4 *Terra cognita sed vacua?*
(Re-)appropriating territory through Hellenistic city foundations

Alex McAuley

Rupture. Invasion. Colonisation. Imperialism. Transformation. Such are the terms in which the Hellenistic landscape is usually described in the regions conquered by Alexander and his successors. The idea in this, as in so many other aspects of Hellenistic history, is that nothing was the same after the conquest of these regions as before; once 'the vessel is broken and the long-secreted elixir poured out for the nations', as Bevan described the spread of 'Hellenism' in 1902, it could not be put back in the bottle.[1] To Bevan, as to many other historians before and after him, the 'Hellenism' which was cast over the Hellenistic landscape with such lasting effect was fundamentally urban in character.[2] The curious anomaly of the Greek *polis*, the unitary city-state, was the crucible in which the abstractions of Greek civic society, philosophy, literature and political theory were created, and this alloy was poured on to the 'foreign' lands now occupied by the Macedonians. Particularly in the Seleucid context, this spread of Hellenism was accomplished and enabled by the network of cities founded by the dynasty's first kings throughout the territories they had conquered. And in the traditional analytical framework of the period this was precisely their intent: the 'fixed policy of the kings' was to establish these Hellenic communities as a means of securing their military control of a given region, and introduce a civilising element over the local 'natives and half-breeds'.[3]

The language and prejudices have softened somewhat since the days of Bevan, but in a sense his overarching conclusions remain the same: we find the same perception of discontinuity and artificial re-appropriation he describes ('Syria' became a 'new Macedonia') in how Grainger concluded in 1990 that the actions of Seleucus I in Syria were 'effectively revolutionary, and irrevocably wrenched the developing Syro-Greek relationship in an entirely new direction'.[4] His actions, along with those of his son in this corner of the empire as elsewhere, were the foundation of dozens of colonies of Greek settlers which began as military establishments and subsequently blossomed into full-fledged *poleis* displaying, according to Walbank in 1981, a distinct cultural homogeneity with the Greek cities of the Mainland.[5] What Sherwin-White and Kuhrt discuss under the heading of 'colonialism and imperialism' was fundamentally driven by the kings themselves, who in the process transformed imperial space into a Seleucid imperial place.[6]

As Paul Kosmin has described, it is precisely this 'recoding of the regional landscape' that lies at the heart of the ideology behind Seleucid city foundations, and in a similar way to those of their Ptolemaic and Antigonid cousins as well. It was by (re-)urbanising the landscape, re-organising it into something new and different that the Seleucids re-appropriated it and fashioned it as their own.[7] 'The establishment of Seleucid colonies,' he writes, 'to a greater or a lesser extent depending on situation, deterritorialized and then reterritorialized the regional and local landscapes of the empire, like the pieces of a shaken kaleidoscope settling into a new order'.[8] This begins with the cities themselves as the nuclei of such a programme, in turn 'radiating out their influences and recognising their hinterlands' through the rationalisation of agricultural space, re-distribution of lands and construction of irrigation channels, all at the behest of the king.[9] It was through this wide-ranging effort that the Seleucid kings fostered and shaped what David Engels has identified as the 'new imperial *koine*', one which was not as exclusively Graeco-Macedonian as earlier commentators had thought but rather a new amalgam of traditions.[10] What could simply have been the plunder leftover from Alexander's campaigns was appropriated, organised and forged into an empire by this policy of the Seleucid kings.[11]

In the context of a volume such as this on the dynamics of plunder and appropriation in antiquity perhaps some measure of nuance can be added to our understanding of how this process played out in the world being re-appropriated by Seleucus and his progeny. Such patterns as discussed above are perceived with a bird's-eye view of the empire as a whole, enabled by the gift of hindsight as well as the broad-angle lens of immense chronological and spatial scope. In such a top-down perspective, it is clear that this emergent urban network can be seen as an imperial policy of re-appropriation conceived at the highest echelon of Seleucid society which then trickles down through the channels of administration and bureaucracy to the local level of the empire.[12] My intention with this chapter is not to argue against any of the conclusions of Engels, Strootman, Kosmin or Grainger, but rather to add a slightly different perspective by considering how this process of territorial appropriation takes on a slightly different hue at the local level. What may appear to be a purely imperial policy when seen from above is marked by rather more give and take when seen from below; a landscape that seems to have been reimagined almost *ex nihilo* seems rather to be more the sum of its constituent parts than a totally new fabrication. Such, I argue, is markedly the case with the foundation of Antioch-on-the-Orontes, which provides us with an ideal case study of an 'imperial' Seleucid foundation, and to consider the diversity of landscapes being re-appropriated we shall later turn our sights to another Hellenistic city, the enigmatic Hanisa in Cappadocia. The process of re-appropriation of territory in this Hellenistic urban world is not quite as simple as old versus new, or Greek versus not Greek, but instead represents a delicate blend of tradition and innovation characteristic of the Seleucid Empire as a whole, and the Hellenistic world more generally.

62   *Alex McAuley*

Tabula rasa? Appropriating the landscape of Antioch

Antioch on the Orontes is generally held to be an example *par excellence* of the ideological programme behind Seleucid city foundations, but in the broader context of our discussion of precisely how the Hellenistic landscape was re-appropriated it provides an illustrative case study because it adds some nuance to a situation that otherwise seems to be a clear-cut case of top-down royal city foundation.[13] When Seleucus I acquired Syria as the spoils of his victory over Antigonus at Ipsus, he assumed control over a region that was rife with economic and strategic potential, but that still bore the scars of four centuries' worth of conquest. With their urban centres having been all but destroyed in various conflicts, the native Syrian population, according to the studies of Grainger and Leriche, resided predominantly in small settlements on the coast and encroaching inland, subsisting primarily on agriculture and trade with the Greek merchants who had long been familiar with the region.[14] Archaeological remains testify to the presence of Greek trading posts at Tell Sukas and Ras al-Basit on the coast (both destroyed after the Persian Wars), as well as at the port of al Mina and the nearby town Sabouni, which survived into the Hellenistic period albeit with a small population.[15] Until the arrival of Alexander in 332 BC there was neither a substantial nor a permanent Greek population in the area that would become Antioch. It was *terra cognita* to the Greeks, decidedly on the margins of the Greek world, but also *terra vacua*, if not *deserta*, given the lack of persistent or large-scale Greek settlement, and the absence of major urban centres. As a nexus of communication for Alexander's empire and a conduit for reinforcements being sent to the East, the region had a transient Greek presence but no significant centres of settlement until the foundation of Antigoneia-on-the-Orontes by Antigonus Monophthalmos in 307 BC.[16]

The early organisation of this region by the Antigonids merits review, as it makes the subsequent foundations of the victorious Seleucus represent less of a paradigm shift and more the continuation of a process that was already well under way by the time of his conquest of Syria. While Demetrius Poliorcetes was campaigning in Cyprus, Diodorus (20.47.5) relates somewhat derisively that 'Antigonus was wasting time in upper Syria by founding a city near the Orontes river which he named Antigoneia after himself,' and in a classic instance of *imitatio Alexandri* he marked out a lavish city with a seventy-stade perimeter that was meant to be a local bulwark from which he could keep an eye on Babylon and the Upper Satrapies, as well as lower Syria heading towards Egypt.[17] But Antigoneia was not an isolated foundation as, according to the suggestion of H. Seyrig the king also founded the city of Alexandreia by Issos as the port city to his new city at roughly the same time.[18] Antigonus was the first to mark out the local landscape as a means of solidifying his power with a fortified city and dedicated port, and his demarcation of the perimeter of the city, beyond simply evoking Alexander's foundation of Alexandria, seems to have been aimed at transforming *doriktetos chora* into

his own well-organised *basilike chora*. [19] A local message was of course meant to be sent with this foundation, but Antigonus also sought to put this new city of his on the Panhellenic map by organising lavish civic games and an equally lavish festival. Somewhat later in Book 20 Diodorus relates that Antigonus spared no expense in expressing his wealth: he had gathered together the most famous and celebrated athletes and artists to compete for glory, renown and extravagant prizes and purses provided by the king. Unfortunately Lysimachus' advance put a spanner in the works and forced Antigonus' attention elsewhere, though the king nevertheless distributed two hundred talents to the athletes and artists who would have taken part in this celebration.[20] In the foundation of Antigoneia we find the origins of the mechanism that would later be used on such a massive scale by Seleucus: the victorious king transforms plunder into possession by organising the landscape with an eponymous city, and then this grandiose act is communicated to a much broader audience through typically Hellenic means of competition. Both, in turn, were following in the footsteps of Alexander.

