

RIET VAN BREMEN

PTOLEMY AT PANAMARA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 35 (2003) 9–14

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## PTOLEMY AT PANAMARA

It is generally taken as a fact that the region which was to become the territory of the Seleukid city of Stratonikeia in the 260s or 250s BC<sup>1</sup> was under Ptolemaic control throughout the 270s, probably from the time of the so-called war of Syrian succession in 280/79 BC.<sup>2</sup> According to some, it remained Ptolemaic also throughout the 260s.<sup>3</sup> *I. Stratonikeia* 1002, an inscription dated to the ninth year of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy (277/6 BC),<sup>4</sup> seen and copied by J. and L. Robert in the school at Eskihisar, is widely accepted as providing direct proof of Ptolemaic suzerainty over the region, even if its precise provenance is unknown.<sup>5</sup> In addition, P. Debord has recently drawn attention to the occurrence of a Sarapieion in a newly-published Stratonikeian fortification inscription of the late third/early second century,<sup>6</sup> and has made an interesting case for considering the presence of a Sarapieion this early and this far inland as further proof of a period of Ptolemaic occupation.<sup>7</sup>

Terms such as ‘the region’ or ‘future Stratonikeian territory’ are not, however, entirely unproblematic. Implicit in their use seems to be the assumption that the communities in the area that was to become Stratonikeian territory formed a unified entity already in the early third century. Such a view is not really justified. The territory of the later Seleukid city was large; several of its future demes were substantial communities in their own right and were

---

<sup>1</sup> On the date of the foundation see most recently P. Debord, *Questions stratoniceennes*, in A. Bresson and R. Descat (eds.), *Les cités d’Asie Mineure occidentale au IIe siècle a.C.* (2001) 157–158, and R. van Bremen, *The demes and phylai of Stratonikeia in Karia*, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 389.

<sup>2</sup> G. M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands and Asia Minor* (1995) 268–269 summarizes the *communis opinio*. For the war of Syrian succession see E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*, 2 vols. (1979) 139ff. Nearby Amyzon and probably Alinda were, however, Ptolemaic already under Ptolemy I: *Amyzon* 127–128, with no. 6. A. Meadow’s suggestion, quoted in J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the cities of Western Asia Minor* (1999) 39, n. 47, that this text could instead be attributed to Ptolemy II, seems unconvincing given the use of the simple formula βασιλεύοντος Πτολ[ε]μαίου, as the Roberts rightly saw.

<sup>3</sup> Ma (prev. n.) 237 argues for a Seleukid reconquest in the 250s BC and a foundation of Stratonikeia in the late 250s. See, however, below, n. 27.

<sup>4</sup> For a justification of the higher date, rather than the Roberts’ 274 BC, see R. A. Hazzard, *The regnal years of Ptolemy II Philadelphos*, *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 140–158. Discussion also in G. Hölbl, *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches* (1994) 32 and 287, and W. Huß, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit, 332–30 v. Chr.* (2001) 254; both provide a full bibliography on the problem of calculating the regnal years of Ptolemy II.

<sup>5</sup> J. and L. Robert, *Mélanges I. Lévy* (Annuaire de l’Institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves vol. 13, 1955) 556 (= *OMS* V, 452).

<sup>6</sup> The sanctuary functioned as an assembly point for soldiers: Τρίτου πύργου μέσης πύλης ὑπὸ τὸ Σαραπιεῖον· ἐπίσημον· Δελφικὸς τρίτους. The inscription, together with two others, already known (*I. Stratonikeia* 1003 and 1004) comes from the city’s hellenistic walls. See the refs. in Debord, next n. The text was published by E. Varinlioglu: *REA* 96 (1994) 189–191 (= *SEG* 44, 917). Cf. Ph. Gauthier, *BE* 1996, 401 rightly proposing ‘au pied de’ as translation for ὑπὸ (which suggests that the sanctuary was situated on the southern edge of the city, where the city walls continue along the crest of a steep hill).

