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I. Introduction

From 1993 onwards the name of Mount Masa was known from an inscription found in the Le-toon. The inscription was published by D. Rousset in 2010, after a lengthy work on its contents. The inscription records a convention between the Lycian League and Termessos at Oinoanda, dated between 160 and 150 B.C., and is one of the most interesting recent epigraphic finds concerning ancient topography, as the text includes a long and detailed description of the demarcation work around Mount Masa. Mount Masa is also recorded in the foedus (treaty) between Caesar and Lycia in 46 B.C. as one of the landmarks on the northern border of Lycia. After Rousset (and after S. Vatin, who translated the text from French and general conclusions into Turkish in the same book on pp. 171-175), the late S. Şahin produced a Turkish translation of the text, presenting some revised readings of the Greek text and in understanding the descriptions. Neither Rousset nor the late S. Şahin nor our team (in 2015) were able to locate Mount Masa precisely in the Akdağlar mountain range. This paper will not focus on its historical background or legal aspects of the text, which have been extensively discussed by D. Rousset, but concerns the location of the demarcated area as a result of preliminary research carried out in 2019, based on study of regional maps and ground testing of our expectations through field surveys, which we believe that we have established the mountain’s topography. We plan more comprehensive research in the near future.
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The text, which is based on Rousset’s edition, and its English translation are as follow:

Topographical abbreviations: Rv = Ravine; R = Road; B = Boundary mark; RG = Golbanounda; RE = Endyrenos

I. 1-8: the dating

- Priesthood for Rome of Lycian Confederacy
- Priesthood for Apollon (Lycia)
- Priesthood for Zeus (Termessos at Oinoanda)
- Priesthood for Rome (Termessos at Oinonda)

I. 9-22: the signatory delegates of both parties

- Five men from Lycia (1 from Xanthos, 1 from Phellos, 1 from Kyaneai, 2 from Tlos)
- Seven men from Termessos at Oinoanda

I. 22-26: Termessans at Oinoanda consent to

- the decisions taken in Kos
- the transit rights concerning Tloans and Kadyandans

I. 27-33: The ownership and use of Mount Masa

- Tloans own the mount
- Termessans at Oinoanda benefit from it only for grazing and lumber

I. 33-91: The demarcation work of Mount Masa

1. 34-37: The southern ravine (Rv1) leading down from the mount and ending on the road between Tlos and...
Termessos at Oinoanda; the first boundary mark.

I. 38-49, main road, second ravine (RV2) and Golbanounda: The unmarked and descriptive part from the first boundary mark up to the ridge
way on the mountain; a considerably long section; The Golbanounda
meets the ravine joining from the right (south), which reaches the
ridge way. The Wooden Hermaion in
between was on the banks of the Gol-
banounda, while no hint for the loca-
tion of “polyandreion”.

I. 44: Şahin Golbaşnou’Izdın
I. 48: perhaps εἰς τε

I. 49-56, the main junction: The
meeting point of the RV2 (west),
ridge way (north-south axis), the
third ravine (RV3; south) and River
Endyrenos (east) is the most precise
location in the text. On this very
point, there is a rock, on which there
should be a boundary mark.

I. 56-70, the third ravine (RV3): The
surveys start climbing up the rav-
ine in a southerly direction. This
is the first part of the main section,
marked with 9 vertical boundaries.
On its eastern slopes the ridgeway
leads up. Here the ravine inter-
sected with the borderline some-
where between B7 and B8. Both the
ravine and the ridgeway reach the
flatland, with the last vertical bound-
ary mark (B10) in the ravine was
carved.

I. 66: perhaps εἰς τὰς πλάκας; see below p. 150 fn. 17.

I. 70: perhaps [..... πλάκας, see below p. 150 fn. 17.

I. 70: Together with the next bound-
ary mark, we see that horizontal
marks on flat stones appear, indicat-
ing that the surveyors reached a plat-

I. 76-77: Şahin (2014, 218 fn. 408j) suggests that the distance here should be taken as two stades (στάδιον δύο), making the ending of I.75 ...ΔΙΑ and
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andοις, ἐφ’ ἢς ὀδὸς[R1] καὶ ἐπεκολάσσαι[ας] ὄρον[R1] ἐπὶ πέτρα-

κατὰ τὸ πολυανδρείον, κατ’ εὐθὺ ἐπὶ τὸ[ν] προσονομαζό-

μενον ἤλιον Ἐρμαιον τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ὄδου[R1], ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἐρμαιοῦ προσβάντες τῇ ὄδῃ[R1] τῇ αὐτῇ τῇ τῇ -τούτι

χεῖς ὡσεὶ ἐκατὸν, ὡς ἢ φάραγγα[γ] [RV2] ενδείξια καταφέρει

κάτα τῆς πολυανδροῦ[RG] τοῦ προσονομαζομένου[νθρ.]

Γόλβανουνθίων, καὶ ἀνὰ ῥοῦν τῷ αὐτῷ ποταμῷ[RG]

τῆς συμβολῆς τοῦ τὸ ποταμοῦ[RG] καὶ τῆς φά-

ραγγειας[RV2], καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ ὑπὸ ἀνατείνει ἡ αὐτῇ φα-

ραγγας[RV2] μέχρι τῆς διόδου[R2] τῆς φερούσης ἀπὸ Τερη-

σοῦ τῆς πρὸς Οἰνοάνδος εἶστε κάμακας τὰς

Τλᾶ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς διόδου[R2] ἐπιστρεφόντων ὡς ἐπὶ

κά’ μ’ ἁκας καὶ προβάντων ὡσεὶ ήπειρί(ς) ἐκατὸν ἐπὶ τῆς φάραγγας[RV3] τῆν ἐγ δεξιῶν τὴν καταφέρουσαν

μέχρι τοῦ ποταμοῦ[R3] τοῦ προσαγορευμένου Ἕννυ

δυρηνοῦ, καὶ ὡς ὁ αὐτοῦ ποταμοῦ[R3] καταφέρει μέχρι

τῆς πέτρας τῆς ὄδους κατὰ τὴν συμβολὴν τοῦ το

ποταμοῦ[R3] καὶ τῆς φάραγγος[RV3] ἐφ’ ἦς καὶ ὄρον[R2] ἐνεκολά-

σαμεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ τοῦ ὄροο πῶς ἀνατείνει ἡ αὐτῇ

φάραγγα[RV3] προβάντων ὡσεὶ σταδίων ὄροο[R3] ἐνεκολάσα-

μεν ἐπὶ πέτρας, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ τοῦ ὄρου τῇ αὐτῇ

