

and Narthakion.¹⁸ The two cities had quarreled previously, in the third century, again in the early second, and once again ca 143 B.C.¹⁹ Whether or not Melitaiia was accustomed to exploit third-party arbitration as a tool of territorial expansion,²⁰ it is clear that in the Hellenistic period the cities of Achaian Phthiotis fought hard to acquire and maintain territory.

The large swallowed small. Melitaiia absorbed Pēreia, which had subsumed two communities allied with Pēreia and Phylliadon.²¹ Stählin's notion that Phylliadon was home to the Phylliadonians who Karandai and Phylliadon decades before may be correct; either way his suggestion that Karandai and Phylliadon were once-autonomous communities that were absorbed by Pēreia is attractive.²² In adjudicating the boundary dispute between Melitaiia and Chalai, and Peuma, the judges referred to a *topos* called Κυρσιλίδα,²³ no doubt a rural village that was to some degree subordinate to one of the larger local cities.²⁴ The numerous territorial settlements from Achaian Phthiotis refer to a great many named places,²⁵ any number of which are likely to have been small villages that were accorded varying degrees of autonomy by the larger *poleis*, such as Melitaiia or Pēreia, whose territories encompassed them.²⁶ I suggest that the Herakleotes who shared an agora with Melitaiia inhabited such a village on Melitaiia's outskirts, and that this Herakleia, like other villages in the region, had been absorbed by the larger city.²⁷

Events on Syros may have been analogous. It is clear that the circumstances were extraordinary: something prompted two imperial letters. If two communities on the island decided to forge a common market, boundaries would have to be drawn and imperial sanction might be sought. The text is in poor shape, but Caracalla does seem to have referred in at least two places to the drawing of boundaries (*IG XII.5* 658.31–32; – | ὀρίξεσθ[–], 34–35; – | τὰ ὀριζόμενα τούτου . μ –).²⁸ The emperor refers to what

18 Sherck, *Roman Documents* 9 (Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations* [as in n. 13] 156); see R. M. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire: The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1995) 174–175; P. Baker, "La cause du conflit entre Méliitéa et Narthakion: Une note à propos de *IG IX* 2, 89," in L. Dubois and E. Masson (eds.), *Philokypros: Mélanges de philologie et d'antiquités grecques et proche-orientales: dédiés à la mémoire d'Oliver Masson* (= *Minos* suppl. 16, Salamanca 2000) 33–47.

19 Third: Sherck, *Roman Documents* 9.25–30 (Magneto, *Gli arbitrati* [as in n. 13] 11 31); Ager, *Interstate Arbitrations* [as in n. 13] 32; second: Sherck, 9.48–54, 63–65 (Ager 79); *ca* 143: Sherck 9.54–59; *AE* (1927–28) 119–127 (Ager 154). The senate found for Narthakion, invoking a prior ruling by T. Quinctius Flaminius: Sherck 9.59–65.

20 So Ager, *AHB* 3 (1989) (as in n. 16) 107–114.

21 *IG IX* 2.1 188.12–16: τὰν δὲ δημοσίαν χώραν, τούς τε Καράνδας καὶ τὰν Φυλιταδόνα, μὴ ἀποδόσθων Μελιταεῖς ὅστε πατρίαν ἔχεν τὸν πρῶτον πολίτην ὀνόματι | Πηρέων μετὰ Μελιταίων, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἀνάλογον μεταβούντω καθὼς καὶ τὸ πρότερον.

22 *Fouilles de Delphes* III.4 351.10–13: ἀπὸ Γρατας Ἀυλᾶς | ἐπὶ τὸν Κυρσιλίδα τόπον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρσιλίδα ἐστὶ τὸ | ἱερὸν καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ ὄριον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀπίου ἐστὶ τὸ Βορλιπᾶ ἱερὸν.

