

THE STRUCTURE OF PTOLEMAIC ADMINISTRATION IN SOUTH-WESTERN ASIA MINOR: CARIA, CAUNOS AND LYCIA

By Alain Bresson

For Vincent, 'fellow Rhodian' and dear friend of many years

Summary: This paper addresses the question of the structure of Ptolemaic administration in south-western Asia Minor in the third century BCE. On the basis of the later command structure of Rhodes over the same regions, it demonstrates that there were not two, but three Ptolemaic *stratēgoi*, one being in charge of Caria, one of Caunos, and one of Lycia. The existence of a specific command over Caunos was justified by the fact that this city was separated from the rest of Caria by a curtain of Rhodian and Seleucid territories.

Introduction

Between 280/79 BCE and the turn from third to the second century, many of the coastal regions of southern Asia Minor found themselves under the control of the Ptolemies.¹ The four regions of Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia and Caria each had specific administrations.² At the top of the hierarchy, with both military and civil powers, it is possible to hypothesize the existence of a *stratēgos* – at least as much can be proven in the case of Cilicia and Caria. For Pamphylia, Louis Robert postulated the existence of a Pamphyliarch in a damaged inscription, whose title may bring to mind the Nesiarch of the Aegean islands. But A. Meadows and P. Thonemann have argued that this restoration cannot be followed. It is possible that what is mentioned in the initial lacuna is a *stratēgos*, but it

- 1 For the administration of foreign Ptolemaic possessions, see Bagnall 1976, especially 80–116 for Asia Minor, and Huß 2011: 157–71.
- 2 On the administration of Cilicia, see Huß 2011: 157–60; of Pamphylia, p. 161; of Lycia, pp. 161–66; of Caria, pp. 167–70.

may just as likely have been a high Ptolemaic official such as an *oikonomos*.³ For Lycia despite there being an important number of testimonies for the presence and role of the Ptolemaic administration, our documentation apparently does not mention any *stratēgos*, to the point that it has been possible to ask whether in fact the region was not treated as an administrative annex of Caria.⁴

When it comes to the Ptolemaic *stratēgoi* in Asia Minor, it is Caria that provides the richest documentation, even if again it is not as explicit as one might wish. A *stratēgos* of Caria is known to us from a decree in Samos for the Macedonian Aristolaos, son of Ameinias, IG XII.6 120, l. 2: [σ]τρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Καρίας κατεστηκ[ώς] (from the reign of Ptolemy II). This is the only one known to us by an explicit title. However, as W. Huß has pointed out, several other texts from Caria might make mention of *stratēgoi* and their case merits particular attention.⁵

- Amyzon. A decree from Amyzon (*Amyzon*, pp. 118-24, no. 3) honors the *stratēgos* Margos, dated to year 9 of Ptolemy II, that is, 277 BCE.⁶ On lines 6-7 he is described as Μάρ|γος ὁ στρατηγός, and ll. 8-9, Μάργον τὸν στρατηγόν. As a very likely hypothesis, one might consider this is an implicit reference to a function – the *stratēgos* of Caria – that was so well-known that there was no need to state so explicitly.
- Labraunda. In a letter from Olympichos to Mylasa concerning the status and privileges of the sanctuary of Labraunda (*I.Labraunda* 3), one finds on line 4 a reference to τὰ παρὰ Σώφρονος γραφέντα πρὸς |⁵ ὑμ|ᾶς καὶ Πτολεμ[α]ίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλέως Πτολε|[μ]αίου. The problem concerning the identities and roles of both Sophron and Ptolemy, brother of king Ptolemy, has recently been the subject of detailed discussion, so it will suffice here to just briefly summarize its results.⁷ For J. Crampa, Sophron was none

3 Meadows & Thonemann 2013, with a new restoration of Robert 1966: 53-58, l. 9.

4 See Meadows 2012: 127-28.

5 See Huß 2011: 168 n. 207, who provides a list and detailed bibliography.

6 The text is dated to 273 by J. & L. Robert, *Amyzon*: 120, but we should calculate the years of the reign starting in 284. See Meadows 2006: 467.

7 Van Bremen 2017: 251-55 (on Sophron see again PP 6 15125).

other than the Seleucid officer in charge of Ephesos, who is known to us from an anecdote from Athenaeus (13 593b-d = Phylarch, *FGrHist*, 81 F24) for having changed sides and joined the Ptolemies during the troubles of the year 246.⁸ C. Habicht departed from this identification and believed the Sophron from the Labraunda inscription to be a Ptolemaic officer, distinct from the Seleucid one posted to Ephesos in 246. He, in turn, suggested that Sophron might be the *stratēgos* of Caria before Ptolemy ‘the Son’ came to exercise authority over the region.⁹ However, M. Domingo Gygax returned to the analysis by Crampa,¹⁰ even if he holds that Ptolemy ‘brother of the king’ was indeed the son of Ptolemy II (brother to Ptolemy III), who, after operating in western Asia Minor, defected in 259. But if this is the case, as R. van Bremen notes, there is no reason to see why the letter by Sophron would have been mentioned before that of Ptolemy. As many other parallel dossiers show, the chronology of documentary pieces turns out to be of fundamental importance.¹¹ We must, therefore, return to the hypothesis by C. Habicht.¹² If the letters by Ptolemy ‘the Son’ to Mylasa ought to be dated to 260, Sophron would have been in office during the 270s or at the beginning of the 260s.