φάρα[γγα] [RV3] προβάντων ὡσεὶ πλέθρα τρία ἐνεκολάσα-

μεν ὄροο[R4] ἐπὶ πέτρας, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ τοῦ ὄρου πῶς ἀνα-

tείνει ἡ αὐτῇ φάραγγα[RV3] εἰς τὸν πετρωδῶν τόπον

δ[λαλον ὄρον[R3] ἐνεκολάσαμεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ κατ’ εὐθὺ

προβάντας τῇ ἐνεκολάσαμεν ἄλλον ὄρον[R6] ἐπὶ πέτρας,

[και] ν[εκλαντες μικρὸν εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ ἐνεκολάσαμ(ας)]

ἐπὶ τοῦ πετρώδη τοῦ ποταμοῦ πῶς ἀνατείνει τὴν ἀνωτάτω

θυ[ς ἐπὶ τὸν πεπόλασαμεν] ἐπὶ τὸν πεπόλασαν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ κατ’ εὐθὺ κατέβαμεν εἰς τὸν πε

τοῦτο[ν] τοῦ ὄρου κατ’ εὐθὺ προελθόντες ὡσεὶ σταδίων

ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας τῆς ἐπάνω τῆς φάραγγος[RV3, καὶ ἀ-

πο τοῦτοῦ κατ’ εὐθὺ ὡς ἀνατείνει τὴν ἀνωτάτω

I.H. I ˺. KA ἐπεκολάσαμεν ἐπὶ πέτρας ὄρον[R10], καὶ ἀπὸ ὑ

to[ῦ] τοῦ ὄρου κατ’ εὐθὺ προελθόντες ὡσεὶ σταδίων

ἐνεκολάσαμεν ἄλλον ὄρον[R8], καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτοῦ κατ’ εὐθὺ προελθόντες ὡσεὶ σταδίων

ἐνεκολάσαμεν ὄρον[R10] ἐπὶ πέτρας ἐπίπεδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ[ῦ] τοῦ ὄρου προβάντες πᾶλιν ἐπὶ εὐθύ ὡςεὶ στα-

δίων ἐπεκολάσαμεν ὄρον[R12] ἐπὶ πέτρας ἐπίπεδου, καὶ
the beginning of l. 76 ΔΥΟ. But the end of l.75 is clearly legible and ΔΥΟ does not make a sense in any circumstance. Rousset thought of the possibility of εὐθέως, but remained reluctant because of ἐπ' εὐθύ employed in previous line with the same meaning.

L 84-91: The defile (ἀὐχήν) mentioned should have provided a pass to the peak of the mountain. The surveyors crossed over its mouth to the south, and carved last two boundary marks. No further boundary mark was carved beyond this point. A walk to the south took them to the top of the first ravine (Rv1).

L 91-97: The cancellation of the Knidian arbitration received from Roman Senate and the termination of the debate.

L 97-104: Lycians pay 25 talent of new Rhodian silver plinthophors to the Termessans at Oinoanda; the penalty of 100 talents for a breach of agreement by one of the parties.

L 104-110: Inscribing the treaty on four stone stelai to be erected in following places:

1. The Letoon of Xanthos
2. Tlos, the temple of Artemis
3. Termessos at Oinoanda, the temple of Zeus
4. Kaunos
When Harpalos was priest for Rome of Lycian Confederacy and Apollon, in the 21st of the month Daisios; while in Termessos at Oinoanda Trokondas (II), son of Diogenes (II) and adoptive son of Kibaimis of Trokondas (I) of Diogenes (I), was priest for Zeus, and Komon, his (=Trokondas II) son, for Rome, in the 18th of the month Daisios of 34th year.

On one side the Lycians per the designated men: Straton from Xanthos, son of Eukles, Tandasis from Phellos, son of Admetos and adoptive son of Straton, Amynatas from Kyaneai, son of Polemon, Limnaios son of Labas and Eirenaios son of Pantakhos, both from Tlos; on the other side, Termessans at Oinoanda per the delegates Sandabis, son of Sandabis of Midas, Polykritos, son of Attalos of Papos, Moles, son of Arpias of Hermaios, Ponekos, son of Hermaios of Ponekos, Hermaios, son of Hephaestion of Artimas, Manes, son of Arkhias of Dorymenes, and Artimas, son of Hermaios of Hermaios, have together come to and drawn up the following terms:

The Termessans conceding that the verdicts and enforcements brought in the city of Koans are valid, (and) that the transit rights concerning Tloans and Kadyandans, with which Termessans brought charges against them, already exist:

Let Mount Masa belong to Tloans, let the Termessans at Oinoanda have its rights of grazing and lumber evermore, without having the authority for building, sowing and harvesting. The mountain mentioned above has been demarcated for grazing and lumber:

Starting the demarcating from the ending part of the ravine\(^{(R_{v1})}\), which slopes down to the road\(^{(R_{1})}\) leading from Tlos to Termessos at Oinoanda, then on this road\(^{(R_{1})}\) we carved a boundary mark\(^{(B_{1})}\) on a rock; and from this (boundary mark) moving along the same road\(^{(R_{1})}\) down to the common burial-place\(^{(2)}\), then straight to the so-called “Wooden Hermaion” on the road\(^{(R_{1})}\); then from the Hermaion walking about a hundred cubits (ca. 45 m) along the same road\(^{(R_{1})}\), as the ravine\(^{(R_{v2})}\) on the right slopes down to the stream called Golbanounta, and upward on the bed of the same stream\(^{(RG)}\) until the junction of the stream\(^{(RG)}\) and the ravine\(^{(R_{v2})}\), and from here, as the same ravine\(^{(R_{v2})}\) slopes up to the pass\(^{(R_{2})}\), which leads from Termessos at Oinoanda to the stakes of Tlos, and from the pass\(^{(R_{2})}\), turning towards as if towards the stakes, and proceeding about hundred cubits (ca. 45 m) to the ravine\(^{(R_{v3})}\) on the right, which slopes down to the stream called Endyrenos, and as the same stream\(^{(RE)}\) runs down until the rock, which is

---

4 Şahin thinks that Trokondas (…Τροκονδου Διογένου…) in l. 5 and Trokondas (…Τροκονδου του Διογένου…) in l. 6 were the same persons, and that Komon was the son of this Trokondas and adoptive son of Kibaimis, see Şahin 2014, 216 with fn. 408b.

