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 *mistrhōsis*, the leasing out of the land acquired. This document could, but need not, have been part of such a larger dossier.³

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


**MYLASA IN 261 BC**


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 πεντηκοστοτίο 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]

ένος καὶ πεντηκοστοτίον ἐπὶ στεφανιφόρου Ἀριστέου τοῦ Ἰατροκλέους, μινὸς Πανήμου προτέραι· ἐπίριτος Πολύτιος Προκτού ὁ Ωτορκονδέων φυλής τοῦ Δίος τοῦ Ὀτορκονδέων παρὰ Αριστέου τοῦ Ἐκταίου οἰκίας δύο κατὰ πόλιν ἐν τοῖς τεμένει τοῖς τοῦ Δίος Ὀτορκονδέων σὺν τῶν προσόντων ἀυλιδίῳ καὶ ὀικοπέδωι, σὺν ἑσόδοις καὶ ἐξόδοις, αἰς γείτονες Διονύσιος Ἰατροκλέους, Γλαύκος Μενίππου, Πρωτέας Τιμοκλέους καὶ τὰ ἔργαστήρια τὰ Δίος Ὀτορκονδέων· ἄλλας οἰκίας τέσσαρας ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶι τεμένει καὶ
2 [- - - ] of the fifty-first. In the year of the stephanophoros 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 Köstes, Pollis son of Polykritis, 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, 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.

Our inscription has a dating formula by stephanophoros, month and day in ll. 2–3. This is preceded, in l. 2 by a numeral in the genitive, ἐνός καὶ πεντηκοστῶν, ‘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 Θεόμυστος Υβρέος 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. 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) on July 16. Both post-date the death of Antiochos I, on June 2nd of 261 BC. 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:

\[ \text{ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ} \]

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:

\[ \text{ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ καὶ Ἀντὶ Καρίας} \]

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’ allowed Antiochos II to make inroads into Ptolemaic possessions in central and western Karia. The presumed ‘Karian campaign’ of Antiochos II, during which Alabanda is said to have been renamed ‘Antiocheia’, Stratonikeia founded, Alinda, Mylasa and Bargylia ‘taken’, has as its only variant in the recent historiography the view of Chr. Habicht and Ph. Gauthier, 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://webspace.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.


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 Panemnos, ninth year of Philadephos (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 Heraklea 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

---

\(^{13}\) J. and L. Robert, *Amyzon* 3. His title may have been στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Καταρίας.

\(^{14}\) 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 Ameinius (*IG* XII 6.1, 120) begins στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Καταρίας κατεστήκται. 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.


\(^{16}\) 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 Apollonios see further below XXX.
Philadelphos (10 May 267 BC). 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 Sōphrôn, 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. 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. In I.Labraunda 3, a letter of the late 240s BC, Olympichos, strategos in the service of Seleukos II, refers to the Mylasan ambassadors having shown him ‘other documents, including those written by Sōphrôn 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 ἦμεν οἱ προσερμόται καὶ χρηματίσαμεν ὅλους τε καὶ τὰ παρὰ Σώφρονος γραφέντα πρὸς [..] υἱὸς καὶ Πτολεμαίου Αἰφενοὺς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου, ὅμώς δὲ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταύτα οἰκονομικά ἄλλα ταύτα νῦν ἂν γράψῃς). 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. 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 Sōphrôn before Ptolemy, something the royal protocol would not have allowed unless a chronological sequence was specifically intended. Sōphrôn, 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.

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.


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 Sōphrôn, see the discussion in Gygax, ‘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 Ephesos, though without being able to speculate further on the exact nature of his authority or his political allegiance during the Laodikeian war. The ordo marchiae 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.

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. The year in which Apollōnios became dioiketes was year 24 of Ptolemy Philadelphos, i.e. 262/1 BC of the Macedonian calendar. 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. 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. 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, 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

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 (ἐπὶ Μεσοπόταμος Σελεύκου τοῦ τιμωροῦ) 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.
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 (πολίχνιον Καρίας ὑπέρθεν 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) βασιλεύς ὑπέρθεν Αντίόχου καὶ Σελευκοῦ, θεσεῖς ὑπὲρ Αντίόχου καὶ Σελευκοῦ could well instead be restored βασιλεύς ὑπέρθεν Αντίόχου καὶ Σελευκοῦ τοῦ ιοίου since we do not know the line-length; and even though l. 4 starts with ΣΕΛΑΣ 7 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. Wörrie, *Chiron* 5 (1975) 59–88 (IK *Laodikeia am Lykos* 1) is dated to Peritios of the 45th year (28 December 268 – 26 January 267) ὑπέρθεν ἀντιόχου καὶ Σελευκοῦ.

\(^{34}\) καὶ ἄνευ δυνάμεως τῶν κύκλων χωρίων, ὅστε καὶ περὶ Σάρδεις ἐνίκησε μᾶλλον ἀντίοχον τῶν Σελευκοῦ.


