 'having written' to him 'to liberate your city' (*I.Labraunda* 3.7–8: κα[θ'] ὄν κ[αίρ]ῶ[ν] ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος [ἐ]λευ[θ]ε[ρῶσ]αι ὑμῶν τὴν πόλιν).⁵⁸

II. The temenos of Zeus of the Otōrkondeis and the act of sale/acquisition

Even if we cannot pin down exactly the date at which Mylasa became Seleukid, between 267 and (?) 263 BC, we have gained much in being able to put a precise date on one of the earliest known transactions in which a Mylasan *phyle* acquired property for the benefit of their Zeus.

In our document, the acquisition by the *oikonomos* consists entirely of real estate: two houses in, or on the outskirts of, the city (κατὰ πόλιν)⁵⁹ with the adjoining small courtyard (αὐλίδιον) and a plot for building (οἰκόπεδον), and four further houses with adjoining small courtyard; no agricultural land. Although the properties were bought from a private individual (Aristeas, son of Hekataios, ll. 5–6), they were located inside the very precinct of Zeus of the Otōrkondeis for whom the acquisition was made. This shows unambiguously that property within a sacred precinct⁶⁰ was subject to a normal process of sale and (re?) acquisition, with the *phyle* administering the sanctuary being one of the parties in the sale.⁶¹

⁵⁶ Blümel (p. 132): 'In dem Brief des Tlepolemos an die Stadt Kildara werden die Bedingungen – Rechte und Pflichten – festgelegt, unter denen die Stadt die Partei gewechselt hat.'

⁵⁷ See also id., 'Nouvelles inscriptions de Claros: décrets d'Aigai et de Mylasa pour des juges colophonieniens' *REG* 112 (1999) pp. 29–31, equally postulating Ptolemaic control over Mylasa until 246 BC. In fact, Gauthier's excellent discussion of the Mylasan decree, and his attribution of it to the first half of the 3rd century ('assez haut dans le IIIe s. ... à l'époque de la domination lagide'), stand, only we may now have to consider that the circumstances were those of Seleukid, not Ptolemaic overlordship). See also my 'Labraunda and the Ptolemies' 246, where I discuss this document in a Ptolemaic context.

⁵⁸ Cf. *I. Labraunda* 8.13–15, and the honorific decree of Mylasa for Olympichos *I.Labraunda* 134, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 41 (2008) 39–52 (*SEG* 58, 1220, improved text and correct date in *CGRN* no. 150) ll. 11–14.

⁵⁹ κατὰ πόλιν can mean either 'in the city' or 'just outside' the city. We do not know the location of the *temenos* of Zeus of the Otōrkondeis. The same designation in *I.Mylasa* 205.8; 206.8; *I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva* 14a; cf. L. Robert, *I.Sinuri* 11.11, with commentary p. 39.

⁶⁰ *Temenos* here clearly has the meaning of sacred precinct of a sanctuary rather than an arable sacred estate located elsewhere whose revenue benefited a god. See the discussion in N. Papazarkadas, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens* (2011) 3.

⁶¹ Whether the properties in question could also be bought and sold between individuals is unknown. I cannot see how this transaction could fit the assertion of L. Migeotte (L'aliénation de biens-fonds publics et sacrés dans les cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique', in M. Gagarin et A. Lanni (eds), *Symposion 2013. Papers on Greek and Hellenistic Legal History* (2014) 287–301, at 294–

We do not know if the seller in this document and the owners of the adjoining properties were themselves members of the *phyle* of the Otörkondeis⁶² nor at what stage and for what reason they or their forebears had acquired either the properties or the right to build on *temenos* land; given the date of our document, the prehistory of the *temenos* and its buildings would take us into the fourth century and probably beyond. Membership of a *phyle* must have come with rights and obligations, perhaps including rights to land: the quite independent organization of the three Mylasan *phylai*, even within the framework of the developed city fits with the impression that they had a physical base in the city's territory alongside a sacred base within, or on the outskirts of, the urban centre.⁶³ This *phyle*'s land seems to have been concentrated in the large plain of Omba to the east of the city, as many examples in *I.Mylasa* s.v. Ὀμβιανὸν πεδίων show.⁶⁴ In two documents of the third century (both discussed below), the Otörkondeis lease out farmland ἐν Τογγρομοίς, a locality probably in the same plain.⁶⁵

