Seleukid Perspectives – Band 1	
Franz Steiner Verlag	Auszug aus:

Seleukid Ideology

CONTENTS

Preface of the Series Editors
Preface of the Volume Editors
List of Figures
1. Richard Wenghofer and Altay Coşkun Introduction: The Dialectics of Seleukid Ideology
SECTION I: FORMATION OF SELEUKID DYNASTIC IDEOLOGY
2. Kyle Erickson Royal Propaganda and the Creation of Royal Status for Seleukos I
3. Eva Anagnostou-Laoutides The King-Ship of the Seleukids: An Alternative Paradigm for the Anchor Symbol
4. Altay Coşkun The First Seleukid Benefactions in Miletos and the Creation of a Dynastic Ideology
SECTION II: ENACTING SELEUKID KINGSHIP
5. Babett Edelmann-Singer Material Culture, Ritual Performance, and Seleukid Rule: Antiochos IV and the Procession at Daphne in 166 BCE
6. Stephen Harrison Antiochos at Daphne and Xerxes at Sardeis: A Comparative Perspective on the Seleukid Vision of Empire
7. Rolf Strootman Ritual Mutilation and the Construction of Treason: The Execution of Molon and Achaios by Antiochos III
8. Benjamin E. Scolnic Second-Hand Propaganda: Polybios and Zeno on the Role of Antiochos IV at the Battle of Panion

6 Contents

SECTION III: RESISTING SELEUKID ROYAL AUTHORITY

9. Deirdre Klokow Connectivity and Rural Spaces in the Seleukid Empire	201
10. Gillian Ramsey Rebel Poleis: The Politics of Anti-Seleukid Violence	219
SECTION IV: REFRAMING SELEUKID IDEOLOGY	
11. Germain Payen Le royaume artaxiade dans l'Empire séleucide: de dominé à dominant	237
12. Benjamin E. Scolnic Śar Wars – How a Judaean Author in the 160's BCE Transformed a Ptolemaic View of Hellenistic History into a Theology for His Time	261
13. Eran Almagor "To All Parts of the Kingdom": The Book of Esther as a Seleukid Text	283
SECTION V: RE-ASSESSING SELEUKID IDEOLOGY	
14. Richard Wenghofer Diplomatic Resistance to Seleukid Hegemony	319
15. Altay Coşkun The Efficacy of Ideological Discourse: Loyalty to the Seleukid Dynasty in Babylonia, Judaea, and Asia Minor	343
About the Authors	
Index of Names	
Index of Sources	381

CHAPTER 9

CONNECTIVITY AND RURAL SPACES IN THE SELEUKID EMPIRE

Deirdre Klokow

Abstract: The territoriality of Seleukid ideology presents a fertile area of study; less often considered in this vein are the impact and reception of Seleukid power in local, rural spaces, where the use, ownership, and development of productive land remained a primary zone of interaction between Seleukid power and the peoples of the empire. By examining two texts on land use and ownership from the life of the Seleukid queen Laodike I, namely the sale of a royal estate in Asia Minor and the Lehmann text from Babylonia, I aim to reconstruct the manner in which Seleukid imperial interventions shaped the rural spaces and experiences of the empire. The focus of this examination is on the responses of local, pre-conquest communities to the imposition of Seleukid space and their engagement with Seleukid authority. I argue that Seleukid imperial hegemony was imprinted on rural spaces through changes to pre-existing settlement patterns and systems of land use, demographic changes, and long-term investment in the infrastructure of connectivity such as roads and waterways. In so doing, the structures of the empire were brought into closer contact with the rural peoples spread throughout its territory, creating opportunities for dialogue and exchange. This paper suggests that the ideological implications of territorial transactions reflect a nuanced, performative negotiation of power and control between local communities and the many levels of the Seleukid imperial presence, extending beyond the well-studied world of kings and elites.

The Seleukid conceptualization of space was the result not just of conquest but of mobility, of the creation, perpetuation, and in some cases even the deliberate destruction of networks of communication linking political, religious, and administrative nodes throughout the imperial space. The definition of the Seleukid space was not, however, one-sided but rather a dialectical process of exchange and response mediated at each level of the social hierarchy. As the Seleukid landscape was reordered and formalized, the local, often indigenous populations were drawn into the Seleukid imperial project and through this contact shaped and redefined it in their own turn. By considering two different texts on land use and ownership from the

* My thanks are due to Paul Kosmin, Altay Coşkun, and Richard Wenghofer for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Feedback from the anonymous reviewers have likewise enhanced this paper, and I am grateful for their contributions while still retaining full responsibility for any remaining errors.

Promotional material
For distribution and publication
For further information please visit our homepage: www.steiner-verlag.de

202 Deirdre Klokow

life of Laodike I, this paper explores how the Seleukid conceptualization of space was implemented on the ground, as well as the role of infrastructure such as roads and waterways in linking the disparate territories into something like a cohesive whole. Tantalizingly, the texts hint at local responses to Seleukid colonization and suggest a more nuanced, reflective relationship between imperial power and non-urban spaces and peoples than the generally elite-focused scholarship would suggest. Separated in time by several decades and spanning much of the empire from west to east, the two texts offer a glimpse not simply at Seleukid negotiations of wealth and power but at the manner in which Seleukid interventions shaped the rural spaces and lived experiences of the empire.