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


\(^{38}\) *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. The evidence of the Hyllarima list of 264/3 BC may therefore be put alongside the pre- or proto-Stratonickeian 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) Stratonickeia 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 Stratonickeian document has long created problems for those who prefer to attribute the foundation of Stratonickeia to Antiochos II, or even later. 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. 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 Stratonickeia, sometime between 268 and 261 BC.

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.

Alabanda

The renaming of Alabanda, further north in the Marsyas valley, to Antiocheia has also been more or less unanimously attributed to Antiochos II. 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. In two Delphic proxeny decrees Hyllarima, may not have remained Ptolemaic much further north in the Marsyas valley, to Antiocheia has also been more or less unanimously attributed to Antiochos II. 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. 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, ‘Stratonickeia’, 116: ‘The date of this foundation [i.e. Stratonickeia] is unclear, but is certainly no earlier than the reign of Antiochus 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’.
43 For previous views on the date of foundation see van Bremen, ‘The Demes and Phylai of Stratonickeia 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.
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archon list.\textsuperscript{47} The first, \textit{FD} III 3: 192 (SGDI 2699), in which Artemidōros features among a number of other \textit{proxenoi}, is dated to the archonship of Aristion (either 267/6 or 266/5 or, on the low dating 262/1 or 261/0 BC).\textsuperscript{48} The second (SGDI 2587) a proxeny decree for Artemidōros and his three brothers, is dated by Aristion’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. \textit{IG} XI 4, 600, from Delos, is an honorific decree for the same Artemidōros son of Menyllos, but here his ethnic is Antiochus. The \textit{rogator} of this decree, Menes son of Eueithōn, is known from a number of Delian documents; his activities have been dated to between 267–246 BC.\textsuperscript{49} The decree for Artemidōros is given a date ‘dans les années 260–250’.\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{Bargylia}

I next consider Bargylia, located south of the Gulf of Iasos on the western shore of a sheltered, narrow sea inlet. Unlike Hyllarima, Stratoniikeia 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 \textit{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 βασιλέως[ζ ἡγαρις] ἔνευς). The honours conferred on the Teian judge are to be announced at Bargylia by the agonothete ἐν τῷ γυμνικῷ ὑγόνι |[[τὸι] συντελουμένῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ δῆμου βασιλείας[ν Ἁντιόχου] ὦι Σωτήρ (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,\textsuperscript{51} the fact that the Bargylitai

\begin{flushright}

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

\textsuperscript{49} L. Robert gave as his dates 267–240 BC (Choix d’écrits 472) but see the next n.

\textsuperscript{50} For the dates see Cl. Vial, \textit{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).

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. M. Holleaux, \textit{Études} III (1938) 35 (Antiochos Sōter); L. Robert, \textit{OMS} 24–26; 1053 n. 5; Ph. Gauthier, \textit{JS} 1994, 167; idem, \textit{BE} 1998, 104; P. Fröhlich, \textit{REA} 218, p. 359 (Antiochos I) and 360 (where Antiochos II is a typo, so P. F. \textit{per ep.}.). L. Capdetrey, \textit{Le pouvoir séleucide} (2007) 299 attributes the sending of the Teian judge to Antiochos II (p. 436) but gives as date for the decree \textit{I. Iasos} 608 (his no. 51) ‘vers 270–261’. Chr. Habicht, \textit{Göttmenschentum 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. \textit{Chron.} 1, 251; Porph. \textit{FgrHist} 260)), is mentioned in II. 46–48: ἄναγγελλάς ὑμῖν ἐκλειμμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ [[β]]ματίλλος, John Ma (\textit{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 agôn in his honour is sufficient proof that the city’s subject status went back to the earlier monarch.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{53}

**Kildara**

In *Epigraphica Anatolica* 20 (1992)\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’). Ἱμεῖς δὲ παρακολουθήσας κόσμος τὸν βασιλέα Πτολεμαίου προσελήλυθός πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ Πτολέμαου 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

\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{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. But in a discussion of the text in the Bulletin épiographique 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’] ὑ[ν] κ[ατ][θ’] ἔγραψεν ὡ[μᾶν] ὁ βασιλεὺς Σέλευκος [ἡ]λεύ[ο]ρ[ω]σ[μ]ι ὑ[μῶν] τὴν πόλιν).58

II. The temenos of Zeus of the Otörkondeis 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 Otörkondeis 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 colophoniens’ 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 Pтолomies’ 246, where I discuss this document in a Ptolemaic context.
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 Otörkondeis. The same designation in I.Mylasa 205.8; 206.8; I.Mylasa Uzun Tuva 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 Otōrkondēs 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, 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. 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. Ὀμβανῶν πεδίον show. In two documents of the third century (both discussed below), the Otōrkondēseis lease out farmland ἐν Τογγρομοῖς, a locality probably in the same plain.

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

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.


