ELECTRUM ∗ Vol. 20 (2013): 57–76
doi: 10.4467/20800909EL.13.004.1433

Ptolemaic Foundations in Asia Minor and the Aegean as the Lagids' Political Tool

Tomasz Grabowski

Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków

Abstract: The Ptolemaic colonisation in Asia Minor and the Aegean region was a significant tool which served the politics of the dynasty that actively participated in the fight for hegemony over the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin. In order to specify the role which the settlements founded by the Lagids played in their politics, it is of considerable importance to establish as precise dating of the foundations as possible. It seems legitimate to acknowledge that Ptolemy II possessed a well-thought-out plan, which, apart from the purely strategic aspects of founding new settlements, was also heavily charged with the propaganda issues which were connected with the cult of Arsinoe II.

Key words: Ptolemies, foundations, Asia Minor, Aegean.

Settlement of new cities was a significant tool used by the Hellenistic kings to achieve various goals: political and economic. The process of colonisation was begun by Alexander the Great, who settled several cities which were named Alexandrias after him. The process was successfully continued by the diadochs, and subsequently by the following rulers of the monarchies which emerged after the demise of Alexander's state. The new settlements were established not only by the representatives of the most powerful dynasties: the Seleucids, the Ptolemies and the Antigonids, but also by the rulers of the smaller states. The kings of Pergamum of the Attalid dynasty were considerably active in this field, but the rulers of Bithynia, Pontus and Cappadocia were also successful in this process.[1] Very few regions of the time remained beyond the colonisation activity of the Hellenistic kings.

The Ptolemaic colonisation, besides displaying some characteristics which had a lot in common with the activities of other Hellenistic kings, was also characterised by sig-

[1] Generally, for the new settlements, founded or refounded in the Hellenistic period see Tscherikover 1927; Cohen 1995, 2006. Seleucid colonies: Cohen 1978; Attalid: Hansen 1971; Allen 1983, in Macedonia: Papazoglou 1988; Ptolemaic: Cohen 1983; Mueller 2006 (focuses on situation in Egypt); local kings and dynasts in Asia Minor: Kobes 1996, 205–230.

nificant differences, which were emphasised by scholars. It is better to address the diverse character of the Ptolemaic colonisation itself, which resulted from the differences in the cultural-economic relationships between Egypt and the foreign properties of the dynasty. As is commonly known, the Ptolemies established only one *polis* in Egypt, which was a real city as understood by the Greeks, that is Ptolemais Hermiou, founded by the dynasty's creator, Ptolemy I. Apart from Ptolemais Hermiou, there still existed only two *poleis* in the state on the Nile (Alexandria[2] and Naukratis). The Lagids' circumspection in founding new *poleis* in Egypt probably resulted from the fact that the state's founder could encounter the extensive and effective system of executing his rule which could have easily been used while organising his own government. Introducing to this complex system a new element, which was *poleis*, was not only unnecessary, but even unfavourable. The extensive network of *poleis*, that is the institutions with their own organisation and autonomy, would have diminished the range of the direct rule of the dynasty. Given numerous opportunities to enrich themselves as well as make careers, the Greeks were still willing to arrive at the state on the Nile. The Ptolemies were able to create such attractive economic conditions for them that they forgot about the inconveniences resulting from the fact of living beyond the system of a *polis*. What is more, although from the Greeks' point of view the settlements founded by the Lagids were only villages, they offered the Greek lifestyle, but with the exclusion of the functioning of autonomic institutions, typical of the *polis*. The Greek-Macedonian newcomers also found the old Egyptian settlement principles in Egypt,[3] and at least in the main towns of the nomes, although they were not formally *poleis*, they could find conditions partly similar to those which were typical of the other cities of the Greek world. The situation must have looked different in the dynasty's foreign domains in the Mediterranean Sea basin, where the Ptolemies acted in the conditions determined by the more or less developed Greek settlement system and the competition of the other Hellenistic powers.

Particular settlements founded in the territory of Egypt were supposed to serve different functions, for instance Ptolemais Hermiou, situated in Thebaid, was meant to be the centre for administrative structures and settlement for the Greek immigrants. The settlements that come to the fore, however, are those whose purpose was to solve one of the urgent problems which the Ptolemies, similarly to the Seleucids, had to face – that is that of creating their own soldier recruitment bases. After the political map of the Hellenistic world had assumed its shape, it was only the Antigonids that could use the Macedonian recruitment base. The process of endowing the soldiers with ground in exchange for their performing military service had already been initiated by Ptolemy I.[4] The military aspects (acquiring combat elephants) besides those of a commercial character were also displayed in the dynasty's exploration and settlement activity, particularly in the case of

[2] For Alexandria and its institutions see Joquet 1948; Fraser 1972, I: 93–131; Cohen 2006, 357, 368–373; Huss 2011, 17–20.

[3] On the ancient Egyptian town planning, see Kemp 1977; 2009, 131–161; 404–414; Mueller 2006, 106–108.

[4] The origins of the cleruchies also prove the attractiveness of the conditions which were offered to the settlers, the majority of whom came from the territories which were not under the direct control of the Lagids. Bagnall (1984) listed that it was more than 2/3 cleruchies. As regards cleruchs and Ptolemaic settlement in Egypt, see Uebel 1968; Marrinan 1998, 15–80; Mueller 2006, 23–29, 60–64, 93–104; Serrati 2008, 472–475.

Ptolemy II, in the territories exceeding the southern borderline and reaching as far as the coast of the Red Sea.[5] The Lagids founded their settlements in almost every region they took control of except for Thrace. The first foundation in Cyrenaica had probably been undertaken by Ptolemy I.[6] The Lagids also conducted a very active colonisation campaign in Coele-Syria. The considerably dense network of Greek settlements in southern Syria was actually attributed particularly to the Ptolemies and their competitors in winning control over the territory, the Selucids. Some researchers implied that the Lagids founded a chain of fortified cities on the coast, to the east of the Jordan valley as well as in Idumea, which surrounded and protected the whole Coele-Syria.[7] Nevertheless, so far it has proved impossible to connect the dynasty with any settlement on the South Syrian coast since the closest situated, Ptolemais/Ake, was situated on the Phoenician coast.[8] A considerable number of Greek settlements appeared in the Jordan valley and further inland.[9]

Most of the settlements were founded by the Ptolemies just in Egypt, and they were a significant tool in achieving economic and financial success.[10] In this way, the Egyptian kings gained the means of pursuing great politics in the territory. This was the main object of interest of the main contenders in the political arena of the time, which was the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin. The first representatives of the dynasty led a considerably large-scale foreign policy. For a long time researchers have been disputing over the objectives they were motivated by in the outer arena, particularly when leading overseas conquests in the Aegean Sea basin – in Asia Minor, in the islands of the

[5] Cf. Thompson 1969, 30–38; Dietze 1994; Sidebotham 1986; 1996; 2002; Burstein 1996; Huss 2001, 287–292, 366–367; Cohen 2006, 305–343; Mueller 2006, 151–157.

[6] Mueller 2006, 143–146.

[7] Rostovtzeff 1941, I: 347–349.

[8] It is interesting that the Ptolemies' activity reached much further towards the North. The ruins of the settlement founded in the mid-3rd century were discovered in Ras ibn Hani on the coast of northern Syria, in the very heart of the Seleucid domains. The considerable number of Ptolemaic coins as well as the inscription including the list of mercenaries in the pay of Egyptian rulers makes it plausible to view the Lagids as its founders: Cohen 2006, 51–52.

[9] Rarely did it happen that they were cities founded on "the raw root." They were more often local centres with their own history, which were refounded and gained new names after the settlement of the new colonisers. On the basis of the archaeological finds (mainly ceramics), attempts have been made to prove the continuation of the settlement from the times of the Persian domination. De facto, only a few cities founded in the Persian times survived in the Hellenic period, which left space for the Ptolemaic and Seleucid foundations – Mueller 2006, 51–52. The idea behind some of the settlements founded by the Lagids was to secure the safety of these territories against the attacks of the Arab desert nomads. A typical example of such a settlement was Brita, in "the Ammonites' country," the precise location of which remains unknown to this day. Most probably, it occupied the acropolis of Rabbat Ammon; however, even the latter of the proposed locations, 20 kilometres west of the present Amman, has its adherents among archaeologists. Cf. *P.Cairo Zen*. I, 59003; Cohen 2006, 237–239, with further literature. As regards the individual Ptolemaic settlements in Coele-Syria, see Schmitt 1995, 18, 90, 279; Sartre 2001, 120–122; Cohen 2006, 102–104, 237–239, 265–274, 290–299, 302–303 (with further literature).