- Territory of the *Mogoreis* (Xystis), certainly of 274 BCE, with mention of a *stratēgos* of Caria and its periphery.¹³
- Samos. Hagesarchos, originally from Megalopolis, appears in a dossier of correspondence with Samos in 245/4 BCE (*IG* XII.6 156) as someone bearing a letter from Ptolemy III. The inscription is damaged, and the title of the individual is lost. His son Ptolemaios was a high dignitary at the court of Ptolemy IV and Ptolemy V and the *stratēgos* of Cyprus (*PP* 6 14778 = 15068). The parallel with the Aris-

8 Crampa in *Labraunda*: 15 and 121-22.

9 Habicht 1972: 167-70.

10 Domingo Gygax 2000: 358-59.

11 A natural example is the arbitrage dossier between Samos and Priene; see *I.Priene*² 132.

12 Van Bremen 2017: loc. cit.

13 See Bresson et al. 2021; Rousset 2024; Bresson forthcoming.

tolaos inscription may legitimately suggest that Hagesarchos was another *stratēgos* of Caria.¹⁴

- Theangela (rather than Halicarnassos). In an honorific decree of the third century (it is not possible to date the text with more precision given the information available to us) for Iason, son of Minnion, C. Marek has proposed reconstructing στρατηγὸς ἐ[πὶ Καρίας] as the individual's title.¹⁵
- Kildara. In a letter to the city of Kildara in 246 BCE, Tlepolemos, son of Artapates, encourages the Kildarians to persevere in the choice they made to support queen Berenice in the conflict between her and Laodice. The letter's introduction does not mention any title for Tlepolemos and leads to the question, without there being any way to answer it, whether he was the *stratēgos* of Caria or if he was there on a special mission.¹⁶
- Caunos. The case of the *stratēgos* Motes poses a particular problem. He is mentioned in the correspondence of Zenon, *P.Cair.Zen.* 59341 (247/6), a ll. 20-21: ἐπὶ τε τὸν στρατηγὸν Μότην καὶ τὸν οἰκονόμον | Διόδοτον, and l. 29, τὸν στρατηγὸν [Μο] καὶ τὸν οἰκονόμον. This papyrus is composed of three memoranda (a-c).¹⁷ The first, sent by Theopropos, who was originally from Kalynda, to the *dioikētēs* Apollonios concerns a financial affair involving the city. The second, sent by Neon, also from Kalynda, is something supposed to be

14 See the argument by Hallof & Mileta 1997: 270-79, who detail the origins and the career of Hagesarchos.

15 Marek 1982: 119-23, ll. 1-3: ἐπειδὴ Ἰάσων] | Μιννίωνος Ἀ[λικαρνασσεύς, ἀποδεδειγμένος] | στρατηγὸς ἐ[πὶ Καρίας ὑπὸ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου?], cf. *SEG* 32 1112. The inscription had been published by Cousin & Diehl 1890: 90-93, no. 1, as coming from Halicarnassus because they had seen it in Bodrum, without realizing that the stone could have another provenance. Like another inscription that they published with a provenance, in fact, from Theangela, C. Marek proposes the hypothesis that the same goes for this decree and notes that it goes well with the mention of the ethnic in l. 2 (which would not have appeared if the person in question had been honoured in his own city).

16 Blümel 1992 (*SEG* 92 1994). Van Bremen 2017: 229 and n. 23 designates him only as a Ptolemaic 'official' (officer). On Tlepolemos, his origins, career and family, see Habicht 1985: 87-88 and *PP* 9 5228.

17 See Orrieux 1983: 53-54.

dealt with by Zenon. It concerns a renewal application for the contribution exemption for the costs of housing soldiers. The father of the individual who originally had benefited from the exemption had been the husband of Zenon's paternal aunt. The third is an explanatory memorandum from Zenon himself. We know that Zenon was from Caunos. Kalynda was the neighbouring city immediately to the east of Caunos. With both the *stratēgos* and the *oikonomos* being mentioned in the same document and at the same level the document stems from the highest level of a provincial administration. But which province was this?

Logically (or so it seems), H. Bengtson, followed by W. Huß, thought of Caria.¹⁸ Besides, both also pointed out that, according to Polybius, Astymedes in his address to the Roman senate had recalled the particular situation of Caunos and Stratonikeia among their possessions in Asia Minor.¹⁹ With regard to Caunos, Astymedes mentions: ἀλλὰ Καῦνον δῆπου διακοσίων ταλάντων ἐξηγοράσαμεν παρὰ τῶν Πτολεμαίου στρατηγῶν, 'But Caunos, as you well know, we purchased from Ptolemy's generals for the price of two hundred talents'. For Bengtson, the plural is only a stylistic flourish, and it is the *stratēgos* of Caria that he really means here.²⁰ However, things may not be so simple.

We must first mention the question of the date on which the Rhodians acquired Caunos. Directly or indirectly, three ancient sources relate to this event. It is first and foremost the explicit testimony of Polybius, which has just been mentioned. But two other sources evoke the fate of Caunos in this period. It is first Livy, who evokes the context in which the Rhodians were brought to prevent the offensive of Antiochos III against the Ptolemaic possessions in the south of Asia Minor. In the summer of 197, the Seleucid offensive unfolded from east to west. This offensive aimed at seizing Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria (Liv 33.19.11). Worried about

18 Bengtson 1937-1952: III, 174-77 (the same point of view in PP 6 15058); Huß 2011: 168 n. 207.

19 Polyb. 30.31.6

20 As noted by Huß 2011: 168 n. 207, the hypothesis by Walbank in his commentary on Polybius (1979, III, 457), according to which 'the generals' would actually mean the *stratēgos* of Caria and the commander of the garrison of Caunos, is not convincing.

these operations, the Rhodians sent an embassy to Antiochos demanding that his fleet should not move beyond the Chelidonian islands on the southeastern tip of Lycia (*ibid.*, 33.20.2). Even if the Roman victory of Cynoscephalae lifted the threat of a convergence between the forces of Antiochos III and those of Philip V and if Antiochos III assured the Rhodians of his will to maintain their traditionally good relations, this did not ensure the safeguarding of the last Ptolemaic possessions in the region. The Rhodians had to take things in their own hands (*ibid.*, 33.20.12-13): 'They did not, however, abandon the other object, the defence of the liberties of the states in alliance with Ptolemy which Antiochos was now threatening. To some they gave active assistance, others they forewarned of the movements of the enemy; it was thus that Caunos, Myndos, Halicarnassos and Samos owed their liberty to Rhodes'.²¹

Some scholars have seen here a contradiction between Livy and Polybius.²² But there is no contradiction at all. In 197 the Rhodians safeguarded the 'freedom' of 'the cities allied to Ptolemy', that is, of the cities that were nominally autonomous but under his control, including the presence of a garrison, by sending armed forces to protect those cities against the Seleucid forces, if needed. This means that the operation was carried out in cooperation with the Ptolemaic authorities on the spot. Then, as testified by Polybius, a second phase could come, which in the case of Caunos meant that the local Ptolemaic *stratēgoi* sold the city to Rhodes.

