

SOME BOUNDARY STONES IN SOUTHERN AIOLIS

(Pl. VII-VIII)

In an article entitled "Contributions to the History of Southern Aiolis"¹, which he wrote on his surveys in 1881, W. M. Ramsay refers to the existence of a boundary stone on a hill one hour distant from the southern bank of the Hermos². It was understood from the inscriptions on this stone that it marked the boundary between two neighboring cities, Melanpagos and Herakleia. Ramsay wrote that the site of Melanpagos should be located on the northern slope of Mt. Sipylos in the ruins at the foot of an imposing cliff, but that he had not had time to visit the place. Herakleia may be one of various sites in the Hermos valley³. After the publication of this boundary stone, other researchers of the last century who were interested in the area joined in the discussion concerning the localisation of the above-mentioned cities and showed their proposed localisations on their maps⁴. However it is clear that concerning these ancient cities, the publications now have shortcomings as far as modern place-names are concerned, because they are so out of date. In 1993 and 1994, for the purpose of identifying the present condition of the sites (see the map on the following page).

According to Ramsay's description, the published boundary stone should be found in the surroundings of the Göktepe village, situated on the first rise south of the modern town of Emiralem. With the guidance of H. Akkurt of Göktepe, who knows the area well, we looked for the above-mentioned boundary stone to determine its present condition⁵. At the same time, from the information provided by H. Akkurt, we learned that there was not only this one boundary marker, but that there were others with inscriptions.

¹ W. M. Ramsay, "Contributions to the History of Southern Aiolis", *JHS* 2 (1881), 44, 54, 271, 305 and *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (1890), London, cf. also *Syll.*², No. 455; *Syll.*³, No. 934.

² W. M. Ramsay, *op. cit.* 296 - 297.

³ *Ibid.*, 297.

⁴ G. Weber, *BCH* 16 (1892), Pl. XVIII; H. Kiepert, *Formai Orbis Antiqui* IX, 4; J. Keil - A. von Premerstein, *Bericht Über Eine Reise In Lydien Und Der Südlichen Aiolis*, Denkschr. Ak. Wien LIII (1908) II, 95; *RE* VIII, 1 s. v. "Herakleia"; J. Keil, "Melampagos im Sipylosgebirge", *JOAI* XVI (1913), 165 - 168.

⁵ I wish to thank H. Akkurt, who showed us all the sites in the surrounding area in the course of our survey in this region, as well as my friend S. Ergül, who contributed unselfishly to our trips, and also the archaeologists, I. Gezgin and C. Tanriver.

The first boundary stone, the one published by Ramsay (No. 1)⁶, is 500 m. southwest of the Göktepe village, on level ground at the summit of the hill in the place called Vakıf Melengiç and in the middle of thick bushes which conceal it from view. The ground upon which the approximately 2.5 m. high boulder rests has been dug up by treasure hunters. On the surface which faces south, towards Mt. Sipylos, is inscribed OPIA MEANΠAΓITΩN and on the surface which faces northwest, towards the valley of the Hermos, HPAKAEΩTΩN (Figs. 1-2).

The second boundary stone, is at the place called Osman Tepe approximately 750 m. SSW of the first one and immediately north of Buruklu hill at the point where begins the slope of the valley through which the Emiralem stream passes. This boundary stone, which separates the same two ancient settlements, is approximately 1.70 m. high. On the surface which faces west, towards the valley, is the inscription OPIA HPAK(A)EΩTΩN (Fig. 3) and on the eastern face MEAA[N]IIAΓITΩN (Fig. 4). In contrast to the first boundary stone, this time the expression *Horia* is found together with the name of Herakleia .



Fig. 3

The third boundary stone, is in a completely different direction, approximately 2 kms southeast of the Göktepe village. It is at the highest point on the western slope of the Değirmendere valley, at the place called Çetili Yaka. It is larger than the two other boulders, which have been considerably damaged by treasure-hunters. On the broken eastern face of

⁶ W. M. Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 296 - 297.

this stone, which faces the valley of the Değirmendere, ΠΑΛΑΥΔΙΤΩΝ (Fig. 5) and on its broken northern face ΟΠΙ^Λ ΜΕ[ΑΑΝΗΙΑ]ΓΙΤΩΝ (Fig. 6) are engraved. In contrast to the other two boundary stones, this one defines the border between the lands of Melanpagos and those of another settlement (Palaudis ?), whose name we encounter today for the first time (Figs. 5-6).