[10] On the whole, it has been confirmed that there were 45 settlements founded (or renamed) by the Ptolemies in Egypt, of which as many as 30 were in Fayum. Mueller (2006, 58–59) rightly noticed, however, that the considerable disproportion between Egypt and the Ptolemaic dominions in Asia Minor and in the Aegean Sea may be, at least, partly misleading. We owe our knowledge of so many settlements in Egypt to the papyrus records, which other regions are deprived of.

region and in Magna Graecia. The key role in this discussion usually falls to the fragment of Polybius' *The Histories* (5.34) in which he characterises the foreign policy of the first Lagids. The Achaean historian writes that by possessing South Syria and Cyprus, the rulers of Egypt constituted a constant threat for the Seleucids. With the supporters on the coast of Asia Minor, from Hellespont to Pamphylia, they could influence the course of the events in the region, and ruling over such cities as Ainos and Maroneia, they could also hold Macedonia in check. Polybius concludes about the policy of the former Ptolemies: καὶ τῷ τοιούτῳ τρόπῳ μακρὰν ἐκτετακότες τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ προβεβλημένοι πρὸ αὐτῶν ἐκ πολλοῦ τὰς δυναστείας, οὐδέποτε περὶ τῆς κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἠγωνίων ἀρχῆς. διὸ καὶ τὴν σπουδὴν εἰκότως μεγάλην ἐποιοῦντο περὶ τῶν ἔξω πραγμάτων. Supported by an opinion of the ancient historiographer, it used to be thought that the Ptolemaic actions on the outside arena were motivated only by defensive purposes.[11] The whole activity of the Lagids was, inclusively, supposed to secure the safety of the country on the Nile. However, Polybius' intentions can also be interpreted as a way of merely emphasising that it was thanks to their active policy that the first Ptolemies managed to ensure the security of the most important part of their state, which was undoubtedly Egypt. The abovementioned passage appears together with the description of Ptolemy IV, and through displaying stark oppositions is expected to be evidence of the ruler's neglect of the outside problems. A historian from Megalopolis writes that that his predecessors had paid much more attention to foreign affairs than to the government of Egypt itself, whereas Ptolemy IV treated all this carelessly and tardily. We should remember that Polybius was not contemporary with the first Ptolemaic rulers and wrote all this from a long time perspective. After Ptolemy IV's death, grave danger loomed over the Lagids' monarchy in the form of the secret partition treaty which was made between Antiochos II and the Macedonian king Philip V, a problem that constituted an important part of Polybius' work. We do not know the whole contents of the treaty, and the ancient authors dealing with the information from it are not unanimous, in terms of not only the scope of the planned annexations, but also the division of the particular territories between the participants.[12] All in all, according to Polybius (3.2.8), it was planned to divide the whole of the Ptolemies' state. Antiochos is said to have assured himself South Syria and Phoenicia, while Philip claimed Egypt, Caria and Samos. In this passage, the Achaean historian might have only wanted to draw the readers' attention to the achievements and services of the predecessors of the – in his opinion – lazy and inefficient Ptolemy IV,[13] to emphasise that under his rule even the central part of the state had ceased to be safe.

[11] Cf. Rostovtzeff 1941, I: 29–30; 332–334; Will 1979/1982, I: 153–168; Errington 2008, 157–158. Economic factors also played a significant role in the Ptolemies' foreign policy; however, economic motifs (mainly trade relationships) cannot be overestimated in view of the steps taken by the kings of Egypt in the external arena. The direct political control was not necessary to apply in order to realise economic goals. The discussion concerning the problem was introduced by Will 1979/1982, I: 168–200.

[12] Apart from Polybius, the treaty is mentioned by App. *Mac*.4.1; Liv. 31.14.4–5; Just. 30.2.8; Porph. *FGrH* 260F 45; Hieronim, *In Daniel*. 11.13. There is a lot of literature behind the problem, and contemporary researchers have even – unconvincingly – tried to point out that it was a fabrication of ancient authors. Probably, however, both Antiochos and Philip planned only the annexation of the Lagids' dominions outside Egypt; cf. McDonald/Walbank 1937, 182–184, 205–207; Magie 1939; Schmitt 1964, 237–261.

[13] Cf. e.g. Plb. 5.62.7; 87.4.

However, in fact, the first Lagids' activity over the whole territory, which constituted the arena of the struggles of the contemporary world's powers, indicates that they were striving to gain hegemony in the Hellenistic world. This, obviously, could be achieved by using Egypt's natural resources, so taking particular care when it came to securing their interests in this country was self-evident, as only perfectly safe control over the country on the Nile could open the gates for large-scale politics. The Hellenistic world did not know the concept of the balance of power; however, in practice in the 3rd century such an equilibrium was achieved.[14] Remembering the role of victory in Hellenic ideology, it is difficult to ascribe a merely preventive character to the military operations that the Ptolemies conducted. The range of the Lagids' expansion in the 3rd century reached far beyond such needs. The Ptolemies' foreign policy could be rather defined as an amalgam of offensive and defensive actions, built on great ambitions as well as rational premises. None of the rulers of Egypt, also before the Lagids, could feel safe without creating an internal defence line. Ruling over South Syria was considerably important from the military point of view. The key resources for creating the sea power could be found in Cyprus as well as in South Syria and Asia Minor. It could be perfectly clear to the Ptolemies that maintaining a powerful fleet was of critical importance for their position in the world. Maintaining the influence over these territories opened access to the local recruitment resources. Last but not least, although together with the military expedition of Alexander the Great the borders of *oikumene* were considerably expanded, the heart of the Greek-Macedonian world still beat in Greece and in Asia Minor. The existence in the Aegean basin was also a matter of prestige, which for every power is of crucial importance. For different reasons, the aforementioned region played a key role in the Ptolemaic politics. The settlements founded by the Ptolemies in this region were an important means for achieving particular purposes.

To specify the aims which the Lagids wanted to realise by founding the new settlements and refounding the existing ones it is of considerable importance to establish the date when a particular settlement was made. Unfortunately, in most cases this is made difficult by the fragmentary character of the written sources, often deriving from a much later period. The inscriptions as well as the numismatic sources, although in a direct way proving the existence of a particular settlement, also rarely allow us to specify the precise date of the foundation.[15] In most cases, what remains is considering the foundation in the light of the geopolitical situation in the region and the politics of the Lagids, as well as an attempt at grasping a wider context. However, there is also a lack of well-preserved historiographic sources containing a constant narrative about the events of the 3rd century.

The Ptolemies founded settlements in nearly all the regions they took control of:[16] in the Troad (1), Ionia (1), Caria (1), Lycia (1), Pamphylia (1), Cilicia (2 or 3[17]), Cyprus (3),

[14] Cf. Braunert 1964; Klose 1972, 91–92; Schmitt 1974, 74–75, 84–86; Will 1979/1982: I, 154.

[15] For sources about Hellenistic settlements see Cohen 1995, 4–13.

[16] Thrace is an exception to the rule; at least there is a lack of information concerning the Ptolemaic settlements in this region. As regards the Ptolemaic presence in Thrace, see Bagnall 1976, 159–161; Huss 1976, 210–213.

[17] Philadelpheia in Cilicia might be the foundation of Antiochos IV, the king of Kommagene. What could be used against the hypothesis that the Lagids were the founders of this settlement was the fact that it was situated inland, whereas all the known Ptolemaic foundations in this region were located on the shore. However, the archeological finds in Meydancikkale confirming the presence of the Ptolemaic garrison in the

Crete (2), Greece and on the Aegean Islands (2) as well as in Cyrenaica (3), Coele-Syria (6) and in the region of the Red Sea (9).

The dynastic names of the founded or refounded settlements were of considerable importance. Among the cities founded by the Ptolemies beyond Egypt, we come across only five names, all of which have direct connotations with the dynasty: Arsinoe, Berenike, Philotera, Philadelpheia and Ptolemais.[18] Even the very nomenclature, regardless of the other premises, indicates that the greatest colonisation activity was displayed by the Ptolemies in the 3rd century.[19] Through the dynastic name the city constituted a visible symbol of the Ptolemaic ambitions and influences, which was particularly important in the regions in which the rivalry between the Hellenistic kingdoms was extremely strong. There existed two settlements with Ptolemaic names even in Aetolia, that is in the region which had never been under the Lagids' rule. The Ptolemies, however, undertook cooperation with the Aetolian League, which in the mid-3rd century became an important power in Greece.[20] The Ptolemies' attention was also attracted by the Aetolians' intense activity in the Aegean Sea. The above region remained in the centre of the Ptolemaic politics, and after the defeat of the Egyptian fleet at Andros circa 245 the position of the Lagids there was no longer as strong as before.[21] In the 250s and the 240s the Aetolian League was connected through a network of links with numerous communities of the Aegean Sea islands as well as Asia Minor coasts, among many others Chios, Delos, Tenos, Miletus, Smyrna and Abdera.[22] The Aegean Sean basin also witnessed at the time numerous pirate raids which were conducted by the Aetolian commanders on their own.[23] Finally, the Ptolemies provided the Aetolians with their support in the war with the Macedonian kings: Demetrius (probably) and Antigonos Doson (for sure), and even concluded a formal *symmachia* with the League.[24] It is very probable that it was just in Aetolia that the city of Ptolemais was established.[25] The case of the other city, that is that of Arsinoe/Konope, the name of which could be associated with the Lagid dynasty, is more disputable. It is very probable that it had nothing to do with the Ptole-

years circa 245–235 in the interior of Cilicia Trachea (Davesne/Le Rider 1989; Davesne 1998, 66) showed that the settlement of the Lagid settlements at a distance from the shore cannot be excluded, cf. Cohen 1995, 368–369.