The only incongruous testimony is that of Appian (*Mithr.* 23.89), who indicates: Καύνιοι Ῥοδίοις ὑποτελεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀντιόχου πολέμῳ γενόμενοι, καὶ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀφεθέντες οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ ... 'The Caunians, who had become subject to Rhodes after the war against Antiochus and had been recently liberated by the Romans ...' This testimony is framed in a rhetorical construction that tends to emphasize the ingratitude and the cruelty of the Caunians, who massacred the Romans and the Italians in 88 BCE. It obviously contains a double error, on the date on which the

21 *Illam alteram curam non omiserunt tuendae libertatis civitatum sociarum Ptolomaei, quibus bellum ab Antiocho imminabat. Nam alias auxiliis iuverunt, alias providendo ac praemonendo conatus hostis causaque libertatis fuerunt Cauniis, Myndiis, Halicarnassensibus Samiisque.* Tr. Canon Roberts, *Everyman's Library* (London 1912).

22 The debate is summarized by Dmitriev 2010: 160-61 with n. 20.

Rhodians had acquired Caunos, and on the one at which they had lost it (since the city was lost by Rhodes as early as 167 BCE). H.-U. Wiemer has observed that Appian was not to be trusted.²³ Yet, after an historiographic review that summarizes the positions of scholars who have commented on this question (with the debate on the supposed contradiction between Livy, who presented the Rhodians as having safeguarded the ‘freedom’ of the Caunians, and Polybius, who signaled that they had been sold to the Rhodians), S. Dmitriev concludes that ‘these texts do not confirm the evidence offered by Polybius that the Rhodians had actually gained Caunos by a purchase. Unlike what we read in Polybius (which surely reflected the Rhodian point of view), neither Livy nor Appian shows how, exactly, Rhodes acquired Caunos’.²⁴ In fact, as we saw, there is no contradiction between Livy, Polybius and the epigraphic sources. Only Appian is divergent, for reasons that can easily be explained: chronological distance from the facts and rhetorical construction. Rejecting Polybius’ testimony on the pretext that it would only reflect ‘a Rhodian point of view’ is untenable. Polybius was in Rome at the time Astymedes had delivered his address before the senate. How could we imagine that Astymedes or a later Rhodian source could have misled Polybius on this question?²⁵

Now, as the epigraphic record shows, in 190, the territory of Daidala, on the western borders of Lycia, was already Rhodian, since already on this date – that is even before the end of the war against Antiochos – there existed a *hagemōn epi Lykias* who was active there.²⁶ It is thus between 197 and 192 (date of the beginning of the Antiochic War) at the latest that the Rhodians acquired Caunos and Daidala. Therefore, the two testimonies of Polybius and Livy are not contradictory. On the contrary they perfectly complement each other. It may be legitimate to think that it was already in 197 or 196 (before the conclusion of the peace between

23 Wiemer 2002: 237 n. 14.

24 Dmitriev 2010: 161.

25 For an analysis of the speeches of Astymedes, that from the winter 168/7 and that from 164, see Thornton 2013: 225–26 and 228, who notes that, according to Polybius 30.4.11, Astymedes was so proud of his first speech that he made sure it was published.

26 See below on this question.

Antiochos III and Ptolemy V in 195) that the sale was concluded, but there is no proof of this for the moment. In any case, the alleged mention of the Caunians in the peace treaty between Miletos and Magnesia by the Meander, traditionally dated to 196 BCE but which more recently has been dated to the 180s, cannot be used to assert that Caunos was still independent at that time. The restoration of the name of Caunos in this document cannot be adopted.²⁷ Moreover the treaty must certainly be dated to the 180s rather than the 190s.²⁸

27 *Milet* I.3 148 (Syll.³ 588, with *I.Kaunos* T149). Not only is the restoration ([Καυ]ν[ί]ων, ll. 12–13) not certain, it is also wholly unlikely. In the list of the ambassadors who came to reconcile Miletos and Magnesia, after Athens and Cnidos, one has for Asia Minor: Myndos, Samos, Halicarnassos, the city with the uncertain name, then Iasos (Crowther 1995a: 98, and 1995b: 232–34; on the basis of a prosopographic identification; for the patronymic Νύσιος of this delegate of Iasos, see now also *LGPN* VB, with eight attestations of the name at Iasos against only two at Mylasa), Teos and Cyzicos. Caunos, isolated at the eastern end of Caria, would break the geographic sequence of the cities of western Asia Minor. The names of several other cities have been proposed and M. Errington (1989, 283) has suggested among others those of Chios, Erythrai and Smyrna, and Wiemer (2002: 237, n. 12), that of Bargylia (but see Wörrle 2004: 53, n. 53: this solution is impossible). As for the only sequence of name plus patronymic in the list of the two delegates from this city that has been preserved, Dionysikles the son of Olympichos (l. 13, Διονυσικλείους τοῦ Ὀλυμπίχο[υ]), one should observe that Διονυσικλῆς is characteristic of western Caria and Ionia (see *LGPN* VA and B, with Bresson *et al.* 2021, 155) and that Ὀλύμπιχος is found in a series of cities, including cities of Asia Minor (*LGPN*), but that neither of them can be found in the inscriptions of Caunos (see index *I.Kaunos*). Besides, one should also observe that the names Διονυσικλῆς and Ὀλύμπιχος are both found in Ephesos, Kolophon and Smyrna only. One should conclude that the city of which the name is mutilated in the inscription has a good chance of being one of these three cities, or possibly of one of the cities where Διονυσικλῆς and Ὀλύμπιχος appear separately. But once again this excludes Caunos.

28 It is not possible to reopen here the dossier of the chronology of the peace treaty between Miletos and Magnesia by the Meander and of that of the arbitration between Samos and Priene (on which see now Magnetto 2008 and *I.Priene*² 132). See however the argument developed by Errington 1989, Bresson 2003: 186–87, and Habicht 2005 in favour of the low dates, and contra Wörrle 2004 and Magnetto 2008 and 2009 in favour of the high chronology (following Magnetto, Badoud 2015: 177, dates to 195 the Rhodian eponym Pratophanes, *I.Priene*² 132, l. 33–34, under whom the treaty was recorded).