23 On *topos*: I. Sordis, *Buckler* I.A. 16–18 (*ca* 200); I. Linton 33.46–49 (*ca* 274 B.C.); I. Didyma 492.B.17–18, 23–25, 492.C.65; C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (New Haven 1934) 55.2–6 (163–155): διὸ καὶ νῦν τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀπορριζόμενος ἐστὶ τὸς τόπος καὶ ἐπισκευόμενος πάντα σαφῶς διασαφίσθη μοι πῶς ἐστὶ χρεῖται ἔξεις στρατιῶν, with p. 247: "By the τόπος, we meant, as often, the country districts;" *cf.* also *idem* 60.13–14; I. Sultian Dagli 1 393.6, with L. Jones and M. Riel, "A New Royal Inscription from Phrygian Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyrtaion the Status of a *Polis*," *Epigraphica* 29 (1997) 1–30, at 13 (*SEG* XLVII 1745).

24 See esp. *Fouilles de Delphes* III.4 351.10–16, 20–25; *IG IX* 2.1 177.12–17, 188.5–11.

25 For a sensitive treatment of the process of symploie see P. Gauthier, "Les Pidaséens entrent en symploie avec les Milesiens: la procédure et les modalités institutionnelles," in A. Bresson and R. Descat (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie mineure occidentale au I^{er} siècle a.C.* (Bordeaux 2001) 117–127.

26 Positive evidence for such a village does not appear to exist elsewhere. One can only wonder at the significance of the three words (all that survives of the inscription) preserved in *IG IX* 2.128 (Halos, ?; | – Μελαί?) [ραεὺς αὐτὸς Ἡρακλεῖ – |].

27 ὀριζόμεν[–] often refers to an appointed time or day; whether it does so here is uncertain. But ὀριζέσθ[–] at 31–32 does seem to refer to boundaries, so that ὀριζόμεν[–] may as well.

appears to be Septimius Severus' intervention on a prior occasion, letters that he himself wrote,²⁹ and perhaps a command (30, προεστ[ραξεν] – –). This is followed by an accusative (30–31, τὴν κλιον[ήν] | ἀγορὰν τ[ῶν] Σιυρίων) and what appears to be an infinitive (31–32, – | ὀρίξεσθ[–]; Septimius ἀφ' ὀριζέσθ[αι – ?]). While much is lost in the lacunas, a plausible syntax is apparent: "[Septimius Severus?] commanded that ... a common agora of the Syrians ... be demarcated." Perhaps "the common agora of the Syrians" was not a redundancy, but the very subject of the correspondence.³⁰

Who then enjoyed the common market? *Syrioi* alone issued coins³¹ and paid tribute to imperial Athens,³² but more than one community is attested on the island of Syros. In the fourth century B.C. Athenians and Delians knew of at least one man from Syrian Galéssos (modern Galéssas), a town on the west coast of the island, just a few kilometers as the crow flies from the city of Syros (modern Hermoupolis).³³ We lack incontrovertible evidence that Galéssos was a *polis*, i.e. that the island was *dipolis*,³⁴ but the site is unexcavated and Syrian inscriptions are few.³⁵ Without descending into the quagmire of Odyssaeian geography we might note that in antiquity Eumaios was thought to hold Syros in mind when he spoke of a certain island called *Syriē* (*Od.* XV 404, νῆσός τις Συρία κικλήσκεται), and when he spoke of a certain island called *Syriē* (*Od.* XV 412–414), ἐνθα δύο πόλεις, διχα δὲ σφαισι πάντα δέδασται / τῆσιν δ' ἄμφοτέρησι πατήρ ἐμὸς ἐμβασίλευε / Κτήσιος Ὀρμενίδης, ἐμπετέλοος ἀθανάτοισιν.³⁶ One island, one king, two

29 *IG XII.5* 658.24–25: – – – τού | θεοῦ μου πατρός εἰ[τα]ν[η]νε[γμ]εν[η]ν(?) – – –; 29: ὅσα γρά[φομεν] πρὸς τὰς πόλεις(?); or, should the first-person plural be taken to indicate the letter from him and his father?

30 It is unclear how best to construe the letters preceding: Le Bas, *Voyage archéologique* II.4 1892.30–31; N. ... ANT. ... ΟΙΝ. ... Ι ΑΓΟΡΑΝΤ. ... C. ... ΙΩ. ... ; should we restore something like <τ>[ο]ρ[ισ]αν[τα] τὴν κλιον[ήν] | ἀγορὰν τ[ῶν] Σιυρίων, in which case ἀφ' ὀριζέσθ[αι] would be construed as a middle?