5 Şahin suggests that πολυανδρεῖον might refer to a common burial place for those who died in the same place after a war, as was already suggested by Rousset (2010, 56). He also also speculated whether the word was correctly inscribed, and suggested as an alternative πολυδένδρεον, ‘place of many trees, related to the woody nature of the place, and connected to the notion of a "Wooden Hermaion" (Şahin 2014, 216-217, fn. 408e). The word πολυανδρεῖον can clearly be read in the inscription.

6 Şahin 2014, 217 fn. 408f suggests that reading should be corrected to Γολβανου Ἰνδῶν, which he relates to the Indos River (Dalaman Çayı), the spring sources of which reach to Kabalia. But this proposal cannot be justified by both the reading and the geography.
situated below the junction of the stream (RE) and the ravine (Rv3), and on which we carved a boundary mark (B2), and from this boundary mark, as the same ravine (Rv3) climbs up, proceeding about a stade (ca. 185 m) we carved a boundary mark (B3) on a rock, and from this boundary mark proceeding about three plethra (ca. 93 m) with the same ravine (Rv3), we carved a boundary mark (B4) on a rock, and from this boundary mark, as the same ravine (Rv3) climbs up to the stony place, we carved another boundary mark (B5), and from this (boundary mark) proceeding straight we carved another boundary mark (B6) on a rock, and slightly inclining to the right we carved another boundary mark (B7), and from this (boundary mark) towards the road (R2) leading to stakes? (or to plateaux?) and stepping over it (=the road; R2) shortly we carved another boundary mark (B8), and from this (boundary mark, walking) straight we carved a boundary mark (B9) on the rock on the upper part of the ravine (Rv3), and from this (boundary mark) straight, as <the ravine?> reaches up to the topmost level ..., we carved a boundary mark (B10) on a rock, and from this boundary mark going forward about a stade (ca. 185 m) we carved a boundary mark (B11) on a flat rock, and from this boundary mark proceeding again straight about a stade (ca. 185 m) we carved a boundary mark (B12) on a flat rock, and from this boundary mark proceeding right ahead about a stade (ca. 185 m) leading straight to the stony place, on which we carved a boundary mark (B13), and from this (boundary mark) proceeding about a plethron (ca. 31 m) we carved a boundary mark (B14) on a rock, and from this boundary mark proceeding about a stade (ca. 185 m) we carved a boundary mark (B15) on a flat rock, which is next to the plain, and from this boundary mark proceeding straight about three plethra (ca. 93 m) we carved a boundary mark (B16) on a flat rock, and from this (boundary mark), turning right and proceeding about three plethra (ca. 93 m) across the defile we carved a boundary mark (B17) on a flat rock, and from this boundary mark proceeding about a stade (ca. 185 m) we carved a boundary mark (B18) on a flat rock, and from this (boundary mark) straight up to the ravine (Rv1) lying by left hand side (southerly), and as the ravine slopes down to the road (R1) leading from Tlos to Termessos at Oinoanda until to the boundary mark (B1), from which we started to demarcate.

[l. 91-97] Let the complaints, about which the Lycians and the Termessans at Oinoanda received from the Senate the people of Knidians as the judge, be invalid, in order that no complaint shall remain for the Lycians against the Termessans at Oinoanda, and for the Termessans at Oinoanda against the Lycians by no manner of means.

[l. 97-104] Let the Lycians bring in twenty-five talents of new Rhodian silver plinthophors to the Termessans at Oinoanda. In case one of them does not abide in what have been written above, and infringe one of them, it shall pay hundred talents of new Rhodian silver plinthophors to the abiding one, and let the supplements or revisions be invalid.

[l. 104-110] They shall set up four stone stelai, inscribing this convention: one in the sanctuary of Leto located beside the Xanthians, one at Tlos in the sanctuary of Artemis, one in the sanctuary of Zeus beside the Termessans at Oinoanda, fourth one beside Kaunians in a sanctuary they would assign.
Both Rousset and Şahin presented hypothetical maps of the possible geographical situation based upon the description provided in the inscription (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). They have understood some sections differently from each other, but both drawings are perfect examples of how people who are unfamiliar with the area, or just don’t know where the mountain is, envisage the topography only from a textual description. Both drawings will surprise readers when compared to the mountain’s actual geography.

Fig. 1) Rousset’s drawing (Rousset 2010, Fig. 42)
II. General observations on the geography and on the topographical description given in the text

Since the main road between Tlos and Termessos lay along a south-north axis, the first important topographical clue is that Mount Masa was isolated from the rest of the mountain range by two ravines, which cannot be confused with the others: one in the south, Rv1 (l. 33-37 and l. 88-91), and one in the north (l. 42-49), Rv2, both of which should join or cross the main road between Tlos and Termessos and lead up to the mountain according to the description (see Fig. 1-Fig. 2 above). Namely, these ravines should have run without interruption between the road and the high mountain crests. The text implies that the northern ravine crosses the road and continues down the western slopes of the Mount Masa. Therefore, determining the course of the main road is very important for establishing the unmarked boundary of Mount Masa. We also understand that two rivers joined into the northern ravine. The river called Golbanounda (RG) flowed by “Wooden Hermaion” in the lower section of the ravine (l. 40-44), while the river called Endyrenos (RE) joined it in the upper sections of the same ravine, where it extended up to the pass/ridgeway (l. 46-49). These are basic elements which define the area.

Another point about the description in the text concerns the movement of the surveyors in the area. Our field surveys have shown that the surveyors did not walk along the entire boundary line that the inscription describes, since some sections were obviously impassable due to the very high rocky cliffs in the gullies and to the steep slopes, as we experienced ourselves in the northern
ravine. There was no need to walk at all in these sections, as the ravines themselves sufficed to define the boundary, and a description alone was sufficient. These sections are indicated in the text by employing ὡς. This word is used in l. 42 to describe a short section between the lower part of the Golbanounda on the road until the point where second ravine (Rv2) joins it higher up; l. 46 describes a slightly longer section from the junction of the Golbanounda and the northern ravine leading up to the ridgeway; l. 53 describes the course of the Endyrenos down to the rock where it meets the third ravine (Rv3); lines 56, 60 and 69 describe the ascent of the third ravine (Rv3); and l. 88 describes the southern ravine (Rv1) sloping down to the road between Tlos and Termessos, where the demarcation started. The sections they walked or journeyed are indicated by phrases using the verb βαίνω on most occasions, or πορεύω, which occurs only once in the middle-voice in l. 38, and which should describe a different sort of movement from βαίνω. In l. 38-40, where πορεύω is employed, the surveyors are said to have gone or perhaps to have been transported (mounted, or in a vehicle) from the first boundary mark to the common burial-place and the “Wooden Hermaion”. Here they start to describe the boundary line formed by the northern ravine (Rv2). Hence, the section between the first boundary mark and the “Wooden Hermaion” seems to be the longest unmarked section of the entire boundary7. In any case, it seems to have been unnecessary to walk this section and to carve boundary marks, since the boundary here was formed by the road itself and the northern ravine. The surveyors certainly walked the section from the second to the eighteenth boundary mark. After the pass and the second boundary mark, the direction of demarcation shifted to the right, namely to the south. All the boundary marks were carved in sequence in this section until it passed over a defile, which is actually a pass to the peak of Mount Masa. This section with boundary marks was contiguous with the territory of Termessos, where the Termessans could enter the area along the mountainous ridgeway starting from the pass (diodos) leading to the Tloan “poles/stakes” and to the plateaux. The demarcation line continued from nearby the defile without marking boundaries up to the top of the southern ravine (Rv1), through which the boundary line descended to the first boundary mark. These descriptions do not enclose and demarcate a fixed area8, since only a small part of the boundary was defined with boundary marks, while the rest was established by main road and the ravines. A detailed study of maps and the use of 3D mapping software provided a good solution for the location of the Mount Masa, and this localization was supported by the field surveys of 2019. These discoveries also improve our understanding of some sections of the text.