64 E.g. φιλάτσικα γέζαι Διὸς Ὀτωρκονήδουν 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 Kendebeisi. E 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 Ουζουμά 13. It is possible that the temenos of the Otōrkondēseis 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 Olympos 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(lis). 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 (καμπήλεια) in the Heraion on Samos, leased out its 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. Roussel in BE 2019, 419) and the complicated structures in the sanctuary of Apollo Asgelatas at Anaphé: IG XII 3, 248A, which contained among others a Ἐθνάειοϛ οἶκον and a Μεϊδέλειοϛ (οἶκον) (I. 13).
The text is not entirely clear, but the specification σὸν εἰσόδου καὶ ἐξόδου 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 ὄτορκονδεῖς of the early second century had to be inscribed ἐπὶ τοῦ τοῖχο[ου] 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.

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. Because of the very specific nature and sequence of documents in the large land-lease dossiers from Mylasa and Olympos, whose chronology, purpose and rationale are still not fully understood, 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) patria – appears to have been borrowed from Macedonian usage).

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 transactions 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.


71 Blümel, J. 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; J. 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 form 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, 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.

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 δικαστά, ‘witnessing judges’ and required two guarantors (βεβαιωταί): both of these roles recur in later acts of sale. 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.Myłasa 201), but Marek and Zingg’s edition of new inscriptions from the Uzun Yuva excavation has added the matching decree of the phyle (I.Myłasa Uzun Yuva 13). The text of both is in the Appendix. The phyle decided, in kyria ekklesia, to commision 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.Myłasa 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 Blümel-van Bremen forthcoming will contain a redating of the Mylasan documents.
74 I discuss the martyres dikastai in Blümel-van Bremen forthcoming. They too may have a Macedonian origin: similarly named judges (μάρτυρες δικαστών alongside plain δικαστα) 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. Arnatoglu, ‘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 (IVe–Ier siècle avant J.-C.) (2004) 242–243.
75 See the complex discussion in I.Myłasa Uzun Yuva pp. 157–160 of the presence of βεβαιωταί, μάρτυρες δικαστά, and a νομοθέτης and the nature of the document in which they feature.
region by Antiochos III, but a date in the 240s (Seleukos II and Olympichos) is equally possible: as Crampa rightly saw, the autonómia and demokratía 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. This need some correction, for the text differentiates between eisphorai, which can be understood as contributions ‘when so required’ and τὰ προσπάθεια ἕκ τῷ βασιλικῷ ἡ [πολιτικόν] (ll. 8–9) and again (l. 11) τῶν φειδιαμάτων μήτε εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν μήτε εἰς τὸ πολιτικόν 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 doses (I.Labraunda 8.20–24): ἀνατάθεμι τοῖς Δῖ τοῖς Ὀσογοι τάδε, καὶ ἢ ἄχο τοῦ[ς] τρόπος ὑπάρχῃ τοῖς θεοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἁπαντὰ χρόνον καὶ κατανάλωσι[ν]ται εἰς τὴν κατὰ μήνα γινομένην παν–ηγουριν– τοῦ Δί, καὶ τὰ ἀνατάθετα ὑπὲρ ἀ[ν] εὑρίσκει τὰ ἢ, καὶ ἡ πρόσθος αἰζηται: καλῶς ἄν πουήσαι[ν] ὑποδέκεσθαι αὐτά εἰς πατρικά 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).


4 έν Τογγρκυμοις τὴν κοινὴν ἀπομείνει τοὺς σιωνόμους Ἐρμυθαν Ἐκκαμαίος, Ἰδόνα Παμφύλου εἰς τὰ πατρικὰ τὸ ἔλεγχον χρυσὸν τρίακοντα πέντε, ἐφ’ ὅτι οἱ μισθωσαμένοι ἐγγύως κοινῆσεσθειν ἀξιοχρέους τοῖς ταμίαις εἰς ἔτη δέκα, καὶ ἔξεσται ἄει τοῖς ἀντι-
I (1870) 404 (Reger).

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 Otorkondeis: the oikonomoi Hermias son of Hekataios and Iason son of Pamphilos are to lease out on a hereditary basis the agricultural land in Toggroma, 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 Otorkondeis; 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
τικον καθαρό καὶ οἱ τὰς ἱδίας γεωργίας γεωργοῦντες· μὴ ἐξεστῶ δὲ τοῖς µησθωσάµην—[χ]υρα παρέχεσθαι πρὸς τί τῶν ὀφειληµµάτων µήτε εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν µήτε εἰς τὸ πολιτικὸν µήτε ἴδιότητι µηθενε· ἐξόστωτος µὲνισθωσάµην εἰς ἔκτεσιν εἰς έτη δέκα καὶ τὸν φόρον διορθώσονται ἃνει[κον] ἄνυπόλοιο[ν] ἀτελε[ά]πάντων ἐπὶ στε-
[φανηφόρον] . [ ]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 Otôrkondeis [and] the oikonomoi elected by the phyle of the Otôrkondeis Hermias son of Hekataios, Iason son of Pamphilos, [and the] tamiai Thyssos son of Apollônios, Apollônios son of Moschos,

4 land of the Otôrkondeis [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 Peritos, [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[phane]phoros - - -]