Fig. 4

According to those who know the area, an abbreviation ΜΕ(ΑΑΝΗΙΑ)ΓΙΤΩΝ ?) once existed on a stone damaged by the road of a recently constructed slaughterhouse. The stone is located in the valley which is immediately east of the Göktepe village and through which the Gökdere stream reaches the Menemen - Manisa highway. Although we were unable to determine the exact location, we have hesitatingly indicated this stone on the map as boundary stone (No. 5).

The fourth boundary stone concerned with Melanpagos, whose localisation is on the Gökkeyası hill, is on the Kırkkayalık hill (827 meters). This hill is immediately south of the ancient settlement and commands the site. Here stands a boulder approximately 3 m. high. On the northward facing (towards Gökkeya) surface only is inscribed, side by side: ΟΡΟC ΟΡΟC. In contrast to the other three boundary stones which determine the borders between Melanpagos on the one hand and the cities of Herakleia and Palaudis on the other, this boundary inscription does not contain the name of any settlement.

Another boundary inscription (No. 6) is located on a westwards-facing cliff 5 m. high, below boundary stone No. 3 in the place called Çetili Yaka on a slope immediately to the west of the abandoned Değirmendere village in the Değirmendere valley. Upon the boulder are: a letter Ο(ΡΟC); immediately below the retrograde abbreviations Π towards the north and, towards the south, ΕΥ. The letters, especially the form of the *epsilon*, are different from the letters on the other four boundary stones; probably this inscription belongs to a later period (perhaps Roman ?) and separates the properties of private persons or temples.

The presence of boundary stones between ancient settlements is generally an indication of boundary disputes. Some boundary stones, found on the southern slopes of the Yamanlar mountain and belonging to the Late Roman - Early Byzantine period, were published towards the end of the 19th century⁷. When one considers the locations of boundary stones 1 to 5, it becomes evident that the disputed land was between Melanpagos and the cities of Herakleia and Palaudis. There is no boundary stone between Herakleia and Palaudis, which are approximately 3 kms distant from each other, for there is between them no tillable land which might become the subject of a dispute.

There is no doubt that the ancient remains on the northern slopes of the Yamanlar mountain, at the place called Gökçaya, belong to the settlement of Melanpagos⁸ named in boundary stones Nos. 1 - 3. The settlement was protected at its back by the bulk of a cliff which, being nearly 40 m. high and almost completely vertical, presented a very important advantage to the defense of the city. The near surroundings lack tillable land and steep slopes rise rapidly to the south towards the summit of Sipylos. Thus the necessary farming land is found on a plateau beginning immediately in front of the city and descending by degrees towards the Hermos river. The plateau averages 2.5 kms in width and 5 kms in length between two valleys carved out by the two streams of Değirmendere to the east and Emiralem to the west. Especially in its northern half, the plateau carries stepped terraces made in ancient times; some are still under intense cultivation, others are abandoned. Again in the north half of this plateau, pottery of the 12th and 13th centuries A. D. attracts attention, on the terraces between the Göktepe village and the Melengerlikaya hill; it is especially plentiful at the place called Arifali Pınarı. At this point, which even today is called Manastır Mevkii ("*the place of the Monastery*") a large structure whose foundations are visible at ground level, together with the ancient necropolis beside it, bear witness to a Byzantine settlement here in the 12th and 13th centuries⁹. Another village of the late Byzantine period, which we identified at the place called Ören at the upper end of the old water depot, and which also lies immediately to the south of the Göktepe village, shows that the land was tilled without interruption until our time.

The boundary stones numbered 1 and 2, which separated the fields of

⁷ For these boundary stones cf. A. E. Kontoleon, *AM* 14 (1898), 93, Nos. 16-19; A. M. Fontrier, *BCII* 16 (1892), 396-398; G. E. Bean, *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatisches Forschung* 3 (= *Anadolu Araştırmaları* 1, 1955), Pl. XVIII, Fig. 9; G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna* II, 1, Bonn, 1986, 307-9, Nos. 828 - 830A -B.

⁸ For the only study on Melanpagos (Gökçaya) cf. J. Keil, "Melampagos im Sipylosgebirg", *JOAI* XIV (1913), 165-168.

⁹ For a study of Byzantine settlements and monasteries, especially those in Smyrna and in its surroundings in the 13th century A. D., based on the records of the Lembos Monastery, cf. H. Ahrweiler, "L'Histoire et la géographie de la région de Smyrne entre les deux occupations Turques", *Travaux et Mémoires* 1 (1964), 1-204.