In modern geography, the general name of the main mountain range between Tlos and Termessos/Oinoanda is Akdağlar. The part north of Tezli Dere is also called Küçük (“Minor”) Akdağlar. There are also different names for separate parts of the range. The road from Tlos to Köristan leads quite straight through the western lower slopes of the Akdağ massif. Accordingly, Mount Masa should have been further north, somewhere between the southern flank of Tezli Dere and a point close to Oinoanda, namely on Küçük Akdağlar. The northern ends of the mountainous country to the north of Tezli Dere are relatively close to the city. From northwest to southeast the hills and mountains around Tezli Dere are:

---

7 Cf. Şahin 2014, 218.

8 Rousset 2010, 121 considers Mount Masa a small part of Akdağlar, see also 126: “entre 90 et 900 hectares”.
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Table 1) The mountains and hills south and the north of Tezli Dere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The south of Tezli Dere</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Acreage (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dikmen Tepe (Karadağ)</td>
<td>1300 m</td>
<td>70 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eren Tepe (Ulualan)</td>
<td>2053 m</td>
<td>570 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keklicek Tepe</td>
<td>2099 m</td>
<td>750 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellidoru Tepesi</td>
<td>2519 m</td>
<td>540 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The north of Tezli Dere</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Acreage (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haciosman Dağı</td>
<td>2440 m</td>
<td>3300 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozkaya Tepesi</td>
<td>2143 m</td>
<td>710 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peynirdeliği Tepesi</td>
<td>2050 m</td>
<td>600 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are other mountains in the direction of Oinoanda and Girdev, northeast of Tlos, but these are too far from the main road for them to be connected with the expected topography. Some of the mountains listed above can also be eliminated. Yellidoru Tepesi and Peynirdeliği Tepesi are too far east of the main road. However, the other mountains may have been accessible from the main ancient road from Tlos to Oinoanda. Mitchell proposed that it should be identified somewhere in the section between the south of Oinoanda and the west of Girdev. Rousset suggests in his maps that the eastern parts of Keklicek Tepe near Darıözü-Deliktaş (Kastabara) might have been Mount Masa, while Şahin does not make any proposal.

Pastoral life and lumbering, described by the terms ἐπινέμησις καὶ ξυλισμός (l. 27-28 and l. 30-31) in the text, are still practised on the mountain plateaux, though they have become less important and most of the forests have become degraded today, as is the case, though better, for building, sowing and harvesting of crops (ἐποικοδομῆσαι, φυτεύσαι and σπεῖραι in l. 32-33). Research has shown that the plateaux to the north of Tezli Dere, i.e. Küçük Akdağlar, are more fertile both for grazing and agriculture.

---

10 Rousset 2010, figs. 41, 43.
Relevant remains concerning the roads between Tlos and Termessos/Oinoanda

There are two roads mentioned in the text. One is the main road (R1; l. 35-42 and l. 88-91), the other is a ridgeway crossing over the mountains leading from Termessos to the “Tloan stakes” (R2; l. 46-50 and l. 65-67). According to the text, the starting point of the demarcation is the end of a ravine, that leads down to the road between Tlos and Termessos. This is the main road leading past the western slopes of Mount Masa, while the ridgeway remains behind its peak to the east.

1. The main road

Detailed accounts of this road, mostly on its southern section, have already been given in other studies. Here I will summarize former conclusions and add the latest results from 2019 campaign, which provided important evidence concerning the road and the topography described in the text. The main road was the one mentioned in Monumentum Patarense (MP) as “ἀπὸ Τλῶ εἰς Ὀινέανδα διὰ Πλατα[...] στάδια σ..”, i.e. “(the length of the road) from Tlos to Oinoanda through (the territory) of Plata[. . .] (is) 2[. . .] stades”. The distance between these two cities is at least 200 stades (ca. 37 km), since the last one or two digits are lost. According to our observations, the length of the possible route was probably more than 40 km. The settlement of Plata[...] mentioned between Tlos and Oinoanda has not been localised, but it was probably around Eren Tepe (Ulualan); and the ancient ruins in Zindan, Köristan, Dikmen Tepe, Çökek may have belonged to Plata[...], although none of the inscriptions found in these places mentions a toponym. The ancient route seems to have been followed by the modern road which leads through Yakaköy, Kayacik and Söğüt. To the east of Köristan, on the western slope of Eren Tepe (Ulualan), we have found letters carved on the rocks (Fig. 5-Fig. 6). These were probably numbers, 5 (E), 6 (?), 7 (Z), perhaps encircling an area for a special purpose. But these marks cannot be related to the demarcation of Mount Masa as described in the text of the inscription.

After Köristan the road leads east into the valley of Tezli Dere, crosses the Tezli stream at the end of the Karabağlık ravine near Boyali, and reaches Çökek, where there are several ancient tombs. We propose that the southern ravine mentioned in the text was the Karabağlık ravine, as this is the only ravine along the whole course of the road, which leads down from the mountain to the ancient road and ends there. The road should have passed east of Kayaarası, where there are significant remains of an outpost on a hill. This outpost overlooks the Xanthian Valley to the west.

---


14 TAM II 2, nr. 712-717; Rousset 2010, 155-166 (Çökek).

15 A part of the northern ancient road leaving Tlos was found by the team headed by T. Korkut, see Korkut 2015a, 118-120; Korkut 2015b, 39 and 108 res. 93.