If the exact date of the purchase of Caunos by the Rhodians eludes us, the context in which the sale of Caunos took place is clear. Ptolemy V was only six years old when his father died in 204. In the following years, the power passed into the hands of a clique of courtiers.²⁹ Between 206 and 185, an Egyptian national revolt started in Upper Egypt. Led by two indigenous pharaohs, Haronnophris and Chaonnophris, it threatened to destroy the Ptolemaic state. In 197, fights took place in Lycopolis, a city of the Delta, close to Alexandria.³⁰ In 196, as testified by the Memphis Decree, Ptolemy V had to make considerable concessions to the Egyptian clergy.³¹ Nevertheless, the unrest continued until the final defeat of the rebels in 185 and even so agitation continued until 182.³² Antiochos III took advantage of this situation to launch an offensive against the Ptolemaic kingdom during the Fifth Syrian War and its follow up. This period saw, after the catastrophic defeat of Panion in 200, the loss of all southern Syria and that of almost all the Ptolemaic positions in Western and Southern Asia Minor.³³ The peace treaty of 195 between the two kingdoms marked the Seleucid victory, since it confirmed the loss of the territories of Syria and Asia Minor to Antiochos III.³⁴

In 197 and in the following years, the Ptolemaic kingdom was on the verge of collapse. One can easily understand how the Ptolemaic *stratēgoi* in southern Asia Minor judged the situation hopeless. As they certainly received no more funding or troops and as they were unable to defend the territories entrusted to them, they preferred to sell some of them to Rhodes, which de facto had already become their real protector. This was at least a way to make a profit, while with a Seleucid take-over these territories would simply have been 'written off from the books'.

To come back to the Rhodians, it can be observed that, when they took control of the regions of southern Asia Minor, they not only had a magistrate in command in Caria and in Lycia, but also one in charge of Caunos. Between 188 and 167, each of the three regions was placed under

29 Huß 2001: 474–86.

30 Veïsse 2004: 3–26.

31 *OGIS* 90 = *SB* V 8299.

32 Huß 2001: 510–13; Veïsse 2004: 9–10.

33 Huß 2001: 487–501.

34 Huß 2001: 500–1

the command of individual *hagemones*, one for Caunos, one for Caria, and one for Lycia.³⁵ However, we know that it was after the acquisition of the territory of Daidala between 197 and 192 (as we saw maybe as early as in 197-196), that they had a ἀγεμῶν ἐπὶ Λυκίας, anticipating the situation that we observe after Apameia. The dedications NS 22 and *I.Lindos* 160, ll.7-8, mention the same ἀγεμῶν ἐπὶ Λυκίας, Hagesandros, the son of Eudamos. Our new restoration of *I.Lindos* 160, ll. 3-4, ἔν τε τῷ | [περὶ τὰ Δαίδαλ]α παρατάξει, ‘in the battle near Daidala’, proved that as *hagemōn epi Lykias* Hagesandros had been directly involved in the events told by Livy (37.22.3) of the operations of the Rhodian fleet under Pamphilidas: *oppugnantibus regiis Dedala et quaedam alia Peraeae castella obsidione emerunt*, ‘they relieved the blockade of Daidala and several other fortresses of the Peraea which were besieged by the king’s troops’.³⁶ Thus, it is clear that there existed a Rhodian *hagemōn epi Lykias* at Daidala, in Lycia, already before the Antiochic War.

It is, therefore, logical to think that it was also in or after 197 (in any case before the outbreak of the Antiochic War in 192) – and having already acquired Caunos – that the Rhodians established the distinction between the three *hagemones*, one being in charge of Lycia (the territory of Daidala), the other of Caunos, and the third of Caria (at that time this must have corresponded to the territory of Stratonikeia). But this tripartite division raises a question. One must ask whether this command structure could not have dated back to the period of the Ptolemies, who might also have made use of provincial commands (at that time entrusted to *stratēgoi*), consisting of, from west to east, Caria, Caunos along with its expanded territory (with Kalynda), and Lycia.³⁷

35 See *IG XII.1* 49 (Syll.³ 619), ll. 59-64: 59: ἀγεμῶν ἐπὶ Καύνου, 61: ἀγεμῶν ἐπὶ Καρίας, 63: ἀγεμῶν ἐπὶ Λυκίας (on the chronology of the inscription, see Kontorini 1989: 39-40, who dates the text c. 185). For more details, cf. Bresson 1999: 125 n. 97.

36 On these questions, see detailed demonstration and parallels in Bresson 1999: 109-110, with notes pp. 124-26 and *SEG* 49 1068 and 1072. Our new restoration and discussion have been skipped by Wiemer 2002: 264 n. 14, and Magnetto 2008: 161 n. 10, which makes their presentations of the dossier pointless. On the allies of Rhodes, see Gabrielsen 2000: 174-79. Text of Livy: Loeb translation.

37 On the complex relations between Caunos and Kalynda during the Hellenistic period, cf. Bresson 1998: 80-81.

First of all, it should be noted that, for the moment, our epigraphic documentation for Ptolemaic control of Caunos during the third century does not provide information concerning the organization of the region's administration. It consists of an altar in honor of Arsinoe Philadelphos and a dedication to Sarapis and the brotherly gods.³⁸ Without Zenon's dossier of correspondence, we would know nothing of the existence of the *stratēgos* Motes and, beyond that, of the close relations among Caunos, Kalynda and Ptolemaic Egypt under Ptolemy II.³⁹ As for the existence of the Ptolemaic *stratēgoi* for Lycia and Pamphylia, 'the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence'. We should be careful about firmly asserting that these regions were not each led by a Ptolemaic *stratēgos* during the period under consideration, even in the case of Lycia, where the documentation for Ptolemaic power is certainly abundant and detailed, but where the randomness of available sources could conceal the hierarchy's top echelon.