But Antigoneia was the only such local project undertaken by Antigonus before Seleucus: in addition to this city named after himself, we find echoes of an early attempt to transform this region of Syria into something of a new or mini Macedon through creative toponyms. According to Strabo the city that would later be founded as Apameia by Seleucus I was the site of a village called Pharnake, but was also at one time called Pella by the Macedonians as a tribute to the birthplace and home of Philip II.[21] Given the other foundations occurring nearby at the hands of Antigonus, it seems likely that he was responsible for this city as well.[22] It is clear that on an ideological programme these city foundations with such evocative toponyms sought to re-appropriate an otherwise foreign landscape by grafting familiar place names into a new milieu, thereby transforming into something more familiar, and thereby one in which the Macedonians belonged. Two observations ought to be borne in mind as we reconstruct this longer history of appropriation: first, the insight of Seyrig that Seleucus would have had a rather limited choice of locations for his new cities given the local political context created by Antigonus; and second, the observation of Laurent Capdetrey that his choice would also have been guided by the fairly advanced state of Macedonian colonisation in the region by the time Seleucus arrived in Syria, 'ce qui priverait l'entreprise séleucide d'une partie de son originalité'.[23] This previous 'empty' landscape, in other words, had already become quite full by the time it fell into Seleucus' hands. He was not working with a *tabula rasa* so much as an unfinished canvas.[24]

By all accounts Seleucus was aware of this fact, and accordingly had to outdo his predecessor in both concrete and symbolic terms. The ideology and mechanisms underlying the massive phase of foundation that ensued in Syria and elsewhere in the empire have been discussed by Cohen, Grainger, Sherwin-White & Kuhrt, and most recently Kosmin, and need not be repeated here save for two salient points.[25] First, the *raison d'être* of each of these foundations was to be a bastion of Hellenicity in the midst of newly conquered territory, thus the cultivation of a Greek civic body served political as

much as cultural ends. If these foundations did not stand out against the local landscape, in a sense they failed to serve their purpose.[26] Second, it must be stressed that although Syria was doubtless a significant possession, it was neither the sole focus of Seleucus' attention nor the exclusive base of his power. Many scholars have been all too willing to retroject Antioch's primacy in the later Seleucid empire to the time of its foundation, but even among the cities of the Tetrapolis it was not intended for pre-eminence.[27] Instead, Seleucia-in-Pieria, poised at the mouth of the Orontes River and bearing the king's own name, was clearly meant to be first among the cities of Seleucid Syria.[28] Neither should we presume that Seleucus was trying to craft the landscape into a new capital of Seleucid power. Capdetrey and Engels have demonstrated convincingly that the king's interest was rather focused on the East, and that Seleucia on the Tigris is the most likely candidate for what we can tentatively call the Seleucid capital.[29]

Antioch, for its part, served a more propagandistic purpose: to erase the last vestiges of Antigonus' claims to the region. Libanius and Malalas tell us that Seleucus destroyed his rival's eponymous city, and transferred its populace and materials only a short distance to a new foundation named after his father.[30] Despite this widely reported gesture, we should note that Antigoneia did not completely cease to exist, either in the short or the long term, as Cassius Dio records that in 51 BC the city was harassed by the Parthians during Cassius' campaign against them, so there was still some form of city extant for nearly three centuries.[31] There is, as ever, a disconnect between how such events are recorded at the level of the court, and how they played out on the ground. At any rate, whatever remained of Antigoneia would have been overshadowed by the emerging structure of the Tetrapolis, the geographical monument to the unity of the still-fledgling royal family that Seleucus carved into the landscape with the chisel of these city foundations: four cities, place four critical locations in Syria, individually named after a member of the royal family, but collectively the four sisters, as Strabo terms them, were the gatekeepers of access to the Seleucid East. To the south on the coast, Laodikeia, named after his mother Laodike, oriented towards the maritime approach from Cyprus and Coele Syria; east of it, Apameia, in honour of his wife Apama, on the banks of the Orontes at a crossroads of East and West trading routes, defended the land approach from Coele Syria and Palestine; to the north, Antioch, a double tribute to his father, Antiochus, as well as to his son of the same name, his chosen successor, was again at the crossroads of the Silk Road and the Royal road heading to the eastern interior; on the coast, Seleucia, the city named after the king himself, a prominent harbour and naval base from which power could be projected into the interior.[32] Each of these cities could not provide an impenetrable defence on their own, but as a collective unit they were a formidable and impressive force. The message was clear: the royal family, like the Tetrapolis, stood unified in the protection of their realm from whatever may seek to beset it.

It is easy simply to stop there and descend into panegyric at the awesome power of this king which extended even into the control of the very landscape of his kingdom. The physical layout of the city would seem at first glance to support this, as it follows the typically impressive Seleucid pattern. It was built on more or less unoccupied land and organised according to the Hippodamian plan, something which does not conform naturally to the landscape around it. This was exactly the point: as Paul Kosmin notes, this and other Seleucid cities were placed quite literally in the way of existing routes, so their impact on the local region and its flow of people and materials could not be missed.[33] But there is rather more at work with the appropriation of the city's landscape and its people than may appear at first glance, and on careful inspection the creation of the city cannot simply be understood as the imposition of the king's will on a compliant canvas.[34] Cities such as Antioch could not be created out of nothing, and even the fearsome power of the Hellenistic kings could not compel people to come to these new foundations without any sense of themselves or their previous history.[35] Settling in such a city entailed the beginning of complex dialogue rather than the end of the discussion. In the case of Antioch, the city's early populace was comprised of two very different groups: the recently displaced populace of Antigoneia, itself made up of a mix of Athenians and Macedonians, and veterans of Seleucus' army who were also Macedonians.[36] This initial group, along with the later settlement of Aetolians, Euboeans and Cretans in the city by Antiochus III roughly a century later, represent the only recorded instances of major migration to Antioch.[37] In the intervening years, the population can be presumed only to have grown by a trickle as migrants arrived or soldiers retired. Yet Antioch is unique in the Tetrapolis for having something akin to a ready-made civic body, one imbued with both the traditions of their Athenian and Macedonian roots, as well as the nascent civic traditions that were being cultivated in Antigoneia. Both of these would soon find themselves expressed in the nascent mythical traditions of the Antiochenes.

Plunder to property? Populating the landscape of Antioch

The mythical tradition of Antioch is among the most robust that survives from Hellenistic foundations, rivalled perhaps only by Alexandria. Preserved primarily in Libanius (11.74–87), John Malalas (8.15) and Strabo (16.2), with small incongruities aside the general body of myths is fairly consistent across all three sources. Even though, as at Alexandria, the myths doubtless became more elaborate and ornate over time, I argue that the fundamental core of the narrative must have emerged shortly after the city's foundation. It is not so much in the fiction of the tradition itself but in the manner and motive of its composition that its value for understanding the dynamics of territorial re-appropriation lies. It was through this myth that the gift of *kleros* given by Seleucus I to each new citizen of Antioch seemed less like an intrusive policy decision by a self-aggrandising king, and more like the fulfilment of destiny.[38]

The peculiarities of the mythical tradition as a whole, rather than simply discrepancies between specific accounts, divulge the presence of different groups at work. There are two broad categories of myth surrounding the city that are often treated in isolation but seldom synthesised: first, the 'royal' tradition of the city's foundation by Seleucus as heroic *ktistes* set in the Hellenistic period; and second, the more pluralistic body of 'ethnic' myths set in the archaic past that relate how various *ethne* arrived in the region that would become Antioch.[39]

The royal tradition recorded in Libanius and Malalas casts Seleucus I as a mythical hero endowed with the sanction of the gods, and in short the myth goes as follows. After Ipsus, the victorious Seleucus travelled to what would be Antioch and sacrificed to Zeus at a shrine established by Alexander on Mt Silpius. An eagle then miraculously swooped down, picked up the sacrificial meat in its talons, and flew some distance away before dropping it. Seleucus quickly recognised this as a divine call for the foundation of a city, and there founded Antioch. Shortly thereafter, when he was out hunting on the Amuk plain, the king's horse uncovered an arrow buried in the ground with its hoof which had Apollo inscribed on it. Nicator again realised this auspicious import, and founded the Temple of Apollo at Daphne on the spot. Ogden, Buraselis and most recently Dumitru have eloquently elucidated the importance of the Alexander connection in Antioch's foundation myth, as well as the political and religious valence of Zeus' intervention in the sacrifice as conferring a sense of divine favour and inevitability to the city's establishment.[40] The idea that Alexander originally wanted to found the city and Seleucus' realisation of his unfinished agenda served not only to legitimise himself as the heir of Alexander's legacy, but also elevated his foundations over those of his rivals (namely Antigonus).[41] Divine guidance for the location of the city further underscores that its existence was predestined.[42] As much as divine favour plays a part in this, without the figure of the king there would be no Antioch; the city, from the very moment of its foundation, is dependent on the monarchy. The presence of Apollo and Zeus in this myth in turn play to the most prominent deities in the Seleucid royal cult, and Apollo's favour in particular further reinforces the alleged mythical descent of Seleucus I from the god.[43] The territorial dynamic merits note as well: the gods put the clues of the future city's destiny in the landscape itself, and these are then recognised or literally unearthed by the king who is destined to rule over them.

