



REVUE DES ETUDES ANCIENNES

1
2
5

TOME 125
2023 - N°1

UNIVERSITÉ BORDEAUX MONTAIGNE

PTOLEMAIC IMPERIALISM IN SOUTHERN ANATOLIA: CARIA, LYCIA, PAMPHYLIA AND CILICIA

Christelle FISCHER-BOVET*

Résumé. – Cet article examine l'impérialisme ptolémaïque en Anatolie méridionale et les changements apportés par les stratégies de domination des Ptolémées. Tout d'abord, de nouvelles sources archéologiques et épigraphiques démontrent que les Ptolémées ont laissé une empreinte plus importante qu'on ne le pensait jusqu'à présent, grâce à un réseau de fortifications qui s'étendait à l'intérieur des terres, à la fondation de villes de la même envergure que les Séleucides et à la diffusion des cultes royaux. Ensuite, l'épais réseau de communications mis en place par les Ptolémées a modifié les sphères politiques et socio-économiques de la région en intégrant les familles des élites locales dans la politique impériale et en recrutant des soldats. Enfin, des signes d'uniformisation d'un système de provinces sont visibles. Si les Ptolémées ont tendance à être considérés comme moins agressifs que leurs rivaux et ne sont pas perçus comme des bâtisseurs d'empire, l'article affirme qu'il existe suffisamment de preuves pour démontrer qu'il s'agit d'une idée fausse.

Abstract. – This paper examines Ptolemaic imperialism in southern Anatolia and the changes brought by their ruling strategies. First, new archaeological and epigraphic sources demonstrate that the Ptolemies left a more significant imprint than previously assumed through a nexus of fortifications that included inland areas, the foundation of cities on the same scale as the Seleucids and the spread of royal cults. Second, the thick network of communications the Ptolemies built altered the region's political and socio-economic spheres by integrating local elite families into imperial politics and recruiting soldiers. Finally, signs of the uniformization of a system of provinces are visible. While the Ptolemies tend to be considered less aggressive than their rivals and are not perceived as empire builders, the article argues there is enough evidence to show this to be a misconception.

Mots-clés. – Lagides, période hellénistique, impérialisme, fortifications, soldats, fondation, Anatolie du sud, Carie, Lycie, Pamphylie, Cilicie, Arsinoé (la cité de Cilicie).

Keywords. – Ptolemies, Hellenistic period, imperialism, fortifications, soldiers, settlement, Southern Anatolia, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia, Arsinoe (the city in Cilicia).

* Department of Classics, University of Southern California ; fischerb@usc.edu

Among the Successors of Alexander, Ptolemy has often been viewed as a “separatist” – only interested in securing Egypt for himself – and his son Ptolemy II as moderately and sporadically invested in an imperial project.¹ This interpretative framework resulted from the influential work of Rostovtzeff and Will, who used the concept of defensive imperialism when they had difficulties explaining Ptolemaic aggression beyond Cyrenaica, Cyprus and Coele-Syria.² This paper argues that the political and military activities of the first three Ptolemies brought more change in southern Anatolia (Asia Minor) than usually thought and contradicts the view of defensive imperialism. The kings took action to establish an empire beyond the so-called core region.³ A survey of the conquests and reconquests of Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia demonstrates a clear Ptolemaic investment in controlling this area. More importantly, the analysis of their ruling strategies in this region demonstrates two aspects of their imperial policies: first, their imprint on the land and second, changes in the political and socio-economic spheres, including in the administration of these regions. New evidence discussed below shows that the Ptolemies left a more significant physical mark on the region than previously assumed, despite the constraints of the environment, updating and refining the only extent analysis of these four regions during the Ptolemaic occupation by Bagnall in 1976.⁴ Moreover, the Ptolemies partly disrupted traditional social formations by offering a new “network of communications” to members of the local elite and local populations; this type of network is useful to analyze empires in formation, as Liverani has shown in the case of the Assyrian empire.⁵ The examples below demonstrate how the Ptolemies effectively thickened social networks between the king (and his high officials) and the population of southern Anatolia

1. Such an approach has recently been challenged by A. MEEUS, «The Territorial Ambitions of Ptolemy I» in H. HAUBEN, A. MEEUS eds., *The Age of the Successors and the Creation of the Hellenistic Kingdoms (323-276 B.C.)*, Leuven 2014, p. 263-306 and the other contributions of this edited volume. On Ptolemy II see P. McKECHNIE, P. GUILLAUME, *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, Boston 2008 and the hypothesis of A. R. MEADOWS, «The Ptolemaic league of islanders» in K. BURASELIS, M. STEFANOPOULOS, D. THOMPSON eds., *The Ptolemies and the Sea*, Cambridge 2013, p. 24-42 that he created the League of the Islanders, though the latter has been generally rejected, e.g. K. BURASELIS, «Federalism and the Sea: The Koïna of the Aegean Islands» in H. BECK, P. FUNKE eds., *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 2015, p. 358-378.

2. E. WILL, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique : 323-30 av. J.-C.*, Nancy 1979 drawing on M. I. ROSTOVITZ, «Foreign commerce of Ptolemaic Egypt», *Journal of Economic and Business History* 4, 1932, p. 728-769.

3. I use the minimalist definition of an empire by M. DOYLE, *Empires*, Ithaca 1986: 45 as “a relation in which one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society. [...] Imperialism is simply the process of establishing or maintaining an empire.”

4. R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, Leiden 1976, p. 89-116.

5. M. LIVERANI, «The Growth of the Assyrian Empire in the Habur/Middle Euphrates Area: A New Paradigm», *State Archive of Assyria Bulletin* 2, 1988, p. 81-98: esp. 83 “the empire is not a spread of land but a network of communications over which materials good are carried”; for a similar approach to the study of pre-modern empires, see M. L. SMITH, «Networks, Territories, and the Cartography of Ancient States», *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 11, 2005, p. 832-849.

through settlement policies and by offering appealing career opportunities. This study focuses on Caria, Lycia, Cilicia and Pamphylia as case studies of Ptolemaic imperialism beyond what is considered the core area of the Ptolemaic state.

I. – GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: CONQUEST AND RECONQUESTS

The complex and shifting political situation of southern Anatolia is partly connected to its geography, split between narrow coastal areas and hilly and mountainous hinterlands bound by narrow valleys.⁶ Though initially culturally and ethnically distinct from the Greeks, Carians, Lycians, Pamphylians and Cilicians had mixed up with Greek settlers to different extents over the previous centuries.⁷ They were ruled by dynasts, even after the Persians established their hegemony.⁸ Carians, for instance, had a long tradition of fighting as mercenaries for Egyptian pharaohs together with Greek mercenaries, and some had settled in Egypt, notably the Caromemphites still attested in Ptolemaic Memphis.⁹ Geographically, Caria can be divided into at least three main zones: a coastal area in the south and around the Ceramic Gulf, partly protected by the island of Cos; another in the west around the Gulf of Iasus; a north-eastern (interior) region limited by the Maeander in the north, with relatively fertile valleys and a mountainous area with plateaux, where Ptolemaic presence was thought almost inexistent but is now attested, with possibly the Harpasus valley as an eastern borderland.¹⁰ Moving east, Lycia was above all a mountainous country, with inland cities connected to coastal ones by valleys. Patara, for instance, with its sheltered harbors, connected the Xanthos valley to the Mediterranean and held an important geopolitical position on the east-west sea road.¹¹ The Pamphylians lived east of Lycia, in a coastal plain about 200 kilometers long, mostly fertile,

6. Strabo XIV 2-5 provides a description of the four regions.

7. Issues of cultural and ethnic interactions are beyond the scope of this article, see e.g., O. CASABONNE, *La Cilicie à l'époque achéménide*, Paris 2004, p. 50-97; M. ADAK, «Names, ethnicity and acculturation in the Pamphylian-Lycian borderland» in R. PARKER ed., *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford 2013, p. 63-78, D. PIRAS, «Who were the Karians in Hellenistic times? The evidence from epichoric language and personal names» in J.-M. CARBON, R. VAN BREMEN eds., *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux 2010, p. 217-233, and L. CAPDETREY, «Le roi, le satrape et le koinon : la question du pouvoir en Carie à la fin du IV^e siècle» in K. KONUK ed., *Stéphanéphoros. De l'économie antique à l'Asie Mineure. Hommages à Raymond Descat*, Bordeaux 2012, p. 229-246.

8. Hdt. I 171-176 on the Persian conquest of these regions.

9. G. VITTMANN, *Ägypten und die Fremden im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*, Mainz am Rhein 2003, p. 155-179; D. J. THOMPSON, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*, Princeton 2012, p. 87-88.

10. See discussion below; A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogōreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra» in P. BRUN, L. CAPDETREY, P. FRÖHLICH eds., *L'Asie Mineure occidentale au III^e siècle a.C.*, Bordeaux 2021, p. 142-171, esp. 165-168 with their excellent map (fig. 3); on the productivity of the different valleys, see J. LABUFF, *Polis Expansion and Elite Power in Hellenistic Karia*, Lanham 2016, p. 30-31, 52, 86-88, 103, 109-110, 117-120, 147, 158.

11. D. S. LENGER, E. DÜNDAR, «Attestation of a Ptolemaic Garrison in the Light of Coins: Tepecik Hill at Patara Lycia», *AJIN* 66, 2020, p. 37-66, p. 37.

surrounded by the Lycian Mountains in the west, the Taurus Mountains in the north, and Rough Cilicia in the east, all rich in coniferous trees.¹² Access by land was difficult, permitted only by a few passes, and even sea access was delicate because of a westward-flowing current and the inland location of most cities. Finally, Cilicia bridged Anatolia to the Near East. It was split between Rough Cilicia or *Tracheia* Cilicia in the west, a mountainous area also rich in timber with a narrow coast, held mainly by the Ptolemies, and in the east Flat Cilicia or *Cilicia Pedias*, a fertile plain closed by the mountains of the Taurus in the north and the Amanus in the east.¹³ Already Xenophon had noted the abundance of sesame, sorghum, millet and barley.¹⁴

Given the regions' resources and geopolitical location, it is unsurprising that Ptolemaic ambitions in southern Anatolia started when Ptolemy (I) was only Satrap. They can be connected to his temporary seizure of Cyprus in 316-306 BC, close to the Cilician coast, in his endless conflict with Antigonos Monophthalmus and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes.¹⁵ The reconstruction of the Ptolemaic conquests and reconquests – sometimes only partial – of southern Anatolia is based on the fragmented epigraphic material combined with allusive mentions of the events by ancient authors. Though Ptolemy I's offensive in Cilicia against the Antigonids, led by his commander Leonidas in 310 BC, was unsuccessful, the king seized Caunos and Myndos in Caria and captured cities in Lycia and Pamphylia in 309, to lose them to Antigonos and Demetrius possibly around 306, at the same time they seized Cyprus.¹⁶ Cos perhaps remained Ptolemaic until 281/0 but Caunos was temporarily lost and reconquered in 295/4, at the same time as Cyprus, or only in 281/0, while Myndos and Halicarnassus were Ptolemaic from c. 280 to 197 BC.¹⁷ According to Meadows, Ptolemy II likely reconquered Lycia only around 281 BC, when he also conquered Pamphylia and Cilicia, since most of

12. J. D. GRAINGER, *The cities of Pamphylia*, Oxford 2009, p. XI-XIV with Map 1.

13. O. CASABONNE, *op. cit.*, p. 21-97; Strabo XIV 5.3 on the abundance of cedar-wood in Cilicia.

14. Xen., *Anab.* I 2.22.

15. On the campaign of 310-308 BC, see H. HAUBEN, «Ptolemy's Grand Tour» in H. HAUBEN, A. MEEUS eds., *op. cit.*, p. 235-262 and A. MEEUS, «The Territorial Ambitions of Ptolemy I», *op. cit.*, p. 287, 289-292.