If all the properties listed as adjoining those being sold (including the *ergasteria* of Zeus of the Otörkondeis) were equally located within the *temenos*, then this gives us an interesting insight into what an (sub?)urban *temenos* looked like.⁶⁶

295) that 'sacred' property – which surely includes property located inside a sanctuary precinct as well as agricultural land outside it – was only ever 'sold' for a defined period, or was not really 'sold' but remained the property of the god, and therefore was in fact leased out. Since the properties of the Mylasan gods were often leased out, no need for this kind of fictional 'sale' would have existed.

⁶² The names (or the patronyms) cannot be associated with either a *phyle* or a *syngeneia* affiliation.

⁶³ On the Mylasan *phylai* see, with caution, A. Laumoiere, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie* (1958) 101–128 (wrongly equating Mylasa's Zeus Osogō with Zeus of the Otörkondeis); *Milas Guide*, p. 1; Pernin, *Baux*, 418–422. The three Mylasan *phylai* occur first in a civic decree of the time of Maussollos: *I.Mylasa* 1, of 367/6 BC, ll. 3–4: καὶ ἐπεκύρωσαν αἱ τρεῖς φυλαί (cf. no 2, of 361 BC, ll. 4, and 3, of 355/4 BC, ll. 12–13).

⁶⁴ E.g. φυλετικὰ γέαι Διὸς Ὀτῶρκονδέων in *I.Mylasa* 209 and 214 clearly located in the Omba plain, and many other examples. The overall picture is complicated by the existence of *syngeneiai*, sub-units of the *phylai*, several of which also owned land collectively and whose members may individually have owned land and other property in parts of the territory. Some examples of land owned by *syngeneiai*: *I.Mylasa* 217.4: land of the Kendebeis. *EA* 19 (1992) 5–6, no. 217B (= Pernin156) shows the complexities of landownership in one part of this plain in the early 2nd century. On *syngeneiai* see A. Bresson, R. Descat *REA* 87 (1985) 191–211, and, in relation to property transactions, Pernin, *Baux* 419–422. I discuss their status and their landed possessions at greater length in Blümel-van Bremen, forthcoming.

⁶⁵ *I.Mylasa* 201 with *I.Mylasa Uzunyuva* 13. It is possible that the *temenos* of the Otörkondeis was located somewhere between the built-up urban centre and the Omba plain. Frank Rumscheid, (*per. ep.*) writes '...scheint es mir am wahrscheinlichsten, daß das Heiligtum am Nord- oder Nordostabhang des Hisarbaşı Hügels zu suchen ist. Reste in situ sind mir allerdings nicht bekannt'. This is precisely the area of the Firuz Bey mosque. The Omba plain, in my estimation, was located broadly to the east of the city, and may have met the Olymis where the road to Labraunda runs out from the city in a N-NE direction. The plain wraps itself around the city, and its southern part, where Beçin is located (perhaps the ancient Leuke Kome) appears to have contained properties of Zeus Osogō(IIIS). e.g. *I.Mylasa* 203.5–6. F. Hild, 'Topographica Carica' in *Vir Doctus Anatolicus. Studies in Memory of Sencer Şahin* (2016) 425–434 and *idem*, *Meilensteine, Straßen und das Verkehrsnetz der Provinz Karia* (2014) 43, placed it to Mylasa's south.