16 Onur 2017, 290, 298-299 figs. 2-5.
and the road to the east, and was probably within the territory of Tlos. The Deliktaş ravine, which is north of the outpost, marked the boundary with Termessos (see below).

The northern section of the road cannot be traced until a clearly visible section on steep slopes to the north of Hacıosman stream (Fig. 11-Fig. 13). The width of the road reaches up to 3 m, and can be followed in two sections one for ca. 500 m on the south-eastern slopes of Eren Tepe below the Hacıosman fountain, another for ca. 150-200 m further up nearby the sources of the Hacıosman stream. The road ran to today’s Çukuryurt, most probably passing by the eastern slope of Kızılca Tepe, and the western slopes of Nohutlu Tepe, finally reaching Kurttaşı through Çukuryurt. After Kurttaşı, Oinoanda is reached by a direct course along the ridge of Susuzdağ.
Figs: The course of the ancient road between Tlos and Oinoanda by Hacıosman Stream
2. The ridgeway from Oinoanda to Tloan Stakes and to the plateaux on the Mount Masa

There is also another road from Termessos to the “poles/stakes” of Tlos across the mountain (l. 46-49). This road not only connected Termessos/Oinoanda to the Tloan stakes but to the plateaux across the mountain. We learned from our field surveys that this road is still in use, leading from Gökbêl Yaylasi to the yaylas of Karanız and Makmara, and then perhaps down to the main road through Çökek Yurdu along the eastern bank of Karabağlık ravine. After Makmara, there are also several roads leading to yaylas including Girdev and other places on the mountain. From Gökbêl Yaylasi to the north in the direction of Oinoanda, the road leads through Elmaağacı, where there are several rock reliefs and a khamasorion tomb with a quite worn inscription. This road follows the demarcated third ravine (Rv3) leaving it on its western side.

In 2015 we discovered two marks carved in bedrock on the mountainous section to the east of Makmara Yaylasi, one in Makmara and the other in Dumlu, to the south of Oinoanda. The first one (Fig. 19) is carved vertically on a flat high rock, a simple round mark, which cannot be seen from the ground level. A tiny canal connects the hole down to a crack in the rock. So, not only it does not seem to have served as a boundary mark, but it was also outside the demarcated area. The second one (Fig. 20) in Dumlu was carved on an upright rock is a typical boundary mark, with the letter Δ inside an O. However, this cannot be one of the marks mentioned in the inscription, since it is too far from the demarcated area. The beginnings of l. 66 and l. 70 contain illegible words which are important to understand the destination of the ridgeway for the former (l. 66), while a place, where the ascent of Rv3 ends, for the latter (l. 70).
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Figs: The ridgeway from Gökbel Yaylası to Karanz Yaylası

Fig. 16

Fig. 17

Fig. 18
The destination of the ridgeway cannot be precisely ascertained, as can also be seen in Rousset’s uncertain restoration (εἰς [κάμ?]ακς) for l. 66. If these κάμακες (the stakes of Tlos; l. 48-50) were beyond the demarcation area, to the south of the mount, this proposal of restoration is still a possible option. One possibility might be Deliktaş/Darıözü (Kastabara), since the ridgeway did not make so much sense for those who wished to go to Tlos, because they would have picked the main road along the slopes of Mount Masa. The ridgeway seems to have served as a road to reach the eastern regions such as Girdev and upper parts of Tezli Dere, to the south of which was located the settlement in Deliktaş/Darıözü (Kastabara). This settlement has towers dating from the Hellenistic period, and probably already existed in the time of this inscription. Its location is also quite strategic, as it was on the way to Mylias from Tlos. But if κάμακες were in the same place with the pass (diodos; see below pp. 153-155), then we might need to find out if there might be some other options for the possible word.¹⁷

¹⁷ For the beginning of l. 70, Rousset gives the following traces: IH.Ι=._ΚΑ, which does not provide any hint of a common geographic description or a place name. One possibility could be that the word ending with -ΚΑ might have been the subject of ἀνατείνει, which is without a subject in the surviving part of the sentence, but there is no suitable word available in the nominative form. From the construction, it seems that the word ending with -ΚΑ here is in the feminine accusative, the article of which is τὴν in the previous line. The whole construction, ἀνατείνει (ἡ φάραγξ;) ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνωτάτω IH.Ι=._ΚΑ, translates as, “the ravine slopes up to the topmost level ... ”. A feminine word ending with -ξ with the genitive root -κος might be required. It might be suitable here to employ the word κάμαξ, only if a series of κάμακες was erected along the ridgeway at least up to the plateau, where the ravine ends (see below pp. 155-157). If the word is not a proper name, but the name of a geographical formation or an adjective for a possible preceding word, since its location is described as in the topmost level, the possible words are limited, as it should also not exceed the gap of 7 letters. All that I have been able to find, although this list may be deficient, carry the -αξ ending: λίθαξ (stony), ἕρμαξ (heap of stones; cairn), κλῖμαξ (step), λεῖμαξ (meadow), πῖδαξ (spring, fountain), βῶλαξ (lump, clod of earth), ἐριβῶλαξ (with large clods), πλάξ (flat land, plain). In the physical geography, the ridgeway reaches the Karanız plateau, while the ravine ends on the western edge of the same plateau. After Karanız, the road continues to the Makmara plateau, from where it also possible to pass to the İğdirce plateau. Further, the boundary mark in Dumlu (Fig. 20) is clearly on the ridgeway to the Girdev plateau. It seems possible that the word in l. 70 might have been πλάξ, indicating today’s Karaniz plateau. The same
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IV. The details of the demarcation and their location in the modern geography

The aim of the topographical description in the text was to define the demarcated area exactly and in detail, thereby preventing any possible confusion to the contracting parties and to contemporaries. The description in the text would have been clear to those who were familiar with the topography. However, matching an ancient description to modern geography is usually difficult, and this is certainly true for a specific area in such a mountainous terrain, even though we have the detailed information, such as ravines, rivers, plateaux (derived from marked flat stones in the text) provided by the inscription. The field survey of 2019 produced firm results concerning the location of Mount Masa and the topographical details in the text. But unfortunately, no demarcation marks were found in the expected area, which is the third ravine (Rv3), except for B2 (see below Fig. 21-Fig. 23), despite several days of searching by the members of the survey team. There are several reasons for this. The nature of the rocks in the area is not durable. The locals call them “Eriyen Kayalar” (“melting rocks”). The surface of the rocks easily splits off. A lot of rock appears to have fallen after earthquakes or as a result of natural erosion, and had fragmented. Geomorphological research is needed to understand the historical progress and conditions. It is also possible that these marks might have already been removed in an earlier period by local people, interpreting them as signs indicating “treasure”, though none of those whom we asked knew or had heard about these marks. Another point might be that these boundary marks lost their utility and were not protected after Termessos/Oinoanda was incorporated into Lycian territory. And of course, it is possible that our team might somehow have failed to notice them.