16. On Caunos in Caria, see Diod. Sic. XX 27 with H. HAUBEN, «Ptolemy's Grand Tour», *op. cit.*, p. 243-244; on Lycia, I follow A. R. MEADOWS, «The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia: SEG 27.929» in K. DÖRTLÜK *et al.* eds., *The IIIrd International Symposium on Lycia Symposium Proceedings*, Antalya 2007, p. 459-470: esp. 466-468 against the view of M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens. I», *Chiron* 7, 1977, p. 43-66, and his response to Meadows in M. WÖRRLE, «Anfang und Ende von Limyras ptolemäischer Zeit» in M. SEYER ed., *40 Jahre Grabung Limyra. Akten des internationalen Symposiums Wien, 3.-5. Dezember 2009*, Vienna 2012, p. 359-369, that Lycia remained Ptolemaic since 309 until 197, or at least was conquered by Ptolemy I as early as 288/7. Meadows challenges Wörrle's dating of an inscription from Limyra honoring two *oikonomoi* (SEG XXVII 929 = TM 642018) to 288/7 based on paleographic and prosopographic ground, because it would be the earliest inscription, and one chronologically isolated, attesting Ptolemaic administration in the region, and proposes the date of 249; the Pamphylian inscription of the Aspendians granting citizenship to Ptolemaic troops for their good service to king Ptolemy and the city (SEG XVII 639) is dated to 301-298 BC and at least attests Ptolemaic influence in Aspendos.

17. J. LABUFF, *op. cit.*, p. 33-36 and table 1.1 summarizes Ptolemaic control in Caria; see also T. BOULAY, A.-V. PONT, *Chalkêtôr en Carie*, Paris 2014, p. 36-43 and R. VAN BREMEN, «Ptolemy at Panamara», *EA* 35, 2003, p. 9-14 with bibliography.

the first attestations of his administration of these provinces are dated to the 270s and the few exceptions can be re-dated to later dates.¹⁸ The defeat of Lysimachus by Seleucus I at Corupedium (281 BC) and the death of both kings offered a unique opportunity to Ptolemy II for expansion in southern Anatolia.¹⁹ Theocritus (*Idyll* 17, l. 88-91) was certainly right to claim that Ptolemy II ruled over all these regions but by the end of the Second Syrian War (c. 253 BC) against the Seleucids, Pamphylia and Cilicia were temporarily lost, to be reconquered about a decade later by Ptolemy III.²⁰

This reconstruction of Ptolemaic presence in the region has at least three implications for our understanding of southern Anatolia and the imperial project of the Ptolemies. First, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia are best conceived, until around 280 BC, as a borderland between the Successors and then between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Ptolemy I certainly tried to control these areas but was unsuccessful. Nevertheless, his early involvement in Caria and Lycia shows he was not a separatist. Second, Ptolemy II was far more aggressive and militarily active than usually thought since he did not simply inherit these regions from his father. He benefitted from the vacuum of power that followed the death of Lysimachus but also actively organized the administration of these regions and the exploitation of their resources. Third, Ptolemy III continued the aggressive policy of his father during the 240s since he reconquered Pamphylia and Cilicia, as he claims in the Adulis inscription.²¹ These two regions and Lycia remained largely under Ptolemaic control until Antiochus III's conquest of most of Anatolia in 197, whereas territorial losses started in the 260s in north-eastern Caria.²²

18. A. R. MEADOWS, «*Deditio in fidem*: the Ptolemaic conquest of Asia Minor» in C. SMITH, L. M. YARROW eds., *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*, Oxford 2012, p. 113-133: 131-133 against the date of 294 for the conquest of Pamphylia and Cilicia, which is an hypothesis based on Ptolemy I's takeover of Cyprus that year; on Pamphylia, see J. D. GRAINGER, *The cities of Pamphylia*, *op. cit.*, p. 85-108.

19. A. R. MEADOWS, «The Ptolemaic league of islanders», *op. cit.*, esp. p. 31-39, argues that it occurred shortly after the foundation of the League of the Islanders by Ptolemy II, which he places in c. 280, but this has generally not been accepted, see e.g. K. BURASELIS, «Federalism and the Sea: The Koïna of the Aegean Islands», *op. cit.*, the absence of fights between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids suggests there was not a "Syrian War of Succession" or "Carian war," see A. R. MEADOWS, «*Deditio in fidem*: the Ptolemaic conquest of Asia Minor», *op. cit.*, p. 117 and A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogōreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra», *op. cit.*, p. 166, n. 147.

20. On this war, see A. DAVESNE, «La deuxième guerre de Syrie (ca. 261-255 av. J.-C.) et les témoignages numismatiques» in M. AMANDRY, S. HURTER eds., *Travaux de numismatique offerts à Georges Le Rider*, London 1999, p. 123-134 and J. D. GRAINGER, *The Syrian Wars*, Leiden 2010, p. 122-136; the content of the inscription on Arsinoe in Cilicia discussed below makes clear that Cilicia was temporarily lost by Ptolemy II but again in Ptolemaic hands under Ptolemy III, see C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia», *Phoenix* 43, 1989, p. 317-346, esp. p. 336.

21. OGIS I 54.

22. R. VAN BREMEN, «Ptolemy at Panamara», *EA* 35, 2003, p. 9-14; A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogōreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra», p. 167-168; the political status of each city during this period is too complex to be summarized here and is still being reconstructed; on Ptolemaic Caria, see n. 17 above.

Meadows argues that Ptolemy II conquered southern Anatolia without large armies and battles, through voluntary surrender.²³ Yet such an undertaking still required an impressive level of military investment: soldiers on large warships had to be ready to besiege cities, which explains why Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III built monstrous warships, as demonstrated by Murray.²⁴ The *Bulletin of the War*, an account of the beginning of the Third Syrian War most likely written by Ptolemy III himself, is representative of the nature of techniques to reconquer Cilicia: a mixture of small- and medium-scale military operations, diplomatic negotiations, and propaganda rather than large pitched battles.²⁵ For instance, only five or fifteen ships were sent to Soloi, the most important town in flat Cilicia, to seize the city by taking advantage of internal troubles.²⁶ Then, when the king reached Seleucia-Pieria in Northern Syria, the population performed sacrifices on altars they had prepared in the streets to celebrate the king's success and honors were decreed. The thickening of the social network of the empire took place at such moments of active propaganda, as well as when the king was receiving former (Seleucid) satraps and *stratêgoi* of the place together with the Ptolemaic commanders of the garrisons in the city. Finally, once in Antioch, Ptolemy III immediately accomplished his expected function by "giving audience to both the military commanders and the soldiers and to all the people of the land, and deliberating about everything."²⁷ The empire expanded gradually through military and ideological forces combined. Yet the emphasis was on celebrations, honors and benevolence. Because this type of warfare did not interest Greek authors as much as the large pitched battles, little of it is known, and the aggressiveness of the Ptolemies is often understated.

In sum, the long but tenacious conquest of southern Anatolia – in fact multiple conquests – makes clear that the Ptolemies had an expansionist policy – as previous Near Eastern empires claimed universalism.²⁸ In what can be described as an anarchic state system – to borrow Eckstein's use of international relation theory – this region became strategically central to the expansion of the Ptolemaic empire towards Thrace – conquered by Ptolemy III – and even for incursions into the Black Sea.²⁹ These regions also provided resources such as soldiers

23. A. R. MEADOWS, «*Deditio in fidem*: the Ptolemaic conquest of Asia Minor», *op. cit.*, p. 133.

24. W. M. MURRAY, *The Age of Titans: the Rise and Fall of the Great Hellenistic Navies*, Oxford 2012.

25. *FGrH* 160 F1 (P. Gurob).

26. The reading of the number is debated, see S. GAMBETTI, «Anonymous, *Belli Syrii tertii annales* (160)» in I. WORTHINGTON ed., *Brill's New Jacoby*, col. i, l. 24 and commentary (2), online at <<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/anonymous-belli-syrii-tertii-annales-160-a160>> [consulted on April 20, 2015] who accepts fifteen.

27. Translation and commentary by S. GAMBETTI, «Anonymous, *Belli Syrii tertii annales* (160)», col. III, l. 94-100.

28. On this concept, see R. STROOTMAN, «Hellenistic imperialism and the idea of world unity» in C. RAPP, H. A. DRAKE eds., *The City in the Classical and Post-Classical World: Changing Contexts of Power and Identity*, Cambridge 2014, p. 38-61, C. FISCHER-BOVET, «The power of statues: constructing imperial narratives under the Ptolemies», *JHS*, forthcoming.

29. A. R. MEADOWS, «The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia: *SEG* 27.929», *op. cit.*, p. 460 on the military importance of Lycia and Pamphylia; Cilicia and Caria are usually only conceived in geographical terms as the "periphery" of the empire, e.g. G. HÖLBL, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, New York 2001, p. 60; on Ptolemy II and the Black Sea, see A. AVRAM, «Antiochos II Théos, Ptolémée II Philadelphie et la mer Noire», *CRAI*, 2003, p. 1181-1213.

and wood for building warships. In other words, southern Anatolia moved from a somewhat peripheral political position within the Achaemenid empire to a central position within the rivalries of the Hellenistic kings.

II. – PTOLEMAIC RULING STRATEGIES IN SOUTHERN ANATOLIA

The following examination of Ptolemaic ruling strategies illuminates how the Ptolemies were not only interested in controlling harbors along the coast but were also invested in developing long-term provincial control.

A. – PTOLEMAIC IMPRINT ON THE LAND

A crucial ruling strategy developed by the Hellenistic kings, in the footsteps of Alexander, was the spread of cities bearing dynastic names (called dynastic foundations by modern historians) and various types of settlements. Throughout the empire, Ptolemy II's high commanders, but also to a lesser extent Ptolemy III's, founded settlements and military bases from the Red Sea and Nubia to Cyrenaica and Coele-Syria, including the Aegean and Anatolia.³⁰ Previous views held that the Ptolemies were mainly interested in establishing strongholds on the sea in southern Anatolia and only re-founded or renamed a few cities.³¹ Marquaille, for instance, interpreted Ptolemaic foundation policies as inconsistent except for using dynastic names.³² In contrast, Mueller emphasized that the variability by region came from earlier regional disparities and that the Ptolemies were, in fact, creating some unifying "Ptolemaic identity" across their possessions through an equal distribution of dynastic names.³³ Indeed, they founded a Ptolemais in Caria (attested only epigraphically), Patara was developed and named Arsinoe in Lycia, while another settlement was likely called Philotera.³⁴

30. K. MUELLER, *Settlements of the Ptolemies: City Foundations and New Settlement in the Hellenistic World*, Leuven 2006 p. 40-59, G. M. COHEN, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley 1995 and *Id.*, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*, Berkeley 2006; R. MAIRS, C. FISCHER-BOVET, «Reassessing Hellenistic Settlement Policies: The Seleucid Far East, Ptolemaic Red Sea Basin and Egypt» in C. FISCHER-BOVET, S. VON REDEN eds., *Comparing the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires. Integration, Communication, and Resistance*, Cambridge 2021, p. 48-85.

31. L. ROBERT, «Sur un décret des Korésiens au musée de Smyrne», *Hellenica* 11-12, 1960, p. 132-176, at p. 156 discusses the foundations and re-foundations of harbors named Arsinoe; e.g. R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 116 on coastal cities in Cilicia.