⁶⁶ Although there are parallels of *temene* containing built structures within their walls or boundaries, these seem on the whole to have had a specific function related to the sanctuary, whereas ours are clearly dwellings. This is not the place for extensive comparisons, but an example are the four shops (καπηλεία) in the Heraion on Samos, leased out to individual takers (*IG* XII 6, 169, mid-3rd century). Cf. also the much smaller *temenos* of Dionysas at Teos, owned by the city's *neoi* (M. Adak, K. Stauner, *Philia* 4 (2018) 1–25, with the discussion of D. Rousset in *BE* 2019, 419) and the complicated structures in the sanctuary of Apollo Asgelatas at Anaphe: *IG* XII 3, 248A, which contained among others a Εὐδῶρειον οἶκον and a Μειδίλειον (οἶκον) (l. 13).

The text is not conclusive,⁶⁷ but the specification σὺν εισόδῳ καὶ ἐξόδῳ implies that (at least some of) the neighbouring properties needed to be crossed in order to gain access to the houses and the courtyards, which suggests close proximity, as does the fact that, of a total of five neighbours, two had property adjoining one or both house(s) listed in l. 6 and one, two, three or four of the houses in l. 11. From *I.Mylasa* 110.17, we learn in addition that an honorific decree of the Otōrkondeis of the early second century had to be inscribed ἐπὶ τοῦ τοίχο[υ] τοῦ περιβόλου τοῦ τεμένου[ς], so a wall of a certain height around the (?entire) precinct has to be assumed, which makes the idea of adjoining houses inside and outside the *temenos* wall harder to envisage.⁶⁸

We may guess that the properties were acquired for the purpose of generating a stable rental income for the *phyle*, to be used for the maintenance of the sanctuary and for cultic activities but we do not know what form the lease contract took.⁶⁹ Because of the very specific nature and sequence of documents in the large land-lease dossiers from Mylasa and Olymos, whose chronology, purpose and rationale are still not fully understood,⁷⁰ it is tempting to see every Mylasan transaction from the perspective of this fully-formed ideal type and especially to see early documents like ours as first steps in a process.

1. decision of the *phyle* to acquire land for their god; to appoint a committee of *ktematōnai*, and for the same men, as *misthōtai*, to lease out the bought land; variation: an individual may appear before the assembly stating his willingness to sell his land and to accept a lease-contract for the same land
2. act of acquisition by the *ktematōnai*;
3. act of taking possession – *embasis*;
4. leasing out of the property usually to the same individual from whom the land had been acquired on a hereditary contract (whose terminology – *misthōsis eis (ta) patrika* – appears to have been borrowed from Macedonian usage).⁷¹

This may not be entirely wrong: most of the individual elements of the ‘model’ set out above were not in themselves unusual; it is the combination of elements, the volume of the transactions⁷² and their concentration in a specific time-period which combine

⁶⁷ Robert Parker (per. ep.): ‘Unlike you I’m not sure that the ‘neighbours’ mentioned necessarily were also within the *temenos*.’ The problem is that we have no grounds other than grammatical, for deciding how many of the properties were likely to have been in, and how many outside, the *temenos*, for we have no comparanda. Even a sceptic has to admit that, at the very least there were six houses with two adjoining courtyards and a building plot inside this particular *temenos* but there may have been twice as many.

⁶⁸ Cf. *I.Mylasa* 108.14: ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τῶ[ι] | [τῆς] φυλῆς Ὀτωρκονδέων (date uncertain: 2nd cent. BC?); 115.9: ἀ[να]γρᾶσαι τόδε τ[ὸ] | [ψήφισμα] ἐν τῶ | περιβόλῳ τ[οῦ] Διὸς | Ὀτωρκονδέων (2nd cent. BC); similar 157.19–20.

⁶⁹ On forms and duration of lease-contracts see the general discussion in Pernin, *Baux*, 21–28; 485–524 (synthesis), and J. Velissaropoulos-Karakostas, *Droit grec d’Alexandre à Auguste* (2011) vol. II, 317–359.

⁷⁰ van Bremen, *Ep.Anat.* 51 (2018) 21–22 with further refs.; Pernin, *Baux*, 444–445.