As for Caunos, the city had always occupied a special place in the Carian universe, if Herodotus is to be believed.⁴⁰ Its remote and isolated geographic position from the rest of the Carian world makes it easy to understand this fact. But the city was undoubtedly and fully Carian, as testified beyond Herodotus by a series of inscriptions in the Carian language

38 *I.Kaunos* 54, under Ptolemy Philadelphos, as shown in the text, and 67, rather under Ptolemy IV, respectively. C. Marek notes that the cult of the brotherly gods dates to after 272 (for this cult, see most recently Grabowski 2014, who, before examining the case of the Aegean islands, presents the general lines of its development). The writing of the inscription with broken-bar *alpha* and line-shaped *apices*, is later than that of *I.Kaunos* 54. In addition, the initial dedication to Sarapis and Isis evokes the series of similar documents which are frequently encountered starting with Ptolemy IV, see SEG 39 1234 with the new edition by Meadows 2013. For other aspects of the Ptolemaic presence in Caunos, see the still unpublished dissertation of P. Kossmann.

39 On these relations, see *I.Kaunos, testimonia*: 53–62, nos. 120–38.

40 Herodotus insisted on the specific ethnicity of the Caunians. It is worth noticing that he begins with telling us that c. 544 Harpagos, the Median general in command of Persian forces, 'launched an expedition against the Carians, Caunians and Lycians' (1.171.1); see more broadly 1.171–72 (origins of the dialect and customs of the Caunians in relation to the other Carians) and 176.3 (imitation of Lycian habits); 5.103.2 (the Caunians finally joined the Ionians and the other Carians in their revolt against the Great King after the siege of Sardis).

and by coin series with Carian legends of the Classical period.⁴¹ It had been part of the Carian *koinon* as far as can be reconstructed from the inscriptions of Sekköy during the time of the Hecatomnids.⁴² However, Caria of the third century had a complicated political geography and the situation was no longer the one that prevailed a century earlier. The vicissitudes of Caunos in the early Hellenistic period illustrate particularly well the complex situation in which the cities of Caria were placed.⁴³ Starting in the 260s the interior of the land was in the hands of the Seleucids. Further south, the Rhodians incorporated the Carian Chersonese into their civic territory following the siege of 305-304.⁴⁴ At the turn of the third and second century they were in control of the territories forming the 'Subject Peraea', from Pladasa to Pisye, and they allied with and subjugated the small cities of the Ceramic Gulf, Idyma, Callipolis and Kyllandos.⁴⁵ But when did they put their hands on the territories of this Subject Peraea?

The Rhodians actively participated in the Second Syrian War (260-253) and sided with Antiochos II against Ptolemy II. A dedication from the people of Rhodes to Athena Lindia known from the *Temple Chronicle* of Lindos formally attests to it.⁴⁶ This testimony reinforces those of Polyaeus and Frontinus on the decisive role of the Rhodian fleet operating

41 Inscriptions in Carian language: Adiego 2007: 151-58, 294-302, and 453-57; coinage: Konuk in Adiego 2007: 471-92.

42 Blümel 1990: 29-30, nos. 11 (SEG 40 991; HTC, no. 90), ll. 18-19, and 12 (SEG 40 992; HTC, no. 91), ll. 5-7, cf. *testimonia* in *IKaunos*, pp. 49-50, no. 113. See the commentary by Debord 2003: 118-25, and map p. 123. On these texts, see also now van Bremen 2013 (SEG 63 911).

43 See Meadows 2006: 462-63.

44 Badoud 2011.

45 See Fraser and Bean 1954: 70-78, and HTC, map on pp. 86-87, as well as, for the period of the war against Philip V, the dossier of the Rhodian *stratēgos* Nikagoras IG XII.1 1036 (SGDI 4234); *ILindos* 151; *IPér.Rhod.* 6 = *IRhod.Per.* 81: the *stratēgos* had reconquered the territories of Pisye, Idyma, Kyllandos and defended the Chersonese. Before the Second Macedonian War, these regions were thus already under the control of Rhodes (see Bresson 2003: 182-83).

46 *ILindos* 2, § XXXVII, ll. 98-99, which mentions the dedication of a shield according to an oracular prediction that, after the dedication, ἐσέϊται λύσις τοῦ τόκα ἐνε[στα]κότος ποτὶ Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλάδελφον πολέμο[υ], 'the war that was then taking place against Ptolemy Philadelphos would come to an end'.

alongside Seleucid forces and led by the naval commander Agathostratos in the victory against Ptolemaic forces at Ephesos probably around 258 BCE.⁴⁷ So far, the reasons for the Rhodian participation against Ptolemy II have not been clarified. It has been suggested that the Rhodians wished to maintain a balance between the great powers or that Ptolemy II wanted to force the Rhodians to join the League of Islanders under their control, but H.-U. Wiemer has demonstrated the weakness of these assumptions.⁴⁸ Thus the reasons for the Rhodian intervention have remained enigmatic. The hostility against the Ptolemies seems all the more surprising if one recalls the reciprocal interests of the Rhodians and Ptolemies in commercial matters and the decisive support given by Ptolemy I to the Rhodians during the siege of Demetrius of 305/4.⁴⁹ The Rhodians must have had reasons much more concrete than simply seeking a 'balance between great powers' in order to involve themselves in this conflict.

We must begin thinking about the problem through a parallel in reverse chronological order. After the Peace of Apameia, between 188 and 167, when the Rhodians obtained control over Caria and Lycia, a conflict developed between them and Eumenes II, although the Attalid kingdom had been their ally during the Second Macedonian War and the Antiochic War. Border incidents took place along the frontier between the Rhodian Peraea and Attalid territories.⁵⁰ Similarly, it is legitimate to assume that it was because they conflicted with the Ptolemies over their possessions

47 Polyæn. *Str.* 5.18; Frontin. *Str.* 3.9.10. The literature related to the issues is presented and discussed by Wiemer 2002: 97-101: there is no reason to disassociate the three sources; the *Temple Chronicle* is related to the Second Syrian War, in which the Rhodians participated alongside the Seleucids, and both Polyænus and Frontinus deal with one and the same episode, the battle of Ephesos. On the career of Agathostratos as *trierarch* and then Rhodian *navarch*, see Badoud 2014 (with Badoud & Herbin 2014 for the monument of Agathostratos at Delos).

48 Wiemer 2002: 101-2, against the views respectively of Berthold 1984: 91 and Rostovtzeff 1932: 748-50 (= *Scripta varia*, 247-48).