[18] A much more considerable diversity in the nomenclature appeared in Egypt. As regards the toponyms of the Ptolemaic settlements, see Mueller 2006, 9–39.

[19] Compare, for example, only five settlements, all of them in Egypt, named *Kleopatris* or *Kleopatra.* This name was introduced to the Ptolemy family only after the marriage of Ptolemy V to Cleopatra, Antiochos III's daughter.

[20] As regards the development of the Aetolian League, see Grainger 1999, 29–129; Scholten 2000, 16–95.

[21] For the political situation in the Aegean, cf. Buraselis 1982, 164–179; Hölbl 2001, 50–51.

[22] *IG* IX 1² 1.185; 1.191; *ISE* II 78; *FD* III 1.482; 1.483; Schmitt 1969: no. 564.

[23] Syll.³ 520; 521. Such raids were extremely profitable. In this period, there was an increase in the number of private dedications in Delphi, often very expensive and massive (*IG* IX 1² 1.181; 200; 202; 203; 185; *Syll*.³ 514). One of the Aetolians, Nikolaos of Proscheion, even founded a festival bearing his name (*Nikolaeia*) at Delos, following in the footsteps of Macedonian and Egyptian kings, who had established their own festivals there (*IG* XI 2.287B.126–128).

[24] *P.Haun* 1.6.18; cf. Schwartz 1978, 98; Habicht 1980, 1–2. On the topic of the relations between the Lagids and the Aetolians, see Grabowski 2010; 2012.

[25] *Syll*³ 545.6; cf. Cohen 1995, 118–119.

mies. It might have been founded still at the time when Arsinoe II was Lysimachos' wife, before her return to Egypt and marriage to Ptolemy II.[26] The aforementioned cases were still not isolated ones in Aetolia: in the 3rd century on the map of this region appeared Lysimacheia, and the existence of Attaleia cannot be excluded either.[27] It is most probable, however, that none of those cities, including Ptolemias, was a royal foundation. They probably owed their foundation to the Aetolians, who in this way honoured the kings who maintained friendly relationships with them and supported them in various ways.[28] Such foundations or refoundations of the settlements under the dynastic name, conducted by the states which were on friendly terms with the kings, were not unusual in the Hellenistic world.[29] It was in this way that the close relationships between the two parties were confirmed, and the founders could count on the support of the kings, who, as is commonly known, willingly appeared in the role of *euergetai*. The Hellenistic foundations, even if they did not bear the name directly referring to a particular dynasty, did not have to be the token of their direct domination, nor the tool of organising the empire.[30] They were, however, of critical importance in terms of propaganda.

The rule of the Lagids over the particular territories of the Aegean Sea basin often lacked continuity. The range of their influences was subject to changes, and, due to the scarce basis of sources, it is difficult to determine the borders of the Ptolemaic dominions at a particular time precisely.[31] This also makes it difficult to date the cities founded or refounded by the kings of Egypt in this region. It was Ptolemy I Soter and Ptolemy II Philadelphos who played a decisive role in creating the Ptolemaic empire in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin. Interestingly, only one foundation – Ptolemias Hermiou in Egypt – can be attributed with any certainty to the former one.[32] As was rightly

[26] Strabo's account (10.2.22) seems to suggest that Arsinoe as Ptolemy II's wife was the founder. Researchers' opinions vary. Longega (1968, 33–35), Hammond/Walbank (1988, 236), Cohen (1995, 109), Scholten (2000, 65) believe that the foundation happened at the time of marriage between Lysiamchos and Arsinoe. Fraser (1954, 60) argues that it was when she was married to Ptolemy II. Mueller (2006, 57) proposes a hypothesis that its foundation might have been connected with the possible cooperation of Ptolemy II with the Aetolian League in the early period of his rule. But nothing, even records (though scarce) from times of the Chremonidean war, indicates that there were particularly close relationships between Ptolemy and the Aetolians, cf. Grabowski 2010, 201–205.

[27] Lysimacheia: Plb. 5.77; Liv. 36.11.7; Strabo 10.2.22, cf. Cohen 1995, 114–115; Attaleia: Allen 1983, 70.

[28] Longega 1968, 33–35; Hammond/Walbank 1988, 236; Cohen 1995, 34, 114, 119. For the relations between the Aetolians and Lysimachos, see Flacelière 1937, 80–82; Grainger 1999, 93; relations with Attalos I: Syll.^{3} 523; Plb. 4.65.6; McShane 1964, 100–102; Hansen 1971, 46–49; Scholten 2000, 193–195.

[29] Cf., for example, Mantinea refounded as Antigoneia by the Achaean League (Plut. *Arat.* 45.6; Urban 1979, 157 n. 246; 179 n. 321; Cohen 1995, 123–125). The outcome of establishing close relationships by Ptolemy III with the Athenians was the establishment in Athens of a new *phyle* Ptolemias, *demos* Berenikidai (the name honoured Berenice II, Ptolemy III's wife). The cult of Ptolemy and Berenice was also established and the king's statue was erected on the Athenian agora and in Delphi; the king in turn financed the construction of a *gymnasion* called the Ptolemaion. Finally, from 224/23, the festival of *Ptolemaia* began to be held: *IG* II^2 836; Paus. 1.5.5; 10.10.2; Steph. Byz., *s.v.* Βερενικιδαι.

[30] Mueller 2006, 58.

[31] For the Ptolemaic presence in this region, cf. Mastrocinque 1979, 66–106; Wörrle 1977; Jones/Habicht 1989; Kosmetatou 1997, 18–20; Behrwald 2000, 49–68; Sartre 2003, 59–62; Domingo Gygax 2005; Huss 2011, 150–178.

[32] *I. Philae* 166.

pointed out by K. Mueller, in comparison with the activity of the founder of the Seleucid dynasty, who was contemporary to Soter, the number of the founded settlements is modest. Mueller submitted for consideration the notion that Ptolemy I should be seen as the founder of still other settlements by providing convincing arguments in the case of Ptolemais in Cyrenaica.[33] Could one, however, associate him with one of the Ptolemaic foundations in Asia Minor, the Aegean or Cyprus known to us?

The longest-lasting dominion of the dynasty beyond Egypt was Cyprus, captured by Ptolemy I for the first time in 313 and finally in 295.[34] The island was very rich, among other things, in timber and tar, which were indispensable for developing the fleet. It was also of considerable importance for anybody who wanted to join the action on the Aegean Sea. During the fights between the *diadochoi* coalition and Antigonus I Monophthalmos, Ptolemy I also took up the action in Asia Minor and the Aegean Sea. As early as 314 Seleukos, who was acting on his behalf, undertook a military action on the coast of Ionia, where he unsuccessfully besieged Erythrai.[35] The first pieces of information about Ptolemy's interest in Caria came from this period too, although his intentions were limited at the time. Establishing cooperation with the local satrap, Asander, was aimed at winning a partner in the war with Antigonos Monophthalmos.[36] In the years 310–308, under the popular slogan of granting freedom to Greek cities, Ptolemy took up the action in Cilicia, Caria and Lycia and organised an expedition to Greece connected with the intense propaganda in the Aegean Sea, particularly in the Cyclades, which made a natural bridge between Greece and Asia Minor. He succeeded in capturing or winning the favour of some of the cities in Pamphylia, Caria and Lycia,[37] and the importance of the Aegean region for the Egyptian satrap was emphasised by choosing the island of Kos for his quarters. The Greek expedition proved less successful, although the Ptolemaic garrisons remained for a few years in Corinth, Sicyon and Megara.[38] Nevertheless, in the subsequent period Antigonos' success temporarily deprived Ptolemy of the control over Cyprus and almost certainly over the bases in Asia Minor.[39] After Antigonos' defeat at Ipsos, and then removing Demetrius I Poliorketes, Ptolemy I strengthened his influences in Lycia and probably in Pamphylia.[40] Eventually, as late as 287 he succeeded in taking

[33] Mueller 2006, 142–144.