On the 5th of Dios, year 59 SE (October 2, 254 BCE), Laodike I purchased from her husband Antiochos II the village of Pannoukome in Hellespontine Phrygia together with its lands, settlements (topoi), tower or fortified house (baris), and inhabitants (laoi), including those who had been resident in Pannoukome but had since relocated. Laodike was to receive the income from these properties for the year in which the sale was concluded, was to pay no royal taxes, and was given permission to attach her new estate to the city of her choice. The dossier recording the sale includes a letter of Antiochos II to Metrophanes, governor of Hellespontine Phrygia, a covering letter from Metrophanes to the oikonomikos Nikomachos, and a report by the *hyparch* charged with the administrative details relating to the sale. Taken together, the texts contain hints at local dissatisfaction with the Seleukid presence; Metrophanes was ordered to see that the borders of Laodike's new property were freshly surveyed as local farmers had ploughed up one of the boundaries along the old royal road in what was, perhaps, an attempt to expand their own holdings.² This action might, however, also be read as a form of active protest against, and deliberate engagement with, the Seleukid reordering of the region. Records of the sale were ordered to be published throughout Asia Minor at multiple sites of religious significance, suggesting a relevance beyond the mere record of a land transaction.

On the 8 *Addar*, 75 SE (= March 21, 236 BCE), the Babylonians reinscribed an earlier text recording that Laodike I and her sons Seleukos II and Antiochos (Hierax) had granted to the citizens of Babylon, Borsippa, and Kutha a stretch of royal lands along the banks of the Euphrates river.³ This land grant, set out in a small cuneiform tablet commonly known as the Lehmann tablet, records the history and conditions of the gift in the form of a declaration by the *šatammu* (chief temple administrator), Nergal-tēši-ēṭer, and the *kiništu* (council) of the Esagil temple. In brief, Antiochos II had given lands to his wife Laodike and to her sons, who in turn

- 1 *I.Didyma* 492A–C = *RC* 18–20 = *OGIS* 225. On the date of the sale, Coşkun 2016a, 117 with n. 47.
- 2 *I.Didyma* 492C, 1l. 65.
- The standard edition, based on a recently discovered copy of the text housed at the British Museum, is now Wallenfels and van der Spek 2014, *CTMMA* IV, text 148A and B. *Editio princeps* by Lehmann 1892, 330–332, n. 2; Sarkisian 1969, 321–323; van der Spek 1986 n. 11; Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1983, 128f. See also Ramsey 2020; Monerie 2018; Pirngruber 2017; Coşkun 2016a and forthcoming.

gave the lands to the cities for attachment to civic land.⁴ This land had been part of the royal possessions in northern Babylonia, having been passed to Antiochos II from his own father and grandfather, and included arable land given in exchange for plots previously confiscated by the royal authority.⁵ The proceeds of the land's harvests were left at the disposal of the owners of the land, while tithes from the harvest were granted to the patron temples of each city, namely Esagil, Ezida, and Emeslam.⁶ Notably, provision was made for the inhabitants of the newly gifted lands to keep their fields and garden plots 'in perpetuity'.⁷ Finally, the boundaries of the grant were to be publicly marked and recorded and the whole gift made public in an inscription protected by both blessing and curse; the text is recorded on a monument in the Ekisalbanda, the courtyard of the Esagil temple. The text itself seems to be a copy made in the reign of Antiochos IV of a *naru*, a stele or other commemorative monument, recording the original land donation.

Both texts have often been read as further evidence for the now well-understood Seleukid policy of making use of royal lands to build connections and buy loyalty in the cities of the empire or with powerful individuals: land as currency. Certainly, the primacy of cities in the Seleukid political and economic project cannot be overlooked, whether one considers newly created settlements, the many ancient cities scattered across the plains of Mesopotamia, the Levant, and the Upper Satrapies, the Greek poleis of the western empire and the creation of Greek politeumata in pre-conquest settlements, or the widespread creation of garrison settlements. In this respect the Seleukids are the true heirs of that prolific city-founder, Alexander III. The rapid colonization of key regions of the empire and the absolute centrality of urban settlements to the Seleukid conceptualization of empire and control are thus scrawled across the map in very deliberate ink. Thanks to the work of a coterie of recent scholars, the geographical and ideological impact of Seleukid urbanization is well understood. Indeed, the cultural and symbolic significance of Seleukid cities has come to define our conception of the Seleukids as a power with ideological rather than administrative strength.⁸ We might, however, question to what extent the former can exist without the latter. Much of the focus on Seleukid cities stems, of course, from the nature of the surviving evidence, but the emphasis does tend to obscure the relationship of the Seleukids with the rural lands of the empire, both in its physical sense as arable, productive territory forming the economic and nutritive

- 4 *CTMMA* IV 148, 11. 3–12.
- 5 CTMMA IV 148, II. 5–7. The land is taken from Antiochos' own estates on the Euphrates river near Babylon (ša bīt ramānišu, his own house). These lands are therefore understood as the private property of the king, which the text clearly categorizes as separate from royal land; see Monerie 2018, 197–202. Pirngruber 2017, 67f. regards this as clear evidence both for the existence of crown property as a legal category, and for the possibility of its alienation as civic property.
- 6 *CTMMA* IV 148, II. 8–11.
- 7 CTMMA IV 148, Il. 37.
- On Seleukid cities, Cohen 1978, 1995, and 2006; Ma 2000; Capdetrey 2007, 51–81, 191–218 and passim; Boehm 2018. On the ideological importance of Seleukid cities, Kosmin 2014. For an emphasis on rural settlements in the Seleukid empire, Schuler 1998; Capdetrey 2007, 135–158; Mileta 2008.

Promotional material For distribution and publication



Tell your friends and colleagues about your latest publication – it's quick and easy and in accordance with copyright conventions. There are no restrictions on sharing this PDF via social media.