⁷¹ Blümel, *I.Mylasa* I, pp. 74–75 (pointing out that the order of the documents is in reverse on the stone, i.e. 4-2-3-1); Pernin, *Baux* 422–427; *I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva* p. 157–160. On the Macedonian origin of the terminology see van Bremen, *Ep.Anat.* 49 (2016) 17–21.

⁷² The Mylaseis (and Olymeis) individually or collectively engaged in property transactions that did not conform either to the purpose or the full format of the Pachturkunden dossiers. They bought, sold and leased or mortgaged land and houses using standard practices and procedures familiar from elsewhere in the Greek world. It is not (yet) clear how significant a proportion of all land transactions (sale or lease) the surviving dossiers represent: the fact of their inscribing on the walls of the sanctuaries that

to make them unique. I have recently shown that the Olymos dossiers belong broadly in the three decades between 160 and 130 BC, with a few earlier exceptions dated to between *c.* 190–160,⁷³ while the Mylasan ones (the majority related to the *phyle* of the Otörkondeis) stretch over a longer period, starting in the final decades of the third century and continuing to the final quarter of the second.⁷⁴

Our document, and the two others I discuss alongside it, predate the bulk of the land-lease dossiers by about half a century. In our act of sale it is the *oikonomos* who acquires the properties on behalf of his *phyle*; no committee of *ktematōnai* is involved. The sale is witnessed by four *μάρτυρες δικασταί*, ‘witnessing judges’⁷⁵ and required two guarantors (*βεβαιωταί*): both of these roles recur in later acts of sale.⁷⁶ We do not know what generated the acquisition: if there was a decision of the *phyle* it has not survived on stone. Equally, a lease document is missing but it may be assumed to have existed.

Such an (early) lease document, together with the initial decision of the *phyle* to lease out common land does survive for the *phyle* of the Otörkondeis. Until recently only the lease document was known (*I.Mylasa* 201),⁷⁷ but Marek and Zingg’s edition of new inscriptions from the Uzun Yuva excavation has added the matching decree of the *phyle* (*I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva* 13). The text of both is in the Appendix. The *phyle* decided, in *kyria ekklesia*, to commission its two *oikonomoi* to rent out on behalf of the *phyle*, on a hereditary basis (*eis ta patrika*) farmland which it owned in Toggrommoi (or Toggromma: the name is not otherwise known) for a minimum annual sum of 35 gold staters. In the lease document the actual annual rent achieved is 40 gold staters (or 800 drachmai, which presupposes a sizeable estate). As in our document, the main officials responsible for the transaction are the *oikonomoi* (here two, in our document one: the size of the transactions is very different). We should further note 1) that the lease is to be on a hereditary basis (*eis ta patrika*), a term borrowed from Macedonian usage; 2) that this is not a lease whose income was designated specifically for the *phyle*’s god and which does not concern sacred land; and 3) that the lessees are to pay the normal taxes, including to the *basilikon*, the royal treasury.

This last fact raises questions about the dating of these two documents. In a previous article, without the benefit of either the newly published *I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva* 13 or the new date of the inscription central to my discussion here, I cautiously wrote ‘we may be in the final decades of the third century, during the reconquest of the

were the beneficiaries of the acquisitions may have favoured their survival but at the same time proportionately distorted their importance. We can only indirectly reconstruct – usually from these same documents – other types of transactions and other types of ownership. I shall deal in more detail with this in Blümel-van Bremen forthcoming.

⁷³ *EA* 51 (2018) 19–35.

⁷⁴ Blümel-van Bremen forthcoming will contain a redating of the Mylasan documents.