The entire tradition, of course, exudes royal interference and artful manipulation, but when we compare this myth to those of the other cities of the Syrian Tetrapolis, we can begin to see a broader strategy at work and a more general pattern that hints at the date and mechanism of the myth's composition. Using the similar research of Buraselis and Ogden, it is safe to conclude that all four cities in the Tetrapolis have essentially the same generic foundation myth which can be recounted generically: the King arrives as *ktistes*, sacrifices in the region, some sort of divine portent marks out the location of the city, and the design of the gods is fulfilled with the city's foundation. All that changes in each city are the precise variables: in Seleucia the portent is thunder, at Antioch, an eagle, but the process is the same in the end, as is the endpoint. A bit of extrapolation

allows us to hazard a date for the emergence of this tradition. The presence of the same myth in all four cities of the Tetrapolis, along with the appearance of Seleucia-in-Pieria's foundation myth in Appian, allows the entire tetrapolitan tradition to be dated roughly to the Hellenistic period – it could not simply have been a much later elaboration by Libanius.[44] Bearing in mind that Nicator founded each of these cities at the same time, and that there is little or no mention of his son or later Seleucids in these myths, as well as the fact that Seleucus would have had a pressing need to re-write the local mythical history of these new foundations in order to give them a sense of tradition and belonging, it would seem that Capdetrey was correct in suggesting that these myths are part of a semi-official tradition ordered by the king shortly after having founded these cities, perhaps around 290 BC.[45] Even with such an early Hellenistic provenance, this foundation myth endured in the region over a great span of time and with remarkable consistency: a Roman mosaic dating to the fourth century AD was unearthed at nearby Apameia in October 2011 showing the foundation of the city is remarkably faithful to the literary tradition. It shows the sacrifice made by Seleucus to Zeus on the slopes of Mt Silpius, this time accompanied by his son Antiochus and Heracles, just at the moment when the mythical eagle has swept down to take the burnt offering. The fact that this scene survived in the region over the course of six centuries indicates the depth to which it was embedded in the regional landscape. Unfortunately the mosaic itself was stolen by traffickers of illegal antiquities and a search by Interpol continues.[46] At any rate, the myth of the city's royal foundation was not relegated to the literary tradition alone.

If the royal mythical tradition was the work of Seleucus, then it follows logically that the 'ethnic' myths relating to the city and landscape must have been the work of the Antiochenes themselves.[47] As a whole the body of ethnic myths is fairly unusual: unlike in other cities where the mythical tradition is modified to unify otherwise disparate ethnic groups, Antioch is unique in that each ethnic tradition remains distinct and in some ways separate. Also worth noting is the setting of these myths in the distant mythical past: they serve to populate the landscape and make it at once familiar and Hellenic, further re-appropriating the region and laying the foundation for an old Greek claim to it that is not contingent on the Seleucid king, or any king, for that matter. The myths themselves relate the arrival of several different groups into what would become Antioch. In the distant past five distinct groups, each with their own hero, came to the slopes of nearby Mt Silpius. Inachus, father of Io, sent a group of Argives under Triptolemus to search for his daughter, who after searching everywhere arrived in the Amuk plain and were so enchanted with the locale that they decided to remain and found a city.[48] Next, the heroic Kasos, guided by divine providence, set out to Mt Silipius with the noblest of the Cretans, where he was gladly received by Argives and settled on the mount in a new settlement named Kasiotis.[49] Later, he married Amyke, daughter of the king of Cyprus, who arrived with some of her countrymen and gave her name to the plain surrounding the city.[50] This last detail involving Amyke is fascinating, as it in essence creates a Greek teleological myth

68   *Alex McAuley*

for a non-Greek toponym. Finally, a group of Heracleidae and Eleans, driven into exile by Eurysthes, wandered through Europe and Asia in search of a home, and eventually settled near what would become Daphne.[51]

At first glance this mythical tradition and the 'historical' record are at odds with one another to the point of being irreconcilable: if our literary sources relate that the early inhabitants of Antioch were Athenians, Macedonians and some scattered Greek settlers, then why does this robust mythical tradition describe the arrival of Argives, Cypriots, Cretans, Heracleidae and Eleans? The archaeological record discussed above discounts the possibility that any of these groups were resident near Mt Silpius before the city's foundation, and neither the Eleans nor the Argives were likely to have made it to Syria before the Hellenistic period.[52] But if we consider the valence and associations of each mythical ethnos, some parallels can be drawn that reconcile the discrepancies between the historical and mythical traditions of the city. First, the Cypriots are certainly within the local orbit of Antioch and may well have immigrated in strong enough numbers to the city to form an identifiable group, thus the myth of Kasos and the Cretans could be their attempt to forge a link between their new city and their ancestral home vis-à-vis an ancestral hero.[53] This Cretan myth may also have an Athenian-Antigoneian nuance to it given the importance of Theseus to the island's tradition. Second, the Heracleid and Argive myths are likely to have originated amongst the Macedonian Antiochenes, both Seleucid soldiers and settlers from Antigoneia and Macedon proper, given the mythical link between the Argead dynasty and Argos, as well as Seleucus' claim of descent from Temenos.[54] An association between Herakles and Athena might well link the Heracleid myth to the Athenian-Antigoneians as well.[55]

Besides these specific associations with the constituent groups of Antioch's new citizen body, the mythic *ethne* themselves are delightfully ambiguous, and almost any Greek Antiochene could plausibly claim descent from one or more.[56] The Eleans had long been associated with panhellenism as the guardians of the Olympic Games, to which the Macedonians of course were admissible since the time of Herodotus. The Heracleidae, for their part, were notoriously itinerant and could plausibly have gone nearly anywhere in the Greek world, hence they too are an easy group from which to claim descent. Indeed the Antiochenes would certainly not have been alone in doing so, as during the early Hellenistic period there are a swathe of cities and groups in Asia Minor and Northern Syria that claim Argive descent thanks to the region's great, and most importantly, imprecise archaic prestige. In this group of myths therefore there was some strand at which every resident of the city could grasp, be they Athenian, Macedonian, Cypriote or a Greek settler from elsewhere. Perhaps most importantly, these new mythical traditions rooted these groups in the landscape around Antioch, not just in the city itself – the region, its lands and features, had long been theirs thanks to these myths, and in appropriating the territory in the historical present they also appropriated its mythical past.

Can these myths, however, be put in the same fairly precise historical context as the royal tradition discussed above? I would argue yes, and that these emerge from the early years following the foundation of the city. The complete absence of the king from these ethnic myths, their plurality and their disparity, and their setting in the archaic past suggests that the Antiochenes came up with this tradition on their own. Doing so gave their city an archaic, Hellenic antiquity that counterbalanced the artificiality of the city's foundation, and above all gave it a tradition that was free of Seleucid and royal interference. Mythologising new surroundings made them more familiar, less foreign, all the while linking them back to their mainland Greek origins. It is likely that they would want to adapt to their new surroundings fairly quickly, and the distinctly Greek character of the myths suggests at least an Hellenistic emergence for the tradition. More specifically, the absence of Euboans and Aetolians, who were settled later during the reign of Antiochus III, suggests that the Heracleidae, Argive and Elean myths were the product of the original groups of settlers under Seleucus I and thus could date from around 300–250 BC. The Cretan myth is a bit more ambiguous: while it could plausibly be Athenian in origin and thus as old as the others, the explicit mention of later settlement of Cretans (Libanius 11.124) suggests that this particular myth came about during the reign of Antiochus III. I would be remiss not to mention that the only point of intersection between the royal and ethnic myths is the figure of the king himself: according to Libanius it was he who persuaded the as-yet disparate *ethne* on the mountain to come and live in his new city.[57] Their unity in the city, as in myth, is contingent on the king, but nonetheless the robustness of this ethnic mythic tradition, its lack of unity and consistency, and absence of the king otherwise shows that the Antiochenes were ready and eager to find their own reason for being in the city (and indeed in the region) that did not revolve around the will of the king.