Mount Masa was today’s Hacıosman Dağı, the acreage of which is ca. 3300 ha, i. e. ca. 33 square kilometres.18 It has three peaks called Haciosmandağı Tepesi (2440 m), Karanlık Tepe (2346 m) and Eren Tepe (2333 m) from north to the south, which constitute the main part of Küçük Akdağlar. On the main road from Tlos to Termessos, only today’s Karabağlık Valley on the southern slope of Mount Hacıosman north of Tezli River fits the description of the southern ravine (Rv1; l. 33-37 and l. 88-91). The northern ravine (Rv2; l. 42-49) is today’s Deliktaş Valley, the only one that provides an exact cut to separate the mountain from northern range. Therefore, the southern and northern borders of Mount Masa, were defined by these two ravines and the other details mentioned below.

word can also be proposed for l. 66, taking into consideration these plateaux on the mountain. The word πεδιάσιος, ον (an adjective) employed in l. 80 gives a similar meaning. While it could have been a nominalized adjective as τὸ πεδιάσιον (Rousset 2010, 59), it can also be understood as ὁ πεδιάσιος (τόπος) like πτερώδης τόπος in l. 61 and 76. While there seems to be no large semantical difference between πλάξ and πεδιάσιον/πεδιάσιος (τόπος), it is possible to observe some differences in the field. The plateaux mentioned are all large, populated, cultivated and quite suitable for livestock. The area described as πεδιάσιον was somewhere between the Karanız and Makmara plateaux. This section has some small flat areas, but certainly not for settlement or farming, as they are not large enough, lack sufficient water sources and are surrounded by rocks. Today these small plain areas are only used for grazing. Another possible restoration suggested by N. P. Milner for l. 70 might be ... γῆν ἐ[φ’ ἧ]ς κα[ὶ] ..., similar to ἐφ’ ἧς ὁδοῦ καὶ ἐπεκολάψ...en in l. 37.

Then the translation of l. 69-70 would be “as the [ravine] extends up to the land on the highest level, on which we likewise carved a boundary mark on a rock...”.

———. (2010, 60-61 and 126) estimates this figure ca. 900 ha at most.
There are several small ravines which lead down to main road, but only the Karabağlık Valley matches the whole description. This deep ravine is at the south end of Hacıosman Dağı, and separates this section from the whole mountain range. Although the marker B1 could not be found, it meets the road from Tlos to Oinoanda exactly on the road, also the modern road, near Boyalı. The distance between the junction points of the southern and the northern ravines with the main road is ca. 9-10 km.

The demarcation surveyors moved to the northern ravine, which should have separated Mount Masa from the mountain range to the north and which meets the road in a place where the “Wooden Hermaion” (ξυλινὸν Ἐρμαιόν) was located, having passed through the “common burial-place” (πολυανδρεῖον). Rousset thought that the surveyors were at the top of a ravine (Rv2), right after Hermaion, but they were actually at the bottom, on the bed/hill of the Golbanounda, since this ravine mentioned in l. 44-46, Rv2, joins Golbanounda, which after this junction descends within ca. 800 m to main road. This ravine (Rv2), which descends from the peak of the mountain, is the Deliktaş ravine, which meets the Hacıosman stream (ancient Golbanounda) in the lower parts. So, they travelled on the main road, riding in a cart or a horse as the verb “πορεύω” used in l. 38 may indicate, ca. 10 km to the north along the western slope of the Mount Masa, traversing northwards from one ravine to another, the natural limits to the mountain. The common burial-place between these two points cannot be precisely determined, but Çökek, considering the ancient tombs there, or Kayaarası, where there is a boundary outpost, are candidates for its location. The “Wooden Hermaion”, which was a sanctuary of Hermes as Rousset defines it, indicates a location on the boundary between Tlos and Termessos where the bed of Golbanounda (Hacıosman Deresi) intersected the road. It is not clear on which side of the Golbanounda or the second ravine the Hermaion stood. Most probably it was on the Tloan side, namely to the south of Golbanounda, probably close to the outpost in Kayaarası. Ca. 45 m from the Hermaion, they reached a point where they were able describe the boundary line. It was a place probably exactly on the boundary, in the lower section of the Golbanounda.

The commission points a very short distance from the main road on the Golbanounda to the junction of the Golbanounda and the ravine coming from the right. The first ravine which joins the Golbanounda from the right is ca. 800 m above the road to the northeast, and bringing the Deliktaş Deresi stream. From this confluence, the boundary ran up the Deliktaş ravine to the ridgeway pass located ca. 1 km east of Gökbel Yaylasi. The remains of this second road still exist (see above p. 147 ff.). It provides a mountainous route, to northern highlands of Tlos. The distance between the junction of the Golbanounda with the Deliktaş ravine near Hermaion and the pass is 6,5-7 km.

The boundary followed the Deliktaş ravine, which has several side rocky streams, up to the pass. Today the stream names attached to the ravine are four: the lowest section joins the Hacıosman Deresi (Golbanounda), the middle part is called the Deliktaş Deresi; above this is the Kuru Dere, and the upmost section is the Sarı Dere. As the ancient surveyors reached the pass, they walked ca. 45 m. to the bottom of the ravine (Rv3) entering from the right, which was also the junction with the stream called Endyrenos. At this point they were in the bed of Endyrenos, today’s Sarı Dere. The meeting point of the (Deliktaş) ravine to the west, the ridgeway, running

---

19 Rousset 2010, 57-58 and fig. 43.
20 Rousset 2010, 57.
on a north-south axis, the third ravine to the south (Rv3) and the River Endyrenos to the south-east, is ca. 1 km southeast of Gökbel Yaylası. This point is the most precise location in the text. Exactly as described, there is a rock at this very point (l. 54), on which there seems to be a worn “Ο” (ὄρος / “boundary”) sign, 45 cm in diameter (B2; Fig. 21-Fig. 23).