32. C. MARQUAILLE, *The External Image of Ptolemaic Egypt*, London 2001, p. 26-36.

33. K. MUELLER, *Settlements of the Ptolemies...*, *op. cit.*, p. 54-55, p. 79-80, p. 83-84, p. 179 with map 2: a mixed dynastic settlement implies a pre-existing settlement but deeper effects

34. G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 245-273 (Caria), p. 327-342 (Lycia and Pamphylia), p. 353-372 (Cilicia), p. 417-419: one Ptolemaic foundation in Caria compared to four Seleucid ones, two Ptolemaic foundations in Lycia compared to one Seleucid village foundation (Karkadon *komē*), two in Pamphylia compared to one Seleucid foundation, and three in Cilicia (without including Meydancikkale, whose Hellenistic name is not known, see below) compared to three Seleucids ones in the third century; P. KOSMIN, *The land of the elephant kings: space, territory, and ideology in the Seleucid Empire*, Cambridge MA-London 2014, p. 183-221 with maps 8 and 9.

In Pamphylia, two settlements bore the dynastic names of Ptolemais and Arsinoe. Finally, an Arsinoe was founded on the territory of Nagidos in Cilicia, as well as a Berenike and possibly a Philadelphia. In fact, both the Seleucids and the Ptolemies established about the same number of dynastic foundations in third-century southern Anatolia, respectively nine and eight, thanks to Ptolemy II's active policy, who appears as imperially driven as the Seleucids. The Ptolemies maintained military control through these settlements and politically and ideologically promoted imperial power. But dynastic settlements were only one means to impose a military presence and to access economic resources more efficiently, both natural and human. New archaeological surveys and inscriptions increasingly shed light on the multiple forms of Ptolemaic imprint on the landscape. The overview aims to analyze case studies and note regional specificities but does not pretend to be exhaustive.

In fact, of the four regions under investigation, Cilicia received the most attention from the Hellenistic kings. An active settlement policy there agrees with Mueller's demographic model that regions with a low pre-Hellenistic population density would have more new and mixed dynastic settlements. Moreover, cities were needed to facilitate its administration and strongholds were necessary for this borderland area. The Seleucids had founded three cities in Cilicia early on, Seleucia-on-the-Calycadnus, Antioch-on-the-Cydnus (previously Tarsus, the satrapal capital) and Antioch-on the Pyramus under Seleucus I, the last two in Flat Cilicia.³⁵ Yet the Ptolemies also had a strong imprint on the physical landscape of Cilicia. Two critical pieces of evidence published in the 1980s indicate that their presence was far more significant than usually thought and reflect imperial claims. First, the fortress of Meydancikkale confirms that the Ptolemies aimed at inland control. Second, an inscription concerning Arsinoe in Cilicia makes clear that the foundation of cities by the Ptolemies was not only limited to the renaming of settlements but sometimes involved new settlements with movement of populations.

The fortified city of Meydancikkale, about 30 kilometers from the coastal city of Kelenderis, was well located to control the way between the sea and the inland. It was perched at 700 meters on the heights of the mountains of Rough Cilicia and served as one of the royal residences, then called Kirshu, of the local Louvite dynasts in the sixth century BC.³⁶ The Aramaic inscriptions, the tomb and the relief from its Persian palace indicate that it remained an important political and religious center in the early fourth century, during Persian occupation.³⁷ In the Hellenistic period, this strategic site was successively in the hands of Alexander, Demetrius, Antiochus I and Ptolemy III, before it returned to a more or less

35. G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 358-363, p. 369-371; the Seleucids founded again dynastic settlements after they seized Cilicia from Ptolemy V, but these second-century BC foundations belong to a historical context beyond the scope of this article.

36. A. DAVESNE, A. LEMAIRE, H. LOZACHMEUR, «Le site archéologique de Meydancikkale (Turquie) ; du royaume de Pirindu à la garnison ptolémaïque», *CRAI* 131, 1987, p. 359-383 with map in fig. 10 and A. DAVESNE, G. LE RIDER, *Gülнар I. Le site de Meydancikkale : recherches entreprises sous la direction d'Emmanuel Laroche (1971-1982)*, Paris 1989, vol. I; the site is eight kilometers southwest of modern Gülнар.

37. A. DAVESNE, G. LE RIDER, *Gülнар I. Le site de Meydancikkale...*, *op. cit.*, p. 64-65.

autonomous status.³⁸ Given the multiple losses and reconquests, Ptolemy II possibly used this fortified place until he lost Cilicia momentarily around 253 BC. In any case, two Greek inscriptions and a large coin hoard attest the presence of a Ptolemaic garrison under Ptolemy III, from 246 BC until the abrupt seizure of the site in 235 BC or 220 BC.³⁹ Davesne interprets the site as a regional center, maybe headed by a Ptolemaic *stratêgos*.⁴⁰ Several archaeological pieces of evidence converge in that sense. First, about twenty more minor military sites were located within a thirty-kilometer perimeter of Meydancikkale, apparently an innovation on the part of the Ptolemies, making it the center of a network of fortifications.⁴¹ Second, the refined architectural style of the monumental entrance (building A), with a large room and most probably a colonnade, indicates that it served as an administrative and military building. One of the largest Ptolemaic hoard coins found outside Egypt (5,215 silver coins) was buried in a paved room and included Ptolemaic coins intended to pay the soldiers in garrison, as suggested by Le Rider and Davesne. Third, the two Greek inscriptions on the site relate to the period of Ptolemaic occupation and corroborate this point. The dedication inscribed on a column of the large room to “Zeus Soter of the Chians” was undoubtedly the work of a mercenary or a group of mercenaries from Chios serving in the Ptolemaic army (see text 1 below).⁴² The second inscription is a dedication to Hermes and Heracles on behalf of Ptolemy (III), queen Berenice and their children by Meas, from Aspendos in Pamphylia, who bears the title of *lampadarch* (see text 2 below).

Text 1: Brixhe, inscription no 2 in A. DAVESNE, G. LE RIDER (1989) 349, 352-353, fig. 5-9

Διὸς Σωτῆρος Χίων	(Dedicated to) Zeus Soter of the Chians
-------------------	---

Text 2. Brixhe, inscription no 1 in A. DAVESNE and G. LE RIDER (1989) 345-351, fig. 1-4 (= SEG XXXI 1323 with lines 5 and 6 added)

Ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολε[μίου] (2) καὶ βασιλίσσης Βερενίκ[ης] (3) καὶ τῶν τέκνων (4) Ἑρμῆ Ἡρακλεῖ (5) Μεᾶς Μ[ο]λεσιος Ἀσπε[νδίου] (6) λαμπαδαρχ	On behalf of Ptolemy, queen Berenice and their children, to Hermes and Heracles, Meas son of Molesis, Aspendian, <i>lampadarchos</i> .
--	--

38. A. DAVESNE, A. LEMAIRE, H. LOZACHMEUR, «Le site archéologique de Meydancikkale (Turquie)...», *op. cit.*, p. 377-379.

39. For a Ptolemaic presence until 220 BC because of smaller later additions to the hoard, see U. WESTERMARK, «Review of Davesne, A. and Le Rider, G. (1989), Gülnar II. Le trésor de Meydancikkale», *SNR* 70, 1991, p. 97-101.

40. A. DAVESNE, G. LE RIDER, *Gülnar I. Le site de Meydancikkale...*, *op. cit.*, esp. 65-66 and 226 and figure 30.

41. On innovations in Hellenistic fortifications in Cilicia and the differences between some aspects of Ptolemaic and Seleucid masonry, see N. KAYE, N. K. RAUH, «Fortification Systems in Eastern Rough Cilicia from the Iron Age to the Hellenistic Era (1200-27 BC)» in H. WINFRIED ed., *The Transition from the Achaemenid to the Hellenistic Period in the Levant, Cyprus, and Cilicia: Cultural Interruption or Continuity? Symposium at Philipps-Universität Marburg, October 12-15, 2017*, Marburg 2020, p. 141-166, p. 154-156.

42. Brixhe in A. DAVESNE, G. LE RIDER, *Gülnar I. Le site de Meydancikkale*, *op. cit.*, p. 349 notes that the epithet Soter is not attested in Chios and was perhaps triggered by the current situation.

The dedicatees and the function of *lampardarch*, which consisted in organizing (and probably subsidizing) torch-races, indicate that there was a *gymnasium*, even if it may have been modest in size and appearance. *Gymnasia* were often closely connected to military settlements by offering a place for physical and military training and could be found outside the structure of a city-state, as was the case in Egypt.⁴³ They were typically places where soldiers displayed their loyalty to the Ptolemaic king and his family, using the Greek preposition *huper* with the meaning “on behalf of” on dedications. Moreover, the presence of Pamphylian soldiers – in Meydancikkale and Arsinoe of Cilicia (see below) – suggests that one Ptolemaic pattern was to hire mercenaries from neighboring regions.

The Ptolemaic occupation of Meydancikkale and the constructions undertaken there attest that the kings of Egypt aimed to control inland territories in southern Anatolia, even if territorial contestations continued.⁴⁴ They were walking in the footsteps of the Persians and earlier Macedonians by using this fortified town, whose name during the Hellenistic period is not preserved, to secure a region rich in woods and thus essential to building warships. Moreover, the Ptolemies’ occupation of such an inland location was not unique; recent archaeological work in Cilicia has similarly revealed extensive Ptolemaic fortifications.⁴⁵ The foundation of Philadelphia in the Cilician inland may indeed be the work of Ptolemy II rather than that of Antiochus IV of Commagene in the first century AD. Its precise location was debated and its attribution to Ptolemy II was challenged because of the assumption that the Ptolemies did not attempt to control territories away from the coast but, as emphasized by Cohen, the discovery of Meydancikkale shows this was a misleading supposition.⁴⁶

Yet Ptolemaic presence in Cilicia was not limited to military strongholds. Dynastic settlements established pro-Ptolemaic settlers, new institutions, and even new magistrates in the case of a fully newly political entity. The only documented example of the processes of founding a Ptolemaic dynastic settlement concerns the city of Arsinoe in Cilicia, established by the Pamphylian Aetos of Aspendos on behalf of Ptolemy II, probably in the 260s. Details concerning its reorganization under Ptolemy III, after 238 BC, are preserved in a letter to the Arsinoeis from the son of Aetos, Thraseas, governor of Cilicia, and in a decree of the neighboring city of Nagidos, both copied on the same stele.⁴⁷ The texts show how Ptolemaic

43. C. FISCHER-BOVET, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge 2014, p. 281-284 with bibliography; previously M. LAUNEY, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, Paris 1949, p. 813-874.

44. The Greek inscriptions published by Cl. Brixhe in A. DAVESNE, G. LE RIDER, *Gülнар I. Le site de Meydancikkale...*, *op. cit.*, p. 346-349 make uncontroversial that the fortress was used under Ptolemy III.

45. E.g. N. K. RAUH, M. DILLON, R. M. ROTHHAUS, «Anchors, amphoras, and ashlar masonry: new evidence for the Cilician pirates» in M. C. HOFF, R. F. TOWNSEND eds., *Rough Cilicia: New Historical and Archaeological Approaches*, Oxford 2013, p. 202-297, esp. p. 229 and p. 252-262. I thank Timothy Howe for pointing to me these archaeological discoveries.