[34] Diod. 19.62.3–6. Ptolemy temporarily lost control over Cyprus in the years 306–295/4 (Diod. 20.47–52). As regards the importance of Cyprus and its resources for the Ptolemaic fleet, see Hauben 1987a, 213–226; Mehl 1986, 216–234. Regarding the Ptolemaic rule in Cyprus, cf. Bagnall 1976, 38–79, 187–194; Mehl 1996, 234–260.

[35] Diod. 19.60.4.

[36] Diod. 19.62.2. On Asandros see Seibert 1969, 157–162; Mastrocinque 1979, 19–25.

[37] *I. Iasos* I.2; Diod. 20.27.1–2. Among the cities conquered by Ptolemy were Xanthos, Myndos, Kaunos, Phaselis, and probably also Iasos and Amyzon, cf. Bagnall 1976, 89–91; Wörrle 1977, 51; Mastrocinque 1979, 28–32; Robert/Robert 1983, 127–131: no. 6; Hauben 1987b, 3–5; Huss 2001, 173–174; Grainger 2009, 79–82.

[38] Diod. 20.37.1–2. As regards Ptolemy's expedition to Greece, see Bakhuizen 1970, 122–128; Huss 2001, 173–178; Grabowski 2008, 38–44.

[39] Cf. Will 1979/1982, I: 140; Meadows 2006, 460–461. The doubts concerning the loss of Lycia were expressed by Wörrle (1977, 52–53).

[40] Lycia: Wörrle (1977) *contra* Meadows (2006, 461–468) opts for Ptolemy II as the one who established the Ptolemaic rule in Lycia. Pamphylia: Bagnall 1976, 111–113; Huss 2011, 160–161.

over the lead in the League of the Islanders, which became the main tool of Ptolemaic politics in the Aegean Sea.

Ptolemy II Philadelphos, Ptolemy I's successor, succeeded at the beginning of his reign in expanding his rule in Asia Minor. The inscriptions confirm a number of successful attempts in Ionia, Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Cilicia and Samos.[41] The Chremonidean War (267–261) and the Second Syrian War (roughly 260–253) brought serious disturbances for the Ptolemies in the Aegean. The battle near Kos upset the Lagids' domination in the sea, although Philadelphos managed to retain a number of important bases.[42] However, for the benefit of the Seleucids, he lost his influences and a number of dominions in Cilicia and Pamphylia as well as Ionia. The Third Syrian War brought the restoration of the Ptolemaic influences in Asia Minor. The famous inscription from Adulis by the Red Sea lists among the territories won by Ptolemy III, among others, Ionia, Pamphylia, Cilicia and even Hellespont and Thrace.[43] The epigraphic sources also confirm the Ptolemaic presence there, but they cannot give the constant picture of the events. As a matter of fact, it seems that, except for Pamphylia,[44] the borders of the dynasty's dominions remained more or less long-lasting until the end of the 3rd century and, together with the disturbances connected with the death of Ptolemy IV and the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy V, the twilight of the Ptolemaic Empire in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin.

Among the Ptolemaic settlements commonly known to be in Asia Minor and in the islands in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea, only two – Arsinoe in Cilicia, near Nagidos, and Arsinoe in Cyprus, near Palaipaphos – are certain to have been new foundations.[45] Moreover, in the case of Ptolemais/Lebedos in Ionia as well as Ptolemais in Caria and Arsinoe/Marion in Cyprus, it is justified to assume that the new settlers might have been brought there.[46] According to the sources, the other five settlements can definitely be

[41] Syll[3] 390; *I. Strat.* 1002; *SEG* 1, 363; 28, 60; *TAM* II, 1; Robert/Robert 1983, 118–124: no. 3; 127 r . 5: cf. Bagnall 1976, 89–102; Wörrle 1978; Jones/Habicht 1989, 335–337; Hölbl 2001, 38; Sartre 2003, 59–60. Theocritus (*Id.* 17.86–90) summed up Ptolemaic possessions at the end of 270s, and in Asia Minor he names Cilicia, Lycia, Pamphylia and Caria.

[42] For the dating of the battle of Kos, see Buraselis 1982, 146–151; Hammond/Walbank 1988, 595–599 – ca. 255 BC, *contra* Reger 1985 – ca. 261 BC. In this period the League of the Islanders ceases to be proved in the sources. To some extent, Ptolemy managed to restore his prestige in the Cyclades in the 450s, cf. *IG* XI 4.1038; 1043; Jos. Flav. *Ant. Jud.* 12.93.

[43] *OGIS* 54.

[44] Plb. 5.73.3–4; 77.1; cf. Huss 1976, 190.

[45] Strabo 14.6.3; inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia with commentary: Jones/Habicht 1989; Kirsten/Opelt 1989.

[46] Ptolemais/Lebedos – towards the end of the 4th century. Antigonos Monopthalmos undertook the action of relocating the inhabitants of Lebedos to Teos, however, he never concluded his plan. Around 290 Lysimachos relocated the Lebedians together with the Kolophonians to Ephesus, which was refounded by him under the name of Arsinoe. The Ptolemies probably allowed the Lebedians to return to the rebuilt Lebedos: Paus. 1.9.7; 7.3.5; *I. Magn.* 53. 79–81; *RC* 3–4, cf. Cohen 1995, 188–191; Ager 1998/2000; Ma 2000, 72 n.71. Ptolemais in Caria was initially a *deme* of Kaunos: *SEG* 12, 463. Marion was destroyed by Ptolemy I in 312 BC and its people were relocated to Paphos: Diod. 19.79.4. Later on, it was probably Ptolemy who refounded the destroyed city as Arsinoe, cf. Cohen 1995, 134–136. Strabo (14.3.6) informs about rebuilding Patara by Ptolemy II and giving it a new name – Arsinoe. We do not know, however, what the rebuilding consisted in, cf. Cohen 1995, 329–330.

regarded as refoundations.[47] However, on the given assumptions it is difficult to arrive at any conclusions concerning the methods of foundation preferred by the Ptolemies since, in the case of the other seven ones, we do not possess appropriate information to allow us to determine with full certainty the way in which the settlement was established. It is also necessary in this case to pay attention to the already existing system of settlement in Asia Minor and the Aegean. As a matter of fact, the Ptolemies adjusted their settlement activity to the situation they encountered.[48] In the aforementioned regions the Greek colonisation had already developed before, and each of the regions varied in the Hellenic period. In some of them the existing settlements were more or less dispersed, and they differed from one another as far as the level of urbanisation is concerned.[49] Nothing indicates that the Ptolemies strove for unification of their dominions in terms of administration and politics; however, granting dynastic names to the founded or refounded settlements in all the foreign dominions favoured unification in the name of the dynasty.[50] The settlements bearing the name referring directly to the dynasty also included a propaganda message and constituted clear evidence of the Ptolemies' presence in a particular region. One of the most important aims of founding new settlements in Egypt was intensification of the land exploitation. In the case of the dominions in the Aegean it was political aims that dominated. Economic factors were of secondary importance; however, some of the settlements were located in the areas providing valuable natural resources, e.g. Arsinoe in Pamphylia, which was located near the forests from which timber for ship building was obtained.[51] It was similar in the case of the settlements in Pamphylia, Cilicia and Cyprus, that is in the regions rich in timber useful in ship building.

Fleets played a key role in the rivalry of Hellenic powers. As early as 314, Antigonus I Monopthalmos initiated armaments in the sea on a large scale.[52] As a result, his fleet became the mightiest power in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea. Such a state of affairs was maintained until the battle of Ipsos in 301 or even later. It took Ptolemy I several years to strengthen his position in the sea as well as to remove Antigonos' successor, Demetrius Poliorketes. Ptolemy I's most important achievements for building Ptolemaic thalassocracy was reinforcing his rule in Cyprus, capturing Coele-Syria, winning control over the League of the Islanders and gaining the centres of support on the coast of Asia Minor. It was of crucial importance for the Ptolemaic empire to maintain the communication routes between the dominions. Moreover, the logistics of the rivalry between the great Hellenic powers demanded a strong presence in the Aegean. Therefore, one of the most important tasks of the settlements founded by the Lagids was to support the dynasty's actions. Together with the other controlled cities, the colonies

[47] Arsinoe/Methana (*IG* IV 72; 76; XII 3.466), Arsinoe/Koressos (cf. Robert 1960, 146–160; Cohen 1995, 137–138), Arsinoe/Patara (Strabo 14.3.6), Arsinoe/Rithymna (cf. Le Rider 1966, 240–245; 1968, 231–234), Ptolemais/Larissa (cf. Robert 1982: 319–333, *contra* Cook 1988: 15).

[48] Mueller 2006, 83.

[49] Alcock 1994, 177–181, 187–189; Mueller 2006, 53–55.

[50] Mueller 2006, 84.

[51] Strabo 14.5.3. Strabo's account refers to the times of Cleopatra VII, but her predecessors surely used local forests.