Considering the monumental geography of the early city along with its numismatic iconography reveals the manner in which this emergent sense of local belonging was physically manifested. Nicator acted hurriedly to bridge the gap between the various religious traditions of Antioch's new populace and its local landscape, revealing an underlying sensitivity to and cultivation of this unique sense of belonging and place. The institutionalisation of a cultic life for the young city, and patronage of the locales in which it was to take place, were of profound importance to the cultivation of the city's fledgling traditions, and, thereby, to the appropriation of the landscape. The recurrence of festivals and rituals served as temporal markers of daily and yearly routines, while fostering an incipient sense of a communal self through religion.[58] Foremost among this is the Temple of Apollo at Daphne, which of course was rooted in the dynasty's own religious traditions while still having broad Panhellenic appeal.[59] The Temple of Zeus Keraunios likewise served manifold purposes by simultaneously honouring a patron of Seleucus I, appealing to the cultic traditions of the city's Macedonians, and reinforcing the city's links to Alexander. Seleucus commissioned a large stone eagle to be

70   *Alex McAuley*

placed at the site where the mythical eagle is reported to have dropped the sacrificial meat, serving to embed the myth of Seleucus as *ktistes* in the landscape itself. In a double-edged gesture that at once commemorates his destruction of Antigoneia and demonstrates his goodwill to its former residents, Seleucus transferred the Tyche of Antigoneia to a prominent position within the city.[60] To further cater to their religious sensibilities, he erected a large bronze statue of Athena to facilitate their integration.[61] The most renowned of Seleucus' gifts to the city was the famed Tyche of Antioch by Euthychides of Sicyon, dating from between 296 and 293 BC. [62] Combining the traditions of the Greek West with the Syrian East by joining Tyche's attributes of fortune and success with the fertility and prosperity associated with the oriental mother-goddesses Ba'alat and Atargatis, the statue also grounds the city itself in the local landscape: Tyche sits on a rock representing Mt Silpius, rests one of her feet on the surging river-god Orontes, and holds a sheaf of wheat representing the fertility of the Amuk plain. Atop her head sits the crown of the city's walls, itself an adaptation of a near-eastern tradition of depicting mural crowns on the head of tutelary goddesses.[63] This artefact elegantly unites the various strands that we have discussed above, as it stands as a physical testament to the efforts of the king and the *demos* alike to ground themselves in the local landscape. In the process, it became re-appropriated as their own.

But before we move on to examine the local dynamics of these royal foundations elsewhere in the empire, an important point needs to be made. In the midst of such prevalent language of rupture, decline and revolution used by contemporary scholars to describe the ideology and process of such city foundations, in the case of Antioch at least it is striking how Seleucus and the Antiochenes went to such lengths to convey the exact opposite impression.[64] The re-appropriation of the landscape around Antioch was cast by the royal mythical tradition as anything but a violent rupture, but rather the accomplishment of something that had been predestined by the gods.[65] When his horse's hoof uncovered the arrow of Apollo, Seleucus was symbolically unearthing an older Greek layer of the landscape that had lain hidden until his arrival, but had always been there. In a sense the foundation of Antioch becomes the restoration of a much older Greek presence in the landscape, rather than in the invasion of an entirely new people.[66] This proclivity for continuity on the part of Seleucus extended to the residents of Antigoneia as well: the inclusion of their cultic and ethnic traditions in the new city, along with the physical transfer of the city's Tyche, served to give the impression that the city is simply being relocated and rebranded, rather than destroyed and created anew. The same can be said of the city's body of ethnic myths: the respective tales told by each of the city's composite groups serves to give them an historical claim to the landscape.[67] While they themselves might have been new settlers, according to these traditions their people had always been there. Again, these traditions emphasise continuity rather than rupture. While Grainger and Kosmin are certainly right to highlight the degree to which

cities such as Antioch were meant to stand out from the local countryside as identifiable bastions of Greekness, the degree to which Seleucus and indeed the Antiochenes themselves look to their immediate landscape and familiarise themselves within it is remarkable. The re-appropriation of the Hellenistic landscape may well have been an imperial design from above, but in practice it was a fundamentally local project.[68]

The other way around: the local landscape of Hanisa

Antioch on the Orontes is a curious case for a variety of reasons not least among them being the fact that we have a fairly robust body of literary sources regarding the city's Hellenistic history, but almost no contemporary archaeological or epigraphic evidence. To gain a fuller picture of the process by which the Hellenistic landscape was re-appropriated through urban foundations, it is beneficial to examine a city for which we have precisely the opposite evidentiary scenario: the mysterious city of Hanisa in Cappadocia which is attested by only one inscription and a few coins.[69] While Antioch is illustrative as a case study derived for the dynamics of royal foundation and benefaction, these other two cities from the Hellenistic periphery provide a somewhat more complicated scenario. While Antioch was established in the first decades of the period as royal traditions were still emerging and the structures of power that would govern the Hellenistic world had not yet solidified, our next case study gives us a snapshot of the local landscape in the second century, thus the High Hellenistic period in which the line between Greek and non-Greek had become somewhat more ambiguous.[70]

In the same way that considering the local tradition of Antioch gives cause to reconsider our suppositions of rupture and discontinuity in the re-appropriation of the Hellenistic landscape, the city of Hanisa in Cappadocia makes us reconsider the sharp distinction between Greek and non-Greek that has traditionally been drawn by historians of the period, as well as the wider question of precisely who was appropriating what.[71] The kingdom of Cappadocia emerged as a client state of the Seleucid empire during the third century, when a formal Achaemenid satrapal lineage had consolidated its hold on the region and sought recognition from the Seleucid royal house. As a means of communicating their prestige to both domestic and external audiences, the Cappadocian kings followed the lead set by their Seleucid overlords and adopted many of the trappings and practices of Hellenistic royalty. The Ariarathids married Seleucid princesses over subsequent generations, they began minting Greek-style coinage that shows increasingly Hellenised portraits of the kings themselves with Greek legends, and they adopted Seleucid court practices.[72] A century after this alliance was first struck, we find a new king acceding to the throne in 163 BC who has had a Greek education, been made a citizen of Athens, and even erected monuments to a famous philosopher in his adoptive city.[73] Suddenly the dynamics of imperial appropriation become more complex: where do we draw the typical Hellenistic lines between Greek and non-Greek, coloniser and colonised, in the case of

Hellenistic Cappadocia? There is a highly visible programme of Hellenisation at work in the highest echelons of Cappadocian society, but the prime movers and shakers of this process were not Greek themselves, and neither were they new entrants to the region. Instead, as a means of bringing their ancestral homeland into the broader Hellenistic *koine* that had emerged by the second century, the Ariarathid dynasty had by either edict or example set the wheels of cultural change in motion.

Just as the Ariarathid kings adopted the titles, iconography and self-image of their Hellenistic overlords, so too did they adopt the practice of city foundations as an expression of royal power and claim to the landscape.[74] Although in the Cappadocian context precisely who founded what city and when is uncertain, it is clear that the Ariarathid kings established cities meant to glorify the dynasty itself in the same manner as Seleucus in Syria. A city named Ariaratheia was built on the modern Zamantisu River, a city previously named Mazake was re-founded as Eusebeia by either Ariarathes IV or V and intended as the new capital of the kingdom, while two other cities, another Eusebeia near the Taurus and Ariaramneia clearly bear the marks of royal intervention.[75] But these cities were not founded in newly conquered territory which was being re-appropriated by what had until recently been an external power; rather, the Cappadocian kings were re-appropriating their own landscape and re-aligning it towards the broader Hellenistic community. It is in this complex background that we find our two attestations of the city of Hanisa: a coin struck in the city bearing the portrait of an Ariarathid king on the obverse and a standing Astarte with sphinxes on the reverse, and an inscription on a bronze tablet discovered in 1879 but lost during World War II.[76] Christoph Michels has recently discussed the institutional dynamics of the inscription in great detail and we need not cover all of this ground again here, but in the context of this chapter the snapshot of the local cultural landscape this inscription provides is invaluable.[77]

The document honours a man named Apollonius for having successfully negotiated a dispute over the estate of a certain Sindenos, who had died without an heir.[78] Various other parties had put forward claims to the estate of Sindenos, but Apollonius, at his own effort and expense, appealed to an official in nearby Eusebeia that the estate should go to the citizens of Hanisa. The official judged the case in his favour, and in return for his good deeds towards the city, the *boule* and *demos* of Hanisa honour him as *euergetes*, and resolve to crown him with a golden wreath at the festivals of Zeus and Herakles. On the surface this decree provides a snapshot of a thoroughly Greek civic culture working flawlessly here in far-flung Cappadocia: in the inscription we find evidence of a full-fledged *polis* with all the structures and officials we would come to expect, which in this instance is resolving a dispute through peaceful arbitration in another Greek civic community. This case regarding property inheritance is resolved by the appropriate channels, and a citizen of the community, in this instance Apollonius, is honoured and recognised for the service he has rendered to that community. This decree reveals not

only the superficial presence of Greek civic structures and institutions, but the smooth functioning of the civic culture which lies beneath them. What we see reflected in this decree is not just a Greek city, but a Greek society.