⁷⁵ I discuss the *martyres dikastai* in Blümel-van Bremen forthcoming. They too may have a Macedonian origin: similarly named judges (*μάρτυρες δικαστῶν* alongside plain *δικασταί*) are attested in the Mieza register of sales (3rd/2nd century BC): J. Game, *Actes de vente dans le monde grec* (2008) 39B with the discussion on p. 100; see also Velissaropoulos-Karakostas vol. II, 274–276, with a further reference to *PCairoZen.* 59003 (259 BC) where a *dikastes* is present at the sale of a slave, and see I.N. Armatoglou, ‘Cultural transfer and law in Hellenistic Lycia: the case of Symmasis’ foundation’ in B. Legras (ed.) *Transferts culturels et droits dans le monde grec et hellénistique* (2012) 205–224, at 214, with n. 47 on magistrates as witnesses, with P. Fröhlich, *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)* (2004) 242–243.

⁷⁶ See the complex discussion in *I.Mylasa Uzun Yuva* pp. 157–160 of the presence of *βεβαιωταί*, *μάρτυρες δικασταί*, and a *νομοφύλαξ* and the nature of the document in which they feature.

⁷⁷ van Bremen *Ep. Anat.* 49 (2016) 21.

region by Antiochos III, but a date in the 240s (Seleukos II and Olympichos) is equally possible: as Crampa rightly saw, the *autonomia* and *demokratia* granted by Seleukos II to the city, by way of his *strategos* Olympichos, did not mean that the city was free from the obligation to contribute to the royal coffers when so required. The obligation in itself cannot date the text'.⁷⁸ This need some correction, for the text differentiates between *eisphorai*, which can be understood as contributions 'when so required' and τὰ προσπί[π]τοντα ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ ἢ [πολι]τικοῦ (ll. 8–9) and again (l. 11) τῶν ὀφειλημάτων μήτε εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν μήτε εἰς τὸ πολιτικὸν which should be seen as obligations to the king's treasury resulting from a subject status. I therefore now prefer to date these documents to before the mid-240s.

There was in any case an element of wishful thinking in this, for I had argued in that same article that the model for the Mylaseis' adoption of Macedonian terminology (*en patrikois*, *eis ta patrika*, used in Macedonian context to indicate hereditary possession of a royal land grant) and its adaptation to a different procedure, namely heritable leasehold, could have been introduced by Olympichos who, in a donation of land to the Mylaseis, himself used the very vocabulary that was to recur in the land-lease dossiers (*I.Labraunda* 8.20–24): ἀνατίθημι τῶι Διὶ τῶι Ὅσογῳι τάδε, καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ το[ύ]των πρόσοδος ὑπάρχει τῶι θεῶι ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον καὶ καταναλίσ[κ]ηται εἰς τὴν κατὰ μῆνα γινομένην παν<ήγυριν> τῶι Διί, καὶ τὰ ἀνατεθέντα ὑφ' ἡ[μ]ῶν ἐμ μνήμη καὶ τηρήσει ἡ, καὶ ἡ πρόσοδος αὔξεται· καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαι[τ]ε ψηφισάμενοι μισθῶσαι αὐτὰ εἰς πατρικὰ τακτοῦ φόρου. . . κτλ.

It is possible however, as I also cautiously wrote, that the text predates Olympichos and belongs to the 250s, when, as we now know, Mylasa was indeed subject to the Seleukid kings, in which case an earlier adoption/adaptation of Macedonian terminology (and procedures?) must be assumed, perhaps under Antiochos II, or Antiochos I, or under Ptolemaic management or earlier still under the satrap Asandros in the late fourth century.⁷⁹ Olympichos may, after all, not have been its prime instigator.

APPENDIX: TWO DOCUMENTS ISSUED BY THE *PHYLE* OF THE OTÖRKONDEIS

1. Marble block, roughly chiselled surface to left, damaged right and below. In Milas museum. Presumed origin Uzunyuva. h. 0.38 m; w. 0.89 m; d. 0.32 m; letters 0.9–1.4 cm. Photo (W. Blümel).

Ed. Ch. Marek – E. Zingg, *Die Versinschrift des Hyssaldomos und die Inschriften von Uzunyuva (Milas/Mylasa)* (2018) 161–165, no. 13 with photo (unclear). (P. Hamon, *BE* 2019, 450).