[52] Diod. 19.58.1–4.

constituted convenient bases for the Ptolemaic fleet.[53] The importance of the coasts of Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia was emphasised by the fact that in the sea basin stretching along over six hundred kilometres down the coasts between Cyprus and Rhodes there are no islands which could be used as military bases. Taking control over those territories, or at least their seaside parts, was thus necessary. Taking into account the conditions of sailing in ancient times, winning control over those territories meant securing the sea route to the Aegean region. This was because each ship had to sail down the southern coasts of Asia Minor. The importance of the Lycian bases was additionally stressed by the fact that on the stretch between Myra and Patara it was difficult to encounter any springs of drinking water and that the shape of the coast in many places hindered or even prevented reaching the shore.[54] As early as 309, Ptolemy realised that Lycia constituted an important stopover for the expeditions from Egypt through Cyprus to the Aegean region and Greece. Therefore, most of the Ptolemaic foundations functioned as ports at the same time. A similar role was played by the settlements founded on the Aegean Sea islands, that is Keos in Crete and Arsinoe/Methana in the Argolid, which was considered to be of considerable importance. The strategic importance of Cilicia was also connected with the rivalry between the Lagids and the Seleucids. The route which was of great importance for the latter led through this territory. It connected the western Asia Minor provinces with the central part of the monarchy, that is Syria. Therefore, what can be observed in this region is unusual colonisation activity on the part of the Seleucids.[55]

Another factor which was also taken into account by the Ptolemies while founding the cities was that of the military recruitment resources of a particular region. Apart from the cleruchs, it was the mercenaries that were the second basic source of recruits. It is known, for instance, that the Cilicians provided the garrison crews in Egypt and in Cyprus, and that a close-knit group of Creteans settled down in Egypt.[56] Besides the Hellens, who constituted a predominant part of the mercenary units, among many others the inhabitants of Lycia and Pamphylia were willingly recruited. It was an important element in the politics of the kings of Egypt to maintain the influence or found settlements in the territories from which, for example from Crete, the mercenaries were particularly eager recruits.[57]

The interesting thing is that in such an important basin as the Aegean Sea there were relatively few Ptolemaic settlements; as a matter of fact, there were not more of them than in the particular regions of Asia Minor. Certainly, part of the answer to the question concerning the reasons for this phenomenon might be the natural conditions, which were unfavourable for establishing new settlements.[58] Neither can the possibility be ruled out that due to the Ptolemies' control over the League of the Islanders, the Lagids did not

[53] This aspect also accounts for the concentration of the Ptolemaic settlement on the coasts. Only in Caria and Lycia did the dynasty's influence reach further inland. Cf. Bagnall 1976, 106; Mastrocinque 1979, 43–47.

[54] Keen 1993, 72–73.

[55] Cf. Cohen 1978, 16; 1995, 55–56.

[56] Launey 1949/1950, I: 476–481; II: 1068–1072.

[57] Research into the ethnic composition of the mercenaries was conducted by Launey (1949/1950, I) and, despite numerous reservations, it still remains the most important point of reference. For soldiers from Pamphylia, cf. Bagnall 1976, 111; Brandt 1992, 87–91.

[58] Mueller 2006, 158.

feel the need to found their own settlements. The League as well as the other Ptolemaic bases were sufficient to maintain the influence in the Aegean Sea. Moreover, the Ptolemaic settlements existed in a few key places, that is in Crete, Keos and the Peloponnese (Arsinoe/Methana).

The majority of the Ptolemaic settlements were founded in the first period of the dynasty existence, both in Egypt and beyond. It was rightly pointed out that since the first Ptolemies were considerably effective in the process of colonisation, in the subsequent period there was no need to found any new settlements.[59] In the case of the territories constituting the Ptolemies' overseas empire in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea, the natural turning point was marked by the turn of the 2nd century, which saw the collapse of the Lagids' rule in the territories beyond Egypt. Most often it is Ptolemy II Philadelphos who is considered to have been the founder of the settlements established by the Lagids, which refers to all the regions of the dynasty's activity.[60] However, we should note that, in the case of Asia Minor, the region of the Aegean Sea, it is only with respect to the two settlements (Arsinoe/Patara, Arsinoe in Cilicia near Nagidos) that such a thesis can be supported by irrefutable, direct source information.[61] The other settlements are associated with Philadelphos on the basis of the name of the settlement and the political situation. In recent times there has been strong opposition to the practice of associating the majority of the foundations with Ptolemy II.[62]

Due to Ptolemy II's activity in Caria, the foundation of Ptolemais is ascribed to him. The existence of this *polis* is confirmed by the two inscriptions, of which the former is dated to the year 205, and the latter, on the basis of the paleographic research, to a time "earlier rather than later Hellenistic."[63] In this case, however, it must be acknowledged that the foundation of this city might have fallen in the times of Ptolemy I, who was also conducting actions in Caria, or of Ptolemy III.

Ptolemais in the neighbouring Pamphylia is also associated with Ptolemy II on the basis of his policy, which was very active in this region. The political situation in Pamphylia in the 3rd century is exceptionally vague. For sure, towards the end of the 270s Pamphylia remained under Ptolemaic control.[64] However, we cannot rule out that the dynasty's rule there had already been initiated by Ptolemy I, since the character of the first *Pamphyliarches* is confirmed possibly in 281/280.[65] Although the Lagids lost Pamphylia during the Second Syrian War, they subsequently regained it during the Laodicean War (246–242/241).[66] However, right after Ptolemy III's death they lost control over it once more,[67] and never again regained it.

[59] Mueller 2006, 81. The new settlements were still sporadically being founded in Egypt in the 1st century BC. Mueller (2006, 82) points out that the refoundations might have been established until the 2nd–1st centuries BC.

[60] Cohen 1995, 417.

[61] Strabo 14.3.6; *SEG* 39, 1426; cf. Jones/Habicht 1989, 317–346; Kirsten/Opelt 1989, 55–66.

[62] Mueller 2006, 141, 158–159, 179.

[63] Bean 1953, 21–23 no. 5; *SEG* 12, 463; *I. Magn.* 59.

[64] Theoc. *Id.* 17.88–89.

[65] Huss 2011, 160; cf. Robert 1966a, 53–58; Bagnall 1976, 111–114.

[66] *OGIS* 54, *ll.* 13–14; cf. Bagnall 1976, 114.

[67] Bagnall 1976, 197 (based on numismatic sources); cf. Huss 1976, 190–191.

The foundation of Philotera in Lycia does not arouse any major doubts when it comes to associating it with Ptolemy II.[68] Philadelphos had a sister of this name, and, according to the information provided by Strabon (16.4.5), it was after her that one of the settlements by the Red Sea was named.

In the case of Berenice in Cicilia[69] there exist two possibilities: it was either the foundation of Ptolemy II or Ptolemy III. As regards the former, the point of reference is again his activity in southern Asia Minor, confirmed, among other things, by establishing Arsinoe/Patara or Arsinoe near Nagidos in Cicilia. As far as the latter is concerned, the name of the settlement, Berenice, was his wife's name.[70] However, it is not the name itself that should settle the matter since, as is commonly known, at least one settlement bearing such a name was established by Ptolemy II. It is worth noticing that yet one more aspect weighs in favour of Ptolemy III.[71] The Laodicean war commenced as a result of the internal turbulences in the monarchy after Antiochos II's death. There were two rivals aspiring to reach power: his once dismissed first wife, Laodike, together with their son Seleukos II and the second wife, Berenice, Ptolemy III's sister, acting on behalf of her child born of the relationship with the deceased king. The defence of his sister's interests, and in particular the interests of her child, who was the rightful heir to the throne, constituted a very convenient pretext for Euergetes to intervene. At the very beginning of the conflict, the Asia Minor dominions of the dynasty sympathised with Laodike. However, it was with Berenice's success that her expedition to Cilicia ended. Her forces captured Soloi and prevented Laodike's supporters from seizing the treasure, which was worth 1500 talents.[72] In the course of the subsequent military operations, Ptolemy III took control over considerable parts of the Seleucids' state. On the basis of the peace treaty, apart from the dominions in Ionia, Caria, Pamphylia, Cilicia and even remote Thrace, he also received Seleucia Pieria – his rivals' most important port and their gateway to the Mediterranean Sea.[73] Taking control over Seleucia Pieria was also strategically important in the context of Cilicia, and vice versa. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility that Ptolemy III, for the sake of strengthening his position in the only just regained territory, founded a settlement there.

Recognising Ptolemais/Lebedos and Ptolemais/Larisa as Ptolemy III's foundations is fully justified. It is not known when exactly the Lagids won control over Lebedos; however, around 267–262, together with the other cities in Ionia, it honoured Antiochus I. Most probably, the recondition of the city under the name of Ptolemias was accomplished by Ptolemy III, who during the Third Syrian War regained those territories for the dynasty.[74] It is likely that during his reign, which coincided with the Third Syrian War, for the first time the Lagids won control over Hellespont. However, they lost the

[68] Wörrle 1979, 104–105; Cohen 1995, 331; Mueller 2006, 141.