<sup>7</sup> Debord (above, n. 1) 160–161. Debord considers the Samothrakion, after which another of the city’s quarters is called (ἄμφοδα τὸ Σαμοθράκιον) in *I. Stratonikeia* 1004, as another sign of early Ptolemaic presence in Stratonikeia’s central site (which he tentatively identifies as Hierakome).

located at some distance from one another (at least 20 km separated e.g. the sanctuary at Lagina, which lay within the *polis* of Koranza, from that at Panamara). While two of the more northern communities shared a boundary with Mylasa (which was Ptolemaic until 259 or somewhat after),<sup>8</sup> at least one of the southern sites was located on the edge of the region that was to become the Rhodian subject Peraia sometime before the middle of the third century.<sup>9</sup> So was the fortified sanctuary site of Panamara (at a distance of about 12 km from the centre), whose integration into Stratonikeia is, moreover, a disputed event, dated variously from the 240s to the 160s BC.<sup>10</sup> Can it be taken for granted that Ptolemaic control over one site would automatically have extended to the others?

The question is relevant because of the uncertainty about the geographical extent of the Ptolemaic 'province of Karia'. Although over the past few years new evidence has considerably increased the number of individual Karian cities known to have been Ptolemaic (Kildara, Euromos, Theangela, Thodasa and probably Bargylia can now be added to others known previously),<sup>11</sup> it is still not clear precisely what was and was not included when the 'province' was at its largest, i.e. in the 270s and 260s. John Ma has recently suggested that it overlapped with the fourth-century Hekatomnid satrapy, containing 'all of Karia west of the river Marsyas'.<sup>12</sup> Sweeping though it may seem, this assessment has already had to be revised, since a new decree from Xystis in the Harpasos valley dated to the eleventh or twelfth year of Ptolemy son of Ptolemy (275/4 or 274/3 BC) and honouring a Ptolemaic officer, shows Ptolemaic control, at least for a while, reaching into the Karian interior well beyond the Marsyas river.<sup>13</sup>

If this highlights the difficulty of drawing tidy boundaries around unstable territorial possessions, it should also remind us of the obscure status of parts of southern Karia. Here the unresolved issue is that of Rhodian expansion onto the Karian mainland and the formation of the so-called Rhodian subject Peraia. In the course of the third century BC a number of Karian communities came under Rhodian control or entered into some kind of dependent relationship

---

<sup>8</sup> For Mylasa see J. Kobes, Mylasa und Kildara in ptolemäischer Hand? Überlegungen zu zwei hellenistischen Inschriften aus Karien, *EA* 24 (1995) 1–6.

<sup>9</sup> Koranza, and Koliorga and probably also Hierakome, if the latter was indeed on the site of the future city centre, all bordered on Mylasan territory; Koraia lay probably in the south-east (?). Cf. P. Debord, *Essai sur la géographie historique de la région de Stratonicee*, *Mélanges P. Lévêque* 8 (1994), map p. 121 (leaving some territory in the south-east unaccounted for).

<sup>10</sup> On Panamara's integration see R. van Bremen, Leon, son of Chrysaor and the Religious Identity of Stratonikeia in Caria, *YCIS* 31 *forthcoming*.

<sup>11</sup> See now H.-U. Wiemer, Karien am Vorabend des 2. Makedonischen Krieges, *EA* 33 (2001) 10, with n. 53 (for his *SEG* 42, 974 read 994 and for *SEG* 38, 857 read 37) and 11.

<sup>12</sup> Ma (above, n. 2) 40, acknowledging a debt to A. Meadows. Cf. also S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (1982) 2, for a description of Hekatomnid 'Karia' and P. Debord, *L'Asie mineure au IVe siècle (412–323 a. C)* (1999) 178–180. 'West of the Marsyas' is not as tidy a notion as it may at first seem: strictly speaking, it leaves out the entire slice of Karia south of the line Bargylia – Muğla which cannot have been intended by those who proposed it.

<sup>13</sup> The decree is still unpublished but is referred to in P. Briant, P. Brun, E. Varinlioglu, Une inscription inédite de Carie et la guerre d'Aristonikos, in Bresson and Descat, eds. (above, n. 1) 244; the Ptolemaic chronology proposed on pp. 244–245 of this article is faulty. The decree's implications are picked up in the revised version of Ma's *Antiochos* (2002) 382–383.

with the island-state.<sup>14</sup> According to P. M. Fraser and G. E. Bean, this process most likely took place between 301 and 287/6 BC.<sup>15</sup> Their version of event, which is argued from plausibility but for which no firm evidence can be adduced, has prevailed for the better part of fifty years without real challenge.<sup>16</sup> The issue of a possible Rhodian enclave north of the Keramic Gulf can therefore not be ignored. If the entire area was Ptolemaic at least for a while (in the 270s) then there are implications for the date and especially for the nature (gift or conquest?) of Rhodes' acquisition of its 'subject Peraia'. If it was not, then the extent of Ptolemaic possessions in southern Karia still awaits further definition.