49 Diod. 20.84.1, 88.9, 94.3, 96.1-2, 98.1, 99.2, 100.1-4.

50 Pol. 27.7.6: μικροῖς δ' ἄνωτερον χρόνοις ἐκ τῶν Λυκιακῶν ἀναξαινομένης τῆς διαφορᾶς ἔκ τινων ἐρυμάτων καὶ χώρας, ἣν συνέβαινε κεῖσθαι μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσχατιᾶς τῆς τῶν Ῥοδίων Περαίας, κακοποιεῖσθαι δὲ συνεχῶς διὰ τῶν ὑπ' Εὐμένει ταττομένων. See Bresson 1999: 109, with literature (it was certainly the region of Daidala, in immediate contact with the Attalid enclave of Telmessos, that was concerned).

in Caria that the Rhodians came into conflict with them during the Second Syrian War.⁵¹

If (which cannot be excluded) the Rhodians had not conquered the region even earlier, following their victorious resistance to Demetrios Poliorcetes in 305–304, we are then faced with two options for the question of the date of the Rhodian acquisition of the Subject Peraea: either the Rhodians took advantage of the void left in the aftermath of the assassination of Seleucos I in autumn 281 and settled in the territories ranging from Pladasa to Pisye around 280–279, just as the Ptolemies were doing similarly elsewhere in Caria and in southern Asia Minor more generally; or they took advantage of the hostilities of the First or Second Syrian War to wrest from the Ptolemies territories under their control and invade what was to become their Subject Peraea. In any case, it is hard to imagine the Rhodians alone initiating a conflict and entering into war with the Ptolemies in order to snatch from them what they had conquered. Whatever the solution retained, the Ptolemaic territories in the Ceramic Gulf came to directly border Rhodian territory, which certainly ended up in the subsequent conflict with Ptolemy II.⁵²

The *neōria* of Akbük, the location of the port of Pladasa, are thus likely to have been built at a time when Rhodian domination of the region had already been established and, therefore, we should not hesitate to restore the name of the people of Rhodes in the dedication ‘to the people’ (the following being unfortunately badly damaged) of the inscription

51 See *HTC*: 165–66, and the question of the division of Pladasa’s territory, some of which certainly went to Keramos. The latter city is very likely to have been under Ptolemaic control or influence like the rest of the northern coast of the Ceramic Gulf west of Pladasa. There is no direct testimony for the presence of Ptolemaic officials or of a Ptolemaic garrison at Keramos, but the inscription *I.Keramos*, 4, intended for the construction of a Sarapeion, which no doubt dates to the third century BCE (see the photograph of the stone in Varinlioğlu 1981: 51–62, no. 1, photo pl. VI.1) would conform well, in this period, with Ptolemaic control. Also a decree of Ouranion, the small city immediately to the west of Keramos, in favour of a Salaminian might also testify to a Ptolemaic presence in this city (Varinlioğlu et al. 1992: 166–67, no. 2, with discussion concerning the Salaminian pp. 173–74).

52 On the Ptolemaic presence in the Ceramic Gulf, see, for Halicarnassus, Isager 2004 and Pedersen 2004. On the penetration of Ptolemaic bronze coins in the region (Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II and, above all, Ptolemy III, but no coins from Ptolemy IV), see Konuk 2004.

HTC, no. 1, l. 2 and 4, which has been dated to the second or third quarter of the third century. It is, in effect, the *plēthos* of the Pisyetans and Pladasians and the members of a series of *koina* who also regularly appear within the Rhodian sphere whom we see mentioned in this text.⁵³ Consequently, we must hold for certain that in the 250s at the latest the Subject Peraea was already under Rhodian control.



Figure 1: Hellenistic Caria and Lycia and Ptolemaic administration in the 260s-250s BCE (O. Henry & A. Bresson)

NB. The map only aims at showing the regions controlled by the main powers of the time and perfect accuracy would be illusory. For western Caria, it illustrates the approximate delimitation of the regions under Ptolemaic control or influence in the 260s-250s (the zone under Ptolemaic control shrank in the course of the century). For Lycia, it is here supposed that the upper Xanthos valley was also under Ptolemaic control. The detail of the border delineation of Seleucid territories south and east of Tabai is especially uncertain. The date of incorporation of the islands of Nisyros and Telos to Rhodian territory is not yet clarified.

With a continuous barrier formed by the Subject Peraea, i.e. the cities under Rhodian domination from the bottom of the Ceramic Gulf and the

⁵³ This restoration, suggested to us by Riet van Bremen, had been cautiously anticipated in HTC: 102. It now seems obvious to us.

Chersonese, as well as further north the territories of inland Caria lost to the Seleucids in the 270s or 260s, Ptolemaic Caunos was cut off from the Ptolemaic territories of western Caria (see map fig. 1). For the Ptolemies there was territorial continuity between Caunos and Lycia (by Daidala and Telmessos), but not between Caunos and western Caria. It is very likely that the Ptolemies tried to unite or re-unite the two parts of their Carian domains, hence the conflict with Rhodes. As they failed in their attempt, the territories of the Subject Peraea remained under Rhodian control and the separation between Caunos and western Caria became permanent.

In the same vein, it should be noted that, at least in the current state of our sources, there is no indication that the Caunians were part of the Chrysaorian *koinon*, centred on Stratonikeia, in western Caria, but whose existence (and perhaps creation?), dated back to the time of the occupation of Caria by Ptolemy II.⁵⁴ All the Carian cities which we are certain belonged to the Chrysaorian *koinon* are to be found in western or central Caria. These are Mylasa, Stratonikeia, Amyzon, Alabanda/Antiocheia, Alinda, Thera and Keramos. To this list V. Gabrielsen suggests possibly adding Tabai and Pisye, which does not modify the observation on the origins of the participating cities.⁵⁵ In this regard, the difference from the Carian *koinon* of the fourth century, of which, as we have seen, Caunos was a member, is significant.⁵⁶ That is why, even if (at least for the moment) our sources do not directly point to the existence of a Lycian *stratēgos*, the concept of a unified command over Caria and Lycia, as in the time of Mausolus (which would thus explain the absence of a Lycian *stratēgos* in our sources), is difficult to accept. Likewise, the territorial separation between Caunos and the rest of Ptolemaic Caria invites us to

54 On the Chrysaorians, see Debord 2003: 125–43, with map on p. 142, and Gabrielsen 2011. The question of the political orientation of the *koinon*, if indeed there was any, has not to be discussed here.