46. G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 368-369 with bibliography and map 10.

47. SEG XXXIX 1426 with a detailed analysis by C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia», *op. cit.*, and A. CHANIOTIS, «Ein diplomatischer Statthalter nimmt Rücksicht auf den Verletzten Stolz zweier hellenistischer Kleinpoleis (Nagidos und Arsinoe)», *EA* 31, 1993, p. 33-42 against their idea that

physical presence and concurring changes in the political sphere were negotiated. At least four elements are worth stressing since we surmise similar mechanisms were at work in the other Ptolemaic foundations, each with its local specificities. First, the temporal gap between the foundation of Aetos and the organization or reorganization of the city is hidden by the illusion of continuous Ptolemaic power, emphasized by the father-son relationship between the two commanders. In fact, Ptolemy II had lost control of the region in the 250s and Ptolemy III conquered it again.⁴⁸ Second, this inscription gives us a glimpse of the problems created by the very imperial act of founding new settlements since Aetos had taken a portion of the land to the Nagidians in order to found the new city. Thraseas had to resolve a dispute over the public land that the Nagidians had to cede. Aetos had also expelled population groups called “barbarians” who lived on the Nagidian chora (l. 23-24) – probably local villagers rather than citizens of Nagidos, according to Habicht and Jones.⁴⁹ This had been a central point of the earlier negotiations between the Ptolemaic official and Nagidians to obtain the latter’s consent.⁵⁰ Third, the three parties – the king represented by Thraseas, the Nagidians and the Arsinoeis – used the same rhetoric and language of negotiation that crystallized around the desire to make the new city worthy of its name. Both the letter of Thraseas and the decree of the Nagidians emphasize that the Arsinoeis should worship the king, his daughter Berenike and, above all, the king’s mother Arsinoe, who was a convenient counterpart to the main deity of Nagidos, Aphrodite.⁵¹ Indeed, Ptolemaic ideology infiltrated the region not only in the new settlement but also in Nagidos since the Nagidians were supposed to attend the sacrifices for the *Gods Adelphei* (Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II) in Arsinoe. The decree of the Nagidians also requires that the Arsinoeis send a sacred ambassador (*theōros*) to honor the king, and his deceased mother and daughter, implying that both the Nagidians and the Arsinoeis sent sacred

Thraseas imposes a sort of dictate; the mention of the *Theoi Adelphei* indicates that the city was founded after 279, probably in the 260s, see C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia», *op. cit.*, p. 336-337, while the *terminus postquem* for this inscription is 238, March 7, date of the death and deification of princess Berenike recorded in the Canopus decree. On Thraseas, see F. GERARDIN, «Antiochus III, Ptolemy IV, and local elites: Deal-making politics at its peak. A. The Greek elites and the crisis of the Ptolemaic empire » in C. FISCHER-BOVET, S. VON REDEN eds. *Comparing the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires. Integration, Communication and Resistance*, Cambridge, 2021, p. 264-284.

48. On the loss of Cilicia and its reconquest by Ptolemy III, see the historical overview above in section I; for another statement giving the illusion of a long Ptolemaic presence, see Ptolemy III’s claim that he received Itanos from Ptolemy II and his ancestors, while our first evidence only dates to Ptolemy II’s general Patroclus settling a garrison there (*OGIS* I 45, 266 BC), as pointed by M. M. AUSTIN, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: a Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge 2006, no. 265, p. 462, n. 1.

49. C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia », *op. cit.*, p. 324.

50. The Nagidian decree also stipulates that the new settlers should be made “colonists of the Nagidians,” in other words that Nagidos should be considered as the mother-city of Arsinoe, a diplomatic strategy according to C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia», *op. cit.*, p. 318, and perhaps a hint that many settlers were from Nagidos.

51. On the association between Arsinoe and Aphrodite, see e.g. S. BARBANTANI, «Goddess of Love and Mistress of the Sea. Notes on a Hellenistic Hymn to Arsinoe-Aphrodite (P. Lit. Goodspeed 2, I-IV)», *AncSoc* 35, 2005, p. 135-165 and D. DEMETRIΟΥ, «Τῆς πάσης ναυτιλῆς φύλαξ: Aphrodite and the Sea», *Kernos* 23, 2010, p. 67-89.

ambassadors to the king, each city from its funds.⁵² Finally, Thraseas also clarifies that once the land dispute with Nagidos is solved, the Arsinoeis should plant the land to enjoy prosperity and contribute more revenues (*prosodoi*) to the king than before (l. 8-9). The intrusion of the royal fisc in the cities of southern Anatolia was deeper than in the Achaemenid period, as demonstrated by Schuler, and it advanced conjointly with the spread of a pervasive Ptolemaic ideology, as discussed below.⁵³

Less is known about Pamphylia. Ptolemy II founded another Arsinoe and a Ptolemais, probably both near Korakesion because this was an area rich in timber for shipbuilding, and Korakesion's fortifications, on the summit of a rocky hill, are most likely Ptolemaic too.⁵⁴ The city exported wine to Alexandria, as attested in a sale record from 259 BC, and most likely benefited economically from the garrison presence, while the harbor infrastructure of Perge also developed around that time.⁵⁵ Overall, Pamphylian cities were most prosperous during the Hellenistic period, when many urban sites expanded and walls were constructed, with the city of Aspendos, c. sixteen kilometers inland on the Eurymedon river, as the most important one.⁵⁶ Side too, its longtime rival, with an equally large *chora* and the best harbor of the region, just east of the treacherous Pamphylian sea, could sell various goods, such as wine, flax, wheat, olive oil, fish, and wood.⁵⁷ It is probably to counterbalance Ptolemaic influence over Aspendos that Antiochus I (281-261 BC) founded a Seleukia near Side when he partially controlled this region.⁵⁸ In Lycia, Ptolemy II restored the coastal city of Patara and named it Arsinoe, as many of the important Ptolemaic naval bases.⁵⁹ Both names remained in use because they are found in two papyri of the Zenon archive from Philadelphia in the Fayyum in the 250s.⁶⁰ However, it is significant that almost ninety years later, when the Ptolemies had lost control of the region, a soldier (*taktomisthos*) of the Pamphylians and holder of a vineyard in the same village of Philadelphia, Krates, still used Arsinoe in Lycia as his ethnic designation, in reference to his ancestors in the third century.⁶¹ The recent discovery of a Ptolemaic hoard of

52. G. PETZL, «Das Inschriftendossier zur Neugründung von Arsinoë in Kilikien: Textkorrekturen», *ZPE* 139, 2002, p. 83-88: 87 corrects *phoron* of the *editio princeps*, unattested in the Ptolemaic context, into *theonon*.

53. C. SCHULER, «Tribute und Steuern im hellenistischen Kleinasien» in H. KLINKOTT, S. KUBISCH, R. MÜLLER-WOLLERMANN eds., *Geschenke und Steuern, Zölle und Tribute. Antike Abgabenformen in Anspruch und Wirklichkeit*, Leiden 2007, p. 371-405.

54. Strabo XIV 5. 2-3.

55. G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 335-337; J. D. GRAINGER, *The cities of Pamphylia*, *op. cit.*, p. 101-103.

56. J. D. GRAINGER, *The cities of Pamphylia*, *op. cit.*, p. 88-91, 103.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 98-100.

58. If the attribution to this king is correct, see G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 340-342: the Seleucids do not seem to have added cities with dynastic names in Pamphylia in the early second century, when they were again momentarily in control of the region.

59. G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 329-330 with bibliography.

60. *P.Mich. Zen.* 1 and 10 (259 BC and 257 BC).

61. *P.Ryl.* 4 583, fr. 1, l. 5 and fr. 2, l. 47 (170 BC) = R. S. BAGNALL, P. DEROW, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, Oxford 2004, no. 114; *taktomisthoi* were soldiers paid in cash, probably a subgroup of *misthophoroi* (mercenaries), see S. SCHEUBLE, «Bemerkungen zu den μισθοφόροι und τακτόμισθοι

nineteen trichrysons at Tepecik, Patara's garrison above the harbor, confirms that Ptolemaic troops occupied it in the second quarter of the third century since such gold coins were only struck between 294 and 272 BC.⁶² They amounted to 1140 drachmas, probably the savings of about ten months' salary of a high commander who hid them wrapped in two lead plates during the First Syrian War (274-271 BC) but never returned.⁶³ Bronze coins that soldiers used for their daily needs were also found in excavations, a fourth of them being Ptolemaic, a proportion similar to those found in Nagidos in Cilicia.⁶⁴ The Ptolemaic bronze belonged to the first three Ptolemies' reigns, thus Ptolemaic troops were present until the garrison was damaged by the Rhodian earthquake (c. 229-226 BC) and never repaired. Tombstones of two Ptolemaic soldiers in Patara, recently published by Zimmerman, also confirm the garrison's long presence: one soldier was from Thera and the other from Arsinoe, most likely the town itself.⁶⁵ A Limyran also served in Limyra, the other important Ptolemaic garrison town in Lycia, a few kilometers off the coast, hinting that soldiers could serve locally.⁶⁶ This combined evidence again shows Ptolemaic control of the sea route and interests in the hinterland and forested areas since Patara allowed them to reach Xanthus, a few kilometers inland. That city, the cultural center of Lycia, held a Ptolemaic garrison at least during the Second Syrian War, but possibly more permanently if an inscription about a *phourach* refers to the nearby garrison in Pydna.⁶⁷ Some Xanthian tombs perhaps belonged to Ptolemaic soldiers, while there

im ptolemäischen Ägypten» in R. EBERHARD *et al.* eds., "...vor dem Papyrus sind alle gleich!" *Papyrologische Beiträge zu Ehren von Bärbel Kramer (P. Kramer) = ArchPF. Beiheft 27*, Berlin 2009, p. 213-222: esp. 220-21.

62. The following discussion is based on D. S. LINGER, E. DÜNDAR, «Attestation of a Ptolemaic Garrison in the Light of Coins: Tepecik Hill at Patara Lycia» and D. S. LINGER, E. DÜNDAR, «A Ptolemaic Hoard from Patara», *AJA* 126, 2022, p. 201-217; unfortunately, the chronology is not precise enough to confirm or reject the Ptolemaic occupation of Cilicia as early as 288/287 BC, rather than only in 281 BC, see n. 17, though these authors accept 288/287 BC.

63. On soldiers' wage, see C. LORBER, C. FISCHER-BOVET, «Getting paid in Ptolemaic Egypt in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC» in T. FAUCHER ed., *Money rules! The monetary economy of Egypt, from Persians until the beginning of Islam*, Cairo 2020, p. 169-202 172-714, 182-187.

64. D. S. LINGER, E. DÜNDAR, «Attestation of a Ptolemaic Garrison in the Light of Coins: Tepecik Hill at Patara Lycia», p. 41-42, n. 12-13 with bibliography: 102 out of 406 in Patara and 60 out of 344 (17%) in Nagidos.

65. K. ZIMMERMANN, «Patara sous domination étrangère : un très long III^e siècle» in P. BRUN, L. CAPDETREY, P. FRÖHLICH eds., *op. cit.*, p. 129-141, nos. 2 and 3, p. 134-135; we cannot know, of course, if the citizen of Arsinoe had in fact been granted citizenship there, yet either way he could stay in the same garrison.

66. M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XIII: Die Weinbergstiftung eines ptolemäischen Burgkommandanten von Limyra», *Chiron* 51, 2021, p. 211-256, p. 215, fr. B, l. 12; another fort was discovered on the large territory of Limyra, see T. MARKSTEINER, «Wehrdörfer im Bonda-Gebiet» in K. DÖRTLÜK *et al.* eds., *III. Likya Sempozyumu, 07-19 Kasım 2005*, Antalya 2006, p. 441-458.