Perhaps it is merely an accident that so far no direct evidence for Ptolemaic control of the region north of the Keramic Gulf that became subject to Rhodes – a wedge-shaped area between Keramos and Idyma in the south and Muğla, Pisyè and Panamara in the north – has been forthcoming. Indirect – though rather uncertain – evidence for possible Ptolemaic control now exists for the newly discovered *polis* of Ouranion, immediately to the west of Keramos. Among the two inscriptions known from this city, one is a late third-century decree in honour of a Salaminian whom the editors suggest may have been a Ptolemaic official.<sup>17</sup> Both its date and its location, however, could be accommodated within the context of the 'présence ptolémaïque continue dans le secteur d'Halicarnasse et Myndos de c. 280 à 197' (which is now known to have almost certainly included Theangela and Bargylia)<sup>18</sup> and do not necessarily say anything about the rest of southern Karia. Apart from an important new inscription from Pisyè, listing contributors to the building of *neôria* on the coast at Pladasa, which will be discussed below, this region has yielded nothing to allow a reassessment of Fraser's and Bean's proposed sequence of events. It is because of this relative uncertainty that the exact status of communities 'on the site of the future Stratonikeia' matters. Until now, it was not clear whether a line between Ptolemaic and Rhodian-dominated territory might not in fact have run somewhere across future Stratonikeian territory, with Panamara's position just as much in the balance as that of nearby communities such as Pisyè.<sup>19</sup>

A very small fragment among the inscriptions copied at Panamara by G. Cousin now takes away some uncertainty. The fragment was not included by Cousin among the texts which he published in *BCH*, nor did Hatzfeld include it in his 1927 publication of the remainder of Cousin's material (also in *BCH*). It is absent therefore also from M. Ç. Şahin's publication in the *IK* series.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> On this region see now the descriptions and discussions in *HTC*: 11–18 for an introduction to its geography, parts III and V for the individual sites and their inscriptions. On the meaning and definition of 'subject Peraia' see P. M. Fraser and G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (1954) 53, 70–78, 98–117, G. Reger in V. Gabrielsen et al., eds., *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture and Society* (1999) 78–81, and V. Gabrielsen in *C&M* 51 (2000) 129–131 (with n. 4 for previous bibliography).

<sup>15</sup> Fraser and Bean (prev. n.) 99–101.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Reger (prev. n.) 78; Gabrielsen though challenging the concept of Rhodian conquest, domination and control used by Fraser and Bean and proposing in its place a system of *symmachiai*, does not seriously question their chronology or discuss the possibility of Ptolemaic control before the Rhodians embarked on their programme of alliances.

<sup>17</sup> E. Varinlioğlu et al., Ouranion en Carie, *REA* 94 (1992) 155–174, text no. 2 with p. 173.

<sup>18</sup> H.-U. Wiemer (above, n. 11).

<sup>19</sup> Whose northernmost site at Selviliçeşme borders on Panamara territory. Cf. *HTC* map p. 19.

<sup>20</sup> For the original *BCH* publications see the concordances in vol. II.1 of *I. Stratonikeia*.

Fragment of an honorific decree<sup>21</sup>

Copy of Cousin (carnet AS10, no. 250); w. 12 cm; h. 13 cm (no further indications given); top left-hand corner of a decree. Letters: *sigma* with divergent branches, *alpha* with straight cross-bar, *pi* with short right *hasta*. Cousin's estampage, though mentioned in the notebook, no longer exists.

Βασιλεύ[οντος Πτολεμαίου τοῦ]  
 Πτολεμ[αίου, ἔτους – c. 5–6 – μηνός]  
 Ἄπελλα[ίου, ἔδοξεν Παναμαρεῦσι?]  
 4 Ἐπειδὴ [ . . .