[69] Steph. Byz., *s.v.* Βερενικε, no 5; Stadiasmus 190 (= *GGM* I, 485).

[70] Ptolemy II: Cohen 1995, 365; Ptolemy III: Tscherikover 1927, 188.

[71] It is absolutely certain that Berenice Troglodytike was the foundation of Ptolemy II. There are much more certain or probable foundations by Ptolemy III which were named as Berenice: one in Syria, four in the Red Sea basin.

[72] *FGrH* 160 F1, col. II, *ll*. 2–16; cf. Piejko 1990.

[73] Plb. 5.58.10; Just. 27.2.9.

[74] *OGIS* 222; cf. Piejko 1991. Cf. Cohen 1995, 189–191 for other arguments, including portraits of the royal couple on the coins identified as Ptolemy III and Berenice II.

majority of Troad during the reign of Ptolemy IV. As early as around 230–220, in one of the Delphic inscriptions on the list of *theodorokei*, the city of Larissa appeared, probably returning to its original name, which had been changed into Ptolemais as a result of the refoundation.[75]

A particularly important place in the research into the Ptolemaic settlements falls to the numerous settlements named Arsinoe which appeared in the territory in question: Arsinoe/Methana in the Argolid, Arsinoe/Koressos at Keos, Arsinoe/Patara in Lycia, Arsinoe in Pamphylia, Arsinoe in Cilicia, two on Crete (Arsinoe/Rithymna and Arsinoe Lyktou) and three on Cyprus (Arsinoe/Marion, Arsinoe near Salamis and Arsinoe near Palaipaphos).[76] The foundation of all of them – or at least the considerable majority – is often attributed to Ptolemy II. It is connected with his policy of developing the fleet. In this logically proposed interpretation, the cities of this name were supposed to be the manifestation of the Ptolemaic *thalassocracy* and the influences of Arsinoe II. These settlements were, above all, ports which were used by the Ptolemaic fleet.[77] It has also been pointed out that the cities bearing this name were often situated in the regions rich in timber, which was used in ship building (Cyprus, Pamphylia).[78] There is every likelihood that the appearance of Arsinoe/Methana and Arsinoe/Koressos ought to be associated with the Chremonidean War.[79] Those two places were, in fact, of great strategic importance. Arsinoe/Methana, situated in Argolid on the protruding into the sea peninsula, allowed the sea traffic in the Saronic Gulf to be controlled. A Ptolemaic garrison was based there, and the city played the role of the port which was important for the Egyptian fleet.[80] The Ptolemaic epistates resided on Keos,[81] which possessed an excellent port. It goes without saying that Cilician, Lycian and Cretan Arsinoes were also of critical strategic importance.[82] As regards the last ones, there were attempts to associate their refoundations on the basis of the interest in the island on the part of the aforementioned ruler; however, it is more plausible to acknowledge them as the attainment of Ptolemy II.[83]

[75] Cook 1973, 219–222; Robert 1982, 319–333; Cohen 1995, 157–159. It was Cook (1988, 15) who expressed his reservations concerning associating Larissa with Ptolemais. As regards the permanence of the Ptolemies' rule in the region of Hellespont, see Plb. 5.78.6; cf. Bagnall 1976, 159–162; Robert 1982, 327–330. Huss (1976, 209) claims that Ptolemy IV did not control any of the cities in Troad.

[76] There were much more Ptolemaic settlements named Arsinoe (in Coele-Syria, Cyrenaica, Red Sea basin).

[77] So Cohen 1995, 35. For the importance of wood in Cyprus for the Ptolemaic fleet, cf. Strabo 16.6.2.

[78] Cohen 1995, 135, 335–336.

[79] Arsinoe/Methana: Heinen 1972, 131; Gill/Foxhall/Bowden 1997, 74; Mueller 2006, 65; cf. also Bagnall 1976, 135; Cohen 1995, 125 (they believe that the refoundation was made shortly after the death of Arsinoe II). Arsinoe/Koressos: Cherry/Davis/Matzourani 1991, 240; Cohen 1995, 137; Mueller 2006, 65.

[80] L. Robert (1960, 159) aptly compared Methana to Gibraltar. It is unclear since when it had been in the Ptolemaic hands, most likely since the Chremonidean War. Cf. also Meyer 1935, 1375–1379; Bagnall 1976, 135–136; Cohen 1995, 124–126; Gill/Foxhall/Bowden 1997, 68–76.

[81] *IG* XII 5.1061; cf. Bagnall 1976, 141–142; Huss 2011, 175.

[82] For the importance of Arsinoe/Patara as a naval base, cf. Robert 1960, 155. Arsinoe in Cilicia: Jos. Flav. *Ant. Jud.* 12.149; cf. Cohen 1995, 135; 335–336. Identification of Arsinoe Lyktou is not certain; most probably it was a port city: Le Rider 1966, 242; 1968, 230; Cohen 1995, 132.

[83] We do not know any settlement of the name of Arsinoe which, contrary to Ptolemy II, could be certainly regarded as Ptolemy IV's foundation. It cannot be ruled out that Ptolemy IV might have refounded Arsinoe Lyktou, which had earlier been founded by his grandfather (in 220–219 the city was destroyed by

There have been several counter-arguments raised against attributing all the settlements known as Arsinoe as well as the predominant majority of the other settlements to Ptolemy II. It has been pointed out that the dynastic toponyms are of lesser importance, the Ptolemaic rule on the territories was unstable, and there were permanent clashes of interest among the Lagids, Seleucids and Antigonids. The process of Ptolemaic colonisation in Asia Minor was meant to resemble a patchwork, within the framework of which the subsequent rulers added new settlements and refounded the old ones.[84] The argument concerning the lack of stability of the spheres of influence seems to be justified, except for Cyprus. Rule over the island since 295 had not been threatened for a long time. On the other hand, it cannot be ruled out that it might also explain the possibly weak activity of Ptolemy I in terms of founding or refounding settlements. In the reality of the epoch, which was filled with the diadochus wars, changing coalitions and the borders of influences, such activity might have been difficult to conduct beyond the territories where his rule was more stable (Egypt, Cyrenaica).

In the case of the settlements named after Arsinoe, however, the fact is that, apart from Ptolemy II's sister-wife, Arsinoe II Philadelphos, in the 3rd century there was only one important member of the dynasty by this name: Arsinoe III, Ptolemy IV's sister-wife.[85] The king in question did not pursue such active politics outside as his predecessors, which raises doubts concerning his settlement activity, although it cannot be ruled out. Ptolemy II proved himself to be a skilled organiser and a man of broad horizons as far as foreign policy was concerned, who extended his political and diplomatic influence as far as India and Italia.[86] One of the fields of Philadelphos's activity was religious policy. He played a decisive role in the organisation of the dynastic cult. It is not impossible that even the marriage to his sister was a part of Ptolemy's intricate religious policy in terms of the dynastic cult. Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II were united in matrimony, following Zeus and Hera's footsteps, which gave rise to the development of the cult of θεοὶ ἀδελφοί.[87] A significant role in the dynastic cult was also played by the separate cult of Arsinoe II. The queen's cult, both in the Egyptian and Greek forms, had very many aspects, one of which was her identification with Aphrodite.[88] Aphrodite was an Olympic deity, who, apart from Dionysius, enjoyed particular support from the Ptolemies. As Isis-Aphrodite, Arsinoe, followed by the other Egyptian queens, became the guarantor of the

Knossos: Plb. 4.53.3–54.3). Cf. Huss 1976, 154–156; Cohen 1995, 133, 139 *contra* Tscherikover 1927, 7 (Arsinoe Lyktou); Le Rider 1966, 140; 1968, 239 (Arsinoe/Rithymna); Bagnall 1976, 119, 201 (Arsinoe/Rithymna, more cautious).

[84] Mueller 2006, 158.

[85] There is no evidence that Arsinoe, Ptolemy I's mother, or Arsinoe I, Lysimachus' daughter and Ptolemy II's first wife played a significant role in the politics and ideology of the monarchy.

[86] *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* I, 25; Liv. *per*. 14; Plin. *NH* 6.58; App. *Sic*. 1.2; Cass. Dio 10. frg. 41; Just. 18.2.9; Eutr. 2.15; cf. Lampela 1998, 32–56; Huss 2001, 301.

[87] It cannot be ruled out, however, that the remarks expressed explicitly or the allusions of this kind which were present in the Alexandrian poetry of the time (cf. Theoc., *Id.* 17.131–134) were an attempt made by the poets associated with the court to justify the steps taken by the ruler in the eyes of the Greeks (as it is commonly acknowledged), but that they reflected the actual intentions of the monarch. For this topic: Carney 1987, 430; Hazzard 2000, 89–90.