67. *SEG* XXXIII 1183 (269/259 BC) about a *phourach* and *TAM* II 262 (257/256 BC) with J. D. GRAINGER, *The Syrian Wars*, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

are hints of a cult of Isis and Sarapis.⁶⁸ This would not be an insulated case since an association (*thiasos*) of worshippers of Sarapis existed at the other end of Lycia in Limyra.⁶⁹ Its members, who belonged to the military milieu, no doubt partly overlapped with a group of *basilistai*.⁷⁰

Ptolemies' imprint in Lycia and the neighboring regions also included deploying monumental architecture. Cavalier and des Courtils have demonstrated the architectural similarities between Ptolemy II's propylon in Samothrace, the monumental exedra dedicated to the *Theoi Philadelphoi* (Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II) in Olympia, the Asclepeion in Cos, a portico in Cnidus and an unusual temple in Caunus in Caria, and, in Lycia, the Letoon of Xanthus and the Ptolemaion of Limyra.⁷¹ The Ptolemaion had a distinctive shape, *i.e.*, a cubical pedestal serving as the basis for a tholos and perhaps served as a dynastic temple. The two historians convincingly argue that the kings developed a programmatic statement about Ptolemaic imperial culture, probably exporting Alexandrian architectural forms. Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III also specifically utilized influential regional (and inter-regional) sanctuaries, such as the Letoon in the case of Lycia, to penetrate the local culture.⁷² In contrast to the Ptolemaic physical and propagandist imprint on the landscape, the Seleucids did not establish cities in Lycia after their conquest, except for the village of Kardakon *komê* during the reign of Antiochus III.⁷³

Ptolemaic physical presence west of Lycia, in Caria, was just evoked in relationship to monumental architecture and Ptolemaic coins for garrisoned soldiers in Lycia, as the two regions were closely connected. The new inscription of the community (*koinon*) of the Mogoreis honoring the "stratêgos of the city and the surrounding territory," Moschion from Thera, found in Xystis and dated to 274 BC, confirms Ptolemaic imprint in inland Caria as far as the Harpasus valley in the 270s. More specifically, its editors, Bresson, Descat and Varinlioğlu stress Ptolemy II's intention to transform the whole of Caria into a province.⁷⁴ The *koinon* thanked Moschion for recovering the fortress (*chorion*) of Xystis for the king (Ptolemy II) and caring for the Mogoreis and their goods. They granted similar honors as those usually given by *poleis*, but interestingly the Mogoreis did not yet form a *polis*. They inhabited the urban center

68. L. CAVALIER, J. DES COURTILS, «Les dédicaces de bâtiments au III^e siècle et la propagande lagide» in P. BRUN, L. CAPDETREY, P. FRÖHLICH eds., *op. cit.*, p. 103-113, p. 109.

69. The dedicant's name, Choirinos, suggests a foreign origin, see SEG LV 1463 bis with M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XIII...», *op. cit.*, p. 241-243.

70. See below on the *basilistai* in Limyra.

71. L. CAVALIER, J. DES COURTILS, «Les dédicaces de bâtiments au III^e siècle...», *op. cit.*, at p. 108-109 with a detailed discussion of Limyra and Xanthos; possibly there was another similar building in Patara-Arsinoe.

72. Infiltration of and capitalization on a regional sanctuary occurred later in Old Paphos in Cyprus, where statues of Ptolemaic governors and their family multiplied, see C. FISCHER-BOVET, «Ptolemaic soldiers in Egypt and Cyprus: Loyalty and trust in dedicatory inscriptions» in P. SÄNGER, S. SCHEUBLE-REITER eds., *Söldner und Berufssoldaten in der griechischen Welt: Soziale und politische Gestaltungsräume*, Stuttgart 2022, p. 175-196, p. 178-182, 189-194.

73. G. M. COHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 330-331.

74. A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogoreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra», *op. cit.*, who announce two other inscriptions in preparation.

and the neighboring territory, hence Moschion's particular title rather than simply "*stratēgos epi tēs poleōs*." Moschion of Thera was also honored by the Calymnians, this time without any official function, for taking care of Calymnian mercenaries in the Ptolemaic garrison of Mogla, not far from Xystis, providing another example of the deployment of soldiers in their region of origin.⁷⁵ The existence of a Serapeum at the foot of the Stratonikeian fortification, a city not far from Mogla, which is still mentioned in the late third century, is also the mark of earlier Ptolemaic involvement inland.⁷⁶ The inscriptions from the sanctuary of Zeus in Labraunda, in central Caria, confirm a peak in Ptolemaic control over Caria in the 270s and early 260s. One of them mentions tax privileges, perhaps in the context of the Chrysaorian League, for the sanctuary of Panamara.⁷⁷ By asserting Ptolemaic presence in such regional cultic centers, Ptolemy II no doubt aimed to advance his power, like at the Letoon in Lycian Xanthos.⁷⁸

B. – CHANGES IN THE POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC SPHERES: OFFICERS, OFFICIALS AND SOLDIERS SERVING THE PTOLEMIES

Ptolemaic imperial ambitions in southern Anatolia influenced the political and socio-economic spheres. In such a borderland area, where competition remained intense between the Hellenistic kings, establishing trustworthy relationships with members of the local elites was essential to the rulers to secure the loyalty of cities and recruit soldiers and officials. In exchange for serving the kings, some of the local elites had become active politically across the Mediterranean as commanders, officers, officials or royal agents. In other words, they had become "supra-polis players" to use Ma's expression.⁷⁹ Even if it remains difficult to quantify the contribution of Carian, Lycian, Pamphylian and Cilician elite members, they represented more than 20% of the officials serving in the administration of the empire outside Egypt.⁸⁰ This figure is reasonably high when contrasted with the participation of Cyrenaeans, about 13%, or Athenians, about 8%, though Athens was only an ally of the Ptolemies.⁸¹ To compare each region systematically would go beyond the scope of this article and would be difficult because of scarce and unequally preserved sources. The examples below offer a range of possibilities, yet

75. A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogōreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiōn de Théra», *op. cit.*, p. 162-165 suggest that Mogla was possibly the city of the Mogoreis.

76. SEG XLIV 917 = TM 950443 (225-200 BC) with R. VAN BREMEN, «Ptolemy at Panamara», *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 6.

77. On I. *Labraunda* III.2.4 (l. 2) mentioning Panamara, see R. VAN BREMEN, «Ptolemy at Panamara», *op. cit.*, p. 12.

78. On Xanthus, see above, n. 71; on Labraunda, see the discussion below with n. 127.

79. J. MA, *Statues and Cities. Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 2013, p. 295.

80. 24 Carians (c. 8%), 13 Lycians (c. 5%), 16 Pamphylians (c. 6%) and 8 Cilicians (c. 3%) out of 285 individuals with an ethnic designation recorded in C. A. LA'DA, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, volume X, *Foreign Ethnicities in Hellenistic Egypt*, Leuven 2002 who also have a function at the court, in international relations, in the empire outside Egypt as recorded in W. PEREMANS, E. VAN T DACK, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*, volume VI, accessed through the online *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* coordinated by M. DEPAUW, Leuven, special visitor access, March 2015. This is a minimal count because only individuals bearing an ethnic label from one of the regions of southern Anatolia were accounted for, to whom individuals whose city of origin is known could be added, such as Aetos from Aspendos.

81. Cyrenaeans, 22 Athenians out of 285 individuals with an ethnic designation, see note above.

some plausible trends appear, such as the smaller number of Cilicians reaching high positions and little knowledge about them. At the other end of southern Anatolia, Apollonios of Caunos became Ptolemy II's *dioiketes*, his finance minister and the highest official of the empire, and may be the tree that hid a forest of Carians, especially Caunians. Zenon, the administrator of his Egyptian estate, also from Caunos, regularly helped Carian fellows and had succeeded in this position to another Carian, Panakestor from Calynda.⁸² Two Carians were *oikonomoi* in Lycia under Ptolemy II,⁸³ while three Carians served as royal agents in Caria in a dispute concerning taxes to the Labraundan sanctuary of Zeus.⁸⁴ Perhaps in slight contrast, the careers of Lycians focused on the military and one can surmise that individuals like Leontiskos, who dedicated an equestrian statue of Ptolemy III, and the high officer Tlepolemos son of Hartapates, both from Xanthos, facilitated such a connection.⁸⁵ Tlepolemos was granted the highest honor of eponymous priest in Alexandria twice (247-245 BC), a unique achievement, and negotiated the incorporation of Kildara in Caria into the empire for Ptolemy III. His grandson Tlepolemos became regent of Ptolemy V as the outcome of the 203 BC Alexandrian riot, while he also held a priesthood in Xanthos, where he returned in 201 BC when he lost the regency, and still had in 186 BC, once Lycia was in Seleucid hand.⁸⁶

Particularly striking is the cluster of individuals from Aspendos in Pamphylia who worked closely towards the interests of the Ptolemies. Yet, the kings scouted across the region since a man from Perge, Artemidoros son of Apollonios, was honored in Thera for his extensive career.⁸⁷ Outside of the military, Zoilos from Aspendos, for instance, was in correspondence with Apollonios' agent, Zenon, about constructing a Serapeum in Memphis, hinting at connections between elites of these regions.⁸⁸ Many, however, like the Lycians, served in the military. High up in the hierarchy and influential in implementing Ptolemaic control in Cilicia was Aetos of Aspendos, founder, as discussed above, of Arsinoe in Cilicia. His family is uniquely well-documented, with members close to the successive Ptolemaic kings over at

82. On Zenon from Caunos, agent of the *dioiketes* (prime minister) Apollonios see e.g. W. CLARYSSE, K. VANDORPE, *Zénon, un homme d'affaires grec à l'ombre des Pyramides*, Louvain 1995; on his ongoing relationship with Carians, see e.g., *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59037, *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59341ab, *P.Col.Zenon* I 11, translated in R. S. BAGNALL, P. DEROW, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation, op. cit.*, nos. 67-68, and 89.

83. *SEG* XXVII 929, see n. 16 above.

84. See n. 127 below.

85. M. WÖRRLE, «Lykiens 'ptolemäisches Jahrhundert': Ein Segen für das Land?» in P. BRUN, L. CAPDETREY, P. FRÖHLICH eds., *op. cit.*, p. 115-128, at p. 124-125 with sources on the two Tlepolemoi and Leontiskos.

86. *Pol.* XV.25.33 gives a detailed account of the riot.

87. J. D. GRAINGER, *The cities of Pamphylia, op. cit.*, p. 86; *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* VI 15188 = *TM* Per 6156 with list of inscriptions.

88. On Zoilos, see G. H. RENBERG, W. S. BUBELIS, «The Epistolary Rhetoric of Zoilos of Aspendos and the Early Cult of Sarapis: Re-reading *P. Cair. Zen.* I 59034», *ZPE* 177, 2011, p. 169-200; K. J. RIGSBY, «Founding a Sarapeum», *GRBS* 42, 2001, p. 117-124 esp. 120, 133-34 demonstrates that Apollonios was not Aspendian *contra* L. CRISCUOLO, «Il dieceta Apollonios e Arsinoe» in H. MELAERTS ed., *Le culte du souverain dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque au III^e siècle avant notre ère. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles, 10 mai 1995*, Leuven 1998, p. 61-72.

least three generations, no doubt belonging to the circle of the *Philoï*.⁸⁹ Their achievements and social networks give us a glimpse into the collaboration between local populations from Pamphylia and the Ptolemies and its outcome for both sides. Aetos was a military officer from Pamphylia who had joined the Ptolemaic army and had reached the function of *stratêgos* in Cilicia when he founded Arsinoe there for Ptolemy II. *Stratêgos* here means “general” in Cilicia and not “governor” of Cilicia, indicating that the king had not yet created a province.⁹⁰ Despite the temporary loss of this region at the end of the Second Syrian War (260-253), Aetos remained close to power and held the high honorific function of eponymous priest in 253, meaning he was the priest of Alexander and of the deified Ptolemies in Alexandria.⁹¹ He and his son Thraseas also received multiple citizenships during their careers, not only in Nagidos and Arsinoe but also in Athens and Alexandria.⁹² Thraseas became governor (*stratêgos*) of Cilicia after the reconquest of the region under Ptolemy III, and he later became governor of Coele-Syria. He likely crossed paths with the Aspendian Meas, *lampadarch* in the inscription of Meydancikkale, even if Thraseas was higher in the hierarchy than him.⁹³ Thraseas’ son, Ptolemaios, commanded the phalanx at the battle of Raphia with his fellow Aspendian Andromachus, who had recently arrived in Egypt – no doubt through his connection with Ptolemaios’ family (Polybius 5.65.3). Andromachus became governor of Syria and Phoenicia after Ptolemy IV’s victory at Raphia, followed by Thraseas until around 204 and then by Ptolemaios.⁹⁴ Yet this family branch joined the Seleucid side soon after the death of Ptolemy IV, perhaps already at the beginning of the Fifth Syrian War (202-197).⁹⁵ This action should not,

89. Yet they are not recorded as such in prosopographical studies such as that of L. MOOREN, *The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography*, Brussels 1975 because *Philos* was not an institutionalized function or official title and thus is rarely attested in the documentary sources.