Cf. W. Blümel, *EA* 51 (2018 [2019]) 38/39 (Photo); E. Zingg – Ch. Marek, *Philia* 5 (2019) 174.

4 ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Ἱεροκλέους τοῦ Μενίππου, μηνὸς Δ[ύσ]-
 τρου πέμπτη ἰσταμένου, ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης, τύχη
 τῆι ἀγαθῆι· ἔδοξεν Ὀτωρκονδέων τῆι φυλῆι· τὴν γεωργίαν τη[ν]
 ἐν Τογγρομοῖς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπομισθῶσαι τοὺς οἰκονόμους Ἑρμί-
 αν Ἐκαταίου, Ἰάσωνα Παμφίλου εἰς τὰ πατρικὰ τοῦ ἐλαχίστου χρυ-
 σῶν τριάκοντα πέντε, ἐφ' ᾧ οἱ μισθωσάμενοι ἐγγύους καταστήσου-
 σιν ἀξιοχρέους τοῖς ταμίαις εἰς ἔτη δέκα, καὶ ἐξέσται ἀεὶ τοῖς ἀντι-

⁷⁸ *ibidem*.

⁷⁹ *ibidem*.

- 8 καθισταμένοι ταμίαις ἐπιδιεγγυᾶν· συντελοῦσι δὲ οἱ μισθωσάμενοι
καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κατὰ τὴν διαγραφὴν καθ' ἣν ἂν κοινή πρὸς τοὺς οἰκονόμους
συνγράψωνται· τὸν δὲ φόρον διορθῶσονται τοῖς ταμίαις κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
ἄνεικον ἀνυπόλογον ἀτελέα πάντων μηνὸς Ξανδικοῦ διχομη-
12 νία· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα ὡς ἂν ἡ μίσθωσις συντελεσθῆι καὶ τὴν δι-
αγραφὴν καθ' ἣν ἂν συνθῶνται ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ ἀναθέτωσαν ἐν τῷ ἱ-
ερῷ τοῦ Διὸς Ὀτωρκονδέων· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα δοῦναι τοὺς ἐνεστῶτας τα-
μίας

Translation

1 In the year of the *stephanephoros* Hierokles son of Menippos, on the fifth (day of the decade) of the beginning of the month Dystros in a regular session of the assembly; to good fortune

3 decision of the *phyle* of the Otörkondeis: the *oikonomoi* Hermias son of Hekataios and Iasōn son of Pamphilos are to lease out on a hereditary basis the agricultural land in Togggroma, common land, for at least thirty-five *chrysoi* (gold staters) on the condition that the tenants provide trustworthy guarantors to the *tamiai* for a period of ten years; it will be permitted to whomever succeeds them as *tamiai* to require additional guarantors;

8 the tenants are to carry out everything else according to the contract which they have agreed with the *tamiai*; they are to pay the rent to the *tamiai* each year, without demur, subject to no claim, free from all taxes, in the mid point of the month of Xandikos;

12 the decree is to be inscribed so that the lease be concluded, and the contract on which they have agreed, on a stone stele and set this up in the sanctuary of Zeus of the Otörkondeis; the money fore this shall be given by the *tamiai* in office.

2. Bluish stone, found by Ph. Le Bas close to the Han of the foreigners, above the Bazar, found again by W. Judeich and by E. Hula (Schede Nr. 141 in the Archive of the Arbeitsgruppe Epigraphik, Vienna) built into a private house, broken in two parts. Letters 1.5 cm. Squeeze Vienna (3 parts, only ll. 1–6). – Photo of the squeeze (Reger).

Ed. Ph. Le Bas – W. H. Waddington, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines recueillies en Asie Mineure* (1870) 404 (copy and squeeze Le Bas).

Cf. W. Judeich, *Athen. Mitt.* 15 (1890) 281; L. Robert, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa I. Les inscriptions grecques* (1945) 74/75

I. Mylasa I (1987) 201. I. Pernin, *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne: corpus épigraphique et étude* (2014) 296/97 No. 137 with translation and commentary.