[88] Tondriau 1948, 16–18. On the cult of Arsinoe, see Fraser 1972, I: 197–198, 228–246; Plantzos 1991/1992; Hölbl 2001, 101–104; Barbantini 2008, 121–132.

dynasty's continuation. The role of Arsinoe-Aphrodite as a patron of sailors was particularly strongly emphasised. Kallikrates of Samos, commander of the Ptolemaic fleet, built the temple of Arsinoe-Aphrodite, also known as Arsinoe-Aphrodite-Zephyritis, on the Zephyrion peninsula, near Kanopos.[89] Ptolemy II managed to create the cult of the new goddess, who descended from the dynasty, and to popularise it in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin. The votive tablets with the name of Arsinoe, found in numerous littoral cities, can be used as evidence of the importance of the cult for the people of the time.[90] The feast of *Arsinoeia* was held on Thera, and the feast of *Philadelpheia* was organised on Delos.[91] Traces of the cult, certainly, can also be found in the cities named after her: e.g. the temple in Arsinoe in Cilicia and the altar dedicated to Arsinoe in Arsinoe/Marion.[92] It therefore seems that this is one more argument weighing in favour of Ptolemy II as the founder or refounder of the settlements named after his sister-wife. Not only was this a large-scale plan in terms of the strategic importance of the particular places, but it also functioned as a scheme immensely charged with religious and propaganda issues.[93]

The Ptolemaic colonisation in Asia Minor and in the Aegean thus had a few goals connected with the imperial policy of the dynasty. Apart from the strategic significance, which in the rivalry between the superpowers of the time and due to the vastness of the Ptolemaic empire was of critical importance, the settlements functioned as a means of control. In Ptolemy II's politics they additionally played a propaganda and religious role. They also constituted the proof of the power of the dynasty. The settlements founded as *polis*, through their contacts with the other cities of the Greek world, provided clear evidence of the Ptolemies' presence in a particular region, which, supported by the euergetism of the Egyptian kings, was an important weapon used in the fight for hegemony in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea basin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock S.E. (1994): Breaking up the Hellenistic World: Survey and Society, in: L. Morris (ed.), *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archeologies*, Cambridge: 171–190.

Ager, S.L. (1998/2000): Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World: The Case of Lebedos, *GRBS* 39: 5–21.

Allen, R.E. (1983): *The Attalid Kingdom*, Oxford.

Bagnall, R.S. (1976): *The Administration of Ptolemaic Possesions outside Egypt*, Leiden.

Bagnall, R.S. (1984): The Origins of Ptolemaic Cleruchs, *BASP* 21: 7–20.

Bakhuizen, S.C. (1970): *Salganeus and the Fortifications on Its Mountains*, Groningen.

[89] Posidip. frg. 12–13 Gow-Page. See Fraser 1972, I: 239–240, 568–569; Hauben 1983, 111–114.

[90] *IG* XI.4.1303; XII.2.513; XII.3.462; 1386; XII.7. 99; 263–264; *OGIS* 34; Mitford 1961, 7–9, nos. 12–14; Robert 1966b, 175–211; Bruneau 1970, 544; Brun 1991, 101–102 no. 2; cf. Hölbl 2001, 104.

[91] *IG* XII 3. 1343; Bruneau 1970, 528–530.

[92] Segre 1937; Hermary 1988, 102; Jones/Habicht 1989, 318; Kirsten/Opelt 1989, 57–61.

[93] Similarly Marquaille (2008, 59–60), who emphasised the importance of naming habits in Ptolemy II's policy.

Barbantani, S. (2005): Goddess of Love and Mistress of the Sea. Notes on a Hellenistic Hymn to Arsinoe-Aphrodite (P.Lit Goodsp. 2 I–IV), *AncSoc* 35: 135–165.

Barbantani, S. (2008): Arsinoe II Filadelfo nell'interpretazione storiografica moderna, nel culto e negli epigrammi del P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, in: L. Castagna, C. Riboldi (eds.), *Amicitiae templa serena. Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò*, vol. I, Milano: 103–134.

Bean, G.E. (1953): Notes and Inscriptions from Caunus, *JHS* 73: 10–35.

Behrwald, R. (2000): *Der Lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verfassung*, Bonn.

Brandt, H. (1992): *Gesselschaft und Wirtschaft Pamphyliens und Pisidiens im Altertum*, Bonn.

Braunert, H. (1964): Hegemoniale Bestrebungen der Hellenistischen Grossmächte in Politik und Wirtschaft, *Historia* 13: 80–104.

Brun, P. (1991): Les Lagides à Lesbos: Essai de Chronologie, *ZPE* 85: 99–113.

Bruneau, P. (1970): *Recherches sur les cultes de Déelos à l'époque hellenistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris.

Buraselis, K. (1982): *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Ägäis*, München.

Burstein, S.M. (1996): Ivory and Ptolemaic Exploration of the Red Sea. The Missing Factor, *Topoi* 6: 799–807.

Carney, E.D. (1987): The Reappearance of Royal Sibling Marriage in Ptolemaic Egypt, *PP* 42: 420–439.

Chaniotis, A. (1993): Ein diplomatischer Staathalter nimmt Rucksicht auf den verletzten Stolz zweier hellenistischer Kleinpoleis (Nagidos und Arsinoe), *EA* 21: 33–42.

Cherry, J.F., Davis, J.L., Matzourani, E. (eds.) (1991): *Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History. Northern Keos in the Cycladic Islands from earliest Settlement until Modern Times*, Los Angeles.

Cohen, G.M. (1978): *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization*, Wiesbaden.

Cohen, G.M. (1983): Colonization and Population Transfer in the Hellenistic World, in: E. van't Dack (ed.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceeedings of the International colloquium, Leuven 24–26 May 1982*, Leuven: 63–74.

Cohen, G.M. (1995): *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley–Los Angeles.

Cohen, G.M. (2006): *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*, Berkeley–Los Angeles.

Cook, J.M. (1973): *The Troad*, Oxford.

Cook, J.M. (1988): Cities in and Around the Troad, *ABSA* 83: 7–19.

Davesne, A. (1998): Reflexions sur l'histoire du site, in: A. Davesne, F. Laroche Traunecker (eds.), *Le Site de Meydancikkale. Recherches entreprises sous la direction d'Emmanuel Laroche (1971–1982)*, Paris: 63–67.

Davesne, A., Le Rider, G. (1989): *Le Trésor de Meydancikkale (Cilicie Trachée, 1980)*, Paris.

Dietze, G. (1994): Philae und die Dodekaschoinos in Ptolemäischer Zeit. Ein Beitrag zur Frage Ptolemäischer Präsenz im Grenzland zwischen Ägypten und Afrika an Hand der architektonischen und epigraphischen Quellen, *AncSoc* 25: 63–110.

Domingo Gygax, M. (2005): Change and Continuity in the Administration of Ptolemaic Lycia. A Note on P.Tebt. I 8, *BASP* 42: 45–50.

Errington, R.M. (2008): *A History of the Hellenistic World 323–30 BC*, Oxford.

Flacelière, R. (1937): *Les Aitoliens à Delphes. Contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au III^e siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris.

Fraser, P.M. (1954): Two Hellenistic Inscriptions from Delphi, *BCH* 78: 49–67.

Fraser, P.M. (1972): *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. I–III, Oxford.

Gill, D., Foxhall, L., Bowden, H. (1997): Classical and Hellenistic Methana, in: C. Mee, H. Forbes (eds.), *A Rough and Rocky Place. The Landscape and Settlement History of the Methana Peninsula, Greece*, Liverpool: 62–76.