However, Michels was quite right in writing that to brand Hanisa as completely Hellenised 'would be too sweeping a characterization', as beneath the surface of the decree we find the reflection of a region that is very much in transition.[79] As Robert noted, several members of the city's populace have what seem to be Cappadocian names, particularly among the patronymics mentioned by the decree: Anoptenes, Maidates, Sasas, Teires. While Apollonius himself seems to have a Greek name, this may well have been theophoric and reflects an assimilation between an indigenous deity and the god Apollo, as happened elsewhere with other Cappdocian deities.[80] It would seem then that this reflects a situation akin to that seen in Ptolemaic Egypt or identified in the Far East by Rachel Mairs: in both cases, ethnically non-Greek residents would adopt a Greek name when interacting with Greek civic structures, though this does not imply complete Hellenisation.[81] The Hellenicity of the deities whose festivals are mentioned by the inscription – Zeus and Herakles – may well be only a veneer, as elsewhere the Anatolian goddess Ma is assimilated with Athena Nikephoros.[82] The closing lines of the decree itself capture this blend of local religious tradition with a new Hellenistic civic influence perfectly: the decree is to be recorded on a bronze tablet and erected in the *pronaos* of the sanctuary of Astarte, 'so that also the others, having witnessed the gratitude of the people, will always strive to render service to the *polis*'.[83]

The Hanisa decree attests to the transplantation of a new civic community and urban structure into a region that, like Antioch, was certainly not a blank slate at the time of these cities' foundation. The integration of territory into the Hellenistic urban network through such royal foundations was not a simple or clear-cut process, as even the power and wealth of the Hellenistic kings could not erase the day-to-day local realities of their subjects. The intertwined local histories of cults, religious sensibilities, even estates, just like family names, could not simply be bent into a new shape by the imposition of a Hippodamian grid. In the decree of Hanisa we see the interaction of non-Greek individuals with new Greek-style legal and civic structures, and it is likely that Apollonius and his contemporaries were the first generation of their families to have done so – or indeed to have had to. The king may have set the royal foundations in motion, but as at Antioch these cities then took on a life of their own as they adapted to the local landscape that had now been integrated into royal territory. And neither was Hanisa alone: the decree mentions the presence of parallel structures at Eusebeia, and there is no reason to assume that the other attested Cappadocian cities of Ariaratheia and Ariaramneia would not have had the same in place as well. One can likewise assume that these other cities would have had their own equivalent to the sanctuary of Astarte, or the religious festivals in honour of Zeus, Herakles or whatever name their ancestral gods were now being called in this new civic language. Yet here, as in Antioch, the integration of territory into the Hellenistic fold was not simply a matter of rupture and discontinuity, but

rather the negotiation of older local realities with the broadened horizons of the period. And here, in these new urban corners of Cappadocia, the hard and fast distinction between Greek and non-Greek falls apart quite quickly, as does the line between appropriation and re-appropriation.

Conclusions: in the footsteps of Darius

The Hellenistic world, as ever, is not nearly as clear and simple as would perhaps be desired. The case of Seleucid Syria reveals that we cannot discuss the foundation of the Tetrapolis by the early Seleucids in terms of rupture and discontinuity; it is not, as early commentators on the period would suggest, a situation in which a new Graeco-Macedonian layer was simply steamrolled on top of the landscape like asphalt, covering all that had once lain beneath it. In the Seleucid context especially, the re-appropriation of territory in such a diverse realm could hardly be so heavy-handed or binary. It is not just plunder being melted down into something that could now be called property. The early history of Antioch is complex. In it we find Seleucus carefully entering into several dialogues with no small measure of nuance: he was eminently aware that he was following in the footsteps of Alexander and his numerous Alexandrias, but on the local level he was also picking up where his defeated enemy Antigonus had left off with his own incomplete re-shaping of this part of Syria. In the meticulous narratives crafted around the landscape by the myths recounting his foundation of the city and the preservation of traditions and sensibilities unique to each of its constituent ethnic groups there is, as I have argued above, a desire on the part of the king to stress continuity and persistence, rather than sudden rupture. The project of incorporating new territory into this fledgling empire was a delicate matter, not the simple domination by blunt cultural means that it may seem from a detached top-down perspective. There is, as ever, a local pushback against more global developments.[84]

This was certainly the case in Cappadocia as well. The Cappadocian kings, in the manner of their suzerains and contemporaries, created a network of city foundations as an urban monument to their power and prestige, as well as a means of demonstrating that they too were fully entitled players in the Hellenistic game. But in the process they were not re-appropriating territory that was not originally theirs, they were rather re-organising their ancestral domain as a means of introducing it into the broader Hellenistic world which brought its own promises of profit, both tangible and intangible. They had, after all, done the same to themselves in previous generations as they re-modelled their own self-image, court customs, even language and education, on the Seleucid precedent as a means of crafting their passport to the Hellenistic *koine*.[85] As in the case of Antioch, though, this was not in and of itself a destructive process, either for the dynasty or their subjects in Hanisa: old traditional elements were placed in a dialogue with new innovations, leading to, for instance, a man bearing a Greek name and a Cappadocian patronymic being honoured with a Greek civic wreath at a (civic) sanctuary of the goddess Astarte.

But whom precisely were the Ariarathid kings imitating, and indeed whom was Seleucus imitating? In the early Hellenistic context it is tempting to point the finger at Alexander and conclude simply that Seleucus and his successors were following in his footsteps as they founded their own equivalents to his dozens of Alexandrias as a means of re-appropriating territory. Yet in this particular corner of the Hellenistic world Alexander was neither the first nor the last to establish new cities on the ruins of others that had been recently conquered as a means of integrating them into a broader network; neither was Seleucus the first to delicately include local sensibilities in an imperial project. Recent work on cultural integration in the Achaemenid Empire published in the *Persika* series has brought to light the delicate middle ground struck by the Achaemenids in simultaneously allowing room for cultural continuity in the local corners of the empire, while also conveying their own supremacy.[86] There is, as Tuplin phrases it, a great deal of 'cultural adjacency' in the Empire, but induced change is rare.[87] Robert Rollinger's study of Greeks in the Achaemenid Empire highlights the variety of roles played by those identified as *yauna* who, interestingly, figure prominently in the Great King's building programmes.[88] At the highest level of the Empire, however, there is a remarkable similarity between the integrative tone conveyed by Darius the Great's own accounts of his monumental constructions and the inclusion of diversity in Antioch's early civic traditions fostered by Seleucus. In the famous Foundation Tablet of Susa (*DSf*), Darius recounts his building of the palace by describing how elements of it were brought from the far-flung corners of his empire: timber from Lebanon, bricks moulded by Babylonians, silver and ebony from Egypt, ornamentation from his Greek subjects.[89] These elements would have remained identifiable in the midst of their inclusion into a new imperial whole, here again the strategy is one of diversity underneath the rule of the Great King rather than a simple project of imperial assimilation. This is precisely the same strategy that would later be adopted by Seleucus.

In the more local vicinity of Syria and Cappadocia we find the Persian satrapal capital of Sardis, which itself had a long history before being conquered by the Achaemenids. The fascinating study of the city's relationship with the Achaemenid Empire published by Elspeth Dusinberre describes the city's trajectory in terms that are remarkably similar to our discussion of Antioch and Hanisa above.[90] There is a mix of continuity and innovation in the establishment of Achaemenid imperial administration in this far western corner of the empire: Achaemenid rule certainly left its mark on the city, but not in a manner that signifies rupture or revolution. Sardis was meant to be an outpost of empire at the end of the Royal Road, but the Achaemenids did not completely divorce the city from its local context.[91] Sardis was a military base for the royal army, it had a set of royal officials and governors, the court of a local satrap, and at times played host to the members of the royal family itself.[92] The Persians left their mark on the city: the old Lydian walls were destroyed and replaced, the acropolis was re-fortified as a defensive bulwark for the king's troops, and literary sources mention the construction of Persian *paradeisoi*. [93] Besides these new imprints on the city, however, the picture

described by Dusinberre is dominated by continuity of local tradition: the palace of Croesus was probably re-used by Persian satraps, there is little to suggest a widespread change in domestic architecture, and indeed traditional cults were reinvigorated with the construction of a new altar to Artemis and the renovation of an older altar to Cybele.[94] Figurines found in the city attest to local cultic continuity as well. This mix between imperial prestige and local continuity in the re-appropriation of the urban milieu at Sardis is precisely the same as we have seen in the Seleucid project at Antioch.