55 Gabrielsen 2011: 337–38 and 341. There were several Tabai in western Asia Minor, but everything points to the existence of a Tabai in the Subject Peraea, close to Thera and Pisye; see detailed discussion in *HTC*, pp. 182–88. Besides, V. Gabrielsen considers that the *koinon* of the Chrysaorians had all the characteristics of a true federal state. See however P. Hamon, *Bull. ép.* 2012: 381.

56 See above n. 44.

think that the Ptolemaic *stratēgos* of Caria could not have had Caunos under his charge. This justifies the existence of a separate *stratēgos* for Caunos.

Despite its specificities, Caunos was undoubtedly Carian, as well as (in this period) as its eastern neighbours Kalynda, Krya, and Lissa/Lissai.⁵⁷ It was also itself a considerable city (together Stratonikeia and Caunos paid yearly 120 talents to the Rhodians), and it could not be assimilated to Lycia.⁵⁸ If Polybius does not detail the case of Daidala, it is because the small importance of this position did not justify a separate treatment given that its fate was implicitly tied to that of the great city of Caunos slightly to the west. The purchase of 'Caunos', therefore, must be understood as not simply the city itself but its surroundings, including on the one hand its dependencies Kalynda and the other minor cities of the west coast of the gulf of Telmessos, and on the other the small contiguous Lycian territory of Daidala, which by the time marked the border with Carian territories.⁵⁹ The reference made by Polybius to the '*stratēgoi* of Ptolemy' suggests that Polybius was implying the Ptolemaic *stratēgos* of Lycia, who by then held only Daidala and the surrounding territory (all that was left to the Ptolemies of their former Lycian possessions) and that of Caunos.

Concluding Remarks

To conclude, from the fact that the Rhodians had three separate commands for Caria, Caunos and Lycia, we may deduce that the three Ptolemaic 'provinces' of Caria, Caunos and Lycia were also each placed under the orders of its own *stratēgos*. Motes was thus certainly the Ptolemaic *stratēgos* of Caunos, which constituted a separate regional command from

57 For the Carian character of Krya in the late Classical period, see the Caunian-Carian inscription of Krya Adiego 2007: 158–59, no. 15 Krya (C.Kr.), with Schürr 2013.

58 Polyb. 30.31.7.

59 On the dependence of Lissa towards Caunos, see also *IKaunos* 183, l. 1, a late Hellenistic or early Imperial dedication from Lissai (see photo and detailed commentary in Tietz 2003) by a man who defines himself as [οἰκῶν ἐν] Λίσσαις τῆς Καυνίας.

the time of the Ptolemies, and not of Caria (as previously suggested) or Lycia.

SPECIAL ABBREVIATIONS

HTC = Debord, P. & E. Varinlioğlu (eds.) 2001. *Les hautes terres de Carie*. Bordeaux.

PP = Peremans, W. & E. Van't Dack (et alii) 1950–2002. *Prosopographia Ptolemaica*. 10 vols. Leuven.

NS = Maiuri, A. 1922. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Florence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adiego, I.J. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden & Boston.

Badoud, N. 2011. 'L'intégration de la Pérée au territoire de Rhodes' in N. Badoud (ed.) *Philologos Dionysios. Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler*. Geneva, 533–66.

Badoud, N. 2014. 'Rhodes et les Cyclades à l'époque hellénistique' in Bonnin and Le Quéré 2014, 115–29.

Badoud, N., & F. Herbin. 2014. 'Le monument d'Agathostratos de Rhodes à Délos' in Bonnin & Le Quéré 2014, 183–88.

Badoud, N. 2015. *Le temps de Rhodes*. Munich.

Bagnall, R.S. 1976. *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*. Leiden.

Bengtson, H. 1937–1952. *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit*, 3 vols. Munich.

Berthold, R.M. 1984. *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age*. Ithaca and London.

Blümel, W. 1990. 'Zwei neue Inschriften aus Mylasa aus der Zeit des Maussollos' *EA* 16, 29–42.

Blümel, W. 1992. 'Brief des ptolemäischen Ministers Tlepolemos an die Stadt Kildara in Karien' *EA* 20, 127–33.

Bonnin, G. & E. Le Quéré (eds.) 2014. *Pouvoirs, îles et mer. Formes et modalités de l'hégémonie dans les Cyclades antiques (VIIe s. a.C.-IIIe s. p.C.)*. Bordeaux.

Bresson, A. 1998. 'Rhodes, Cnide et les Lyciens au début du IIe siècle av. J.-C.' *REA* 100, 65–88.

- Bresson, A. 1999. 'Rhodes and Lycia in Hellenistic Times' in V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad & J. Zahle (eds.) *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture and Society*. Aarhus, 9-131.
- Bresson, A. 2003. 'Les intérêts rhodiens en Carie à l'époque hellénistique jusqu'en 167 a.C.' in F. Prost (ed.) *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée. Cités et royaumes à l'époque hellénistique* (= Pallas 62). Rennes, 169-92.
- Bresson, A. forthcoming. 'Xystis, Ptolemaic Caria, and the War against Antiochos I'.
- Bresson, A., R. Descat & E. Varinlioglu 2021. 'Décret des Mogôreis pour le stratège ptolémaïque Moschiôn de Théra' in P. Brun, L. Capdetrey & P. Fröhlich (eds.) *L'Asie Mineure occidentale au IIIe siècle a.C.* Bordeaux, 141-71.
- Cousin, G. & C. Diehl 1890. 'Inscriptions d'Halicarnasse' *BCH* 14, 90-121.
- Crampa, J. 1969. *Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches*. Vol. III. Part 1: *The Greek Inscriptions*. Lund.
- Crowther, C. 1995a. 'Iasos in the Second Century BC III: Foreign Judges from Priene' *BICS* 40, 91-138.
- Crowther, C. 1995b. 'The Chronology of the Iasian Theatre Lists: Again' *Chiron* 25, 225-34.
- Debord, P. 2003. 'Cité grecque – village carien. Des usages du mot "koinon"' *Studi Ellenistici* 15, 115-80.
- Dmitriev, S. 2010. 'The Rhodian Loss of Caunus and Stratoniceia in the 160s' *HSCP* 105, 157-76.
- Domingo Gygax, M. 2000. 'Ptolemaios, Bruder des Königs Ptolemaios III. Euergetes, und Mylasa: Bemerkungen zu I. Labraunda Nr. 3' *Chiron* 30, 353-66.
- Errington, R.M. 1989. 'The Peace Treaty between Miletus and Magnesia (I. Milet 148)' *Chiron* 19, 279-88.
- Fraser, P. & G. Bean. 1954. *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands*. Oxford.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2000. 'The Rhodian Peraia in the Third and Second Centuries B.C.' *C&M* 51, 129-83.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2011. 'The Chrysaoreis of Caria' in L. Karlsson & S. Carlsson (eds.) *Labraunda and Caria*. Uppsala, 331-53.
- Grabowski, T. 2014. 'The Cult of the Ptolemies in the Aegean in the 3rd Century BC' *Electrum* 21, 21-41.