The surveyors did not need to mark the ca. 18 km section between B1 and B2, which is near to the pass up on the mountain, since the Hermaion on the road and the ravine running from the river Golbanounda to the pass and to the Endyrenos, clearly defined the northern and north-western boundary of the demarcated area. The word κάμακες, sg. κάμακ, mentioned l. 48 and 50 is enigmatic. Its primary meaning is “vine-pole, vine-prop”. Rousset’s first suggestion is that this was a fence made of wooden poles to delimit a certain area, but he also gave a lengthy account of the word’s primary meaning, which Şahin also accepted. Both associated the term with viticulture in

---

Fig. 21) Gökbel Yaylası. B2 is visible as a large “Ο” on the rock (in middle) in the junction of Endyrenos (Sari Dere) and the ravine on the right (Rv3)

Fig. 22) B2 on the rock

Fig. 23) B2 on the rock

---

21 See LSJ s.v. κάμακ.
However, the geographical and topographical features of Hacıosman Dağı are unsuitable for viticulture. The altitude in the northern mountainous part of the demarcation, namely from *diodos* near the Gökbel Yaylası to the top of the first ravine near Çökek Yaylası, ranges between ca. 1750m and ca. 1870m. Grapes at this altitude have a very short ripening period and can only be cultivated with great care. Weather conditions including heavy showers, hail, and strong winds can pose great problems for vine cultivation, and yields would be too low for the high effort involved, although the product might be of high quality. A research group investigating the potential for grapevine cultivation in Turkey shows that the area of Akdağlar does not meet the conditions for production, and in their map the area is indicated as “uygun olmayan” (“unsuitable”). Vineyards might, however, have existed nearby in Gökbel Yaylası or on the northern banks of Tezli Dere, where there are south-facing sunny slopes at an altitude of ca. 1300m. Another suggestion for the meaning of κάμακες is that they formed a ford or causeway, marked by stakes. Poles marking the ford on the Saklıkent River can be seen in the painting of “Turkish Merchants crossing the River Mangerchi” by William Müller of 1845, showing that this ancient tradition persisted until recent times. The “Tloan Stakes” might refer to a ford on River Endyrenos, which would have formed the boundary itself, or they could have been stakes designed to stick out above the snow in winter, to mark a pathway, as there was enough winter snow, as is today, on the region for this to have been necessary.

Rousset prefers to locate “Tloan stakes” out of the demarcated area, while Şahin thinks that it was in the same place with the pass (*diodos* in l. 47-49; see also p. 147 above) of the ridgeway (see here fn. 22). This difference originated from their different approaches to the word εἴστε in l. 48: Rousset accepts a meaning identical to μέχρι, while Şahin takes it as “namely” (“yani” in Turkish), so the former accepts it as a destination of the ridgeway to the south, the latter as the upper end of the ravine in *diodos*. As Rousset points out (see fn. 26), the meaning of the word εἴστε is uncertain. Syntactically, in the sentence “καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτου ὡς ἀνατείνει ἡ αὐτὴ φάραγξ μέχρι τῆς διόδου τῆς φερούσης ἀπὸ Τερμησοῦ τῆς πρὸς Οἰνοάνδοις εἴστε κάμακας τὰς Τλῶ”, μέχρι defines the orientation of φάραγξ *up to the pass* and εἴστε defines the destination of “the ridgeway, which leads to the stakes of Tlos (as well)”. So, the meaning of “namely”

---

22 Rousset 2010, 22 and 120, see also fig. 43 (here Fig. 1 above). However, he cautiously kept the word in translation as “pieux”, i.e. “stakes” or “poles”; Şahin 2014, 217, see also his sketch in ibid, 219 (here Fig. 2 above). He translates it as “Tlos Bağları” in Turkish, i.e. “vineyards of Tlos”.


24 Alsancak Sırlı et al. 2015, 57, 60 and fig. 2.

25 Wallis – Chamberlain 1896, 7 no. 30 (a photo of the painting is between p. 10 and 11). Solly 1875, 294-295 described this painting as following: “The dark river swollen by recent rains is rushing impetuously over a rapid and the water is tumbling amidst rocks and the broken stumps of trees in the immediate foreground. The ford is indicated by tall poles placed here and there in the bed of the river, where some four or five baggage camels, led and urged on by their turbaned drivers, are seen fording the stream. On the left, some Turks are seen, kneeling near piles of picturesque oriental baggage strewn around; a kneeling camel shows they are occupied before crossing in readjusting the loads on the patient beast. Several other Turks, and one or two camels are standing near. On the far side of the river (the extreme right), underneath a rocky bank, the caravan appears to have just encamped, a number of Turks being collected around watch-fires.”; see also Duggan 2017, 506-508.

26 Rousset 2010, 55, 58; Şahin 2014, 217.
may logically make sense, since *diodos* and the stakes might have been in the same place. So, to me, it is better to understand εἴστε as εἰς or εἴς τε, instead of μέχρι.

**L. 56-65:** The surveyors turned right in the direction of the κάμακες, and entered the ravine (Rv3) between Yaylacık Tepe and Çataloluk Sırtı, leading south to the Karanız plateau. Remains of an ancient route leading up to Karanız, Makmara and other plateaux are still visible on the eastern side of this ravine (s. p. 147-15 above and Fig. 14-Fig. 18). There is also a pathway on the western side of the ravine, but it could only be followed until a rocky area.

![Fig. 24](image1.png) View to the north from the ridgeway. “Diodos” in the middle, as the junction of the Endyrenos (to the right, Sari Dere) and Rv3 (to the left), which joins it “from right”. East of Gökbel Yaylası.

![Fig. 25](image2.png) View to the south. Rv3 sloping up to Karanız Yaylası

![Fig. 26](image3.png) View to the north. Rv3 sloping down to diodos near Gökbel Yaylası

**L. 65-70:** Here it is understood that the ridgeway was close on the left-hand side. After B7 the surveyors crossed the road and continued with the road on their right. Here we also see that the ascent of the ravine ended with B11. Then they started to walk on the level plain.

**L. 70-78:** In the text the sole use of προέρχομαι (προελθόντες) possibly indicates the end of the ascent and the entrance into the plain, since they finally reached the plateau, today called Karanız Yaylası. Here they started to use flat rocks, as in this level area there are not many high rocks on the way.
L. 78-87: In this section a small plain, a πεδιάσιον, is mentioned, near which B15 was carved on a vertical rock. This should be one of the rocks in the small plains we walked through close to the defile. After B16, the surveyors turned right and crossed the defile (αὐχήν), leading to Sarıçukur and Teke Pınarı, as this is the only pass to the summit between the peaks of Hacıosmandağı Tepesi (2440 m) and Karanlık Tepe (2346 m). The surveyors crossed the mouth of the defile that ran to the east and continued south. They carved the last two boundary marks on the flat rocks on this side of the defile. In the text, the total distance given between B10 and B18 is ca. 1,142m, a length, which fits the distance between the western edge of the Karanız Plateau and a point a little beyond the defile. B13 is carved on a “stony place”, while B14 was carved after ca. 31m and B15 after ca. 185m in vertical positions in the middle of the plain. There is actually a semi-vertical rocky section to the western end of the plain, which fits with the distance, but no sign could be found on these
rocks. A walk from the last boundary mark ἐπὶ τὴν παρα[κε]μένην ἐξ εὐωνύμων φάραγγα (l. 87-88), ca. 3 km to the south, took them to the top of the first ravine (Rv1), through which the boundary passed down to B1 at the bottom of the Karabağlık Valley.