On the level of civic society, we find a situation in Achaemenid Sardis that is similar to what we have found at Hanisa: a local elite interacts with a new imperial milieu in a manner that blends tradition and innovation. Continuity in burial practice and religious iconography point to the persistence of local cultic traditions, and while there are still separate and distinct tomb types linked to ethnicity, in the artefacts found within the tombs there is what Dusinberre identifies as 'a *koine* in artistic style extending across such points as country of origin or ethnic affiliation, uniting the elite in a group linked by status rather than nationality'.[95] The coexistence of Lydian, Aramaic and Greek epigraphic material in Achaemenid Sardis likewise hints at the continuity of local diversity under the new imperial administration, while at the same time elites from various groups began imitating Achaemenid practices as a means of local self-distinction.[96] In the same manner as the Cappadocians of Hanisa could remain Cappadocian while still gaining access to the Hellenistic *koine* through some measure of cultural imitation, so too could the local elite of Sardis remain set in their traditional ways while still interacting in the broader Achaemenid network.[97] The Achaemenids, of course, were not the last to leave their mark on the local world of Sardis in an attempt to bring it into an imperial fold: the Seleucids themselves refashioned the city at some point in the third century in a manner that was highly reminiscent of their Persian predecessors. Under the Seleucids the city's history and local traditions were not simply whitewashed over with a new and Greek layer, but again a more nuanced process was at work. At the time of Alexander, the city had some Greek elements but was not a *polis* and did not have Greek-style magistracies or a Greek legal system.[98] Even in the early third century, the city did not have the usual civic buildings associated with a *polis* community like those we find at Hanisa or Antioch. But by 213 BC a series of epigraphic documents give us a somewhat picture of the local life of Sardis: a letter of Antiochus dated to March/April 213 shows the king communicating with what appears to be a Greek *polis*, with a gymnasium, magistrates and all the institutions we would come to expect.[99] A passage of Polybius (7.15–17) describing roughly the same time mentions a theatre and a hippodrome as well.[100] The transformation, however, was neither complete nor total: another epigraphic document records a decision to inscribe a letter from Laodice III to the people of Sardis on the portico of the temple in the Metroon, which must be the Greek identification of the traditional temple of Cybele that we have discussed above.[101] Just as under the Achaemenids, the traditional cult of Artemis would be reinvigorated as the new king paid homage to local cults in the same manner as the old: a massive temple of Artemis has been dated to the earlier

third century and must be the product of Seleucid benefaction. This, too, continued to play to local sensibilities: although the temple was built in the Greek style, the dedication inscribed on two columns for the temple was written in Lydian. The apparent 'Hellenisation' of Sardis was neither something that happened overnight nor was it an entirely top-down process; rather, as Sherwin-White and Kuhrt argued, here as elsewhere it is the product of close interaction between the king and local elites seeking to gain access to a much broader empire.[102]

Perhaps, then, the Ariarathid kings as well as the Seleucids themselves were imitating an Achaemenid mechanism of territorial re-appropriation which was characterised by a delicate mix of local continuity and imperial innovation. The Achaemenids, like the Seleucids and their client kings, did not come into the landscape of Sardis, raze it to the ground, and erect something distinctly new and imperial in the ashes of its former settlements. Rather there is a mix of the local and the trans-local at work in the re-appropriation of the region that placed it on a much broader imperial map and included it in the imperial fold, but without sacrificing local place in its inclusion into imperial space. This would not have been the only element of continuity in the transition between the Achaemenid Empire and the Hellenistic monarchies in this region or elsewhere: the contributions to a 2006 volume on the topic edited by Pierre Briant and Francis Joannès argue that in such diverse corners of the Achaemenid world as Anatolia, Babylon, Uruk and Egypt, this transition cannot be characterised as a widespread disruption of the past.[103] The project of city foundations as a means of creating a new imperial *koine*, one which was not exclusively Greco-Macedonian but rather characterised by a dominant sense of Hellenicity, can perhaps be seen as another element of this continuity. So too can the broader notion that the landscape, just like every other form of wealth and prestige ranging from men and horses to silver and precious textiles, must be refashioned somehow in the process of being repossessed, the conqueror must leave his or her stamp on what has been taken from the conquered, and in the process plunder is transformed into property. The re-appropriation of the landscapes we have encountered in Syria and Cappadocia was not marked by a sense of discontinuity or rupture, neither was it intended to. The Seleucids, the Ariarathids, their contemporaries, and indeed Alexander were not the first to try to bring these diverse landscapes into a new imperial network, and they would certainly not be the last.[104]

Notes

1 Bevan (1902) 1.14. Given the vast bibliography on many of the subjects considered in this chapter, I have opted for Syme's approach to referencing and thus mention only those works immediately pertinent to the present discussion. I do not intend to provide an exhaustive bibliography in these footnotes.

2 A thought further developed in Bevan (1902) 1.1–22, his opening chapter 'Hellenism in the East' predicates Greek culture on the membership of the individual in the state, by extension the *polis*, as opposed to the perceived despotism of the East. On the decline of the Greek *polis* equating to the decline of Greek civic

78   *Alex McAuley*

culture, see, for instance, Glotz (1928) 448; Tarn (1951) 79: Giovannini (1993) among others.

3   Bevan (1902) 1.209.

4   Bevan (1902) 1.208 for the first quotation, Grainger (1990) 47 for the second. Grainger (1990) 40–38 discusses the early Greek presence in this corner of Syria in great detail, and provides a very helpful narrative of Seleucus' foundations in the subsequent chapter.

5   Walbank (1981) cited in Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 143–144. See especially their comments on the scholarly history of Seleucid colonisation and Hellenistic urbanism more generally at Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 145–149.

6   Their entire discussion on colonisation and imperialism is eminently erudite and helpful. See Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 141–187 with its pioneering discussion of the experience of Seleucid Babylon and Ai-Khanoum.

7   Kosmin (2014) 192–199. The quotation above is the name Kosmin gives to this section of his analysis. Also see 93–119 for his analysis of the colonisation of Syria – what he identifies as 'diasporic imperialism' and the elegantly twinned chapters 'King makes City' 183–221 and 'City makes King' 223–252. Many of the observations below are inspired by Kosmin's erudite work on the topic.

8   Kosmin (2014) 199.

9   Kosmin (2014) 199.

10   See Engels (2017) 211 as well as his broader discussion from 157 to 212.

11   On the consolidation of the early Seleucid Empire, see the volume edited by Erickson (2018). See also the prefatory discussion of Engels (2017) 3–12.

12   Especially in the reconstruction of Kosmin (2014) and Grainger (1990). On the mechanism of Seleucid colonies as royal foundations, see Cohen (1978) and Bickerman (1938). See also Capdetrey (2007). For the process behind the introduction of royal cult in Seleucid Syria, with extensive references, see Strootman (2016).

13   On the sources (or lack thereof) regarding Hellenistic Antioch: epigraphical deficiency, Gatier (2003) 102-103; archaeological issues, Morey (1936) 637-638; literary sources, Downey (1961) 24.

14   On the pre-Hellenistic circumstances of this region of Syria, see Grainger (1990) 7, 17–20; Leriche (2003) 130–135.

15   On the long development of this site, see Boardman (1999) on the Greek presence in Syria.

16   Bosworth (1974) 46–60; Grainger (1990) 37–39 on Antigoneia. See also the detailed discussion of Cohen (2006) 76–79 with notes.

17   Diod. 20.47.5: οὗτος δὲ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον διέτριβε περὶ τὴν ἄνω Συρίαν, πόλιν κτίζων περὶ τὸν Ὀρόντην ποταμὸν τὴν ὠνομασμένην Ἀντιγονίαν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ. κατεσκεύαζε δὲ πολυτελῶς, τὴν περίμετρον ὑποστησάμενος σταδίων ἑβδομήκοντα: εὐφυὴς γὰρ ἦν ὁ τόπος ἐφεδρεῦσαι τῇ τε Βαβυλῶνι καὶ ταῖς ἄνω σατραπείαις καὶ πάλιν τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ καὶ ταῖς ἀπ᾽ Αἰγύπτου σατραπείαις (At this time Antigonus was tarrying in upper Syria, founding a city on the Orontes River, which he called Antigonia after himself. He laid it out on a lavish scale, making its perimeter seventy stades; for the location was naturally well adapted for watching over Babylon and the upper satrapies, and again for keeping an eye upon lower Syria and the satrapies near Egypt).