Herakleia from those of Melanpagos, were placed near the northwestern and northern limits of the plateau. The boundary stone No. 1, which is located on a hilltop commanding the whole plain of the Hermos, leaves a small piece of land to Herakleia at the northern limit of the plateau. As for boundary stone No. 2, this is exactly on the border of the eastern slope of the valley through which the Emiralem stream passes, at the place called Osman Tepe. Thus it is understood that the valley of the Emiralem stream and the valley slopes were left to Herakleia, while almost the whole of the plateau was given to Melanpagos. As far as Herakleia was concerned, the boundary's passing so nearby was not a loss in terms of land. This is more easily understandable when one considers the fertility of the agricultural land around the modern town of Emiralem, on the southern side of the Hermos river.

Compared to Melanpagos, which is easily identified at Gökkayaşı hill, the localisation of Herakleia is a little more problematic. In contrast to other fortress-settlements of the region, such as Neonicichos, Temnos, Melanpagos and Palaudis, which are placed on steep and easily defensible locations, no strongly fortified settlement is visible in the nearby area in the northern or northwestern direction, which is indicated by the boundary stones No. 1 and 2 for the settlement of Herakleia. Nevertheless there are two small and weakly fortified settlements mentioned by W. M. Ramsay¹⁰ and J. Keil¹¹ without giving the place names. Of these the first is on the hill called Kale Tepe, located immediately northwest of the Çoban'ın Tepesi (95 meters above sea level) hill. This is at the place where the plateau joins the Hermos plain and 250 m. to the north of boundary stone No. 1. It is evident that since the time when Ramsay encountered traces of fortifications, the damage here has increased. The second place is on the slopes of the Ballık Kayası, against which the now abandoned village of Eski Emiralem was built. This is to the west in the valley cut by the Emiralem stream. Its summit is about 40 meters square and on it are visible rock-cut beddings upon which fortifications walls were built. Further, there are three cisterns cut into the rock in spite of the place being so small. The fortification here is seen to be weak, like that on the hill at Çoban'ın Tepesi. Perhaps because of these weak defenses, their lands may have been ravaged during the campaign of the Bithynian king Prusias II against Pergamon. For, after the war, the name of Herakleia occurs among some Western Anatolian cities to which Prusias II paid reparations¹².

¹⁰ W. M. Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 297 and 300.

¹¹ J. Keil, *op. cit.*, 165.

¹² According to Polybios, in an agreement made at the end of the war between Prusias II and Attalos II in 156-154 B. C., there was a question of damages being paid to cities and sacred places whose lands were plundered by the Bithynians during the hostilities. Herakleia's name is mentioned among those cities receiving reparations (XXXIII 15): διορθώσασται δὲ Προυσιᾶν καὶ τὴν καταφθορὰν τῆς χώρας τε Μεθυμναίων καὶ τῶν Αἰγαίων καὶ τῆς Κυμαίων καὶ Ἡρακλειωτῶν, ἑκατὸν τάλανδοντα τοῖς προειρημένους). According to L. Robert this Herakleia should be identified with Herakleia on the slopes of the Sipylos,

Boundary stone No. 3, which separated the territories of Melanpagos and Palaudis, is at the place called Çetili Yaka at the head of the steep-sided Değirmendere valley at the eastern limit of the plateau. The inscription ΠΑΑΥΔΙΤΩΝ faces the valley on the east. Just above this inscription is found a second one: ΟΡΙΑ ΜΕΑΝΠΑΓΙΤΩΝ. This faces not Melanpagos on the Gökkaya summit, but northwards, where the city's fields are found. It is clear from the position of this boundary stone that the Değirmendere valley, together with its eastern and western slopes, was left to Palaudis in its entirety. As we mentioned above, the boundary stone No. 5, which records the abbreviation ME, and which was recently destroyed in the course of road construction, shows that the boundary of Melanpagos was extended downwards as far as the Gök Dere valley and the Menemen- Manisa road. Thus a small fortification upon the Taş Kuyu hill, between boundary stone number 3 at Çetili Kaya and the now lost stone No. 5 must have belonged to the *Melanpagitai*. The fortress commands the entrance to the Değirmendere from the west.