90. He was also an “eponymous officer,” see W. PEREMANS, E. VAN ‘T DACK, *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* vol. II/VIII 1828, which means that soldiers or cleruchs under his command called their troops after his name, see C. FISCHER-BOVET, W. CLARYSSE, «A military reform before the battle of Raphia?», *APF* 58, 2012, p. 26-35.

91. W. CLARYSSE, G. VAN DER VEKEN, *The Eponymous Priests of Ptolemaic Egypt. Chronological Lists of the Priests of Alexandria and Ptolemais with a Study of the Demotic Transcriptions of Their Names*, Leiden 1983; on the loss of Cilicia and its reconquest by Ptolemy III, see section I above.

92. C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia», *op. cit.*, p. 342.

93. On Meas, see text 1 above.

94. C. HABICHT, C. P. JONES, «A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia», *op. cit.*, p. 345-46 on the basis of an equestrian statue of Ptolemy IV dedicated by Thraseas, see J.-P. REY-COQUAIS, «Apport d’inscriptions inédites de Syrie et de Phénicie aux listes de divinités ou à la prosopographie de l’Égypte hellénistique ou romaine» in L. CRISCUOLO, G. GERACI eds., *Egitto e storia antica. Atti del Colloquio internazionale. Bologna, 31.8-2.9.1987*, Bologna 1989, p. 609-619.

95. D. GERA, «Ptolemy the Son of Thraseas and the Fifth Syrian War», *AncSoc* 18, 1987, p. 63-73 for a defection between 204 and 201 BC; C. LORBER, «Numismatic evidence for the chronology of the Fifth Syrian War» in S. HONIGMAN, O. LIPSCHITS, C. NIHAN eds., *Times of transition. Judea in the Early Hellenistic Period*, Philadelphia 2021, p. 31-41, proposes a new chronology of the Fifth Syrian War and suggests the betrayal occurred toward the end of the war based on the re-dating of the first correspondence between Ptolemaios and Antiochus III recorded on the Hefzibah inscription as Seleucid Era 114, *i.e.* 199/198 BCE, though she accepts that the defection could have happened earlier; yet, before Lorber’s article was published, the dossier had safely

however, be interpreted as a straightforward betrayal of the Ptolemies but must be understood within the troubled period of court intrigues during the regency of Ptolemy V. In fact, another branch of the family stayed in Egypt. Ptolemaios' cousin Aetos (III) was *stratêgos* (governor) of the Arsinoite nome in 203/2 BC. This does not mean, though, that Aetos (III) did not have a military career because of the defection of his cousins.⁹⁶ First, a *stratêgos* of a nome often had a military career.⁹⁷ Second, Aetos' eponymous priesthood in Alexandria, granted in 196 after the end of the Fifth Syrian War – as it was to his grandfather, the military commander Aetos at the end of the Second Syrian War – suggests that he received a reward for serving during the war.⁹⁸ His honorific function indicates that he was one of the most influential persons in 196 when the young Ptolemy V was finally crowned at Memphis. The point is that maintaining close connections with Aspendians was essential for the Ptolemies after the recent loss of southern Anatolia if they hoped to reconquer it. Aetos' family illustrates the use of the local elites from one region as royal officials and officers in the neighboring region or in Egypt.

The careers of men such as Aetos and Thraseas must have been emulated by their fellows in Aspendos and other Pamphylian cities. Through them, critical social networks thickened and kept the empire together. On the other hand, the advantages for the local elites of the cities of southern Anatolia in serving one king were also evident. Some of these families became extremely powerful in the Eastern Mediterranean through their governorship – and certainly extremely wealthy.

There are also hints that the local populations of these regions, beyond elite families, wished to maintain a good relationship with the Ptolemaic dynasty. For instance, the Xanthians from Lycia acknowledged their kinship with king Ptolemy (through the Argead kings, descendants of Heracles).⁹⁹ They used arguments based on mythical genealogies to negotiate some privileges with the Ptolemies. Employment in the Ptolemaic army was an appealing career for men from these regions, who almost exclusively served the Ptolemies in the third century.¹⁰⁰ Carian soldiers could be garrisoned anywhere, even in Caria itself, as the

been redated to 202-200 and 195 BC, see the implications in I. SAVALLI-LESTRADE, «Le dossier épigraphique d'Hefzibah (202/1-195 a.C.): chronologie, histoire, diplomatique», *REA* 120, 2018, p. 367-383; B. CHRUBASIK, «The epigraphic dossier concerning Ptolemaios, son of Thraseas, and the Fifth Syrian War», *ZPE* 209, 2019, p. 115-130 convincingly argued for a betrayal just before the war, as Gera, but accepts the new chronology of the war reconstructed by Lorber.

96. *Contra* J. D. SOSIN, «P. Duk. inv. 677: Aetos, from Arsinoite Stratêgos to Eponymous Priest», *ZPE* 116, 1997, p. 141-156 who assumes he did not have a military career.

97. C. FISCHER-BOVET, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 323, 326.

98. This title is recorded in the Memphis decree on the Rosetta Stone (*OGIS* I 90).

99. Decree of the Xanthians, l. 40-48 (*SEG* XXXVIII 1476, 206/5 BC) in J. BOUSQUET, «La stèle des Kyténiens à Xanthos de Lycie», *REG* 101, 1988, p. 12-53, at p. 14-20, 39-41 a response to the small city of Kytenion in Doris which emphasizes its kinship relation with Xanthos to obtain financial support for building fortifications.

100. New evidence discussed here confirm the work of M. LAUNEY, *op. cit.*, p. 451-471, 476-481 and G. T. GRIFFITH, *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge 1935: index under Carians, Cilicians, Lycians, Pamphylians.

Calymnian mercenaries.¹⁰¹ Some Caunian soldiers were stationed in Sidon, with soldiers from Pinara in Lycia and from other Carian and Lycian cities, as well as Laconia, Lydia, Pisidia and Crete.¹⁰² A new inscription from Limyra, dated to the late summer of 199, gives a list of seventeen soldiers serving under the Macedonian garrison commander Menyllos: two of them still from Caria, three from Lycia – one from Limyra itself, as already mentioned, another from Myra and the last without a city of origin –, two from Aspendos in Pamphylia, thus more than a third from southern Anatolia itself.¹⁰³ They formed an association of *basilistai*, *i.e.*, devoted to the king's cult, which indicates these soldiers' long-term presence. The stele commemorates Menyllos's donation of a vineyard to the *basilistai*. He aimed to finance a new royal festival in exchange for caring both for its cultivation and for his grave, *i.e.*, his funerary cult to take place during the Herakles festival at the gymnasium, possibly because he did not have any descendants. Wörrle proposes that the date of the festival coincided with the Egyptian New Year and the deification of Ptolemy V.¹⁰⁴ The celebration of the royal festival points to the strengthening of the relationship between the Limyrans and Alexandria and to the expectation of a successful conclusion of the Fifth Syrian War given the recent hiring of troops by the high commander Skopas.¹⁰⁵ While in some cases, foreign military inherited property in their garrisoned city because their father had married a citizen, Wörrle surmises that in Menyllos' case, the vineyard was part of a *klêros* he received out of the royal land.¹⁰⁶ The name of the association, *thiasos*, may suggest that soldiers were granted land, as in Cyprus and Thera.¹⁰⁷ In contrast, soldiers dispatched for shorter periods could be a burden when billeting was imposed on the local population.¹⁰⁸ Individuals directly connected to a Ptolemaic agent, such as a Carian from Calynda with Apollonios' estate agent Zenon, could negotiate an exemption that would be communicated to the Calyndan *boulê* and *dêmos*.¹⁰⁹

101. See n. 75 above.

102. The tombstones of soldiers in Sidon attest a *politeuma* of the Caunians and one of the Pinarians, see P. SÄNGER, «Some Considerations about the Ethnic Politeumata of Sidon» in P. SÄNGER, S. SCHEUBLE-REITER eds., *Söldner und Berufssoldaten in der griechischen Welt. Soziale und politische Gestaltungsräume*, Stuttgart 2022, who demonstrates that these soldiers served the Ptolemies and called themselves a *politeuma* with the meaning of “citizenry” and not of “association.”

103. M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XIII...», *op. cit.*

104. M. WÖRRLE, *ibid.*, p. 236-241.

105. Livy XXXI 43, 4-7.

106. M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XIII...», *op. cit.*, p. 227-229 about an example from Xanthos (*SEG XXXVI 1220 = TM 981556*, 202/201 BC).

107. On a *thiasos* and, possibly, cleruchs in Cyprus, see C. FISCHER-BOVET, «Ptolemaic soldiers in Egypt and Cyprus: Loyalty and trust in dedicatory inscriptions», *op. cit.*, p. 179, n. 22.

108. S. PFEIFFER, «Zur Einquartierung von Soldaten des ptolemäischen Heeres. Rechtsgrundlagen, Konflikte und Lösungsstrategien» in S. PFEIFFER ed., *Ägypten unter fremden Herrschern zwischen Satrapie und römischer Provinz*, Frankfurt am Main 2007, p. 165-185, C. FISCHER-BOVET, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 242-246.

109. *P.Cair.Zen.* III 59341 (Alexandria, 247 BC).

Employment by the Ptolemies also led soldiers from the four regions to settle as cleruchs in Egypt. Their proportion remained small (3%), with more than a third from Pamphylia, thus far below that of the Thracians (17%) but still above that of the Cretans (1.5%) and of the Athenians (2%).¹¹⁰ Yet, the percentage of cleruchs does not do justice to the presence of soldiers from southern Anatolia in the Ptolemaic army because most of them – a far larger number – served as Ptolemaic mercenaries outside Egypt. In Cyprus, for instance, a third-century list from the gymnasium of Paphos in Cyprus about oil supply, with seven of the eight men from Lycian cities, and the later *koina* of Lycians and Cilicians, provide evidence for their significant presence on the island.¹¹¹

During the Seleucid occupation of Lycia and Pamphylia, from 197 until the 180s, at least 4,000 Lycians, Pamphylians and Pisidians served in the Seleucid army of Antiochus III at Magnesia (Livy XXXVII 40.14). Seleucid presence was more substantial in Cilicia, especially in flat Cilicia from 218/17 until 165, when Antiochus IV still had 3,000 Cilicians in the procession of his army at Daphnae (Polybius XXX 25.4). However, the close link between southern Anatolia and the Ptolemies remained strong. The dedication by the *koinon* of the Lycians, in Alexandria, of a statue (c. 125-157 cm) of the courtier Ptolemaios, Master of the Royal Hunt (*archikynegos*), dated to 184-180 BC, is to be understood in this context. The soldiers at the core of this association (not the League of the Lycians) wanted to thank him and his father, also Master of the Royal Hunt, for their continuous care for the royal family and the association itself.¹¹² It was advantageous to remain well-connected to influential officers, while for officers, such organizations could facilitate recruitment. Even in the second half of the second century, the Ptolemies employed soldiers from southern Anatolia, which indicates that past relationships had never really stopped or were re-activated. Many of these soldiers served as mercenaries in Cyprus and in Egypt, where they formed associations called *politeumata*, such as the *politeuma* of the Cilicians, established in the second century BC, and possibly that

110. These calculations are based on the unpublished master thesis of M. STEFANOY, «Η εθνική των πολεμιαίων κληρούχων έως 146 Π.Χ», *Unpublished Masters Thesis*, Athens 2008, which is an updated catalogue of F. ÜEBEL, *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, Berlin 1968.