18   Discussed by Cohen (2006) 73–76, 122 originally in Seyrig (1970) 298–309 with reference to Plutarch, *Dem.* 17.2–5; also discussed by Capdetrey (2007) 61.

19   On this process more broadly see Billows (1995) especially his analysis of kings and estate holders in Asia at 111–131 and his reading of the Mnesimachos inscription at 132–145. On the foundation of Alexandria, see Plutarch, *Alex.* 26.3–10 in which we find many of the same elements that will later recur in the Seleucid foundation myths. On land policy in the Seleucid context see Van der Spek (1993).

T&F PROOFS NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

20 Diod. 20.108.1: Ἀντίγονος δὲ προκεχειρισμένος ἀγῶνα μέγαν καὶ πανήγυριν ἐν Ἀντι-γονίᾳ συντελεῖν πάντοθεν ἀθλητάς τε καὶ τεχνίτας τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους ἐπὶ μεγάλοις ἄθλοις καὶ μισθοῖς ἠθροίκει. ὡς δ᾽ ἤκουσε τὴν Λυσιμάχου διάβασιν καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν τὴν ἀπόστασιν, τὸν μὲν ἀγῶνα διέλυσε, τοῖς δ᾽ ἀθληταῖς καὶ τοῖς τεχνίταις ἀπέδωκε μισθοὺς οὐκ ἐλάττους διακοσίων ταλάντων (Antigonus, who had made preparations to celebrate great games and a festival in Antigonia, had collected from all sides the most famous athletes and artists to compete for great prizes and fees. But when he heard of the crossing of Lysimachus and the desertion of his own generals, he abandoned the games but distributed to the athletes and artists not less than two hundred talents as compensation).

21 Strabo 16.2.10 discussed by Cohen (2006) 94–95, 122. See especially the following remark of Strabo: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Πέλλα ποτὲ ὑπὸ τῶν πρώτων Μακεδόνων διὰ τὸ τοὺς πλείστους τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐνταῦθα οἰκῆσαι τῶν στρατευομένων, τὴν δὲ Πέλλαν ὥσπερ μητρόπολιν γεγονέναι τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου πατρίδα (It was also called Pella at one time, by the first Macedonians, because the majority of the Macedonians who made the expedition took up their abode there, and because Pella, the native city of Philip and Alexander, had become, as it were, the metropolis of the Macedonians.).

22 See Cohen (2006) 97 n. 3 for scholarly discussion mentioning Billows (1997) 299.

23 Seyrig (1970) 290–311; Capdetrey (2007) 61.

24 Interestingly, neither did Seleucus or his successors leave the area as a finished canvas. Daubner (2011) argues for a similar process in Asia Minor in which local military settlements in the region are the product of Attalid administration, rather than the initial wave of Seleucid colonisation. As will be discussed below, the Seleucids were neither the first nor the last to continue re-shaping the region.

25 See notes in the introduction above.

26 Cohen (1978) 4–30; Grainger (1990) 55–60; Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 22–30. See especially the discussion of Cohen (1978) 32–35; Kuhrt (1996) 44–47.

27 A tendency that is by and large decreasing as time goes on, but certainly implicit in the studies of Downey and Haddad.

28 Grainger (1990) 60; Downey (1961) 64–67. On the broader context of Seleucid imperial consolidation, see Engels' (2017) discussion of the Upper Satrapies that by all accounts represent the thrust of Seleucid focus.

29 Capdetrey (2007) 51–60; Engels (2017) 103–156.

30 Cohen (2006) 80–93 provides a comprehensive bibliography of the ancient and modern discussions of Antioch. It is so thorough that it need not be condensed here. Diodorus 20.47 is the only dissenting voice, asserting that the Antigoneians were instead brought to Seleucia-in-Pieria, though the questionable wisdom of transfer-ring settlers to a new city named after himself, along with the unanimity of Anti-ochene sources, makes it clear that Diodorus was in error, as discussed by Grainger (1990) 96–98; Kasher (1982) 72–74; Downey (1958) 84–90; Libanius 11.97–99.

31 Cassius Dio 40.29.1.

32 See Strabo 16.2.3–6 for the foundation of these cities. See also the relevant discus-sions in Grainger (1990) chapter 3; Cohen (2006) s.v. the respective city names.

33 For a variety of fascinating case-studies of the situation of these cities in the local landscape from throughout the empire, see Kosmin (2014) 186–208.

34 On the early organisation of the city and its populace see Downey (1958) 84–87; Haddad (1949) 74–75; Aperghis (2004) 93–94 in addition to the references to Cohen (2006) above.

35 In this sense I agree completely with Billows (1995) 149–154, *pace* Briant, that Greek settlers to the region were not poor or bankrupt emigres.

36 On the early relationship between king and populace see Kuhrt (1996) 44–47; Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 162–166; Cohen (1978) 81–85.

80 *Alex McAuley*

37 For the reign of Antiochus III and later waves of migration to the city see Libanius 11.124; Downey (1961) 92–94; Grainger (1990) 96–105; Strabo 16.2.4.

38 The discussion below heavily employs the interesting analysis of Dumitru (2016), which discusses the religious dimensions of Seleucid city foundations in various parts of the kingdom.

39 In contemporary discussion of these foundation myths, there tend to be two groups. The first, represented by Downey (1961) 80–82; Grainger (2010) 107 and Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993), tends to dismiss the myths as embroidered artefacts. The second group, including Buraselis (2010); Ogden (2010); and Haddad (1949), treats the myths primarily as literary devices with little historical value. Bevan's treatment (1902) of these myths is a notable exception. See also the references to previous discussions of these myths in Strootman (2016) notes 22–25. See more recently Ogden (2017) on the broader mythical tradition surrounding Seleucus I.

40 Ogden (2010); Buraselis (2010) 264–270; Dumitru (2016) 183–194.

41 Capdetrey (2007) 62–63; Downey (1961) 80–85.

42 Libanius 11.74–87; Malalas 8.14–16; Buraselis (2010) 268–270.

43 Justin *Epit*.15.4.2–10 for Seleucus' mythical parentage. See Erickson (2009) on numismatic associations between the early Seleucids and the god Apollo.

44 In the same vein, the presence of parallel myths in Seleucid city foundations discussed by Ogden (2010) in Diodorus allows us to date the entire tradition to the late Hellenistic period at the very latest.

45 Capdetrey (2007) 62–65.

46 On the mosaic itself see the news article by Olszewski & Saad (2017) and an image of the mosaic on M. Olszewski's *academia.edu* profile page.

47 Downey (1961) 55 goes as far as to call them 'patently local'. See also the discussion of Bevan (1902) 1.212.

48 The Argive myth is found in Strabo 16.2.5; Libanius 11.52–56; discussed by Downey (1961) 50; Haddad (1949) 38–39.

49 Libanius 11.52–55; Malalas 8.15.

50 Libanius 11.52–55; Malalas 8.15.

51 For the Cretan/Cypriote myth, Libanius 11.52–5; Malalas 8.15; Argive myth, Strabo 16.2.5; Libanius 11.52–6; Malalas 8.15. Eleans come through in the above Argive citations as well.

52 Grainger (1990) 20–25.

53 On Theseus, Athens and Cyprus see Walker (1995) 52–53. See also Strootman's discussion of these myths (2016) with extensive references.

54 On the malleability of the Argive *ethnos* see Scheer (2005) 226–229 and her general discussion of the malleability of myth in this context, 217–225. See also Scheer's previous studies (1993, 2000) which bear on the Argive context.

55 Downey (1961) 50–55; Haddad (1949) 38–44.

56 Grainger (1990) 35; Haddad (1949) 40–43. See also McAuley (forthcoming a) on Argive religious connections with Macedon and elsewhere in the Aegean being developed in the early Hellenistic period.

57 This aligns neatly with the bonds of personal obligation fostered between the king and the city's new resident settlers through his civic benefactions, as discussed by Grainger (1990) 112–123, and then the evolution of the urban hierarchy, 121–142, and his conclusion regarding the relationship between the Seleucid cities of Syria and the Seleucid kings, 143–149.

58 Kondoleon (2001) 198. Downey (1961) 74–77 provides an invaluable examination of the city's early geography.

59 On this development of Daphne see Strootman (2016) 16–19. See also the work of Petridou (2016) on the role played by divine epiphany in civic traditions.