Grabowski, T. (2008): Ptolemy's Military and Political Operations in Greece in 314–308 BC, *Electrum* 14: 33–46.
Grabowski, T. (2010): Związek Etolski w polityce greckiej pierwszych Ptolemeuszy, in: E. Dąbrowa *et al*. (eds.), *Hortus Historiae. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Profesora Józefa Wolskiego w setną rocznicę urodzin*, Kraków: 191–216.
Grabowski, T. (2012): The Ptolemies versus the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues in the 250s–220s BC, *Electrum* 19: 83–98.
Grainger, J.D. (1999): *The League of the Aitolians*, Leiden.
Grainger, J.D. (2009): *The Cities of Pamphylia*, Oxford.
Habicht, C. (1980): Bemerkungen zum P. Haun 6, *ZPE* 39: 1–5.
Hammond, N.G.L., Walbank, F.W. (1988): *A History of Macedonia*, vol. III, Oxford.
Hansen, E.V. (1971): *The Attalids of Pergamon*, New York.
Hauben, H. (1983): Arsinoé II et la politique extérieure de l'Égypte, in: E. van't Dack, P. van Dessel, W. van Gucht W. (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven 24–26 May 1982*, Leuven: 99–127.
Hauben, H. (1987a): Cyprus and the Ptolemaic Navy, *RDAC*: 213–226.
Hauben, H. (1987b): On the Ptolemaic Iasos Inscription IGSK 28.1, 2–3, *EA* 10: 3–6.
Hazzard, R.A. (2000): *Imagination of a Monarchy: Studies in Ptolemaic Propaganda*, Toronto.
Heinen, H. (1972): *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Zur Geschichte der Zeit des Ptolemaios Keraunos und zum Chremonideischen Krieg*, Wiesbaden.
Hermary, A. (1988): Le culte d'Aphrodite a Amathonte, *RDAC* 2: 101–109.
Hölbl, G. (2001): *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*, London.
Huss, W. (1976): *Untersuchungen zur Aussenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV*, München.
Huss, W. (2001): *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332–30 v.Chr.*, München.
Huss, W. (2011): *Die Verwaltung des Ptolemaischen Reichs*, München.
Jones, C.P., Habicht, C. (1989): A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia, *Phoenix* 43: 317–346.
Jouquet, P. (1948): Les Assemblees d'Alexandrie a l'epoque Ptolemaique, *BSAA* 37: 71–92.
Keen, A. (1993): Gateway from the Aegean to the Mediterranean. The strategic Value of Lycia down to the Fourth Century B.C., in: J. Borchardt, G. Dobesch (eds.), *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions, Wien 6–12 Mai 1990*, Wien: 71–77.
Kemp, B.J. (1977): The Early Development of Towns in Egypt, *Antiquity* 51: 185–200.
Kemp, B.J. (2009): *Starożytny Egipt. Anatomia cywilizacji*, Warszawa.
Kirsten, E., Opelt, I. (1989): Eine Urkunde der Gründung von Arsinoe in Kilikien, *ZPE* 77: 55–66.
Klose, P. (1972): *Die völkerrechtliche Ordnung der hellenistischen Staaten in der Zeit von 280 bis 168 v. Chr. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts*, München.
Kobes, J. (1996): *Kleine Konige: Untersuchungen Zu Den Lokaldynasten im hellenistischen Kleinasien (323–188 v. Chr.)*, St. Katharinen.
Kosmetatou, E. (1997): Pisidia and Hellenistic Kings from 323 to 133 BC, *AncSoc* 28: 5–37.
Lampela, A. (1998): *Rome and the Ptolemies of Egypt. The Development of Their Political Relations 273–80 B.C.*, Helsinki.
Launey, M. (1949–1950): *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, vol. I–II, Paris.
Le Rider, G. (1966): *Monnaies crétoises du V au I siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris.
Le Rider, G. (1968): Les Arsinoéens de Crete, in: C.M. Kray, G.K. Jenkins (eds.), *Essays in Greek Coinage Presented to Stanley Robinson*, Oxford: 229–240.
Longega, G. (1968): *Arsinoe II*, Roma.
Ma, J. (2000): *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
Magie, D. (1939): The „Agreement" between Philip V and Antiochus III for the Partition of the Egyptian Empire, *JRS* 29: 32–44.
Marquaille, C. (2008): The Foreign Policy of Ptolemy II, in: P. McKechnie, P. Guillaume (eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, Leiden: 39–64.

Marrinan, R. (1998): *The Ptolemaic Army: Its Organization, Development and Settlement*, University College London (Unpublished PhD Thesis).
Mastrocinque, A. (1979): *La Caria e Ionia Meridionale in Epoca Hellenistica (323–188 a.C.)*, Roma.
McDonald, A.H., Walbank, F.W. (1937): The Origins of the Second Macedonian War, *JRS* 27: 180–207.
McShane, R.M. (1964): *The Foreign Policy of the Attalids of Pergamum*, Urbana.
Meadows, A. (2006): The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia, SEG 27.929, in: K. Dörtlük *et al*. (eds.), *The III[rd] Symposium of Lycia. 7–10 November 2005, Antalya. Symposium Proceedings*, vol. 2, Antalya: 459–470.
Mehl, A. (1996): Militärwesen und Verwaltung der Ptolemäer in Zypern, *RCCM* 38: 215–260.
Meyer, E. (1935), Methana, *RE* XV, 2: 1375–1379.
Mitford, T.B. (1961): The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos, *ABSA* 56: 1–39.
Mueller, K. (2006): *Settlements of the Ptolemies: City Foundations and New Settlement in the Hellenistic World*, Leuven.
Papazoglou, F. (1988): *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*, Paris.
Piejko, F. (1991): Decree of the Ionian League in Honor of Antiochus I, ca 267–262 B.C., *Phoenix* 45: 126–147.
Piejko, F. (1990): Episodes from the Third Syrian War in a Gurob papyrus, 246 BC, *ArchPF* 36: 13–27.
Plantzos, D. (1991–1992): ΕΚΘΕΩΣΙΣ ΑΡΣΙΝΟΗΣ. On the Cult of Arsinoe Philadelphos, *Archaiognosia* 7: 119–133.
Reger, G. (1985): The Date of the Battle of Kos, *AJAH* 10: 155–177.
Robert, J., Robert, L. (1983): *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie*, vol. I, Paris.
Robert, L. (1960): Sur un décret des Korésiens au musée de Smyrne, *Hellenica* 11–12: 132–176.
Robert, L. (1966a): *Documents de l'Asie Mineure Méridionale. Inscriptions, monnaies et géographie*, Genéve–Paris.
Robert, L. (1966b): Sur un décret d'Ilion et un papyrus concernant ds cultes royaux, *AmStP* 1: 175–211 (= *id*., *Opera Minora Selecta*, vol. VII, Amsterdam 1990: 599–635).
Robert, L. (1982): Documents d'Asie Mineure, *BCH* 106: 309–378.
Rostovtzeff, M. (1941): *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, vol. I–III, Oxford.
Sartre, M. (2001): *D'Alexandre à Zénobie. Histoire du Levant antique IV[e] siècle avant J.-C. – III[e] siècle après. J.-C.*, Paris.
Sartre, M. (2003): *L'Anatolie hellénistique de l'Égée au Caucase (334–31 av. J.-C.)*, Paris.
Schmitt, G. (1995): *Die Siedlungen Palästinas in griechisch-römischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden.
Schmitt, H.H. (1964): *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seine Zeit*, Wiesbaden.
Schmitt, H.H. (1969): *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums III. Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.* München.
Schmitt, H.H. (1974): Polybios und das gleichgewicht der Mächte, in: E. Gabba (ed.), *Polybe*, Genève: 67–93.
Scholten, J.B. (2000): *Politics of Plunder. Aitolians and Their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279–217 B.C.*, Berkeley–Los Angeles.
Schwartz, J. (1978): Athenes et L'Etolie dans la politique lagide (à la lumière de P. Haun 6), *ZPE* 30: 95–100.
Segre, M. (1937): Il culto di Arsinoe Filadelfo nelle citta greche, *BSAA* 31: 286–298.
Seibert, J. (1969): *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemiaos' I.*, München.
Serrati, J. (2008): Warfare and The State, in: P. Sabin, H. van Wees, M. Whitby (eds.), *Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare*, vol. I, Cambridge: 461–497.
Sidebotham, S.E. (1986): Ports of Red Sea and the Arabia-India Trade, *MBAH* 5: 16–36.
Sidebotham, S.E. (1996): An Overwiev of Archaeological Work in Eastern Desert, *Topoi* 6: 773–783.
Sidebotham, S.E. (2002): From Berenike to Koptos. Recent Results of the Desert Route Survey, *Topoi Suppl.* 3: 415–438.

Thompson, L.A. (1969): Easter Africa and the Graeco-Roman World (to A.D. 64), in: J. Ferguson, L.A. Thompson (eds.), *Africa in Classical Antiquity. Nine Studies*, Ibadan: 26–59.
Tondriau, J. (1948): Princesses ptolémaiques comparées ou identifiées à des déesses, *BSAA* 37: 12–33.
Tscherikover, W. (1927): *Die hellenistischen Städtegrünfungen von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf die Römerzeit*, Leipzig.
Uebel, F. (1968): *Die Kleruchen Ägyptens unter den ersten sechs Ptolemäern*, Berlin.
Urban, R. (1979): *Wachstum und Krise des Achäischen Bundes. Quellenstudien zur Entwicklung des Bundes von 280 bis 222 v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden.
Will, É. (1979–1982): *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*, vol. I–II, Nancy.
Wörrle, M. (1977): Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens I, *Chiron* 7: 43–66.
Wörrle, M. (1978): Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens II. Ptolemaios II und Telmessos, *Chiron* 8: 201–246.
Wörrle, M. (1979): Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens III, *Chiron* 9: 83–111.