The ancient site nearest to the east, facing ΠΑΑΥΔΙΤΩΝ on boundary stone No. 3 at Çetili Yaka, is on Asarlık Tepe¹³, at the eastern entrance to the Değirmendere valley. This settlement is located at a very strategic place west of the Dere Mahallesi. This is immediately east of the bridge where the modern Emiralem - Manisa highway crosses over the Değirmendere stream. From this position it controls the narrow pass of the Hermos which links southern Aiolis to Lydia and through which went the ancient Phokaia - Sardis road. The modern road also goes through a narrow pass between the hill of Asarlık Tepe and Telli Tepe hill to the north of it. Although Palaudis, on top of the Asarlık Tepe, is in a position to control the highway, it is clear that it needed to offset the defense gap created by its relative distance from the Hermos through the fortification of the Kocakaya Tepesi, in front of which the Hermos makes a bend¹⁴.

whose name is recorded on the above-mentioned boundary stones. Additionally, it has been suggested that the city mentioned by Stephanos Byzantios as πόλις πρὸς τῇ Κυμαίτῃ τῆς Αἰολίης must be the Herakleia on the slopes of the Sipylos (cf. L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 112; 115-116).

¹³ The first brief information, concerning Asarlık Tepe, including a topographic map, was supplied by R. Meriç, who made surveys in Aiolis (see "1984 yılı İzmir ve Manisa illeri yüzey araştırmaları", *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı III* (1986), 200.

¹⁴ The Kocakaya Tepesi is located between the Gediz River and the Menemen-Manisa highway. The fort on the summit must have controlled, together with Palaudis, the Hermos and the pass through Phokaia to Sardeis; this was an important pass in ancient times. The eastern and part of the northern portions of the hill are so steep as to need no fortifications. Only some small ravines seen in places on the northern slope were closed with walls. On the easier western slope remains of fortification walls in polygonal masonry are observable. On the top of the hill in an east-west orientation are two rocky summits and a large area of flat ground. On the eastern summit, in the soil excavated from an illicit excavation's trench, fragments of 4th century B. C. *amphorae* produced in Mende and also black glazed imitation of Attic *skyphoi* were recovered. It is clear that this settlement was probably founded in order to close the gap (with respect to the Hermos) in

As is shown by boundary stones Nos. 1-2, the border dividing the territories of Melanpagos and Herakleia passes very close to the latter, just as the Melanpagos - Palaudis boundry line marked by stone number 3 passes very close to Palaudis, which we have located on Asarlık Tepe. Between the two there is only the valley of the Değirmendere, both sides of which are steep and infertile. However, immediately to the east of Asarlık Tepe and at a more easily reached height and distance, there are two small plains with terraced fields¹⁵ on the plateau which lies among the villages of Ayvacık, Çaltı, Alaniçi and Karaorman. Furthermore there is no other ancient settlement of the Hellenistic and earlier periods between Asarlık Tepe and Magnesia, 20 kms to the east, including whole length of the Hermos' southern bank and the northern slopes of the Sipylos mountain.

According to W. M. Ramsay, though the inscription on boundary stone No. 1 might suggest an earlier period for the *Melanpagitai*, it is in fact no earlier than 300 B. C. He proposes the explanation that the archaic form of ΟΡΙΑ ΜΕΛΑΝΠΑΓΙΤΩΝ can be linked to the poor education of the people of a mountain settlement¹⁶. As for the letters on boundary stone number 2, these have no characteristics that could be dated to an early period. The date of boundary stone No. 3 is no different from the first two. Here the name ΠΑΛΑΥΔΙΤΩΝ has been deeply carved, whereas the ΟΡΙΑ ΜΕΛΑΝΠΑΓΙΤΩΝ immediately above it consists of smaller and shallower letters. The last word *Horia* was later added above.

Concerning the boundary stone No. 1, J. Keil differed from J. W. Ramsay's opinion, proposing that it should be dated to no later than the end of the 5th century B. C.¹⁷. L. Robert¹⁸ accepted the dating of J. Keil without mentioning that given by J. W. Ramsay. However it is probable that all three researchers based their opinions on the letter forms, without clarifying the reasons for their chronologies.

the defenses of Palaudis on Asarlık Tepe.