- Habicht, C. 1972. Review of Crampa 1969, *Gnomon* 44, 162-70.
- Habicht, C. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- Habicht, C. 2005. 'Datum und Umstände der rhodischen Schlichtung zwischen Samos und Priene' *Chiron* 35, 137-46.
- Hallof, K. & C. Mileta 1997. 'Samos und Ptolemaios III. Ein neues Fragment zu dem samischen Volksbeschuß AM 72, 1957, 226 Nr. 59' *Chiron* 27, 255-85.
- Huß, W. 2001. *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332-30 v. Chr.* Munich.
- Huß, W. 2011. *Die Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Reichs*. Munich.
- Isager, S. 2004. 'Halikarnassos and the Ptolemies I: Inscriptions on Public Buildings' in Isager & Pedersen 2004, 133-44.
- Isager, S. & P. Pedersen (eds.) 2004. *The Salmakis Inscription and Hellenistic Halikarnassos*. Odense.
- Kontorini, V. 1989. *Ανέκδοτες επιγραφές Ρόδου*. II. Athens.
- Konuk, K. 2004. 'The Ptolemaic Coins in the Bodrum Underwater Archaeology Museum' in Isager & Pedersen 2004, 167-75.
- Magnetto, A. 2008. *L'arbitrato di Rodi fra Samo e Priene*. Pisa.
- Magnetto, A. 2009. 'La querelle territoriale entre Samos et Priène: propositions pour un débat' *Topoi* 16, 7-17.
- Marek, C. 1982. 'Ein ptolemäischer Strategos in Karien' *Chiron* 12, 119-23.
- Meadows, A.R. 2006. 'The Ptolemaic Annexation of Lycia: SEG 27.929' in K. Dörflük (ed.) *The Third International Symposium on Lycia 07-10 November 2005 Antalya*. Antalya, vol. II, 459-70.
- Meadows, A.R. 2012. 'Deditio in Fidem: The Ptolemaic Conquest of Asia Minor' in C. Smith & L.M. Yarrow (eds.) *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius (Papers in Memory of Peter Derow)*. Oxford, 113-33.
- Meadows, A.R. 2013. 'Two "Double" Dedications at Ephesus and the Beginning of Ptolemaic Control of Ionia' *Gephyra* 10, 1-12.
- Meadows, A.R. & P. Thonemann 2013. 'The Ptolemaic Administration of Pamphylia' *ZPE* 186, 223-26.
- Orrieux, C. 1983. *Les papyrus de Zénon. L'horizon d'un Grec en Égypte au IIIe siècle avant J.-C.* Paris.
- Pedersen, P. 2004. 'Halikarnassos and the Ptolemies II: The Architecture of Hellenistic Halikarnassos' in Isager & Pedersen 2004, 145-64.
- Robert, J. & L. Robert 1983. *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie*. Paris.

- Robert, L. 1966. *Documents de l'Asie mineure méridionale: inscriptions, monnaies et géographie*. Geneva.
- Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1932. 'Foreign Commerce of Ptolemaic Egypt' *The Journal of Economic and Business History* 4, 728-69 (= *Scripta varia*, ed. by A. Marcone. Bari 1995, 231-63).
- Rousset, D. 2024. 'La communauté des Mogôreis, la forteresse des Xystioi et Moschiôn, stratégie ptolémaïque en Carie vers 275 av. J.-C.' *JS*, 17-46.
- Schürr, D. 2013. 'Kaunisch-Karisches in Krya: Revision der Grabinschrift und Vergleiche' in O. Henry (ed.) *4th Century Caria. Defining a Carian identity under the Hekatomnids*. Istanbul, 21-31.
- Thornton, J. 2013. 'Polybius in Context: The Political Dimension of the Histories' in B. Gibson & T. Harrison (eds.) *Polybius and his World: Essays in Memory of F.W. Walbank*. Oxford, 213-29.
- Tietz, W. 2003. 'Lissai und Kaunos – eine neue Grabinschrift aus dem lykisch-karischen Grenzgebiet' *EA* 36, 121-26.
- Van Bremen, R. 2013. 'A Property Transaction between Kindye and Mylasa. *I.Mylasa* 11 Reconsidered' *EA* 46, 1-26.
- Van Bremen, R. 2017. 'Labraunda and the Ptolemies: a Reinterpretation of Three Documents from the Sanctuary of Zeus (*I.Labraunda* 51, 45 and 44)' *Studi Ellenistici* 31, 223-59.
- Varinlioğlu, E., A. Bresson, P. Brun, P. Debord & R. Descat. 1992. 'Ouranion en Carie' *REA* 94, 155-74.
- Varinlioğlu, E. 1981. 'Two Inscriptions from Ceramus' *ZPE* 44, 51-66.
- Veisse, A.-E. 2004. *Les 'révoltes égyptiennes': recherches sur les troubles intérieurs en Égypte du règne de Ptolémée III à la conquête romaine*. Leuven.
- Walbank, F.W. 1957-1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Wiemer, H.-U. 2002. *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos*. Berlin.
- Wörle, M. 2004. 'Der Friede zwischen Milet und Magnesia. Methodische Probleme einer Communis opinio' *Chiron* 34, 45-57.