V. Closing remarks

This geographical investigation made throughout the area between Tlos and Termessos showed that there is no mount, which fits with all descriptions – nor in fact another with even a 50 per cent fit – other than Hacıosman Dağı. The identification of Mount Masa as today’s Hacıosman Dağı raises questions regarding the territories and frontier between Tlos and Termessos, both in the Hellenistic Period and in the Roman Imperial Era. The result of these geographical investigations has shown that Tloan, and so north Lycian territory extended to the northern end of Hacıosman Dağı, close to Termessos, in the Hellenistic Period. From the sentence “Τὸ δὲ Μασα ὄρος ἔστω Τλωέων” in l. 27 of the text, it is understood that Mount Masa was not within territory of Tlos earlier or it was a matter of debate, which was solved through this convention. However, the Termessans’ claim on the mount indicate its proximity to Termessos and that the Termessans earlier benefited from the mount. One of the questions with this localization seems to be the territorial affiliation of Çökek, which is located on the southwest slope of Hacıosman Dağı. We have no direct evidence as to the ancient affiliation of this site. Rousset citing Robert’s claim and based upon two inscriptions, BCH 24 (1900) 341, 2 (Seki) and TAM II 713 (Çökek), which carry identical texts and each mention a κτήτορι τῶν ἐνγαίων, indicates that Çökek was in Oinoandan territory during the Imperial Era, since these identical inscriptions most probably honoured the
same person, who was the “possessor” of the lands in the same territory, namely in that of Oinoanda. Depending on the territory of Oinoanda in the Imperial Period, the question arises as to how Tlos territory, which included Haciosman Dağı in the Hellenistic period, became reduced to the south of Çökek, i.e. Tezli Dere.

We know from the MP that these two cities were no longer neighbours, since a settlement called Plata [...] flourished between Tlos and Oinoanda (see above fn. 13), Kastabara was probably also another settlement between these two and Khoma, and so the territory of at least one, and probably both cities, as the MP shows, would have been reduced to make room for Plata [...] and also Kastabara, which was in the territory of Tlos in a later period in the imperial era. Perhaps, when Termessos was integrated into Lycian territory, it might have made possible only with the condition that the Termessans should be given Mount Masa, as the northern border of Lycia had often caused conflict with the northern neighbours. As we know from the foedus (see above fn. 2), Caesar re-assured the preservation of the Mount Masa in Lycian territory, or handed it over to Lycians. In this treaty, we see many place names, which were indicated as within the Lycian territory, while some of these later re-appear as the villages of Oinoanda in the imperial period, such as Marakanda, Ouauta and Elbessos. It can also be seen that the settlements on the northern border drawn in the foedus follow a near-straight line from the west to the east, and the location of Haciosman Dağı falls within this line, aligned at least with most of the names mentioned. We do not know what exactly happened in this duration. Even though these all are simply assumptions, it is clear that there was a new territorial arrangement, affecting the boundary between the lands of Termessos/Oinoanda and Tlos, dating back at least to the time when Lycia became a province of the Roman Empire, or to the time when Termessos became integrated into Lycia. In any circumstance, one should pay attention to that this was essentially a circular demarcation of Mount Masa, not of the boundary line between Tlos and Termessos, which most probably coincided only with some sections of the demarcation. Further investigation of Mount Masa is needed, not only to understand the territorial issues, but also to determine what made it so special in terms of its strategic, economic and common use for grazing and wood cutting. For this we are planning a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary research using modern geographical devices and methods.
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Helenistik Dönem Lykia’nın Kuzey Sınırlarında Masa Dağı
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The Location of Mount Masa on the Northern Border of Hellenistic Lycia

Abstract
A mount called Masa is mentioned in an inscription from the Letoon (Rousset 2010) and in the foedus (treaty) between Caesar and Lycia (Mitchell 2005), as northern border of Hellenistic Lycia. The inscription from the Letoon, which dates from sometime 160-150 B.C., reads that this mount has been the subject matter of a border conflict between Termessans at Oinoanda and Lycians. This conflict was resolved in a case tried in Kos and parties accepted that Mount Masa should belong to Tloans, but Termessans at Oinoanda could use its wood and grass being prohibited to sow, to harvest or to build on its lands. In the sequel, Lycians had to pay 25 talents of new Rhodian silver plinthophors to Termessans at Oinoanda. Within the frame of this agreement, Mount Masa was demarcated all around and all the details of demarcation fulfilled by a commission were given.
in the inscription. In addition to 18 boundary marks carved on bedrock, through several geographic descriptions such as roads, ravines, streams, defiles, plateaux and stony places, a comprehensive picture around the mount was presented. However, the location of the mount was not found, in spite of all the details given in the text. As a result of our 2019 campaign, the ravines are determined on the field and it is understood that Golbanounda, one of two streams mentioned in the inscription, was today’s Haciosman Deresi, and the second, Endyrenos, was today’s Sarı Dere, to the east of Gökbel Yaylası. Therefore, it has now been understood that Mount Masa was Haciosman Dağı of today. This contribution contains the details of this discovery.

Keywords: Mount Masa, Mount Haci osman, Tlos, Termessos, Oinoanda, Lycian Confederacy, boundary marks, Letoon.
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Fig. 36) Mount Masa between Tlos and Termessos at Oinoanda and the demarcated area (Base map: Google Terrain)
Fig. 37) The details of demarcation around Mount Masa in accordance with the text (Base map: Google Terrain)

Fig. 38) Rv1: Karabağlık Ravine (Google Earth)

Fig. 39) Rv2: Deliktaş Ravine (Google Earth)
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Fig. 40) View to the south (Google Earth)

Fig. 41) View to the North (Google Earth)

Fig. 42) View to east (Google Earth)
Fig. 43) View to the south (Google Earth)

Fig. 44) Photograph taken by Fatma Avcu, September 5th 2016, Bayırköy, as our team was investigating the course of the road between Tlos and Oinoanda. View to the east. I am looking towards Hacıosman Dağı