31 Also Καθίρων Συρίων: *BMC Crete and Aegean* pp. 123–126; *cf.* Kern, "Kabeiros und Kabeiroi," *RE* 13.99–1450, at 1411–1412. Other island issues: Kos; Wroth, *BMC Troas* 151 nos. 13–14, 152 no. 21; Head, *HN* 2 632–634; Lesbos: Head, *BMC Caria* 194–220 *passim*.

32 *E.g.* *IG* 12 161.A.iv.31; 266.C.iv.22; 270.C.v.33; 282.A.iii.22; it was not uncommon, however, for islands with multiple cities to pay tribute as a group: *cf.* *Amorgioi* (*e.g.* *IG* 3 279.C.ii.80; 281.iii.58), *Kéoi* (*e.g.* *IG* 7 71.i.69; 263.A.iv.21; 270.C.iv.23); and *Kóioi* (*e.g.* *IG* 3 262.A.iv.15; 263.A.i.7; 265.B.i.37); *Amorgioi* joined the second Athenian naval confederacy: *IG* 12 43.B.ii.28; these islands stood, it is assumed, for their constituent cities, but non-*poleis* were signatory: M. Dreher, "Poleis und Nicht-Poleis im Zweiten Athenischen Seebund," in M. H. Hansen (ed.), *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State* (Copenhagen 1995) 171–200; see also in the same volume, W. Schuller, "Poleis im Ersten Attischen Seebund," 165–170.

33 *I.Délos* 98.B.a.18–19 (374/4); Πριτανεὺς Συρίος Γαλήσσιος ΔΑΔΑΓΓ. I.Délos 104(9).11 (355/4); though it bears remembering that if not for a passage in Ps.-Skylax and a single inscription we might think that Mykonos had only one *polis*: Ps.-Skylax, *Periopl.* 58 (Müller, *GGM* I pp. 46–47); ΝΗΣΙΟΙ ΚΥΚΛΑΔΕΣ. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἀττικὴν εἶσι νῆσοι αὶ Κυκλάδες καλούμεναι, καὶ πόλεις αὐτῆ ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ... Μύκονος (αὐτῆ διπολις); *Syll.* 3 1024.2–5 (Mykonos *ca* 200); ἐπ' ἀρχόντων Κρατίων, Πολυζήλου, Φιλόφρονος, ὅτε ἰ συνωκίσθησαν αὶ πόλεις, τότε ἔδοξεν Μυκονοῖς τε[ρ]τῆ | θεῖν πρὸς τοὺς πρότερον καὶ ἐπινορθῶθαι περὶ τῶν πρότερον. *Mykonioi* also paid tribute (*e.g.* *IG* 3 71.i.75; 262.A.1.11; 264.A.v.8) and joined the second confederacy (*IG* 12 43.B.ii.19). See G. Reger, "The Mykonian *Synokismos*," *REA* 103 (2001) 157–181; on islands with multiple *poleis*, including Mykonos, see *idem*, "Islands with One *Polis* versus Islands with Several *Poleis*," in M. H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community* (Copenhagen 1997) 450–492.

34 Ps.-Skylax, *Periopl.* 58 (Müller, *GGM* I pp. 46–47), does not call Syros *dipolis*; where he errs as to the number of cities on an island he overestimates: P. Flensted-Jensen and M. H. Hansen, "Pseudo-Skylax' Use of the Term *Polis*," in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub (eds.), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (= *Historia Einzelschriften* 108, Stuttgart 1996) 137–167, esp. 147–148.

35 *Cf.* A. Manthos, "Ευρημίαια ἐπιφανείας ἀπὸ τὸν Γάλησσὸς πῆς Σύρου," *AAA* 12 (1979) 39–45, esp. p. 40 fig. 1 for a picture of the bay.

36 Σ.XV 403 (Dindorf); Συρία | μετὰ τῶν Κυκλάδων ἡ Συρία, εἰρηται δὲ Συρία ὡς τὰ Ψύρα Ψύρια, "νῆσου ἐπὶ Ψύρτης," (*Od.* γ. 171.) [H]; μετὰ τῶν Κυκλάδων ἡ Συρία, ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενη Σύρα

cities. Whatever Homer meant,³⁷ Galässos, along with its harbor, stood in classical antiquity, and stands today, in the shadow of its larger neighbor to the east. I suggest that the Syrian story was not unlike the Melitaian, that the city Syros absorbed the smaller community. Perhaps this was an amicable merger, the one granting the other joint ownership of its agora. While the walk across the saddle in the hills between the two places is not very strenuous, the creation of a common market may have been attractive to both parties.³⁸ It would have conferred prestige on Syros as the principal partner and allowed Galässos a greater measure of economic freedom. The island is small and the gesture would be understandable.