L. 2: the initial Π stands underneath the second letter in l. 1 (the A), but the general sequence of king, year, month, makes it unlikely that there would have been space for τοῦ at the beginning of l. 2. The total number of letters in l. 2 should be approximately 25–26, which leaves c. 5–6 for the regnal year. Since years one, two and three are non-existent in the chronology of Ptolemy II's regnal years,<sup>22</sup> and τετάρτου is too long (as is, probably, πέμπτου), ἔκτου, ὀγδούου, ἐνάτου (the same year as that which dates *I. Stratonikeia* 1002) are the most likely years.

L. 3: ἔδοξεν Παναμαρεῦσι is uncertain but based on the analogy of *I. Stratonikeia* 501, ll. 1–4, a decree of the Koarendeis of 323 BC. Similar formulas are known from e.g. Euromos (*SEG* 43, 704), Kildara (*IK* 35, no. 961), Amyzon (*Amyzon* no. 2). The known – but later – decrees of the Panamareis all have ἔδοξεν Παναμαρέων τῶι κοινῶι (e.g. *I. Stratonikeia* 9, ll. 3–4) which is too long for the line. But we are here in the 270s and in the formative stages of this community's political organization.<sup>23</sup> In the honorific decree *I. Stratonikeia* 1030 (268 BC) for a man from Koliorga, possibly issued by the Koranzeis, the dating by (Seleukid) kings, year and month is followed immediately by Λέων ἱεροκῆρυξ εἰ[πεν]· ἐ[πειδὴ N]οννουσ κτλ. A similar, if not identical, formula is possible in our text only if the name of the ἱεροκῆρυξ is short. The possibility that the decree was set up at Panamara by another community more or less close to the sanctuary must also be considered: cf. e.g. *I. Stratonikeia* 8 (now with *HTC* pp. 149–150) set up by the Londeis, a community to Panamara's south (see below).

L. 4: only Γ is left of the first *epsilon*; the *pi* and second *epsilon* are complete (but look very small on C's drawing); the top of the *iota* and *delta* are visible.

So we may add Panamara to the anonymous community of *I. Stratonikeia* 1002 as having been among Ptolemaic possessions in the 270s. Several points can now be made. First, the reference to the sanctuary at Panamara in *Labraunda* III.2, 44 (l. 2) of the early 260s BC(?), mentioning Zeus of Labraunda, a *basileus* Ptolemaios, a Ptolemaic *strategos* and the word *ateleia*, must refer to privileges granted earlier (?) by a Ptolemaic king to the Panamareis, perhaps within a Chrysaoric context. The *asylia* referred to as one of the sanctuary's privileges renewed by the priest Leon after 167 BC, in *I. Stratonikeia* 7, was therefore almost certainly granted first by a Ptolemaic king (if not specifically as *asylia* then as some other

<sup>21</sup> I am grateful to D. Mulliez, director of the École Française at Athens, and the School's archivist, E. Rochetto, for allowing me to study the notebooks of G. Cousin's three journeys in Caria which form the basis of the publication of all of Panamara's (and some of Lagina's) inscriptions, and for giving me permission to publish the present fragments. Apart from these, and a fragment of a hellenistic inscription, the notebooks contain no other unpublished texts.

<sup>22</sup> On the dating see n. 4 above.

<sup>23</sup> The designation κοινόν was moreover most probably a term used only within the context of Rhodian control over mainland Karian communities and not some pre-existing Karian concept. See most recently A. Bresson in *HTC*, 101: 'comme *koinon*: c'est-à-dire comme collectivité ayant perdu le statut d'autonomie'.

form of privilege).<sup>24</sup> The particular interest shown by Philip V in the sanctuary at Panamara which his soldiers took in 201 BC, may now be seen as a conscious continuation of earlier royal tradition.<sup>25</sup> P. Debord's suggestion that it was the Ptolemies who first fostered the Chrysaoreis as an organization becomes increasingly attractive, though questions about its original membership persist: does the membership of Thera and Keramos, attested later in the hellenistic period, go back to the initial stages? If so, does this mean that they too were Ptolemaic at the time?<sup>26</sup>

At least part of future Stratonikeian territory had become Seleukid by 268, as is shown by *I. Stratonikeia* 1030 dated to that year (the forty-fourth year of the Seleukid era, in the reign of King Antiochos and his son Antiochos) in which a man from Koliorga is honoured by an anonymous community which may be Koranza.<sup>27</sup> The fate of Panamara is not known, but if it, too, became Seleukid, this would explain the plural *asyliai* which Leon is said to have renewed.