60 Kondoleon (2001) 198 and Downey's discussion (1961). Malalas 202.6–7 for the construction of a statue at the site of the sacrifice, and also Malalas 201.5–18 for the early landscape of the city.

61 On this statue see Malalas 201.16–18; Downey (1961) 76 notes 102–103. Interestingly the connection between Seleucus and Athena is emphasised on the city's early coinage, for instance, Houghton (2002) 1.20–22; Newell (1941) 92–94.

62 Downey (1961) 74 on the statue. On Hellenised Atargatis see Bilde (1990) 152–165.

63 The presence of mural crowns associated with city sovereignty is an extremely old one in the Ancient Near East, found in Assyria and in Elam. For an overview of the image, see Metzler (1994). Among the early images that we have of queens being associated with mural crowns is Aššur-šarrat, wife of Ashurbanipal, who is depicted in his garden scene with mural crown as discussed by Ataç (2018) 168–175.

64 On the later troubled interaction between king and *demos*, Grainger (1990) 126–154; Gatier (2003) 109: Downey (1961) 96–107. For the most concise summary of Antiochene revolts in later Seleucid dynastic politics see Grainger (2010) 321–380; Downey (1961) 119–142.

65 See Kosmin (2014) 211–218 for further discussion of these foundation narratives elsewhere in the empire.

66 From this perspective of continuity and restoration, we begin to see the other side of the coin described by Kosmin (2014) 210 when he writes 'Seleucid nomenclature quite deliberately framed their colonial enterprise as something new. Although much would have remained of the earlier cities physically and demographically, court-derived naming patterns chose to portray a specific image – the Seleucid monarch forging, not inheriting, an empire.' This certainly may be the case from the top-down royal perspective, but the creation of local traditions at Antioch adds some nuance to this process.

67 On this relationship between myth and the local landscape see Strootman's (2016) relevant comments.

68 In this context, see also the Wright (2012) on the role played by religion in the appropriation of Seleucid Syria over the longer span of time. Wright uses a variety of evidence in his analysis, and seeing these mythical patterns reflected in the numismatic iconography he analyses is particularly interesting in the context of the present discussion. On this, see chapters 3–6, and also his discussion of religion in Syria under the later Seleucids.

69 Much of my discussion below is owed to the insight of Michels (2012) who applies the peer-polity interaction model to the Hellenisation of Cappadocia, with interesting results. Michels nevertheless provides an invaluable overview of the scholarship and situates this decree of Hanisa in the broader questions surrounding Hellenisation and cultural transfer in the period, especially 283–286. See also McAuley (forthcoming b) on the inclusion of Hellenistic Cappadocia in the Seleucid Empire, and especially the role played by royal women in this process, McAuley (2017).

70 The High Hellenistic as a concept and period will be elaborated in more detail in Llewellyn-Jones & McAuley (forthcoming).

71 On Cappadocia in the Hellenistic period see Gabelko (2017); Hansen (1947) 73–76; Grainger (2010) 131; Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 32–36; Ballesteros-Pastor (2013). Michels (2012) 284 n. 9 for discussions of Achaemenid-era Cappadocia.

72 Diod. 31.19.6; Por. F32.6 record the first marriage between the Seleucids and the Ariarathids. Discussed by Grainger (2010) 131. See Diodorus' description of the subsequent generations of the dynasty at 31.19.6. See McAuley (2017) 196 for the next marriage within the dynasty, and the adoption of Seleucid court practice in McAuley (forthcoming b).

73   The king in question is Ariarathes V, who at some point between 163 and 160 BC made a benefaction to the Dionysiac Technitai in Athens in which he is recorded as being a member of the deme Sypalletos and the Phyle of Kekropis, and thus a full Athenian citizen in *OGIS* 353. Diodorus 31.19.8 praises Ariarathes for his Greek education and his encouragement of a Greek-style court in the kingdom. He had a close relationship with the philosophe Carneades, and according to Diogenes Laertius 4.65 carried on correspondence with him. Ariarathes and his brother in law Attalus II dedicated a statue to the philosopher in Athens, Syll[3] 666 = IG II² 3781.

74   On this see McAuley (forthcoming a).

75   Cohen (1995) 375–276 for a full discussion of this Ariaratheia, with references to its external and internal attestations. On Eusebeia near Argaios see Strabo 12.2.7, and Cohen's discussion (1995) 377–378 of the city s.v. 'Eusebeia near Argaios'. Eusebeia near the Tauros is discussed by Cohen (1995) 378–379, with references and epigraphic attestations. Given the use of the epithet Eusebes, we can safely date the city to the reign of either Ariarathes IV Eusebes or Ariarathes V, the city would have been founded at some point in the early second century BC. Ariaramneia is a scantly attested city, Cohen (1995) 375.

76   For an image of the coin and its scholarly history see Michels (2012) 286 n. 20, who discusses the debate regarding precisely who struck the coin and when. See also his discussion 286–288, and the image of the coin, 291 Fig. 21.

77   The following recapitulation of the decree is based on the excellent text, translation and commentary of Michels (2012) 286–291.

78   Following the text and translation of Michels (2012) 287 and Fig. 22 for an image of the decree itself.

79   Michels (2012) 290.

80   Robert (1963) 508; Michels (2012) 290 n. 29. Michels also mentions the discussion of Lipinski, who concluded that some of the names in the inscription were potentially Semitic.

81   See the authoritative study of Mairs (2014) for this fascinating experience of selective identities in selective contexts. On the Ptolemaic parallel, see the various case studies in Lewis (1986) and the discussion of Goudriaan (1988).

82   On the debate for this see Michels (2012) 291 n. 33 with discussion, mentioning the objections of Mitchell (1993) to this hypothesis.

83   ὅπως ἂν και οἱ λοιποὶ θεωροῦντες τὸ τοῦ δήμου | εὐχάριστον πειρῶνται ἀεί τινος ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιοι | γίνεσθαι τῆι πόλει (ll. 32–34).

84   See also Kosmin (2014) 222–251 on the other dynamic of, as he puts it, how 'city makes king'.

85   On this see McAuley (forthcoming a) and the concluding discussion to Michels (2012).

86   The volume edited by Briant and Chauveau in 2009, *Persika* 14, is an important contribution to our understanding of the Persian Empire. My brief recapitulation here is based on Tuplin's (2009) conclusion to the volume and summarising remarks, especially 427.

87   Tuplin (2009) 427.

88   Rollinger (2009) 343–348 on the Greeks at Babylon, and his preceding discussion of how the Greek are identified in the Persepolis fortification tablets. See also the case studies on Egypt by Defernez, Persepolis and the Skurdrians by Henkelman, and the interaction among Persians, Anatolians, and Greeks in Asia Minor by Lintz in the same volume.

89   *DSf* lines 28–45 for the various ethnic contributions to this project, which is mirrored in how Darius describes the construction of Persepolis and the vast variety of materials contributed from through the empire. On the imperial dynamics of the king and his court, see Llewellyn-Jones (2013).

90　See Dusinberre (2002) who situates the discussion of Achaemenid Sardis brilliantly in the larger context of debates regarding empire in the Achaemenid world and elsewhere. My summary of her findings also draws on the excellent and thorough review of the work by Ebbinghaus (2004) published as *BMCR* 2004.02.20.

91　Dusinberre (2002) 1–31.

92　Dusinberre (2002) 31–45 with conclusions summarised 196–218.

93　Drawn from Dusbinerre's (2002) discussion of the urban structure of Achaemenid Sardis 46–77.

94　Dusinberre (2002) 60–68.

95　Dusinberre (2002) 148 quoted by Ebbinghaus (2004).

96　Dusinberre (2002) 128–171 on the evidence from mortuary practices and seal stones.

97　Dusinberre (2002) 148–154.

98　On this see Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 180–184. According to Arrian. *Anab.* 1.17.3, Lydian laws were in use in the city at the time of Alexander the Great, and a decree of Miletus for the inhabitants of Sardis Syll.[3]273 does not mention any Greek magistrates in the city, or any Greek civic structures.

99　Gauthier (1989) 13–15 cited by Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 181 with a translation of the letter.

100　On Polybius' descriptions of Sardis after the siege by Antiochus and the defeat of Achaeus see Piejko (1987).

101　Gauthier (1989) 47–49 for the document itself, and discussion in Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 181–182.

102　Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993) 183–187.

103　Briant & Joannès (2006) which was published as *Persika* 9, especially the concluding remarks by Kuhrt 471–476.

104　On the legacy of Hellenistic city foundation myths in the Roman world see Noreña (2016).