¹⁵ In the survey we made on the plateau's eastern boundary where Yoğurtçu Kale (an important fort in the late Byzantine period) is located, we found four village-sized settlements dated to the Late Roman and Late Byzantine periods. The first is immediately south of the boundary of the Çaltı village and yields ceramics dated to the 12th and 13th centuries A. D., together with paved streets and houses destroyed to foundation level. The second is immediately south of the road between the villages of Alaniçi and Karaorman. The third is north of the Çaltı village on the Halka hill and the fourth is north of the Uzunburun village on the western slopes of Mersinli Tepe. Near each of the settlements in question there are small plains and terraces which could have been exploited agriculturally. We believe that with a more systematic survey to be done upon the plateau, which rises by degrees towards the summit of Sipylos mountain in the south, much richer knowledge of the area's settlements and agricultural patterns can be obtained.

¹⁶ W. M. Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 300.

¹⁷ J. Keil - A. v. Premerstein, *loc. cit.*, note 7.

¹⁸ *Loc. cit.*, 115.

Due to the lack of systematic excavations and surveys in this area we need more evidence concerning the date of these settlements. Of the three cities, the center which gives the most numerous and recognisable ceramic finds is Palaudis, on the Asarlık Tepe. As a result of illicit digging, large numbers of 6th and 4th century B. C. pottery fragments are found on the surface at this site. The rare pieces of West Slope Ware and Megaran bowl fragments show that settlement here survived until the 3rd and 2nd centuries B. C. The pottery seen on Ballık Kayası, where Herakleia has been located, is not easily identifiable. On the other hand, the fact that Herakleia is included among the cities whose losses were repaired by Prusias II in 155 B. C. is chronologically in harmony with the latest pottery found on the surface at Palaudis. As for Melanpagos, the surface finds consist of fragments of pots for common ware which are not easy to identify.

In the arguments relative to the time in which the land disputes among the three cities were settled with boundary stones, it is well to keep in mind other boundary disputes in the Aiolian and neighboring regions in the complicated political situation of the Hellenistic period¹⁹. There must have been frequent quarrels over boundaries in Late Hellenistic period in the mountainous area of Aiolis, especially between Aigai and Myrina, since in this region we encounter a remarkably high number of boundary stones²⁰. In fact, an inscription records that in a dispute of this kind involving Aigai Antiochos II (261-246 B. C.) himself had to intervene for solving the problem²¹.

THE INSCRIPTIONS

1. Vakıf Melengiç Mevkii:

Bibliography: W. M. Ramsay, *JRS* 2 (1881), 44-54, 271-305; *Syll.*², No. 455; *Syll.*³, No. 934 (Height of the letters: 12 - 14 cm.).

A- On the side facing north :

B- On the side facing south:

ΟΡΙΑΜΕ
ΛΑΝΠΑΓΙΤΩΝ

ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΤΩΝ

2. Osmantepe Mevkii:

¹⁹ For an inscription concerning a territorial dispute between Klazomenai and Temnos which settled by judges from Knidos cf. P. Herrmann, *IstMitt* 29 (1979), 249-271.

²⁰ For these boundary stones cf. J. Keil - A. v. Premerstein, *Erste Reise* (Wien 1908), no. 204-207 and P. Herrmann, *Neue Inschriften zur historischen Landeskunde von Lydien und angrenzenden Gebieten* (Wien 1959), no. 2 (= H. Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Manisa Museum*, Wien 1994, no. 2, without text). For a boundary stone of Pergamon carved in the bedrock on the peninsula of Aliaga near Kyme cf. Helmut Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Kyme* (Bonn 1976), 76-78, no. 27.

²¹ P. Herrmann, *loc. cit.*

A- On the side facing west:
(Height of the letters: 9 - 17 cm.).

ΟΡΙΑ
ΗΡΑΚ(Α)Ε
ΩΤΩΝ

B- On the side facing east:
(Height of the letters: 10 - 15 cm.).

ΜΕΛΑ[N]
ΠΑΓΙΤΩΝ

3. Çetili Yaka Mevkii:

A- On the side facing north:
(Height of the letters: 9 - 17 cm.).

ΟΡΙ^ΑΜΕ[ΛΑΝΠΑ]
ΓΙΤΩΝ

B- On the side facing east:
Height of the letters: 10 - 15 cm.).

ΠΑΛΑΥΔΙΤΩΝ

4. Kırkayaklık hill above Gökkaya (on the side facing north):
(Height of the letters: 12 - 14 cm.).

ΟΡΟC ΟΡΟC

5. Gökdere valley (now destroyed):

ΜΕ[ΛΑΝΠΑΓΙΤΩΝ] ?

6. Çamlıbıçı:
(Height of the letters: 12 - 14 cm.).

Ο
ΞΥ ΕΡ

E. Doğer
İzmir 1995