What, if anything, we can conclude from the new fragment about the region to Panamara's south remains problematic. Dating the new *neôria* inscription referred to above becomes crucial. This inscription was found at Yeşilyurt/Pisiköy, ancient Pisyë; it lists financial contributions from individual members of local communities to the building of dockyards on the coast at Akbük – ancient Pladasa, some of whose citizens had formed a *koinon* with the Pisyetai.<sup>28</sup> Among the contributing communities are the Leukoideis and Londeis, both immediately to Panamara's south, the Koloneis, between Pisyë and Pladasa, and several others, no doubt located somewhere along what was the most direct route from the port at Akbük diagonally across to Pisyë where it met the main north-south road along the Marsyas valley. The underlying question is obviously whether the dockyards were built to serve the Ptolemaic fleet, or the Rhodian, and whose further journey into the Carian interior the Pladasa-Pisyë link-up was meant to facilitate. One possible reconstruction of the inscription's fragmentary first lines has the *demos* of the Rhodians as the main force behind the project.<sup>29</sup> If this is right, then the lack of certainty about its date still allows for Rhodian activity after the region was abandoned by Ptolemaic forces. The text has been dated by its editors, on letterforms, to between 275–225 BC.<sup>30</sup> The letters most likely point to a date in the 270s, 260s or 250s which is still not precise enough. Until further evidence brings clarification, or the Pisyë text can be more closely dated or restored with more certainty, the questions about the status of this part of Karia has to remain open.

---

<sup>24</sup> Van Bremen, above, n. 10; on pre-*asylia* privileges see K. Rigsby, *Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (1996), Introduction. The plural *asyliai* is used: see below.

<sup>25</sup> *I. Stratonikeia* 3, l. 5: a gift of *φιάλας καὶ κάδων*.

<sup>26</sup> On the membership see *Amyzon* 223–24, Gabrielsen, *C&M* (2000) 157–161.

<sup>27</sup> Found in Yatağan. Paradoxically, the new text from Xystis, showing Ptolemaic control in Karia further east than was previously thought, makes it even less likely that *I. Stratonikeia* 1030 is a 'pierre errante from eastern Karia' as was proposed by John Ma in an attempt to date the Seleukid reconquest of this region to Antiochos II, after 259 and thus to keep the Stratonikeian region Ptolemaic throughout the 260s.

<sup>28</sup> See the extensive commentary in *HTC* at no. 1. The designation of *koinon* might in itself be thought sufficient to point in the direction of Rhodian control, though in this inscription the word is not specifically used. Above, n. 23.

<sup>29</sup> *HTC* no. 1 ll. a1–4, with the discussion on pp. 101–103.

<sup>30</sup> *HTC* no. 1 with a discussion of the date on p. 103.

For the sake of completeness but without hope of making any sense of it, I present here also a second fragment copied by Cousin which may or may not be connected to that above. It was annotated by Cousin specifically as having ‘même caractères que le n° 250’.

## 2. Fragment

W. 9 cm; h 19 cm. Copy of Cousin (carnet AS 10, no. 301); Cousin notes that the letters of this fragment resemble those of no. 250). C’s drawing appears to indicate an – uninscribed – block to the right of the present fragment, and therefore that we have the end of lines. Cousin annotates ‘E incompl.’; Hatzfeld annotates ‘E’ for estampage but this is now lost. It is unclear whether the O at the end of l. 4 is part of the text or of an annotation.

N  
 ONI  
 MOI  
 4 OIPA (O?)  
 ΦI

### Abbreviations used

<i>Amyzon</i>	J. and L. Robert, <i>Amyzon, Fouilles d’Amyzon en Carie. Tome 1. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions</i> , Paris 1983.
<i>HTC</i>	<i>Les hautes terres de Carie</i> , sous la direction de P. Debord et E. Varinlioğlu (Ausonius Publications, Mémoires IV), Bordeaux 2002.
<i>Labraunda</i> III.1 and 2	J. Crampa, <i>Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches, the Greek Inscriptions</i> vol. III, part I (1969), vol. III part 2 (1972), Stockholm.
<i>I. Stratonikeia</i>	M. Ç. Şahin, <i>Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia (IK 21, 22.1 and 22.2)</i> vol. I: Panamara, vol. II,1: Lagina, Stratonikeia and surroundings, vol. II,2: New inscriptions and indices, Bonn 1981–1990.