111. I. Paphos 66 (224-223 BC) = I. Hell. Paphos 8 with R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 68 who notes that the list was longer; on *koina* in Cyprus, see T. KRUSE, «Ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt» in V. GABRIELSEN, C. A. THOMSEN eds., *Private Associations and the Public Sphere. Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010*, Viborg 2015, p. 270-300 and P. SÄNGER, *Die ptolemäische Organisationsform politeuma*, Tübingen 2019, p. 87-89, p. 241-243.

112. I. Alex. Ptol. 27 (= CPI 56 = TM 6315) with P. KOSSMANN, «Intercéder pour la cité dans l'Asie Mineure Lagide» in C. FEYEL *et al.* eds., *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain*, Nancy-Paris 2012, p. 161-184: 176; E. LANCIERS, «The alleged relations between Ptolemaic Egypt and Lycia after 197 BC and the founding date of the Lycian League», *ZPE* 204, 2017, p. 116-127 has now convincingly argued that the *koinon* was an association rather than the League of the Lycians, whose creation he dates to 167 BC. However, this does not challenge, in my opinion, the existence of close links between the Lycians and the Ptolemies after the loss of Lycia, though it makes them less formal.

of the Lycians.¹¹³ To sum up, a clear pattern of loyalty and traditional military service for the Egyptian king remained, facilitated by the strong social network between the inhabitants of these regions and the Ptolemaic court.

C. – ESTABLISHING AN IMPERIAL ADMINISTRATION

Because of the assumption that an empire should attain some degree of homogeneity, historians usually identify Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia as “dependencies” or as “possessions outside Egypt,” as it was coined in Bagnall’s fundamental study.¹¹⁴ Yet the Greek term for “provinces,” *topoi*, existed in the Hellenistic administration.¹¹⁵ Moreover, there is no reason to expect all the provinces to be uniform, especially after only a few decades of rule and in such a borderland area between rival states. While the variety of titles used for the governor of each province had suggested a lack of consistency in the administration of these regions, some coherence has become visible these past two decades. First, Cilicia was governed by a *stratêgos*, as one would expect. Second, Pamphylia was also most likely administered by a *stratêgos* and not by a “Pamphyliarch,” a restitution that Meadows and Thonemann have convincingly rejected and that would be an *hapax* in the epigraphic corpus.¹¹⁶ What territories Ptolemy III actually controlled again is debated, but the argument for a high degree of autonomy based on coinage requires some caution.¹¹⁷ Third, the two *oikonomoi* in Lycia were probably the Ptolemaic equivalent of the two *archontes* used by the earlier Hecatomnid dynasts of Caria to administrate Lycia, with the titles adjusted to match Ptolemaic terminology.¹¹⁸ They were appointed by the king and received letters from the *dioiketes* in Alexandria, which confirms that the taxation of the provinces was centrally supervised, with regional adaptation, since they were two. Moreover, the two *oikonomoi* honored in an inscription from Limyra came from Caria,

113. P. SÄNGER, «Contextualizing a Ptolemaic Solution: The institution of the ethnic politeuma» in C. FISCHER-BOVET, S. VON REDEN eds., *Comparing the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires. Integration, Communication and Resistance*, Cambridge 2021, p. 106-126; no *politeuma* of the Pamphylians is attested but a *politeuma* of the Lycian in Alexandria in an inscription from the Roman period, a street of the Lycians in Krokodilopolis and a quarter of the Lycians in Oxyrhynchus are mentioned in papyri from the Roman period but possibly existed earlier, see sources in M. LAUNEY, *op. cit.*, p. 463-464.

114. R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt, op. cit.*, p. 89-116 on these four provinces.

115. It is attested in a few Ptolemaic sources: *OGIS* I 54 (Adulis inscription), *Syll.*³ 502 and *P. Tebt.* I 8 = M. M. AUSTIN, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest, op. cit.*, nos. 268, 269 and 278.

116. See the revisions by A. R. MEADOWS, P. THONEMANN, «The Ptolemaic administration of Pamphylia», *ZPE* 186, 2013, p. 223-226; 224 to Robert (1966) 53-8, with *BE* (1967) 601 (Termessos); they explain that the gap contains 8-10 letters, so that *oikonomos* could be another possible restitution, if the fiscal branch of the administration is meant here.

117. J. D. GRAINGER, *The cities of Pamphylia, op. cit.*, p. 86-87 points to Phaselis’ city emblem on coins where Ptolemy IV’s head is small, whereas the city did not strike issues between 309 and c. 250, when mostly under Ptolemaic control. But since Aspendos and Side struck their own coins all along, the argument cannot be decisive.

118. *P. Tebt.* I 8 (Tebtunis, 219/218 or 202/201 BC) with M. D. GYGAX, «Change and continuity in the administration of Ptolemaic Lycia: A note on *P. Tebt.* I 8», *BASP* 42, 2005, p. 45-50.

both from Caunos, in continuity with the Hecatomnid.¹¹⁹ Yet Lycia was no doubt governed by a *stratêgos* like the other provinces, who oversaw the commanders of cities and of garrisons, such as the garrison commander (*phourarchês*) attested in Xanthos.¹²⁰ It was probably the governor (*stratêgos*) who received a royal *prostagma* aiming to prevent abuses regarding tax collection by tax farmers about which the *oikonomoi* had done nothing.¹²¹ As pointed out by Wörrle, the mention of laws concerning tax-farming, *diagrammata* and *prostigmata* indicate that the Ptolemies had developed a large body of regulations for administrating and taxing their empire, which they made publicly available to the local population in front of the *logeutêria*, i.e., treasury buildings.¹²² According to Wörrle, Lycian cities had to contribute significantly to the Ptolemaic treasury, yet that was the price to pay to live more or less in peace.¹²³ He points, in fact, to the variability regarding tax exemptions from one city to another. Regarding abuses, however, royal officials and officers were at times successful at preventing them, assuming the honorific decree from Limyra for the two *oikonomoi*, or that for the *phourarchês* in Xanthos, speak some truths. Finally, the penetration of Ptolemaic administration in the region, and a continuous movement towards centralization, can also be inferred from the dating of documents by the eponymous priests of Alexander and the dynasty attested in Xanthos and Limyra in the late third century, together with the harmonization of the Macedonian calendar used in the Lycian cities with the Egyptian calendar.¹²⁴

Though the spread and duration of Ptolemaic control in Caria were not as extensive as in Lycia and remain difficult to reconstruct, Ptolemy II conceived the region as a province governed by a *stratêgos* of Caria.¹²⁵ The fiscal administration was also in the hands of an *oikonomos*. In one instance, he was presumably the official with authority to divert the revenue from a tax collected by the cities, the *iatrika* that provided medical care to citizens, for a royal

119. SEG XXVII 929, see n. 16 above.

120. SEG XXXIII 1183 with A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogôreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra», *op. cit.*, p. 149 and n. 45 with further bibliography on *phouria* and garrison commanders.

121. SEG LX 1536 = TM 964562, either 277/6 or 239/8 BC with M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens VIII: Ein ptolemäisches Prostagma aus Limyra über Missstände beim Steuereinzug», *Chiron* 40, 2010, p. 359-394, at p. 389-392, where he surmises it may be Aristoteles, mentioned in Ptolemy II's letter guarantying the Telmessians they will not be given as a gift (SEG XXVIII 1224, 282 BC); p. 392 Wörrle stresses the text does not concern taxes in nature, that were probably collected more uniformly from the royal land across the empire.

122. M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens VIII...», *op. cit.*, p. 369-376; for similar and at times more expensive regulations see *P.Rev.* = TM 8859 (259/258 BC) and SB V 8008 = TM 5707 (after 260 BC) about the registration of livestock and slaves in Syria and Phoenicia.

123. M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XIII...», *op. cit.*, p. 115 and 123-124.

124. M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XIII...», *op. cit.*, p. 232-234.

125. The Macedonian Aristolaos son of Ameinias is honored as governor of Caria in Samos: *JG* XII.6 120, 1.15-17 (270-259 BC) = SEG XXXIII 694 = TM 113394; the *stratêgos* Margos, honored in Amyzon, see J. ROBERT, L. ROBERT, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie*, Paris 1983, p. 118-124 (277 BC), no 3, had possibly the same function.

purpose, in that case, fixing a ship.¹²⁶ The *oikonomos* also accumulated judicial functions, as van Bremen showed in her reconstruction of an epigraphical dossier related to the honorific decree of the Chrysaoric league for the *oikonomos* Apollonios at the temple of Zeus at Labraunda (266/267 BC).¹²⁷ Apollonios was honored for his “incorruptibility and irreproachable” (l. 5-6, ἀ[δωρο]δόκητος καὶ ἀνέγκλητος), virtues also expressed more generically in the Limyrian inscription honoring the two *oikonomoi* who were said to be “excellent and just” (l. 5-6, καλοὶ κάγαθο[ὶ καὶ] δίκαιοι). These honorific texts hint at the Ptolemies’ aims to prevent abuses by their officials by appointing respectable men and thus limit potential troubles or change of allegiance to another king. Moreover, Van Bremen convincingly argued that the dispute for which the *oikonomos*, likely Apollonios, had appointed three royal agents from Caria, concerned tax privileges Ptolemy II granted to the two main sanctuaries of the Chrysaoric League, of Labraunda and Panamara Zeus, regarding their contributions to the League. It is noticeable that the Ptolemies oversaw a dispute that did not concern obligations to the king but was internal to the league. Thus, the dossier brings little support to the idea that the Ptolemies used leagues to control some regions of their empire, whereas the Ptolemies interacted individually with Carian *poleis*.¹²⁸ Similarly, the Lycian League was formed in the second century and was not a tool of the Ptolemaic imperial administration.¹²⁹ In contrast, Ptolemy II’s relationship with the Mogoreis in Caria via Moschion, whose urban center of Xystis would become a *polis*, and the king’s creation of a city in the neighboring Bargasa, as suggested by the tribe Ptolemais, led Bresson, Descat and Varinlioğlu to propose that Ptolemy II saw in such creations the warranty of his power.¹³⁰ Their interpretation can be pushed further since a similar reliance on the towns Koressus in the Aegean and Methana in the Peloponnese, which initially did not have the status of *poleis*, as well as in Cyprus, may indicate a specific strategy:¹³¹ the perspective to be granted a *polis* status could be an incentive for the local inhabitants to remain loyal. However, Ptolemaic interference in the civic institutions of southern Anatolian *poleis* is more difficult to assess since their development is fragmentarily

126. *P.Cair.Zen.* I 59036 = *Sel.Pap.* II 410 = *TM* 696 (257 BC) with M. WÖRRLE, «Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens. III. Ein hellenistischer Königsbrief aus Telmessos», *Chiron* 9, 1979, p. 83-111, at p. 106-109.