On the other hand, the process prompted not one but two imperial letters, which suggests rather more than simple imperial ratification of local redistricting. Thus, we might conjecture that this union grew from a dispute,³⁹ as may have been the case with the *sympolitieia* of Melitaia and Pèreia. Perhaps Galässos launched an independent bid for market rights, circumventing Syros and going directly to the emperor. Dependent communities are known to have done so, but only very rarely, for such maneuvers risked provoking the anger of the neighboring *polis*.⁴⁰ Is this the sort of instigation that might have prompted a dispute on Syros? Boundaries had to be drawn, so that Syros may not simply have admitted Galässos to its existing agora. Instead, both seem to have submitted to the demarcation of new, common, ground. If this interpretation is warranted then Caracalla's mention of the common agora of the Syrians was not a simple passing reference, but a declaration, affirmation, or enforcement of status.

If these suggestions are correct then *IG XII.5 658* gives no cause to think that Syros was attempting to set grain prices,⁴¹ still less to think that in diverting trade in grain from the wide, deep, protected harbor at Peiraeus and re-directing it to a smaller, more exposed harbor in the middle of the Aegean, the emperor sought simultaneously to punish Athens and create a new common grain market for the entire Aegean basin.⁴² Whatever the stone said, there is no evidence to suggest that Syros' port was able at any point in antiquity to bear such a burden. Anyway, to understand the episode we need not resort to the politics of revenge or pan-Aegean markets. This looks like a familiar story: a local quarrel that made its way to the top.

Duke University, Durham, NC

Joshua Sosin

[B.O.] Suda, s.v. Pherekydés (214), would appear to concur that Syra is Syros: Φερεκυδῆς, Βάβυος, Σύριος· ἔστι δὲ νῆσος μετὰ τὸν Κυκλάδιον ἢ Σύρα, πλησίον Δήλου.

37 It has been suggested that Homer's Syrië was not Syros, but Syria, which some early traveler is alleged to have mistaken for an island; on this view: H. L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (London 1950) 80–84. S. Reinach, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure* (Paris 1888) 14–17, esp. 14 n. 10, followed I. N. Boulétra, *Γεωγραφία τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀρχαίας καὶ νεωτέρας* (1841) 108–109 [*non videt*] and L. Ross, *Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des Ägäischen Meeres* (Stuttgart 1843) II 25–27, in conjecturing that Syros' second city lay south of Galässos, near modern Phoinikas or Dellagrázia; this is also a possibility, although no inhabitants are attested from this place in antiquity, as they are from Galässos.

38 For a somewhat later imperial grant of market rights to what may have been a dependent village in the territory of Philadelphía: J. Nollé, Nundinas instituere et habere: *epigraphische Zeugnisse zur Einrichtung und Gestaltung von ländlichen Märkten in Afrika und in der Provinz Asia* (New York 1982) 59–86 (*SEG XXXII 1220*).

39 Emperors were called upon to settle territorial disputes: A. Aichinger, “Grenzziehung durch kaiserliche Sonderbeauftragte in den römischen Provinzen,” *ZPE* 48 (1982) 193–204; G. Burton, “The Resolution of Territorial Disputes in the Provinces of the Roman Empire,” *Chiron* 30 (2000) 195–215. Hadrian commissioned an enquiry into competing claims of ownership of the harbor and pasturage at Delphi: Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* (as in n. 1) 75. II.31–40.

40 J. Nollé, “Marktrechte außerhalb der Stadt: Lokale Autonomie zwischen Stathalter und Zentralort,” in W. Eck (ed.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1999) 93–113, esp. 99–101.

41 G. Reger, *Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1994) 114 n. 86, includes *IG XII.5 658.30–31* in a list of various interventions by the state in grain markets, including public purchase and price-setting.

42 Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* (as in n. 1) p. 492.