- [ἐπὶ] στεφ[ανηφόρου Ἱεροκλέους] τοῦ Μενίππου, μηνὸς [. . . .], ἐκκλησίας κυρία[ς
γενομένης ἐν]
[Τ]αυροφονίοις κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, τύχη τῇ ἀγαθῇ· [εἰς μίσθωσιν] ἔδωκεν ἡ φυλὴ ἢ
Ὀτωρκ[ονδέων καὶ οἱ]
αἰρεθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς Ὀτωρκονδέων φυλῆς οἰκονόμοι Ἑρμίας Ἐκαταίου, Ἰάσων
Παμ[φίλου καὶ οἱ]
4 ταμίαι Θυσσος Ἀπολλωνίου, Ἀπολλώνιος Μόσχου γῆν τὴν Ὀτωρκονδέων τη[ν ἐν
Τογγρομ]-
μοις εἰς τὰ πατρικά, ἐκάστου ἔτους χρυσῶν τεσσαράκοντα· ἄρξει δὲ τῆς ἐρ[γασίας]
χρόνος ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου τοῦ μετὰ Ἱεροκλῆν Μενίππου ἐσομένου μὴν Περίτιος, ἵ[να
γεωρ]-
γῶνται οἱ μισθωσάμενοι τὴν γῆν καθάπερ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τὰς ἰδίας γεωργίας ἐ[ργάζον]-
8 ται· καὶ τὰς τε εἰσφορὰς διορθῶσονται πάσας [καὶ τὰ] προσπί[π]τοντα ἐκ τοῦ
βασιλικοῦ ἢ [πολι]-

τικοῦ καθάπερ καὶ οἱ τὰς ἰδίας γεωργίας γεωργοῦντες· μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ τοῖς
 νοῖς μῆτε ἀποδόσθαι τὴν γῆν ταύτην μῆτε ὑποθεῖναι μηδὲ ἄλλοις παραδοῦναι μηδ'
 [χ]υρα παρέχεσθαι πρὸς τι τῶν ὀφειλημάτων μῆτε εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν μῆτε εἰς τὸ
 12 τε ἰδιώτηι μηθενί· ἐγγύους δὲ καταστή[σ]ουσιν οἱ μισθωσάμενοι ἀξιο[χρέ]ους εἰς
 εἰς ἔτη δέκ[α καὶ τὸ]ν φόρον διορθώσονται ἄνει[κον] ἀνυπό[λο]γον ἀτελ[έα πά]ντων
 [φανηφόρου]· []ΠΑΙΚΕ[]

Translation

1 [In the year of the *stephanephoros* Hierokles son] of Menippos, in the month [- - -], in regular assembly during the Taurophonia according to ancestral custom, to good fortune.

2 [have leased out] the *phyle* of the Otōrkondeis [and] the *oikonomoi* elected by the *phyle* of the Otōrkondeis Hermias son of Hekataios, Iasōn son of Pamphilos, [and the] *tamiai* Thyssos son of Apollōnios, Apollōnios son of Moschos,

4 land of the Otōrkondeis [in Tongrom]ma on hereditary leasehold for forty *chrysoi* (gold staters) per year;

5 the start time of the [agricultural work] is in the year of the *stephanephoros* following Hierokles son of Menippos, (in the) month of Peritios, [so that] the tenants work the land as the other (farmers) [work] their own fields;

8 and they shall pay all levies and everything that falls to them from the king's treasury or that of the city just like those who cultivate their own land;

9 it will not be permitted to the tenants to sell this land or to mortgage it or to transfer it to others or to put it up as surety for a debt either to the king's treasury or to that of the city or to a private individual;

12 the tenants are to put up trustworthy guarantors for the payment in full for a period of ten years and to fulfill the obligation to pay the rent without demur, subject to no claim, free from all taxes in the year of the *ste[phanephoros]* - - -]