127. I. *Labraunda* 43 = *TM* 857936 with R. VAN BREMEN, «Labraunda and the Ptolemies: a reinterpretation of three documents from the Sanctuary of Zeus (I. *Labraunda* 51, 45 and 44)», *Studi Ellenistici* 31, 2017, p. 223-259.

128. See also R. VAN BREMEN, «Labraunda and the Ptolemies...», *op. cit.*, p.250 and J. LABUFF, «Leagues of Carians as Local Rather than Imperial Structures» in M. MUNN ed., *Hellenistic Monarchies in the Mediterranean World: Building a New World Order?*, forthcoming, p. XXX *contra e.g.*, A. R. MEADOWS, «The Ptolemaic league of islanders», *op. cit.*

129. See n. 112 above.

130. I. *Nordkarien* 551, l. 2, see A. BRESSON, R. DESCAT, E. VARINLIOĞLU, «Décret des Mogoreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra», *op. cit.*, p. 157.

131. M. GODSEY, «The archaeology of Ptolemaic garrison supply in the early Hellenistic Aegean», *Unpublished dissertation*, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2023, p. 37 and 71; on Golgoi, Tamassos and Ledroi in Cyprus, see A. HERMARY, «Autour de Golgoi : les cités de la Mesaoria aux époques hellénistique et romaine», *Cahiers du Centre d’Etudes Chypriotes* 34, 2004, p. 47-68 49-54 with sources and fig 1 with map.

known. In Pamphylia, the Aspendians already had a *boulê* and a *demos* that honored Ptolemaic troops as early as 301-298 BC.¹³² In Lycia, many cities had three *archontes* in the early third century, but a *boulê* is attested in Xanthos towards the end of Ptolemaic occupation, which, according to Wörrle, was probably established around the same time in Limyra, but the role of the Ptolemies in this development is unknown.¹³³ The historian is cautious not to assume too quickly that the *dêmos* would have gained power.

Finally, a significant aspect of imperial control was the use of coinage, long thought to confirm Ptolemaic lack of intention to integrate fully southern Anatolia into their empire. The principle of the closed currency system, in which only Ptolemaic coins that weighed less than coins issued on the Attic standard could be used, was not applied in southern Anatolia. This led Bagnall and everybody after him to draw a line between the “core region” of the Ptolemaic state, where only coinage on the Ptolemaic standard circulated (Egypt, Syria-Phoenicia and Cyprus), and the so-called external possessions.¹³⁴ It was probably both difficult and disadvantageous to prevent other coinages from entering the borderland region of southern Anatolia, which was still little monetized. However, Bagnall also noticed that the Ptolemies had forbidden some Pamphylian cities to mint tetradrachms, notably Aspendos.¹³⁵ The hoard from Patara in Lycia, as well as coins found in Lycia and Caria, also gives support to the circulation of Ptolemaic currency in these regions.¹³⁶ Moreover, it is noticeable that hoards, including the largest one in Meydancikkale, contained both Ptolemaic and non-Ptolemaic coins mixed together.¹³⁷ There was in fact a Ptolemaic mint in Telmessus in Lycia and one in Tarsus in Cilicia.¹³⁸ An

132. See n. 16 above.

133. M. WÖRRLE, «Lykiens ‘ptolemäisches Jahrhundert’: Ein Segen für das Land?», *op. cit.*, p. 121.

134. R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 210-11; on the creation of the system, see F. DE CALLATAÏ, «L’instauration par Ptolémée 1^{er} Sôter d’une économie monétaire fermée» in F. DUYRAT, O. PICARD eds., *L’exception égyptienne? Production et échanges monétaires en Égypte hellénistique et romaine*, Cairo 2005, p. 117-134 and M. LIANOÛ, «Ptolemy I and the Economics of Consolidation» in H. HAUBEN, A. MEEUS eds., *op. cit.*, p. 379-411; Cyrenaica had its own closed-system, see C. LORBER, *Catalogue of Ptolemaic Coins. Part I: Ptolemy I to IV*, New York 2018, p. 17 n. 199.

135. R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 194-200, esp. 197.

136. D. S. LENGER, E. DÜNDAR, «A Ptolemaic Hoard from Patara», *op. cit.*, p. 210 and 214, who also mention the Hüseyinli hoard near Antiocheia in Hatay Province (Turkey) with 58 gold coins, correcting the previous supposition by R. S. BAGNALL, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*, *op. cit.*, p. 194-200, 210-212; on coins found in Caria, see A. CAVAGNA, *Monete Tolemaiche oltre l’Egitto*, Milano 2015, p. 213-220, no. 15.4.6-26.

137. A. DAVESNE, «Le trésor d’Aydincik 1974» in M. AMANDRY, G. LE RIDER eds., *Trésors et circulation monétaire en Anatolie antique*, Paris 1994, p. 37-43 and the catalogue of hoards in C. LORBER, *Catalogue of Ptolemaic Coins. Part I: Ptolemy I to IV*, p. 496-497. I thank Cathy Lorber for sharing her expertise and her work while it was still forthcoming; see also n. 36 above.

138. For Tarsus, already under Ptolemy II, see A. DAVESNE, «La deuxième guerre de Syrie (ca. 261-255 av. J.-C.) et les témoignages numismatiques», *op. cit.*, p. 129-131; for Telmessus, see R. H. J. ASHTON, «Ptolemaic coins from Fethiye Museum», *Numismatic Circular* 110.1, 2002, p. 7-12.

additional mint was used in Soloi in Flat Cilicia during the Fifth Syrian War to pay Ptolemaic troops.¹³⁹ Therefore, the presence of Ptolemaic coins on the lighter weight standard together with the Ptolemies' policy towards some Pamphylian cities can be interpreted as steps towards the imposition of a closed currency system in the long term.¹⁴⁰

In fact, when the Seleucid and Ptolemaic monetary policies in southern Anatolia are compared, the Ptolemies appear as active as their rivals. When the Seleucids held Cilicia, they also had a single mint in Tarsus and added another during the Third Syrian War, as the Ptolemies did in Soloi in Cilicia during the Fifth Syrian War. Finally, it is remarkable that around 184 BC, about twelve years after the Ptolemies had lost Cilicia, the personnel of the mint in Soloi moved to a mint in Cyprus, which still belonged to the Ptolemaic empire. As Lorber and Kovacs have proposed, this was perhaps part of a plan to pay troops in order to recover Coele-Syria.¹⁴¹ In any case, the transfer of personnel suggests once more that the Ptolemies had generated strong connections with the locals.

III. – CONCLUSION

The reexamination of southern Anatolia as a case study of Ptolemaic imperialism aimed to illuminate essential aspects of change brought by the kings' ruling strategies. Even if these policies were not completely unique to the Ptolemies, the way this dynasty was active in thickening a network of communications, especially in this region, appears particularly efficient and may have put pressure on the Seleucids.

That each province retained some specificities given its geography, demography, history, and the duration of Ptolemaic presence is to be expected. Yet the settlement policies indicate a determined investment in fortifications, both inland and along the coasts, with garrisoned harbors at reasonable distances to allow effective communication. Constructions of infrastructures seemed more needed in Cilicia and Pamphylia, whereas two key Lycian and Carian cities displayed monumental building that was part of a larger Ptolemaic program. But all types of settlements spread the cults of the king or of various royal members, and even at times of Sarapis (and Isis). They left an imprint on the land by promoting Ptolemaic royal ideology, which was an indispensable counterpart of the military in the construction of an empire. All settlements also facilitated, in one way or another, the extraction of resources in nature and cash that were vital for such an undertaking.

139. C. LORBER, F. L. KOVACS, «A Ptolemaic mint at Soli: a tale of two magistrates», *Schweizer Münzblätter* = *Gazette numismatique suisse* = *Gazzetta numismatica svizzera* 47, 1997, p. 92-99; T. LANDVATTER, «The Serapis and Isis Coinage of Ptolemy IV», *AJN* 24, 2012, p. 61-90, esp. 80-81, 86.

140. Moreover, when an area was momentarily under Ptolemaic control in western Anatolia, no mint issuing (posthumous) Alexander drachms, which followed the Attic standard, was found there, see the recent argument by A. R. MEADOWS, «Invasion and Transformation. The development of the civic Alexander coinage in Western Asia Minor, c. 323 to 223 BC» in M.-C. MARCELLESI, S. KREMYDI eds., *Les Alexandres après Alexandre: histoire d'une monnaie commune*, Athens 2019, p. 63-87.

141. C. LORBER, F. L. KOVACS, «A Ptolemaic mint at Soli: a tale of two magistrates», *op. cit.*, p. 94.

The Ptolemies carefully cultivated the loyalty of the officials and officers whom they hired from the diverse local elites: proximity to the king, rewards and honors from the kings and from the local communities, strengthening of the officials' personal international networks in agreement with Ptolemaic ideology. All these new prospects changed the political and social landscape of the region. Such officials and officers would recruit among their local populations, opening new possibilities but also contributing to tensions. The civilians encountered soldiers from anywhere in the empire, but many from neighboring regions and sometimes from the region or the city itself. Yet the sources also hint at a long-term presence conducive to more convivial interaction between soldiers and civilians. For now, Aspendos in Cilicia stands out as the place of origin of several high officers, while Pamphylia may have provided slightly more soldiers than the neighboring regions, possibly because it was becoming less insulated.

Even if the administration of southern Anatolia reflects a mixture of continuity and change with the previous period, a process of making the provinces more uniform, within the capacity of a pre-modern state, was in progress. The governor of each province oversaw *stratêgoi* (officers) posted in cities and garrison commanders, while one or several *oikonomoi* supervised tax collection and related matters. The king's interlocutors in the four regions were the *poleis* and their representatives, each trying to negotiate some privileges. There is no reason to expect more uniformity after only a few decades of presence in a region always challenged by rivals. The Ptolemies tend to be considered less aggressive than their rivals and are not perceived as empire builders, but new evidence has shown this to be a misconception.

SOMMAIRE

ARTICLES :

CHRISTELLE FISCHER-BOVET, <i>Ptolemaic Imperialism in Southern Anatolia: Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia</i>	3
MICHAËL GIRARDIN, <i>Recomposer la linéarité dynastique de la famille hasmonéenne : un défi pour l'auteur de 1 Maccabées</i>	29
FRANÇOIS SANTONI, <i>Polybe, les Grecs envoyés à Rome en 167 et leur statut</i>	45
MANFREDI ZANIN, <i>Ante o post censuram? La cronologia della legazione di scipione Emiliano a Oriente</i>	55
ANDREA FRIZZERA, <i>Fuggire dalle proscrizioni lontano da Roma: il caso di Gaio Norbano</i>	73
JUAN GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ, <i>The turma Salluitana and Pompey's Iberian clientelae: a Critical Reassessment</i>	93
PAUL MARIUS MARTIN, <i>Sauve qui peut ! César arrive</i>	107
NICOLAS WILLIAMS-GASNIER, <i>Titres honorifiques fondés sur le lexique de la parenté et dimension performative du langage métaphorique</i>	117
Jean-Christophe COURTIL, <i>Castration thérapeutique et virilitas : le traitement de l'épilepsie chez Célius Aurélien</i>	139

LECTURES CRITIQUES

JULIEN ZURBACH, <i>La disparition de la cité ?</i>	161
Comptes rendus.....	179
Notes de lectures	289
Liste des ouvrages reçus	291
Table of content.....	293